

Bylaws of the Department Of Information Technology

The University Of West Florida

Preamble

The Community of Scholars Concept dictates that policy making within a department be vested in the Faculty of the Department. In keeping with this concept, the Faculty of the Department of Information Technology shall recommend policy; the Department Chair shall carry out policy. For the purposes of this document, the Department Chair shall be defined as the person responsible for faculty evaluations and budgetary issues. In the firm conviction that orderly process is essential to the government of a department, we, the Faculty of the Department of Information Technology, do enact these bylaws.

1. Mission

The Department of Information Technology will deliver the highest possible quality of instruction to all students; develop a research program that will engage UWF students and contribute to our disciplinary knowledge; and seek to inspire and engage the UWF, regional, and national community through outreach activities.

2. Governance and Policies

2.1. The Faculty

The Department shall be administered by the Department Chair with advice from the Faculty. Subject to the Board of Trustees regulations and the bylaws of the University Faculty Senate and the Hal Marcus College of Science and Engineering Council, the Faculty shall develop the policies and procedures of the Department. The Faculty shall provide advice and recommendations to the Department Chair in matters of (1) educational policy, (2) promotion and tenure, (3) resource allocation priorities for equipment, personnel, and physical plant, and (4) student affairs.

2.2. Voting Membership

Members of the Faculty (including phased retirees during the term in which they teach) who hold the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, or lecturer are voting members of the Department.

All other persons affiliated with the Department (faculty associates, adjuncts, emeritus professors, and visiting faculty of any designation) are encouraged to attend and participate in faculty meetings, but are not extended voting privileges.

A majority vote shall be defined as greater than half of the eligible voters within the Department.

2.3. Department Meetings

Faculty meetings will be held at least twice during the Fall/Spring academic year. Special meetings may be called during the Fall/Spring academic year by the Department Chair or upon written request by three or more members of the Faculty.

2.4 Cancellation of Classes

In the event of an illness or emergency, the instructor must contact the chair at the earliest possible time. The Chairperson will attempt to arrange for a suitable substitute. If one cannot be found, the instructor should review the current schedule and make adjustments as needed to get the class back on schedule.

In the event of a planned absence, such as for a conference, the instructor must either arrange for a substitute, or make other adjustment to the course to keep the class on schedule.

3. Departmental Committees

3.1. The Scholarship Committee

This committee shall be responsible for assigning scholarship and assistantship funding.

3.2. The Curriculum and Assessment Committee

This committee shall develop programs for degrees, tracks, or options, and shall review and approve new course proposals, texts, and changes of current course descriptions. The committee shall also be responsible for the Department's continuous improvement process, reviewing reports from assessment activities and, as appropriate, recommending curriculum changes. Major proposed course modifications and other major recommendations shall be presented to the full Faculty for approval.

3.3. The Promotion and/or Tenure Committee

This *ad hoc* committee will be convened to consider requests for promotion and/or tenure. The committee will consist of all tenured faculty in the Department of Information technology; the Department Chair may also invite the participation of faculty from outside the Department if the committee would otherwise be inconveniently small. In all cases, the Department Chair shall not be a member of the committee. The committee shall discuss candidates for tenure and/or promotion and provide the Department Chair with a written recommendation at both the mid-point review time, and at the time of application for tenure and/or promotion. The committee will also carry out any additional tasks requested by the Chair related to the promotion and tenure process.

3.4. The Search Committees

These ad hoc committees are responsible for the recommendation of appropriate applicants for all open and converted faculty positions within the Department. Faculty search committees shall advertise and screen potential candidates for faculty positions, subject to the procedures and regulations of the University. Recommendations of these committees shall be submitted to the Department Chair for appropriate action.

3.5. The Mentoring Committees

As provided for in the University's Annual Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion Policy, the Department Chair will establish *ad hoc* mentoring committees to assist new faculty members in their professional growth and adaptation to the University.

The Chairperson will appoint a committee consisting of at least three members, at least two of whom are members of the Department, to mentor new faculty in tenure-earning positions. The Mentoring Committee is expected to meet with the new faculty member and to review progress toward tenure and promotion annually until the new faculty member applies for tenure or promotion. The Mentoring Committee will review the new faculty member's mid-point dossier, provide formative feedback to the faculty member, and prepare a written assessment to be shared with the faculty member and chairperson. The new faculty member and the Mentoring Committee should review all material in the annual file, including the Dean's and Provost's response to the previous year's evaluation by the Department. Copies of the Mentoring Committee Review Report are to go directly to the reviewed faculty member. A second copy of the committee report will go to the Chair for inclusion in the overall new faculty member's annual evaluation. The reviewed faculty member must review and sign the Mentor Committee Review Report, which will be kept in the faculty member's personnel file.

3.6. Additional Committees

The Department Chair may form additional ad hoc committees to carry out specific tasks when such are needed for the functioning of the Department.

4. Membership of Committees

When vacancies are open on any committee, the Department Chair shall poll the Faculty for volunteers or nominations. The Chair shall then name committee members having regard for the experience of each member of the Faculty and for the need for diverse representation of viewpoints. In case of conflicts, the Chair shall call for a vote of Faculty.

5. Voting Procedures

Issues carried to the Faculty for resolution by vote require a majority of eligible voters for passage. Eligible voters are those faculty identified in section 2.2. Absent members may vote by means of a signed proxies.

6. The Department Chair

The Department Chair is expected to provide leadership for the faculty in the areas of teaching, research, curriculum and program development, and general university service. The chair nominates ad hoc committees, supervises all elections, and administers the academic and budgetary policies of the Department with advice and assistance from the Faculty.

6.1. The Department Plan

The Department Chair is charged with the task of preparation and maintenance of a long-range plan consistent with the academic planning process of the University. This plan shall be presented annually to the Faculty for informational purposes.

6.2. Performance Evaluation

The term of service as Department Chair will be four years, and is able to be renewed based on input from the faculty and approval of the HMCSE Dean. Performance of the Chair will be evaluated using the procedures and instruments developed by the departmental committee formed for that purpose.

7. Tenure and Promotion

UWF has adopted a set of criteria and standards for the assessment of a faculty member's performance of assigned duties and responsibilities. There are three performance categories: teaching, scholarship and creative projects, and service. These assessment criteria from each of the performance categories shall form the basis for promotion and tenure decisions. The following performance levels will be used in evaluating faculty efforts in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service.

Poor - Unacceptable level of performance, and major areas of weakness require remediation.

Fair - Overall performance includes some strengths, but one or more major weaknesses exist.

Good - Overall performance includes some strengths, but one or more minor weaknesses exist.

Excellent - Meets department standards for professional performance, and no areas of weakness exist.

Distinguished - Exceeds department standards for professional performance, and exceeds the standards for excellence in quality, quantity, or both.

For details on the above rankings, please refer to section 7.3.

7.1. Minimum Standards

The minimum performance standards are expected with sustained effort throughout the evaluation period. Evaluation will be based on the three categories: teaching, scholarship and creative projects, and service.

7.1.1. Mid-Term Review

In accordance with UWF policies on Tenure and Promotion, the Department shall conduct a tenure mid-term review approximately half way through each faculty member's probationary period. This would normally be during the third year of a faculty member's appointment at the UWF unless a different probationary period was indicated in the appointment letter. The Chair shall establish an appropriate timeline for each faculty member's review process.

7.1.1.1. Mid-Term Review Process

It is the responsibility of the faculty member's mentors to guide the faculty member in preparing the mid-point review. The faculty member shall prepare a dossier for review summarizing activities during the probationary period, as defined in UWF's T & P guidelines, containing at least the following items:

- a) Letter of Initial Appointment.
- b) Statement of Contributions (self-evaluation).
- c) Current CV.
- d) Annual Evaluations.
- e) Student/Peer Evaluations of Teaching.
- f) Examples of Teaching Materials.
- g) Evidence of Scholarship.
- h) Examples of Service.

The Mentoring and Tenure and Promotion Committees shall review the dossier and provide written recommendations to the Chair, with a copy to the faculty member. Recommendations may include suggestions for a performance enhancement plan if such seems indicated.

Faculty members may elect to include a copy of the mid-point review recommendations in the tenure portfolio; however, inclusion is not required.

7.1.2. Tenure

To be granted tenure, a faculty member must demonstrate excellent teaching and at least one Excellent and at least one Good rating in the other two categories.

Scholarship and Creative Activity Indicators:

- At least three peer-reviewed journal publications and the equivalent of one tier-one item (tier-one items are elaborated in section 7.3.2) over the evaluation period.

7.1.3. Promotion to Associate Professor

To be promoted to Associate Professor, a faculty member must demonstrate excellent performance in all three categories.

Scholarship and Creative Activity Indicators:

- At least four peer-reviewed journal publications and the equivalent of two tier-one items (tier-one items are elaborated in section 7.3.2) over the evaluation period.

7.1.4. Promotion to Full Professor

To be promoted to Full Professor, a faculty member must demonstrate distinguished performance in at least one category and at least excellent in each of the other two categories.

Scholarship and Creative Activity Indicators:

- At least five peer-reviewed journal publications (after promotion to Associate) and the equivalent of three tier-one items (tier-one items are elaborated in section 7.3.2) over the evaluation period.

7.2. Criteria

It is expected that all faculty will conduct themselves in accordance with the policies outlined in UWF Professional Standards, and the UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement Collegiality will be used in the evaluation. Criteria evaluating teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service include, but are not limited to, the following (the order of the listing does not reflect relative importance):

7.2.1. Teaching

For tenure and promotion, a record of excellent teaching is required. Teaching effectiveness can be demonstrated with, but is not limited to

- Satisfactory student evaluations
- Peer evaluations of teaching based on direct observation including, but not limited to, classroom observation
- Organization and planning of courses
- Clear and definitive explanation of assignments
- Engaging students in research projects
- Implementing new/innovative learning strategies
- Updating course material to incorporate advancements in the field
- Design, develop, and deliver new courses and/or programs
- Conference workshop or seminar participation related to specialized area
- Teaching awards
- Participation in teaching-development programs
- Teaching specialty topics in seminars, discussion groups, and other student-centric delivery forums
- Directing students in undergraduate and graduate theses
- Directing students in undergraduate and graduate projects

7.2.2. Scholarly and Creative (Research) Activity

Scholarly and creative activity consists of creative works that are externally reviewed and publicly available, including, but not limited to

- Peer-reviewed journal publications
- Developed software that is in use by industry, academic institutions, or is publicly available through a well- recognized software-dissemination organization. Examples include GNU and Open Source.
- Internally sponsored research
- Externally sponsored research
- Peer-reviewed conference publications
- Invited talks on research area
- Chapters or books on specialized subjects
- Presentations resulting in peer review of research
- Poster sessions resulting in peer review of research
- Organize conferences or workshops

7.2.3. Service

Service is broadly defined and includes a wide range of services including, but not limited to

- Service on University, College, and Department governance
- Service as Department Chair or program director
- Community service related to one's discipline
-
- Directly providing, or actively facilitating, activities leading to student professional development with internal or external partners
- Activities that identify and expand internship and practicum opportunities for students and nurture those industry relationships.
- Advising student organizations
- Advising student curricula
- Service to professional organizations
- Services related to recruitment and retention of students
- Service on editorial review boards
- Service on conference committees
- Articulation efforts at various levels
- Outreach activities that promote the Department
- Participation in Computer Science and Information Technology professional organizations or their local chapters
- Organize or participate in the implementation of district-wide activities such as programming contests, mathematical or science contests, science fairs, and other science-education activities.
- Textbook, manuscript, and grant-reviewing activity
- Curriculum development to meet the needs of the community and to keep abreast of the rapidly evolving computing sciences
- ABET and ACM accreditation activities
- Recruitment and retention activities

7.3. Departmental Criteria for Evaluation

7.3.1. Teaching

In this performance area, the ratings in the first three performance categories (Poor, Fair, Good) do not facilitate favorable tenure and promotion decisions.

7.3.1.1. Poor

This performance level demonstrates serious problems in attaining success in the teaching role as reflected either by (1) a combination of many negative indicators or (2) fewer but more extreme behaviors that produce substantial negative outcomes on students and their learning. In general, teaching performance is well below the Department standards of excellence.

Indicators

- Student evaluations document consistent and substantive problems (ratings well below the Department average)
- Teaching philosophy missing, poorly articulated, or poorly expressed in course activities and planning
- Syllabi fail to establish clear and relevant expectations
- Assessment practices are inadequate to support student learning and Department needs (e.g., learning outcomes are inadequate, inappropriate, or missing; testing strategies are not effective or fair)
- Goals and course content reflect no continuous improvement efforts; no assistance rendered for Department assessment plan
- Pedagogical practices are unsound (e.g., disorganization; late, missing, unhelpful feedback; standards too lax or too challenging; routinely poor preparation; disengaging, chaotic, or hostile classroom environment)
- Student support practices are unsound (e.g., late or absent for class, not responding to email, not keeping office hours, showing favoritism)
- Consistent and very negative ratings in advising, mentoring, and supervision of students' scholarly or creative activities
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, general education) avoided or poorly executed
- Chronic academic integrity concerns identified including evidence of disrespect for students and their rights
- Does not engage in experiences that would facilitate improvement of teaching

Implication:

Requires major remedial work.

7.3.1.2. Fair

Demonstrates some positive teaching outcomes, but produces major areas for concern that have a moderately negative impact on students and their learning typically as reflected by a combination of several of the indicators below. In general, teaching performance is moderately below the Department standards of excellence.

Indicators:

- Student evaluations document areas of moderate concern (ratings below the Department average)
- Teaching philosophy not clearly expressed in course planning and activities
- Syllabi need to provide clearer and more appropriate expectations
- Assessment practices show some difficulty in supporting student learning and meeting department needs
- Goals and course content reflect limited continuous improvement effort
- Some pedagogical practices need attention
- Some student support practices need improvement
- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices need improvement
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, general education) could be executed with greater competence
- Occasional challenges related to academic integrity, including disrespect for students and their rights
- Does not typically participate in teaching development activity

Implication:

Some remediation is necessary. Change will need to be substantial to qualify for tenure and promotion.

7.3.1.3. Good

Demonstrates overall teaching effectiveness, but some minor areas for concern, typically reflected by some combination of the indicators listed below. In general, teaching performance is mildly below the Department standards of excellence.

Indicators:

- Student evaluations document adequate impact on learning
- Teaching philosophy expressed in course planning and activities
- Syllabi provide reasonably clear and appropriate expectations
- Assessment practices support student learning and contribute to department needs
- Goals and course content give evidence of continuous improvement effort
- Majority of pedagogical practices is appropriate and effective
- Majority of student support practices are appropriate and effective
- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices are appropriate and effective
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, general education) executed with reasonable skill
- Maintains appropriate standards of academic integrity, including respect for students and their rights
- Participates in teaching development activities when directed to do so

Implication:

Performance at this level suggests positive potential, but does not justify tenure or promotion.

7.3.1.4. Excellent

Demonstrates consistent high-quality teaching with positive outcomes for student as reflected by the indicators below. In general, performance at this level meets all or almost all Department standards of excellence.

Indicators:

- Student evaluations document consistently positive impact on learning
- Teaching philosophy provides foundation for coherent course planning and activities
- Proposing projects to enhance the Department of Information Technology educational program, as supported by UWF internal funding (e.g., ITEP or QEP)
- Syllabi outlines comprehensive, clear, and appropriate performance expectations
- Assessment practices enhance student learning and contribute to department needs
- Goals and course content routinely provide evidence of continuous improvement effort
- Pedagogical practices facilitate optimal learning conditions
- Student support practices facilitate optimal student development
- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices receive consistent favorable review
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, general education) executed with expert skill
- Appropriate standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights
- Participates voluntarily in professional development activities to improve teaching quality and flexibility

Implication:

Performance at this level justifies favorable tenure and promotion decision.

7.3.1.5. Distinguished

Demonstrates unusually high degree of quality in teaching as shown by the following indicators that build upon indicators for excellence. In general, performance at this level exceeds Department standards of excellence.

Indicators:

- Securing and deploying projects to enhance the Department of Information Technology educational program, as supported by UWF ITEP funding
- Numerical student evaluation data document clear statistical exceptionality vis-à-vis program peers
 - The Department Chair and faculty will evaluate SAI data to identify specific metrics for the targeted teaching items 8, 17, and 18
- Narrative statements emphasize powerful impact on learner or transformative learning experiences
- Teaching awards honor high caliber of performance
- Leadership evident in the promotion of high-quality teaching and curriculum development in the Department
- Descriptions of meaningful engagement in, and response to, the teaching peer-review process
- Developing industry partnerships that directly contribute to student professional development

Implication:

Performance at this level easily justifies favorable tenure and promotion decision.

7.3.2. Scholarship and Creative Activities

In this performance area, the ratings in the first two performance categories (Poor, Fair) do not facilitate favorable tenure decisions, and the ratings in the first three performance categories (Poor, Fair, Good) do not facilitate favorable promotion decisions. Ratings are based on two tiers of accomplishments. The indicators listed below are for the evaluation period. While all accomplishments listed in the two tiers are considered significant activities, the tier-one accomplishments demonstrate a level of maturity within the discipline.

Tier-one exemplars include IT-related accomplishments:

- Peer reviewed journal publication
- Securing competitive external grant of approximately \$10,000 or more
- Conference publications, with a peer-review process equivalent to that required to publish a peer-reviewed manuscript (e.g., documents revision process, acceptance rate of approximately 35% or less, etc.)
- Organized conference or workshop
- Authored widely accepted software
- Authored book or textbook for professional/academic publisher
- Authored chapter in research book for professional/academic publisher.

Tier-two exemplars include computing-related accomplishments:

- Peer-reviewed conference publication, without documented peer-review process
- Securing competitive external grant of approximately \$10,000 or less
- Pursuing competitive external grant of approximately \$10,000 or more
- Securing internal or noncompetitive research contracts and grants
- Peer-reviewed poster session
- Peer-reviewed conference presentation
- Lead session in conference workshop or panel discussion
- Contributed to widely accepted software
- Invited to talk on research
- Edited book or textbook
- Published technical report

Tier-one and tier-two items are the means for measuring the criteria for the different performance categories. Three tier-two items are considered equivalent to one tier-one item; tier-two items can be used to replace only a single tier-one requirement.

7.3.2.1. Poor

Demonstrates serious problems in developing scholarship and creative projects as reflected by the indicators below. In general, scholarly, and creative production is well below the Department standards of excellence.

Indicators:

- Scholarly agenda or creative plan has not been identified (e.g., central focus of career interest has not materialized)
- Minimal pursuit of scholarly and creative projects
- No pursuit of professional organization involvement that could help disseminate or display faculty work
- Failure to pursue expected professional enhancement activities (e.g., licensure, continuing education, technology training)
- No pursuit of funding for scholarly and creative activities
- Ethical regulations violated regarding scholarly or artistic production
- No documented attempts at scholarly and creative activities

Implication:

Major remedial work is required. Scholarship and creative projects mentors should be considered.

7.3.2.2. Fair

Demonstrates only minor tangible progress toward executing a scholarly and creative agenda as shown by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative projects are moderately below the Department standards of excellence.

Indicators:

- General focus of interest identified
- Evidence of some completion of beginning stages of scholarly process (e.g., data collection, manuscript outline, creative project plan)
- Exploration of possible scholarly collaboration or resource network to help with specific plan
- Professional organizations identified that will support scholarly and creative goals
- Appropriate professional educational opportunities (e.g., licensure, technology training, special educational opportunities) identified
- Sources of external support for scholarship or creative activities agenda identified and explored
- Judgment about ethical standards for scholarly and artistic production may be problematic at times
- Limited documented attempts at scholarly and creative activities

Implication:

No support for tenure or promotion, but shows future productivity promise.

7.3.2.3. Good

Demonstrates moderate tangible progress in scholarship or creative activity agenda as shown by the indicators below, but work falls mildly below Department standards of excellence in quality and quantity.

Indicators:

- Equivalent of at least one tier-one item in the current year and one journal publication in the last three years.

Implication:

May qualify for tenure if other effort areas are at least excellent, but does not qualify for promotion.

7.3.2.4. Excellent

Demonstrates satisfactory execution of scholarship or creative activity agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university context as shown by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative projects meet the Department standards for excellence in both quality and quantity.

Indicators:

- Equivalent of at least one tier-one item in the current year and two journal publications in the last three years.

Implication:

Performance at this level facilitates favorable promotion/tenure decisions.

7.3.2.5. Distinguished

Demonstrates unusually high degree of skill in design and execution of scholarly and creativity projects as shown by the indicators below that build upon the indicators for excellence. In general, this performance exceeds Department standards for excellence in both quality and quantity.

Indicators:

- Equivalent of at least one tier-one in the current year and at least three journal publications in the last three years.

Implication:

Easily qualifies for favorable promotion and tenure decisions.

7.3.3. Service

In this performance area, the ratings in the first two performance categories (Poor, Fair) do not facilitate favorable tenure decisions. The ratings in the first two performance categories (Poor, Fair) do not facilitate favorable promotion decisions to associate professor, and the ratings in the first three performance categories (Poor, Fair, Good) do not facilitate favorable promotion decisions to Professor.

7.3.3.1. Poor

Demonstrates serious problems in fulfilling appropriate service role for faculty as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is well below the Department standards for excellence.

Indicators:

- Service activity nonexistent or very poor in quality, producing a potentially adverse impact on the goals of the relevant organization.
- Community service, if any, does not in any way provide synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions, for example, serving as the director of a local church choir.

Implication:

Remedial work is required; may include recommendation to find a context that is a better match to the individual's service values than the substantial service needs relevant to the regional comprehensive context. No support for tenure or promotion.

7.3.3.2. Fair

Demonstrates only minor tangible progress in service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is moderately below Department standards for excellence.

Indicators:

- Appropriate arenas for service identified and explored
- Minimal contributions made in service role (e.g., "sits" on committees as compared to active participation)
- Recognition of service obligation in faculty role shapes consideration
- Over-commitment to service spreads faculty time and energy too thinly to facilitate effectiveness
- Community service, if applicable, provides limited, tangential synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and service functions.

Implication:

No support for tenure/promotion.

7.3.3.3. Good

Demonstrates major tangible progress in relevant service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is somewhat below Department standards for excellence.

Indicators:

- Emerging service agenda reflects reasonable expectation for rank
- Selection of service activity expresses understanding of faculty service role in regional comprehensive university
- Usually participates actively and constructively in service activity
- Usually effective in service as citizen of the Department
- Balance across service obligations may be a struggle
- Community service, if applicable, provides reasonable synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions

Implication:

Acceptable performance early in career as potential is demonstrated, but expectation is that service excellence is the standard that produces positive personnel decisions.

7.3.3.4. Excellent

Demonstrates satisfactory execution of service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service contributions meet the Department standards for excellence.

Indicators:

- Scope and effort level meet Department standards
- Colleagues view contributions to the Department as effective
- Service agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university mission
- Service contributions represent strategic decisions that balance demands from the discipline, department, campus, and community
- Potential shown for wide recognition inside and outside of the university
- Community service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions. For example, serving as the technical consultant for a local school.

Implication:

Performance at this level qualifies for favorable promotion/tenure decisions.

7.3.3.5. Distinguished

Demonstrates high degree of skill in service contributions as shown by the indicators below that build upon indicators for excellence. In general, service contributions exceed the Department standards for excellence.

Indicators

- Leadership demonstrated in targeted arenas of service (e.g., holds elected office; collaborates skillfully and innovatively)
- Problems solved proactively through vigorous contributions
- Wide external recognition (local, national, or international audiences) or awards achieved for quality of service contributions
- Community service provided significant and measurable impact; service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions

Implication

Performance easily qualifies for favorable tenure and promotion decisions.

8. Amendments

These bylaws may be amended by a majority vote of the Faculty. The text of any proposed amendment must be submitted in writing to the members of the Faculty as an agenda item at least one week prior to the meeting at which the amendment is to be voted upon.

9. Enactment

The provisions of these bylaws shall be enacted and shall govern the activities of the Department upon an affirmative vote of the majority of the Department.

10. History

June 5, 2017	Drafted for review by faculty
August 11, 2017	Distributed to faculty for review
October 31, 2017	Revised version distributed to faculty for review
November 1, 2017	Accepted by faculty as provisional bylaws
May 17, 2018	Revised version distributed to faculty for review
June 29, 2018	Final 2018 revision submitted for faculty review
July 16, 2018	Accepted by faculty and forwarded to HMCSE Dean