

THE UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA

DEPARTMENT OF EARTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

BYLAWS AND STANDING RULES

Ratified by acclimation of E&ES faculty November 18, 2015

Revised and approved April 18, 2016

Accepted by Hal Marcus College of Science and Engineering April 28, 2016

Revised and approved October 19, 2018

Accepted by the Hal Marcus College of Science and Engineering February, 2020

Table of Contents

1. Name of Department	2
2. Mission	2
3. Members of the Department	2
4. Officers	3
5. Departmental Meetings	4
6. Committee Structure	4
7. Department Performance Standards for Evaluation	5
A. Performance Ratings	5
B. Criteria	6
8. Mid-point Review	14
A. Background	14
B. Content	15
C. Preparation	15
D. Timeline	15
9. Tenure and Promotion.....	16
A. Background	16
B. Criteria	17
C. Expectations	20
D. Procedures	21
10. Policies and Procedures	22
A. Annual Salary Increment Increases	22
B. Summer Supplemental Contract Opportunities	22
C. Allocation of Paid Overload Appointments	22
D. Departmental Resources	22
E. Requests for Release Time	23
F. Seed Account	23
G. Mentor Committee	23
H. Procedures for Annual Work Assignments	23
11. Academic Policies	24
A. Undergraduate Advising	24
B. Changes in Policies	24
C. Grading and Examination Policies	23
D. Office Hours	24
12. Amendment	24
13. Dates of Adoption/Revisions	25
APPENDIX: DEPARTMENT MERIT SALARY CRITERIA	26

DEPARTMENT OF EARTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

BYLAWS AND STANDING RULES

1. Name of Department

The Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, hereafter referred to as the Department, is a unit of the Hal Marcus College of Science and Engineering at The University of West Florida.

2. Mission

The Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences is committed to educating and training students in such a manner that they will be equipped to function in the world of today, and be able to adapt to and perform in the world of tomorrow. Students are stimulated to think independently while obtaining intellectual breadth that will forge them into future leaders. The Department contributes to the University's mission by preparing students to think critically, communicate effectively, and act ethically.

The Department promotes high quality research by faculty in collaboration with colleagues, students, and staff. The Department seeks truth in science and encourages science-based engagement of the regional community and dissemination of noteworthy results to the scientific community. The Department strongly encourages faculty to seek external support (facilities, equipment, release time, and funding). The Department endorses service activities in all arenas, including service to the college, university, professional organizations, and community.

The Department sanctions and fully accepts the mission statement of the University, especially as it pertains to providing: "...students with access to high-quality, relevant, and affordable undergraduate and graduate learning experiences".

3. Members of the Department

The Department shall be composed of faculty members, lecturers, instructors, adjunct instructors, faculty associates, visiting instructors/professors, and staff. One of the faculty of the Department shall serve as the Department Chair.

Faculty holding the rank of permanent lecturer, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor are eligible to participate in Departmental governance activities and to vote on non-personnel matters. The eligibility to vote on faculty personnel matters is restricted to full-time tenured/tenure-earning faculty in a manner consistent with university guidelines. All

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

4. Officers

The Chair

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

It is expected that the chair will perform all responsibilities in the best interests of the Department by taking into account the wisdom and advice of faculty colleagues.

The Dean of the College of Science and Engineering shall select the Chairperson of the Department in consultation with the faculty of the Department. The Chairperson must be tenured in the Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences and hold the rank of associate professor or professor. The Department Chair shall serve for a period of up to four years. With approval from the Dean and consent of the faculty, the Chair may serve additional four-year terms. If a Chair takes a sabbatical or other leave, that interlude shall be considered part of the chair's elected term. A retiring Chair shall advise and assist the elected successor at least through the term prior to the commencement of the succeeding chair.

The Associate Chair

The Department Chair may appoint an Associate Chair, subject to confirmation by the Dean. The Associate Chair will be a tenured or tenure-track faculty member of the Department. The tenure of the Associate Chair shall be for one academic year. With approval from the Dean and consent of the faculty, the Associate Chair may serve any number of consecutive terms.

The Associate Chair will aid the Chair with regard to managing administrative duties and decision-making. The Associate Chair will represent the Department Chair in his or her absence and will serve as Acting Chair if the office of the Chair is temporarily vacant. The Associate Chair will carry out assignments designated to him/her by the Chair and agreed upon at the beginning of each semester.

The Graduate Coordinator

The Department Chair may appoint a Graduate Coordinator, subject to confirmation by the

Dean. The Graduate Coordinator will be a tenured or tenure-track faculty member of the Department. The tenure of the Graduate Coordinator shall be for two academic years. With faculty approval, the Graduate coordinator may serve additional two-year terms.

The Graduate Coordinator acts as the liaison between the Graduate School and the Department and its graduate students. The Graduate Coordinator ensures that the Department conforms to Graduate School regulations and communicates Graduate School regulations to faculty and graduate students. The Graduate Coordinator advises the Graduate School about matters of concern to faculty and students and will represent the Department at Graduate Council Meetings when possible.

The Graduate Coordinator advises entering graduate students of Departmental and Graduate School programs, policies, and regulations and offers initial advice about courses. The Graduate Coordinator monitors graduate student progress and consults with students about any deficiencies in academic achievement or violations of Departmental or Graduate School regulation. The Graduate Coordinator annually evaluates the records of students approaching graduation to be sure that they have met Department and Graduate School degree requirements.

The Graduate Coordinator oversees the management of a database on graduate students maintained by the Department, including such information as date of initial enrollment, entering GPA and GRE score, track (thesis vs. non-thesis), financial aid received, and degree progress.

5. Departmental Meetings

There shall be at least one faculty meeting per semester during the Fall and Spring academic terms. A simple majority of eligible faculty must be present to carry out official Departmental business. Parliamentary procedures, order of business and voting procedures, etc. will be carried out according to Robert's Rules of Order. Issues carried to the Faculty for resolution by vote require a simple majority for passage. Eligible voters are those faculty identified in section 3 above. Absent members may vote by means of a signed proxy.

At least one week's notice shall be given for departmental meetings, except in emergency situations. Faculty may place items on the agenda via the Department Chair. The agenda will circulate at least two days prior to the meeting.

6. Committee Structure

Ad hoc committees may be formed by the Chair as the need develops to carry out specific responsibilities. In memoranda or agenda, the Chair shall propose committee memberships to the

faculty as a whole for ratification. Committees will consist of at least three regular faculty. These Ad hoc committees are disbanded following completion of assigned duties. Specific Ad Hoc committees that may be formed by the Chair include:

1. Planning and Governance Committee

Charge: To consult with the Chair in matters respecting the Department's internal governance, its response to changes in college and university policy, and its long-term prospects and needs. To advise the Chair in awarding financial support to students.

2. Curriculum Committee

Charge: To review the nature and the sequencing of courses, Departmental degree requirements and advisement policies. To research and propose new programs, tracks, and options, and to review and approve new course proposals and changes of current course descriptions. Adjunct faculty will be invited to participate in discussions if relevant.

3. Assessment Committee

Charge: To design tools and implement procedures to gather adequate, proper and usable data to ensure that intended pedagogical goals are being met in all courses graduate and undergraduate; to evaluate/assess gathered data and report results to the Department faculty, suggesting changes whenever necessary.

7. Department Performance Standards for Evaluation

A. Performance Ratings

The following criteria represent guidelines to make appropriate judgments on quality of performance for annual evaluations. Performance is rated on a five-step scale:

Poor: Unacceptable level of performance. Major areas of weakness require remediation.

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

Good: Moderate progress toward long-term professional goals, but one or more minor weaknesses exist.

Excellent: Meets Department standards for professional performance. No areas of weakness exist.

Distinguished: Exceeds Department standards for professional performance. Exceeds the standard for excellence in quality or quantity or both.

B. Criteria

Teaching

In this performance area, the ratings in the first three performance categories (*poor, fair, good*) do not facilitate favorable tenure and promotion decisions.

Poor

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

Indicators:

- Student evaluations document consistent and substantive problems. The annual average score of all reported sections taught for items 1 (communication of ideas), 8 (facilitation of learning), 10 (instructor's command of the subject), 11 (overall assessment of instructor) and 12 (overall course organization) on the Student Assessment of Instruction is below 2.5. This indicator should not be valued over the others.
- Teaching philosophy may be missing, poorly articulated or poorly expressed in course activities and planning
- No indication of course development and revision
- Syllabi fail to establish clear and relevant expectations
- Assessment practices are inadequate to support student learning and Department needs (e.g., learning outcomes are inadequate, inappropriate, or missing; testing strategies are not effective or fair)
- Goals and course content reflect no continuous improvement efforts; no assistance rendered for Department assessment plan
- Pedagogical practices are unsound (e.g., disorganization; late, missing, unhelpful feedback; standards too lax or too challenging; routinely poor preparation; disengaging, chaotic, or hostile classroom environment)
- Student support practices are unsound (e.g., late or absent for class, not responding to email, not keeping office hours, showing favoritism)
- Consistent and very negative ratings in advising, mentoring, and supervision of student's scholarly or creative activities
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, general education) avoided or poorly executed
- Chronic academic integrity concerns identified including evidence of disrespect for students and their rights
- Avoids teaching developmental experiences

Fair

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

Indicators:

- Student evaluations document consistent and substantive problems. The annual average score of all reported sections taught for items 1 (communication of ideas), 8 (facilitation of learning), 10 (instructor's command of the subject), 11 (overall assessment of instructor) and 12 (overall course organization) on the Student Assessment of Instruction is below 2.5. This indicator should not be valued over the others.
- No indication of course development and revision
- Teaching philosophy may not be clearly expressed in course planning and activities
- Syllabi need to provide clearer and more appropriate expectations
- Assessment practices show some difficulty in supporting student learning and meeting Department needs
- Goals and course content reflect limited continuous improvement effort
- Some pedagogical practices need attention
- Some student support practices need improvement
- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices need improvement
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, general education) could be executed with greater competence
- Occasional challenges related to academic integrity, including disrespect for students and their rights
- Does not typically participate in teaching development activity
- Does not participate in design or implementation of assessment procedures, protocols, or instruments.

Good

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

Indicators:

- Student evaluation data is below the Department norm. The annual average score of all reported sections taught for items 1 (communication of ideas), 8 (facilitation of learning), 10 (instructor's command of the subject), 11 (overall assessment of instructor) and 12 (overall course organization) on the Student Assessment of Instruction is between 2.5 and 2.8. This indicator should not be valued over the others.
- No indication of course development and revision
- Student evaluations document adequate impact on learning
- Syllabi provide reasonably clear and appropriate expectations
- Goals and course content give evidence of continuous improvement effort

- Majority of pedagogical practices are appropriate and effective
- Majority of student support practices are appropriate and effective
- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices are appropriate and effective
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, general education) executed with reasonable skill
- Maintains appropriate standards of academic integrity, including respect for students and their rights
- Participates in teaching development activities when directed to do so
- Participates in design or implementation of assessment procedures, protocols, or instruments only when directed to do so

Excellent

Demonstrates *consistent high quality* teaching with positive outcomes for student as reflected by a combination of the below indicators. In general, excellence *meets* all or almost all the standard expectations for faculty who are successful in tenure and promotion decisions.

Indicators:

- Student evaluation data meets or exceeds Departmental norm. The annual average score of all reported sections taught for items 1 (communication of ideas), 8 (facilitation of learning), 10 (instructor's command of the subject) , 11 (overall assessment of instructor) and 12 (overall course organization) on the Student Assessment of Instruction is above 2.8. This indicator should not be valued over the others.
- Evidence provided of ongoing course content update and revision to reflect changes in the field and pedagogy
- Student evaluations document positive impact on learning
- Syllabi outline comprehensive, clear, and appropriate performance expectations
- Course content appropriately provides evidence of continuous improvement effort
- Pedagogical practices facilitate excellent learning conditions
- Student support practices facilitate excellent student development
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, general education) executed with skill
- Appropriate standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights
- Directs undergraduate and graduate (thesis and non-thesis) research
- Participates in design or implementation of assessment procedures, protocols, or instruments

Distinguished

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

Indicators:

- Numerical student evaluation data document clear statistical exceptionality as indicated by a minimum of 3.3 annual average of all reported sections taught for items 1 (communication of ideas), 8 (facilitation of learning), 10 (instructor's command of the subject), 11 (overall assessment of instructor) and 12 (overall course organization) on the Student Assessment of Instruction. This indicator should not be valued over the others.
- Teaches at multiple levels of the undergraduate and graduate curriculum
- Demonstrates substantive and productive course design or revision
- Narrative statements emphasize powerful impact on learner or transformative learning experiences
- Teaching awards honor high caliber of performance
- Peer evaluation indicates high caliber of teaching performance
- Leadership evident in the promotion of high quality teaching and curriculum development
- Directs undergraduate and graduate (thesis and non-thesis) research
- Publication of peer-reviewed articles on the scholarship of teaching and learning
- Active and substantial participation in design or implementation of assessment procedures, protocols, or instruments

NOTE: For the purpose of assigning a numerical value to ratings in teaching evaluation

- Numerical student evaluation data is compiled on items 3 (communication of ideas), 5 (facilitation of learning), 8 (overall assessment of instructor), 17 (instructor's command of the subject) and 18 (overall course organization) on the Student Assessment of Instruction.
- A POOR is assigned 0 points, FAIR is 1 point, GOOD is 2 points, VERY GOOD is 3 points, EXCELLENT is 4 points. To account for differences in SAI results between courses of different level (undergraduate, graduate, general education) scores for graduate level courses will be multiplied by 0.97 and scores for general education courses will be multiplied by 1.10.

Scholarship

Poor

Demonstrates *serious* problems in developing scholarship as reflected by the indicator below. In general, scholarly production is *well below* the Department norms.

Indicators:

- Scholarly agenda has not been identified (e.g., central focus of career interest has not materialized)
- Does not advise research students at undergraduate or graduate level

- No demonstrated pursuit of internal or external funding for research activities
- Minimal pursuit of scholarly projects
- Avoidance of professional organization involvement that could help disseminate or display faculty work
- Failure to pursue expected professional enhancement activities (e.g., licensure, continuing education, technology training)
- Avoidance of grant exploration or pursuit
- Ethical regulations violated regarding scholarly or artistic production
- Poor time management strategies handicap work output

Fair

Demonstrates only *minor* tangible progress toward executing a scholarly agenda as shown by the indicators below. In general, scholarly production is *moderately below* the Department norms.

Indicators:

- General focus of interest identified
- Evidence of some completion of beginning stages of scholarly process (e.g., data collection, manuscript outline, research plan)
- Does not advise research students at undergraduate or graduate level or only co-advises research students
- No demonstrated pursuit of internal or external funding for research activities
- Exploration of possible scholarly collaboration or resource network to help with specific plan
- Professional organizations identified that will support scholarly goals
- Appropriate professional educational opportunities (e.g., licensure, technology training, special educational opportunities) identified
- Sources of external support for scholarship activities identified and explored
- Judgment about ethical standards for scholarly production may be problematic at times
- Questionable time management strategies limit production

Good

Demonstrates *moderate* tangible progress in scholarship as shown by the indicators below but work falls *mildly below* Department standards of excellence.

Indicators:

- Scholarly projects completed but falls short of rate of Department standards related to the rate of completion or quality of dissemination venue
- Serves as primary advisor for fewer than two graduate students or only serves as coadvisor
- Completed projects suggest the potential for significant, high quality scholarship over the candidate's career.
- Appropriate professional educational opportunities pursued

- Involvement with professional organizations that will support scholarly goals
- Pursues only internal grants
- Pursues only grants that do not directly support student efforts
- Adheres to relevant ethics conventions for scholarly projects
- Reasonably effective time management strategies contribute to success

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

Excellent

Demonstrates *satisfactory* execution of scholarship activities as shown by the indicators below. In general, scholarly projects *meet* the standards of the Department.

Indicators:

- Serves as primary advisor for one graduate student in a capstone course, which leads to a peer-reviewed publication or major conference presentation for the student, or serves as thesis director for two graduate students in the thesis track.
The faculty may use other one-on-one graduate student research experiences in lieu of one or more theses but it is incumbent upon the faculty to demonstrate that the totality of all experiences (thesis and/or other) is equivalent to two graduate theses.
- Engages in undergraduate research mentoring
- Demonstrated efforts to prepare manuscripts for submission to peer-reviewed publications for work in which faculty member is primary author
- Significant contributing author on presentations at regional, national, or international meetings
- Scholarly activities well suited to regional comprehensive university context
- Meets Department production targets for both quantity and quality of scholarship
- Favorable review by and respect from majority of colleagues in the Department for scholarly works
- Potential for recognition of quality outside of the University
- Pursues external grants and contracts
- Pursues external grant and contracts that support student research efforts
- Internal support captured to facilitate scholarship

Distinguished

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

Indicators:

- Serves as primary advisor for two graduate students in a capstone course, which leads to a peer-reviewed publication or major conference presentation for each student, or serves as thesis director for three or more graduate students in the thesis track.
The faculty may use other one-on-one graduate student research experiences in lieu of one or more theses but it is incumbent upon the faculty to demonstrate that the totality of all experiences (thesis and/or other) is equivalent to two graduate theses.
- Engages in undergraduate and graduate research mentoring
- Advises students who lead professional academic presentations
- Obtains external grants and contracts
- Obtains external grants and contracts that support student research efforts
- Publishes manuscripts in peer-reviewed publications as primary author or primary faculty author for manuscripts co-written with students
- Primary or faculty author (with student co-authors) on presentations at regional, national, or international meetings
- Both quantity and quality measures clearly exceed Department expectations
- National or international recognition earned for quality
- Achievements in continuing professional training show merit
- Strong record of grant pursuit, grant awards, successful completion of projects, and dissemination of results
- Serves the discipline through manuscript review, editorial services, organization of conferences or workshops

Service

Service is broadly defined and should include a wide range of services including, but not limited to, the following:

Service on University, college, and Department governance

Public lectures

Service as Department chair, program director or other departmental officer

Unremunerated consultancies

Community activities related to one's discipline

Advising student organizations

Service to academic organizations

Service to professional organizations

Service on editorial review boards

Service to the university in the form of travel to and from remote campuses locations

Although there is no requirement about the balance of service activities that faculty should select, there is an expectation that the faculty member will function effectively as a department citizen, assisting in completing the work of the Department's programs.

Poor

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

Indicators:

- Service activity nonexistent or very poor in quality, producing a potentially adverse impact on the goals of the relevant organization
- Significance of the obligation of service in the faculty role in a regional comprehensive university not apparent (e.g., faculty seems resistant or oblivious to service needs)
- Does not provide community service.

Fair

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

Indicators:

- Appropriate arenas for service identified and explored, but not engaged
- Minimal contributions made in service role (e.g., "sits" on committees as compared to active participation)
- Recognition of service obligation in faculty role shapes consideration
- Over-commitment to service spreads faculty time and energy too thinly to facilitate effectiveness
- Provides limited service to community.

Good

Demonstrates tangible progress in relevant service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is *somewhat below* Department norms. Acceptable performance early in career as potential is demonstrated but expectation is that service excellence is the standard that produces positive personnel decisions.

Indicators:

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

Excellent

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

Indicators:

- Scope and effort level meet Department standards
- Active participant in committees within and outside Department, including college and University engagement
- Colleagues view contributions to Department as effective
- Service well suited to regional comprehensive university mission
- Potential shown for recognition inside and outside of the university
- Community service provides synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions.

Distinguished

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

Indicators:

- Leadership demonstrated in targeted arenas of service (e.g., holds elected office; collaborates skillfully and innovatively)
- Actively leads committees within and outside Department, including college and University engagement
- Problems solved proactively through vigorous contributions
- Wide external recognition (local, national or international audiences) or awards achieved for quality of service contributions
- Community service provides significant and measurable impact; service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions.
- Reports to the media about teaching and research.

8. Mid-point Review

A. Background: UWF Policy on Annual Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion

“It is also the responsibility of the Department to conduct a review during the mid-point of the probationary period. The Dean must identify the approximate date of the mid-point review in the initial appointment letter. The Chair shall take responsibility for ensuring that the Department completes the review, whether the Chair provides the evaluation or

delegates the responsibility (e.g., mentoring committee).” (Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion Policy, 2014-2015).

“The mid-point review is intended to provide formative feedback to optimize faculty success in the tenure decision. The review should corroborate success and encourage faculty who are making solid progress toward tenure, inform faculty who may need to improve in selected areas of performance, and warn faculty where lack of progress could jeopardize a favorable outcome. Faculty members may elect to include a copy of the mid-point review in the tenure portfolio; however, inclusion is not required.” (Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion Policy, 2014-2015).

“All mid-point reviews should address the performance of annual assignments, including teaching, scholarly and creative projects, and service occurring during the preceding tenure-earning years of employment. In addition, all reviews should assess overall performance and contributions critically in light of mid-point expectations.” (Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion Policy, 2014-2015).

B. Content

In addition to the preceding information, the mid-point review should include a:

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

C. Preparation

- a. It is the responsibility of the faculty member’s mentors to guide the faculty member in preparing the mid-point review.
- b. The mentors will provide feedback to the faculty member, which will include a performance improvement plan, if necessary.
- c. The Chair will prepare a written summary of the evaluation that will go in the faculty member’s personnel file and for the Dean’s review.
- d. The Dean will review the Department’s written mid-point review and respond to the Department and the faculty member in writing.
- e. Faculty members may elect to include a copy of the mid-point review in the tenure portfolio; however, inclusion is not required.

D. Timeline

- a. The faculty member will submit the mid-point review at the beginning of the Spring semester during the third year, unless otherwise indicated in the faculty's appointment letter.
- b. The mentors will review the dossier during the Spring semester and provide written feedback to the faculty member.
- c. The mentors will have a meeting with the faculty member before the end of the Spring semester and provide feedback to the faculty member as well as the Chair.
- d. The Chair will submit a written evaluation along with the annual evaluation, to be submitted to the College Dean.

9. Tenure and Promotion

A. Background: UWF Policy on Annual Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion

“Faculty beginning careers at UWF. Candidates for tenure must submit for tenure review no later than the fall of the 6th year of employment. Candidates for tenure with unusually strong performance records may submit for review no earlier than the fall of the 5th year.” (Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion Policy, 2014-2015).

“Faculty transferring to UWF. Faculty members may negotiate up to 2 years of credit toward tenure based on past performance. The initial appointment letter must clearly identify the number of years of credit toward tenure. When the Dean grants 2 years of credit toward tenure, regular consideration for tenure will transpire in the fall of the 4th year of employment. Early consideration for tenure, in cases where candidates demonstrate unusually strong performance, will initiate tenure review in the fall of the 3rd year. In cases for which service outside UWF produced credit toward tenure, a copy of the initial appointment letter documenting this credit must be included in the portfolio. Any subsequent changes to years of credit toward tenure also must be documented and included in the portfolio.”(Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion Policy, 2014-2015).

“Candidates for Associate Professor will typically complete 5 years of employment at the assistant professor level before submitting a dossier for review in the fall of the 6th year. Candidates may submit for review after the completion of 4 years of employment in exceptional cases where annual evaluations point to success in meeting performance expectations for the preceding 3-year period. A candidate being reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor should be expected to have at least excellent ratings in all 3 categories of review for 3 years at UWF prior to submission of the dossier.” (Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion Policy, 2014-2015).

“Candidates for Professor will typically complete at least 5 years of employment at the associate level, 3 of which should transpire at UWF. Candidates may submit for review

after the completion of 4 years of employment at the associate level, at least 3 years of which have transpired at UWF, in exceptional cases where annual evaluations point to success in meeting performance expectations. A candidate being reviewed for promotion to Professor should demonstrate at least excellent ratings in all areas of review (teaching, scholarly and creative projects, and service) and at least 1 area should be rated as distinguished in the 3 years immediately preceding submission of the dossier. The distinguished rating can be in different areas over the course of the 3 years but a minimum of one distinguished rating each year must be reflected in the evaluation.” (Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion Policy, 2014-2015).

B. Criteria

The Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences supports the university position that a candidate for tenure and promotion must show expertise in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The performance standards for tenure and promotion in these three areas are based on performance evaluations and additional criteria.

Performance based criteria.

The University of West Florida dictates that performance in all three areas be ranked according to a 5- point scale: distinguished, excellent, good, fair, or poor (see section 7 above for description of ranks). The ranks are expected in accordance with the time frames set forth in the institution’s Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion Policy (see section 9.A above for excerpt of policy):

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

To be promoted to **associate professor**, a faculty member must demonstrate *excellent* performance in all three categories.

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

Additional tenure and promotion criteria

It is expected that all faculty will conduct themselves in accordance with the policies outlined in UWF Professional Standards and the UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement. Collegiality will be used in the evaluation. The additional criteria evaluating teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service include, but are not limited to, the following:

Teaching Criteria

Very significant

- External Honors, awards and other accomplishments related to teaching.
- Design and testing of new laboratory activities or major revision of established laboratories.

- Directing students in undergraduate and graduate (non-thesis) research: five research products (e.g., papers, presentations, or posters).
- Directing graduate students in formal research: three theses or faculty serves as primary advisor for three graduate students in a capstone course, which leads to a peer-reviewed publication or major conference presentation for each student.
The faculty may use other one-on-one graduate student research experiences in lieu of one or more theses but it is incumbent upon the faculty to demonstrate that the totality of all experiences (thesis and/or other) is equivalent to three graduate theses.
- Nomination for, or winning, SGA teaching award.
- Publication of peer-reviewed articles on the scholarship of teaching and learning.
- Peer evaluations of teaching or other evidence documenting outstanding teaching performance.

Significant

- Clear and effective communication in the classroom or online environment.
- Design and implementation of new assessment procedures, protocols, and instruments that measure student learning outcomes and program effectiveness.
- Unsolicited student comments/feedback.
- Innovation and introduction of new teaching techniques.
- Internal publication of new laboratory manual.
- Satisfactory student evaluations.
- Activity undertaken for professional growth that will enhance the instructor's effectiveness as a teacher.
- Design of new courses.
- Revisions, innovations, and development of established courses.
- Teaching specialty topics in seminars, discussion groups, and other student-centric delivery forums.
- Organization and planning of courses.
- Obtaining Quality Matters Certification for online courses.
- Clear and definitive explanation of assignments.

Scholarship Criteria

Very significant

- Publication of book or monograph.
- Publication of book chapter on specialized subject.
- Invited lecture to international, national, or regional meetings.
- Peer-reviewed publication.
 - Must be able to demonstrate a rigorous peer-review process (e.g., editorial and independent reviewers providing feedback on required manuscript revisions)

- Peer-reviewed conference proceedings subject to editorial review.
 - Must be able to demonstrate a rigorous peer-review process (e.g., editorial and independent reviewers providing feedback on required manuscript revisions)
- Publishing an invited review article on a research related topic.
- Grant received, competitive external.
- Contracts received, competitive external.
- Editor for a journal or book.

Significant

- Presentation at professional meetings (non-invited lecture or poster).
- Faculty advisor of student presenting at professional meeting.
- Publication of technical report.
- Published papers of a non-research type.
- Grants received, non-competitive or internal.
- Contracts received, non-competitive or internal.
- Professional seminars or lectures.
- Reviewer for a peer-reviewed journal.
- Pursued extramural support (pursued unsuccessfully).
- Organize and/or lead panel or special session at professional conference.

Service Criteria

Service to the Department

- Serving on Department committees, such as search committees or ad hoc committees.
- Providing service to student organizations related to the Department.
- Promoting the Department and recruiting students through outreach opportunities, such as Community College or High School articulation, Phone-a-thons, Open Houses, and Orientations.
- Other services related to recruitment and retention of students.
- Mentoring untenured faculty.
- Serving as Associate Chair, Graduate Coordinator, or in similar positions.
- Preparing students for professional conferences or publication.
- Advising and mentoring students.

Service to the College and University

- Active participation in college and university councils and committees.
- Providing service to university wide student organizations, such as honor societies, fraternities, or sororities.
- Reporting to the media about a research related topic.

Service to the Community

- Involvement in faculty development programs for community college and high school faculty.
- Assisting in organizing district wide activities such as mathematics or science contests, science fairs (as judges, etc.) and other science education activities.
- Delivering public presentations to local organizations, schools, or businesses.
- Providing information when requested by the public or middle or high school students.
- Demonstrating exceptional impact to community in publicity, public recognition, etc.

Service to the Discipline

- Serving on editorial review boards.
- Organize national-level conferences or workshops
- Editing a scholarly journal.
- Serving as a reviewer/referee on textbooks, monographs, or grants.
- Serving on the boards of professional organization or services to those organizations.
- Serving on conference committees, such as program committee or book award committee.
- Participating in roundtable or panel discussions, special sessions at professional meetings.
- Providing keynote addresses.

C. Expectations

The candidate for tenure must:

- Demonstrate a high level of competence in teaching while contributing to the instructional needs of Departmental programs. The faculty member will develop and instruct lecture/laboratory course(s) in area(s) of expertise and assist at all levels of instruction in a collegial atmosphere. The candidate must have met a total of at least three criteria from the “Very Significant” list of teaching criteria while employed at the University of West Florida. The candidate may utilize a collection of items from the “Significant” list of teaching criteria as a substitute for a single “Very Significant” item. A strong and compelling case must be made within the tenure packet regarding the impact of the “Significant” criteria.
- Establish an area of research specialty in the discipline. The candidate's scholarly activity must be recognized by peers external to the University and must have met a total of at least five criteria from the “Very Significant” list of scholarship criteria while employed at the University of West Florida. The candidate may utilize a collection of items from the “Significant” list of scholarship criteria as a substitute for a single “Very Significant” item. A strong and compelling case must be made within the tenure packet regarding the impact of the “Significant” criteria.
- Show tangible evidence of service to the University, community and profession. The candidate must have met a total of at least three of the service criteria while employed at the University of West Florida.

The candidate for promotion to associate professor must:

- Demonstrate a high level of competence in teaching while contributing to the instructional needs of Departmental programs. The faculty member will develop and instruct lecture/laboratory course(s) in area(s) of expertise and assist at all levels of instruction in a collegial atmosphere. The candidate must have met a total of at least three criteria from the “Very Significant” list of teaching criteria while employed at the University of West Florida. The candidate may utilize a collection of items from the “Significant” list of teaching criteria as a substitute for a single “Very Significant” item. A strong and compelling case must be made within the tenure packet regarding the impact of the “Significant” criteria.
- Establish significant and tangible scholarship in the area of expertise. The candidate’s scholarly activity must be recognized by peers external to the university. The candidate must have met a total of at least five criteria from the “Very Significant” list of scholarship criteria while employed at the University of West Florida. The candidate may utilize a collection of items from the “Significant” list of scholarship criteria as a substitute for a single “Very Significant” item. A strong and compelling case must be made within the tenure packet regarding the impact of the “Significant” criteria.
- Show tangible evidence of service to the University, community and profession. The candidate must have met a total of at least three of the service criteria while employed at the University of West Florida.
- Note that the products and activities used to address these criteria may be the same items used in the application for tenure.

The candidate for promotion to professor must:

- Demonstrate a high level of competence in teaching while contributing to the instructional needs of Departmental programs. The faculty member will develop and instruct lecture/laboratory course(s) in area(s) of expertise and assist at all levels of instruction in a collegial atmosphere. The candidate must have met a total of at least three criteria from the “Very Significant” list of teaching criteria since the last promotion. The candidate may utilize a collection of items from the “Significant” list of teaching criteria as a substitute for a single “Very Significant” item. A strong and compelling case must be made within the tenure packet regarding the impact of the “Significant” criteria.
- Show substantial and highly tangible efforts in scholarship, as recognized by peers external to the university. The candidate's scholarly activity must have met a total of at least six criteria from the “Very Significant” list of scholarship criteria since the last promotion. The candidate may utilize a collection of items from the “Significant” list of scholarship criteria as a substitute for a single “Very Significant” item. A strong and compelling case must be made within the tenure packet regarding the impact of the “Significant” criteria.
- Demonstrate the ability to shoulder major responsibilities in service within and/or beyond the University. The candidate must have met a total of at least four of the service criteria since the last promotion.

A candidate may be considered for tenure or promotion without having met all the criteria shown above. For example, the Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences recognizes that

"significant and/or substantial contributions" in the area of expertise can result from one finding derived from many years of study, culminating in a single publication.

D. Procedures

For tenure, the Chair will request all tenured full-time faculty in the Department to submit a formal, signed, evaluation on tenure for each eligible faculty member. A Department member may decline to submit such an evaluation. Evaluations shall be submitted to the Chair, who is obligated to maintain confidentiality about the evaluation. Other full-time (non-tenured) faculty may provide the Chair with opinions of the candidate's dossier.

For promotion, the Chair will request all full-time faculty (excluding visiting faculty) in the Department to submit a formal, signed, evaluation on promotion for the promotion candidate. A Department member may decline to submit such an evaluation. Evaluations shall be submitted to the Chair, who is obligated to maintain confidentiality about the evaluation.

10. Policies and Procedures

A. Annual Salary Increment Increases

Annual salary increments are made by the college and university administration per guidelines negotiated with the United Faculty of Florida (UFF) union. Only merit distributions are normally determined within the Department, and the merit pay policy is described in the appendix.

B. Summer Supplemental Contract Opportunities

All regular full-time faculty are given the opportunity to teach during the Summer term, contingent upon the allocation of sufficient lines and programmatic needs. Visiting instructors/professors and adjunct faculty will be given consideration for summer employment on a second priority basis.

C. Allocation of Paid Overload Appointments

Paid overload appointment—if available--will be granted contingent upon rotation through a list showing faculty expertise in the area of need.

D. Departmental Resources

At the end of Spring semester, each faculty member will submit anticipated teaching, research and administrative needs for the following academic year. These data will be used by the chair to prioritize items for procurement, as allowed by other needs and commitments of the Department. The chair will provide information on budgetary allocations and report timely updates to the faculty.

Any request to use equipment and other Departmental resources for purposes external to the academic/scholarly mission of the Department must be submitted in written form to the chair for review and decision.

E. Requests for Release Time

The Department is committed to assisting faculty development in ways that will not adversely affect instructional programs. Faculty requesting release time for curriculum and/or research development should present the plan to the chair for review and recommendation by an ad hoc committee. (Note: it is extremely rare that unfunded release requests will be granted.)

F. Seed Account

Both Departmental and individual seed accounts are normally generated (and replenished) via the redistribution of research project overhead funds. These funds provide partial financial support to full-time faculty for the purpose of carrying out new research projects. Use of individual seed accounts are quite flexible and left to the professional discretion of the individual faculty member. The Department seed account may be tapped for special needs, and written requests should be submitted to the Chair well in advance.

G. Mentor Committee

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

H. Procedures for Annual Work Assignments

All assignments will be made in consonance with the collective bargaining agreement. The written document will specify class assignments and address research projects and service functions. The work assignment is the joint product of the Chair and the individual faculty member.

11. Academic Policies

A. Undergraduate Advising

A student will begin degree planning with a dedicated Department undergraduate advisor during their sophomore year. A record of the degree plan will be maintained in the student's file. The advisor will review the degree planning sheet and approve graduation. Students are required to check with their advisors on a periodic basis following any deviation from the set degree plan and also to receive their advising PINS.

During the second semester of their junior year, a student will be assigned a faculty advisor for career advising. A student may either choose a faculty member whose expertise coincides with the student's career or educational goals or can request a faculty advisor to be chosen for them by the Department undergraduate advisor. Upon completion of career advising the faculty member will contact the Department undergraduate advisor to confirm release of the remaining advising PINS.

B. Changes in Policies

All changes to academic and curricular policies must be approved by simple majority vote of eligible faculty and forwarded by the Chair through the Dean to appropriate review committees.

C. Grading and Examination Policies

Grading and examination policies are made at the discretion of the instructor. These policies are to be published in class syllabi. Controversy over grading practices should begin with the concerned parties and follow the grievance process outlined by the university.

D. Office Hours

All full-time faculty and graduate teaching assistants are required to meet a posted schedule of two (2) office hours per week per 3-credit course distributed over at least two days and several time blocks. Other instructors and lecturers will hold two (2) office

hours per week on the campus where they teach. The office hours will be consistent with the mode of delivery of the courses taught.

12. Amendment

Any amendment to this document must come through petition of a faculty member and subsequent discussion and approval by two-thirds of the voting members of the Department (see Section 3). The text of the proposed amendment must be submitted to the Department Chair and distributed to the voting membership at least thirty days before the meeting at which the amendment is to be considered.

13. Dates of Adoption/Revisions

Adopted January 30, 2001
Revised December 17, 2003
Revised October 30, 2015
Dean's comments received March 2, 2016
Revised April 18, 2016
Revised October 19, 2018

APPENDIX: DEPARTMENT MERIT SALARY CRITERIA

The following merit criteria are used by the Chair to determine Department merit salary increments for faculty. The criteria are consistent with the ideals stated in the Mission Statement and reflect the philosophy that faculty responsibilities involve research, teaching, and service. Teaching has been assigned the highest priority (50%), but research is also highly weighted (35%). Service (15%) involves work on behalf of professional organizations, the University, and its mission within the public domain. Outreach is rewarded in all three categories.

CRITERIA

Teaching

Teaching is primarily judged by the quality of instructional performance and includes formal course instruction and educational outreach activities.

Rating for teaching on the previous two annual evaluations:

- ◆ poor or fair: no points
- ◆ good: 1 point
- ◆ excellent: 2 points
- ◆ distinguished: 3 points

Research

Research is creative scholarly work that contributes to the advancement of knowledge; it is generally evaluated on the basis of a product and includes both theoretical and applied or outreach activities.

Rating for research on the previous two annual evaluations:

- ◆ poor or fair: no points
- ◆ good: 1 point
- ◆ excellent: 2 points
- ◆ distinguished: 3 points

Service

Meritorious service involves the application of knowledge and skill to the discipline, the University, and its outreach mission.

Rating for service on the previous two annual evaluations:

- ◆ poor or fair: no points
- ◆ good: 1 point
- ◆ excellent: 2 points
- ◆ distinguished: 3 points

PROCEDURES

1. The Chair determines the funds available for Department merit salary increments by subtracting guaranteed minimum salary increments from the total salary increment funds allotted to the Department.
2. The Chair divides the funds available for Department merit salary increments into three (3) categories: 50% to teaching, 35% to research, and 15% to service.
3. The Chair determines the merit salary value of one point in each of the three categories by dividing the total funds in a category by the total number of points obtained in that category by the faculty.
4. A faculty's merit salary increment for each category is determined by multiplying his/her points in a category by the merit salary value of one point in that category.
5. The Department merit salary increment for a faculty is determined by adding his/her increment from each category.
6. Minor adjustments by the Chair may be necessary to equate raises to available dollars.
7. The Chair recommends Department merit salary increments to the Dean, College of Science and Engineering.