



Department of Global
Hospitality & Tourism
Management

Bylaws

Inaugural Bylaws Submitted to Department of Hospitality, Recreation and Resort Management Faculty for Review: November 3, 2014

Inaugural Bylaws Approved by Department of Hospitality, Recreation and Resort Management Faculty: December 11, 2014

Inaugural Bylaws Approved by College of Education and Professional Studies: January, 2015

Revised Bylaws Submitted to Department of Global Hospitality & Tourism Management Faculty for Review: May 20, 2016

Revised Bylaws Approved by Department of Global Hospitality & Tourism Management Faculty:

Revised Bylaws Approved by College of Business:

**Bylaws for Department Governance
Department of Global Hospitality & Tourism Management (GHTM)**

Article I. Name

The name of this unit is the Department of Global Hospitality & Tourism Management. The unit is housed in the College of Business at the University of West Florida.

Mission Statement

The mission of the Department of Global Hospitality & Tourism Management is to build a foundation of hospitality, recreation, and resort management knowledge and to prepare students with professional skills and analytical abilities to assume prominent positions in hospitality, recreation, and resort management across the state and nation.

Article II. Voting Membership

The Department's voting membership shall consist of all full-time faculty eligible for annual contract.

Article III. Meeting Structure

- The Department Chair will convene departmental meetings at least once in each Fall and Spring semesters.
- A majority of the voting membership may direct the Department Chair to convene a department meeting in a timely and efficient manner.
- An agenda will be distributed at least two days prior to a scheduled meeting.
- Although most of the work can be accomplished in an informal manner, when necessary the Department Chair will institute Robert's Rule of Order to move forward meeting business.
- A majority of the voting members will constitute a quorum.
- Voting membership shall notify the Department Chair in a timely fashion if they cannot attend a scheduled meeting. The member who is unable to attend a meeting may give a written proxy to another faculty member.
- Voting will normally be by "voice" or show of hands. If any member requests a secret ballot on any issue, a secret ballot will be conducted.
- The Department Chair votes whenever his/her vote will affect the result. He/she can vote as any other faculty member when the vote is by ballot.

- Minutes of each meeting will be recorded and distributed by the Office Manager or other designee.

Article IV. Committee Structure

Standing Committees

1) Bylaws Review Committee

- Chair: A faculty member appointed by the Department Chair.
- Membership: Members will be appointed by the Chair.
- Responsibilities – The Bylaws Review Committee is charged with an annual review of departmental bylaws. The responsibilities of the Bylaws Review Committee include the following:
 - Convene in January to review and update GHTM Bylaws;
 - Draft recommended changes to the GHTM Bylaws;
 - Provide a copy of proposed changes to all faculty members for a 30 day review period (February);
 - Conduct an approval/disapproval vote, requiring only a simple majority approval, on all changes in March;
 - In the event a proposed change is disapproved, the bylaws will remain unchanged; and
 - The Department Chair of GHTM may call a special meeting(s) of the Bylaws Review Committee to resume or continue revision of the bylaws.

2) Faculty Development Committee

- Department Chair – A faculty member appointed by the Department Chair of GHTM.
- Membership – Members will be appointed by the Department Chair of GHTM.
- Responsibilities – The Faculty Development Committee is charged with facilitating the continuous development of faculty through mentorship and support. The committee will oversee the: 1) faculty mentorship program; and 2) participate in the Mid-point Review under the guidance of the Department Chair.
- *Faculty Mentorship Program* includes the assigning of mentors, adherence to program guidelines, and providing resources or opportunities to enhance the mentor-mentee relationship. Mentorship and support should focus on career development. Career mentoring may include coaching, professional advising, networking assistance, explaining typical routes to advancement, and facilitating positive professional exposure. The following are proposed guidelines for a mentorship program.
 - Each untenured faculty member (visiting or tenure track) should be assigned a mentor from among the tenured faculty. Post-tenure Assistant Professors should also be assigned a mentor from among senior faculty.

- Mentor-mentee assignments should be time limited; one academic year is suggested. Longer pairings should be possible by mutual agreement.
- The Department Chair of GHTM should ultimately determine faculty pairings, based on committee recommendations, faculty workloads, and other relevant factors.
- Faculty pairs should agree to meet at regular intervals to discuss factors that may affect the mentee's professional growth. Both partners should show initiative in arranging these meetings. Although this is a formal mentoring program, it is desirable for faculty to develop the type of informal relationship that could occur naturally.
- At the end of the academic year, the Department Chair of the Faculty Development Committee should report to the GHTM Department Chair on the effectiveness of the program.
- *Mid-point Review* provides untenured faculty with formative feedback to enhance faculty success in the tenure and promotion process. The review should encourage faculty who are making solid progress toward tenure and promotion by highlighting achievements, notify faculty who may need to improve in certain areas of performance, and inform faculty where lack of progress could jeopardize a favorable outcome. Guidelines for the Mid-point Review process are covered in *Article VI. Tenure and Promotion Evaluation and Mid-point Review*.

Article V. Annual Evaluation Criteria

Performance Standards for Evaluation

For the purpose of evaluating faculty members, the Department of Hospitality, Recreation and Resort Management, has adopted a set of standards for the assessment of a faculty member's performance of assigned duties and responsibilities.

Part-time faculty, faculty associates, and adjunct faculty will be evaluated using the following criteria that are specific to their assigned contract.

The following categories will be used in evaluating faculty efforts in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service for the purposes of Annual Evaluation.

- **Distinguished:** Exceeds department standards for professional performance. Exceeds the standard for excellence in quality or quantity or both.
- **Excellent:** Meets department standards for professional performance. No areas of weakness exist.
- **Good:** Moderate progress toward long-term professional goals, but one or more minor weaknesses exist.
- **Fair:** Overall performance includes some strengths, but one or more major weaknesses exist.
- **Poor:** Unacceptable level of performance. Major areas of weakness require remediation.

Recommendations to Faculty in Achieving These Standards

(1) Statement on Teaching**CRITERIA THAT WILL BE USED IN THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

- Teaching awards and other accomplishments related to teaching.
- Peer evaluations of teaching, such as those of Department Chair or department mentor.
- Supervision of theses and/or dissertations.
- Supervision of undergraduate and graduate capstone projects and internships.
- Service on thesis or dissertation committees.
- Supervision of honors' theses.
- Supervision of graduate/undergraduate internships/field studies or directed studies.
- Participation in Department's assessment plan and curriculum mapping.
- Participation in teaching development programs, including conferences, workshops, or seminars related to subject areas taught.
- Design of new courses and programs.
- Organization and planning of courses.
- Evidence of course revisions to reflect current knowledge in area.
- Punctuality in classroom attendance, grading assignments, etc.
- Clear and effective communication in the classroom or online environment.
- Syllabi, course assignments, testing procedures, attendance requirements, grading standards, and record-keeping that adhere to rigorous academic standards and University requirements and ensure the equitable treatment of students.
- Maintenance of adequate office hours and student records and timely response to student inquiries in advising and mentoring.
- Student evaluations of teaching that demonstrate the ability to challenge students and stimulate student learning.
- Evidence of scholarship and currency in subject area in selection of topics, resource materials, and content of lectures.
- Self-evaluations, observations from other faculty, inside or outside the Department arranged by the faculty member.

TEACHING PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**Distinguished Performance**

Distinguished performance demonstrates that the weight of evidence supports an unusually high degree of quality in teaching as shown by the following indicators that build upon performance indicators for excellence.

Performance indicators that will be used to support distinguished ratings:

- Narrative statements emphasize powerful impact on learner or transformative learning experiences.
- Teaching awards honor high caliber of performance.
- Leadership evident in the promotion of high quality teaching and curriculum development in the department.
- Numerical student evaluation data document clear statistical exceptionality.

Excellent Performance

Excellent performance represents consistent high quality teaching with positive outcomes for students as reflected by the performance indicators below.

Performance indicators that will be used to support excellent ratings:

- Teaching philosophy provides foundation for coherent course planning and activities.
- Syllabi outline comprehensive, clear, and include appropriate performance expectations.
- Assessment practices enhance student learning and contribute to department needs.
- Goals and course content routinely provide evidence of successful continuous improvement effort.
- Pedagogical practices facilitate optimal learning conditions.
- Student support practices facilitate optimal student development.
- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices receive consistent favorable review.
- Special teaching assignments (i.e., honors, capstone, general education) executed with expert skill.
- 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.
- Student evaluations document consistently positive impact on learning (above average).

Good Performance

Good performance demonstrates overall teaching effectiveness but some minor areas for concern. In general, the weight of evidence suggests that teaching performance is below what is required for tenure and promotion decisions.

Performance indicators that will be used to support good ratings:

- Teaching philosophy expressed in course planning and activities.
- 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 (i.e., honors, capstone, general education) executed with reasonable skill.

- Maintains appropriate standards of academic integrity, including respect for students and their rights.
- Participates in teaching development activities when directed to do so.
- Student evaluation data document adequate impact on learning.

Fair Performance

Fair performance demonstrates some positive teaching outcomes but produces major areas for concern for the department. The weight of evidence suggests that teaching performance in this category is below what is required for tenure and promotion decisions.

Performance indicators that will be used to support fair ratings:

- Teaching philosophy may not be clearly expressed in course planning and activities.
- Syllabi need to provide clearer and more appropriate expectations.
- Assessment practices show some difficulty in supporting student learning and meeting department needs.
- Goals and course content reflect limited continuous improvement effort.
- Some pedagogical practices need attention.
- Some student support practices need improvement.
- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices need improvement.
- Special teaching assignments (i.e., honors, capstone, general education) could be executed with greater competence.
- Occasional challenges related to academic integrity.
- Some indications of disrespect for students and their rights.
- Does not typically participate in teaching development activity.
- Student evaluation data document areas of moderate concern (ratings below the department average).

Poor Performance

Poor performance demonstrates *serious* problems in attaining success in teaching role as reflected either by (1) a combination of many negative indications, or (2) fewer but more extreme behaviors that produce substantial negative outcomes on students and their learning. In general, the weight of evidence suggests teaching performance is well below the department and university norms. Because of the high priority placed on teaching at UWF, this level of performance requires major remedial work.

Performance indicators that will be used to support poor ratings:

- Teaching philosophy missing, poorly articulated or poorly expressed in course activities and planning.
- Syllabi fail to establish clear and relevant expectations.
- Assessment practices are inadequate to support student learning and department needs (i.e., 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 (i.e., disorganized; late, missing, unhelpful feedback; standards too lax or too challenging; routinely poor preparation; disengaging, chaotic, or hostile classroom environment).
- Student support practices are unsound (i.e., 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 (i.e., honors, capstone, general education) avoided or poorly executed.
- Chronic academic integrity concerns identified including evidence of disrespect for students and their rights.
- Student evaluation data document consistent and substantive problems (ratings well below the department average).

(2) Statement on Scholarly and Creative Activities

CRITERIA THAT WILL BE USED IN THE EVALUATION OF SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE PROJECTS

The Department of Global Hospitality & Tourism Management **should** consider a broad range of activities that express our mission and vision. Moreover, we recognize that regional comprehensive universities have limited resources that may constrain scholarly expectations (i.e., relatively limited travel support diminishes the opportunity for international participation). Scholarship and creative projects **must be** externally reviewed and publicly available, including projects involving the creation, production, exhibition, presentation, or publication of works by one or more individuals demonstrating originality in design or execution. GHTM will consider and address a wide range of venues for disseminating scholarly and creative projects, including the following:

- Peer-reviewed publications (i.e., journal, book, book chapter)
- Editorially reviewed publications
- Convention and conference contributions
- Grant activity (intramural/extramural)
- Electronic outlets
- Development of curriculum
- Other performance indicators for scholarly and creative activities *deemed acceptable to the Department of GHTM*

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE PROJECTS PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Distinguished Performance

Distinguished performance demonstrates that the weight of evidence supports an unusually high degree of quality in scholarship as shown by the following indicators that build upon performance indicators for excellence.

Performance indicators that will be used to support distinguished ratings:

- Peer-reviewed original research publications (first author).

- Funding of a significant peer-reviewed research grant from a nationally recognized granting agency.
- Book authorships in related academic discipline/area of expertise.

Excellent Performance

Excellent performance represents consistent high quality scholarship with positive outcomes for the Department and UWF as reflected by the performance indicators below.

Performance indicators that will be used to support excellent ratings:

- Peer-reviewed original research publications (first author/non-first author).
- Peer-reviewed publications (first author).
- Funding of a significant peer-reviewed research grant.
- Book chapter authorships in related academic discipline/area of expertise.

Good Performance

Good performance demonstrates overall scholarship effectiveness but some minor areas for concern. In general, the weight of evidence suggests that scholarship and creative project performance is below what is required for tenure and promotion decisions.

Performance indicators that will be used to support good ratings:

- Peer-reviewed original research publications (non-first author).
- Significant progress on the development and/or publication of original research.
- Submitting a research grant (non-funded or awaiting review) to any source outside the University.

Fair Performance

Fair performance demonstrates some positive scholarship outcomes but produces major areas for concern for the department. The weight of evidence suggests that scholarship and creative project performance in this category is below what is required for tenure and promotion decisions.

Performance indicators that will be used to support fair ratings:

- No peer-reviewed original research publications.
- Little or lack of progress on the development and/or publication of original research.
- Significant contributions to original research grant proposals of other faculty members in the University.
- Significant assistance in administering large grants of another faculty member in the University.

Poor Performance

Poor performance demonstrates *serious* problems in attaining success in scholarship. In general, the weight of evidence suggests scholarship and creative project performance is well below the Department and University norms.

Performance indicators that will be used to support poor ratings:

- No peer-reviewed original research publications.
- No progress on the development and/or publication of original research.
- No contribution to any research projects.
- No contributions to grant proposals or grant administration/operations.

(3) Statement on Service***CRITERIA THAT WILL BE USED IN THE EVALUATION OF SERVICE***

The Department of Global Hospitality & Tourism Management will use following service activities but is not limited to:

Department

- Curriculum development
- Advising students
- Mentoring students
- Developing Departmental materials/facilities
- Serving as Department Chair, Associate Department Chair, Program Director or Program Coordinator
- Serving on Department committees
- Serving on special Departmental assignments/projects
- Assuming temporary administrative assignments
- Attending University functions
- Advising student clubs/organizations
- Maintaining a presence in professional organizations
- Recruiting of students in professional organizations

School/University

- Serving on committees
- Curriculum development
- Serving on special College/University assignments/projects
- Assuming administrative assignments
- Attending functions/events

Local/State/Regional/National/International

- Serving in an administrative and/or discipline-specific professional role on committees, boards, workshops, etc.
- Serving as a liaison for the Department/College/University
- Presenting papers, or other public presentation, not based on original research

- Attending functions/events
- Sponsoring/developing University events
- Engaging in student recruitment at events/organizations
- Providing unremunerated consultancies

Conclusions drawn about quality of service will be influenced the following performance indicators:

- A measure of the scope of service activities
- Peer evaluation of contributions to the service mission
- Quality of service leadership
- Service agenda well suited to the UWF regional comprehensive university mission
- Service contributions represent strategic decisions that balance demands from the discipline, department, campus, and community
- Recognition for service inside or outside of the university or both
- Synergy between faculty member's area of expertise and service function
- Other service activities defined by the Department

SERVICE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Distinguished Performance

Distinguished performance demonstrates a high degree of skill in service contributions as shown by the performance indicators below that build upon performance indicators for excellence. In general, the weight of evidence in the faculty service contributions *exceeds* the criteria for excellent.

Performance indicators that will be used to support distinguished ratings:

- Leadership demonstrated in targeted arenas of service (i.e., holds elected office).
- Collaboration is skillful and innovative.
- 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 function.

Excellent Performance

Excellent performance demonstrates satisfactory execution of service contributions as shown by the performance indicators below.

Performance indicators that will be used to support excellent ratings:

- Scope and effort level meet department criteria.
- 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.
- Potential shown for wide recognition inside and outside of the University.

Good Performance

Good performance demonstrates *moderate* tangible progress in service contributions but may reflect some minor challenges that interfere with excellent performance. The weight of evidence suggests that work falls mildly below department criteria of excellent.

Performance indicators that will be used to support good ratings:

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

Fair Performance

Fair performance demonstrates only minor tangible progress in service contributions that can be the result of many factors; including limited pursuit of service, passive participation, or inability to manage obligations. In general, the weight of evidence suggests that service is moderately below department and UWF norms. Remediation is recommended to assist the faculty member to come to terms with the service obligations and appropriate behaviors to achieve positive outcomes in the regional comprehensive university context.

Performance indicators that will be used to support fair ratings:

- Appropriate arenas for service identified and explored.
- Minimal contributions made in service role (i.e., "sits" on committees as compared to active participation).
- Recognition of service obligation in faculty role shapes consideration.
- Over-commitment to service spreads faculty time and energy too thinly to facilitate effectiveness.

Poor Performance

Poor performance demonstrates serious problems in fulfilling appropriate service role for faculty. In general, the weight of evidence suggests that service is well below the department and UWF norms. Remediation should be required to help the faculty member develop an appropriate orientation to service in a regional comprehensive university context and strategic plan to accomplish that objective.

Performance indicators that will be used to support poor ratings:

- Service activity nonexistent or very poor in quality; producing a potentially adverse impact on the goals of the relevant organization, Department of GHTM, and/or UWF.
- Significance of the obligation of service in the faculty role in a regional comprehensive university not apparent (i.e., faculty seems resistant or oblivious to service needs).
- Community service, if applicable, does not in any way provide synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service function.

Annual Evaluation Process:

Full-time Contracted Faculty

Each faculty member will provide the GHTM Department Chair hardcopies of the following information by the announced date.

- A **complete** updated Curriculum Vitae
- Separate list of items added to Curriculum Vitae during the previous academic year
- CAERS reports for the previous academic year
- A "statement of contributions" as reflected in Sedona

Refer to the information below from the Provost regarding statement of contributions:

- *Statement of contribution. The purpose of the statement is to highlight noteworthy achievements of the year. Any extenuating circumstances that should be considered in rendering judgment about unusual constraints should also be articulated in the statement. The contribution form may include a self-assessment of quality where endorsed by the department or college. The statement of contribution should not merely repeat or list data provided in either the vita or CAERS form. Instead, the emphasis should be on quality of effort and scope of impact. Department Chairs, Deans, and the Provost may require specific forms or narrative formats for the statement of contribution.*

Examples of appropriate contributions may include the following:

- a) indication of high quality of course-related student contacts, including advising, counseling, student conferences, and thesis and/or intern supervision;*
- b) high quality of course syllabi that provide appropriate and clear direction, including articulation of student learning outcomes;*
- c) evidence of appropriately rigorous intellectual demands made upon students, including examples of high quality of test design or assignments;*
- d) peer or Department Chair classroom evaluation;*

- e) *assessment data reflecting appropriate student progress in mastering course content and achieving course outcomes;*
 - f) *description of substantial revision of established courses or development and teaching of new courses;*
 - g) *description of professional growth that will enhance the faculty member's value as a teacher;*
 - h) *peer evaluations that identify progress made toward achieving pedagogical goals;*
 - i) *evidence of quality derived from peer reviewed process related to a performance or scholarly work;*
 - j) *a formal note of appreciation for service that emphasizes scope of impact or significance of service; and*
 - k) *self-assessment that highlights how submitted material supports success in fulfilling course objectives and achievement at a particular performance level.*
- Copies of any original research publication submitted for consideration for evaluation of your research (NOTE: research submitted this year will not be considered in subsequent years. For example, if you submit that an article is “in press” this year, it will not also be considered “published” for next year’s evaluation since it is only one piece of original research). The Department Chair will review last year’s evaluation submission with regards to this request. If it is in press, please provide a copy of the acceptance notification from the editor. If it is an online journal, please provide an active link.
 - Submission of any evidence of effective teaching:

It is incumbent upon the faculty member to make a case for the quality of their teaching.

Following the submission and review of submitted materials, the Department Chair will evaluate each faculty member’s annual performance. The Department Chair will inform the faculty member of the results of their evaluation. Each faculty member will also be informed of the timeline and process to appeal the results of their evaluation. For specific deadlines, faculty members and Department Chairs should refer to the Provost’s current academic year calendar for completion of annual evaluations.

May: Faculty member provides evaluation file to Department Chair.

June: Department Chair shares evaluation with faculty member; Faculty member may rebut Department Chair’s statement and should have one week to complete rebuttal before packet

goes forward to the Dean.

- Department Chair adds evaluation and forwards evaluation file, including faculty rebuttal to the Dean.

July: The following must take place:

- Dean provides his/her written evaluation to the faculty member
- Faculty member is provided the opportunity to submit a rebuttal to Dean's evaluation and should have one week to complete the rebuttal before the packet goes forward to the Provost

July: Dean forwards to the Provost the evaluation file, including the faculty member's rebuttal (if any)

August: Provost reviews annual evaluations and returns evaluation file to Dean.

- Dean makes available to faculty member contents of evaluation file for inspection.
- Faculty member has the right to write a rebuttal letter, if he/she chooses, which must be included in the evaluation file.

Part-time Faculty, Faculty Associates and Adjunct Faculty

The Department Chair will oversee the evaluation process for Part-time Faculty, Faculty Associates and Adjunct Faculty. This process is initiated in the beginning of the semester with faculty posting their current syllabi and curriculum vitae to the UWF Faculty Academic Credentials System (FACS). At the end of the semester, the Department Chair will meet with faculty to review course evaluations and/or other contracted duties not related to course instruction.

Article VI. Tenure and Promotion Evaluation and Mid-point Review

Tenure and Promotion Evaluation

Tenure and Promotion Evaluation and Third-Year Reviews should be based upon Departmental teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service criteria. The criteria and performance indicators used in the tenure and promotion evaluation and mid-point review are covered in *Article V. Annual Evaluation Criteria*. Additionally, the following guidelines along with university criteria for tenure and promotion decisions as outlined in the most recent version of the *UWF Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion* online document form the basis for decisions related to reemployment, promotion, and tenure.

1. Excellent teaching and promising signs of good scholarship and service justify a period of yearly reappointment at the Assistant Professor level.
2. Excellent teaching, significant evidence of scholarship and service, including a measure of tangible and public evidence, justify the decision to grant tenure. Service must include membership on college and/or university committees.
3. A strong positive reputation within the University as teacher and scholar justifies the decision to promote to Associate Professor. Substantial tangible and public scholarship, recognized as such by colleagues, is always a criterion, and this scholarship usually signifies the potential for recognition outside the University. Substantial contributions in the area of service, including membership on college and/or university committees, are required.

4. Very substantial, tangible, and public contributions to the profession measured by favorable acknowledgment in the disciplines outside the University – and excellent teaching – justify promotion to the rank of Professor. As a general guideline, a faculty member normally would not apply for promotion to the rank of Professor without five years of service at the rank of Associate Professor.

Refer to the current *UWF Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion* document for the Administrative Guidelines related to the T & P process.

Mid-point Review Process

All untenured assistant professors shall undergo a mid-point review of their progress toward promotion and tenure during the fall/spring semester of the third year of employment at UWF.

- The Department Chair will convene the Department's Faculty Development Committee plus at least one tenured faculty member from an outside department and establish the appropriate dates for the review.
- The Department Chair must inform the untenured assistant professor of the dates for the review no later than the second week of the contract year during which the review will take place.
- The untenured assistant professor shall prepare and submit a mid-point review dossier that parallel's the format required by the College for application for tenure/promotion, excluding letters of recommendation.
- The Department Chair and/or faculty mentor will provide guidance to the untenured faculty member in the preparation of the review materials.

The Department's Faculty Development Committee will provide its review, in writing, to the untenured faculty member and to the Department Chair using the criteria on the *Evaluation Form for Department Colleague Review in Tenure and Promotion Decisions*.

- The Department Chair will review the dossier and Faculty Development Committee letter and prepare a written review of the untenured assistant professor's progress, which will then be provided to the untenured assistant professor and forwarded to the Dean of the College.
- The Dean will review the department's written mid-point review and respond to the department and the faculty member in writing.

An untenured assistant professor may request an earlier review upon giving reasonable advanced notice to allow for a review committee to be formed. A tenured faculty member may request the Committee to review his/her progress toward promotion upon giving reasonable advance notice to allow for a review committee to be formed.

Article VII. Amendments:

These bylaws may be changed or amended at any regular faculty meeting by a simple majority vote of members present, provided that proposed change(s) have been submitted in writing to the Departmental Department Chair and distributed to the voting membership at least 30 days prior to the meeting at which the proposed change(s) are to be considered.

Revised 05/18/2016