

**UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA  
DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS  
DEPARTMENTAL BYLAWS**

**a) Name of Department**

Department of Physics

**b) Vision**

To distinguish the Physics Department as a dynamic teaching and research center, which provides students with a challenging, strongly personalized training program while caring for their needs and aspirations, and maintains a creative research environment with significant contributions to the field.

**c) Mission and Purpose**

To provide high-quality instruction in Physics and to train competent physicists who can contribute significantly to the physics and engineering environment in the country.

To develop and maintain a high standard of research by the faculty, and to involve the students in such front-line research activities.

To promote awareness of the physics program in the community by outreach and cooperative activities with local schools, community colleges, industries, and defense establishments.

**d) Definition of Departmental Members**

- (a) Permanent faculty are defined as tenured, tenure-track, instructors, and lecturers.
- (b) All faculty (including visiting and adjunct) may participate in departmental discussions. Visiting faculty are expected to participate in departmental discussions. Staff members and adjunct faculty may be invited by the Chairperson or a majority of the faculty. The Chairperson, or a faculty member designated by the Chairperson, will issue the invitation.
- (c) All permanent faculty members may vote on non-personnel matters. Visiting faculty may vote by invitation of the Chairperson or a majority of the permanent faculty.
- (d) Only tenured and tenure-track faculty members may vote on personnel decisions. Only tenured faculty members may vote on tenure decisions.

**e) Departmental Meetings**

The Department Chairperson serves ex officio as presiding officer at department meetings. The department will hold faculty/staff meetings only during the regular academic year as requested by the Chairperson or by a majority of the faculty. The department will meet at a minimum of once per month during the academic year. All academic and student-related matters requiring departmental action shall be discussed at the faculty meetings.

- (a) The agenda for each meeting will be included in the meeting announcement in hard-copy and/or through e-mail. The agenda for meetings will be distributed two working days in advance, when practical, by the Chairperson or his/her designee. Any faculty may request that an agenda item be added at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. In the event that the agenda item cannot be discussed during the next available meeting, then it will be addressed during the next meeting. If necessary, a special meeting can be called to address agenda items that are not addressed in the available time frame.

- (b) As far as practicable, department faculty on sabbatical or other authorized paid leave shall be informed of faculty meetings and shall be given opportunity to participate in discussions and votes.
- (c) For all faculty meetings, a simple majority of the eligible voting faculty members shall constitute a quorum. If all faculty members are not present at a meeting, the required votes to approve any measures is a simple majority of the entire faculty, not a just the majority of the faculty members that are present.
- (d) In the event that a faculty member is unable to be present at a meeting, the faculty member may provide a proxy vote to a faculty member of his/her choosing.
- (e) All votes will be by show of hands. In items relating to personnel matters, or when requested by at least one-third of the faculty present, the voting shall be by secret ballot. The Chairperson shall tally the votes for recording in the minutes.
- (f) Committee recommendations and/or decisions shall be based on simple majority rule. If a committee recommendation or decision has an impact on the majority of the department faculty, it should come for a vote from all faculty.
- (g) In the event a vote ends in a tie, the Chairperson holds the deciding vote.
- (h) During the summer, the Chairperson and the available faculty may make decisions and take action on an emergency basis; any decisions and actions will not be binding until approved by the faculty during the next academic year. Even if there is a quorum of faculty members available, a review of the decisions made by the department will occur at the first departmental meeting of the academic year.
- (i) Different opinions and views are encouraged. All members shall have equal opportunity to participate in discussions and to express their views and opinions. Members may need to agree on how to share the floor to ensure broad input.
- (j) If requested by any faculty member, the minutes of the faculty meeting shall be tape recorded, typed, and circulated (in hard-copy or through e-mail). The minutes must be approved by a two-thirds majority at the next faculty meeting. The tape may be used only for verification of the minutes; it must be erased after the minutes have been approved.
- (k) Robert's Rules of Order will be followed when requested by one-third of the faculty present.

**f) Collegiality**

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

- (a) Treat colleagues with respect in all dealings, being verbal or written,
- (b) Undertake all activities with openness and fairness, and respond to concerns raised by colleagues with respect,
- (c) Deal with conflicts and disagreements among colleagues in a professional manner, and
- (d) Bring unresolved conflicts/disagreements to the attention of the Chairperson. The Chairperson shall attempt to resolve the conflict with the parties involved.

All faculty members shall also abide by the university guidelines related to collegiality and faculty cooperation.

**g) Professional Integrity**

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

h) **Faculty Mentoring**

Mentoring new faculty is an important task and is critical to the success of the department. A committee of at least three faculty will be appointed by the Chairperson in consultation with the concerned faculty member. At least once a semester, the Chairperson will meet with untenured faculty to help assess progress.

i) **Committee Structure**

Ad hoc committees will be appointed by the Chairperson as needed and membership shall be shared fairly by all faculty members.

j) **Policies and Procedures**

(a) **Annual Faculty Evaluation**

The criteria for tenure and promotion specified in Appendix I shall be used in the annual evaluations of tenure-track faculty. Lecturers and instructors shall be evaluated based on the assignments made by the Chairperson in teaching and service. The criteria of evaluation in these two areas shall be the same as those used to evaluate tenure-track faculty.

(b) **Tenure and Promotion**

The department will follow the procedures described in the [Collective Bargaining Agreement](#) (CBA) established between the United Faculty of Florida (UFF) and the university. In addition, the department will follow the [Tenure and Promotion Criteria](#) established by the university. If there are any conflicts between the two, the CBA will take precedence.

When a faculty member becomes eligible for tenure and/or promotion, the faculty member will submit a portfolio for evaluation. The Chairperson will disseminate the portfolio to all eligible voting faculty, who will meet to discuss the portfolio. The eligible faculty will provide a report to the Chairperson and vote as to whether the faculty member is deserving of tenure and/or promotion. The eligible faculty are as follows:

- For tenure and for Associate Professor, all faculty that have a rank of Associate Professor or higher are eligible.
- For Professor, all faculty that have a rank of Professor are eligible.
- In the event that there are no faculty of the required rank to serve, a report will be prepared by the Chairperson unless he/she is not of sufficient rank. In such cases, the Dean will appoint a committee to review the portfolio.
- In the event that the Chairperson is untenured or is seeking promotion, his/her portfolio will be evaluated by a committee appointed by the Dean unless the Chairperson has negotiated a different arrangement upon being offered the position (see Section 11 below).

The Chairperson will provide a report to the Dean. The faculty member will be judged in accordance with the criteria established by the CBA and the departmental tenure and promotion guidelines described in Appendix I, which are consistent with the university's tenure and promotion criteria.

(c) **Mid-Tenure Reviews**

When a tenure-track faculty member has reached the third year of their appointment, he/she will undergo a mid-point review. The Dean will 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). Faculty under a mid-point review will submit to the Chairperson a packet containing all materials that the faculty member wishes to be assessed for evaluation. The Chairperson will review the materials and will appoint a committee to review the packet. Both the committee and the Chairperson will provide an assessment of the packet to the faculty member for review. The Chairperson will discuss the assessment with the faculty member and guide the faculty member on how to improve the portfolio.

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 will 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 will assess overall performance and contributions critically in light of mid-point expectations. The mid-point review will not be as extensive as the formal tenure review that occurs toward the end of the probation period, but should be based on a set of documents, including a current vita; annual evaluations; student/peer evaluation of teaching; selected examples of teaching materials and scholarship; and a self-evaluation by the faculty member. The Dean will review the department's written mid-point review and respond to the department and the faculty member in writing. Further use of these materials is at the discretion of the faculty member.

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

The Chairperson will endeavor to balance FTE assignments among faculty. The average FTEs from the previous three (3) summer assignments determine priority in teaching assignment. New faculty will start with an FTE average that will be negotiated during the hiring process. If the contract does not explicitly state the starting FTE for a new faculty member, the default will be an FTE of 0.00. Tenure-track faculty and lecturers will automatically receive preference over adjunct faculty for summer positions. Assignments will be given to faculty members with the lowest average FTE first. Any specialty courses that are offered will be prioritized to the faculty members that are most qualified to teach said courses. The department shall keep a record of summer assignments.

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

Each opportunity will be reviewed by the Chairperson, subject to approval by the Dean, on its merit and subject to state regulations.

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

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

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

Travel resources will be fairly distributed among faculty as available.

**(h) Requests for Release Time**

Un-sponsored professional development opportunities will be shared equally over time. Requests for additional release time must be made as far as possible before the end of the previous semester. Release time for sponsored service and scholarly and creative activity will be consistent with contract or grant funds. The faculty requesting the release

time must teach at least one three-credit hour course or its FTE equivalent per semester. All release time must be approved by both the Department Chair and the College Dean.

(i) **Office Hours/Availability to Students**

Each faculty will make him/herself available to students either in person or digitally. The time that a faculty member makes him/herself available shall be referred to as office hours, which shall be maintained using the following guidelines:

- A minimum of two (2) hours for every 3-hour lecture course
- A minimum of one (1) hour for every 3-hour lab

With a normal teaching load of 9 credit hours, the minimum number of office hours will be six (6) for a fulltime faculty without any scholarly and creative activity or other release time. If someone is teaching an overloaded schedule, then the maximum number required of office hours to be held is six (6).

(j) **Student Advising**

The department shall provide two types of advising for its students: faculty advising (performed by a faculty advisor), and academic advising (performed by an academic advisor). The purpose of the faculty advisor is to answer general questions concerning the profession of physics research, teaching and other career opportunities, to serve as a mentor, and to assist students in selecting specific technical elective courses that will meet the student's professional goals and interests. All teaching faculty members will serve as faculty advisors. The academic advisor will provide academic advising.

(k) **Annual Work Assignments**

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

(l) **Grade Appeal Procedure**

The department will follow the [university guidelines and procedures](#).

(m) **Canceling of Classes**

In the event of an illness or emergency, the instructor must contact the chair at the earliest possible time. The Chairperson will attempt to arrange for a suitable substitute. If one cannot be found, the instructor should hold one or more make-up sessions as needed to bring the class in line with the course schedule. In the event that a make-up session cannot be held, the instructor should formulate a revision statement to the syllabus to be approved by the Chairperson of the department.

In the event of a planned absence, such as for a conference, the instructor must either arrange for a substitute or provide make-up classes. The instructor can provide a digital lecture in place of a face-to-face. This should be done in consultation with the Chairperson.

(n) **Substitute Teaching of Classes**

A suitable substitute is one of the permanent faculty. If the missing class is a review session, the teaching assistant for the class is acceptable.

(o) **Use of Undergraduate Teaching Assistants**

Teaching assistants may be used to grade homework, quizzes, and laboratory reports. They cannot be used to teach a class without the instructor present or grade any tests or examination (including the final exam). They may teach a review session before an exam as well as hold tutoring sessions.

(p) **Curricular Review**

A curricular review meeting should be held at least once a year. The Chairperson should appoint a Curricular Review Committee. The committee will formulate suggested changes and present them to the department for approval. The department will assess the timeline for implementation of any approved changes.

**(q) Assessment Protocols**

In order to appropriately compare courses from one year to the next, the department will use a combination of national standard established through Physics Education Research and departmentally generated pre- and post-tests to assess learning gains. The department will use common final exams for any course with multiple sections and/or instructors. The information gained from these tests is for departmental self-assessment and cannot be used towards one instructor's annual evaluation, tenure, or promotion unless the instructor wishes to include it.

**(r) Others**

- All departmental matters that need to be addressed to the Dean of the College shall be routed through the Chairperson.
- The request for university support through OCO/expense accounts shall be prepared by the Chairperson in consultation with the faculty.
- Program revisions, course development, and curriculum design for new tracks shall be done by one or more faculty appointed by the Chairperson. All program revisions shall be subject to a vote by the faculty.

**k) Selection of the Department Chairperson**

- (a) The Chairperson shall be selected from the permanent faculty of the Department by a majority vote of all tenured and tenure-track faculty, subject to approval by the Dean of the college.
- (b) The term of service for the Chairperson is three academic years.
- (c) No faculty member may serve more than two terms consecutively as Chairperson unless required by extenuating circumstances.
- (d) The position of the Chairperson is expected to rotate among the tenured faculty, but a tenure-track faculty member is eligible to serve.
- (e) If a non-tenured faculty member is required or elected to serve, the faculty member will receive an evaluation of no less than Excellent in the Service category and the criteria for Scholarly and Creative Activity may be reevaluated in light of the extra service duties required of the Chairperson. Any non-tenured faculty member has the right to negotiate with the Dean the details of the promotion procedure.
- (f) In the event of the absence of the Chairperson for any reason, the Chairperson shall designate one of the faculty as acting Chairperson to fulfill the duties of the Chairperson.

**l) Responsibilities of the Department Chairperson**

- (a) The daily operation of the Department.
- (b) All requests by the Dean's office.
- (c) Annual review of the faculty, including observation of classroom instruction as part of the review process.
- (d) Meet with each faculty at least once per semester.
- (e) Hold faculty meetings at a minimum of once per month.
- (f) Arrange substitutes for absent faculty and staff.
- (g) Implementing all duties outlined in these Bylaws.

## APPENDIX A

### ANNUAL EVALUATION, PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA

It is expected that all faculty will conduct themselves in accordance with the policies outlined in the UWF Professional Standards and the UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement. A candidate for tenure and/or promotion should have demonstrated collegiality and a willingness to work with colleagues in supporting the goals and mission of the department, college, and university.

The Department has a set of criteria and standards for the assessment of a faculty member's performance of assigned duties and responsibilities. There are three performance categories: teaching; scholarship and creative activities; and service. These assessment criteria form the basis for promotion and tenure decisions. The standards stated here are from the Tenure and Promotions Guidelines document from 2013-2014 and may change over time per the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the UFF and the university. If there are any discrepancies between the following standards and the CBA, the CBA takes precedence.

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

- **Poor:** Unacceptable level of performance. Substantial weaknesses exist that jeopardize professional progress. Performance at this level requires remediation.
- **Fair:** Overall performance includes some strengths, but one or more major weaknesses exist in performance.
- **Good:** Moderate progress toward long-term professional goals, but one or more weaknesses render the performance not quite to the expectations of excellence.
- **Excellent:** Meets department standards for professional performance. No major areas of weakness exist.
- **Distinguished:** Exceeds department standards for professional performance. Exceed standards of excellence in quality, quantity or both.

The minimum standards are:

- **Tenure:** To be granted tenure, a faculty member must demonstrate excellent teaching and at least one excellent and at least one good rating in the other two categories.
- **Promotion to Associate Professor:** To be promoted associate professor, a faculty member must demonstrate an excellent performance in all three categories of review for three successive years.
- **Promotion to Professor:** To be promoted to professor, a faculty member must demonstrate an excellent rating in all three categories and at least one 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.

The performance levels are expected as an average with sustained effort throughout the decision period. Performance in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service will be evaluated according to the criteria listed below, which constitute minimum expectations. Criteria evaluating teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service include but are not limited to the following: (The order of the listing does not reflect relative importance.) A candidate must have served at least five years at UWF in order to be eligible to apply for tenure (University requirements), unless credit is given at the time of employment by the University for work done at prior institutions.

#### 1. Teaching

The rating of excellent in teaching is required for tenure. Excellence in teaching and a strong positive reputation within the University as a teacher are required for promotion to associate professor or professor. In this performance area, the ratings in the first three performance categories (Poor, Fair, Good) do not facilitate favorable tenure and promotion decisions.

### CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING

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

- Satisfactory student evaluations, to be collected every semester included in the period of evaluation.
- Peer evaluations of teaching.
- Organization and planning of courses.
- Clear and definitive explanation of assignments.
- Scholarship in teaching areas.
- Engaging students in research projects.
- Updating course material to reflect advancements in the field.
- Design of new courses, laboratories, and/or programs.
- Teaching awards.
- Participation in teaching development programs.
- Teaching specialty topics in seminars, discussion groups, and other student-centric delivery forums.
- Mentoring students in directed studies, capstone or honors projects or theses.

### **1.1. Poor**

This performance level demonstrates serious problems in attaining success in the teaching role as reflected by teaching performance that is well below the department standards of excellence.

*Indicators:*

- Student evaluations document consistent and substantive problems (ratings well below the department average).
- Syllabi fail to establish clear and relevant expectations.
- Assessment practices are inadequate to support student learning and department needs (e.g., learning outcomes are inadequate, inappropriate, or missing; testing strategies are not effective or fair).
- Pedagogical practices are unsound (e.g., disorganization; late, missing, unhelpful feedback; standards too lax; routinely poor preparation; disengaging, chaotic, or hostile classroom environment).
- Student support practices are unsound (e.g., late or absent for class, not responding to email, not keeping office hours, showing favoritism).
- Consistent and very negative ratings in advising, mentoring, and supervision of students' scholarly or creative activities.
- Chronic academic integrity concerns identified including evidence of disrespect for students and their rights.

### **1.2. Fair**

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

*Indicators:*

- Student evaluations document areas of moderate concern.
- Syllabi need to provide clearer and more appropriate expectations.
- Assessment practices show some difficulty in supporting student learning and meeting department needs...
- Some pedagogical practices need attention.
- Some student support practices need improvement.

- Occasional challenges related to academic integrity, including disrespect for students and their rights.

### **1.3. Good**

Demonstrates overall teaching effectiveness but produces some areas for concern reflected by teaching performance that is mildly below the department standards of excellence.

*Indicators:*

- Student evaluations document adequate impact on learning as indicated by a minimum of 2.3 average of all reported sections taught on each of the items 8 (overall assessment of instructor), 17 (instructor's command of the subject), and 18 (overall course organization) on the Student Assessment of Instruction.
- Syllabi provide reasonably clear and appropriate expectations.
- Majority of pedagogical practices are appropriate and effective.
- Majority of student support practices are appropriate and effective.
- Maintains appropriate standards of academic integrity, including respect for students and their rights.

### **1.4. Excellent**

Demonstrates consistent high quality teaching with positive outcomes for students. Performance at this level meets the majority of the indicators below.

*Indicators:*

- Student evaluations document consistently positive impact on learning as indicated by a minimum of 2.8 average of all reported sections taught on each of items 8 (overall assessment of instructor), 17 (instructor's command of the subject), and 18 (overall course organization) on the Student Assessment of Instruction.
- Syllabi outline comprehensive, clear, and appropriate performance expectations.
- Pedagogical practices facilitate optimal learning conditions.
- Student support practices facilitate optimal student development.
- Mentoring of undergraduate research projects, and capstone and honors projects.
- Appropriate standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights.

### **1.5. Distinguished**

Demonstrates unusually high degree of quality in teaching. The performance at this level exceeds department standards of excellence.

*Indicators:*

- Numerical student evaluation data document clear statistical exceptionality as indicated by a minimum of 3.3 yearly average of all reported sections taught on each of items 8 (overall assessment of instructor), 17 (instructor's command of the subject), and 18 (overall course organization) on the Student Assessment of Instruction.
- Teaching awards – internal and external.
- Syllabi outline comprehensive, clear, and appropriate performance expectations.
- Pedagogical practices facilitate optimal learning conditions.
- Student support practices facilitate optimal student development.
- Mentoring of undergraduate research projects, and capstone and honors projects.
- Appropriate standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights.
- Leadership evident in the promotion of high quality teaching and curriculum development for courses and laboratories.

**NOTES:** For the purpose of assigning a numerical value to rating in teaching evaluation

- Numerical student evaluation data is compiled on items 8 ( overall assessment of instructor), 17 (instructor's command of the subject) and 18 (overall course organization) of the Student Assessment of Instruction.
- A POOR is assigned 0 points, FAIR is 1 point, GOOD is 2 points, VERY GOOD is 3 points, EXCELLENT is 4 points.

## **2. Scholarship and Creative Activity**

The minimum expectations for tenure and/or promotion are:

- (a) TWO research articles published in refereed journals or refereed conference proceedings, and TWO outcomes from the list below are considered the minimum expectation for tenure and promotion to associate professor.
- (b) TWO research articles published in refereed journals or refereed conference proceedings and TWO outcomes from the list below after the first promotion (i.e. the promotion to the rank of associate professor), and submittal of external funds are considered the minimum expectation for promotion from the rank of associate professor to professor.

### Research Outcomes:

1. Articles published in refereed journals or refereed conference proceedings
2. Published chapters or books on specialized subjects
3. Published invited review articles on a research related subject
4. Author or co-author on an issued patent
5. External grants received
6. Very significant contracts received, internal or external
7. Service as editor for a journal or book

In addition, the following functions will enhance an applicant's candidacy for tenure and/or promotion:

- Invited lectures to international, national, or regional meetings
- Invited technical seminars to international, national or regional companies
- Presentation of research results at international, national, or regional meetings (non-invited lecture or poster)
- Published papers of a non-peer reviewed or non-research type
- Evidence of research and creative activities with UWF students which have not resulted in formal publication
- Submittal of external research grants
- Very significant internal grants received

### **NOTES:**

- The department views articles published in refereed conference proceedings as equivalent to articles published in refereed journals. Manuscripts submitted for publication in a refereed conference proceeding will undergo a review process comparable to a journal's review process.
- In order to count for the minimum number, the quality of the works from 1-7 must be evaluated by external reviewers chosen with the approval of the chairperson of the department.

- Outcomes 1-7 completed at previous institutions may count towards the minimum expectations if the candidate received credit by UWF at the time of hiring.
- If the candidate has published important articles or received prestigious grants, the work may be counted as two outcomes towards the minimum expectations. The importance and impact of such works is to be determined by no fewer than three distinguished external reviewers chosen with the approval of the chairperson of the department,
- If the candidate has built and maintained instrumentation resulting in works from outcomes 1-7, the work may be counted as two outcomes towards the minimum expectations. The candidate must clearly document evidence of time spent building and maintaining instrumentation with no fewer than three reviewers evaluating the importance and impact of such instrumentation.

### Criteria for Evaluating Scholarly and Creative Activity

Scholarly and creative activities include outcomes 1-7 above, as well as those items that enhance an applicant's candidacy for tenure and/or promotion. A yearly evaluation of scholarly and creative activities will account for all outcomes produced in the most current 3-year period. In general, faculty performance ratings are defined as:

- **Poor:** 0 outcomes from 1-7 with indicators from section 2.1
- **Fair:** 0 outcomes from 1-7 with indicators from section 2.2
- **Good:** 1 outcome from 1-7 with indicators from section 2.3
- **Excellent:** 2-3 outcomes from outcomes 1-7 with indicators from section 2.4
- **Distinguished:** more than 3 outcomes from 1-7 with indicators from section 2.5

#### NOTES:

- It is possible to use the enhancement outcomes to raise performance ratings in a given year. However, the enhance outcomes may not be used towards minimum expectations for tenure and promotion.
- The scholarly and creative activities of tenure-track faculty with fewer than 3 years are evaluated according to progression towards tenure.

#### 2.1. Poor

Demonstrates serious problems in developing scholarship and creative projects as reflected by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative productive is well below department expectations.

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
- Failure to pursue expected professional enhancement activities (e.g., licensure, continuing education, technology training)
- Ethical regulations violated regarding scholarly or artistic production
- Poor time management strategies handicap work output

#### 2.2. Fair

Demonstrates only *minor* tangible progress toward executing a scholarly and creative agenda as shown by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative projects are *moderately below* the department expectations.

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
- Judgment about ethical standards for scholarly and artistic production may be problematic at times
- Questionable time management strategies limit production

### **2.3. Good**

Demonstrates *moderate* tangible progress in scholarship or creative activity agenda as shown by the indicators below but work falls *mildly below* department expectations of excellence.

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 department standards related to the rate of completion or quality of dissemination venue
- Completed projects suggest the potential for significant, high quality scholarship over the candidate's career.
- 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

### **2.4. Excellent**

Demonstrates *satisfactory* execution of scholarship or creative activity agenda as shown by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative projects *meet* the department's expectations of excellence.

Indicators:

- Refined scholarly agenda or creative plan well suited to regional comprehensive university context
- Meets department production targets for both quantity and quality of scholarship
- Potential for wide recognition of quality outside of the University
- 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

### **2.5. Distinguished**

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

Indicators:

- Both quantity and quality measures clearly exceed department expectations

- High profile journal articles
- National or international recognition earned for quality
- Awards received for scholarly or creative projects
- Strong record of grant pursuit, grant awards, successful completion, and dissemination of results
- Campus and/or disciplinary leadership in promoting scholarly and creative projects

### **3. Service**

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

The candidate for tenure and/or promotion should show evidence of at least FOUR years of service to the department, college, university and the professional community while in rank.

#### **Criteria for Evaluating Service**

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

- Service on university, college, and department governance.
- Community service related to one's discipline.
- Advising student organizations.
- Service to professional and student organizations.
- Services related to recruitment and retention of students.
- Service on editorial review boards.
- Service on conference committees.
- Articulation efforts at various levels.
- Outreach activities that promote the department.
- Participation in the activities of local or national professional organizations.
- Assisting in organizing district wide activities such as science fairs, and mathematics competitions.
- Textbook, manuscript and grant reviewing activity.
- Mentoring and assisting new faculty.
- Student advising.

#### **3.1. Poor**

Demonstrates serious problems in fulfilling appropriate service role for faculty as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is well below the department standards for excellence.

*Indicators:*

- Service activity nonexistent or very poor in quality, producing a potentially adverse impact on the goals of the relevant organization.
- Significance of the obligation of service in the faculty role in a regional comprehensive university not apparent (e.g., faculty seems resistant or oblivious to service needs).
- Community service, if applicable, does not in any way provide synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions, for example, serving as the director of a local church choir.

#### **3.2. Fair**

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

*Indicators:*

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

### **3.3. Good**

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

*Indicators:*

- Participates effectively in the service activities listed above.
- Usually participates actively and constructively in service activity.
- Usually effective in service as citizen of department.
- Community service, if applicable, provides reasonable synergy between the faculty member’s area of expertise and the service functions.

### **3.4. Excellent**

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

*Indicators:*

- Participates effectively in the service activities listed above.
- Demonstrates leadership in departmental, college or university committees.
- Community service, if applicable, provides excellent synergy between the faculty member’s area of expertise and the service functions. For example, serving as a judge in a science competition or in a mathematics competition.

### **3.5. Distinguished**

Demonstrates high degree of skill in service contributions as shown by the indicators below that build upon indicators for excellence. In general, service contributions exceed the department standards for excellence.

*Indicators:*

- Participates effectively in the service activities listed above.
- Leadership demonstrated in key college or university committees.
- Community service, if applicable, provided significant and measurable impact; service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member’s area of expertise and the service functions.

### **Review/Revision of these bylaws:**

- ✓ The Department shall review these bylaws at least once every two years. Proposed amendments will be posted to the faculty at least two weeks before the recommendations are brought to a vote.
- ✓ Dates of approval of each current version of this document shall be appended below the document title and annotated at the end.
- ✓ A candidate for tenure/promotion shall elect the set of bylaws in use at the point of employment offer or any set of a later year.

This document was approved by Physics faculty on November 17, 2015.