

THE UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

BY-LAWS

(Updated July 16, 2014)

Contents

I.	Mission of the Department.....	4
II.	Structure of the Department	4
	A. Voting Rights	4
	B. Committees.....	5
III.	Academic Policies of the Department.....	5
IV.	Departmental Meetings.....	6
V.	Chairperson's Role	6
	A. The Chairperson is responsible to the College Dean:.....	6
	B. The Chairperson is responsible to members of the faculty unit:.....	7
	C. The Chairperson is responsible to students:.....	7
	D. The Chairperson is responsible to staff:	7
	E. The Chairperson is responsible to governing bodies:.....	8
	F. The Chairperson has authority within the faculty unit to do the following:	8
VI.	Personnel Policies/Procedures	8
	A. Recruitment/Selection of New Faculty	8
	B. Mentoring Committee	8
	C. Procedures for Annual Work Assignments	10
	D. Office Hour Policies.....	9
	E. Policy for Summer Supplemental Contract Opportunities	9
VII.	Guidelines for Annual Evaluation and T&P	9
	A. Performance Standards for Evaluation.....	11
	B. Teaching.....	11
	a. Criteria that may be used in the evaluation of teaching:	11
	b. Teaching Performance Indicators:.....	12
	C. Research.....	15
	a. Criteria that may be used in the evaluation of scholarship and creative activities:.....	15
	b. Scholarship and Creative Performance Indicators:.....	16
	D. Service.....	17
	a. Criteria that may be used in the evaluation of service:.....	17

b. Service Performance Indicators:	18
VIII. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion	20
A. Tenure.....	20
B. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor	22
C. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor	22
Appendix A.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

I. Mission and Vision of the Department

A. Mission Statement:

The Faculty of History seeks first to educate students, providing them the opportunity to explore the history of peoples and cultures from the earliest historic times to the present. We also help students to develop the skills of research, critical thinking, and writing. We are concerned with giving students the opportunity to prepare for careers and both professional and graduate studies. Finally, we offer students the opportunity to study for personal enrichment.

The Faculty of History is dedicated to scholarship. As scholars, the faculty members engage in historical research and writing, and they present that research to the academic community and where appropriate to the community at large. We believe that our students also should be engaged in creative scholarship. We encourage them to prepare public presentations of their scholarship and to participate in professional programs whenever possible.

Finally, the Department of History, faculty and students, are committed to serve the community. All of the faculty participate in service to the university community within the department, the college, and the university at large. Furthermore, some of us are active in state, local, and/or national professional associations.

Each of us responds, when time permits, to serve the Northwest Florida community in a professional capacity, making presentations in our respective areas of expertise, judging History Fair in the local schools, conducting oral histories, providing internships, addressing and advising community groups and agencies, and other activities where our specialized knowledge and skills can be applied. We also encourage our students to engage in such volunteer activities.

B. Vision Statement:

The Department of History at the University of West Florida will be a nationally recognized model of excellence at the baccalaureate and master's degree levels.

II. Structure of the Department

A. Voting Rights

Faculty holding the rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor shall vote on all Department matters that are submitted for a vote, except in the determination of tenure and promotion. Only faculty in tenure earning (i.e. assistant professor and above) may vote for tenure and promotion.

For tenure and promotion, the Chair will request all tenured full-time faculty members to submit a formal evaluation on tenure for each eligible faculty member within the appropriate unit. The evaluation shall be submitted to the Chair, who is obligated to maintain confidentiality about the evaluation. Other full-time faculty may provide the Chair with opinions of the candidate's dossier. On a separate document, all tenured faculty in the department or unit shall vote regarding the acceptability of tenure for the candidate.

The Chair will request all full-time faculty (excluding visiting faculty) in the department or unit to submit an evaluation on promotion for the promotion candidate.

http://uwf.edu/academic/facultyresources/pte/2013_2014_files/Promotion_Tenure_Evaluation_Information_2013_2014.pdf

A quorum is defined as 50% plus one of the voting faculty. Proxies will be accepted in all matters, except for personnel decisions.

B. Committees

The Chairperson appoints all committees with the advice of the faculty. Permanent committees shall include the following:

1. Assessment
2. Graduate
3. Scholarship
4. Mentoring Committee

The Chairperson may appoint additional committees as the need develops, and the Chairperson shall report the establishment of a new committee as soon as possible.

III. Academic Policies of the Department

A majority of the eligible faculty must approve all proposed changes in academic policy and curricula. The faculty must be aware and have materials provided of any proposed changes in academic policy and curricula at least one week prior to the meeting during which the faculty will decide on any proposals.

While each faculty member is essentially in control of course structure and requirements for his/her courses, there are certain agreed upon common expectations that should be used as guidelines.

- a. Class attendance and makeup policies. The department follows the attendance and makeup policies outlined in the UWF catalog. You are expected to attend each class and to be prepared for lectures, discussions, and reports.
- b. Assignments are your responsibility. The instructor will announce his or her position on late assignments. Any request for extension of time must be made before the due date.
- c. The department follows the policies outlined in the UWF Academic Misconduct Code (UWF/REG 3.030 Academic Misconduct) found on Academic Affairs Website.
- d. An incomplete grade is not a substitute for withdrawal from a course. A student who has successfully completed at least 70% of the work and has clearly established extenuating circumstances for not completing the course work may request an incomplete grade and, at that time, make arrangements with the instructor for completion of the work.
- e. Grading and examination policies are left to the professional judgment of the classroom instructor. These policies should be in keeping with university and departmental policies and should be included in the syllabus given to students at the beginning of the term.

- f. The Chairperson upon the recommendation of the History Faculty shall make all appointments of graduate teaching and research assistants, graders, and other working graduate or undergraduate students in the History Department. Such appointments shall be made on the general basis of student quality and appropriateness for said positions and shall include, but not be confined to, GPA, academic qualifications, background, experience, demeanor, ability to perform assigned tasks, take instruction, compliance, professionalism, timeliness, and ability to work with students and his or her supervisor. Once appointed, failure to perform adequately in any of these areas can lead to non-renewal of appointment or immediate termination of appointment upon the recommendation of the supervisor, the History Graduate Committee, and the Department Chairperson.
- g. All staff and faculty will adhere to the professional standards of the American Historical Association.

IV. Departmental Meetings

There shall be at least one faculty meeting in each of the Fall and Spring semesters. Faculty may place items on the agenda by giving notice to the Office Administrator at least two days before the meeting. Any three faculty members may call a meeting on their own motion at any time. The Chair is responsible for providing relevant material and for setting the agenda at least one week prior to the meeting.

V. Chairperson's Role

The Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences shall select the Chairperson of the History Department upon the recommendation of a majority of the faculty. The Chairperson must be tenured and hold the rank of associate professor or professor. Although the Chairperson of history, like all other administrators, holds only a one-year contract in that administrative position, he or she may expect to hold that position for three years. At the end of the three year term, the history faculty will either select another person to be nominated as chair or request that the dean reappoint the incumbent.

The Chairperson is a key administrative officer in maintaining the quality of the University and a sense of belonging to the University and support for its purposes among the faculty members. Not only is the Chairperson responsible to the formal administrative structure, but he/she is also responsible to faculty colleagues, students, and faculty governance units. The Chairperson's responsibilities and authority include the following:

A. The Chairperson is responsible to the College Dean:

1. Carrying out the policies of the University and the College and the specific directions of the Dean.
2. Assisting in the formulation of College and/or University goals and policies.
3. Representing the view of the Dean to members of his/her faculty.
4. Submitting five-year and annual planning documents which are consistent with the University and College missions and strategic goals as well as the aspirations of the department.

5. Enhancing the achievement of University and College goals through evaluations, disciplinary actions, and recommendations for merit raises, appointments, promotions, and tenure.
6. Formulation of budgetary requirements and the careful and effective management of activities of the unit within funds allocated.
7. Handling of faculty and USPS grievances in accordance with established procedure.
8. Fostering and encouraging cooperation between and among faculty units to enhance the efficiency and/or effectiveness of the College and University as a whole.
9. Ensuring that all hiring is consistent with national, state, and University EEO/AA policies and procedures.
10. Ensuring that all employment actions and all student program and activity actions are consistent with national, state, and University policies and procedures related to individuals with disabilities; ensuring that interactions between and among faculty and students are free from sexual, racial, and other forms of bias and harassment.
11. Actively participating in the process of recruitment of students.

B. The Chairperson is responsible to members of the faculty unit:

1. Acting as the spokesperson for the unit to persons and organizations outside the unit, both within and without the University.
2. Stimulating innovative programs and activities within the University.
3. Stimulating innovative programs and activities within the faculty unit which are in harmony with the overall goals of the College and the University.
4. Creating an environment for and fostering opportunities for scholarship and professional growth of members of the faculty unit, especially in terms of teaching, advisement, and service.
5. Engaging in teaching and research activities in a manner which does not detract from his/her responsibilities as a chairperson.
6. Supporting continued faculty development.
7. Mentor faculty on tenure-track requirements and evaluate all faculty
8. Administer the Collective Bargaining Agreement at the departmental level

C. The Chairperson is responsible to students:

1. Ensuring that the needs and aspirations of students, while enrolled at UWF and subsequent to graduation, are reflected in the curriculum, course schedules, course content and quality, teaching quality, facilities, and attitudes of faculty members of the unit.
2. Representing the needs and aspirations of majors and other students to members of other disciplines and gaining interdisciplinary cooperation of faculty and administrators in meeting those needs and aspirations.
3. Providing an interface between students and professional groups outside the University.
4. Handling student suspensions, readmissions, probationary decisions, and graduate admissions in a manner which enhances the overall quality of the University.
5. Handling student grievances and complaints in keeping with policies and procedures identified in the Student Handbook.

D. The Chairperson is responsible to staff:

1. Assigning work and defining work expectations that are reasonable and equitable.
2. Ensuring that an appropriate work environment is provided.
3. Ensuring that support personnel are treated with dignity and respect by faculty and students.
4. Encouraging participation in professional development activities and assigning duties to prepare for promotional and other advancement opportunities.

E. The Chairperson is responsible to governing bodies:

1. Participating actively on committees and councils as appropriate.
2. Recommending membership on committees and ensuring active and dedicated participation of members of the faculty unit in various committees and councils of the University.
3. Cooperating with and carrying out the decisions and policies established through various governing bodies.

F. The Chairperson has authority within the faculty unit to do the following:

1. Approve academic programs and priorities within the faculty unit for presentation to various approving bodies, the Dean and the Provost/Academic Vice President.
2. Assign academic counseling and teaching responsibilities.
3. Cancel classes if they do not meet the department's enrollment management plan and reassign teaching responsibilities to meet contract obligations. (Appendix B)
4. Approve budget proposals for submission to higher authority.
5. Allocate resources in support of teaching and research functions within the unit.
6. Initiate recruitment actions and provide recommendations to final hiring authority consistent with EEO/AA policies, goals, and procedures.
7. Evaluate faculty and make recommendations for promotion, tenure, and disciplinary action.
8. Recommend initial salaries at the time of hire and annual salary increases within guidelines established by the BOT, Provost, and the College Dean.
9. Exercise direct supervision over staff assigned to the unit.
10. Where there are conflicts between or among the above duties, such conflicts shall be resolved, subject to federal and state laws and regulations, in priority of:
 - a. the professional standards of the American Historical Association
 - b. the obligations to students
 - c. the obligations to faculty
 - d. the obligations to higher administrators

VI. Curricular Review and Assessment

A. Academic Compacts and Academic Plans.

Every undergraduate program must have an Academic Learning Compact (ALC) which includes the program mission, a list of the program-level student learning outcomes, a description of how the department assesses these outcomes, and a list of jobs frequently taken by graduates of the program. Graduate programs have Academic Learning Plans (ALP). These documents are archived on the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (CUTLA) website. CUTLA staff review these links once a year and notify departments of broken links that must be repaired.

B. Strategic planning

All program planning, annual reporting goals, hiring plans, budget requests, etc. must align with the strategic directions and priorities in the 2012-2017 UWF Strategic Plan. As part of the process of establishing the 2012-2017 Strategic Plan, the University reaffirmed its commitment to “accounting for its effectiveness through the integration and alignment of transparent planning, budgeting, assessment, and accountability processes to support continuous improvement and the strategic and prudent use of resources.”

C. Annual reporting

The annual report is the opportunity for the chair to codify short and long term planning goals and objectives and to report on the activities and accomplishments of the previous year. The chair reports on departmental goals and objectives, assessment results (General Education, Undergraduate Programs (ALC), Graduate Programs (ALP), Certificate Programs, and contributions to interdisciplinary programs in which the department participates), major accomplishments of the unit, and Carnegie Engagement service contributions. Annual reporting is conducted through the Strategic Planning Online (SPOL) System.

VII. Personnel Policies/Procedures

A. Recruitment/Selection of New Faculty

Initial screening and interviewing will, in most cases, be conducted by a committee appointed by the Chair in consultation with the entire faculty. The faculty will note the strengths and weaknesses of the candidates so that the Dean may appoint the most suitable individual.

B. Mentoring Committee

The Chairperson will appoint a committee consisting of three members, at least two of whom are members of the History faculty, to mentor new faculty. The Mentor Committee is expected to review progress toward tenure and promotion annually and add their report to the Chairperson’s annual evaluation of progress toward tenure. Copies of the Mentor Committee Review Report are to go directly to the reviewed faculty member. A second copy of the committee report will go to the chair for inclusion in the overall new faculty member’s annual evaluation. Like the chair’s evaluation, the reviewed faculty member must review and sign the Mentor Committee Review Report going in the permanent file submitted to the dean. The new faculty member and the Mentor Committee should review all material in the annual file, including the dean’s and provost’s response to the department’s evaluation. In addition, members of the committee should observe teaching and offer advice concerning service and scholarship at any time during the review period.

C. Procedures for Annual Work Assignments

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

D. Office Hour Policies

Full-time faculty teaching at least nine semester hours will be available to students through a minimum of five office hours per week, reasonably distributed. Three of those hours must be face-to-face. The remaining two may be face-to-face or online. If the office hours are online, the faculty must post those hours in his/her syllabi and have them posted in the Department.

E. Policy for Summer Supplemental Contract Opportunities

The Department will follow a rotation based on seniority to allocate summer teaching opportunities. In the event that a summer line is not available to every History faculty member who desires one, this rotation will determine the order in which faculty members will be denied a summer line, with the newest hire as the first denied. See Appendix A for current rotation.

VIII. Guidelines for Annual Evaluation and T&P

A. MID-POINT REVIEW

1. Purpose of the mid-point review:

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

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

“All mid-point reviews should address the performance of annual assignments, including teaching, scholarly and creative projects, and service occurring during the preceding tenure-earning years of employment. In addition, all reviews should assess overall performance and contributions critically in light of mid-point expectations.” (Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion Policy, 2013-2014)

2. Content:

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

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

3. Preparation:

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

4. Timeline:

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

B. Performance Standards for Annual Evaluation

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

- 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.

1. Teaching

a. Criteria that may be used in the evaluation of teaching:

- Teaching awards and other accomplishments related to teaching.
- Student evaluations of teaching that demonstrate the ability to challenge students and stimulate student learning.
- Peer evaluations of teaching, such as those of department chair or department mentor.
- Supervision of theses and graduate practicum reports.
- Supervision of research seminar papers.
- Service on thesis or graduate practicum committees.
- Supervision of honors' theses.
- Supervision of undergraduate internships/field studies or directed studies.
- Participation in Department's assessment plan: General Education and Capstone.
- Participation in teaching development programs, including conference, workshop, or seminars related to subject areas taught.
- Design of new courses and programs.
- Organization and planning of courses.
- 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 (5 hours per 9 s.h. of teaching) and student records and timely response to student inquiries in advising and mentoring.
- Evidence of scholarship and currency in subject area in selection of topics, resource materials, and content of lectures.
- Supervision of graduate directed studies.
- Supervision of graduate students enrolled in Teaching Academy.
- Teaching a course online, via Tandberg, or at off campus location.
- Unsolicited student comments/feedback.

b. 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 may be used to support distinguished ratings:

- Numerical student evaluation data document clear statistical exceptionality.
- 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.
- Assessment practices obviously enhance student learning and further Departmental efforts.

Excellent Performance

Excellent performance represents consistent high quality teaching with positive outcomes for students as reflected by the performance indicators below. Performance indicators that may be used to support excellent ratings:

- Student evaluations document consistently positive impact on learning.
- Teaching philosophy provides foundation for coherent course planning and activities.
- Syllabi outline comprehensive, clear, and appropriate performance expectations.
- Assessment practices in place.
- 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 (e.g., honors, capstone, General Studies) 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.

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, which is outlined above as “Excellent” indicators. Performance indicators that may be used to support good ratings:

- Student evaluations data document adequate impact on learning .
- 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 (e.g., honors, capstone, general education) executed with reasonable skill.
- Maintains appropriate standards of academic integrity, including respect for students and their rights.
- Participates in teaching development activities when directed to do so.

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 performance category is well below what is required for tenure and promotion decisions. Performance indicators that may be used to support fair ratings:

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

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 norms. Because of the high priority placed on teaching at UWF, this level of performance requires major remedial work. Performance indicators that may be used to support poor ratings:

- Student evaluations data document consistent and substantive problems.
- 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 (e.g., learning outcomes are inadequate, inappropriate, or missing; testing strategies are not effective or fair).
- Goals and course content reflect no continuous improvement efforts.
- No assistance rendered for department assessment plan.
- Pedagogical practices are unsound (e.g., disorganization; late, missing, unhelpful feedback; standards too lax or too challenging; routinely poor preparation; disengaging, chaotic, or hostile classroom environment).
- Student support practices are unsound (e.g., late or absent for class, not responding to email, not keeping office hours, showing favoritism).
- Consistent and very negative ratings in advising, mentoring, and supervision of students' scholarly or creative activities.
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, General Studies) avoided or poorly executed.
- Chronic academic integrity concerns identified including evidence of disrespect for students and their rights.

2. Research

a. Criteria that may be used in the evaluation of scholarship and creative activities:

Level 1: Refereed. Warrants 3 years of distinguished rating, 4 years if award winning (in instances of co-authorship, the faculty member must clarify his/her role).

- Monograph of original research based on primary sources, such as archival material, documents, interviews, oral histories, and material culture, as well as secondary sources including scholarly books, articles, chapters, and reports, that is published with a respected university or trade publisher.

Level 2: Refereed/Peer Reviewed. Warrants 1 year of distinguished rating, 2 years if award winning. (in instances of co-authorship, the faculty member must clarify his/her role).

- Books that are edited works, such as documentary or critical editions, collections of primary sources that contain introductory material or notes that aid the reader in interpreting documents, translations with introductory material or notes, and edited works containing chapters from other academics or professionals.
- Textbooks and book-length bibliographies.
- Major museum exhibits along with significant films, documentaries, and television programs.
- Articles based on original research, using primary and secondary sources, which appear in respected scholarly journals with state, regional, national, or international distribution
- Chapters in edited books that meet the criteria for articles listed above.
- Published working papers published by a university or a recognized public policy or research center.
- Substantial published or unpublished research reports, policy papers, commissioned studies, bibliographies, databases, environmental studies, community studies, policy papers, contextual analyses, and archival projects, such as those in the fields of historic preservation and cultural resource management, resulting from contracts or grants.

Level 3

- Popular histories.
- Published translations of articles or chapters with introductory material or notes by the translator to aid the reader in understanding the work.
- Small museum exhibits along with short films, documentaries, and television programs.

- Major research grants or fellowships (more than \$5000) earned.
- Scholarly presentations at regional, state, national, or international conferences, which meet the criteria of original research as outlined above in 1a, 2a, and 3a.
- Special or guest lectures in academic settings, provided the lectures are based on original research.
- Published working papers not subject to a referee and editing process, which are published by a university or a recognized public policy or research center.

Level 4

- Brief publications, such as review articles, book reviews, essays, classroom materials, bibliographies, newsletter articles, encyclopedia articles, and contributions to non-academic works, including popular books and magazines.
- Participation as a commentator on a panel or in roundtable discussion at conferences, workshops, and special or guest lectures, which are academic but not based on original research.
- Providing expert testimony, copies of advice as a consultant, and contributions to film or media projects.
- Minor research grants or fellowships (less than \$5,000) earned.

b. Scholarship and Creative Performance Indicators:

Distinguished Performance

Distinguished performance demonstrates unusually high degree of skill in design and execution of scholarly and creativity projects as shown by the performance indicators below that build upon the performance indicators for excellence. In general, the weight of evidence in this performance *exceeds* department criteria for excellence. As indicated above, Level 1 warrants 3 years of Distinguished and Level 2 warrants 1 year of Distinguished. Performance indicators that may be used to support distinguished ratings:

- Both quantity and quality measures clearly exceed department expectations (see criteria for Tenure and Promotion, section 9 in the by-laws).
- Wide 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.

Excellent Performance

Excellent performance demonstrates reasonable execution of scholarship or creative activity agenda as shown by the performance indicators below. Performance indicators that may be used to support excellent ratings:

- Refined scholarly agenda or creative plan well suited to regional comprehensive university context.
- Meets department production targets for both quantity and quality of scholarship.
- Favorable review by and respect from majority of colleagues in the department for scholarly and creative works.
- 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.
- External support captured to facilitate scholarship or creative activities agenda.
- Adheres to relevant ethics conventions for scholarly and creative projects.
- Skilled time management facilitates success of scholarly agenda or creative plan.
- Skilled use of collaboration as demonstrated by the commitments proposed, accepted, and fulfilled (e.g., group projects, creative activities, and grants).

Good Performance

Good performance demonstrates moderate tangible progress in scholarship or creative activity agenda as shown by the performance indicators below but the weight of evidence suggests that work falls mildly below department standard of excellent. Performance indicators that may be used to support good ratings:

- 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 department criteria related to the rate of completion or quality of dissemination venue.
- Appropriate professional educational opportunities pursued.
- Involvement with professional organizations that will support scholarly or creative goals.
- Grants developed and submitted to capture external support.
- Adheres to relevant ethics conventions for scholarly and creative projects.
- Reasonably effective time management strategies contribute to success.
- Commitments made and reasonably fulfilled in collaborative activity (e.g., group projects, creative performances, and grants).

Fair Performance

Fair performance demonstrates only minor tangible progress toward executing a scholarly and creative agenda. In general, the weight of evidence suggests that scholarly and creative projects are moderately below the department norms. This level of performance offers no immediate support for tenure or promotion decisions but provides evidence of some promise for future productivity. Remediation is recommended. Performance indicators that may be used to support fair ratings:

- General focus of interest identified, but falls short of rate of production required for promotion and tenure decisions.

- Evidence of some completion of beginning stages of scholarly or artistic process, (e.g., data collection, manuscript outline, artistic plan), but falls short of the production required for tenure and promotion decisions.
- Exploration of possible scholarly collaboration or resource network to help with specific plan.
- Identification of professional organizations that will support scholarly and creative goals, but not actively involved at this time.
- 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.
- Erratic performance in collaborative activities (e.g., grants, research collaborations, creative performance) negatively influences project quality.

Poor Performance

Poor performance demonstrates *serious* problems in developing a scholarship or creative agenda. In general, the weight of evidence suggests that scholarly and creative production is well below the department norms attributed to inactivity or avoidance, absence of planning, poor time management, problematic collaborative behavior, or ethical challenges. In such circumstances, major remediation efforts may be identified and pursued. Performance indicators that may be used to support poor ratings:

- Scholarly agenda or creative plan has not been identified (e.g., 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 work output handicap.
- Unreliability and problematic collaborative skills harm project completion and quality.

3. Service

a. Criteria that may be used in the evaluation of service:

Service to College or University

- Serving on university or college committees or councils.
- Providing service to student organizations, such as honor societies, fraternities, or sororities.
- Community outreach and service.

Service to Department

- Serving on department committees, such as Graduate Committee, Scholarship Committee, search committees or ad hoc committees.
- Providing service to student organizations, such as advising Phi Alpha Theta or History Club.
- Serving as Department Chair, Program Director, Program Coordinator, or Track Coordinator.
- Delivering courses to remote locations or via video conferencing.
- Promoting the department and recruiting students through outreach opportunities, such as Community College or High School articulation, History Fairs, Phone-a-thons, Open Houses, and Orientations.
- Mentoring untenured faculty.
- Advising and mentoring students.
- Preparing students for professional conferences or publication.

Service to Geographic Community

- Working with local professional organizations.
- Delivering public presentations to local organizations, schools, or businesses.
- Delivering workshops and developing materials to improve social studies education in middle schools and high schools.
- Providing information when requested by the media, public, or middle or high school students.
- Consulting without remuneration.

Service to Professional Community

- Serving on editorial review boards.
- Editing a scholarly journal.
- Organizing conferences or serving on conference committees, such as program committee or book award committee.
- Chairing panels or participating in roundtable discussions at conferences.
- Serving on the boards of professional organization or services to those organizations.
- Serving as a reviewer/referee on textbooks, monographs, journal articles, or grants.
- Consulting without remuneration.
- Providing keynote addresses without remuneration.

b. 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 may be used to support distinguished ratings:

- Leadership demonstrated in targeted arenas of service (e.g., 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 may 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 may 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 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 may be used to support fair ratings:

- 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 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 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 may 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.
- 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 applicable, does not in any way provide synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service function.

9. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

“Faculty beginning careers at UWF: Candidates for tenure must submit for tenure review no later than the fall of the 6th year of employment. Candidates for tenure with unusually strong performance records may submit for review no earlier than the fall of the 5th year.”

“Faculty transferring to UWF: Faculty members may negotiate up to 2 years of credit toward tenure based on past performance. The initial appointment letter must clearly identify the number of years of credit toward tenure. When the Dean grants 2 years of credit toward tenure, regular consideration for tenure will transpire in the fall of the 4th year of employment. Early consideration for tenure, in cases where candidates demonstrate unusually strong performance, will initiate tenure review in the fall of the 3rd year. In cases for which service outside UWF produced credit toward tenure, a copy of the initial appointment letter documenting this credit must be included in the portfolio. Any subsequent changes to years of credit toward tenure also must be documented and included in the portfolio.” (Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion Policy, 2013-2014)

A. Tenure

Persons under consideration for tenure in the Department of History must demonstrate significant and consistent accomplishments in teaching, research, and service. The Department recognizes service as less significant than scholarship and teaching.

How do you feel about the following criteria? We didn't have anything outlined for someone just to get tenure but not promotion.

- Candidate must demonstrate excellence in teaching in accordance with departmental criteria and performance indicators used in the evaluation of teaching. Candidate must demonstrate repeated evidence of quality scholarship by achieving one of the following:
 - 2 items from level 2, 1 of which must be a published refereed journal article, chapter or working paper.

- 1 item from level 2 and 5 items from level 3
- A strong and continuous record of University, Department, professional, and community service.
- A strong record of University, Department, professional, and community service.

B. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

“Candidates for Associate Professor will typically complete 5 years of employment at the assistant professor level before submitting a dossier for review in the fall of the 6th year. Candidates may submit for review after the completion of 4 years of employment in exceptional cases where annual evaluations point to success in meeting performance expectations for the preceding 3-year period. A candidate being reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor should be expected to have at least excellent ratings in all 3 categories of review for 3 years at UWF prior to submission of the dossier.” (Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion Policy, 2013-2014)

To merit promotion to associate professor, an assistant professor must demonstrate excellence in teaching, research, and service using the same criteria required for tenure. The Department recognizes service as less significant than scholarship and teaching.

- Candidate must demonstrate generally excellent teaching with positive outcomes and be highly regarded by teaching peers who are associate or full professors.
- Candidate must demonstrate repeated evidence of quality scholarship by achieving one of the following three:
 - 1 item from level 1
 - 3 items from level 2, 1 of which must be a published refereed journal article, chapter or working paper.
 - 2 items from level 2 and 5 items from level 3
- A strong and continuous record of University, Department, professional, and community service.

C. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor

“Candidates for Professor will typically complete at least 5 years of employment at the associate level, 3 of which should transpire at UWF. Candidates may submit for review after the completion of 4 years of employment at the associate level, at least 3 years of which have transpired at UWF, in exceptional cases where annual evaluations point to success in meeting performance expectations. A candidate being reviewed for promotion to Professor should demonstrate at least excellent ratings in all areas of review (teaching, scholarly and creative projects, and service) and at least 1 area should be rated as distinguished in the 3 years immediately preceding submission of the dossier. The distinguished rating can be in different areas over the course of the 3 years but a minimum of one distinguished rating each year must be reflected in the evaluation.” (Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion Policy, 2013-2014)

To merit promotion to full professor, an associate professor must continue to establish his/her reputation in all three areas, demonstrating a distinguished performance record in research or teaching and at least excellent in each of the other two categories. The Department recognizes service as less significant than scholarship and teaching; therefore, a candidate does not merit promotion to full professor based on a distinguished record of service.

- Teaching should demonstrate evidence of generally excellent or distinguished instruction.
- Research shall be especially productive and of high quality. As a minimum, promotion to full professor requires one the following achievements beyond what was accomplished for promotion to associate professor:
 - 2 items from level 1 (at least 1 must be published after promotion to associate professor)
 - 1 item from level 1 and 3 items from level 2 (either level 1 item or level 2 items must be published after promotion to associate professor)
 - 1 item from level 1, 2 items from level 2, and 5 items from level 3 (either level 1 item or level 2 and level 3 items must be published after promotion to associate professor)
- Service to the University, Department, community, and profession that is noteworthy for its impact and intrinsic value.

10. Review of By-Laws

The departmental by-laws are developed by the faculty, and can only be changed by a vote of the department. The by-laws are the regulations of the department and set the criteria that the department will use to evaluate faculty. The by-laws will be reviewed annually, or as deemed necessary, and will be circulated for revision and approval to all full-time faculty and staff. UWF department by-laws are publicly posted at <http://uwf.edu/academic/facultyresources/bylaws/bylaws.cfm>

APPENDIX B

Enrollment Management Plan

Department Background

The Department of History has both an undergraduate and graduate degree. The M.A. offers three tracks, traditional history, early American studies or public history. In addition, the department has a graduate certificate in Historic Preservation. The Department typically averages just over 200 undergraduate majors and approximately 45 graduate majors. Our SCH averages for undergraduate courses averaged 3,864 for Fall 2011-2013, with enrollments slightly lower in the spring semesters, with an average of 3,176 SCH. For graduate courses the department averaged 270 SCH for the fall and 251 SCH for the spring. Summer SCH for undergraduate courses averaged 1,005 SCH and graduate courses averaged 155 SCH. For 2013 we had 20 undergraduates graduate and 8 graduate students. For 2012, we had 52 undergraduates and 20 graduates; and for 2011 we had 31 undergraduates and 14 graduates complete their programs.

Current Enrollment, Fall 2013

These numbers were taken approximately half-way through the semester. The current enrollment for our larger survey courses, which cap at 80 students, have an average 78 students per section. We offered 7 sections of the larger survey sections and 4 of the smaller sections. The smaller survey sections, which cap at 45, average 43.5 students per class. Our upper-level courses cap at 28 students and have an average of 27.1 students enrolled across the 14 courses offered. (if you add dual listed courses, the average goes up to 27.4) Our graduate courses, average 14.8. For the fall semester we offered 5 graduate courses.

Strategy for Growth

High enrollment for lower division courses help offset any undergraduate courses that are under-enrolled. The department rarely allows more than one, or two, under-enrolled upper-level courses to be taught in any given semester. Instead, those courses will be cancelled to help populate any other courses that have low enrollments. The same policy applies to graduate-level courses as well. If additional courses are needed at the graduate level, the department allows faculty to open classes to additional students or it will open a graduate section to an undergraduate course. We have implemented a new graduate track in Early American Studies that should promote growth at the graduate level. This interdisciplinary M.A. will articulate with Government, English, Philosophy, and Anthropology to build off of strengths in the Department of History as well as in those programs.

Targets

- Maintain robust enrollments in the general studies courses.
- Most faculty will teach at least one general studies course per semester.

- Maintain an average of at least 25 students in the upper-level courses.
- Maintain an average of at least 15 students in the graduate-level courses.
- Only 1 upper-level under-enrolled course will be allowed per semester, any additional under-enrolled courses must have the Dean's approval.
- Only 1 graduate-level under-enrolled course will be allowed per semester, any additional under-enrolled courses must have the Dean's approval.
- No course is allowed to extend their cap until all other courses have made their minimum requirements.
- Maintain at least 450 SCH annually for all full-time faculty.