DEPARTMENTAL BYLAWS
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
v1.0, 2018-09-21

I.   Statement of Principles
The History Department at the University of Massachusetts Amherst is dedicated to the idea that an understanding of the past is essential to a free and enlightened citizenry. The History Department's mission is to teach and encourage the intellectual growth of our students, to further cutting-edge research, and to promote the role of our department in the university at large, the profession, and beyond. These bylaws are designed to provide a framework for the History Department's governance. They were first adopted by the faculty of the Department on September 21, 2018.

II.   Faculty membership, rights, privileges, and responsibilities
The Department's faculty (the "Faculty") includes all faculty in the Department without regard to bargaining-unit status, tenure status, or full-time equivalency. In general, members of the Faculty have the right and responsibility to participate in governance of the Department, except as specified elsewhere in these bylaws.

Non-Unit Faculty. Non-unit faculty (department chair, associate deans, deans, and other non-unit administrators) may not participate as voting members in personnel actions governed by the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). Such non-unit faculty members may not serve on the Departmental Personnel Committee and may not participate as voting members of the Faculty in promotion and tenure cases. Non-unit faculty may participate in other aspects of academic governance (such as curricular decision-making and faculty searches), provided those faculty do not have separate administrative purview over the same matters.

III.   Departmental Units (committees and officers)
A. Committees: The Department maintains the following standing and ad hoc committees:
*   Department Personnel Committee/Department Executive Committee (See below)
*   Graduate Studies Committee (also serves as Graduate Admissions Committee): The GSC, chaired by the GPD, includes, in addition to the GPD, 5-7 members of the department faculty (of any rank), appointed by the chair in consultation with the GPD. One of the faculty members may be from the Five Colleges.
*   Undergraduate Studies Committee (as also serves as the curriculum committee for undergraduate matters). The USC is chaired by the UPD; it consists of a minimum of three members, who may be faculty (of any rank), appointed by the chair in consultation with the UPD.

    Ad hoc committees, appointed by the chair, include:
*   Feinberg Family Lecture Series
*   Search committees
*   Other committees as appropriate

B. Major service positions in the department:
*   The Department Chair serves a term of three years (see below)
*   The Scheduling Officer/Associate Chair is appointed by the chair for a three-year term; duties here include working with the Undergraduate Program Assistant and the Faculty to craft each semester's schedule (including surveying faculty for course preferences and balancing departmental needs, working to ensure an equitable balance of teaching assistants, and assisting

faculty with proposing new courses and course changes); taking minutes at department meetings; consulting with Chair and other departmental officers on administrative matters; and stepping in for Chair to represent the department as needed. A course release of 1 course/semester is typical.

- The Undergraduate Program Director is appointed by the chair for a three-year term; duties here include advising existing and prospective majors; helping craft the UG curriculum; chairing the Undergraduate Studies Committee; nominating students for awards, and generally promoting the major. The UPD directs the work of the UP Assistant, the UG Internship and Career Advisor, and any peer mentors. A course release of 1 course/semester is typical.

- The Graduate Program Director is appointed by the chair for a 3-year term; duties here include overseeing each student's progress toward their degree; helping craft the graduate curriculum; chairing the Graduate Studies Committee; making TA assignments; planning the spring Writer-in-Residence program; and working with the Graduate Admissions director to manage admissions. The GPD directs the work of the GP Assistant. A course release of 1 course/semester is typical.

- The Department Personnel Committee Chair is elected by the members of the DPC at the first meeting of the academic year. The DPCC's duties are described in section V.C below).

- The Public History Program Director is appointed by the chair and oversees the activities of the program, the progress of the students, and, especially, the many outreach activities the program undertakes to create learning opportunities for the students and to raise the profile of the program and department in the community, region and nation. Some course accommodation is typical.

- The Honors Program Director is appointed by the chair, and obtains FERPA certification and gain access to "SPIRE for Advisors" and "SPIRE Query; recruits honors students proportionate to the number of undergraduates served by the major; provides information to Departmental Honors Students, CHC students not yet in DH, and outstanding students who are potential national and international scholarship competitors; stimulates increased department faculty participation in Commonwealth Honors College; and reviews and approves honors courses created via contracts and petitions, SPIRE-advertised honors courses, DH track and CHC standards, and Multidisciplinary Honors (MH) plans that relate to the major. Each spring semester the HPD will typically teach the Honors Seminar for students completing Honors Theses that year as one of their regular course assignments.

C. Department Chair
The department shall be headed by a chair who is responsible for ensuring proper procedures are followed at the departmental level. Other roles and responsibilities include: advocating for faculty resources, overseeing allocation of resources, coordinating administrative matters related to personnel actions, keeping faculty informed of their rights and responsibilities, appointment of administrative positions, ensuring compliance with University policies and collective bargaining agreements, evaluation of staff, and developing and maintaining long range planning. *(See also 3.5 and 6.4 of the Redbook*)

1. History Department Chair Search Procedures
   (April 14, 1999; updated/affirmed April 26, 2016) (Note that chair appointments are governed by Senate Documents No. 90-029 and 90-029C.)

   The Dean, after consulting with the Department Personnel Committee (DPC), shall appoint a Search Committee that includes the members of the DPC as well as one or two representatives of closely related departments. The Search Committee presents its recommendation to both the department and the Dean, and if a majority of the department accepts the recommendation and the Dean agrees, then the Dean shall proceed with the appointment with the concurrence of the Provost.

Step One: Straw Polls.
We begin by holding one or more straw polls. The names of all tenured faculty are included on the first ballot. Former Chairs are listed on the ballot with a notation as to the years of their service. Subsequent ballots, if needed, may consist of the names of the frontrunners only.

All full-time faculty participates in the balloting. Voters are instructed to check the names of those colleagues they believe the committee should consider as candidates.

Step Two: Identifying Candidates.
The Search Committee reviews the straw poll results. The committee then contacts the top vote-getters to determine whether they are willing to be considered for the post.

Step Three: Short List.
After contacting prospective candidates, the Search Committee draws up a short list of candidates. Dividing itself into pairs, the committee contacts all faculty to solicit their individual comments on the short list candidates. Best practice is for pre-tenure faculty to be consulted by the external member or members; any member of the faculty may request an individual meeting with the external member or members. To assure as much candor as possible, each pair should report their findings to the full committee without revealing the names of individuals who expressed a given opinion about a candidate or candidates.

Step Four: Final Ballot.
The Search Committee presents one or more names to the full department for a secret ballot. In the case of a contested election, the name receiving a majority is forwarded to the Dean.

If a majority of the department accepts the recommendation, but the Dean does not, the Dean shall meet with the department to achieve a resolution. If that fails, the matter shall be referred to the Provost for resolution, in consultation with the department. If a majority of the department rejects the recommendation, the Dean shall meet with the department and the Search Committee to try to resolve the matter. If no resolution is achieved, the Dean may re-open the search with the same or different search committee or refer the matter to the Provost for resolution, in consultation with the department. (See Senate document no. 90-029.)

2. Review of Chairs
   Chairs who are continuing in office shall be evaluated during every third year in office in a review process initiated by the Department Personnel Committee, in keeping with Senate Documents nos. 90-029 and 82-021.

IV. **Department Meetings (Committee of the Whole)**
    Department meetings, which include all full and part-time faculty members, shall be convened by the chair for the purpose of sharing information, seeking counsel from members of the department, receiving reports and recommendations from standing committees, and conducting other departmental business.

   A. Schedule and frequency of meetings
   The department will aim to meet roughly once each month during the regular semester, though meetings may be called more often when issues of particular urgency demand it. The department chair will strive to schedule meetings at varied times, to accommodate a range of schedules.

   A. Faculty Duty of Participation.
   The Department expects that all Faculty members attend all general faculty meetings as well as all special meetings. For purposes of a quorum, Tenure-system faculty only will be counted.

B. Notification of meetings
The chair will send out a schedule at the beginning of each semester establishing the dates of meetings, and send out a reminder email a week or so before the meeting.

C. Distribution of agendas and minutes
The Chair will distribute an agenda for each regular Department meeting at least 48 hours before the meeting. Any member of the faculty may submit items for the agenda. The Chair will publish the agenda for any special meeting at the time of the meeting's announcement.

D. Minutes and Recordkeeping.
Department meeting minutes are taken by the Associate Chair, or, in his or her absence, an alternate member of the faculty; minutes are then circulated to the faculty, delivered to the Office Manager, and submitted for approval at the following department meeting. If minutes are revised before approval, the Associate Chair will deliver the revised and approved minutes to the Office Manager. The Department will maintain records of all meetings, including minutes and votes, for at least five years.

E. Normal department voting procedures
All faculty in the tenure system or with multi-year contracts (and if they have a shared appointment those whose home department is History), without regard to bargaining unit status, are full voting members of the department. On matters requiring a vote of the Faculty, voice votes or a show of hands on any matter are traditional and preferred unless any individual member of the Faculty requests (either prior to or during the meeting) a secret ballot. Votes may be made by proxy or electronically in a method to be determined by the Chair. Except as otherwise specified in these bylaws, a simple majority vote will suffice to carry a motion.

F. Quorum
A quorum will consist of fifty percent plus one of the voting faculty in residence., i.,e. not on leave of any kind.

V.   **Department Personnel Committee (DPC)**
The MSP contract mandates that faculty at the department level establish, once a year, a personnel committee in order to exercise the responsibilities described in the collective bargaining agreement. These include but are not limited to: review of AFRs; distribution of merit; reappointments, promotions and tenure; anomaly requests and PMYR processes. The term of service for DPCs begins at the end of the spring semester in which it is elected until the end of the following spring semester. For summer-time work, members of the previous DPC who are available may be called upon for advice. Only members of the MSP bargaining unit are eligible to serve on and vote on DPC matters.

A. Election and Constitution of the DPC (Passed by the department on 4/29/2015; updated/affirmed April 26, 2016; revised September 21, 2018)

1. The Personnel Committee is to be composed of seven tenure-track and tenured faculty members. Of the seven members, no more than two may be pre-tenured.

2. Only faculty who are members of the bargaining unit may vote in the DPC election (per the 2017-20 CBA). All bargaining unit members who are tenure-track, tenured, or non-tenure-track on renewable or continuous appointments may vote.

3. In counting the votes, all faculty members will be ranked in order of the number of votes they received.

4. Only the top two ranking pre-tenured faculty members will be placed on the committee and any remaining pre-tenured faculty will be exempted. For example, if pre-tenured faculty members received votes to rank at numbers 3, 5, and 7, the one in the slot of #7 would be removed and the next-ranked tenured faculty member would take the next seat.

5. Pre-tenured faculty will only be asked to serve a maximum of two years during their pre-tenure period.

6. All faculty who serve two consecutive years on the Personnel Committee will be ineligible for a third consecutive appointment.

7. Faculty who are on leave for Sabbatical, a Research Intensive Semester, an RCEL, family leave or other kinds of leave will be ineligible for election for the academic year in which they are on leave.

8. Faculty who serve as officers of the department or have appointments outside of the department, but remain in the bargaining unit, are not exempt from serving on the Personnel Committee and should not be listed in a manner on the ballot to suggest otherwise.

9. Members who are excluded should be listed in a separate category on the ballot with a note as to why they are ineligible.

B. Independence of the DPC.
On personnel actions for which the CBA identifies independent roles for the DPC and the Chair—such as AFR reviews, reappointment, promotion, tenure, PMYRs, merit-pay allocations, and anomaly recommendations—the DPC will operate independently. At the discretion of the DPC, the Chair may be invited to attend meetings.

C. Duties of the DPC Chair
The Chair (or co-chairs) of the DPC should be elected by the members of the committee and should be a full time, tenured faculty member in the department. The Chair/ co-chairs will schedule and convene regular meetings, and will communicate personnel action decisions in writing to the affected member and the Chair in a timely manner. The Chair/co-chairs is also responsible for adhering to the MSP collective bargaining agreement and Red Book policies. The DPC Chair/co-chairs also addresses any apparent conflict of interest by voting faculty members and can recuse them from particular decisions.

D. DPC Vacancies
Should a member not be able to serve out the elected term, the DPC may choose to ask the department to elect another member through their normal departmental voting process. (And see section V.A.iv, above.)

E. DPC Procedures:
NOTE: Deliberations of the Personnel Committee are confidential. Members of the DPC under no circumstances may discuss the contents of DPC meetings with other members of the faculty or with students in the department. If approached by a member of the department with questions and concerns, DPC members should direct him or her to the DPC chair; the DPC chair remains bound by the confidentiality policy, and cannot reveal details about DPC deliberations. Members of the department are expected to respect this policy, and should not approach DPC members with questions about these deliberations. DPC members should not hesitate to discourage further discussion by simply stating that DPC members are not allowed to comment on the topic in question as per department policy.

A meeting of the outgoing DPC and the incoming DPC is scheduled at the end of the spring semester to discuss the transition.

The work of the DPC is largely driven by the administrative calendar. Over the course of the academic year, nominations for various awards will be requested, and other ad hoc business. Only the major ongoing tasks are discussed below. The DPC members will deliver all minutes, spreadsheets and other documentation to the department staff person who maintains those files.

1. Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion cases

2. Overseeing searches

3. AFRs (See Appendix A)

4. Merit pay procedures (See Appendix B)

5. PMYR (Periodic Multi-Year Review)

The DPC is also guided by some policies and statements developed by the department over time. For the policies on Temporary and NTT Faculty and on Adjunct Appointments, see Appendices C and D.

F. Department Executive Committee
The DPC also serves as the department's Executive Committee. Matters before the DEC are not governed by the same confidentiality policies as those before the DPC; all matters requiring confidentiality must be handled by the DPC.

   i. DEC Purview. The DEC advises and assists the Chair in the management of the Department, reports on the DEC members' operational areas, and promotes two-way communications between the Chair and the Faculty.

1. DEC Composition. The DEC is the DPC.

2. DEC Meetings and Operations. The DEC meets as per the DPC described above, except that the Chair is always present at DEC meetings.

3. Minutes. Minutes from DEC meetings are made available to the department.

VI. Tenure-System Faculty Search Committees & Procedures: The Department will conduct individual tenure-system faculty searches as follows:

A. Search Procedures, new faculty (Feb. 2, 1999; updated/affirmed April 26, 2016)

1. The Search Committee is responsible for screening candidates and bringing to campus those individuals who are, in the committee's view, best qualified.

2. The DPC will consult with the Search Committee all the way through the search process.

3. All faculty should participate in the on-campus part of the process: reviewing credentials (subject to section VI.D, below), meeting the candidates, and submitting written comments. In addition, the search committee should schedule a meeting with all candidates, of the same length for each candidate, to ask a series of prepared questions, including addressing diversity practices (voted October 22, 2014).

4. Once all candidates have visited campus, the Search Committee will convene a meeting of the history faculty to discuss the candidates. At this meeting, the faculty as a whole does not formally rank or vote upon the candidates; this meeting is advisory to the search committee.

5. The Search Committee then, drawing on both written evaluative feedback as well as the department discussion, shall make its recommendation(s) to the Personnel Committee.

6. The DPC then ranks the candidates and submits its recommendation(s) to the Chair of the Department. The Chair is required to write a separate recommendation.

B. Appointment of Search Committees for Tenure-System Faculty.
When the Provost and the College's Dean have authorized a search for a tenure-system faculty member, the Chair will solicit, from among the faculty, interest in serving on the search committee. The Chair will appoint members of the committee from among those expressing interest and from other members of the faculty whose service on the committee would benefit the search process. Students are not eligible to serve as members of such search committees; however, students should be given opportunities to meet faculty candidates and to provide feedback to the search committee. In selecting members, the Chair will attempt to compose a committee that is representative of the Department, that ensures well qualified consideration of applicants' credentials, that promotes the achievement of the University's diversity goals, and that will achieve efficient execution of the search. The Chair will designate the committee chair from among its members.

C. Purview of Search Committees in Tenure-System Searches
Committees charged with conducting searches for tenure-system faculty will collaborate with the Chair in developing the position description, advertising/recruitment plan, facilities plan, and other elements of the hiring requisition; will work with the Department's Hiring Manager to fulfill the advertising/recruitment plan; will work with the Office of Equal Opportunity & Diversity with regard to promoting the recruitment of a diverse applicant pool; will receive and screen applications; will conduct initial interviews by phone, by Internet video connection, or at professional meetings (as applicable); will propose a campus-interview list; will make confidentially available to the faculty the application materials of approved campus interviewees—provided the faculty individually agree to maintain that confidentiality as described below; and will organize campus visits, including public sessions open to all faculty and students, for approved interviewees. (see above)

D. Access to Confidential Applicant Materials. The Department will place in a secure online location the application materials of candidates who have been approved for campus interviews (but not for other applicants). The Department Chair and any faculty members who wish to view applicant materials may do so only after first signing a confidentiality statement that specifies the following:

1. They will not disclose or distribute the contents of such confidential information to anyone outside the Department's Faculty or academic administration.

2. They will not disclose or distribute the contents of such confidential information to any of the candidates, including the candidate who may be ultimately employed.

3. They will not make a physical (including printed) or electronic copy of any of the materials.

4. They will not contact, for any reason related to the search, any of the parties who have provided confidential references.

5. They will abide by university policies in using the information disclosed in the materials. In particular, she or he will adhere to the university's guidelines on impartiality/objectivity in the university's non-discrimination policy.

6. Except for applicants' CVs and cover letters, confidential materials should not be made available to students.

E. Conflicts of Interest
A real or perceived conflict of interest between an applicant and a faculty member engaged in the search process must be disclosed to the DPC, who can evaluate its relevance and determine an appropriate response.

VII. **Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) Faculty Search Committees & Procedures**
When possible, the Department prefers to hire NTT faculty full-time (see Appendix D) through an open search. Search waivers for appointments at 0.5 FTE or greater should be sought only if there is not time to conduct a search, or if an exceptional candidate is available for a position. If the Department is searching for long-term NTT faculty, the tenure-track search procedure in Article VI should be followed. The following procedure is streamlined because NTT searches must often be conducted quickly.

A. Search Procedures, short-term Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (Sept. 21, 2018)

1. The Search Committee is responsible for screening candidates, selecting and interviewing finalists, and recommending those candidates who are, in the committee's view, best qualified.

2. The search committee will make its recommendation in writing to the DPC and Chair, and will provide both with the cover letters and curriculum vitae of their recommended candidate(s).

3. The DPC and Chair should review the search committee's recommendation(s) and send any queries to the search committee for responses.

4. If the DPC and Chair are satisfied with the qualifications of the finalist(s), the DPC will submit its recommendation(s) to the Chair of the Department, and the Chair will submit a separate recommendation to the Dean. If either the DPC or the Chair is dissatisfied, they will confer with the Search Committee, who may, if needed, interview further candidates.

B. Appointment of Search Committees for short-term NTT Faculty.
When the Provost and the College's Dean have authorized a search for a short-term NTT faculty member, the Chair will solicit, from among the faculty, interest in serving on the search committee. The Chair will appoint members of the committee from among those expressing interest and from other members of the faculty whose service on the committee would benefit the search process. In selecting members, the Chair will attempt to compose a committee that is representative of the Department, that ensures well qualified consideration of applicants' credentials, that promotes the achievement of the University's diversity goals, and that will achieve efficient execution of the search. The Chair will designate the committee chair from among its members.

C. Purview of Search Committees in NTT Searches
Committees charged with conducting searches for NTT faculty will work with the Department's Hiring Manager to fulfill the advertising/recruitment plan; will work with the Office of Equal Opportunity & Diversity with regard to promoting the recruitment of a diverse applicant pool; will receive and screen applications; will conduct interviews by phone, by Internet video connection, or at professional meetings (as applicable); will recommend a finalist or finalists to the DPC and Chair; and will respond to any queries from the DPC or the Chair about the qualifications of the recommended finalist(s).

D. Conflicts of Interest
A real or perceived conflict of interest between an applicant and a faculty member engaged in the search process must be disclosed to the DPC, who can evaluate its relevance and determine an appropriate response.

VIII. **Department Specifications for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT).**
All standards and most procedures related to reappointment, promotion, and tenure of Faculty are governed by the CBA and the Red Book. The following additional terms do not alter or interpret those standards and procedures but instead set department-level specifications where the CBA and Red Book permit local control.

A. External Reviews of RPT Cases.

1. Personnel Actions Requiring External Reviews.
    All promotion and all tenure cases for tenure-system faculty require external reviews (as specified in the Red Book and CBA). Reappointments of tenure-system faculty during their probationary periods do not require external reviews. Neither reappointments nor promotions for non-tenure-system faculty require external reviews; however, as permitted by the CBA's Article 21, Lecturers may request external reviews.

2. Number of External Reviews.
    The Department Chair will make a good-faith effort to secure eight external reviews, at least half of which must be "arm's-length" reviews, for every promotion and/or tenure case that requires external reviews. The Chair's contact list is typically compiled by soliciting equal numbers of suggested reviewers from the candidate and at least one other colleague (usually in the department) who is familiar with the candidate's field. Some external reviewers will be "close" to the candidate. Such close reviews are especially helpful in cases where the reviewer can describe the candidate's particular contributions to collaborative work.

3. Identification and Solicitation of External Reviewers.
    The CBA charges the Chair with soliciting external reviewers and permits the candidate to suggest external reviewers, some or all of whom may be solicited by the Chair. The Chair may consult with the DPC or other members of the Faculty in identifying appropriate external reviewers but may not delegate the solicitation process to others. Similarly, the Chair may receive assistance in describing the "standing" of each external reviewer in the candidate's file, but the Chair is ultimately responsible for ensuring that that description clearly makes the case for why each external reviewer is well positioned to perform the review; this description should be crafted for academic audiences who are unfamiliar with the pertinent scholarly field. Under most circumstances, the solicitation of external reviews should occur no later than three months before the candidate's file submission deadline.

4. Qualifications of External Reviewers.
    In general, external reviewers should be well recognized scholars or professionals in the candidate's fields.

5. Candidate's Rights Regarding External Reviewers.
    Before soliciting external reviews, the Chair must show the solicitation list and message to the candidate, who may comment on but may not demand changes to the list or message. The list should include some of the external reviewers suggested by the candidate. If the candidate identifies a conflict of interest with any of the proposed reviewers, the Chair should assess whether a true conflict exists and, if one does, should eliminate, mitigate, or manage the conflict.

B. Internal Reviews of RPT Cases.

1. Identification & Solicitation of UMass Faculty & Staff Reviews.
    The candidate and the Chair may identify potential reviewers internal to UMass Amherst, including faculty, staff and students. Such internal reviews are not required and should not be regarded as substitutes for external letters. Internal letters may be especially helpful in cases where the reviewer can describe the candidate's particular contributions to collaborations within the department or across campus. Faculty with joint appointments, either in other colleges or departments, should take special care to get letters from the other unit that's involved.

2. Waiver of Rights of Access to Review Letters.
    Candidates for RPT may waive or decline to waive their rights of access to internal and external review letters that have been individually solicited. The decision whether or not to waive those rights belongs exclusively to the candidate, and neither the Chair nor any other member of the faculty should pressure the candidate to decide one way or another.

C. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness for RPT.
The CBA's Article 33 requires that every department develop or adopt one or several modes appropriate to the evaluation of teaching in that unit, and procedures for the administration of student evaluations of teaching. This may include peer evaluations, the SRTI survey instrument, input from advisees, general contributions to curricular development, and other materials as appropriate.

D. Evidence of Effective Service for RPT.
Applications for RPT should include evidence of the candidate's contributions to service. The CBA and Red Book require that all tenure-system Faculty engage in service. NTT faculty are required to engage in service only if it is part of their assigned duties. The CBA requires that service to the faculty union and service outside the Department be considered at the department level as part of any Faculty member's AFR or evaluation for RPT purposes. In general, the consideration of service should be inclusive, acknowledging the contributions that candidates make both inside and outside the Department and inside and outside the university, especially for faculty with shared or joint appointments, across campus or the Five Colleges. Service may include that provided in governance or management of the Department, the College, the University, or the profession; that representing outreach to extend knowledge beyond the university/professional community; and that intended to promote community engagement as a benefit both to the university community and to the off-campus community.

IX. Bylaw adoption and amendments

Bylaws shall be adopted by a vote of at least two-thirds of all eligible faculty in the department, not counting abstentions. Should the bylaws not be approved, the department shall convene a meeting to discuss any disagreements in order to facilitate an amended document and re-vote.

Bylaws will be become effective immediately upon the results of voting.

Amendments to the bylaws can be brought by any elected committee or by ten percent of the total eligible faculty members before the last department meeting of the year. The proposed amendment must be circulated for at least ten days before the department meeting. After discussion, and amendment, the proposal must again circulate as a written referendum before a final vote of the department by secret ballot.

X. Separability clause

In the event of a conflict between these bylaws and federal or state law, Trustee policies, Amherst campus policies, or the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the applicable law, policy, or agreement will prevail, without invalidating the remainder of the bylaws.

APPENDICES

These appendices describe current procedures concerning these activities. They are not part of the bylaws proper, but support them by articulating the development and application of our practices.

Note: they were not adopted formally on September 21, 2018, and thus remain statements of working practices but not binding rules. In particular, Appendix B, Point D, has been referred to the DPC for discussion.

Appendix A: AFR Procedures

Completing the AFR: The fall semester generally involves reading the AFR forms and writing comments. Faculty members typically complete the AFR in September, reporting on activities during the prior 12 months. Given that these forms are used to track both individual and overall department productivity, all faculty members should strive to be as thorough as possible in completing the AFR. Junior faculty should be especially attentive when completing the AFR, since it plays a vital role in the tenure and promotion process.

Reviewing the AFR: Typically three teams of two (the DPC Chair is exempted) divide the faculty files alphabetically in thirds, review the files and draft comments; drafts of the comments are distributed to the DPC members, and edited collectively at a series of fall meetings. This means that all DPC members should read all of the files in order to be able to comment effectively on the draft comments. Once comments have been drafted and edited, they are submitted electronically to the administrative assistant for the DPC, who transfers them to the faculty members AFRs. Once complete, faculty members are asked to read and sign their reviews.

In the case of joint appointments, input will be solicited from the other department or program involved.

While reviewing the AFRs, it is wise for DPC members to also tackle the rating for merit pay. Though the master calendar may change about when merit awards are decided, it will save you time to do both at once; take good notes about the elements guiding your thinking at the time.

Appendix B: Merit Procedures

Pool A Merit
A. Each member of the DPC independently evaluates every member of the department in three categories: teaching, research and publication, and service.

B. Points are assigned on the following numerical scales:
   1. Teaching: 0-5
   2. Research and Publication: 0-4, except where the publication of a major scholarly book is reported: 0-8
   3. Service: 0-4

C. Consistency: Generally, it is not so important to come out with the same number as most members of the committee as it is to be consistent within your own ranking. (There's an opportunity to check on apparent anomalies, both high and low, during committee discussions of the results of the first round of voting.)

D. To ensure equity, in the case of NTT or other faculty whose contractual duties do not include one or two of the three areas of service, the final merit point average will be normed by multiplying by 13 divided by the total possible points (e.g., 13/9 in the case of faculty with no research obligations). Since NTT faculty do not have the expectation of publishing scholarly books, the DPC may, additionally, consider awarding up to 4 additional points to the normed average in the case of comparable achievements in teaching or service (e.g., receipt of a major teaching or service award).

E. After the committee has done all the above, two further procedures remain to be done:

1. "Echo" points are voted based on books that received 4 or more points in previous years.

    NOTE: The Personnel Committee of 1985-86 proposed this principle because they thought that the 4.0 ceiling in each category (teaching, research, service) did not do justice to the achievement represented by a scholarly book. They recommended that in each of the two years following publication of a book, the author should receive a bonus of one quarter of the merit points voted in the year of publication. Thus, if the book earned a 4.0 in the scholarship category in the year of publication, it should get one extra point in each of the two following years.

    The Personnel Committee of 1986-87 decided to adopt this recommendation. In applying it they considered it necessary to distinguish between full-fledged scholarly books and other works in a book format, such as anthologies and translations. They decided to evaluate all publications in book format from the previous two years, placing them in one of three categories: a full-fledged scholarly book, receiving 25% of the point rating that the person received in the research category in the year of publication; a second level that would receive 10% of the point rating awarded in the year of publication; and other book-format publications that were not considered appropriate for application of the "echo rule."

    The 1987-88 Personnel Committee decided to continue this policy, making its own review of book-format publications of the two previous year to decide whether it considered them full-fledged books, etc.

2. An increment of $500 per semester of service is added for "executive" service in the department. NOTE: per a motions from the Merit Procedures Review Committee, Fall 1988: Moved that the Department, through the DPC, add $500 from the Department's merit money to the merit increment recommended for faculty who served as Graduate Program Director, Associate Chair and Undergraduate Program Director in the reporting year. Half-year service will be recognized proportionately.

F. To Distribute Merit Money by a Cohort System (per a motions from the Merit Procedures Review Committee, Fall 1988):

Moved that in making merit recommendations to DPC divide the faculty into three, four, or five cohorts, the precise number of cohorts and percentage of individuals in each to be determined by the pattern of faculty achievement in the reporting year. The three basic cohorts and their possible subdivisions would be as follows:

Category 1: high merit. From ten to twenty-five percent of the faculty might qualify. This cohort may be divided into category 1a, "exceptional merit," and 1b, "highly meritorious."

Category 2: meritorious. From fifty to seventy percent of the faculty might qualify.

Category 3: minimum or no merit. From ten to twenty-five percent of the faculty might qualify. This category may be divided into category 3a, "minimum merit," and category 3b, "no merit this year."

G. Procedures for Assigning Merit Points in Teaching and Service for Persons on Leave One or Both Semesters in the Year Under Review (Updated from the 1970s)

Teaching Ratings

➢ For persons on leave for one semester only, use the figure that results from the committee's evaluation for the year.
➢ For persons on leave both semesters, use the figure from the person's most recent year that included at least one semester of teaching.

Service Ratings

➢ For persons on leave one semester only, use the committee rating for one semester's service, if that is higher than the departmental median for the year. If the figure is not higher than the departmental median for the year, apply rule 2a-2b as described below.

➢ For persons on leave both semesters, use a or b.
    a. Use the departmental median, if that is lower than the individual's past average (two most recent ratings).
    b. Use the individual's past average (two most recent ratings), if that is lower than the departmental median for the year under evaluation.

Explanation: 2a. The reasoning here is that someone with high service ratings in the past—e.g. a 4.0 average for service in some important capacity—should receive a solid rating but not one in excess of the departmental median.

Explanation: 2b. This rule prevents someone with low service ratings from receiving a higher rating than his/her past average simply by going on leave.

Pool B Merit
Unlike Pool A Merit, which is calculated by the DPC and not alterable by the Dean, Pool B Merit is only a recommendation from the DPC to the Dean. Unlike Pool A, which rewards activity across all three evaluative areas (Research, Teaching & Service), the department makes recommendations for awards of Pool B merit to reward publication, the receipt of awards on or off campus, and other accomplishments deemed especially "significant" by the DPC, bearing in mind that decisions about Pool B awards are made by the Dean of the College.

DPC members, in their review of AFRs. flag activity eligible for Pool B merit, and review to reach consensus about which activities qualify for merit pay. The DPC then calculates the amounts to be recommended for each activity. The sum available for Pool B merit is generally equivalent to the sum available for Pool A merit.   It has been the department's practice to recommend higher amounts for the publication of single-author books, and determine lesser amounts for other sorts of publication activities, from co-authored or co-edited books to articles and book chapters. The DPC must also determine what constitutes "major" on or off campus awards, and recommend funds appropriately. The DPC may also choose to recognize popular magazine articles, blogs, exhibitions and other sorts of publications.

Appendix C. Policy on Temporary and NTT Faculty

Only those teaching faculty, temporary or regular, who hold a Ph.D. can supervise TAs. The justification is that such supervision can be regarded as a form of graduate teaching.

Statement of Preferences

1. The History Department believes that because teaching and research go hand in hand, teaching should be entrusted as much as possible to its core of tenured and tenure-track research faculty. Although we understand the need to employ temporary and NTT faulty to supplement that core from time to time, we wish to be cautious about their role within the department.
2. We prefer full-time temporary to part-time temporary faculty. Full-time faculty members do more than simply teach their courses and go home. Unlike part-timers, they are available to work with students on independent study projects and honors theses, to write letters of recommendation, as well as advise students on an informal basis. Full-time appointments allow temporary faculty time to become accustomed to the departmental culture and permit more efficient course planning. Moreover, if the temporary faculty member already has his or her Ph.D. in hand, it allows the department to teach more classes with enrollments over 60 that involve the use of teaching assistants.
3. In hiring temporary faculty, we prefer full-time faculty with the Ph.D. in hand because they can be deployed more flexibly in the classroom. It is a matter of Department policy that only faculty with Ph.D.s in hand can teach courses with enrollments of 60 students or more because that involves the supervision of teaching assistants which we regard as a form of graduate teaching. Those without Ph.D.s will be limited to teaching self-contained classes with enrollments capped at 35-50).
4. We prefer to use part-time faculty only to offer specialized courses in fields of study unavailable from the core research faculty

Appendix D: Policies on Adjunct Appointments
(As amended on: April 4, 1988)

1. The Personnel Committee may recommend the appointment of historians to adjunct status after consultation with the department.

2. To be considered for such an appointment, the candidate:

    a. Should be trained in history at the graduate level
    b. Should present evidence of a serious commitment to historical scholarship.
    c. Should be regularly employed by the University or by an agency or institution otherwise associated with the Department or be retired with the distinction from an appropriate institution; and
    d. Should be a potential contributor to the teaching and/or other activities of the department

3. Consistent with the provision 2d. above, the prospective adjunct in concert with the departmental Chair shall identify at least one departmentally-related activity (e.g. giving a lecture, teaching, cross-listing, or co-teaching a course, advising students doing research papers, serving as consultant or liaison at another institution) that will fulfill the intent of this clause during the period of the adjunct appointment.

4. Adjunct appointments may be for the term of up to five years. In the final year of the term the Personnel Committee shall review the appointment and determined whether it shall be renewed. The length of the appointment and a copy of this policy shall be given to the appointee.

5. Under no circumstances shall such an appointment be understood as constituting a regular faculty appointment; nor shall it be viewed as leading to such an appointment.

6. The appointment process shall conform to the rules and regulations established by the University Board of Trustees and contained in this Academic Personnel Policy of the University of Massachusetts (the Red Book).