

UNIVERSITY *of* WEST FLORIDA

Division of Academic Affairs

Policies and Procedures for:

Tenure

Promotion

Annual Evaluation

Sustained Performance Evaluation

2017-2018

Part I: Framework for Decisions

Part II: Administrative Guidelines

ANNUAL EVALUATION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION POLICY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Framework for Decisions	
A. Definition of terms	4
1. Regional comprehensive university	
2. Compliance levels	
3. Criteria and performance indicators	
4. Categories of performance	
B. Tenure and promotion criteria	6
1. University criteria for tenure and promotion	
2. Department criteria for tenure and promotion	
C. Department annual evaluation performance indicators	7
1. Performance indicators for teaching	
2. Performance indicators for creative and scholarly projects	
3. Performance indicators for service	
II. Administrative Guidelines	
A. Tenure	11
1. Eligibility for tenure	
a. Faculty beginning careers at UWF	
b. Faculty transferring to UWF	
2. The role of chair's annual evaluation in tenure review	
3. The department's role in preparation of tenure-track faculty	
4. The role of the department in tenure evaluation	
B. Promotion	13
1. Eligibility for promotion	
a. Promotion to professor	
b. Promotion to associate	
2. The role of the chair's annual evaluation in promotion decisions	
3. The role of the department in promotion evaluation	
C. General principles and processes for tenure and promotion	14
1. Confidentiality	
2. Securing colleague supporting materials	
a. External evaluations	
b. Internal letters of support	
3. Preparing the dossier	
4. Levels of review	
5. Review decisions	

6. Department procedures and/or bylaws	
7. Promotion and tenure review calendar	
D. Special Considerations	17
1. Linkage of tenure and promotion	
2. Enhanced department requirements	
3. Changing department standards	
4. Early review considerations	
5. Joint appointment	
E. Suggested ordering of materials in promotion and tenure dossiers	19
1. Format, scope, and custody of dossier materials	
2. Order of dossier materials	
F. Annual Evaluation procedures	20
1. Evaluation period	
2. Materials	
a. Faculty prepared materials	
b. Student evaluation data	
3. Order of materials for annual evaluation file	
4. Chair's review	
5. Faculty rebuttal	
6. Dean's review	
7. Provost's Review	
8. Review calendar	
G. Sustained Performance Evaluation	24
1. Process	
2. Steps of the SPE Process for Faculty Members	
3. Steps of the SPE Process for Librarians	
4. Dossier for Sustained Performance Evaluation	
5. Performance Improvement Plan	
6. Calendar	

APPENDICES

A. Guidelines for Departmental Annual Performance Indicators	30
B. Evaluation Form for Department Colleague Review for Nominees Being Considered for Promotion	37
C. Evaluation Form for Department Colleague Review for Nominees Being Considered for Tenure	38
D. Secret Ballot by Tenured Members of Department for Nominees Being Considered for Tenure	39

PART I. FRAMEWORK FOR DECISIONS

A. DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. “Regional Comprehensive University”

Henderson (2007) elaborated the following unique features of the regional comprehensive university.¹ Such institutions

- democratize education, making a college education broadly available to students with diverse preparation and motivation;
- focus specific attention on meeting the workforce needs of the region;
- emphasize the importance of effective teaching over research productivity;
- range from medium to large in size;
- concentrate on undergraduate education but offer selected graduate courses at the master’s level and a limited number of doctorates;
- are primarily supported through state funding and tuition.

The term “comprehensive” does not imply that the university will offer every conceivable university program, but instead connotes that the university is multi-purpose and selective in its goals. As such, faculty roles can be diverse in the regional comprehensive university, including those entirely committed to teaching and others whose primary focus is research. However, the majority of faculty will strive to balance commitments across teaching, scholarly and creative projects, and service in accordance with their departments’ mission.

2. Compliance Levels

When describing procedures and requirements, this policy document uses the verbs **must**, **should**, and **may**. The meanings follow:

- a. **Must** implies that the department must comply in all cases, without exception.
- b. **Should** implies a presumptive requirement, and the department is expected to comply in all cases. However, when “should” is used, the *department* may, in certain limited circumstances, deviate from the requirement. Deviations should be the exception, not the rule, and should be justified by the department during the review process.
- c. **May** indicates a polite suggestion that departments are encouraged to address, if appropriate.

¹ Henderson, B.B. (2007). *Teaching at the people’s university: An introduction to the state comprehensive university*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

3. Criteria and Performance Indicators

- a. “University tenure and promotion criteria” addresses expectations about aspects of performance for major personnel decisions that are common across departments and programs.
- b. “Department tenure and promotion criteria” refers to the expectations departments develop for purposes of tenure and promotion decisions.
- c. “Department annual evaluation performance indicators” describes how departments adapt university criteria to fit their disciplines. Performance indicators reflect activities that faculty must have actually accomplished so that personnel committees can fairly evaluate whether a candidate satisfies the university and department expectations. These indicators might also be viewed as outcome measures, as they capture the outcomes that are expected for achieving a given performance rating.

4. Categories of Performance

These adjectives are ordinal rankings of the department annual evaluation performance criteria: **distinguished, excellent, good, fair, poor**. Departments *must* use performance criteria that reflect the same ordinal scale and the same adjectives to depict that scale.

Distinguished performance clearly exceeds department expectations for excellence.

Excellent performance is defined as meeting department expectations; no major areas of weakness exist.

Good performance indicates *moderate* progress in a given area but one or more weaknesses render the performance not quite to the expectations of *excellence* in the department.

Fair performance suggests minor progress in an evaluation area because one or more major weaknesses exist in performance. Although there may be one or more strengths as well, the performance clearly is not consistent with the department’s expectations for excellence. Performance at this level warrants remediation planning.

Poor performance is characterized as having *substantial* weaknesses that jeopardize professional progress as a UWF faculty member. Performance at this level requires remediation activity. In extreme cases, out-counseling may be the most appropriate course of action to assist the faculty to find an institution that will be a better match for the faculty member’s abilities, values, and/or work ethics.

B. TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA

1. University Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

This section describes the university criteria for promotion and tenure for regular, full-time, tenure earning faculty.

Reflecting the mission of UWF as a regional comprehensive university, the university criteria emphasize 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		

2. Department Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

Departments should strive to create tenure and promotion evaluation criteria that are as straightforward and transparent as possible. Department tenure and promotion criteria **must** clearly state how ordinal annual evaluation rankings (along with other factors the department determines are important) translate to the conclusions drawn in tenure and promotion decisions as shown in Table 1.

Candidates for tenure and promotion are responsible for assembling portfolios in which the weight of evidence documents sustained performance at the appropriate levels required for favorable decisions. Departments **should** provide guidance to faculty on what constitutes acceptable sustained performance. For example, departments **may** require a specific level of achievement for two or three years as evidence of readiness for promotion or tenure. Departments **may** also establish a target number of publications, creative works, or performances that must take place during the evaluation period.

C. DEPARTMENT ANNUAL EVALUATION PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Departments should devise Annual Evaluation Performance Indicators that reflect the mission of the university and department. In each of the three areas (teaching, scholarship/creative projects, and service) departments **must** develop specific and measurable performance indicators that address the following:

- *Quality criteria relevant to each activity;*
- *The frequency of activities and outcomes expected within review period, where relevant.*

Performance indicators **must** clearly distinguish the differences between and among performance criteria (ordinal rankings: distinguished, excellent, good, fair, and poor). Appendix A provides university-level behavioral criteria for the five levels of performance that guide department discussions of their criteria.

1. Performance Indicators for Teaching

Because high-quality teaching is critical to the university's *regional comprehensive* mission and vision, excellent performance is required for all tenure and promotion decisions. Teaching includes all teaching and learning activities in and out of the classroom that result in relevant, appropriate course learning outcomes, including the following:

- *Face-to-face classroom teaching at Pensacola or branch campuses*
- *Online teaching*
- *Teaching in distance learning circumstances*
- *Research group and one-on-one supervision and mentoring*
- *Studio teaching in group or one-on-one formats*
- *Continuing education assignments*
- *Advising*

Department performance indicators for teaching **should** include student evaluations of teaching. Conclusions drawn about teaching performance **may** also be influenced by the following indicators:

- a. Teaching awards and other accomplishments related to teaching
- b. Peer evaluations of teaching
- c. Pedagogical and quality enhancement activities that improve learning (e.g., active learning and student engagement techniques)
- d. Participation in professional development activities that improve teaching
- e. Respect for students and their rights
- f. Quality of teaching philosophy
- g. Quality of syllabi and course goals
- h. Effectiveness of assessment practices
- i. Evidence of student support practices
- j. Effectiveness of advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices
- k. Quality of execution of special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, General Studies)
- l. Quality of supervision of thesis, dissertations, or field experiences
- m. Other relevant performance indicators specified by the department

2. Performance Indicators for Scholarship and Creative Projects

Departments **must** adopt performance indicators for scholarship and creative projects, taking into consideration issues of both quality and frequency of production, where relevant, that are consistent with the university's mission, vision, and resources to support scholarly and creative work. Accordingly, departments **should** consider a broad range of activities that express their mission and vision. Moreover, departments **should** recognize that regional comprehensive universities have limited resources that may constrain scholarly expectations (e.g., relatively limited travel support diminishes the opportunity for international participation).

Scholarship and creative projects **must** be externally reviewed and publicly available. These projects include the following:

- Creation, production, exhibition, artistic performance, or publication of works by one or more individuals demonstrating originality in design or execution
- Discovery of new knowledge
- Development of new technologies, pedagogy, methods, materials, or uses
- Integration of knowledge leading to new understanding
- Application of knowledge to consequential problems

Departments **should** consider and address a wide range of venues for disseminating scholarly and creative projects, including the following:

- Peer-reviewed publications
- Editorially reviewed publications

- Convention and conference contributions
- Grant activity
- Electronic outlets
- Broad performance venues for the creative and performing arts
- Other performance indicators for service *deemed acceptable to the department*

Conclusions drawn about the quality of scholarly and creative projects **may** be influenced by the following performance indicators:

- a. Recognition or awards earned
- b. Scholarly or creative projects agenda or creative plan
- c. Peer reviews or other evidence of quality
- d. Adherence to ethical standards
- e. Professional development activity (e.g., licensure, technology training, etc.)
- f. External grants or other support to facilitate scholarship or creative activities
- g. Time management skills
- h. Skilled use of collaboration as demonstrated by the commitments proposed, accepted, and fulfilled (e.g., group projects, creative activities, and grants)
- i. Other relevant performance indicators specified by the department

3. Performance Indicators for Service

Departments **must** adopt performance indicators for service, taking into consideration issues of both quality and frequency, which are consistent with the university's mission and vision. Moreover, departments **should** recognize that service is relatively more important in a regional comprehensive university than what might be expected at a research-intensive university.

Service activities may include the following:

- Service to university or college or department
- Discipline-related service to the community
- Service as Department Chair or Program Director
- Unremunerated consultancies
- Community activities related to one's discipline
- Advising student organizations
- Service to academic or professional organizations (e.g., editorial review boards, organization leadership; conference organizer)
- Travel time to and from remote campuses locations

Although there is no specific requirement about the balance of service activities that faculty should select, there is an expectation that the faculty member will function effectively as a department citizen, assisting in completing the work of the department's programs.

Faculty will vary in their execution of a service plan. For example, service may reasonably emphasize activity on the campus at the expense of the other options where that plan works with the university and department missions. In such a case, greater depth of service would be expected.

As faculty progress in their service commitments, the general trend is to move from less involved participation (e.g., "sitting" on a committee and being reactive to emerging plans) through more intense investment (e.g., exercising leadership and solving service problems proactively).

At the outset of employment, service activities are likely to be the relatively lowest priority of the three categories. As such, department Chairs and Program Directors should advise new faculty about the necessity of service in a regional comprehensive university and how these activities can be incorporated strategically into their work assignments. Service expectations should be somewhat lighter for new faculty who are establishing themselves as teachers and scholars/artists, but new faculty should ultimately be encouraged to render high quality service in their selected activities. Departments should provide equitable access to service opportunities for all members and be reasonable in making service assignments that fit with other faculty responsibilities.

Community service is more valuable when it is related to a faculty member's disciplinary background. For example, a biology professor serving as the director of a local church choir would not represent service contributions for the purpose of promotion and tenure evaluation. However, such service for a music professor probably would. Departments' performance indicators *may* address how compensated service should be evaluated in the context of their discipline and department.

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

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

PART II. ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDELINES

A. TENURE

1. Eligibility for Tenure

- a. **Faculty beginning careers at UWF.** Candidates for tenure must submit for tenure review no later than the fall of the 6th year of employment. Candidates for tenure with unusually strong performance records may submit for review no earlier than the fall of the 5th year.
- b. **Faculty transferring to UWF.** Faculty members may negotiate up to 2 years of credit toward tenure based on past performance. The initial appointment letter must clearly identify the number of years of credit toward tenure. When the Dean grants 2 years of credit toward tenure, regular consideration for tenure will transpire in the fall of the 4th year of employment. Early consideration for tenure, in cases where candidates demonstrate unusually strong performance, will initiate tenure review in the fall of the 3rd year. In cases for which service outside UWF produced credit toward tenure, a copy of the initial appointment letter documenting this credit must be included in the portfolio. Any subsequent changes to years of credit toward tenure also must be documented and included in the portfolio.

2. The Role of Chair's Annual Evaluation in Tenure Review

The Chair's annual evaluations provide systematic feedback to the faculty member over the course of employment. The Chair shall evaluate each faculty member annually in writing, assess progress toward tenure and promotion, give the faculty member a copy of the written evaluation, and discuss the written evaluation with the faculty member. If the evaluation reflects deficiencies in the faculty member's performance, the Chair shall make specific suggestions to give the faculty member an opportunity to improve performance, thereby enhancing the likelihood of successful tenure and/or promotion. The faculty member may submit a rebuttal to the annual evaluation that will become part of the official file.

The Chair's annual evaluations should carry some degree of weight in tenure and promotion decisions; however, this perspective represents just one component of the formal review process. At each level of review, the candidate's accomplishments are subject to professional and peer scrutiny. Therefore, strong annual evaluations represent summative feedback about faculty performance but cannot be construed as a guarantee of either tenure or promotion.

3. The Department's Role in Preparation of Tenure-Track Faculty

Departments must have a procedure devoted to mentoring new faculty. Departments have the responsibility for designing and maintaining a mentoring program that facilitates new faculty members' professional growth and adaptation to the university.

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

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

All mid-point reviews should address the performance of annual assignments including teaching, scholarly and creative projects, and service occurring during the preceding tenure-earning years of employment. In addition, all reviews should assess overall performance and contributions critically in light of mid-point expectations. 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.

4. The Role of the Department in Tenure Evaluation

The Chair will request all tenured full-time faculty members to submit a formal evaluation on tenure for each eligible faculty member within the appropriate unit. (See Appendix C.) The evaluation form should be completed and signed by each faculty member and submitted to the Chair. Other full-time faculty (excluding visiting faculty) may provide the Chair with opinions of the candidate's dossier. On a separate document, all tenured faculty in the department or unit shall vote regarding the acceptability of tenure for the candidate. The unsigned votes will be included in the tenure dossier in an envelope without disclosure of how individual faculty voted in the decision. (See Appendix D for the form on which to record the results of the secret ballot.)

B. PROMOTION

1. Eligibility for Promotion

The faculty member and the Chair shall confer about the readiness of the faculty member as a candidate for promotion. The process of submitting a dossier for consideration for promotion shall be initiated upon request of the faculty member or upon agreement between the faculty member and Chair. The Chair will forward the request to the Dean.

Eligibility for promotion involves both quality of performance and time served in existing rank. Candidates will typically be considered worthy of promotion when their annual evaluations demonstrate quality in performance consistent for three prior years with the expected level of performance for the rank to which the candidate aspires. Candidates will also have to achieve any specific targets for production of scholarly and creative projects that are identified in department by-laws, criteria or policies.

If candidates do not succeed in their bid for promotion, they should refrain from immediate resubmission unless the intervening changes show substantial improvements. Results of all prior unsuccessful reviews shall be required in subsequent promotion reviews.

- a. **Promotion to Professor.** Candidates for Professor will typically complete at least 5 years of employment at the associate level, 3 of which should transpire at UWF. Candidates may submit for review after the completion of 4 years of employment at the associate level, at least 3 years of which have transpired at UWF, in exceptional cases where annual evaluations point to success in meeting performance expectations. A candidate being reviewed for promotion to Professor should demonstrate at least excellent ratings in all areas of review (teaching, scholarly and creative projects, and service) and at least 1 area should be rated as distinguished in the 3 years immediately preceding submission of the dossier. The distinguished rating can be in different areas over the course of the 3 years but a minimum of one distinguished rating each year must be reflected in the evaluation.
- b. **Promotion to Associate.** Candidates for Associate Professor will typically complete 5 years of employment at the assistant professor level before submitting a dossier for review in the fall of the 6th year. Candidates may submit for review after the completion of 4 years of employment in exceptional cases where annual evaluations point to success in meeting performance expectations for the preceding 3-year period. A candidate being reviewed for promotion to Associate

Professor should be expected to have at least excellent ratings in all 3 categories of review for 3 years at UWF prior to submission of the dossier.

2. The Role of the Chair's Annual Evaluation in Promotion Decisions

The Chair shall be responsible for keeping the faculty member informed about the Chair's assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments and progress toward promotion. Candidates and administrators should refer to relevant articles in the Collective Bargaining Agreement for guidance.

3. The Role of the Department Members in Promotion Evaluation

The Chair will request all full-time faculty (excluding visiting faculty) in the department or unit to submit an evaluation on promotion for the promotion candidate. (See Appendix B.) The evaluation form should be completed and signed by each faculty member and submitted to the Chair. Should a faculty member decline to submit an evaluation of a colleague, the faculty member should return the evaluation with a notation that the faculty member declined to complete an evaluation. The decision to decline the evaluation will be placed in the promotion file without attribution to the source of the decision. Promotion recommendations do not require a formal vote; however, eligible faculty members should provide input on this important decision.

In cases where there are fewer than three tenured faculty to assist in making the promotion evaluation decisions, the respective college council shall develop a procedure to provide an additional evaluation method. Chairs shall notify the college council at the start of the academic year when an alternative needs to be implemented.

C. GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND PROCESSES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

- 1. Confidentiality.** All evaluators, including faculty, Chairs, Deans, and committee members as well as staff members who assist in the process shall keep all recommendations and committee deliberations in strict confidence.
- 2. Securing colleague supporting materials.** Candidates will secure a total of 6 colleague evaluations for inclusion in their dossiers.
 - a. External evaluations.** In consultation with the candidate, the Chair must secure 3 evaluation letters for personnel decisions (tenure and/or promotion) from knowledgeable peers outside the university who have expertise in the candidate's discipline. For these letters, peers should be in a position to make independent judgments. The evaluators should specify how long and in what capacity they have known the candidate and include an abbreviated curriculum vita. Prior to

the consideration of the faculty member's candidacy, the candidate should review the contents of the relevant file and may attach a brief response to any materials therein.

- b. **Internal letters of support.** Candidates must include 3 letters of support from knowledgeable peers within the university (outside the home department).
3. **Preparing the dossier.** Faculty members are encouraged to consult with the Chair as a mentor to facilitate the smoothest preparation process possible; however, ultimately the candidate shall be responsible for including all pertinent information in the dossier in the recommended order and meeting appropriate deadlines. The Chair shall assist the candidate with preparation of the dossier and shall make available to the candidate all necessary materials, information, and forms.
4. **Levels of Review.** Before the President makes a final decision on the status of the application, the candidate's dossier will undergo sequential review by the following entities:
 - the department and Chair;
 - the College Faculty Personnel Committee (CFPC);
 - the Dean;
 - the University Personnel Committee (UFPC); and
 - the Provost.

Each review judgment should be regarded as independent and advisory.

A review by the UFPC will be required if there are any negative reviews from any prior reviewing bodies. Additionally, the Provost may request a UFPC review if he or she believes that further deliberation and input will facilitate the most defensible decision. Any candidate may also request a review by the UFPC.

A review by the UFPC will not be required under the following conditions:

- a) The departmental faculty render majority support or tie vote in favor of the candidate; *and*
- b) The Chair agrees with the majority (or breaks the tie) in favor of the candidate; *and*
- c) The CFPC agrees in favor of the candidate, with no negative opinions; *and*
- d) The Dean agrees in favor of the candidate.

In summary, a candidate whose dossier produces no negative feedback through the Dean's level of review should not expect to be reviewed by the UFPC unless extenuating circumstances prompt to the Provost to ask for additional assistance from the UFPC.

The President shall recommend to the University Board of Trustees on all tenure matters, taking into account the recommendations of all groups or individuals described in this statement. Promotion decisions do not go before the Board for confirmation, which means the President is the final authority in these decisions.

5. **Review Decisions.** All reviewers shall exercise independent judgment. Each decision, starting with the decision rendered by the Chair, must be accompanied by a rationale for the decision rendered. When a decision is unfavorable, the rationale should provide sufficient detail to enable the candidate to address the concerns in a rebuttal. The conclusions of the CFPC and UFPC committee must reveal the vote tally; however, the decision must not disclose how individual committee members voted in the decision.
6. **Department Procedures and/or Bylaws.** Departments shall ensure that relevant department procedures and/or bylaws are in accord with the principles outlined in this document.
7. **Promotion and Tenure Review Calendar.** The following represents the schedule by which the various levels of decisions will be rendered for promotion and tenure.

2017

JUN 30	The Dean shall provide to each Chair a list of faculty members eligible to apply for tenure and promotion in the Chair's department.
SEP 1	Deadline for those faculty members with credit towards tenure to withdraw all or a portion of such credit. (May only be withdrawn once)
SEP 8	Candidate provides curriculum vitae (CV) update and other materials as set out on page 19, Suggested Ordering of Materials in Promotion and Tenure Dossiers.)
SEP 29	Chair requests peer evaluations and confers with candidate.
OCT 30	Chair adds his/her evaluation to the dossier and must assure that a copy of his/her evaluation is accessible by the candidate no later than this date.
NOV 6	Candidate adds rebuttal letter (if he/she chooses) to the dossier. Chair forwards dossier to the Dean.
NOV 7	Dean forwards the dossier to the College Faculty Personnel Committee (CFPC).
DEC 1	CFPC adds its recommendation and returns the dossier to Dean. CFPC must assure that a copy of the recommendation is accessible by the candidate no later than this date.

DEC 8 Candidate provides a rebuttal letter (if he/she chooses). The Dean includes the rebuttal in the dossier.

2018

JAN 5 Dean adds his/her recommendation to the dossier and must assure that a copy of the recommendation is accessible by the candidate no later than this date. Dean also informs the members of CFPC regarding his/her recommendation and sends a copy of recommendation to the candidate's Chair.

JAN 12 Candidate provides a rebuttal letter (if he/she chooses). The Dean includes the rebuttal in the dossier.

JAN 16 Dean forwards complete dossier to Provost who forwards dossier to University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC), when necessary.

FEB 12 UFPC adds its recommendation and forwards complete dossier to Provost. UFPC sends a copy of the recommendation to the candidate, Chair, and Dean.

FEB 19 Candidate provides a rebuttal letter to Provost, if he/she chooses, to be included in dossier.

MAR 15 *Deadline for withdrawal for tenure and/or promotion consideration.*

MAR 19 Provost adds his/her recommendation and sends a copy to candidate, Chair, Dean, and members of the CFPC and UFPC.

MAR 26 Candidate provides a rebuttal letter (if he/she chooses). The Provost includes the rebuttal in the dossier.

MAR 27 President receives complete dossier.

APR 23 President informs the candidate of the promotion decision and/or tenure recommendation, in writing, with copies to Chair, Dean, Provost, and the Chairs of the CFPC and UFPC. Dossier returned to Deans' Office.

D. SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. Linkage of Tenure and Promotion

Many candidates will go up for promotion to associate and tenure at the same time; however, that linkage is not a university requirement. Reviewers should recommend tenure, but not promotion, only when they have confidence that the candidate is close to qualifying for promotion. Otherwise, departments may end up with the challenge of having made a career commitment to a faculty member who will be

unable to realize the full range of faculty demands during their careers at the university, perhaps having an adverse long-range impact on the quality or scope of what the department can accomplish.

2. Enhanced Department Requirements

Departments can exercise more stringent performance requirements than the university standards as described in Part I, as long as they are consistent with the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Such enhancements must be clearly identified in department bylaws as enhancements beyond university standards so reviewers who do not share the department's disciplinary orientation can understand and support the department's standards.

3. Changing Department Standards

When departments choose to change or enhance their standards, the UFPC must review these proposed changes. Changes in department standards must be consistent with the applicable provisions in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

4. Early Review Considerations

Some candidates for tenure and/or promotion may be inclined to take advantage of the option to go up early for review for tenure or promotion. In general, candidates should only go up early when the history of work supports a favorable and easy decision at all levels of review. If the candidate is unsuccessful in an early bid for tenure and/or promotion, the results of the first review along with any recommendations made by the reviewing body will be included in any subsequent review.

5. Joint Appointment

If a faculty member is hired as a joint appointment, the Chairs of the respective departments will confer at the time of the appointment to determine which department will serve as the primary for administrative purposes. The Chair of the primary department shall be responsible for personnel decision processes, but is obliged to confer with the Chair of the secondary department before rendering judgment. The relevant departments shall confer regarding how the faculty member's scholarly or creative agenda should relate to relevant evaluation criteria. If an existing faculty member's status is changed to a joint appointment, the administrative responsibilities between the departments should be determined at the point the change in status transpires. In a joint appointment, the standard for scholarly production should be a hybrid of the two departments' expectations; the faculty in a shared appointment should not be expected to meet separate production targets for both departments.

E. SUGGESTED ORDERING OF MATERIALS IN PROMOTION AND TENURE DOSSIERS

1. Format, Scope, and Custody of Dossier Materials

To facilitate the work of review committees and responsible University officials, candidates applying for promotion and/or tenure should arrange their binders and supporting material in the order listed below. Candidates are limited to only one 3-ring binder (up to 3" in size) and one box for supporting materials (primarily the candidate's scholarly and creative projects).

When a candidate is applying for promotion and tenure in the same year, one portfolio should be used for both with a divider marking off the section for official recommendations for promotion.

Candidates should restrict the inclusion of materials in their evaluation files to those that are germane to fair consideration of candidate's contributions. Evaluation files that include irrelevant or redundant materials inhibit the work of committees and administrators and are inimical to the best interests of the faculty member and the institution.

Once the candidate submits the dossier, the custody of the dossier moves from Chair to Dean to Provost, in accordance with the tenure and promotion schedule. Should the candidate wish to include additional material after submitting the dossier, the custodian of the dossier will indicate date of receipt on the added materials. The custodian must notify the candidate if materials (e.g., late-arriving evaluations) are added to the file after submission. A copy of the materials will be sent to the faculty member within 5 days. See the Collective Bargaining Agreement for additional detail. Materials added after submission shall not trigger reevaluation from reviewers who have already rendered judgment.

2. Order of Dossier Materials

- a. A copy of the approved departmental promotion and tenure criteria.
- b. Statement of contributions justifying tenure and/or promotion. This statement should include the candidate's self-evaluation concerning teaching, creative and scholarly activities, and service. The candidate should address not only the quantity but the quality and significance of his/her work.
- c. Curriculum Vitae (CV). The CV should clearly define publication headings; e.g., books and other monographs, journal articles, conference proceedings, and technical reports. Published items and items forthcoming should be clearly distinguished and separately listed. The CV should also distinguish work that is peer reviewed.
- d. Letter of initial appointment.

- e. Annual work assignments and Chair's evaluations of the candidate's performance since joining UWF or since his/her last promotion. Candidates may initially choose to redact the Chair's statements regarding progress toward tenure; however, the candidate must honor a request from any reviewer to submit the statements of progress.
- f. Student evaluation data. Candidates must submit numerical results of all student course evaluations that have been conducted during the 3 years preceding the review. Those who have been on sabbatical or leave during the preceding 3 years should submit all student course evaluations conducted over the 4 years preceding the review. Ideally the 3 most recent years of student evaluation data should be considered. If any data are missing for any other reason, the candidate shall offer an explanation.
- g. External evaluations (3 letters, extra letters may be placed in bin).
- h. Internal letters of support (3 letters from UWF colleagues outside the home department).
- i. Departmental peer evaluations.
- j. Secret ballot results (in the case of tenure).
- k. Recommendation of Chair. (Any rebuttal letter.)
- l. Recommendation of CFPC (including the vote tally). (Any rebuttal letter.)
- m. Recommendation of Dean. (Any rebuttal letter.)
- n. Recommendation of UFPC (including the vote tally). (Any rebuttal letter.)
- o. Recommendation of Provost. (Any rebuttal letter.)
- p. Documentation of special circumstances. Any situations that require a departure from expected procedure should be documented in this section. Examples include:
 - If a candidate has been unsuccessful in a prior application for tenure and/or promotion, the candidate must include the judgments and recommendations (Chair, CFPC, Dean, UFPC, Provost, and President) from the prior deliberation in this section of the current dossier.
 - If a candidate or Chair has requested materials to be included after the dossier has been submitted, the cover letter making the request should be included in this section of the current dossier.
- q. List of supporting materials, e.g., books, reprints, and research reports. (Examples of scholarship and/or creative activity should be submitted in a separate container along with selected materials addressing teaching and service.)

F. ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES

1. Evaluation Period

The evaluation period should correspond to the type of appointment. For example, 12-month faculty should be evaluated over the entire year whereas 9-month faculty should

be evaluated only for those semesters included in the regular contract; summer teaching for 9 month faculty members should not be included.

2. Materials

a. Faculty Prepared Materials

For the evaluation period, the faculty member will prepare the following for submission to the Chair:

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

Examples of appropriate contributions may include the following:

- a) indication of high quality of course-related student contacts, including advising, counseling, student conferences, and thesis and/or intern supervision;
- b) high quality of course syllabi that provide appropriate and clear direction, including articulation of student learning outcomes;
- c) evidence of appropriately rigorous intellectual demands made upon students, including examples of high quality of test design or assignments;
- d) peer or Chair classroom evaluation;
- e) assessment data reflecting appropriate student progress in mastering course content and achieving course outcomes;
- f) description of substantial revision of established courses or development and teaching of new courses;
- g) description of professional growth that will enhance the faculty member's value as a teacher;

- h) peer evaluations that identify progress made toward achieving pedagogical goals;
- i) evidence of quality derived from peer reviewed process related to a performance or scholarly work;
- j) a formal note of appreciation for service that emphasizes scope of impact or significance of service; and
- k) self-assessment that highlights how submitted material supports success in fulfilling course objectives and achievement at a particular performance level.

b. Student Evaluation Data

Student evaluations will be conducted on all courses and all sections for the contract period. The faculty member has access to the evaluations only after grades in the courses have been assigned.

Candidates must submit numerical and narrative student comments on all courses conducted during the regular academic year. Candidates may choose to submit additional evaluation material from the summer session, but it is not required.

3. Order of Materials for Annual Evaluation File

- a. Assignment letter;
- b. Statement of contributions;
- c. CAERS form or equivalent;
- d. Updated vita;
- e. Student Evaluation Data;
- f. Any relevant materials that support the evaluation;
- g. Chair's evaluation and appraisal of progress toward tenure and promotion;
- h. Dean's evaluation; and
- i. Rebuttal letters, if any, should be placed immediately following the rebutted evaluation.

4. The Chair's Review

The Chair and faculty member discuss the evidence the faculty member has submitted. The Chair considers and weighs all evidence relevant to the decision and produces a defensible judgment that is subsequently reported to the faculty member. The Chair may propose that judgment as tentative and request further feedback and discussion from the faculty member. The Chair's judgment will include both quality of performance during the academic year as well as estimate progress, or lack thereof, toward relevant tenure and promotion decisions.

Both the Chair and the faculty member sign the evaluation. Faculty signature signifies that the discussion has been conducted. It does not connote agreement with the Chair's conclusions. The Chair submits to the Dean the total annual evaluation file on which the Chair's judgment was based.

5. Faculty Rebuttal

A faculty member who is convinced that the Chair has rendered judgment that underestimates performance is encouraged to submit a written rebuttal to the Chair's evaluation, which becomes an official part of the annual evaluation file.

6. Dean's Review

The Dean's judgment about both annual performance and progress of tenure and promotion decisions must be rendered in writing. Any unresolved differences between Chair and Dean evaluations shall be discussed concurrently among the Chair, Dean, and faculty member. Either the Chair or Dean can initiate a meeting to address and resolve the difference in opinion.

7. Provost's Review

Generally, only those annual evaluations for tenure-earning faculty will be forwarded to the Provost for review.

8. Review Calendar for Annual Evaluations

The calendar governing annual evaluations should be followed by all parties involved in the process and should reflect the general targets below:

2018

MAY 30	Faculty member provides evaluation file to Chair.
JUN 20	Chair shares his/her written evaluation with faculty member.
JUN 27	Faculty provides a rebuttal letter (if he/she chooses) which is added to the evaluation file. The complete file is then forwarded to the Dean.
JUL 18	Dean provides his/her written evaluation to the faculty member.
JUL 25	Faculty provides a rebuttal letter (if he/she chooses) which is added to the evaluation file. The complete file is then forwarded to the Provost (<i>tenure-earning faculty only</i>).

AUG 15

Provost reviews annual evaluations, for tenure-earning faculty, and returns evaluation file to the Dean.

G. SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

1. Process

Based on the Collective Bargaining Agreement (2014-2017), the Sustained Performance Evaluation Process has changed. *Please reference CBA articles **11.1 (b)** and **11.3 (b)** for full details.*

Tenured Professors and Associate Professors, University Librarians and Associate University Librarians will receive a Sustained Performance Evaluation. *CBA 11.1 (b)*

The purpose of the Sustained Performance Evaluation is to assess the faculty member's sustained performance and professional growth as of the date of the evaluation. The expectations for sustained performance shall be aligned with the qualifications for tenure in place at the time of the evaluation. For faculty in the ranks of Librarian or Associate University Librarian, the expectation shall be aligned with the qualifications for promotion in place at the time of the evaluation. *CBA 11.3 (b)(1)*

The Sustained Performance Evaluation shall be conducted in the tenured faculty member's sixth (6th) year after receiving tenure and every sixth (6th) year thereafter and will evaluate the faculty member on his or her performance over the previous six (6) year period. **Each faculty member may elect a one (1) year deferral once in his or her career at UWF.** This would allow the sustained performance evaluation to be conducted in the seventh (7th) year. For University Librarians and Associate University Librarians this Sustained Performance Evaluation shall be conducted the sixth (6th) year after appointment or promotion to the rank of University Librarian or Associate University Librarian and every sixth (6th) year thereafter. *CBA 11.3 (b)(2)*

There are three tiers for the Sustained Performance Evaluation. The attainment of **Distinguished (Tier One)** shall reflect distinction that clearly exceeds the University and departmental tenure standards and expectations in place at the time of the evaluation for excellence in quantity, quality or both. The attainment of **Satisfactory (Tier Two)** shall satisfy the University and departmental tenure standards and expectations in place at the time of the evaluation for excellence in quantity, quality or both. An evaluation that is **Unsatisfactory (Tier Three)** reflects performance that does not satisfy the University and departmental tenure standards and expectations in place at the time of the evaluation for excellence in quantity, quality or both. A Tier Three Rating will require the faculty member to enter into a formal Performance Improvement Plan. University

Librarians and Associate University Librarians will be evaluated in the same manner except that the University and departmental promotion standards and expectations in place at the time of the evaluation will apply. *CBA 11.3 (b)(3)*

Faculty receiving a ‘Distinguished’ (*Tier 1*) or ‘Satisfactory’ (*Tier 2*) evaluation are eligible for a base salary increase. Faculty receiving an ‘Unsatisfactory’ (*Tier 3*) evaluation are not eligible. *CBA 11.3 (b)(4)* is summarized in the chart below.

Rank	SPE Tier	Increase
Professor / University Librarian	Tier 1	\$6,000
Professor / University Librarian	Tier 2	\$4,000
Professor / University Librarian	Tier 3	no increase
Assoc. Professor / Assoc. Univ. Librarian	Tier 1	\$3,000
Assoc. Professor / Assoc. Univ. Librarian	Tier 2	\$2,000
Assoc. Professor / Assoc. Univ. Librarian	Tier 3	no increase

2. Steps of the SPE Evaluative Process for Faculty Members.

The Faculty Member submits his or her dossier to his or her Chair, Director, or Unit Head for review. The Chair/Director/Unit Head will make a recommendation regarding whether the employee has met the University and departmental tenure criteria in place at the time of the evaluation. The dossier will be forwarded to the Dean. The Dean will ask the College Faculty Personnel Committee (CFPC) to make a recommendation on the same question. The Dean will then review the dossier and the recommendation of the CFPC, and make a recommendation to the Provost regarding whether the tenure criteria in place at the time of the evaluation were met and recommend to the Provost the SPE Tier at which the employee should be ranked. The Provost will review the dossier and consider the recommendations of the Chair/Director/Unit Head, CFPC, and Dean. The Provost will make a final decision on whether the employee has met the University and departmental tenure criteria in place at the time of the evaluation, and will assign the employee an SPE ranking of Tier One, Tier Two or Tier Three.

3. Steps of the SPE Evaluative Process for Librarians.

The Librarian will submit his or her SPE binder to the Library Faculty Committee (LFC) subcommittee for review. The Committee will make a recommendation to the employee’s supervisor regarding whether the employee met the applicable promotion criteria in place at the time of the evaluation. The supervisor will review the SPE binder and the LFC recommendation and make a recommendation to the Dean of Libraries. The Dean will review the dossier, recommendations of the supervisor and LFC, and make a recommendation to the Provost regarding whether the employee met the applicable promotion criteria in place at the time of the evaluation and regarding the SPE Tier at which the employee should be ranked. The Provost will make a final decision

on whether the employee has met the applicable promotion criteria in place at the time of the evaluation and assign the employee an SPE ranking of Tier One, Tier Two or Tier Three.

4. Dossier for Sustained Performance Evaluation*

All materials, except for supporting documents, should be submitted in a 3-ring binder (up to 3" in size).

The materials to be submitted by the faculty member being evaluated will be the same as an application for tenure or in the case of a University Librarian or Associate University Librarian as an application for promotion. There shall be no internal or external letters of recommendation included in the submission. Evidence of sustained performance must be substantive and detailed with documentation. *CBA 11.3 (b)(6)*

The faculty member's dossier for the Sustained Performance Evaluation shall be submitted to the faculty member's Department Chair for review and a recommendation to the Dean. The Dean will ask the College Faculty Personnel Committee for a recommendation. The Dean will make a separate review and recommendation to the Provost. The recommendations of the Chair, College Faculty Personnel Committee and Dean will be submitted to the Provost who will conduct a separate review and make a final decision. *CBA 11.3 (b)(7)*

**Librarians should refer to the Policies and Procedures for Assignment, Evaluation, Merit & Promotion.*

Order of Materials

- 1) A copy of the approved, current, departmental tenure criteria.
- 2) Statement of contributions justifying sustained performance and establishing how the employee meets the tenure criteria in place at the time of the evaluation. This statement should include the faculty member's self-evaluation concerning teaching, creative and scholarly activities, and service. The faculty member should address not only the quantity but the quality and significance of his/her work.
- 3) Curriculum Vitae (CV). The CV should clearly define publication headings; e.g., books and other monographs, journal articles, conference proceedings, and technical reports. Published items and items forthcoming should be clearly distinguished and separately listed. The CV should also distinguish work that is peer reviewed.
- 4) Letter conveying tenure and letter conveying of promotion to highest rank.
- 5) Annual work assignments and Chair's evaluations of the faculty member's performance for the previous six (6) year period.

- 6) Student evaluation data. Faculty members must submit numerical results of all student course evaluations that have been conducted during the 3 years preceding the review. Those who have been on sabbatical or leave during the preceding 3 years should submit all student course evaluations conducted over the 4 years preceding the review. Ideally the 3 most recent years of student evaluation data should be considered. If any data are missing for any other reason, the candidate shall offer an explanation.
- 7) Recommendation of Chair.
- 8) Letter rebutting Chair's recommendation, if applicable.
- 9) Recommendation of CFPC (including the vote tally).
- 10) Letter rebutting CFPC's recommendation, if applicable.
- 11) Recommendation of Dean.
- 12) Letter rebutting Dean's recommendation, if applicable.
- 13) Documentation of prior SPE ratings.
- 14) Any situations that require a departure from expected procedure should be documented in this section. For example:
 - If a faculty member has requested materials to be included after he or she has submitted the dossier, the cover letter making the request should be included in this section of the current dossier.
- 15) List of supporting materials, e.g., books, reprints, and research reports. (Examples of scholarship and/or creative activity should be submitted in a separate container along with selected materials addressing teaching and service.)

5. Performance Improvement Plan

Faculty receiving "Unsatisfactory" ratings on a sustained performance evaluation will enter into a Performance Improvement Plan. The Performance Improvement Plan will be developed by the Chair in concert with the Dean within thirty (30) days of the date of the evaluation. The faculty member will be provided with an opportunity to provide input into the Performance Improvement Plan. The Performance Improvement Plan shall outline each of the areas needing attention and improvement so that the Faculty member shall meet the tenure standards (or promotion standards for Librarians and Associate Librarians) in place at the time of the evaluation, upon successful completion of the Performance Improvement Plan. The Performance Improvement Plan shall provide specific performance targets and a time period for achieving the targets.

The Performance Improvement Plan must be approved by the Provost. The Chair will meet regularly with the faculty member to review progress toward meeting the performance targets. However, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to attain the performance targets specified in the performance improvement plan within the specified time frame and demonstrate competency in his or her position. *CBA 11.3 (b)(9)*

6. Calendar *(Actions must be completed by dates shown)*

Librarian-specific parts are noted in red.

2017

- MAY 4** The Provost notifies Deans of the Faculty/Librarians who will undergo a SPE during the upcoming academic year.
- MAY 8** Dean's Office notifies Faculty/Librarian, and Chair/Supervisor, that he or she will undergo a Sustained Performance Evaluation during the upcoming academic year.
- SEP 8** Faculty/Librarians who are electing one-time one-year deferral must make election in writing and provide it to Chair/Supervisor by this date. A copy is sent to the Dean and Provost.
- SEP 11** Faculty member provides dossier, including updated CV and all other required materials, to Chair.
Librarian provides dossier, including updated CV and all other required materials, to the Library Personnel Committee (LPC).
- OCT 16** Chair reviews dossier and provides recommendation to the Dean. A copy of recommendation is sent to the faculty member.
LPC reviews dossier and provides recommendation to the Supervisor. A copy of recommendation is sent to librarian.
- OCT 23** If faculty member wishes to rebut, he or she must submit rebuttal to Chair by this date.
If librarian wishes to rebut, he or she must submit rebuttal to Chair by this date.
- OCT 24** Dean forwards dossier to College Faculty Personnel Committee so that it can make a recommendation.
LPC forwards dossier to Supervisor for recommendation.
- NOV 29** College Faculty Personnel Committee adds its recommendation to the dossier and returns it to the Dean. A copy of recommendation is sent to faculty member.
Supervisor reviews dossier and provides recommendation to the Dean. A copy of recommendation is sent to librarian.
- DEC 6** If faculty member wishes to rebut CFPC recommendation, he or she must submit rebuttal to Dean by this date.
If librarian wishes to rebut Supervisor recommendation, he or she must submit rebuttal to Supervisor by this date.

2018

- JAN 8** Dean reviews dossier and makes a recommendation. A copy of recommendation is sent to faculty/librarian.
- JAN 16** If faculty/librarian wishes to rebut Dean's recommendation, he or she must submit rebuttal to Dean by this date.
- JAN 17** Dean provides dossier to Provost.
- FEB 20** Provost informs faculty/librarian of SPE decision in writing, with copies to Chair/Supervisor, College/Library Personnel Committee Chair, and Dean.
- MAR 23** Any Performance Improvement Plan(s) are due to Provost.
- APR 13** Provost reviews and approves. Performance Improvement Plan.

APPENDIX A

GUIDELINES FOR DEPARTMENTAL ANNUAL EVALUATION PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Departments must use scaled performance indicators that clearly delineate the differences between the performance levels of *distinguished*, *excellent*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*. Departments must not merely list the performance indicators without providing guidance about the relative importance of the indicators that are required for each performance level. Moreover, those indicator measures must both cohere with university criteria described in this document and fairly capture unique characteristics of their disciplinary and departmental cultures.

The following sections provide guidelines for departments on how to make appropriate judgments for tenure and promotion recommendations on quality of performance (i.e., distinguished, excellent, good, fair and poor).

TEACHING PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Distinguished Performance

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

Performance indicators that may be used to support distinguished ratings:

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

Excellent Performance

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

Performance indicators that may be used to support excellent ratings:

- a. Student evaluations document consistently positive impact on learning (above average)
- b. Teaching philosophy provides foundation for coherent course planning and activities
- c. Syllabi outlines comprehensive, clear, and appropriate performance expectations
- d. Assessment practices enhance student learning and contribute to department needs
- e. Goals and course content routinely provide evidence of successful continuous improvement effort
- f. Pedagogical practices facilitate optimal learning conditions
- g. Student support practices facilitate optimal student development

- h. Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices receive consistent favorable review
- i. Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, General Studies) executed with expert skill
- j. Appropriate standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights
- k. Participates voluntarily in professional development activities to improve teaching quality and flexibility

Good Performance

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

Performance indicators that may be used to support good ratings:

- a. Student evaluations data document adequate impact on learning
- b. Teaching philosophy expressed in course planning and activities
- c. Syllabi provide reasonably clear and appropriate expectations
- d. Assessment practices support student learning and contribute to department needs
- e. Goals and course content give evidence of continuous improvement effort
- f. Majority of pedagogical practices are appropriate and effective
- g. Majority of student support practices are appropriate and effective
- h. Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices are appropriate and effective
- i. Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, General Studies) executed with reasonable skill
- j. Maintains appropriate standards of academic integrity, including respect for students and their rights
- k. Participates in teaching development activities when directed to do so

Fair Performance

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

Performance indicators that may be used to support fair ratings:

- a. Student evaluations data document areas of moderate concern (ratings below the department average)
- b. Teaching philosophy may not be clearly expressed in course planning and activities
- c. Syllabi need to provide clearer and more appropriate expectations
- d. Assessment practices show some difficulty in supporting student learning and meeting department needs
- e. Goals and course content reflect limited continuous improvement effort
- f. Some pedagogical practices need attention
- g. Some student support practices need improvement

- h. Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices need improvement
- i. Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, General Studies) could be executed with greater competence
- j. Occasional challenges related to academic integrity
- k. Some indications of disrespect for students and their rights
- l. Does not typically participate in teaching development activity

Poor Performance

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

Performance indicators that may be used to support poor ratings:

- a. Student evaluations data document consistent and substantive problems (ratings well below the department average)
- b. Teaching philosophy missing, poorly articulated or poorly expressed in course activities and planning
- c. Syllabi fail to establish clear and relevant expectations
- d. 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)
- e. Goals and course content reflect no continuous improvement efforts
- f. No assistance rendered for department assessment plan
- g. Pedagogical practices are unsound (e.g., disorganization; late, missing, unhelpful feedback; standards too lax or too challenging; routinely poor preparation; disengaging, chaotic, or hostile classroom environment)
- h. Student support practices are unsound (e.g., late or absent for class, not responding to email, not keeping keep office hours, showing favoritism)
- i. Consistent and very negative ratings in advising, mentoring, and supervision of students scholarly or creative activities
- j. Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, General Studies) avoided or poorly executed
- k. Chronic academic integrity concerns identified including evidence of disrespect for students and their rights

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE PROJECTS PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Distinguished Performance

Distinguished performance demonstrates unusually high degree of skill in design and execution of scholarly and creativity projects as shown by the performance indicators below that build upon the performance indicators for excellence. In general, the weight of evidence in this performance *exceeds* department criteria for excellence.

Performance indicators that may be used to support distinguished ratings:

- a. Both quantity and quality measures clearly exceed department expectations
- b. Wide national or international audience
- c. National or international recognition earned for quality
- d. Awards received for scholarly or creative projects
- e. Achievements in continuing professional training show unusual merit
- f. Strong record of grant pursuit, grant awards, successful completion, and dissemination of results

Excellent Performance

Excellent performance demonstrates satisfactory execution of scholarship or creative activity agenda as shown by the performance indicators below.

Performance indicators that may be used to support excellent ratings:

- a. Refined scholarly agenda or creative plan well suited to regional comprehensive university context
- b. Meets department production targets for both quantity and quality of scholarship
- c. Favorable review by and respect from majority of colleagues in the department for scholarly and creative works
- d. Potential for wide recognition of quality outside of the University
- e. Completes appropriate schedule of professional educational opportunities (e.g., licensure, technology training, etc.) in a timely fashion
- f. External support captured to facilitate scholarship or creative activities agenda
- g. Adheres to relevant ethics conventions for scholarly and creative projects
- h. Skilled time management facilitates success of scholarly agenda or creative plan
- i. Skilled use of collaboration as demonstrated by the commitments proposed, accepted, and fulfilled (e.g., group projects, creative activities, and grants)

Good Performance

Good performance demonstrates moderate tangible progress in scholarship or creative activity agenda as shown by the performance indicators below but the weight of evidence suggests that work falls mildly below department standard of excellent.

Performance indicators that may be used to support good ratings:

- a. Specific scholarly agenda or creative plan identified, including appropriate timelines and preferred dissemination or display venues

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

Fair Performance

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

Performance indicators that may be used to support fair ratings:

- a. General focus of interest identified, but falls short of rate of production required for promotion and tenure decisions
- b. Evidence of some completion of beginning stages of scholarly or artistic process, (e.g., data collection, manuscript outline, artistic plan), but falls short of the production required for tenure and promotion decisions
- c. Exploration of possible scholarly collaboration or resource network to help with specific plan
- d. Identification of professional organizations that will support scholarly and creative goals, but not actively involved at this time
- e. Appropriate professional educational opportunities (e.g., licensure, technology training, special educational opportunities) identified
- f. Sources of external support for scholarship or creative activities agenda identified and explored
- g. Judgment about ethical standards for scholarly and artistic production may be problematic at times
- h. Questionable time management strategies limit production
- i. Erratic performance in collaborative activities (e.g., grants, research collaborations, creative performance) negatively influences project quality

Poor Performance

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

Performance indicators that may be used to support poor ratings:

- a. Scholarly agenda or creative plan has not been identified (e.g., central focus of career interest has not materialized)
- b. Minimal pursuit of scholarly and creative projects
- c. Avoidance of professional organization involvement that could help disseminate or display faculty work
- d. Failure to pursue expected professional enhancement activities (e.g., licensure, continuing education, technology training)
- e. Avoidance of grant exploration or pursuit
- f. Ethical regulations violated regarding scholarly or artistic production
- g. Poor time management strategies work output handicap
- h. Unreliability and problematic collaborative skills harm project completion and quality

SERVICE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Distinguished Performance

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

Performance indicators that may be used to support distinguished ratings:

- a. Leadership demonstrated in targeted arenas of service (e.g., holds elected office)
- b. Collaboration is skillful and innovative
- c. Problems solved proactively through vigorous contributions
- d. Wide external recognition (local, national or international audiences) or awards achieved for quality of service contributions
- e. Community service, if applicable, provided significant and measurable impact; service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service function

Excellent Performance

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

Performance indicators that may be used to support excellent ratings:

- a. Scope and effort level meet department criteria
- b. Colleagues view contributions to department as effective
- c. Service agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university mission
- d. Service contributions represent strategic decisions that balance demands from the discipline, department, campus, and community
- e. Potential shown for wide recognition inside and outside of the university

Good Performance

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

Performance indicators that may be used to support good ratings:

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

Fair Performance

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

Performance indicators that may be used to support fair ratings:

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

Poor Performance

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

Performance indicators that may be used to support poor ratings:

- a. Service activity nonexistent or very poor in quality, producing a potentially adverse impact on the goals of the relevant organization
- b. 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)
- c. Community service, if applicable, does not in any way provide synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service function

APPENDIX B

**EVALUATION FORM FOR DEPARTMENT COLLEAGUE REVIEW
FOR NOMINEES BEING CONSIDERED FOR **PROMOTION****

DEPARTMENT OF: _____

COLLEGE OF: _____

UWF policy provides that each nomination for promotion shall be acted upon, with careful consideration being given to the qualifications of the faculty member, including evaluations by colleagues. After carefully reviewing the candidate's dossier, including the departmental criteria for awarding promotion, please complete the evaluation form below which will help in the evaluation process. Please deliver your completed evaluation form to your department chair by **[insert date]**, for inclusion in the dossier being assembled.

PEER EVALUATION FOR: **Insert name** _____

	Distinguished	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Insufficient Information	Not Applicable
Teaching Effectiveness							
Scholarship and Creative Projects							
Service Effectiveness							
Academic Advising Effectiveness							
Interactions With Students							
Disciplinary Expertise							
Works Constructively Within the Department							
Overall Contribution to Your Faculty							
Overall University Contribution							
Overall Candidate Ranking							

Please attach additional comments if needed.

EVALUATOR: _____

DATE: _____

APPENDIX C

**EVALUATION FORM FOR DEPARTMENT COLLEAGUE REVIEW
FOR NOMINEES BEING CONSIDERED FOR **TENURE****

DEPARTMENT OF: Insert name

COLLEGE OF: Insert name

UWF policy provides that each nomination for tenure shall be acted upon, with careful consideration being given to the qualifications of the faculty member, including evaluations by colleagues. After carefully reviewing the candidate’s dossier, including the departmental criteria for awarding tenure, please complete the evaluation form below which will help in the evaluation process. Please deliver your completed evaluation form to your department chair by insert date, for inclusion in the dossier being assembled.

PEER EVALUATION FOR: Insert name

	Distinguished	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Insufficient Information	Not Applicable
Teaching Effectiveness							
Scholarship and Creative Projects							
Service Effectiveness							
Academic Advising Effectiveness							
Interactions With Students							
Disciplinary Expertise							
Works Constructively Within the Department							
Overall Contribution to Your Faculty							
Overall University Contribution							
Overall Candidate Ranking							

Please attach additional comments if needed.

EVALUATOR: _____

DATE: _____

APPENDIX D

**SECRET BALLOT BY *TENURED* MEMBERS OF DEPARTMENT FOR NOMINEES BEING
CONSIDERED FOR TENURE**

DEPARTMENT OF: Insert name

COLLEGE OF: Insert name

SECRET BALLOT FOR: Insert name

 YES

 NO