

**Department of Risk Management/Insurance, Real Estate and Legal Studies
College of Business**

BYLAWS

Adopted, September 2006

Revised, January 2013

Revised, September 2018

(Approved by a majority of faculty)

Revised, December 2019

The purpose of the following is to provide a general framework for the operating procedures for the Department of Risk Management/Insurance, Real Estate and Legal Studies (*the Department*).

Section A: Faculty Membership and Voting Privileges

The faculty of the Department shall consist of those persons holding full-time rank of teaching faculty, research faculty, assistant professor, associate professor or professor in the Department.

The voting membership of the Department is defined as the Faculty above. Upon nomination and majority approval of the full-time faculty, the Department Chair may appoint other faculty (e.g., associate deans, visiting or part-time faculty) who have teaching assignments within the Department to voting membership.

Except where the Bylaws specify a different procedure, voting can be conducted: 1) at a faculty meeting, 2) via letter, 3) via e-mail, or 4) via secret ballot.

Section B: Jurisdiction

The faculty shall be the basic legislative body of the Department. Subject to the rules and the Constitution of the Florida State University (*the University*), and the Bylaws and policies of the College of Business (*the College*), the Department Faculty shall determine the bylaws, policies, requirements, curricula, and course offerings for the academic programs within the Department.

The faculty may reflect and deliberate any issue of general interest to the University, College, or Department and make recommendations to the appropriate officer or body.

Faculty and staff members are expected to be familiar with and follow the Florida State University Substantive Change Policy as found on the university web site <http://provost.fsu.edu.sacs>.

Section C: Meetings

The faculty shall meet at least once during the academic year at the call of the Department Chair. The Department Chair, or Chair's designee, shall be the presiding officer.

Special sessions may be held at the call of the Department Chair or at the written request of at least four members of the faculty. At the request of any voting member, Robert's Rules of Order shall be invoked.

One-half plus one of the voting members shall constitute a quorum at any regular or special meeting.

Unless specifically stated herein, decisions shall be made by a majority vote of the faculty conducted by voice vote, letter ballot or e-mail ballot.

Section D: Department Organization and Committees

The Department is organized into three curricular groups:

- (1) Risk Management/Insurance (RMI),
- (2) Real Estate (REE) and
- (3) Legal Studies (LS).

The Department Chair, appointed by the Dean of the College of Business in consultation with the Department Faculty, serves as the chief administrator of the Department. The Department Chair may at his or her discretion designate other appointees to effectively administer specific programs within the Department. This can include but is not limited to Program Directors/Advisors and Graduate Coordinators. The Chair may also appoint an Assistant Chair to assist in the administration of the Department.

The Department Chair serves as the chief executive officer of the Department, responsible to the University administration and the faculty of the Department. The Chair will consult with the proper committees on such matters as appointments, selection of new faculty, promotion and tenure recommendations, salary adjustments, curriculum, and general questions concerning allocation of Departmental resources.

Unless specifically stated otherwise herein, the Department Chair is an ex-officio (nonvoting) member of all Department committees. The Chair may cast the deciding vote in the event of a tie vote among committee members.

The Department Chair is evaluated by the Dean of the College of Business for purposes of annual evaluation.

The following committees shall be established and empowered. Each of the committees shall meet at least once during the academic year and decisions of these committees are the responsibility of faculty members

Risk Management/Insurance Program Curriculum Committee: This committee consists of all faculty having assignments within the risk management/insurance program. A committee chair shall be selected by majority vote of the committee membership.

This committee is responsible for the review and oversight of the undergraduate and graduate risk management/insurance program curricula. The committee is responsible for instituting curriculum changes involving the creation, deletion, and modification of requirements for majors, degree programs and certificate programs. This includes establishing, reviewing and assessing learning goals and reporting outcomes.

Minutes of the committee meetings shall be maintained by the committee and filed with the Department.

Real Estate Program Curriculum Committee: This committee consists of all faculty having assignments within the real estate program. A committee chair shall be selected by majority vote of the committee membership.

This committee is responsible for the review and oversight of the undergraduate and graduate real estate program curricula. The committee is responsible for instituting curriculum changes involving the creation, deletion, and modification of requirements for majors, degree programs and certificate and/or specialization programs. This includes establishing, reviewing and assessing learning goals and reporting outcomes.

Minutes of the committee meetings shall be maintained by the committee and filed with the Department.

Legal Studies Curriculum Committee: This committee consists of all faculty having assignments within the Legal Studies area. A committee chair shall be selected by majority vote of the committee membership.

This committee is responsible for the review and oversight of the undergraduate and graduate Legal Studies curricula. The committee is responsible for instituting curriculum changes involving the creation, deletion, and modification of course requirements. This includes establishing, reviewing and assessing learning goals and

reporting outcomes. (Note that the FSU Course Catalog retains the former “BUL” designation for course numbers.)

Minutes of the committee meetings shall be maintained by the committee and filed with the Department.

Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee: This committee consists of three full-time tenure-track faculty members, with one from each of the Risk Management/Insurance, Real Estate and Legal Studies curricular areas. Generally, all members shall be tenured; however, consistent with University policies, non-tenured faculty may hold membership on this committee as long as tenured faculty members comprise a majority. This committee is responsible for reviewing faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure, conducting a secret ballot, and providing a narrative of the meeting and a recommendation to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee in accordance with the applicable policies of the University regarding the candidates being considered for promotion and tenure.

The Department Chair shall initiate a secret ballot poll prior to or at the beginning of the academic year, requesting each faculty member to vote for not more than three individuals to serve on the committee. The individuals receiving the highest number of votes shall constitute the committee, with the requirement that a majority must be tenured and each curricular area represented. In the event of a tie vote, the Department Chair will select the final member(s) from among those tied. The Department Chair and any faculty members being considered for promotion and/or tenure are not eligible to serve on this committee.

The P&T Committee chair shall be selected by majority vote of the committee. The P&T Committee chair, or his or her designee from the committee, shall serve as the department representative on the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

The P&T Committee shall consider all faculty members below the rank of full professor for promotion or tenure, or both, if applicable, each year. In addition, as part of the promotion and tenure process, the P&T Committee shall conduct third-year faculty reviews.

Evaluations shall be conducted consistent with the promotion and/or tenure criteria and procedures of the University, the College and the Department (i.e., The Department of Risk Management/Insurance, Real Estate and Legal Studies – Faculty Evaluation Criteria).

Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC): This committee consists of the members of the department P&T Committee and two additional full-time voting faculty members

elected by the department faculty. The FEC Chair may be selected by majority vote of the committee if needed.

The FEC is responsible for conducting annual peer evaluations, peer teaching evaluations, sustained performance reviews and providing merit recommendations of the Department faculty. All members of the FEC are expected to participate in the evaluation and to provide their recommendations directly to the Department Chair. The evaluations and recommendations of the FEC are to be considered by the Department Chair in the annual evaluation of each faculty member and in determining merit. Non-tenure track faculty with primary appointments in one of the Department's Centers will be evaluated by the Center Director for purposes of annual evaluation. All evaluations must contain a narrative explanation attached to the evaluation summary form.

The FEC may also recommend to the Department Chair faculty deserving of special awards and/or recognitions of merit and achievement (e.g., named Professorships) within the University. Meetings of the FEC may be called by the FEC chair, the Department Chair or by at least three members of the FEC, with seven-day notice.

Evaluations shall be conducted consistent with the evaluation criteria and procedures of the University, the College and the Department (i.e., The Department of Risk Management/Insurance, Real Estate and Legal Studies – Faculty Evaluation Criteria), and the UFF-FSU Collective Bargaining Agreement. See Appendix A for specific evaluation criteria.

Other Ad Hoc Committees: The Department Chair may establish ad hoc committees as the Department Chair deems necessary to conduct the business of the Department (e.g., bylaws review, scholarship, and faculty recruiting committees). The chair of an appointed ad hoc committee is selected by the Department Chair.

Faculty Senate Representative: All College of Business representatives to the Faculty Senate, and official alternates, are nominated and elected College-wide, in accordance with the College of Business Bylaws. Members of the faculty of the Department of Risk Management/Insurance, Real Estate and Legal Studies serve as Senators when nominated and elected by the College as a whole.

Section E: Assignment of Responsibilities (AOR)

Each year, in consultation with faculty, AORs will be completed. AORs will outline each faculty member's expected allocation to teaching, research, and service. These allocations will be considered by the FEC in evaluating faculty members. This will make the evaluation criteria applicable to both tenure-track and specialized faculty.

Changes to AORs may be necessary if needs of the department change. Faculty will be consulted and notified of any changes to assignments.

Section F: Amendments

These Bylaws may be amended at any meeting of the department faculty by two-thirds vote conducted by ballot where a quorum is present. The proposed amendments shall be submitted to each member of the faculty at least 14 calendar days prior to the meeting at which voting is to take place.

APPENDIX A
Department of Risk Management/Insurance, Real Estate and Legal Studies
Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines
(Adopted – March 2007)
(Revised – January 2013)
(Revised – September 2018)
(Revised – December 2019)

This document describes the criteria and procedures used by the Department of Risk Management/Insurance, Real Estate and Legal Studies for conducting faculty reviews for five distinct, but related purposes: (A) annual faculty evaluations and merit raise decisions; (B) third-year reviews; (C) promotion and tenure; (D) sustained faculty performance reviews; and (E) other special recognitions and awards. No evaluation process shall require a forced distribution of evaluation ratings.

It is recognized that the evaluation criteria include both qualitative and quantitative aspects of performance that require judgment and interpretation by the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee, Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) and other evaluators.

As outlined in the department Bylaws:

- The department's FEC conducts and makes recommendations regarding annual faculty reviews, peer teaching evaluations, sustained faculty performance reviews, merit raise decisions, and other meritorious recognitions.
- The department's P&T committee considers all faculty members below the rank of full professor for promotion and tenure each year and conducts all third-year faculty reviews.

The Department expects a faculty member to perform effectively in the areas of teaching, research and service. In evaluating faculty for promotion, tenure and merit raises, the Department will give due regard to the nature of the faculty member's assigned duties within the Department.

Annual evaluations and merit raise decisions are based on quality performance in the assigned duties of research, teaching, service and administration. The criteria used are consistent with the specific provisions delineated in the FSU Faculty Handbook and in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Meritorious performance as defined by the Collective Bargaining Agreement is "Performance that meets or exceeds the expectations for the position classification and department/unit".

Section A. Annual Faculty Evaluations and Merit Raise Decisions

Annual evaluations of all faculty in the Department are conducted in the spring of each year and will take into account performance of assigned duties over the past year. Each faculty member is asked to complete a faculty performance report summarizing his or her research, teaching, service and administrative accomplishments for the previous year, and to provide an up-to-date vita. These materials are used by the FEC and the Department Chair to help evaluate annual performance. Faculty will be notified at least two weeks prior to the date they are asked to submit their performance report.

Each member of the FEC shall individually review the information provided and recommend to the Department Chair an overall ranking (as well as specific rankings for teaching/advising, research and service) for each faculty member, except himself or herself. The Collective Bargaining Agreement and the Faculty Handbook outline specific factors that should be considered in the evaluation process. The criteria outlined here are based on these resources. Each FEC member should consider the following:

1. **Evaluative Criteria for Teaching:** The purpose of teaching is to impart knowledge and critical thinking skills in the theoretical, practical, and ethical aspects of the corresponding discipline within the department. The following evidence, if provided, must be considered in the evaluation process. The listing of evidence that follows does not imply an order of priority.
 - **Course Materials and Methodology:** The development of innovative course materials, media, and methodology.
 - **Special Teaching Responsibilities and Related Assignments:** Teaching workshops or seminars; honors courses; adult education courses; in-service courses; DIS, supervised research; membership on masters or doctoral committees; and number of masters or doctoral major professor responsibilities.
 - **Out-of-Class Student Contact:** Academic advising – number of students, and extent of accessibility to students.
 - **Awards or Other Public Recognition:** Department, college, and university awards and other recognition of teaching excellence.
 - **Student Evaluations:** Results of teaching evaluative instruments and other independent student input.
 - **Peer Evaluations:** Includes only reasonably objective evidence such as from visitation and videotapes.
 - **Other Evidence:** Statement of candidate; willingness to assume new teaching assignments and schedules; and other teaching activities that are important to the department or college.

This evidence provides the basis for evaluating teaching performance. In evaluating teaching performance, consideration will be given to both the quality and quantity of the teaching activities. Consideration will also be given to factors

including but not limited to class size, class format/preparation time, and availability of assistance.

2. **Evaluative Criteria for Scholarship/Research:** The purpose of research and creative activity is to discover and develop a deeper understanding of knowledge with direct or indirect applicability to the disciplines represented within the faculty member's discipline. Research results from the communication of knowledge by way of a variety of publication media and oral presentations. The following evidence, if provided, must be considered in the evaluation process. The listing of evidence that follows does not imply an order of priority.
 - **Journal Articles:** Prestige of journal; whether or not the journal is refereed; single versus multiple authorship; importance and contribution of the article to the discipline.
 - **Scholarly Books:** Monographs; textbooks; edited and/or translated books; bibliographical books; books of readings; casebooks. Consideration must be given to the reputation of the publisher; whether or not publications are refereed; stage of completion of the book; book reviews; frequency of citation of the book by others; and number of copies printed.
 - **Articles in Published Works:** Proceedings of conferences or symposia; technical reports; semi-popular articles; book and other reviews; and abstracts.
 - **Related Scholarship:** Papers presented at meetings and academic conferences; discussant or chairperson roles at conferences and symposia; invited lectures; editorship for journals; professional scholarship awards; research grants; publication and research referees. Consideration must be given to the reputation of the meeting/activity; whether the publication process is regional, national, or international in scope; and the importance and contribution to the discipline.
 - **Other Evidence:** Work in progress; working papers, and other scholarship activities that are important to the department and college.

This evidence provides the underlying basis for evaluating research performance. In evaluating research performance, consideration will be given to the quality and quantity of the total portfolio of research evidence. Publications in highly selective and more rigorously refereed outlets will be more highly valued in the evaluation process than less rigorous and non-refereed outlets. The evidence of research performance must be interpreted

in light of the effort required, methodologies used, difficulty of the research process and the overall importance and contribution to the discipline.

3. **Evaluative Criteria for Service:** The purpose of service is to facilitate the accomplishment of departmental, college, university, community and professional goals. Service incorporates activities which are not considered strictly teaching or scholarship, but which enrich teaching and scholarship and benefit the university community, its stakeholders, and the State of Florida. The following evidence, if provided, must be considered in the evaluation process. The listing of evidence that follows does not imply an order of priority.
 - **Recognized Service:** Membership on department, college and university committees essential to the operation of the respective units; partial administrative duties to include serving as a center director and/or program coordinator; activity in professional groups (local, regional, national) such as officer or committee member; non-funded professional advisory service or presentations to community, civic, governmental or other external organizations; representative of department, college, or university at professional meetings; testimony on professional matters to legislative bodies; advisor for student organizations.
 - **Other Evidence:** Other service activities, such as external outreach and development, intra-departmental/university relations, and paid services that are important to the department or college.

This evidence provides the underlying basis for evaluating service performance. In evaluating service performance, consideration will be given to the quality and quantity of the total portfolio of service evidence. The evidence of service performance must be interpreted in light of the importance of the service activities to the department, college and university. The department should not recognize service only in the area of committee work. Leadership, time, effort, and breadth of service should also be considered.

Faculty shall be ranked on a scale of 1.0 to 5.0; where
5.0 is excellent, "Substantially Exceeds FSU's High Expectations" and deserving of high merit;
4.0 is very good, "Exceeds FSU's High Expectations" and deserving of merit;
3.0 is satisfactory, "Meets FSU's High Expectations" and deserving of merit if possible;
2.0 - marginal, "Official Concern" and where no merit is warranted; and
1.0 - poor, "Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations" and is unacceptable performance.

For faculty who are meeting expectations, there are three categories:

- Substantially Exceeds FSU's High Expectations – This describes a faculty member who far exceeds performance expectations during the evaluation period and achieves an extraordinary accomplishment or recognition in teaching, research, and service, which may include several of the following: highly significant research or creative activities; demonstrated recognition of the individual by peers as an authority in his/her field; securing significant external funding; attaining significant national or international achievements, awards, and recognition.
- Exceeds FSU's High Expectations – This describes an individual who exceeds expectations during the evaluation period by virtue of demonstrating noted achievements in teaching, research, and service, which may include several of the following: high level of research/creative activity, professional recognitions, willingness to accept additional responsibilities, high level of commitment to serving students and the overall mission of the Department, involvement/leadership in professional associations, initiative in solving problems or developing new ideas.
- Meets FSU's High Expectations – This describes an individual who demonstrates the requisite knowledge and skills in his/her field of specialty and completes assigned responsibilities in a manner that is both timely and consistent with the high expectations of the university.

If an individual's overall performance rating falls below "Meets FSU's High Expectations," specific suggestions for improvement should be provided to the employee. There are two performance rating categories for individuals who are not meeting expectations:

- Official Concern – This describes an individual who demonstrates the requisite knowledge and skills in his/her field of specialty but is not completing assigned responsibilities in a manner that is consistent with the high standards of the university.
- Unsatisfactory – "Does Not Meet FSU's High Expectations" - This describes an individual who fails to demonstrate with consistency the knowledge, skills, or abilities required in his/her field of specialty and/or in completing assigned responsibilities.

A Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) is required when a non-tenured faculty member receives a “Does Not Meet FSU’s High Expectations” rating. A tenured faculty member may be placed on a PIP if he/she receives an overall performance rating of “Does Not Meet FSU’s High Expectations” on three or more of the previous six performance evaluations.

The Department Chair considers all documentation, including the faculty performance report, rankings by members of the FEC, and pertinent information from other applicable sources and completes the Annual Evaluation Summary Form indicating one of the five performance rating categories. The Department Chair shall meet individually with each faculty member in the spring to provide evaluative feedback. The Department Chair shall discuss any material differences between the chair’s final rankings and the average FEC ranking with the faculty member affected, and report the differences to the Dean.

Merit raise decisions will be based on the average of the final annual performance rankings over the previous three years. Merit criteria may not mandate a merit pay award for all members of the department and must reflect distinctive levels of merit reflecting the differences in performance. Because the funds available for merit can change dramatically from year to year, no specific allocation method is adopted. If merit funds become available, the FEC will meet to recommend a distribution procedure to the Department Chair (e.g., merit if possible = \$x; merit = \$2x; and high merit = \$4x).

Non tenure track faculty employed in Department Centers will be evaluated by the Center Director for purposes of annual evaluation.

Section B. Third-Year Reviews*

The third-year review is a more detailed evaluation for the purpose of providing additional feedback to tenure-earning faculty regarding their progress to date toward promotion and tenure.

All assistant professors are required to undergo third-year evaluations beginning in the fall semester of their third year in rank. Evaluative materials are to be collected during the fall semester and submitted to the department’s P&T Committee at the beginning of the spring semester. The preparation of these materials (i.e., binders) should follow the

* Assistant Professors hired July 1, 2019 or later shall receive a tenure review in their third year. Assistant Professors hired before July 1, 2019 and who have not yet had a 2nd-year review may choose between a 2nd and 4th year set of reviews or a 3rd year review. Assistant Professors hired before July 1, 2019 and who have already had a 2nd year review shall have a 4th year review. Assistant Professors hired with credit toward tenure shall have credited years included in the determination of the timing of the third-year review unless an alternative schedule is mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and his or her supervisor.

general guidelines for preparing promotion and tenure binders, except that outside letters are not required.

The department P&T Committee will review the binders during the spring semester and prepare a letter of recommendation to the candidate. The Department Chair will add his or her letter and forward the entire package to the Dean. The Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair, will make a decision regarding the provisions of renewal or non-renewal of the faculty member's contract.

Section C. Promotion and Tenure

These criteria, in addition to the criteria listed in the current Faculty Handbook and the current annual Promotion and Tenure Memorandum issued by the Dean of Faculties, constitute the minimum criteria used in the promotion and tenure process by the Department of Risk Management/Insurance, Real Estate and Legal Studies.

Promotion or Appointment to the Rank of Assistant Professor: The promotion or appointment to the rank of assistant professor shall be based on demonstrated competency in teaching, service, and the promise of scholarly development. Promotion shall be considered automatic upon completion of the doctoral degree, but full documentation shall be submitted with other promotion materials.

Promotion or Appointment to the Rank of Associate Professor: The promotion or appointment to the rank of associate professor shall be based on demonstrated effectiveness in teaching, scholarly research, service, and recognized standing in the discipline as attested by required letters from competent scholars outside the University.

Promotion or Appointment to the Rank of Professor: The promotion or appointment to the rank of professor shall be based on superior teaching, scholarly research, service, and recognized standing in the discipline as attested by required letters from competent scholars outside the University.

Criteria for Tenure: The criteria for tenure shall be the same as promotion criteria to the rank of associate professor or professor and, additionally, the faculty member shall demonstrate his or her ability to continue to make significant professional contributions to their discipline, the College, the University, and the academic community.

Promotion from "Assistant in" to "Associate in:" Masters degree (or terminal degree) and three (3) years at the "Assistant in" rank **OR** Bachelors degree and five (5) years at the "Assistant in" rank

Promotion from "Associate in" to "Research Associate:" Ph.D. (or terminal degree) **OR** ten (10) years experience at the "Assistant in" and/or "Associate in" ranks.

Section D. Other Special Recognitions and Awards

The FEC may, at its option, recommend to the Department Chair and/or Dean faculty to receive special recognitions (e.g., professorships, fellowships, and directorships) and/or awards available through the Department, College or University.

APPENDIX B
Department of Risk Management/Insurance, Real Estate and Legal Studies
Summer Teaching Assignments
(Adopted – January 2008)
(Revised – January 2013)
(Revised – September 2018)

Summer teaching assignments will be based on (1) the summer teaching budget allocated to the Department; (2) the course needs to facilitate the Department's programs and accommodate student demand; and (3) faculty availability. Before making summer teaching assignments, the Department Chair will consult with each faculty member about his or her desire to teach and their expectations regarding their other summer appointments (e.g., internally- or externally-funded teaching, research or service appointments).

Supplemental summer assignments shall be offered to qualified faculty members before anyone who is not a faculty member. Every effort will be made to give summer teaching assignments to those desiring to teach. Doctoral students who have completed their first academic year in residence will be expected to carry a minimum one-course summer teaching load, unless a teaching or research assistantship is deemed to be in the best interest of the student and/or the program.

Priority for summer teaching assignments will be given first to faculty who have not taught in the summer in recent years (but were otherwise eligible); second to non-tenure track faculty; and third to those who do not have other internally-funded summer financial support (e.g., COFRS grants, Panama City courses, International Programs, or other internal service or research assignments). Priority within the third category will be made relative to the level of internal funding received – those with less funding receive higher priority.

Faculty who have developed, or more recently redeveloped, an online graduate program course will be offered the first option to teach the course if it is required to be offered during the summer.

To encourage faculty to apply for external funding opportunities, the priority of summer teaching assignments is not affected by receiving teaching, research, or service appointments (e.g., research contracts, grants, stipends, or fellowships) funded by public or private sources outside Florida State University.