

**DEPARTMENT OF MEDICAL
LABORATORY SCIENCES
BYLAWS**

Department of Medical Laboratory Sciences

ByLaws

University of West Florida
11000 University Parkway
Pensacola, Florida 32514

Table of Contents

1	Name of Department
2	Mission and Vision
3	Values and Code of Ethics
4	Structure of the Department
5	Faculty Meetings
6	Committee Structure
7	Academic Policies
8	Personnel Policies/Procedures; Tenure and Promotion
9	Department Chair
10	Cancellation of classes
11	Department Resources
12	Faculty Development
13	Curricular Review and Assessment
14	Date of Adoption

Appendix I - Medical Laboratory Sciences Tenure and Promotion Criteria

Appendix II – Medical Laboratory Sciences Clinical Track

1. Name of Department

The Department Medical Laboratory Sciences, hereafter referred to as the Department is a unit in the College of Health. The College was originated in Fall of 2015 and the Department was organized in 2016. Clinical Laboratory Sciences is an accredited program within the department.

2. Mission and Vision

Mission statement

The mission of the UWF College of Health (COH) is to provide high quality education to current and future health and wellness professionals in a learning environment infused with interprofessional education, innovative research, hands-on practicums, and diverse engaging community activities. The mission of the MLS department is to maintain the high standards of training required by the National Accrediting Agency for Clinical Laboratory Sciences, and produce students capable of being certified by the American Society for Clinical Pathology. Graduates of the Department will contribute creatively and ethically to education, research and service in medical and public health laboratories.

Vision statement

The vision of the Medical Laboratory Sciences Department is:

- to be the school of choice for medical laboratory sciences students in the state of Florida by creating innovative educational programs and carrying out research relevant to the profession
- to be the provider of choice to hospital employers by producing graduates with state of the art skills
- to be the investment of choice for hospitals by accepting internship students and participating in a training relationship

3. Values/Code of Ethics

A set of values form the foundation upon which we have created a vision and mission for the Department. These values include:

- **Integrity and candor** in the pursuit of knowledge through intellectual inquiry and discourse
- **Dedication** to and innovation in educating our students to excel
- **Excellence** in teaching, research and service
- **Creativity** in designing and implementing our programs to fit the needs of the region
- **Cooperation and collaboration** with community and UWF partners in providing quality education
- **Diversity** in thought, attitude, understanding, appreciation and practice
- **Responsibility** in managing, utilizing and protecting our resources and the environment
- **Concern** over the creation of a safe and dynamic learning environment that encourages development of individual potential

4. Structure of the Program

Section 1. Members of the Department

The MLS department consists of a department chair, clinical faculty, instructors, adjuncts, visiting instructors, a clinical site coordinator and administrative specialist.

Section 2. Eligibility in Governance

- (a) A shared governance model encourages all faculty (including instructors, lecturers and visiting faculty) to participate in Department discussions and vote on non-personnel matters. Administrative staff members may be invited to participate in discussion by the Department Chair or a majority of the faculty.
- (b) All faculty members shall vote on any personnel matters unrelated to promotion and tenure.
- (c) Only tenured faculty vote on tenure decisions for candidates. All votes will go into the dossier on an anonymous basis.
- (d) If the Department has fewer than three tenured faculty, then the Department will involve additional tenured faculty members as needed from the College of Health as evaluators.
- (e) No action shall be taken without a quorum in attendance. A quorum shall consist of a simple majority of voting members of the Department.
- (f) All actions shall be based on a majority vote.

5. Department Faculty Meetings

Faculty meetings will be scheduled during the regular academic year as requested by the Chair or the majority of the faculty. Department faculty on sabbatical or other authorized paid leave shall be informed of faculty meetings and shall be given opportunity to participate in discussions and votes. There will be at least two faculty meetings in each of the Fall and Spring semesters. A minimum of two weeks' notice shall be given, with the exception of emergency meetings called by the Chair.

The agenda for each meeting will be distributed electronically and faculty may add items to the agenda. The agenda will be distributed two working days in advance when practical.

Minutes will be taken by the administrative staff and distributed at least one week before the next meeting for review. One hard copy will be filed in the Department. A majority at the next faculty meeting must approve the minutes.

For all faculty meetings, a simple majority of the eligible voting faculty members shall constitute a quorum. All votes will be by a show of hands. Missing faculty may provide a proxy. In items relating to personnel matters, or when requested by at least one-third of the faculty present, the voting shall be by secret ballot. The Recorder shall tally the votes for recording in the minutes.

Robert's Rules of Orders shall be followed. These rules can be accessed at <http://www.robertsrules.com/authority.html>.

If there are individual programs within the department, the individual programs may call ad hoc meetings to address issues that pertain exclusively to their program. These arise on a more informal schedule. The Department Chair should be appraised of the outcomes of those meetings.

6. Committee Structure

Section 1. Working Groups and Reviewers

Due to the small size of the unit, the faculty will work in concert on most projects. An individual may be appointed or volunteer to be the main reviewer for the project and present his/her findings to the rest of the group. Examples of recurring projects include

- Website review
- By-laws review
- Assessment review
- Annual report review
- Curriculum review

Section 2. Standing committees

The Chair will serve as ex officio member to all standing committees.

A. Mentoring Committee

Each faculty member will be assigned a 1-2 member Mentoring Committee. Within the first semester of employment, the Chair will meet with each new hire and make a good faith effort to balance the qualifications on the Mentoring Committee with the track-appropriate career goals of each mentee, including finding outside mentors where necessary. The committee will meet with the faculty member on an annual basis to review his/her progress towards track-appropriate career goals and make recommendations for success. To ensure equitable mentoring for all candidates, the Chair will serve as the ex-officio member of all mentoring committees. A written evaluation of the candidate's progress will be provided to the candidate by the committee annually and at the mid-career point. Evaluations forms will be based on those currently provided by the Division of Academic Affairs (e.g., the [Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion Policy](#)). As career goals are met, the Chair and each mentee will mutually decide on mentorship guidance going forward. A resource for the mentors is [UMass Amherst guide to mutual mentoring](#).

B. Promotion and Tenure Committee

Faculty in the department may be tenure or clinical track.

1. The P&T committee will consist of all faculty with a rank higher than instructor in the Department. The Committee will meet once each fall semester to review the credentials of faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion intending to put their packet forward the following fall. The Committee will produce a single memo, signed by all members, describing how the candidate appears to meet or fails to meet the tenure and/or promotion criteria. The Committee will also provide the Chair with an anonymous preliminary vote on P&T for that faculty member.
2. During the fall term in which the final promotion and P&T packets are due, the Committee will meet and examine the completed tenure/promotion packet of any faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion and the committee will provide a formal, anonymous vote in favor of or against tenure/promotion for this candidate. The Department as a whole will meet at least every 3 years in order to review tenure and promotion criteria as needed.

Section 3. Department-community specific committees

The MLS department relies on community members as advisors and evaluators. Full time faculty members are expected to serve on the following department-community committees on a regular basis. Adjunct faculty are encouraged to participate

CLS Advisory Committee

CLS Student Selection Committee

Section 4. COH Council

One member of the faculty will be elected to COH Council, to serve a term of 3 consecutive years.

7. Academic Policies

Section 1. Advising

Advising will be carried out by the designated unit professional advisor or by faculty assigned as advisors who will also coordinate student recruiting and progression to completion. CAERS reports assign one contact hour per 30 advisees.

Section 2. Changes in Policies

All changes to academic and curricular policies must be approved by majority vote of all eligible unit faculty.

Section 3. Grading and Examination Policies

Grading and examination policies are made at the discretion of the instructor. Online examination policies must be in accord with university policies with respect to proctoring. Policies must be published in the course syllabi, which also reside at the university level in uwf.edu/acad. Syllabi must be posted by the end of the first week of class and preferably before the class begins. Controversy over grading practices should begin with the student and the instructor. Student grievances should proceed as outlined in the Student Handbook (found at the website for Academic Affairs).

8. Personnel Policies/Procedures; Tenure and Promotion

Section 1. Recruitment/Selection of New Faculty

Faculty lines are allocated to academic units by Academic Affairs and the Dean of the College and usually when an existing position is vacated within the department. Advertising, recruiting, and selection of new faculty follow the established University procedures. When a faculty line is provided or becomes available to any of the programs, a faculty Search Committee is formed to screen all candidates' credentials and to provide the hiring authority with the candidates' strengths and weaknesses. The hiring authority is the Dean. The Search Committee is composed of the following:

- Department chair
- Two core faculty
- A student representative. This is likely to be the President of the student association for that program (an office to which the student is elected by all students within the program)
- One member may be selected by the Chair from an outside academic unit within the Department

Each Search Committee must include one minority member and must comply with the rules and regulations established by the Office of Human Resources at UWF. Guidelines for these regulations are available at <http://uwf.edu/ohr/Employment/RecrSeleAppt.cfm>.

The general process includes the following steps:

- The pool of candidates is narrowed down by the committee based on input of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses provided by the Search Committee. The committee will select candidates for phone interviews to provide additional information for the Search Committee to construct evaluation of each candidate's strengths and weaknesses. This process is used to narrow the candidate pool to the top 3 candidates.
- The narrowed list of candidates is given to the Dean of Health for approval.
- Following approval of the candidate list by the Dean, each of the three candidates is invited to campus for interviews with the Search Committee, the Department Chair, representative students, the Dean and the Provost.
- Each of the candidates presents a seminar on their area of health expertise to the faculty and student representatives.
- The Search Committee, based on input from the above stakeholders will list the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate and present this information to the final Hiring Authority.
- Based on input from the Search Committee and stakeholders, the Hiring Authority will approve the list or meet with the Search Committee and discuss any objections to the list.
- Once the list is approved, the Hiring Authority will apply the information provided on strengths and weaknesses by the Search Committee to choose the candidate to which the job offer will be extended.
- The Chair will contact the selected candidate and discuss details of the job offer.
- The Dean makes the formal offer of rank and salary to the successful applicant and sends the chosen candidate a letter of offer which must be signed and returned within a stated time.
- Receipt of a signed letter of offer from the candidate will complete the process.

Section 2. Annual Work Assignments

The Department Chair will establish the faculty member's assignments in teaching, research, and service for the upcoming academic year. These assignments are based upon the needs of the individual programs and the professional development of the faculty member. The Chair prepares and submits the letter of assignment.

Section 3. Annual Evaluation Criteria and Procedures

Annual evaluations are conducted by the Department Chair. The evaluation is based on the annual work assignment letter written by the Chair and acknowledged by the faculty member. The assignment letter addresses expectations for teaching, research, and service. The Chair and faculty member review and discuss the material submitted by the faculty member in the form of an updated CV, a statement of accomplishments, and student evaluations from all courses taught during the academic year under consideration. The Chair writes a letter of evaluation with a rating of Poor, Fair, Good, Excellent, or Distinguished in each area being evaluated based on assessment of the submitted materials. The letter of evaluation, signed by the

faculty member, is forwarded to the Chair for further evaluation, and then to the Dean. If the faculty is tenure-track or clinical-track the evaluation proceeds to the Provost. Annual evaluations are a key evaluation tool in promotion. Tenure and promotion criteria specific for the Medical Laboratory Sciences department is found in the appendices. Criteria that are germane to the evaluation of Teaching follow in Part A, Research/Scholarly activities in Part B and Service in Part C below. The “*ranking*” system described herein is a university standard

Section 3, Part A. Annual Evaluation of Teaching

Teaching: Activities

1. Courses

- # Different courses taught
- # Course sections taught
- # Students taught
- New courses developed and first offering

2. Graduate students

- Thesis committees as chair
- Thesis committees as member

3. Directed Studies

- # Graduate or undergraduate directed studies or honor students

4. Record of Quality Improvement in Teaching

- Participation in training, workshops, conferences on online teaching
- Employment of innovative and new instructional strategies
- Course assessment (where appropriate)
- Course material effectively addresses programmatic competencies

5. Student Evaluations and Summary of Student Complaint/Compliment Log Entries

6. Awards and Honors Related to Teaching

7. Assessment planning and execution

Teaching: Department Standard

Category 1, 2 and 3 activities are performed based on assigned contact hours per individual contract. Individuals are also expected to address issues in Categories 4 and 5 and pursue demonstration of excellence in teaching with Category 6 and 7 activities. Student evaluations should document consistently positive impact on learning. Assessment, syllabi, curriculum development, etc. should be in compliance with Program policies.

Teaching: Ranking for Evaluation of Poor

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

Indicators:

- Student evaluations document consistent and substantive problems (ratings well below the program average)
- Student Complaint Log reflects consistent and substantive problems in performance

- 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 program needs (e.g., competencies are inadequate, inappropriate, or missing; testing strategies are not effective or are unfair)
- Goals and course content reflect no continuous improvement efforts; no assistance rendered for programmatic assessment plans
- Pedagogical practices are unsound (e.g., disorganization; late, missing, unhelpful feedback; standards too lax or too challenging; routinely poor preparation; failure to master eLearning environment)
- Student support practices are unsound (e.g., routine failure to respond to student queries in Discussion forums; routine failure to respond to emails from students)
- Consistent and very negative ratings in advising, mentoring, and supervision of students in Directed Studies projects
- Chronic academic integrity concerns identified including evidence of disrespect for students and their rights

Teaching: Ranking for Evaluation of Fair

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

Indicators:

- Student evaluations document areas of moderate concern (ratings below the program average)
- 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 program needs
- Goals and course content reflect limited continuous improvement effort
- Some pedagogical practices need attention
- Some student support practices need improvement
- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices need improvement
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, general education) could be executed with greater competence
- Occasional challenges related to academic integrity, including disrespect for students and their rights

Teaching: Ranking for Evaluation of Good

This performance level demonstrates overall teaching effectiveness but some minor areas for concern, typically reflected by some combination of the indicators listed below. In general, teaching performance is mildly below the programmatic standard.

Indicators:

- Student evaluations 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 programmatic 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
- Maintains appropriate standards of academic integrity, including respect for students and their rights

Teaching: Ranking for Evaluation of Excellent

This performance level demonstrates consistent high quality teaching with positive outcomes for students as reflected by the indicators below. Excellence meets the program standard.

Indicators:

- Student evaluations document consistently positive impact on learning (above average)
- Teaching philosophy provides foundation for coherent course planning and activities
- Syllabi outlines comprehensive, clear, and appropriate performance expectations
- Assessment practices enhance student learning and contribute to programmatic needs
- Goals and course content routinely provide evidence of continuous improvement effort
- Pedagogical practices facilitate optimal learning conditions
- Student support practices facilitate optimal student development
- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices receive consistently favorable review
- Appropriate standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights

Teaching: Ranking for Evaluation of Distinguished

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

Indicators:

- 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 program

Section 3, Part B. Annual Evaluation of Scholarly Activity

The University of West Florida is a regional, comprehensive university. The expectation for research (creative and scholarly activity) by tenure-earning faculty is guided by the university's mission.

Scholarly Activities:

1. Publications (Refereed)

- Journals: accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
 - Books as author: accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
 - Books as editor: accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
 - Chapters in books: accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
 - Proceedings full paper: accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
2. Publications (Non-refereed)
- Books as author: accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
 - Books as editor: accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
 - Chapters in books: accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
 - Proceedings full paper: accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
3. Meeting/Conference Presentations: international, national, regional, local
4. External grants/contracts
- Federal: submitted, new awards, continuing
 - State: submitted, new awards, continuing
 - Local: submitted, new awards, continuing
 - Private: submitted, new awards, continuing
5. Internal grants/contracts: submitted, new awards, continuing
6. Other Activities
- Abstracts: accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
 - Patents on products related to field of study: filed, awarded
 - Consulting projects (paid) in area related to field of study
 - Workshops attended related to field of study
 - Technical reports: submitted, accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
 - Maintenance of professional licensure
7. Preparation of accreditation documents
8. Qualitative assessment by Director
- Citation index
 - Impact factors
 - Awards related to field of study

Research: Department Standard

Individuals in tenure-track positions in the Program are expected to participate in research-related activities. The following standard is based on a 3:3 fall:spring teaching load, which is adjusted for some faculty with significant service assignment. Two research activities (any combination from categories 1-7) should be accomplished each year. Tenure-earning faculty must choose activities that address the benchmarks for promotion.

Research: Ranking for Evaluation of Poor

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

Indicators:

- 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 handicap work output

Research: Ranking for Evaluation of Fair

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

Indicators:

- General focus of interest identified
- Evidence of some completion of beginning stages of scholarly or artistic process (e.g., data collection, manuscript outline, artistic plan)
- Exploration of possible scholarly collaboration or resource network to help with specific plan
- Professional organizations identified that will support scholarly and creative goals
- Appropriate professional educational opportunities (e.g., licensure, technology training, special educational opportunities) identified
- Sources of external support for scholarship or creative activities agenda identified and explored
- Judgment about ethical standards for scholarly and artistic production may be problematic at times
- Questionable time management strategies limit production

Research: Ranking for Evaluation of Good

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

Indicators:

- Specific scholarly agenda or creative plan identified, including appropriate timelines and preferred dissemination or display venues
- Scholarly and creative projects completed but falls short of rate of program standards related to the rate of completion or quality of dissemination venue
- Completed projects suggest the potential for significant, high quality scholarship over the candidate's career
- Appropriate professional educational opportunities pursued
- Involvement with professional organizations that will support scholarly or creative goals
- Grants developed and submitted to capture external support
- Adheres to relevant ethics conventions for scholarly and creative projects
- Reasonably effective time management strategies contribute to success

Research: Ranking for Evaluation of Excellent

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

Indicators:

- Refined scholarly agenda or creative plan well suited to regional comprehensive university context
- Meets program production targets for both quantity and quality of scholarship
- Potential for wide recognition of quality outside of the University
- Completes appropriate schedule of professional educational opportunities (e.g., licensure, technology training, etc.) in a timely fashion
- External support captured to facilitate scholarship or creative activities agenda
- Highly skilled application of ethical conventions in discipline
- Skilled time management facilitates success of scholarly agenda or creative plan

Research: Ranking for Evaluation of Distinguished

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

Indicators:

- Both quantity and quality measures clearly exceed program expectations
- National or international audience
- National or international recognition earned for quality
- Awards received for scholarly or creative projects
- Achievements in continuing professional training show unusual merit
- Strong record of grant pursuit, grant awards, successful completion, and dissemination of results
- Campus and/or disciplinary leadership

Section 3, Part C. Annual Evaluation of Service

Service: Activities

1. Institution (program, college, university)

- Committee/council/task force as member
- Committee/council/task force as chair
- Institution sponsored activities: open house, orientations, recruitment
- Sponsorships for student organizations

2. Profession

- Associations/Societies: officer, committees, invited seminars
- Journals: editorships, reviewer
- Agencies: board memberships, reviewer
- Meeting/conference: hosting, chairing sessions
- Publishing houses: textbook reviews

3. Community

- Invited seminars
 - Juror/Judge
 - Sponsor/participant outreach activities
4. Qualitative Assessment by Chair
- Awards related to service

Service: Department Standard

Individuals in the department are expected to participate in service related areas including activities from all three of the first three categories listed above with at least four activities total. Two activities may be single events (such as an outreach activity related to community public health); two activities must be recurring events (such serving on a standing committee or sponsoring a student organization or serving on a standing committee). All tenure-earning lines must structure activities in line with goals for promotion and tenure. Faculty holding non-tenure-earning lines are expected to engage in service as indicated below.

Service: Ranking for Evaluation of Poor

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

Indicators:

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

Service: Ranking for Evaluation of Fair

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

Indicators:

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

Service: Ranking for Evaluation of Good

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

Indicators:

- Emerging service agenda reflects reasonable expectation for rank

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

Service: Ranking for Evaluation of Excellent

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

Indicators:

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

Service: Ranking for Evaluation of Distinguished

This performance level demonstrates a high degree of skill in service contributions as shown by the indicators below that build upon indicators for excellence. In general, service contributions exceed the standards of excellence of the program.

Indicators:

- Leadership demonstrated in targeted arenas of service (e.g., holds elected office; collaborates skillfully and innovatively)
- Problems solved proactively through vigorous contributions
- Wide external recognition (local, national or international audiences) or awards achieved for quality of service contributions
- Community service provides significant and measurable impact; service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions

Section 3, Part D: Adjunct assignment and evaluation

Adjunct instructors are required to pass the same credential review required for tenure-earning faculty, including submission of transcripts, letters of recommendation, and an updated CV. These items need only be submitted when a new adjunct is first hired into the UWF system. In following semesters, the same SACS form and supporting documentation can be used for subsequent appointments. Adjuncts are typically assigned on a term-by-term basis and an Adjunct Appointment Form is submitted for each adjunct instructor during the semester prior to their assigned teaching. All faculty are required to pass a background check before the offer is made. The background check will be repeated annually unless the adjunct is employed on a continuous basis.

The Chair informs the adjunct of the responsibilities of the position and the compensation. If the adjunct is teaching online, they also meet with the faculty coordinating online teaching and training and arrange for completion of online teaching training requirements. Adjuncts will be evaluated each semester using criteria that includes: student evaluations, student complaints and praise, and responsiveness to students. Repeated or excessive complaints from students regarding technical difficulties within the control of the adjunct to solve will be grounds for termination of appointment.

Section 4 Merit Pay

Merit pay decisions are made by the Dean upon consultation with the Chair based on the annual evaluation and the merit pay criteria negotiated by UFF.

Section 5 Summer Supplemental Contract Opportunities

The MLS department operates 12 months of the year. All of the faculty in the department are on 12 month appointment.

Section 6 Office Hours

All full-time faculty are required to meet a posted schedule of a minimum of six office hours per week distributed over at least two days and several time blocks.

Section 7 Allocation of Paid Overload Appointments

Paid overload appointments will be granted contingent upon departmental need and selection of instructors having faculty expertise in the area of need. Overload courses will be offered on the basis of student program needs and enrollment projections. Faculty will be offered supplementary contracts based on their area of specialization and qualifications to teach the courses offered. Compensation for overload teaching is detailed in the Collective Bargaining Agreement in section 9.4. If more than one faculty member is qualified to teach a scheduled course, the supplementary appointments will be offered on a rotation basis. Those receiving a course one year will be placed at the end of the list for the following year. The department chair will keep a record of overload assignments starting from the summer of 2016.

Section 8 Multi-year Appointments for Instructors and Lecturers

The UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement specifies the criteria for instructors and lecturers to qualify for three-year multi-year contracts. Individuals have completed the three year contract, and who have received an overall Dean's rating of "excellent" or above in the six most recent annual evaluations qualify for a base wage increase. The CBA can be found at the website for Academic Affairs. <http://uwf.edu/offices/academic-affairs-division/>

Section 9 Promotion and Tenure

Upon arrival at UWF, untenured faculty will be assigned a mentoring committee from among the tenured faculty who will meet at least annually with the faculty to review his/her performance in the areas of teaching, research and service. A written evaluation will be provided to the faculty member and discussed with the candidate to inform him/her of his/her progress. A mid-term developmental tenure review occurs at the level of the department during the spring semester of the third year. The candidate will generate a mid-term tenure portfolio which will be viewed by the department members. Faculty members will discuss the mid-term portfolio at the final faculty meeting of the spring semester, and provide written feedback to the candidate. The goal of the

feedback is to help the candidate focus on weaknesses of the packet in the next year. The mid-term portfolio should have the following subsections: the departmental bylaws, the most recent CV, all of the annual evaluation summaries, all of the results of student evaluations, and a statement of contributions with regards to teaching, research and service. It is preferable that the portfolio is also critiqued by a former member of the college or university personnel committee. The mid-tenure review does not progress beyond the level of the department. Faculty in the clinical track should submit a mid-time review as well.

After a period of 5 years, but no longer than the sixth year, the untenured, tenure-track faculty member will follow the University Guidelines for initiating the P&T process. After a minimum period of 5 years in-rank, a tenured Associate Professor can submit his/her credentials for consideration for promotion to Professor.

Promotion and tenure decisions are made at the Provost's level. The Department specific guidelines are listed in the appendix. The criteria and timeline are found at the website for Academic Affairs.

Section 10 Sustained Performance

Faculty in the tenured ranks of Associate Professor and Professor will undergo a Sustained Performance Evaluation SPE in the sixth year after receiving tenure and every sixth year thereafter. The SPE evaluates the previous six year period. The faculty members's dossier is submitted to the Department Chair for review and recommendation. The College Personnel Committee makes a recommendation, and the Dean will review all materials and make a recommendation to the Provost for a final decision. Outcomes of a positive SPE are an increase in base salary, based on the individual's rank and ratings. An unsatisfactory SPE review requires a Performance Improvement Plan to be developed and implemented. Details for the SPE are found in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 11.3 (b 1-9). The expectations for sustained performance on the SPE are aligned to the tenure expectations of the department. In depth discussion of SPE can be found in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, found at the website for Academic Affairs <http://uwf.edu/offices/academic-affairs-division/>.

9. Department Chair

The Department Chair is a faculty member in the department and serves at the pleasure of the Dean. Appointments are typically made after consultation with the faculty of the department and the Provost. Appointments may be made on a rotating or renewable basis. The Chair must hold rank minimally as an Assistant Professor with a terminal degree preferred.

The Chair must be familiar with the departmental by-laws and the governing laws of the university. Policies are found at the Academic Affairs website. Directors are not required to be tenure-track, or hold a terminal degree. They must be qualified to teach within their program and meet accreditation standards.

Department Chairs and Program Directors have a responsibility to students, faculty, and administration. The Chair and the Directors are responsible for overseeing the quality of instruction in the Department/Program, and oversight of accreditation standards. This includes curriculum planning and assessment, recruiting and developing faculty, and departmental resource management. Multiple processes are in place to ensure that academic standards are upheld. The Chair works with

the Department faculty to complete these processes, however the Chair is responsible for the reporting of such. The Chair's Handbook is an electronic resource to aid Chairs and Directors in completing their recurring duties. It can be found at the website for Academic Affairs.

10. Cancellation of classes

The minimum class size is determined by several characteristics. Graduate classes are expected to have less students than undergraduate classes. Classes that are electives and classes that are required for a degree have a minimum "make number" for undergraduates and for graduates as provided by the Dean. Exceptions to these are internships and directed studies. Enrollment should be monitored during registration, and the decision to cancel a class should be made before the previous semester ends. Full-time faculty should be reassigned to another class to maintain their 12 contact hour requirement.

11. Department Resources

Section 1. Budgeting

The departmental/programmatic expense budgets are determined at the level of the College. The MLS program receives and maintains Education and General (E&G) funding and carryforward accounts. Increased needs in this category should be conveyed to the Chair for presentation to the College Dean. E&G is provided on a fiscal year basis, and leftover is swept at the end of the year.

Section 2. Equipment

Operating Capital Outlay (OCO): The Chair and the Program Directors will maintain a list of capital equipment needs and keep requests for these updated through the College Resource Request web portal. Faculty input is necessary for prioritization.

Section 3. Specialized fees: Material and Supplies fees and Equipment fees

The MLS program is the only face-to-face program in the department, and offers multiple courses that have laboratory sections. M&S and equipment fees are collected for each of the laboratory sections and must be spent on student consumables and equipment used by the students.

Section 4. Foundation account

Foundation accounts are funded by donations and may have specific goals. Foundation accounts in general can be used for faculty travel, professional development, refreshments, etc., and is the least restrictive of the accounts.

Section 5. Carryforward account

Carryforward accounts are awarded by the Dean as profit sharing for summer teaching. The formula to predict the award varies, but the carryforward accounts can be used at the discretion of the Chair with input from the faculty. Funds can be used for faculty research needs, travel, office furniture, etc.

12. Faculty Development

The Department is committed to assisting faculty development in ways which will not adversely affect instructional programs. Faculty requesting sabbaticals will notify the Chair at least two years in advance of the sabbatical year. Faculty requesting release time for curriculum and/or research development should present the plan to the Chair with sufficient time to find an alternate instructor. Sabbatical requests must be submitted to the Dean.

Faculty are encouraged to participate in UWF faculty training opportunities and at least one regional or national conference per year. Funding for faculty travel is available through the college and is competitive; tenure-track faculty have priority over non-tenure-track faculty. Faculty should discuss departmental funding for conferences with the Chair.

Tenure-track faculty may be provided with laboratory space and a seed account for purposes of starting up new research projects. The seed account/start up funds are negotiated with the Dean during the hiring process.

13. Curricular review and assessment protocols

Section 1. Accreditation review

The MLS program is accredited by the National Accrediting Agency for Clinical Laboratory Science. Curricula, faculty credentials, and programmatic standards should be reviewed annually with respect to the accrediting agency. The accreditation cycle is for a period 7 or 10 years.

Section 2. UWF Program Review

Each program at UWF undergoes a formal review process every seven years. The guidelines are provided by the Provost office a year prior to the review, and the program produces a self-study. A review team that consists of two UWF faculty members from outside the department and an external reviewer who is expert in the field review all documents, meet with faculty and students, and provide peer recommendations for improvement.

Section 3. Assessment Review

Each program determines specific learning outcomes from its Academic Learning Compact to assess and improve. It is not necessary to assess every outcome every year, but each domain should be addressed during the seven year review cycle. The program faculty should determine the assessment plan for each year, and meet at least once at the year's conclusion to review results and recommend changes to the curriculum based on the review. Faculty members should also participate in university-wide assessment review workshops offered by the Center for Undergraduate Teaching, Learning and Assessment (CUTLA).

Section 4. Annual Report

Departments and Colleges determine their strategic goals and report on progress annually through ASPIRE. Annual reporting also includes reporting on assessment reviews.

All department faculty have the right to be informed and the responsibility to be involved in strategic planning, assessment, accreditation, curriculum review and execution of departmental and programmatic goals.

14. Date of adoption: August 1, 2016

Appendices

These appendices pertain to promotion criteria that is specific to the Medical Laboratory Sciences Department. This pertains to tenure and clinical track faculty.

Additional criteria established for evaluation of faculty within the CLS program are as follows:

Teaching: The candidate ...

1. Shows a record of participation in CUTLA, ATC, ITS, local/regional teaching related workshops or equivalent training approved by the Department Chair.
2. Participates in assessment planning and execution.
3. Has received student evaluations with a minimum average of 70% of rankings in all categories greater than or equal to Very Good in all courses taught.
4. Have fulfilled their assigned teaching responsibilities since the beginning of their employment at UWF.
5. Actively solicits input from hospital partners to update materials on a regular basis.

Research: The candidate ...

1. Has published an average of 1 paper/year in a peer-reviewed journal or presented an average of 1 presentation or poster/year in the laboratory medicine arena since the beginning of their employment at UWF; a minimum of 3 papers in peer-reviewed journals must be published during their tenure as an Assistant Professor to be considered for promotion to Associate Professor. For promotion to Professor, the candidate must list at least 5 peer reviewed journal articles, book chapters, monographs or technical reports of studies carried out while employed at UWF that were published after promotion to Associate Professor. The CLS program recognizes that books require significant effort, and 1 book can substitute for 3 papers.
2. Has attended an average of 1 local, regional, national or international professional event in laboratory medicine/year since the beginning of their employment at UWF.
3. Has involved students in their research activities.
4. Has applied for external funding (this is required for tenure), and received external funding (this is required for promotion). Funding amount is not specified.
5. Maintains professional certification, and licensure if applicable, along with the associated requisite continuing education.
6. Participates in the authorship of NAACLS accreditation documents. Primary authorship of the self-study document is equivalent to one peer-reviewed journal article.

Service: The candidate ...

1. Has served on all Program committees, including curriculum development, QEP, Assessment, Advisory and student selection. Serves on at least 1 College-level or University-level committee or Task Forces during their tenure as an Assistant Professor. For promotion to Professor, demonstrates leadership in committee work by chairing a college or university level committee or serving on a task force.

2. Has participated in or helped develop service events involving the student organization, and/or is the faculty advisor for a UWF student association.
3. Has engaged in hospital affiliate recruiting and retention.
4. Has engaged in student recruitment and progression.
5. Holds membership in at least 1 professional related organization during their tenure as an Assistant Professor, such as ASCP or ASCLS.

Appendix I – Medical Laboratory Sciences Program Tenure Track faculty Promotion & Tenure

The Promotion guidelines and criteria for the MLS program are modeled after those established by the University, but have been tailored to address the unique teaching, research and service needs of the program. The Promotion & Tenure process used is that established by the University.

Upon arrival at UWF, untenured, tenure-track and clinical track faculty will be assigned a mentor from among the tenured or clinical faculty who, in collaboration with the Chair, will annually evaluate the faculty's performance at the end of each year in the three areas of teaching, research and service. A written evaluation will be provided to the faculty member and discussed with the candidate to inform them of their progress. This will comprise the annual evaluation required by the University. A more extensive evaluation will be provided to the candidate at the mid-tenure point (year 3).

After a period of 5 years, but no longer than the sixth year, the untenured, tenure-track faculty member will follow the University Guidelines for initiating the P&T process. After a minimum period of 5 years in-rank, a tenured Associate Professor can submit their credentials for consideration for promotion to Professor. Promotion and tenure decisions are made at the Provost's level. The criteria and timeline are found at website for Academic Affairs. The Departmental guidelines are also listed here.

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

Table 1. University Criteria for Tenure and Promotion Decisions

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

Appendix 2 Clinical Practice Track- Non-tenure, adapted from the UWF Department of Nursing

CLINICAL PRACTICE TRACK STANDARDS FOR PERFORMANCE AT RANK			
Lecturer	Assistant Professor of Medical Laboratory Sciences	Associate Professor of Medical Laboratory Sciences	Professor of Medical Laboratory Sciences
1. Academic qualification: Masters in Clinical Laboratory Sciences, Biology or a commensurate degree in an appropriate discipline required.	1. Academic qualification: Masters in MLS, Biology or a commensurate degree. Doctorate Preferred.	1. Academic qualification: Doctorate	1. Academic qualification: Doctorate
2. Demonstrates effective teaching skills and the potential for success in classroom, clinical, and seminar settings.	2. Demonstrates competency in teaching in area of expertise.	2. Demonstrates continuous competency in teaching in area(s) of expertise.	2. Recognized for excellence in teaching related to area(s) of expertise.
3. No requirement for scholarship with this rank.	3. Develops a program of scholarship in specialty area.	3. Acquires stature in a program of scholarship in specialty area, tangible output of research	3. Sustains a program of scholarship in specialty area.
4. Participates in service-related activities within the Department of MLS	4. Provides service to the department, the community, and the profession.	4. Assumes leadership positions in service to the department, university, community, and profession.	4. Recognized as a leader in the university and among peers in specialty area, locally and nationally/internationally.

5. Demonstrates competence and leadership within a defined laboratory science practice area.	5. Demonstrates competence and leadership within a defined laboratory science practice area.	5. Demonstrates competence and leadership within a defined laboratory science area.	5. Demonstrates competence and leadership within a defined laboratory science area.
--	--	---	---

TYPES OF EVIDENCE IN RANK BY CRITERION			
Lecturer	Assistant Professor of Medical Laboratory Sciences	Associate Professor of Medical Laboratory Sciences	Professor of Medical Laboratory Sciences
<p>1. Demonstrates effective teaching skills in classroom, clinical, and seminar settings.</p> <p>The Lecturer:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Serves as course faculty Develops and uses appropriately creative and evidence-based course-related materials. Demonstrates qualities desired in a program and course team member. Demonstrates respect for students and their rights. Seeks out mentors from the faculty. Incorporates suggestions from peer evaluations Recognizes the value of the student-teacher relationship Receives student evaluations with 	<p>1. Demonstrates competency in teaching in area of expertise.</p> <p>In addition to evidence cited under Lecturer, the Assistant Professor:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Assumes leadership in teaching (e.g. course coordinator, course co-coordinator, team leader) with advancing years in rank. Develops, implements, and evaluates innovative methods for promoting student learning, demonstrating advancement while in rank. Contributes to new course development, revision, and evaluation and program 	<p>1. Demonstrates continuous competency in teaching in area(s) of expertise.</p> <p>In addition to evidence cited under Assistant Professor, the Associate Professor:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Utilizes new technologies in the teaching-learning process. Mentors and supervises novice teachers in the academic and clinical settings. Leads theses and dissertation committees in area of specialty. Develops, implements, and evaluates new courses in specialty area across academic and clinical settings. Participates as a member of the team writing program grants. Leads curriculum development/progr 	<p>1. Recognized for excellence in teaching related to area(s) of expertise.</p> <p>In addition to evidence cited under Associate Professor, the Professor:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Mentors junior faculty and graduate teaching assistants in clinical teaching and field supervision of students. Provides leadership in curriculum development across all department programs and in clinical education programs as appropriate.

<p>an average of 3.0 or greater across years in rank</p> <p>i. Receives positive annual evaluations</p>	<p>development and evaluation.</p> <p>d. Participates in writing accreditation reports.</p>	<p>am planning efforts.</p> <p>g. Receives awards or commendations in specialty area.</p> <p>h. Serves as manuscript reviewer or as member of editorial review board in specialty area.</p>	
<p>2. This rank has no requirement for research</p>	<p>a. Develops a program of scholarship in specialty area.</p> <p>In addition to evidence cited under Lecturer, the Assistant Professor:</p> <p>b. Establishes opportunities for scholarship with mentors in specialty area.</p> <p>c. Practices and participates in scholarly inquiry in area of expertise</p> <p>d. Disseminates findings of scholarly inquiry in practice area of expertise on a regional and national level.</p> <p>e. Participates in scholarly projects and significant evidence-based project development.</p> <p>f. Participates on grant-writing</p>	<p>2. Acquires stature in a program of scholarship in specialty area</p> <p>In addition to evidence cited under Assistant Professor, the Associate Professor:</p> <p>a. Initiates scholarly inquiry in area of expertise</p> <p>b. Disseminates findings of scholarly inquiry in practice area of expertise on an international level.</p> <p>c. Serves as mentor for junior faculty who are writing for peer-reviewed publication(s)</p> <p>d. Initiates grant-writing as lead author, principle investigator, or project director.</p> <p>e. Contributes to continuing education programs in area of focus/expertise</p>	<p>2. Sustains a program of scholarship in specialty area.</p> <p>In addition to evidence cited under Associate Professor, the Professor:</p> <p>a. Mentors educators and clinicians in the scholarly inquiry of teaching and practice problems in the respective settings.</p> <p>b. Mentors faculty in dissemination of scholarly inquiry findings.</p> <p>c. Mentors faculty in grant-writing</p>

	<p>teams as appropriate.</p> <p>g. Contributes to continuing education programs in area of focus/expertise</p>		
<p>3. Participates in service-related activities at the department.</p> <p>The Lecturer:</p> <p>a. Attends and contributes at departmental and COH meetings (e.g. Faculty Assembly, town meetings, program meetings)</p>	<p>2. Provides service to the department, the community, and the profession.</p> <p>In addition to evidence cited under Lecturer, the Assistant Professor:</p> <p>a. Serves as a member of committees or boards of community and professional organizations.</p> <p>b. Participates in activities related to the department and college’s mission and goals (e.g. alumnae activities, recruitment efforts, fund raising, other activities including student health, counseling, testing, computer support, etc.)</p>	<p>3. Assumes leadership positions in service to the department, university, community, and profession.</p> <p>In addition to evidence cited under Assistant Professor, the Associate Professor:</p> <p>a. Participates in university committees.</p> <p>b. Provides leadership to the department and college committees and boards of community and professional organizations.</p> <p>c. Serves on national panels, committees, and task forces to advice in area of expertise.</p>	<p>3. Recognized as a leader in the university and among peers in specialty area, locally and nationally or internationally.</p> <p>In addition to evidence cited under Associate Professor, the Professor:</p> <p>a. Serves as leader for university committees.</p> <p>b. Receives recognition through elected membership in societies (e.g. ASCLS)</p> <p>c. Serves as a leader in professional organizations</p>

<p>4. Demonstrates competence within a defined practice area.</p> <p>The Lecturer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is recognized by the Florida Board of Clinical Laboratory Personnel as a licenced practitioner applicable to education/role b. Holds national certification in area of clinical expertise (if available) c. Applies practice expertise to classroom and clinical teaching d. Is recognized by colleagues for expertise in a particular area of practice 	<p>3. Demonstrates competence and leadership within a defined practice area.</p> <p>In addition to evidence cited under Lecturer, the Assistant Professor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Applies practice expertise to classroom and clinical teaching b. Is recognized by colleagues for expertise in a particular area of practice. c. Develops presentations related to practice d. Submits peer reviews of practice e. Develops reports of clinical demonstration of practice 	<p>4. Demonstrates competence and leadership within a defined practice area.</p> <p>In addition to evidence cited under Assistant Professor, the Associate Professor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Consults in focus area, receives awards or commendations in focus area b. Serves as manuscript reviewers or as members of editorial review boards c. Writes reports compiling and analyzing patient or health services outcomes d. Develops reports of meta-analyses related to practice problems 	<p>4. Demonstrates competence and leadership within a defined practice area.</p> <p>In addition to evidence cited under Assistant and Associate Professor, the Professor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Presents at national or international meetings or conferences b. Consults nationally and internationally regarding scholarly work c. Receives invitations for lectureships and visiting professorships
---	---	--	--