

Bylaws

Adopted by the Journalism Department Faculty April 5, 2019

1. **Department name & general provisions.** In accordance with Article 12 of the UMass-MSP Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), these Bylaws have been adopted by a majority vote of the faculty of the Department of Journalism (the “Department”) in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (the “College”) at the University of Massachusetts Amherst (the “University” or “UMass”). Federal and state laws, UMass Trustee policies (including, but not limited to, T76-081, the Academic Personnel Policy, aka the “Red Book”), the CBA, and other established university policies will prevail in instances of conflict with these bylaws. As required by Article 12, these bylaws are subject to review by the Administration and MSP to ensure that the bylaws do not conflict with prevailing laws, policies, and the CBA; such review must occur before the bylaws or their amendments take effect.
2. **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, all members of the Faculty have both the right and duty to participate in governance of the Department, including voting on matters brought before the Faculty, except as specified otherwise below and elsewhere in these Bylaws.
 - 2.1 *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 CBA. Such non-unit faculty members may not serve on core DPCs (or DPCs expanded to become a committee of the whole) and may not participate as 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.
 - 2.2 *Access & Voting Rights.* All bargaining-unit Faculty may have access to relevant information and may deliberate on all promotion and tenure cases but may vote only on cases where they have themselves achieved the rank and/or tenure status under consideration for the candidate.
 - 2.3 *Graduate Faculty.* Only Faculty who have been designated Graduate Faculty by the Dean of the Graduate School may deliberate and vote on graduate program and graduate curricular matters.
 - 2.4 *Part-Time Faculty Appointments Under 50%.* Part-time bargaining-unit non-Graduate Faculty with an FTE less than 50% may have access to relevant information and may deliberate on all non-graduate programmatic and curricular matters but may not vote on such matters.
 - 2.5 *Faculty Appointments Greater than 50%.* Bargaining-unit, non-Graduate Faculty with an FTE of 50% or greater, without regard to tenure status, should have access to relevant information and may deliberate and vote on all non-graduate programmatic and curricular matters.
 - 2.6 *Duty to Participate in Governance.* Except where the composition of an individual’s assigned workload would prohibit such an obligation, all

members of the Faculty have a responsibility to participate in governance of the Department and in service to the Department, the School/College, and the University.

- 2.7 *Rights and Duties of Faculty on Leave.* Faculty on full-time paid leave (including parental leave, sabbatical leave, and sick leave) maintain their rights during the leave to exercise their rights to participate in the governance of the Department. Faculty on full-time paid sick leave and on full-time unpaid leave forfeit their rights of governance for the duration of such leave. Unless the leave is taken in an emergency, faculty on leave must make prior arrangements for students whose grades may be affected by the leave.
3. **Standing Committees:** The Department maintains the following standing committees [examples only]:
- 3.1 *Department Personnel Committee (DPC).*
- 3.1.1 DPC Purview. The Department's Faculty will annually elect a core DPC to perform the functions assigned to it by the CBA, including but not limited to reviewing the Annual Faculty Review and Evaluation of every member of the Department's Faculty; reviewing and making recommendations on all promotion and tenure applications within the Department; reviewing and making recommendations on all reappointments of tenure-track Faculty within the Department; reviewing and making recommendations on all promotions of non-tenure-system faculty; participating in Periodic Multi-Year Review of Faculty as prescribed by the CBA; reviewing and determining Pool A allocations of merit pay among the Department's eligible Faculty as provided for by the CBA; reviewing and making recommendations for anomaly adjustments to salaries as provided for by the CBA; leading the review process for potential reappointment of the Chair/Head.
- 3.1.2 Composition & Eligibility. The core DPC will consist of three tenured Faculty and may include untenured TT Faculty and NTT Faculty. For all reappointment, promotion, tenure cases within the DPC's purview as determined by the CBA, the core DPC will expand to include all of the Department's Faculty whose rank and tenure status is equal to or greater than that of the proposed personnel action. (For example, only tenured Faculty may vote on applications for tenure.)
- 3.1.3 Means of Election. By April 1 of each year, the Department Chair/Head will solicit nominations for service on the core DPC for the ensuing academic year and will confirm the nominees' eligibility and willingness to serve and will announce the nominees to the Faculty. All of the Department's Faculty except for non-unit Faculty are eligible to vote in electing the core DPC. The election should occur within two weeks after announcement of the nominees. The election should occur by secret ballot at a Department meeting to be convened by the Department Chair/Head. Eligible Faculty who cannot attend the meeting may vote by e-mail to the Department Chair/Head.
- 3.1.4 Leadership of the DPC. Once elected, the members of the core DPC will select their own committee chair.

- 3.1.5 Independence of the DPC. On personnel actions for which the CBA identifies independent roles for the DPC and the Chair/Head—such as AFR reviews, reappointment, promotion, tenure, PMYRs, merit-pay allocations, and anomaly recommendations—the DPC will operate independently, and the Chair/Head must not convene or deliberate with the DPC, nor may the Chair/Head attempt by any means to influence the deliberations or judgment of the members of the DPC.
- 3.1.6 DPC Meetings and Operations. The core DPC should organize and schedule its meetings as necessary to perform its duties and meet the deadlines established by the campus master calendar or by College or Department policies. The core DPC should provide a schedule of its assigned work for the year at the first or second faculty meeting in the fall. The DPC, whether meeting as the core or expanded committee, requires a quorum of two-thirds of its eligible members in order to conduct official business; in voting and in drafting written materials, the DPC may conduct its business electronically. When addressing confidential personnel matters, DPC meetings will not be open to non-DPC members. The core DPC should keep a record of its meetings and transactions, which the Department should retain for five years and should be available to subsequent core DPC members; the DPC need not keep meeting minutes.
- 3.1.7 DPC Responses to the Dean's Queries in RPT Cases. Under the CBA and the Red Book, a dean must consult with the DPC if she/he is considering making a recommendation that differs from the recommendation of the DPC in reappointment, promotion, and tenure cases for tenure-system Faculty. The core DPC must respond in writing.
- 3.1.8 DPC Consideration of Merit Pay. When the CBA authorizes the award of merit pay and authorizes the DPC to recommend or determine the amounts of merit pay to be allocated to individual members of the Faculty, the DPC must adhere to the CBA's terms for eligibility and the basis of evaluation for such allocations. The DPC may not exclude from consideration any merit-eligible member of the Faculty based on tenure status, rank, full-time equivalency, or constraint of assigned duties.
- 3.2 *Curriculum Committee.* By April 1 of each year, the Chair will ask faculty to nominate peers to serve, or express interest in serving, on the Curriculum Committee the following year. The Chair will appoint a three- to four-person CC from this group after assessing willingness to serve and will appoint a committee chair. Any full-time faculty member may serve on this committee, and the Chair may sit on the committee as a non-voting ex officio member. The committee chair will call at least one and likely more meetings per semester to discuss and make decisions on curriculum matters. The committee is empowered to make decisions about minor curriculum matters but large matters, such as a change to the major requirements, must be brought by the committee to the full faculty for vote. Three members constitutes a quorum for the conduction of committee business. Voting will be conducted by voice or any other manner the committee agrees to use.

Informal agendas will be provided to members in advance of meetings, and minutes will be kept in a central repository.

- 3.3 Summer Programs Committee (SPC). By April 1 of each year, the Chair will ask faculty to nominate peers to serve, or express interest in serving, on the SPC the following year. The Chair will appoint a two to three person SPC out of this group after assessing willingness to serve and will appoint a committee chair. The SPC will collaborate with the Chair and relevant faculty and staff members throughout the year to develop special Summer Programs to serve the Department's educational mission, recruitment efforts, and special revenue operations. The SPC will regularly report its activities at faculty meetings and consult with the Curriculum Committee and follow CC procedures for any programming directly related to curriculum matters.
4. **Tenure-System Faculty Search Committees & Procedures:** The Department will conduct individual tenure-system faculty searches as follows:
 - 4.1 *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/Head will solicit from among the faculty interest in serving on the search committee. The Chair/Head 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/Head 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. For senior and open-rank searches, the composition of the committee should be weighted toward senior members of the Faculty. The Chair/Head will designate the committee chair from among its members.
 - 4.2 *Purview of Search Committees in Tenure-System Searches.* Committees charged with conducting searches for tenure-system faculty will collaborate with the Chair/Head 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; will organize campus visits, including public sessions open to all Faculty and students, for approved interviewees; will organize a meeting of all of the Department's Faculty after the last campus interview in order to deliberate and vote (by secret ballot) on the ranking of the acceptable finalists; will write a recommendation that reflects the Faculty's ranking and rationale for that ranking and may offer the committee members' independent assessment of the finalists. If the Hiring Authority for the search has asked for an unranked list of acceptable finalists, the Faculty will limit its vote to distinguish between acceptable and unacceptable candidates, and the search committee will use its recommendation to report that information and to describe the strengths and weaknesses of the acceptable finalists.

- 4.3 *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/Head and any Faculty who wish to view applicant materials may do so only after first signing a confidentiality statement that specifies the following:

- ▶ She/he will not disclose or distribute the contents of such confidential information to anyone outside the Department's Faculty or academic administration.
- ▶ She/he will not disclose or distribute the contents of such confidential information to any of the candidates, including the candidate who may be ultimately employed.
- ▶ She/he will not contact any of the parties who have provided confidential references, unless approved to do so by the Search Committee. The Search Committee is exempt from this rule.
- ▶ She/he 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.

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

- 4.4 *Role of Faculty in Tenure-System Searches & Selection.* All members of the Department's Full-time Faculty have a duty to engage in the search and selection process from the beginning of the campus-interview phase through the meeting at which the Faculty rank the acceptable finalists. In order to fulfill that duty, the Faculty should inform themselves by reviewing candidates' application materials and attending candidates' public sessions.

- 4.5 *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 and must be managed, mitigated, or eliminated. The principles underlying the above prescription include:
- ▶ Neither professional nor personal relationships between applicants and evaluators should influence the selection decision.

- ▶ Neither professional nor personal relationships between applicants and evaluators should *appear* to influence the selection decision.
- ▶ When such relationships exist, the evaluator must disclose the relationship.

Management, mitigation, or elimination of such conflicts should occur as follows:

- 4.5.1 Search committee members engaged in a **personal** relationship or **close professional** relationship with an applicant must disclose the relationship to others involved in the evaluation of the candidate. The member with the relationship may deliberate about and/or vote on the candidate if approved by the search committee. The member(s) may recuse themselves if so desired.
 - 4.5.2 A search committee member with a **distant** professional relationship (few collaborations or collaborations older than five years) with an applicant who has reached the shortlist need not recuse him/herself from the committee's work but should disclose the relationship to others involved in evaluation of the candidate. The Faculty member may participate in all discussions of that applicant and need not abstain from voting on any applicant.
5. **Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) Faculty Search Committees & Procedures:** The Department will conduct individual non-tenure-track faculty searches using the same procedures as those described above for tenure-system faculty searches with these exceptions:
- 5.1 *Committee Composition.* While the composition of committees for tenure-system faculty searches should be weighted toward tenured faculty (or, in the case of senior searches, faculty of equal or higher rank), committees composed for NTT searches need not favor senior or tenure-system faculty and should include at least one current TT and one current NTT faculty member if the Department has such faculty members available whose workload composition would permit such participation.
 - 5.2 *Purview of Search Committees in NTT Searches.* The purview of the search committee in NTT faculty searches is the same as that for tenure-system faculty searches.
 - 5.3 *Role of the Faculty in NTT Searches.* The Department's Faculty have a duty to engage in searches for NTT faculty whose appointments are 50% FTE or greater due to the potential for such faculty eventually achieving continuing appointments.
6. **Representation by Faculty on College- and University-Level Committees.** Faculty may volunteer for or may agree to be appointed by the Chair/Head to service on college- and university-level committees and in similar roles. Service on the following committees, however, is by election as described below:
- 6.1 *College Personnel Committee (CPC).* All of the Department's Faculty will annually elect one representative to the CPC to perform the functions

assigned to it by the CBA. Eligibility for service on the CPC will be limited to full-time tenured faculty per College requirements.

- 6.2 *College Review Committee (CRC)*. The CRC reviews the promotion applications of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers and is elected at large across the College by Faculty with any form of the title Lecturer. The Department's Faculty with any form of the title Lecturer will annually nominate from among themselves one person to stand for election to the CRC.

7. Department Meetings.

- 7.1 *Frequency*. At least twice per semester and with at least one week's notice, the Chair/Head will schedule and convene general meetings of the Faculty. The Chair/Head may call and convene additional special meetings as necessary to address urgent business of the Department. By petition of at least 20% of the Faculty, the Chair/Head will convene additional special meetings to address matters raised by the petitioners.
 - 7.2 *Faculty Duty of Participation*. All Faculty of the Department are expected to attend all general faculty meetings and to attend all special meetings unless university-related duties or events conflict with the special meeting.
 - 7.3 *Meeting Agendas*. The Chair/Head will publish the agenda for each regular Department meeting. The Chair/Head will publish the agenda for any special meeting at the time of the meeting's announcement.
 - 7.4 *Rules of Order*. The Department will follow relaxed Roberts' Rules of Order in conducting meetings of the Faculty as needed.
 - 7.5 *Quorum*. The Department may meet and act on the business of the Department with a quorum consisting of at least half of the Faculty.
 - 7.6 *Voting*. On matters requiring a vote of the Faculty, votes may be made by written proxy or electronically in a method to be determined by the Chair/Head. Voice votes on any matter are acceptable unless any individual member of the Faculty requests otherwise, in which case the vote must occur by secret written ballot. Except as otherwise specified in these bylaws, a simple majority vote will suffice to carry a motion.
 - 7.7 *Minutes and Recordkeeping*. Minutes will be taken at all faculty meetings and approved at the subsequent meeting. The Department will maintain records of all meetings, including minutes and votes, for at least five years.
8. **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.

- 8.1 *External Reviews of RPT Cases.*
- 8.1.1 *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.
- 8.1.2 *Number of External Reviews.* The Department Chair/Head will make a good-faith effort to secure at least six "arm's-length" external reviews for every promotion and/or tenure case that requires external reviews. The Chair/Head may solicit and add to the file any number of reviews from reviewers "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.
- 8.1.3 *Identification and Solicitation of External Reviewers.* The CBA charges the Chair/Head with soliciting external reviewers and permits the candidate to suggest external reviewers, some or all of whom shall be solicited by the Chair/Head. The Chair/Head 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/Head may receive assistance in describing the "standing" of each external reviewer in the candidate's file, but the Chair/Head is ultimately responsible for ensuring that that description clearly and completely 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.
- 8.1.4 *Qualifications of External Reviewers.* In general, external reviewers should be well recognized scholars or professionals in the candidate's field, should hold the rank of Professor, should have active scholarly programs, and should be at institutions that are at least peers of UMass. External reviewers who do not meet these criteria may be appropriate and acceptable, but in describing the "standing" of such reviewers, the Chair/Head should carefully explain why such reviewers are appropriate for the task of commenting on the candidate's having met the relevant standards.
- 8.1.5 *Candidate's Rights Regarding External Reviewers.* Before making such solicitations, the Chair/Head must show the solicitation list and solicitation message to the candidate, who may comment on but may not demand changes to the list or message. The list shall 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/Head should assess whether a true conflict exists and, if one does, should eliminate, mitigate, or manage the conflict.
- 8.2 *Internal Reviews of RPT Cases.*

- 8.2.1 *Identification & Solicitation of UMass Faculty & Staff Reviews.* The candidate and the Chair/Head may identify potential reviewers internal to UMass Amherst. 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. The Chair/Head must individually solicit such internal reviews.
- 8.2.2 *Identification and Solicitation of Student Reviews.* The Chair/Head may solicit comments from individual students. Written, signed comments from individual students—especially from those for whom the candidate has served as an advisor, mentor, or collaborator—are especially helpful in identifying the candidate's work outside the classroom. Such reviews should be individually solicited. The Chair/Head may also solicit comments from groups of students; responses to such non-individual solicitations are never protected by the candidate's waiver of access rights, and any "group solicitations" should advise potential respondents that their responses will not be confidential.
- 8.3 *Waiver of Rights of Access to Review Letters.* A candidate for RPT may waive or decline to waive her/his 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/Head nor any other member of the Faculty should pressure the candidate to decide one way or another.
- 8.4 *Participation of Faculty in RPT Cases.* Section 2 above describes the permissible participation of the Faculty beyond the core DPC in the consideration of RPT cases.
- 8.5 *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. In compliance with that requirement, the Department adopts the following:
- 8.5.1 *Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness in Classroom Settings.* All Faculty should use the centrally administered SRTI instrument to solicit and receive student evaluations in every course section taught. Faculty may not themselves administer or collect student evaluations. Individual Faculty may supplement but may not replace the SRTI instrument with other another instrument(s).
- 8.5.2 *Peer & Expert Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness.* Untenured Faculty in their probationary period and NTT Faculty intending to seek promotion should seek consultation and formative evaluations of their teaching effectiveness from the Institute for Teaching Effectiveness & Faculty Development. Such Faculty plus tenured Faculty expecting to apply for promotion within a year or two should solicit evaluations through direct observation of their teaching from peers inside or outside the Department.

While peer and expert evaluations are not required of any Faculty member, they help provide valuable evidence in making a case for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure.

- 8.5.3 *Contributions to Program & Curriculum Development.* Applications for RPT should include evidence of the candidate's contributions to program and curriculum development (if any).
- 8.6 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. The extent to which service outside the university is relevant to a case for RPT depends on the pertinence of that service to the individual's professional profile or to advancement of the university's mission. 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. Especially important is evidence of leadership in making service contributions.
9. **Annual Faculty Review and Evaluation.** The CBA's Article 33 requires use of the bargained AFR form by every member of the Faculty who is 50% FTE or greater. Faculty who fail to timely submit an AFR may be subject to all pertinent College and University policies. The core DPC and the Chair/Head will conduct their evaluations of each Faculty member's AFR.
10. **Review of the Department Chair/Head.** If the Chair/Head wishes to be reappointed to another term in that position, the Department's Faculty, led by the DPC, will conduct a review of the Chair/Head during the fall semester of the final year of her/his appointment. The DPC will follow the procedures prescribed by Senate Document #82-021, beginning the process no later than October 15 during the final year of the Chair/Head's appointment.
- 10.1 *Self-Evaluation.* As an initial step, the Chair/Head will prepare a written self-evaluation of her/his administrative achievements during the current appointment and will provide that document to the Faculty no later than October 15th.
- 10.2 *Survey.* The DPC will prepare and distribute four confidential surveys no later than November 1st: (1) one to departmental staff; (2) one to all undergraduate majors and all graduate students; (3) one to Heads/Chairs of Departments within the College and to those outside of the Department who have interacted with the Head; and (4) one to the Department's Faculty. Each survey will include specific questions regarding overall performance,

both administrative, interpersonal, and management of departmental interactions. These surveys will provide space for extended comments. Raw data and summaries of responses to these surveys will be reviewed by the DPC, will be redacted to protect the identities of all respondents, and will be included with the DPC's report to the dean but will not be available to faculty, staff, or students.

- 10.3 *Meetings with Constituencies.* The DPC will offer to meet with employee and student groups to receive confidential assessments of the Chair/Head's performance. Summaries of information gathered in such meetings will be included with the DPC's report to the dean but will not be available to faculty, staff, or students.
- 10.4 *Meeting with the Chair/Head.* After most data collection is complete, the DPC will invite the Chair/Head to meet to discuss the initial findings of the data collection process. The Chair/Head may decline to meet.
- 10.5 *Draft Report.* No later than December 1st, the DPC will complete and distribute to the Faculty a draft report (excluding raw or other data that could compromise the confidentiality of those contributing to this process), including a summary of findings, an assessment of areas of success and of needed improvement, and a non-binding recommendation regarding whether the Chair/Head should be reappointed. The report should assiduously limit its assessment to areas within the purview and control of the Chair/Head.
- 10.6 *Concluding Meeting of the Faculty.* Before the end of fall semester, the DPC will convene the Faculty to discuss the draft report and to receive recommendations for revision of the document.
- 10.7 *Final Report.* The DPC will finalize its report and will then submit it to the Dean, simultaneously providing a copy to the Chair/Head (excluding raw and other confidential data). The Dean may ask to meet with the DPC to discuss the report, but neither the DPC nor the Dean is obliged to meet.
- 10.8 *Chair/Head's Response.* The Chair/Head may prepare and submit to the Dean a written response to the final report.

11. Implementation of these bylaws: By at least a two-thirds' majority vote of the Faculty, these bylaws are adopted and take effect on [date]. The terms of these bylaws supersede existing policies or practices of the Department to the extent that they address or conflict the matters addressed by such policies and practices. However, if ongoing processes would be unreasonably disrupted by implementation of these bylaws, individual provisions of these bylaws may be deferred until those processes are complete, provided that such deferral lasts no longer than one year beyond the effective date cited in this paragraph. Deferral of individual provisions will not result in deferral of other provisions.

12. Amendment of these bylaws: By majority vote, the Faculty may elect an ad hoc committee to review and propose amendments to these bylaws. Adoption of any such amendments, including their dates of effectiveness, requires a two-thirds' vote of the Faculty.