

**UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF ENGINEERING**

DEPARTMENTAL BYLAWS

1. Name of Department

Department of Engineering.

2. Vision

The vision of the Department of Engineering is to be recognized in the state of Florida and the nation for its outstanding undergraduate teaching and outreach programs, and for the quality, character, and integrity of its graduates and faculty.

3. Mission and Purpose

The mission of the Department of Engineering is to offer baccalaureate degree programs of excellence in engineering that serve the needs of the West Florida region, the state, and the nation.

The goal of the baccalaureate degree programs is to prepare students to embark upon a professional career in electrical engineering, computer engineering, mechanical engineering, or to pursue graduate study. The Bachelor of Science degrees in Electrical Engineering and Computer Engineering are ABET accredited. Both programs shall be revised continuously to meet the criteria for ABET accreditation. The department will seek ABET accreditation for the Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering program as soon as it graduates its first cohort of students or shortly thereafter.

4. Departmental Meetings

The department Chair serves *ex officio* as presiding officer at department meetings. The Chair votes only in case of a tie among the voting faculty.

- (a) The department will hold faculty/staff meetings only during the regular academic year as requested by the Chair or by a majority of the faculty. All academic and student-related matters requiring departmental action shall be discussed at the faculty meetings. During the summer, the Chair and the faculty present may make decisions and take action on an emergency basis; such decisions and such action will not be binding until approved by the faculty during the next academic year.
- (b) The agenda for each meeting will be included in the meeting announcement in hard-copy and/or through e-mail. The agenda for meetings will be distributed two working days in advance, when practical. Any faculty may request that an agenda item be added.
- (c) As far as practicable, department faculty on sabbatical or other authorized paid leave shall be informed of faculty meetings and shall be given opportunity to participate in discussions and votes.
- (d) For all faculty meetings, a simple majority of the eligible voting faculty members shall constitute a quorum.
- (e) All full-time faculty (including instructors, lecturers, and visiting) may participate in departmental discussions. Staff members may be invited by the Chair or a majority of the faculty.
- (f) All full time faculty members may vote on non-personnel matters.
- (g) The faculty will follow university guidelines regarding voting and evaluation of tenure and promotion cases.
- (h) All votes will be by show of hands. In items relating to personnel matters, or when requested by at least one-third of the faculty present, the voting shall be by secret ballot. The Chair shall tally the votes for recording in the minutes.

- (i) Committee recommendations and/or decisions shall be based on simple majority rule. If a committee recommendation or decision has a broader impact on the department, it should come for a vote from all faculty.
- (j) Different opinions and views are encouraged. All members shall have equal opportunity to participate in discussions and to express their views and opinions. Members may need to agree on how to share the floor to ensure broad input.
- (k) If requested by any faculty member, the minutes of the faculty meeting shall be tape recorded, typed, and circulated (in hard-copy or through e-mail). The minutes must be approved by a two-thirds majority at the next faculty meeting. The tape may be used only for verification of the minutes; it must be erased after the minutes have been approved.
- (l) Robert's Rules of Order will be followed when requested by one-third of the faculty present.

5. Collegiality

Collegiality, in the sense of collaboration and constructive cooperation between academic colleagues, identifies important aspects of a faculty member's overall performance. A collegial atmosphere is essential in a department environment. Such an atmosphere makes both faculty members as well as students feel more welcome, and helps them better achieve their academic objectives. Therefore, regarding collegiality at the department level, a faculty member is expected to:

- (a) Treat colleagues with respect in all dealings, being verbal or written,
- (b) Undertake all activities with openness and fairness, and respond to concerns raised by colleagues with respect,
- (c) Deal with conflicts and disagreements among colleagues in a professional manner, and bring unresolved conflicts/disagreements to the attention of the Chair. The Chair shall attempt to resolve the conflict with the parties involved.
- (d) All faculty members shall also abide by the university guidelines related to collegiality and faculty cooperation.

6. Professional Integrity

Faculty members commit to observing the highest standards of ethical and professional conduct. They must adhere to university and state guidelines related to this area.

7. Faculty Mentoring

The Chair will consult with the new tenure-earning faculty member to select a mentoring committee during the first two years of appointment to that rank. Generally, two tenured engineering faculty members will be appointed to each committee, and ideally a third member from outside the department. At the request of the tenure-earning faculty member, the committee will be enlarged to include another tenured faculty member of his/her choice. The committee will designate one member who will be responsible for convening meetings. The committee will annually confer with the Chair, prior to annual evaluations, for the purpose of advising the Chair of the candidate's "progress toward tenure."

8. Committee Structure

Ad hoc committees will be appointed by the Chair as needed and membership shall be shared fairly by all faculty members. The scope and composition of departmental committees are determined by the Chair in consultation with the faculty members.

9. Policies and Procedures

(a) Annual Faculty Evaluation

The criteria for tenure and promotion specified in Appendix I shall be used in the annual evaluations of tenure-track faculty. Lecturers and instructors shall be evaluated based on the assignments made by the Chair in

teaching and service. The criteria of evaluation in these two areas shall be the same as those used to evaluate tenure-track faculty. If, in the opinion of the Chair, a faculty member's performance is lacking in any area, the Chair should promptly discuss the matter with the faculty member and offer an action plan for improvement.

(b) **Tenure and Promotion**

The department will follow the university guidelines and procedures. See department tenure and promotion guidelines in Appendix I.

(c) **Salary and Merit Pay Distribution**

Distribution of merit pay should be based on annual evaluations of each faculty member and should take into consideration the salary level, compression, and inversion.

(d) **Allocation of Summer Supplemental Lines**

The Chair will endeavor to balance FTE assignments among faculty.

(e) **Allocation of Paid Overload Appointments**

Each opportunity will be reviewed by the Chair on its merit and subject to state regulations.

(f) **Requests for Use of Departmental Resources**

Requests for use of departmental resources must be made with proper justification to the Chair/ committee. Each request will be reviewed by the Chair/committee on its merit and subject to state regulations. Disputes will be resolved by the faculty.

(g) **Allocation of Departmental Travel Resources**

Travel resources will be fairly distributed among faculty and staff as available.

(h) **Requests for Release Time**

Un-sponsored professional development opportunities will be shared equally over time. Requests for additional release time must be made as far as possible before the end of the previous semester. Release time for sponsored service and scholarly and creative activity will be consistent with contract or grant funds. The faculty requesting the release time must teach at least one three-credit hour course or its FTE equivalent per semester.

(i) **Office Hours**

Each faculty will maintain a minimum of two (2) office hours for every three teaching contact hours. When practicable, the office hours should be offered on multiple days and/or different times of the day.

(j) **Cancellation of Classes**

In the event of an illness or emergency, the instructor must contact the Chair at the earliest possible time. The Chair will attempt to arrange for a suitable substitute. If one cannot be found, the instructor should hold one or more make-up sessions (or pre-recorded lectures) as needed to bring the class in line with the course schedule. In the event that a make-up session cannot be held, the instructor should formulate a revision statement to the syllabus to be approved by the Chair. In the event of a planned absence, such as for a conference, the instructor must either arrange for a substitute or provide make-up classes. The instructor can provide a pre-recorded lecture in place of a face-to-face. This should be done in consultation with the Chair.

(k) **Curricular Review and Assessment Protocols**

All faculty members are expected to participate in outcome assessment and accreditation activities as assigned by the Chair.

(l) **Student Advising**

The department shall provide two types of advising for its students: faculty advising (performed by a faculty advisor), and academic advising (performed by an academic advisor). The purpose of the faculty advisors is to answer general questions concerning the profession of engineering, to serve as a mentor, and to assist students in selecting specific technical elective courses that will meet the student's professional goals and interests. All teaching faculty members will serve as faculty advisors. The Chair will assign advising duties equally among faculty. The purpose of the academic advisor is to provide academic advising, curriculum planning, and to ensure that all degree requirements are met. Academic advising shall be under the supervision of the Chair, who may assign advising related duties to non-tenure-earning departmental faculty or staff.

(m) **Annual Work Assignments**

The work assignment will be made in consultation with the Chair and subject to UWF guidelines.

(n) **Mid-Point Review Procedure**

The mid-point review will be done by the Mentoring Committee during the third year of appointment and it is intended to provide formative feedback to optimize faculty success in the tenure decision. The mid-point review should address the performance of annual assignments including teaching, scholarship and service occurring during the preceding tenure-earning years of employment. In addition, the review should assess overall performance and contributions critically in light of mid-point expectations. The mid-point review will not be as extensive as the formal tenure review that occurs toward the end of the probation period, but should be based on a set of documents, including a current vita; annual evaluations; student/peer evaluation of teaching; selected examples of teaching materials and scholarship; and a self-evaluation by the faculty member in the form of a Statement of Contributions. The Mentoring Committee shall report the outcome of this evaluation by means of a letter to the candidate and the Chair within two weeks after the end of the spring semester of the evaluation year. The Chair shall submit a written summary to the Dean with the annual evaluation of the faculty.

(o) **Grade Appeal Procedure**

The department will follow the university guidelines and procedures.

(p) **Others**

- All departmental matters that need to be addressed to the college's Dean shall be routed through the Chair.
- The request for university support shall be prepared by the Chair in consultation with the faculty.
- Program revisions, course development, and curriculum design for new tracks shall be done by the faculty.

10. Administrative Positions in the Department

(a) **Department Chair**

The department Chair is the administrative and executive officer of the department and its spokesperson to the university administration and communities outside the university.

- **Term of Office**

The term of office of the department Chair shall be three (3) years. There is no limit to the number of terms that a faculty member may serve as Chair. An election is to be conducted at the end of each 3-year term.

- **Eligibility**

Any full time faculty member (excluding visiting) can be nominated (including self-nomination) for the position. If there are no faculty willing or able to serve as Chair, the faculty can request that the Dean allow an external search.

- **Voting Procedure**

- *Voting eligibility:* All full time faculty members (excluding visiting) may vote in the Chair election.
- *Proxy voting:* Qualified faculty who are unable to attend the election meeting may vote by proxy. The method will be determined on a case by case basis.
- *Ballots:* Voting will be done by secret ballot.
- *Election:* The nominee who receives a simple majority of votes will win the election. In the case of a tie, both names will be submitted to the Dean for him/her to choose.

(b) **Associate Department Chair**

The appointment of an Associate Chair is recommended to the Dean by the Chair. The term of office of the Associate Chair shall be three (3) years, renewable at the discretion of the Chair and the Dean. The position is open to all full time faculty (excluding visiting). The Associate Chair will be based at the campus at which the Chair is not located.

11. Amendment

These bylaws will be reviewed and updated as needed. A complete review is scheduled for December 2018.

Date of Adoption: December 1997

First Revision: Initiated December 2000. The bylaws were approved by the ECE faculty on February 23, 2001.

Second Revision: Initiated January 2002. The bylaws were approved by the ECE faculty on March 4, 2002 by a majority vote of 3 "YES" to 1 "NO".

Third Revision: Initiated December 1, 2003. The bylaws were approved unanimously by the ECE faculty on October 29 2004.

Fourth Revision: Initiated December 1, 2007. The bylaws were approved unanimously by the ECE faculty on February 22, 2008.

Fifth Revision: Initiated February 7, 2014. The bylaws were approved unanimously by the ECE faculty on February 13, 2015.

Sixth Revision: Initiated September 28, 2015. The Bylaws were approved by the ECE faculty via email vote on December 4th, 2015: seven voted “YES”, one voted “NO” and one “ABSTAIN”.

APPENDIX I

PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA

UWF has adopted a set of criteria and standards for the assessment of a faculty member's performance of assigned duties and responsibilities. There are three performance categories: teaching; scholarship and creative activity; and service. These assessment criteria form the basis for promotion and tenure decisions.

The following criteria categories will be used in evaluating faculty quality of performance:

- **Poor:** Unacceptable level of performance. Major areas of weakness require remediation.
- **Fair:** Overall performance includes some strength, 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 standards for excellence in quality, quantity or both.

1. Minimum Expectations

The minimum expectations for tenure and promotion are as follows.

(a) **Tenure**

To be granted tenure, a faculty member must demonstrate at least an average of excellent rating in teaching and at least one excellent and one good rating in the other two areas (scholarship and creative activity and service) for at least three out of last five years of employment at UWF.

(b) **Promotion to Associate Professor**

To be promoted to Associate Professor, a faculty member must earn at least an excellent rating in all areas of review (teaching, scholarly and creative projects, and service) during at least three out of last five years at UWF with no less than good rating in the remaining years. In addition, the faculty must have at least three (3) scholarship items of weight 3 or more as listed in Table 1, at least one of which must be a refereed journal article during the last five years at UWF. With fewer opportunities for research collaboration, limited resources and additional challenges inherent with working at a remote location, the publication requirement mentioned above will be reduced by one item for faculty members based at the Fort Walton Beach campus. In exchange, increased emphasis will be placed on the faculty member's teaching and/or service performance to the department.

(c) **Promotion to Professor**

To be promoted to Professor, a faculty member will typically complete at least five years of employment at the Associate Professor level, at least three of which should transpire at UWF. In exceptional cases where annual evaluations point to success in meeting performance expectations, a candidates may submit for review after the completion of only four years of employment at the Associate Professor level, at least three of which should transpire at UWF. 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 one area should be rated as distinguished in the three years immediately preceding submission of the promotion dossier. The distinguished rating can be in different areas over the course of the three years but a minimum of one distinguished rating each year must be reflected in the evaluation. In addition, the faculty must have at least four (4) scholarship items of weight 3 or more as listed in Table 1, at least one of which must be a refereed journal article during the last five years at UWF. With fewer opportunities for research collaboration, limited resources and additional challenges inherent with working at a remote location, the publication requirement mentioned above will be reduced by 1 item for faculty members based at the Fort Walton Beach campus. In exchange, increased emphasis will be placed on the faculty member's teaching and/or service performance to the department.

2. Criteria

It is expected that all faculty will conduct themselves in accordance with the policies outlines in UWF Professional Standards and the UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement. Criteria evaluating teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service include but are not limited to the following: (The order of the listing does not reflect relative importance.)

2.1. Teaching

For tenure and promotion, a record of averaged excellent teaching is required. Teaching effectiveness can be demonstrated with, but not limited to:

- Satisfactory student evaluations.
- Peer evaluations of teaching.
- Organization and planning of courses.
- Clear and definitive explanation of assignments.
- Engaging students in research projects.
- Scholarship in teaching areas.
- Updating course material to reflect advancements in the field.
- Design of new courses and/or programs.
- Conference, workshop, or seminar participation related to specialized area.
- Teaching awards.
- Participation in teaching development programs.
- Outcome based teaching.
- Teaching specialty topics in seminars, discussion groups, and other student-centric delivery forums.
- Mentoring of capstone projects, honors projects, student competitions, and/or independent studies.
- Other teaching activities.

2.2. Scholarly and Creative Activity

Scholarly and creative activity can be demonstrated with, but not limited to:

- Peer reviewed journal publications.
- Peer reviewed conference publications.
- Externally sponsored research.
- Internally sponsored research.
- Submission of proposals to funding agencies
- Invited talks on research area.
- Chapters or books on specialized subjects.
- Presentations resulting in peer review of research.
- Poster sessions resulting in peer review of research.
- Writing of technical reports.
- Research awards.
- Mentoring of capstone projects, honors projects, student competitions, and/or independent studies.
- Other scholarly and creative activities.

2.3. Service

Service is broadly defined and includes a wide range of activities including, but not limited to:

- Service on university, college, and department governance.
- Service as Department Chair, Associate Chair, Program Director, or Program Coordinator.
- Community service related to one's discipline.
- Service to the university in the form of delivering courses to remote locations.
- Advising student organizations.
- Advising student curricula.
- Service to professional and student organizations.

- Services related to recruitment and retention of students.
- Service on editorial review boards.
- Service on conference committees.
- Articulation efforts at various levels.
- Outreach activities that promote the department and/or university.
- Participation with the local professional organizations.
- Assisting in organizing district wide activities such as robotics competitions and science fairs.
- Textbook, manuscript and grant reviewing activity.
- Curriculum development to meet the needs of the community and to keep abreast of the rapidly evolving Electrical and Computer Engineering field.
- ABET accreditation activity.
- SACSCOC accreditation activity.
- Program evaluation
- Mentoring and assisting new faculty.
- Student advising.
- Obtaining/maintaining professional licenses in one's discipline.

3. Departmental Criteria for Evaluation

The criteria categories Poor, Fair, Good, Excellent, and Distinguished will be used in evaluating faculty efforts in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service.

3.1. Teaching

In this performance area, the ratings in the first two performance categories (Poor, Fair) do not facilitate favorable tenure and promotion decisions.

3.1.1. Poor

This performance level demonstrates serious problems in attaining success in the teaching role as reflected either by (1) a combination of many 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 standards of excellence.

Indicators:

- Student evaluations document consistent and substantive problems (ratings well below the department average).
- 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; 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 students' scholarly or creative activities.
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone) avoided or poorly executed.
- Chronic academic integrity concerns identified including evidence of disrespect for students and their rights.
- Avoids teaching development experiences.

Implication: Requires major remedial work.

3.1.2. Fair

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 a combination of several of the indicators below. In general, teaching performance is moderately below the department standards of excellence.

Indicators:

- Student evaluations document areas of moderate concern.
- 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) 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.

Implication: Some remediation is necessary. Change will need to be substantial to qualify for tenure and promotion.

3.1.3. Good

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

Indicators:

- Student evaluations document adequate impact on learning.
- Syllabi provide reasonably clear and appropriate expectations.
- Assessment practices support student learning and contribute to department needs.
- 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) 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.

Implication: Performance at this level over three out of the last five years period of employment at UWF does not justify tenure or promotion.

3.1.4. Excellent

At least four (4) of the indicators below must be satisfied in order to qualify for this rating.

Indicators:

- A minimum of 2.8 yearly average of all reported sections taught on each of items 8 (overall assessment of instructor), 17 (instructor's command of the subject), and 18 (overall course organization) on the Student Assessment of Instruction. If an instructor teaches more than one section of the same course in a semester, the instructor may choose to report only one of those sections.
- Mentoring of capstone and/or honors projects. Each full time faculty member should have the opportunity for mentoring at least one capstone or honors project per year.
- Syllabi outline comprehensive, clear, and appropriate performance expectations.
- Documented course folders to demonstrate the achievement of student learning outcomes and student outcomes for ABET accreditation.
- Assessment practices enhance student learning and contribute to department needs.
- Goals and course content provide evidence of continuous improvement effort.

- Pedagogical practices facilitate optimal learning conditions.
- Student support practices facilitate optimal student development.
- Appropriate standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights.
- Participates voluntarily in professional development activities to improve teaching quality and flexibility.

Implication: Performance average at this level over three out of the last five years period of employment at UWF justifies favorable promotion/tenure decision.

3.1.5. Distinguished

At least six (6) of the indicators below must be satisfied in order to qualify for this rating.

Indicators:

- A minimum of 3.3 yearly average of all reported sections taught on each of items 8 (overall assessment of instructor), 17 (instructor's command of the subject), and 18 (overall course organization) on the Student Assessment of Instruction. If an instructor teaches more than one section of the same course in a semester, the instructor may choose to report only one of those sections.
- Mentoring of capstone and/or honors projects. Each full time faculty member should have the opportunity for mentoring at least one capstone or honors project per year.
- Syllabi outline comprehensive, clear, and appropriate performance expectations.
- Documented course folders to demonstrate the achievement of student learning outcomes and student outcomes for ABET accreditation.
- Assessment practices enhance student learning and contribute to department needs.
- Goals and course content provide evidence of continuous improvement effort.
- Pedagogical practices facilitate optimal learning conditions.
- Student support practices facilitate optimal student development.
- Appropriate standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights.
- Participates voluntarily in professional development activities to improve teaching quality and flexibility.
- Teaching awards honor high caliber of performance.
- Leadership evident in the promotion of high quality teaching and course improvement/development in the department.

Implication: Performance average at this level over three out of the last five years period of employment at UWF justifies favorable promotion/tenure decision.

3.2. Scholarship and Creative Activity

In this performance area, the ratings in the first two performance categories (Poor, Fair) do not facilitate favorable tenure and promotion decisions.

3.2.1. Poor

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 department standards of excellence.

Indicators:

- 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.

Implication: Major remedial work is required. Scholarship and creative projects mentors should be considered.

3.2.2. Fair

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 department standards of excellence.

Indicators:

- Minimum of one (1) scholarship activity item of weight 1 or its equivalent as listed in Table 1.

Implication: No support for tenure or promotion but shows future productivity promise.

3.2.3. Good

Demonstrates moderate tangible progress in scholarship or creative activity agenda as shown by the indicators below, but work falls mildly below department standards of excellence in quality and quantity.

Indicators:

- Minimum of two (2) scholarship activity items of weight 1 or their equivalent as listed in Table 1.

Implication: Performance average at this level over three out of the last five years period of employment at UWF justifies favorable tenure if other effort areas are at least excellent but not promotion decision.

Table 1. Scholarly Activities Types and Weights

Scholarly Activity Type	Weight
UWF research funding proposal	0.5
UWF funded research project of \$2K-\$19K	1
Refereed conference publication	1
Mentoring two semester-sequence capstone design project	1
External research funding proposal of \$10K or less	1
Invited lecture	1
External funded research project between \$10K and \$100k	2
UWF funded research project of \$20K or more	2
Edited book	2
Peer-reviewed conference publication with acceptance rate of 35% or less	3
Refereed journal paper	3
Refereed or invited book chapter	3
External funded research project of \$100K or more	3
Published book	6

3.2.4. Excellent

Demonstrates satisfactory execution of scholarship or creative activity agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university context as shown by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative projects meet the department standards for excellence in both quality and quantity.

Indicators:

- Minimum of three (3) scholarship activity items of weight 1 or their equivalent as listed in Table 1.

Implication: Performance average at this level over three out of the last five years period of employment at UWF justifies favorable promotion/tenure decision.

3.2.5. Distinguished

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

Indicators:

- Minimum of six (6) scholarship activity items of weight 1 or their equivalent as listed in Table 1.

Implication: Performance easily qualifies for favorable promotion/tenure decisions.

3.3. Service

In this performance area, the ratings in the first two performance categories (Poor, Fair) do not facilitate favorable tenure decisions. The ratings in the first two performance categories (Poor, Fair) do not facilitate favorable promotion decisions to Associate Professor, and the ratings in the first three performance categories (Poor, Fair, Good) do not facilitate favorable promotion decisions to Professor.

3.3.1. 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 standards for excellence.

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, for example, serving as the director of a local church choir.

Implication: Remedial work is required; May include recommendation to find a context that is a better match to the individual's service values than the substantial service needs relevant to the regional comprehensive context. No support for tenure or promotion.

3.3.2. Fair

Demonstrates only minor tangible progress in service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is moderately below department standards for excellence.

Indicators:

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

Implication: No support for tenure/promotion.

3.3.3. Good

Demonstrates major tangible progress in relevant service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is somewhat below department standards for excellence.

Indicators:

- Participates effectively in at least 5 of the service activities listed in section 1.3 of this appendix.
- 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, if applicable, provides reasonable synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions.

Implication: Acceptable performance early in career as potential is demonstrated but expectation is that service excellence is the standard that produces positive personnel decisions.

3.3.4. Excellent

Demonstrates satisfactory execution of service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service contributions meet the department standards for excellence.

Indicators:

- Participates effectively in at least 6 of the service activities listed in section 1.3 of this appendix
- Scope and effort level meet department standards.
- Colleagues view contributions to department as effective.
- Service agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university mission.
- Service contributions represent strategic decisions that balance demands from the discipline, department, campus, and community.
- Community service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions. For example, serving as a judge in a science competition.

Implication: Performance at this level qualifies for favorable promotion/tenure decisions.

3.3.5. 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 department standards for excellence.

Indicators:

- Participates effectively in at least 10 of the service activities listed in section 1.3 of this appendix
- 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 provided significant and measurable impact; service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions.

Implication: Performance easily qualifies for favorable promotion/tenure decisions.