

**DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY
BYLAWS AND STANDING RULES**

1. Name of Department

The name shall be the Department of Biology hereafter referred to as the Department.

2. Mission

The Department is dedicated to the creation, transmission, application, and preservation of knowledge at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Within this framework, the primary mission of the Department is to develop, support, and conduct high-quality education and research programs in the life sciences with emphasis on the areas of specialty of the faculty.

The Department encourages the performance of original work in the production of research by faculty in collaboration with colleagues, students, or staff. As a primarily undergraduate teaching institution, the department recognizes and promotes the integration of research with teaching.

The Department will assist in seeking support (e.g., facilities, equipment, financial, release time) for faculty. The Department ascribes to the notion that faculty have the professional obligation to inform the scientific community of noteworthy results through refereed publications.

The Department encourages faculty to engage in service activities that enhance the university, profession, and community.

3. Structure of the Department

3.1. Members of the Department

The Department shall be composed of a chair, faculty members, adjuncts, visiting instructors/professors, and support staff.

3.2 General Membership

The membership of the Department of Biology shall include all full-time and part-time individuals who function within the Department and are classified as faculty, lecturers, instructors, visiting assistant professors, adjuncts, administrative assistants, and laboratory and research staff.

3.3 Faculty Membership

The Faculty shall include (a) all full-time tenured and tenure-track academic members of the University within the Department with the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor, (b) all full-time, non-temporary lecturers and instructors, and (c) in-residence administrators tenured in the Department.

3.4 Emeritus Membership

A tenured member of the Faculty may, after retirement, petition the active Faculty for election to emeritus status. Emeritus faculty are not members of the Department or Faculty, as defined above.

3.5. Eligibility in Governance

Faculty holding the rank of instructor, lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor are eligible to participate in departmental governance activities and to vote on departmental matters including department chair but excluding tenure and promotion. The eligibility to vote on tenure and promotion is restricted to full-time tenured faculty in a manner consistent with University guidelines. The faculty may, by simple majority vote, extend voting rights to other individuals associated with the Department. Voting members in phased retirement shall retain voting privileges until completion of the phased retirement period. Retired faculty members, including those with emeritus status, do not have voting privileges.

3.6. Role of the Chair

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 Chair is responsible for the scheduling of courses, management of departmental financial resources, assignment of duties to faculty and staff, annual evaluation of faculty and staff, initial adjudication of grievances filed by faculty and students, coordination of departmental committees, scheduling of departmental meetings, and other administrative activities necessary for departmental function.

4. Department Governance

4.1 In instances where the collective bargaining agreement between the UWF chapter of United Faculty of Florida and the UWF Board of Trustees allows, the Department of Biology is authorized to define and/or clarify terms and conditions of employment-related specifically to the department and these bylaws constitute the sole and exclusive document wherein those department-specific terms and conditions reside.

4.2 Bylaws.

The provisions of these Bylaws are severable, and if any provision shall be held invalid or unenforceable, that invalidity or unenforceability shall attach only to that provision and shall not in any manner affect or render invalid or unenforceable any other provision of these Bylaws, and these Bylaws shall be carried out as if the invalid or unenforceable provision were not contained herein. Further, this document is considered an extension of the UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

The Department of Biology shall reserve unto itself all other rights, privileges, and powers pertaining to the development, maintenance, and revision of academic activities related to teaching, scholarship, and service in the biological sciences.

Areas of responsibility include but are not restricted to:

- A. promotion and guidance of student interest in the biological sciences;
- B. determination of Departmental goals and objectives;
- C. development, administration, and execution of curricula;
- D. delineation and implementation of academic requirements for students in the biological sciences;
- E. administration of funds appropriated to the Department;
- F. recommendations for tenure and promotion of its faculty;
- G. encouragement and support of the creative activities of its faculty; and
- H. governance of its physical facilities, space, and scheduling of activities.

5 Departmental Meetings

5.1 A quorum shall consist of a simple majority of the eligible membership. A majority vote is more than half of the votes cast by persons legally entitled to vote after taking blank votes and abstentions into account.

5.2 The chair shall convene departmental meetings at least once (1) each fall and spring semester. Typically there should be at least one faculty meeting per month during the fall and spring semesters. At least one-week notice shall be given, excepting emergencies for scheduling or canceling a faculty meeting. Faculty may place items on the agenda by contacting the Chair before the notice of the meeting.

An agenda will be provided to those in attendance, and Robert's Rule of Order will prevail. All items for a vote must be on the agenda one week before the vote is taken. If one week's notice is not provided, the vote is to be delayed until one week has passed to give faculty time to review the material being considered. If $\frac{2}{3}$ of all eligible faculty agree to allow a vote to be cast (as recorded at the meeting, or via proxy by mail or e-mail) before one week, then this should be noted in the minutes and a vote may be taken.

A simple majority of eligible members may direct the Chair to convene a department meeting at times other than the fall and spring semester that should be scheduled promptly.

Eligible members shall notify the Departmental Chair within two (2) days of the scheduled meeting if they are unable to attend a scheduled meeting. The member may give a written proxy in writing or via email.

Minutes of each meeting will be recorded and distributed by the Office Administrator or chair designee no later than 3 weeks following the meeting.

5.3 Voting will usually be by "voice" or show of hands during faculty meeting. If any member requests a secret ballot on any issue, a secret ballot will be conducted. Unless otherwise specified in the bylaws, the chair will vote as any other faculty member. Voting outside of the faculty meeting will be available to voting members for 72 hours via email to the department chair.

6. Committee Structure

6.1 Ad Hoc Committees/Working Groups

Ad Hoc committees/working groups are formed by the Chair as needed to carry out specific duties (examples: personnel committee, space, and equipment working groups). Ad Hoc committees/working groups are disbanded following completion of assigned duties.

6.2 Standing Committees

Each standing committee will consist of at least three faculty members, including a chair. Standing committees of the Department shall be the Graduate Admissions Committee and Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Executive Committee: The executive committee will consist of three full-time faculty members. Of the three additional members one must be junior (pre-tenure or less than 5 years at UWF) and one senior (post-tenure or greater than 5 years at UWF). Additional membership may be requested at the request of the executive committee chair or department chair. The executive committee may be called to work on Departmental goals and/or information requests from the Dean (via the Dept. Chair) that benefit from multi-faculty perspectives and as a way to more quickly and effectively address departmental issues and needs. In addition, the executive committee will facilitate the election of the department chair (as specified in section 6.3).

Graduate Admissions Committee: The Graduate Admissions Committee will review applications and make recommendations for the admittance of prospective students into the graduate program. The committee will make recommendations on awarding scholarships to students and maintain a general interest in the educational development of all graduate students. The committee will consist of 5 faculty members, representing the spectrum of faculty expertise in the department.

Promotion and Tenure Committee: The P&T Committee will consist of all tenured faculty in Biology. The P&T committee will meet at two points in the tenure and promotion timeline of a faculty member seeking tenure and promotion.

1). A mid-tenure review will take place at the end of the spring semester in the third year of a faculty member seeking tenure and promotion. The candidate will supply the Chair of the Department with a dossier documenting accomplishments (CV, student evaluations, publications, etc.). The Chair of the Department will circulate the dossier to the P&T committee for review. The P&T committee members will individually provide the Chair of the Department with comments on the dossier.

2). During the fall term in which the final P&T packets are due, the Committee will meet to examine the completed tenure/promotion dossier of a faculty member seeking tenure and/or promotion. The Committee will provide a formal, anonymous vote in favor of or against tenure/promotion for the candidate. The Committee will produce a single memo, signed by all

members, describing how the candidate appears to meet, or fails to meet, the tenure and promotion criteria set forth by the departmental by-laws.

The Committee will meet at least every three years or as necessary in order to assess and make recommendations on altering tenure and promotion criteria as needed.

6.3 SELECTION OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR

The College Dean, with consideration of Department faculty recommendation, officially appoints the Chair. The Chair shall ordinarily serve a three-year term, which can be extended by the Dean upon consideration of the recommendation by the faculty. The faculty recommendation to the Dean shall be generated as follows:

During the fall semester of the third year of an incumbent's tenure as Chair, the Executive Committee (EC) shall meet with the incumbent to determine that individual's preference for remaining Chair for another term. The EC will consult with the Dean regarding the viability of a 2nd term for the incumbent and/or the viability of other potential candidates. The EC will then seek input from the faculty regarding whether there is any tenured member at or above the rank of associate professor to be considered for the Chair position for the next term, the general level of satisfaction with the incumbent or whether a search should be conducted for a candidate outside the Department.

If there is a member of the faculty who wishes to be considered as Chair, the EC will advise that person to meet with the Dean to discuss the viability of his/her candidacy. If the incumbent wishes to be considered for a second term and there is one or more other potential candidates, the EC will conduct an election to determine the faculty's preference. Each candidate, including the incumbent, will be asked to provide a written statement to the faculty describing a vision for the Department over the next three years, a description of areas in need of change, and potential strategies for accomplishing the changes and achieving the vision.

Voting members will review these statements, and each candidate will be allowed to meet with the voting members as a whole for open discussion of critical issues. Following these steps, voting members will vote by secret ballot. The candidate who receives over 50% of the votes will be recommended to the Dean as Chair for the subsequent three-year term. For the purpose of selection of the Chair, two-thirds of the eligible voting members must cast a non-abstaining ballot for the election to be valid. If no candidate receives over 50% of the votes, a second election will be held one week later. If no candidate receives over 50% of the vote at that time, all candidate names will be forwarded to the Dean for consideration.

If the incumbent expresses a preference for remaining in the Chair position for an additional three-year term, and if no faculty member wishes to be considered in an election, the EC will provide feedback to the incumbent based on their survey of the faculty.

The EC will communicate the faculty's preference to the Dean. If the Dean concurs with the

faculty's decision, the individual will be named Chair. If the Dean does not concur, the EC will request a meeting between the Dean and the faculty to address the issue and seek resolution prior to any appointment becoming formalized.

7. Academic Policies

7.1 Student Advising

Formal academic advising will be carried out by college academic advisors. Career advising may be conducted by faculty.

7.2 Changes in Policies

All changes to academic and curricular policies must be approved via the Curriculum Change Review process (CCR). The process starts by a majority vote of eligible faculty and forwarded by the Chair through the Dean to appropriate review committees.

7.3 Course Related Policies

Grading and examination policies are made at the discretion of the instructor. The 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.

Attendance policies for financial aid verification and mandatory attendance are to be published in class syllabi.

Drop policies concerning separate lab lecture courses are to be published in class syllabi for both lecture and lab.

Protocol for canceling classes is to be published in class syllabi for both lecture and lab.

7.4 Role of Adjunct Faculty

Beyond teaching duties, adjunct faculty can only serve as members or Co-Chairs for thesis committees and only on a case-by-case basis with approval by Departmental Chair. Adjuncts may offer directed studies for graduate and undergraduate students with approval by the Department Chair.

8. Personnel Policies/Procedures

8.1 Recruitment/Selection of New Faculty

Advertising, recruiting, and selection of new faculty follow the established university procedures.

8.2 Faculty Search Committees

Membership -- Faculty Search Committees shall consist of at least three faculty members appointed by the Department Chair.

Committee Responsibilities -- Committees shall conduct faculty searches per the policies and procedures of the Office of the Provost. Also, search committees shall seek input from, and make recommendations to the Faculty and the Department Chair regarding (1) the position announcement and advertising copy, (2) qualified applicant pool, (3) semi-finalist pool, (4) finalists invited for campus interview and (5) the interview process, and (6) any evaluation rubric used during the process. When campus interviews are complete, the search committees shall consider input from the Faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students during their evaluation of the interviewees. Search committees shall then meet with the Faculty to present the recommendations and strengths and weaknesses of the candidates.

Department Chair Responsibilities --The Department Chair shall consider input from the search committees and the Faculty in deciding the order in which the approved, acceptable interviewees are offered the position, according to the approved process.

8.3 Process for other appointments such as joint, affiliate, and similar (not including graduate thesis committee members).

The chair shall present to the faculty the CV, a written statement from the candidate regarding their desire and rationale, and a signed document (e.g., an MOU) stating their rights and responsibilities. A vote regarding the appointment shall be placed on the agenda according to the guidelines above. A 2/3 majority is required to offer the appointment. The appointment shall be for one year with annual renewal. For joint appointments, the MOU should clearly define the reporting lines, rights, and responsibilities regarding the impact of this appointment on promotion and tenure, if applicable. Additional documents from the candidate's home department chair and Dean must be included that further indicate an understanding of rights and responsibilities of the faculty member and each department, particularly regarding elements and reporting for promotion and tenure as well as annual evaluation.

For faculty members that have joint appointments, the criteria for promotion and tenure will be generally based upon the MOU between the department and the faculty member's primary unit. In no case shall the requirements for promotion and tenure be less than that required within the Departmental by-laws. Faculty should refer to their letter of appointment and MOU and discuss with their Unit Head and the Chair of Biology throughout their appointment.

8.4 Annual Work Assignments

The Chair, in consultation with the faculty member, will establish the faculty member's assignments in teaching, research, and service for the upcoming nine-month academic year. These assignments are based upon the needs of the department, and the professional development of the faculty member. The Chair prepares and signs the letter of assignment, and refers to the Dean for further processing.

8.5 Faculty Mentoring

Mentoring of untenured, tenure-track faculty is a critical part of moving the faculty member toward a successful tenure decision. The Chair, in consultation with the faculty member, will identify at least two tenured faculty from within the department and one from outside the department to serve on their mentoring committee. While the usual committee consists of three tenured faculty, the committee may consist of up to five members. The five year development period passes quickly, so it is recommended that meetings be held at the end of each semester to assess progress in teaching, research, and service. Mentored faculty are expected to provide a statement on their accomplishments in the three areas during the previous semester, as well as a summary of their accomplishments for the period during which they have been in the tenure track at UWF. The Chair will confer with the candidate's mentoring committee in preparing the annual Progress Toward Tenure letter that must accompany the Annual Evaluation of non-tenured, tenure-earning faculty each spring.

8.6 Annual Evaluation Procedures (see Appendix for criteria)

Annual evaluations are made by the Chair. The evaluation is based on the annual assignment letter written by the Chair and acknowledged by the faculty member. The assignment letter addresses teaching, research, and service.

The faculty member will document accomplishments for the year under consideration based on the annual evaluation criteria. The Chair and faculty member review and discuss the submitted material and the results of the evaluation form. The chair writes a letter of evaluation with a rating of poor, fair, good, excellent, or distinguished in each area being evaluated based on the results from the evaluation form. Overall evaluation is also provided based on the results from the evaluation form. The letter of evaluation is submitted electronically and forwarded to the Dean for further evaluation.

8.7 Annual Reappointment

Excellence in teaching, demonstration of scholarship, and documented evidence of service contribution to the university, community, and/or profession justify the yearly reappointment of an assistant professor, associate professor, professor, lecturer or instructor.

8.8 Tenure (see Appendix for criteria)

Excellence in teaching, significant demonstration of scholarship, and tangible evidence of service to the university, community, and profession justify the decision to grant tenure.

During the tenure earning years, the faculty member, in pursuing activities listed on the *Criteria for Annual Evaluation*, should seek critiques and guidance from the assigned mentors, as well as other colleagues within the university.

Mid-Tenure review will take place at the end of the third year. The faculty member will put together a dossier consisting of a list of contributions to teaching, research, and service, current

CV, a summary of teaching evaluations, and documentation (reprints) of accomplishments. Letters of evaluation from outside the department are not necessary for the mid-tenure review process. The candidate will supply the Chair of the Department with the dossier. The Chair of the Department will circulate the dossier to the P&T committee for review. The P&T committee members will individually provide the Chair of the Department with comments on the dossier, and the Chair will add comments and a summary. The comments from the Department will be sent to the faculty member and the Dean for consideration.

The Department will follow the University guidelines for tenure and promotion. Members of the Biology Promotion and Tenure Committee will sign a single memo resulting from their evaluation of the candidate for promotion.

8.9 Promotion (see Appendix for criteria)

The Department will follow the University guidelines for tenure and promotion:

1. University Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

This section describes the university criteria for promotion and tenure for regular, full-time, tenure earning faculty. Reflecting the mission of UWF as a regional comprehensive university, the university criteria emphasize teaching relative to scholarship/creative projects and service. A minimum of excellent teaching performance is required in all promotion and all tenure and promotion decisions. Favorable promotion decisions also require excellent performance in scholarship/creative projects and service for promotion decisions. However, faculty need not achieve excellent ratings in all three areas to achieve tenure. As shown in Table 1, good ratings in either service or scholarship/creative projects, combined with an excellent or distinguished rating in the other area and excellent or distinguished rating in teaching, should result in a favorable tenure decision. Except in unusual circumstances (e.g., egregious ethical violation), if faculty members meet the criteria described above, they should receive favorable decisions, but the meeting of such criteria cannot be construed as a guarantee of either tenure or promotion.

TABLE 1 University Criteria for Tenure and Promotion Decisions

| | <i>For a favorable personnel decision, the weight of the evidence must show sustained performance at these levels</i> | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--|------------------|
| Personnel Decision | Teaching | Scholarship and Creative Projects | Service |
| <i>Tenure</i> | Excellent | At least Excellent in one category and at least Good in the other category | |
| <i>Promotion to associate</i> | Excellent | Excellent | Excellent |
| <i>Promotion to professor</i> | Distinguished in at least one category and at least excellent in the other two categories | | |

Members of the Biology Promotion and Tenure Committee will sign a single memo resulting from their evaluation of the candidate for promotion.

8.10 Sustained Performance Evaluation

All full-time faculty beyond the rank of assistant professor are evaluated for sustained performance every six years. Evaluation is based on criteria set for tenure status. Faculty receiving an unsatisfactory sustained performance evaluation must construct a performance enhancement plan outlining measures to correct deficiencies.

8.11 Summer Supplemental Contract Opportunities

All full-time faculty are given the opportunity to teach during the summer term contingent upon high enough class enrollment and programmatic needs. Available supplemental appointments will be offered equitably as appropriate to qualified faculty, not later than five (5) weeks before the beginning of the appointment, if practicable, per written criteria. The criteria will be made available in each department/unit (Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 9.4.)

Summer schedules and the assignment of summer teaching lines will be built on consideration of three factors: (1) courses which fulfill the greatest programmatic need; (2) courses which are likely to produce high student credit hours; and (3) courses which guarantee the fair distribution of summer teaching lines. Adjunct faculty will be considered for summer employment on a secondary priority basis. Further, each academic year, the chair will request summer course teaching preferences from full-time faculty. Assignment of summer courses will use the following guidelines: 1. Full-time faculty members shall receive priority for supplemental summer teaching assignments. 2. Full-time faculty members have the right of first refusal for any courses offered by the Department. 3. Following the initial allocation of supplemental summer teaching assignments, no summer course or courses of a full-time faculty member will be reallocated to another faculty member without the consent of the full-time faculty member to whom the course or courses were initially assigned. 4. Faculty should be assigned courses matching the faculty member's content expertise and qualifications. 5. The salary amount a faculty member receives for teaching a summer course or courses shall not be a consideration in the prioritization or allocation of supplemental summer teaching assignments

8.12 Office Hours

All full-time faculty shall provide an opportunity for communication and academic support with students as part of their instructional assignment through regularly scheduled office hours. The specific number and format of office hours should be appropriate for the assigned number of courses and modality.

8.13 Allocation of Paid Overload Appointments

Paid overload appointments will be granted by the Dean as needed to fulfill the teaching obligations of the department, and contingent upon rotation through a list showing faculty expertise in the area of need.

8.14 Faculty Development

The Department is committed to assisting faculty development. To facilitate planning, faculty requesting sabbaticals will notify the Chair. Faculty requesting release time for curriculum

and/or research development should present the plan to the Chair for review. Release time can only be granted by the Provost or Dean.

Seed Account: When available, these funds can be used to give partial financial support to full-time faculty to carry out new research projects. Requests (\$500-\$1500) are made by submitting a brief research proposal to the chair. Funding is to be used for the purchase of reagents and supplies and excludes salary compensation for faculty.

Support for student assistance, particularly at the graduate level, will be considered.

9. Departmental Resources

9.1 Budgeting

Laboratory Fee Accounts: Funds in the laboratory fee accounts are in the form of supply fees and equipment fees, which are earned through charges to students for those expenses. Funds will be disbursed for the purchase of expendable supplies, and for equipment from the appropriate pool of funds earned through enrollment in the respective courses to operate the teaching laboratory sections.

9.2 Equipment

Operating Capital Outlay (OCO): The Department will maintain an OCO list, which will be periodically updated and prioritized through the input of the faculty.

Request for the use of Departmental Resources: 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.

10. Amendments to Bylaws

Any amendment to the Department of Biology Bylaws and Standing Rules must come through a petition of a faculty member and subsequent discussion and approval by a 2/3 majority of all eligible faculty.

11. Revision History

October 3, 2005

January 27, 2007

April 27, 2007

November 6, 2008

June 20, 2017

APPENDIX I
DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY
PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA
(Revised Fall 2005, Revised Summer 2017)

The Department of Biology supports the University's assertion that a candidate for tenure and promotion must demonstrate expertise in the areas of teaching, research, and service. However, the Department declares the privilege to define where a specific activity resides. The Department of Biology declares that the candidates for promotion and tenure within the Department must demonstrate expertise in areas under the aegis of the Department.

The criteria that must be met for teaching, research, and service contributions will reflect the relative distribution of assigned duties stated on the candidate's contracts for evaluation. The candidate must provide a summary of how the relative distribution of duties was estimated, and copies of all contract assignments for the period of evaluation must be available in the tenure/promotion packet. The Department Chair must approve the summary allocation of duties (teaching, research, service) in writing in the form of the letter of assignment. The standard UWF 9-month contract is 18 contact hours of teaching (0.75 FTE); those faculty assigned fewer teaching contact hours by the Chair will be expected to demonstrate appropriate productivity in service, research, or non-credit generating teaching activities.

Given the diversity of specializations and areas of expertise among biology faculty (e.g., field ecology, biochemistry, physiology, etc.), and the differences in contact hour allocation, tenure, and promotion assessment may require individual considerations distinct from other faculty within the department.

A. TEACHING

The faculty member must demonstrate competence in teaching while contributing to the instructional needs of departmental programs. The faculty member will develop and instruct lecture/laboratory course(s) in the area(s) of expertise and assist at all levels of instruction in a collegial atmosphere.

Tenure requires that the faculty member demonstrate a continuous record of excellent teaching for the three years leading up to tenure. A continuous excellent-distinguished record in teaching is required for promotion to associate professor as described in the University criteria. Distinguished teaching and a positive reputation within the University is required for promotion to professor.

B. RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

Promotion and tenure criteria are based on the production of substantial research products. These products include:

- Peer-reviewed research articles, review or education-based journal articles, book chapters, or technical reports, where the candidate is a primary, corresponding (or anchor), or co-author.
- Completed graduated thesis student serving as chair
- Extramurally-funded research grant
- Other source(s) of external support including but not limited to equipment grants from non-vendor sources, training grant, education- or research-related ship time, or funds from an organization outside of UWF that supports education and/or research
- Patents from work generated at UWF

In all cases, justification for publications or grants as qualifying under these by-laws may be necessary by the applicant. This list of substantial research products is not comprehensive and the quality of each activity will be taken into consideration when determining the appropriate category and weight for each activity.

The department should also consider the normal variations in timing of grants, publications such that annual evaluations are reflective of such variances in rates of publication/grants/contracts as to not effectively penalize concentrated production periods.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Criteria:

The candidate for tenure must establish an area of research in the discipline. The research laboratory must be functional and active, involving undergraduate and/or graduate student participation. The candidate for promotion to associate professor must establish a significant and tangible scholarship in the area of expertise. The candidate's scholarly activity must be recognized by peers external to the University.

In order for a candidate to be considered for both tenure and promotion to associate professor, the candidate must have at least five substantial research products (listed above). Three of the five research products must be peer-reviewed research articles with the candidate as first or corresponding author/anchor author on at least two articles. In addition, in order to be considered for tenure and promotion to associate professor, the candidate must provide evidence of substantial and progressive effort toward obtaining an externally-funded research grant, contract, or other source of support including but not limited to equipment grants from non-vendor sources, a training grant, education- or research-related ship time, or funds from an organization outside of UWF that supports education and/or research.

Promotion to Professor Criteria:

In order for a candidate to be considered for promotion to the rank of professor, the candidate must have eight substantial research products at the rank of associate professor to bring the total to at least thirteen substantial research products (including products the candidate counted toward promotion to associate professor). Three of the eight research products must be peer-reviewed research articles (candidate as first or corresponding author/anchor author) or major extramural grants with the candidate as PI. In addition, consideration for promotion to the rank of professor requires that the candidate must be awarded at least one externally-funded research grant, contract, or other source of support including but not limited to equipment grants from non-vendor sources, a training grant, education- or research-related ship time, or funds from an organization outside of UWF that supports education and/or research. Substantial and tangible contributions in scholarship, as recognized by peers external to the university, in the area of expertise justify promotion to the rank of professor.

C. SERVICE

The candidate for tenure must show tangible evidence of service to the University, community, and profession. Leadership in service to the department, college, and University must be shown by the candidate for promotion to associate professor. The candidate for professor must demonstrate the ability to shoulder significant responsibilities in service within and/or beyond the University, including leadership roles.

Department Statement on Service

The Department of Biology encourages the following service activities to be considered in the evaluation of service efforts:

Department

- Curriculum development
- Accreditation/reaffirmation
- Advising/Mentoring
- Development of Departmental materials/facilities
- Serving on Departmental committees
- Serving on special Departmental assignments/projects
- Assuming temporary administrative assignments
- Attend assigned University functions
- Administration of student clubs/organizations
- Maintaining a professional presence in professional organizations
- Recruitment of students in professional organizations

School/University

- Serving on committees
- Curriculum development
- Serving on special School/university assignments/projects

Assuming administrative assignments
Attending assigned functions/events

Professional/Local/State/Regional/National/International

Active participation in professional organizations

Serving in an administrative role on committees, boards, workshops, etc.,

Serving as a consultant

Serving as a liaison for the Department/School/University

Presenting papers, or other public presentations, not based on original research

Attending assigned functions/events

Sponsoring/developing University events

Assigned student recruitment at events/organizations

Active volunteer in community service organizations/events and/or community
service opportunities

APPENDIX II
DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY
ANNUAL EVALUATION CRITERIA
(Revised Fall 2009, Revised Spring 2017)

Faculty members are required to submit a statement and documentation of accomplishments yearly at the end of the spring semester for annual review and evaluation by the Chair of the Department of Biology. The evaluation is then sent to the Dean of the College of Science, Engineering, and Health. Faculty members are evaluated and receive rankings (poor, fair, good, excellent, distinguished) in three areas: service, research, and teaching. They also receive an overall combined ranking.

The following document lists activity categories for each of the three areas and describes the indicators of each of the rank levels. The rank level of “Excellent” is explicitly defined under the statement “Departmental Standard,” and all other ranking levels are based on relative comparison to the departmental standard expectations. The list of activity categories is not meant to be all-inclusive, but a set of common activities most faculty members are involved with. Other activities may be included by a faculty member in their annual evaluation portfolio.

The overall combined ranking is made by the Chair of the Department of Biology based on all three areas. The assessment includes considering the degree of accomplishment in each area as it relates to the others to weight each area in arriving at the overall ranking. The Chair will assess the faculty member based on their performance according to the annual letter of assignment and will include the faculty member’s contributions to the department above and beyond those guidelines as observed by the Chair.

In all areas of scholarly activity (Service, Research, Teaching), the Chair has the prerogative to include qualitative factors in arriving at a ranking for an individual faculty member. Faculty should be aware that Promotion and Tenure are based on criteria related to total effort in service and teaching while at UWF, and to research before and during one’s tenure at UWF at the time a dossier is submitted for the Promotion and Tenure process. Promotion and Tenure are not based on merely adding annual evaluation rankings across the time of employment.

Criteria for Annual Evaluation for Service

Service: Activity (areas of effort) Categories

1. Institution (department, college, university)
 - Committee/council/task force as member
 - Committee/council/task force as chair
 - Institution sponsored activities: open house, orientations, recruitment.
 - Sponsorships for student organizations
2. Profession
 - Associations/Societies: officer, committees, invited seminars
 - Journals: editorships, reviewer
 - Agencies: board memberships, reviewer
 - Meeting/conference: hosting, chairing sessions
 - Publishing houses: textbook reviews
3. Community
 - Invited seminars
 - Juror/Judge
 - Sponsor/participant outreach activities
4. Awards related to service

Service: Departmental Standard

Individuals in the Department of Biology are expected to participate in service-related areas, including activities from at least two of the first three categories listed above with at least four activities total. Two activities may be single events (such as review of a manuscript); two activities must be recurring events (such as serving on a standing committee), one of the two recurring events must be from category one institutional activities.

Service: Evaluation Ranking & Indicators

Poor

This performance level demonstrates serious problems in fulfilling the appropriate service role for faculty, as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is absent.

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)
- * Community service, if any, does not in any way provide synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions

Fair

This performance level demonstrates only minor tangible progress in service contributions, as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is moderately below the departmental standard.

Indicators:

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

Good

This performance level demonstrates major tangible progress in relevant service contributions, as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is somewhat below the departmental standard. Indicators:

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

Excellent

This performance level demonstrates satisfactory execution of service contributions, as shown by the indicators below. In general, service contributions meet the departmental standard. Indicators:

- * Scope and effort level meet department standards
- * Service agenda well suited to the regional comprehensive university mission
- * Service contributions represent strategic decisions that balance demands from the discipline, department, campus, and community
- * Potential is shown for wide recognition inside and outside of the university
- * Community service, if applicable, provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions

Distinguished

This performance level demonstrates a 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)
- * Problems solved proactively through vigorous contributions
- * Wide external recognition (local, national or international audiences) or awards achieved for quality of service contributions

* Community service, if applicable, provided significant and measurable impact; service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions

Criteria for Annual Evaluation for Research & Scholarly Activity

Research & Scholarly Activity (areas of effort) Categories

1. Publications (Refereed)

Journals: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
Technical reports: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
Proceedings full paper: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
Books as author: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
Books as editor: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
Chapters in books: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)

2. Publications (Non-refereed)

Technical reports: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
Proceedings full paper: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
Books as author: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
Books as editor: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
Chapters in books: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)

3. Meeting/Conference: international, national, regional, local Presentations Invited speaker

4. External grants/contracts (Reviewed)

Federal: submitted, new awards, continuing
State: submitted, new awards, continuing
Local: submitted, new awards, continuing
Private: submitted, new awards, continuing

5. External grants/contracts (Non-reviewed)

Federal: submitted, new awards, continuing
State: submitted, new awards, continuing
Local: submitted, new awards, continuing
Private: submitted, new awards, continuing

6. Internal grants/contracts: submitted, new awards, continuing

7. Student Research

Graduate student: chair of committee, activities in support of faculty research
Undergraduate student: thesis, activities in support of faculty research

8. Other Activities

Abstracts: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
Patents on products related to field of study: filed, awarded
Workshops attended related to field of study

9. Awards related to field of study

Research: Departmental Standard

Individuals in tenured/tenure earning positions in the Department of Biology are expected to participate in research-related activities (not applicable to instructor or lecturer positions). The following standard is based on a 3:3 fall: spring teaching load, which should be adjusted in proportion to assigned contracts. Individuals are expected to perform at least five total activities comprised from at least three categories. The activities listed are not exhaustive, and the actual ranking is the discretion of the chair based on the quality and scope of the activities. For annual evaluations, faculty members are responsible for justifying their proposed ranking, including the addition of activities not listed above. An executive committee may be established as needed to discuss activities not included on the lists above. The executive committee would be comprised of 2 tenured faculty and one junior faculty with expertise in the appropriate discipline.

Research: Evaluation Ranking & Indicators

Poor

This performance level demonstrates serious problems in developing scholarship and creative projects, as reflected by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative production is well below the departmental standard.

Indicators:

- * Scholarly agenda or creative plan has not been identified (e.g., the central focus of career interest has not materialized)
- * Minimal pursuit of scholarly and creative 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

This performance level demonstrates only minor tangible progress toward executing a scholarly and creative agenda, as shown by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative projects are moderately below the departmental standard.

Indicators:

- * General focus of interest identified
- * Evidence of some completion of beginning stages of scholarly or artistic process (e.g., data collection, manuscript outline, artistic plan)
- * Exploration of possible scholarly collaboration or resource network to help with a specific plan
 - * Professional organizations identified that will support scholarly and creative goals
 - * Appropriate professional educational opportunities (e.g., licensure, technology training, special educational opportunities) identified
 - * Sources of external support for scholarship or creative activities agenda identified and explored

* Judgment about ethical standards for scholarly and artistic production may be problematic at times

* Questionable time management strategies limit production

Good

This performance level demonstrates moderate tangible progress in scholarship or creative activity agenda, as shown by the indicators below, but work falls mildly below the departmental standard.

Indicators:

* Specific scholarly agenda or creative plan identified, including appropriate timelines and preferred dissemination or display venues

* Scholarly and creative projects completed but falls short of the rate of department standards related to the rate of completion or quality of dissemination venue

* 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 or creative goals

* Grants developed and submitted to capture support

* Adheres to relevant ethics conventions for scholarly and creative projects

* Reasonably effective time management strategies contribute to success

Excellent

This performance level demonstrates satisfactory execution of scholarship or creative activity agenda, as shown by the indicators below. Excellence meets the departmental standard.

Indicators:

* Refined scholarly agenda or creative plan well suited to regional comprehensive university context

* Meets department production targets for both quantity and quality of scholarship

* Potential for wide recognition of quality outside of the University

* Completes appropriate schedule of professional educational opportunities (e.g., licensure, technology training, etc.) in a timely fashion

* Support captured to facilitate scholarship or creative activities agenda

* Highly skilled application of ethical conventions in the discipline

* Skilled time management facilitates the success of scholarly agenda or creative plan

Distinguished

This performance level demonstrates an unusually high degree of skill in design and execution of scholarly and creative projects, as shown by the indicators below that build upon the indicators for excellence. In general, scholarly and creative projects exceed the standards of excellence of the department.

Indicators:

* Both quantity and quality measures clearly exceed department expectations

* National or international audience

* National or international recognition earned for quality

- * Awards received for scholarly or creative projects
- * Achievements in continuing professional training show unusual merit
- * Strong record of grant pursuit, grant awards, successful completion, and dissemination of results
- * Campus and/or disciplinary leadership in promoting scholarly and creative projects

Criteria for Annual Evaluation for Teaching

Teaching: Activity (areas of effort) Categories

1. Course and Curriculum Planning/Organization

- Teaching Philosophy
- Syllabi development
- Assessment Practices
- Planned class activities
- Course development
- Program Curriculum/Program Assessment
- Special teaching assignments

2. Course Execution

- Pedagogical strategies
- Classroom management
- Assessment implementation
- Student Assessment of Instruction

3. Continuous improvement plan

- Course revision
- Professional development
- Awards related to teaching
- Grants related to teaching

4. Professional Responsibility and Academic Integrity

- Accessibility to Students
- Feedback to Students
- Promotion of Academic Integrity

5. Unscheduled Teaching

- Directed Studies (undergraduate and/or graduate)
- Undergraduate honor's thesis
- Graduate thesis committees

Suggested supporting evidence of performance

Narrative Statements support evaluation rankings

Teaching Philosophy

Sample syllabi

Sample activities documenting high impact practices

Sample assessments of learning outcomes

Narrative statements may refer to other SAI elements other than Overall assessment of instructor or overall rating of course organization

Letters or emails from students

Letters, emails, or documents from other stakeholders.

Evidence of professional development courses

Evidence of participation in peer evaluation of instruction
Other documents that may support evaluation rating

Teaching: Departmental Standard

Individuals in the Department of Biology are expected to participate in teaching-related activities. Category 1, 2, 3, and 4 activities are performed based on assigned contact hours per individual contract. Tenure-track individuals should participate in at least one of the Category 5 activities throughout a three-year interval. Category 5 activities are not required for individuals on instructor/lecturer contracts but may be used to support a distinguished evaluation. Annual evaluations should document a consistently positive impact on learning, assessment, syllabi, curriculum development, etc. and should comply with departmental policies. Annual evaluations will be based on all required components of teaching.

Teaching: Evaluation Ranking & Indicators

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 departmental standard.

Fair

This performance level demonstrates some positive teaching outcomes but produces major areas for concern that have a moderately negative impact on students and their learning, typically as reflected by generally meeting the indicator standards contained within the evaluation rubric. In general, teaching performance is moderately below the departmental standard.

Good

This performance level demonstrates overall teaching effectiveness but some minor areas for concern, typically reflected by generally meeting the indicator standards within the evaluation rubric. In general, teaching performance is mildly below the departmental standard.

Excellent

This performance level demonstrates consistent, high-quality teaching with positive outcomes for students, as reflected by generally meeting the indicator standards within the evaluation rubric. Excellence meets the departmental standard.

Distinguished

This performance level demonstrates an unusually high degree of quality in teaching, as shown by the following indicators that build upon indicators for excellence within the evaluation rubric. In general, teaching contributions exceed the standards of excellence of the department.

| Teaching | Poor Performance | Fair Performance | Good Performance | Excellent Performance | Distinguished Performance |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| Teaching Philosophy | Teaching Philosophy: Teaching philosophy absent | Teaching Philosophy: Teaching philosophy included in portfolio but may not be clearly expressed in course planning and activities (syllabi, handouts, assessments, etc.) | Teaching Philosophy: Teaching philosophy included in portfolio and is generally expressed in evidence of course planning and activities (syllabi, handouts, assessments, etc.) | Teaching Philosophy: Teaching philosophy included in portfolio and is clearly expressed in evidence of course planning and activities (syllabi, handouts, assessments, etc.) | Teaching Philosophy: Teaching philosophy included in portfolio and is clearly expressed in evidence of course planning and activities (syllabi, handouts, assessments, etc.) |
| Course and Curriculum Planning / Organization | Course Plan and Organization: Syllabi do not include all required components. Syllabi do not provide adequate expectations and course-specific SLOs Assessment practices inadequate to support student learning and are unrelated to the course-specific SLOs (e.g., learning outcomes are inadequate, inappropriate, or missing) Class activities inadequate in supporting student learning and are related to the course-specific SLOs Course content is clearly outdated | Course Plan and Organization: Syllabi includes required components with prompting Syllabi may not provide reasonable expectations and course-specific SLOs Assessment practices do not clearly support student learning. Class activities inadequate in supporting student learning Course content is slightly outdated with reference to the disciple | Course Plan and Organization: Syllabi includes required components Syllabi provide reasonable expectations and course-specific SLOs Assessment practices support student learning. Class activities support student learning Course content is current to the disciple | Course Plan and Organization: Syllabi includes required components Syllabi provide clear and appropriate expectations and course-specific SLOs Assessment practices support student learning and are related to the course-specific SLOs Class activities support student learning and are related to the course-specific SLOs Course content is current to the disciple. Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, seminar, bioskills, general education) demonstrate SLOs appropriate to the student population | Course Plan and Organization: Syllabi includes required components Syllabi provide clear and appropriate expectations and course-specific SLOs Syllabi describe assessment practices and provide criteria for performance expectations (grading rubrics) Assessment practices support student learning and are related to the course-specific SLOs and utilize multiple assessment formats Class activities support student learning and are related to the course-specific SLOs. Specific examples of these activities are provided Course content is current to the discipline |
| Teaching | Poor Performance | Fair Performance | Good Performance | Excellent Performance | Distinguished Performance |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|---|--|---|
| <p>Course Execution</p> | <p>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) Is not available to help students or provide feedback Classroom poorly organized and not well-managed (often late or absent from class) Guidance to students is inadequate Assessment standards are inappropriate for the course (assessment strategies are not effective or fair) Student evaluations document substantial negative outcomes related to learning (substantially below departmental average) as evidenced by SAI Overall evaluation of Instructor below 50% combined very good and excellent Student evaluations document substantial negative outcomes related to course organization</p> | <p>Pedagogical strategies are often not appropriate for the course Rarely available to help students/provide feedback The classroom is inadequately organized Guidance to students needs improvement Assessment standards are often not appropriate for the course Assessments within special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, seminar, bioskills, general education) are often not appropriate for the individual student population and often do not relate to the course SLOs Student evaluations document areas of moderate concern regarding impact on learning (moderately below departmental average) as evidenced by SAI Overall evaluation of Instructor 50% - 60% combined very good and excellent Student evaluations document areas of moderate concern</p> | <p>Majority of pedagogical strategies are appropriate for the course Generally available to help students/provides feedback Classroom is organized and well-managed Provides adequate guidance to students Assessment standards are appropriate for the course Assessments within special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, seminar, bioskills, general education) are appropriate for the individual student population and mostly relate to the course SLOs Student evaluations document adequate impact on learning (mildly below departmental average) as evidenced by SAI Overall evaluation of Instructor 60% - 70% combined very good and excellent Student evaluations document adequate course organization (mildly below departmental average) as evidenced by SAI Overall evaluation of course organization 60% - 70% combined very good and excellent</p> | <p>Most pedagogical strategies are appropriate for the course Routinely available to help students/provides feedback Classroom is organized and well-managed Provides clear and adequate guidance to students Assessment standards are appropriate for the course Assessments within special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, seminar, bioskills, general education) are appropriate for the individual student population and relate to the course SLOs Student evaluations document consistently positive impact on learning (at departmental average) as evidenced by SAI Overall evaluation of Instructor 70% - 80% combined very good and excellent Student evaluations document that consistently positive course organization (at departmental average) as evidenced by SAI Overall evaluation of course organization 70% - 80% combined very good and excellent</p> | <p>Pedagogical strategies are appropriate for the course Routinely available to help students/provides feedback Classroom is organized and well-managed Provides clear and adequate guidance to students Assessment standards are appropriate for the course Assessments within special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, seminar, bioskills, general education) are appropriate for the individual student population and relate to the course SLOs Student evaluations document consistently positive impact on learning (above departmental average) as evidenced by SAI Overall evaluation of Instructor above 80% combined very good and excellent Student evaluations document that consistently positive course organization (above departmental average) as evidenced by SAI Overall evaluation of course organization above 80% combined very good and excellent At least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrative statements emphasize powerful impact on learner or transformative learning experiences |
|--------------------------------|--|--|---|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| | <p>(substantially below departmental average) as evidenced by SAI Overall evaluation of course organization below 50% combined very good and excellent</p> | <p>regarding course organization (moderately below departmental average) as evidenced by SAI Overall evaluation of course organization 50% - 60% combined very good and excellent</p> | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Teaching awards honoring a high caliber of performance. ● Grants related to teaching or student mentorship |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|

| Teaching | Poor Performance | Fair Performance | Good Performance | Excellent Performance | Distinguished Performance |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| Continuous improvement efforts | <p>Narrative does not include plan to address SAI deficiencies or comments</p> <p>Actively refuses or avoids teaching developmental experiences</p> | <p>Narrative does not include plan to address SAI deficiencies or comments</p> <p>Has not developed a plan or taken action to improve course/curriculum planning, organization, and execution even when prompted by the Department Chair.</p> | <p>Narrative includes plan to address SAI deficiencies or comments</p> <p>Has developed a plan or taken action to improve course/curriculum planning, organization, and execution when prompted by the Department Chair.</p> | <p>Narrative includes plan to address SAI deficiencies or comments</p> <p>Has developed a plan to improve course/curriculum planning, organization, and execution. This plan may include one or more of the following or their equivalent with evidence provided by narrative statement and/or certification of activity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Requested/performed peer evaluation of teaching ● Participated in University workshops that promote best pedagogical practices ● Shows clear personal research of best pedagogical practices ● Participates in departmental, college, or university curriculum decisions ● Participate in continuing education course(s) outside the University but within the biological sciences | <p>Narrative includes plan to address SAI deficiencies or comments</p> <p>Has taken action to improve course/curriculum planning, organization, and execution. This may include 2 of the following or their equivalent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Requested/performed peer evaluation of teaching ● Participated in University workshops that promote best pedagogical practices ● Shows clear personal research of best pedagogical practices ● Participates in departmental, college, or university curriculum decisions ● Participate in continuing education course(s) outside the University but within the biological sciences |

| Teaching | Poor Performance | Fair Performance | Good Performance | Excellent Performance | Distinguished Performance |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| Professional Responsibilities and Academic integrity | Chronic pattern of disrespect for students and their rights. Many students complaints often with evidence of disrespect Chronically inaccessible to students (fails to keep office hours or respond to emails, shows favoritism) Chronic pattern of inappropriate student feedback | Occasionally shows clear disrespect for students and their rights. Student complaints common with supporting evidence Often inaccessible to students (office hours) Student feedback poor with many occurrences of inappropriate feedback to students. | Shows a pattern of respect for students but with a few serious classroom incidents Above-average number of student complaints Irregular pattern of accessibility to students (office hours) Pattern of adequate and appropriate student feedback with several occurrences of inappropriate feedback to students. | Shows a pattern of respect for students with no serious incidents Consistent pattern of accessibility to students (office hours) Appropriate standards of academic integrity are promoted Consistent pattern of adequate and appropriate student feedback with only isolated occurrences of inappropriate feedback to students. | Shows a pattern of respect for students with no serious incidents student complaints rare Specific class activities to promote appropriate standards of academic integrity are included within course curricula. Consistent pattern of accessibility to students (office hours) Consistent pattern of adequate and appropriate student feedback. |
| Unscheduled Teaching (tenure track faculty) | Does not participate in unscheduled teaching activities (DIS, etc.) Does not participate in thesis, thesis equivalent, or internship committee Fails to guide students to degree completion Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices receive consistent and very negative reviews | Does not engage in unscheduled teaching activities Does not participate in thesis, thesis equivalent, or internship committees Fails to guide most students to degree completion Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices receive inadequate review | Does not engage in unscheduled teaching activities Member of at least one thesis, thesis equivalent, or internship committee Successfully guides approximately half of all students to degree completion Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices receive adequate review | Engages occasionally in unscheduled teaching activities (Directed Independent Study) Chairs at least one thesis, thesis equivalent, or internship committee Successfully guides most students to degree completion Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices receive consistent favorable review | Engages often in unscheduled teaching activities (Directed Independent Study) Chairs at least multiple thesis, thesis equivalent, or internship committee Successfully guides most students to degree completion Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices receive consistent favorable review and document exceptional student impact. |