AGENDA

THE UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Academic Affairs Committee Meeting
May 21, 2015

University of West Florida Conference Center
11000 University Parkway, Pensacola, FL 32514

Call to Order/Roll Call. ................................................................. Robert Jones, Chair

Chair’s Greeting. ................................................................. Robert Jones

Action Item(s):
  1. Approval of Request to Explore B.S. in Mechanical Engineering
  2. Tenure Approval

Information Item(s):
  1. Update: Facts & Figures Web Links

Other Committee Business:

Adjournment
Issue: Request to Explore – B.S. in Mechanical Engineering

Proposed action: Approve

Background information:
The creation of the Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering (BSME) at UWF is in direct response to the increased workforce demand for mechanical engineers in northwest Florida and consistent requests to start such a program by the local community. The BSME is envisioned to be a hands-on, high-quality program that will seek ABET accreditation as soon as it graduates its first bachelor’s students or shortly thereafter. The program will be offered on both the Pensacola and Emerald Coast campuses via the same Distance Learning setting that is currently being used by the Electrical and Computer Engineering programs. The BSME program will enhance the engineering offerings at UWF and may catalyze the creation of other engineering programs that have been requested by the community.

This Request to Explore is the second phase in the process of establishing the BSME program. UWF successfully navigated the first phase (New Academic Program Pre-Proposal) in 2014. UWF has engaged Dr. Robert Warrington, an experienced ME professor, ABET evaluator, and former dean of engineering at Michigan Technological University as a consultant to help set the foundations of the program and design a solid curriculum that encompasses best practices in engineering education and aligns with the needs of the local community (see attached proposed BSME curriculum draft). UWF has also extended a successful job offer to Dr. Michael Reynolds, an experienced ME professor, ABET evaluator, and currently the engineering department head at University of Arkansas—Fort Smith. Dr. Reynolds will join UWF in August 2015 and has already contributed to the draft of the BSME curriculum.

To help market the BSME program, recruit students and get them ready to start taking core courses in the Fall 2016 semester when the program is scheduled to start, UWF has created a Pre-Mechanical Engineering (Pre-ME) Banner code so that students interested in the BSME program can declare this major starting Fall 2015 and begin taking prerequisites to core ME courses (see attached Pre-Mechanical Engineering curriculum developed with the help of Dr. Warrington and Dr. Reynolds). In addition, a website containing information about the BSME program and the Pre-ME curriculum was created (uwf.edu/me).

Recommendation: Approval

Implementation Plan: Effective Fall 2016

Fiscal Implications:
The state legislature has allocated recurring ($1M) and non-recurring ($1.5M) funds for the proposed program. A generous private donation of $700K from the Bear Foundation will also be used to support
the BSME program. These funds should be sufficient to support the program with minimal additional burden on UWF’s budget. A rough draft of the program’s budget for the next 5 years is presented in the attached Request to Explore – B.S. in Mechanical Engineering document.

Supporting documents:

- **Request to Explore – B.S. in Mechanical Engineering**
  [http://uwf.edu/aadocs/bot/BS_Mechanical_Engineering.pdf](http://uwf.edu/aadocs/bot/BS_Mechanical_Engineering.pdf)

- **BSME Curriculum Draft**

- **Pre-ME Curriculum Draft**

**Prepared by:** Mohamed Khabou, Ph.D., Chair, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, 850-857-6031, mkhabou@uwf.edu

**Facilitator/Presentor:** Michael Huggins, Ph.D., Dean, College of Science, Engineering & Health 850-474-2741, mhuggins@uwf.edu
Appendix B
The University of West Florida
Division of Academic Affairs

Request to Explore and Plan a New Academic Program Template

Name of the proposed program: B.S. Mechanical Engineering
Level and degree name: Undergraduate, BS Mechanical Engineering
Proposed CIP code: 14.1901
Offering department: Electrical and Computer Engineering
Contact person: Mohamed Khabou
Telephone: (850) 857-6031
E-mail: mkhabou@uwf.edu
Offering college: Science, Engineering and Health
Proposed implementation date: Fall 2016

Description of the proposed program including principal student learning outcomes:

The creation of the proposed Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering (BSME) at UWF is in direct response to the increased workforce demand for mechanical engineers in northwest Florida and consistent requests to start such a program by the local community. For example, during the 2011-2012 Academic Visioning process, BSME was one of the top-priority programs requested by the internal and external stakeholders at UWF.

The proposed program is envisioned to:
1) Respond directly to the regional and state workforce needs. To this end, the Engineering Advisory Council (EAC) membership has been revised to include representatives of local businesses, research labs, and the military community who typically hire mechanical engineers. A survey is being developed/conducted to determine the area(s) of specialization that are most relevant to the region’s needs. The survey results will provide important information to consider as the program curriculum is developed in detail.

2) Be a hands-on, high-quality program that will seek ABET accreditation as soon as it graduates its first bachelor’s students or shortly thereafter. The program will include an engineering design sequence that begins in the freshman year and culminates in a capstone experience in the senior year. The success of Electrical and Computer Engineering’s (ECE) Unmanned Systems Lab, the student satisfaction with the capstone project experience, and the Vision 2030 report of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) emphasize the importance of integrating the design experience/component as early as possible in the curriculum.

Because of the ABET accreditation goal, the program will be designed to satisfy student
outcomes (a) through (k) required by ABET. The program may add additional outcomes that future Mechanical Engineering faculty may deem necessary. According to ABET guidelines, BSME graduates must demonstrate:

a) an ability to apply knowledge of mathematics, science, and engineering;
b) an ability to design and conduct experiments, as well as to analyze and interpret data;
c) an ability to design a system, component, or process to meet desired needs within realistic constraints such as economic, environmental, social, political, ethical, health and safety, manufacturability, and sustainability;
d) an ability to function on multidisciplinary teams;
e) an ability to identify, formulate, and solve engineering problems;
f) an understanding of professional and ethical responsibility;
g) an ability to communicate effectively;
h) the broad education necessary to understand the impact of engineering solutions in a global, economic, environmental, and societal context;
i) a recognition of the need for, and an ability to engage in life-long learning;
j) a knowledge of contemporary issues; and
k) an ability to use the techniques, skills, and modern engineering tools necessary for engineering practice.

3) Be offered on both the Pensacola and Emerald Coast (EC) campuses via the same Distance Learning (DL) setting that was highly praised by the ABET team during its 2012 re-accreditation visit of the ECE programs. The presence of high-tech companies and research labs that work with the military installations around Fort Walton Beach (FWB) will provide a steady stream of potential students and potential employment opportunities (approximately 50% of ECE graduates find employment in or around FWB). If the ECE program can be taken as an indicator, the ratio of roughly 2:1 students between Pensacola and FWB students will hold true for the BSME program.

One of the key factors for the success of the ECE program in FWB has been stationing three full-time ECE faculty and one part-time office support staff in FWB. Students prefer to have face-to-face conversations with the faculty and direct access to a person in case of academic difficulties, program questions, and other issues. The department envisions hiring at least one BSME faculty member to be assigned to FWB to provide the necessary support to BSME students at that location. As is the case with the ECE program, the department also plans to duplicate the Pensacola lab setting at the FWB campus. This will require extra financial resources to set up the duplicate labs, but this is crucial to ensure an equivalent educational experience for FWB students.

Rationale for the proposed program including identification of the relationship of the program to priorities established by the Board of Governors, the University, and the College and justification of the program in relation to supply and demand for graduates from the proposed program:

The local community has consistently requested the UWF engineering offerings be expanded to include mechanical, civil, and environmental engineering, among others. During the 2011-2012 Academic Visioning process conducted by Academic Affairs at UWF, the BSME program was one of the top three academic programs requested by both internal and external stakeholders. The community expressed clearly that the success of the ECE program at UWF, its steady growth
(see graphs below), and excellent reputation are strong indicators that UWF can successful expand its engineering offerings. In fact, there is a strong opinion among local community leaders that UWF should build and offer an entire suite of engineering programs for the benefit of its student body and the community at large.

The creation of the BSME program at UWF will have a positive direct impact on UWF’s standing in the Board of Governors (BOG) Performance Funding Metrics. In the U.S. ECE and ME fields are almost identical in terms of student population, number of graduates, job openings, starting salaries, job growth, and many other factors. In applying ECE statistics and experiences to the proposed ME program and gauging its impact on the BOG performance metrics, it is clear that a BSME will have a positive impact on UWF’s metrics. Specifically, the ME program will directly affect:

- **Metric 1. Percent of Bachelor’s Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education Further**: ECE employment statistics indicate that about 50% of UWF’s graduates find employment in northwest Florida, about 20% find employment elsewhere in Florida, and the rest primarily find employment in surrounding states (mainly Alabama). This employment trend should extend to BSME graduates, which will have a direct positive impact on the regional and state economy. Similar to ECE, BSME graduates enjoy some of the highest starting salaries and one of the lowest unemployment rates of any 4-year degree graduates.

- **Metric 2. Average Wages of Employed Baccalaureate Graduates**: With a national median starting salary of $63,137 and an average salary of $83,930 (source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics), mechanical engineers enjoy one of the highest salaries among graduates with a 4-year degree.

- **Metric 6. Bachelor’s Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM)**: During the 2013/2014 academic year, the ECE program awarded 65 engineering degrees, continuing a steady upward trend (see figure above). The addition of the BSME program will enhance the number of STEM degrees awarded by UWF and positively affect its standing with respect to this BOG metric.

- **Metric 8b. Freshman in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class**: Engineering programs attract students in the top tier of their high school classes because they understand that engineering programs are very demanding and academically rigorous. The ECE program continues to attract top-tier students from local high schools and beyond. The fact that the ECE program is ABET accredited provides an important incentive for students to pursue their engineering education at UWF and assures them of a high-quality program of study.
The hands-on and high quality BSME program that is envisioned at UWF—especially after ABET accreditation is applied for and achieved—will attract top-tier high school graduates and help UWF improve this metric.

Statutory and other external requirements
Common prerequisites (bachelor’s degree programs only):

Similar to the ECE program, the proposed BSME program will comply with the common prerequisites requirement. In fact, students will be required to complete the same common prerequisites as the ECE program.

Credits-to-degree limits (bachelor’s degree programs only):

All ME programs offered at other universities in Florida’s State University System (SUS), require more than 120 semester hours to earn a BSME degree. For example the BSME programs at University of Florida, Florida State University, and University of Central Florida, require 128 credit hours to graduate. The proposed BSME program at UWF will require a similar number of credit hours.

Limited-access status (if relevant; bachelor’s degree programs only):

The proposed ME program will not seek limited-access status.

Relationship to licensure/certification in the field:

Similar to the ECE field, licensure in the ME field is possible (Professional Engineer—PE), but it is not as widely pursued nor required for employment as is required by some other engineering fields (e.g. Civil Engineering). Obtaining a PE license does have many benefits to those who earn it, but many engineers do not pursue it due to its stringent requirements and extensive preparation. If the ECE program can be taken as an indicator, some graduates choose to pursue a PE license and their pass rate is greater than the average graduate of other ABET-accredited programs in the U.S. (72.4% for UWF graduates vs. 70% for national average). Similar to the ECE program, the proposed BSME program will prepare its graduates well for the PE license examination should they choose to pursue it.

Anticipated impact of the proposed program on each of the following
Students:

Whether during recruiting visits to high schools and community colleges or during Open Houses at UWF, students routinely ask about whether UWF is planning to offer engineering program other than ECE. The question is also asked by some pre-engineering students at UWF, some of whom transfer to other SUS universities to complete their education in engineering fields not offered at UWF. In addition, based on the survey results of the 2011-2012 Academic Visioning process, students indicated that ME is a program they hoped UWF would offer. The new BSME program will be a very welcome addition to the list of engineering programs that students can pursue at UWF.
Faculty:

Currently UWF does not have faculty members with an ME background. The program will require at least three full-time faculty in Pensacola and two full-time faculty in FWB to help develop/teach the core BSME courses and labs. One faculty position has been advertised to begin in fall 2015. Additional positions will be advertised/filled as soon as they are authorized and as program needs dictate. Meanwhile, the department has engaged Dr. Robert Warrington, an experienced ME professor, ABET evaluator, and former dean of engineering at Michigan Technological University as a consultant to help set the foundations of the program and design a solid curriculum that encompasses best practices in engineering education and aligns with the needs of the local community.

Staff:

A full-time office administrator and a lab manager are two staff positions that are necessary to support the new proposed program in Pensacola. An additional support staff may be needed in FWB to support the program there. This staff member can be shared with the ECE program.

Budget:

The state legislature has allocated recurring ($1M) and non-recurring ($1.5M) funds for the proposed program. A generous private donation of $700K from the Bear Foundation will also be used to support the proposed program. These funds should be sufficient to support the program with minimal additional burden on the University’s budget. The table on the following page presents a rough draft of the program’s budget for the next 5 years.

Space:

The proposed BSME program will be hands-on and will incorporate a design experience that begins in the freshman year and culminates with a capstone project in the senior year. Hence, the program requires substantial lab and design space. The BSME consultant (Dr. Warrington) visited the Pensacola and FWB campuses in January 2015, examined the available space to host the new program, and commented on its adequacy. Dr. Warrington concluded that the space available at the EC campus in FWB might be adequate with remodeling and modification of the available space. However, he also concluded that the space available in Building 4 on the Pensacola campus would not be sufficient to host the different labs and design space. His space concern was discussed with the dean of the College of Science, Engineering, and Health who had anticipated space would be an issue and has developed a plan to create space for the BSME program in Building 4 by gradually moving some current occupants/programs to another building on campus. The BSME consultant was satisfied that with this reconfiguration of space, the BSME program would have adequate room in Building 4.

As for teaching space, the current two Distance Learning (DL) rooms in Building 4 and their corresponding rooms in FWB should provide adequate space for the first two years of the program. However, it is clear that an extra DL room on the Pensacola campus and a corresponding room on the FWB campus will be needed in the near future as both ECE and BSME program enrollment continues to grow steadily.
In terms of faculty and staff office space, converting the open student space on the fourth floor of Building 4 would provide four extra offices and would fulfill office space needs for the foreseeable future. At the FWB site, there is already available office space for the ME faculty and staff who would be stationed there. Some remodeling and office furniture will be needed to make the available space more usable.

Library and other learning resources:

UWF’s library contains a variety of resources in print and electronic formats that address the needs of engineering faculty and students. For example, UWF library subscribes to a variety of the most commonly used science and engineering databases and electronic resources such as Elsevier Science, ProQuest Engineering Collection, and IEEE Xplore—just to name a few. These resources serve a variety of engineering fields including ME; however, the library might need to add some resources that are specific to the ME field including electronic access to the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) journals and proceedings.

Specialized equipment:

Hands-on experience, experimental skills, and the engineering design process will be emphasized in the new program. The curriculum will contain a variety of labs and a multi-year design sequence that require a variety of lab and specialized equipment. The final list of all needed equipment has not been determined; however, based on conversations with the BSME consultant and UF ME faculty at the Research Education and Engineering Facility (REEF) in FWB, the preliminary cost of equipment is approximately $1M-$1.5M. This estimate is subject to change based on what type of specialization(s) the University deems appropriate to pursue in the program and what kind of technical electives the local business community desires to be offered. A survey has been developed and will soon be sent to our Engineering Advisory Council members and other representatives of the local business community to get a better idea of local and regional needs and hence what type of lab equipment will be required.

Accreditation:

The BSME program will be designed to meet all ABET criteria for accreditation (see criteria (a) through (k) in earlier section). Application for ABET accreditation will proceed as soon as possible after the first BSME degrees are awarded. Since both the BSEE and BSCE programs are ABET accredited, the faculty are familiar with ABET accreditation requirements and will follow the same guidelines and procedures currently used with the ECE programs in preparing the ABET accreditation application for UWF’s BSME.

Related programs:

There is considerable overlap between the Mechanical, Computer, and Electrical Engineering programs, especially in terms of the lower level courses. For example, BSME majors have to take the same calculus, physics, and chemistry sequence as ECE majors. BSME majors are usually required to take Circuits I, Statics, and a programming language exactly like ECE majors. Moreover, due to ABET accreditation requirements, both BSME and ECE majors are
required to do a capstone project. In addition, some ECE core courses can be minimally modified in terms of prerequisite requirement and content so that ME majors can take them as well as technical electives. Examples of such courses are Robotics and Control Theory.

Other related information:

Even though the BSME program will initially be offered under the ECE department umbrella, it is logical that the program will separate into its own department once BSME enrollment reaches a critical mass. A senior-level Mechanical Engineering faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor will be appointed by the fall of 2015 who will provide support to develop the curriculum of the program, help determine how best to furnish the labs, and play a role in hiring other BSME faculty in addition to providing other support for beginning the program. It is understood that this senior faculty will be the leading candidate for chairing the new BSME department as the program matures and plans are made to create a standalone department.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th></th>
<th>15-16</th>
<th></th>
<th>16-17 (1st year program offered)</th>
<th></th>
<th>17-18</th>
<th></th>
<th>18-19</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>Fringe</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>Fringe</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>Fringe</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Consultant</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td>$13,200</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td>$13,200</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td>$13,200</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>$84,500</td>
<td>$27,040</td>
<td>$111,540</td>
<td>$87,035</td>
<td>$27,851</td>
<td>$114,886</td>
<td>$89,646</td>
<td>$28,687</td>
<td>$118,333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>$92,000</td>
<td>$29,440</td>
<td>$121,440</td>
<td>$94,760</td>
<td>$30,323</td>
<td>$125,083</td>
<td>$97,603</td>
<td>$31,233</td>
<td>$128,836</td>
<td>$100,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; ME program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>$84,500</td>
<td>$27,040</td>
<td>$111,540</td>
<td>$87,035</td>
<td>$27,851</td>
<td>$114,886</td>
<td>$89,646</td>
<td>$28,687</td>
<td>$118,333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>$84,500</td>
<td>$27,040</td>
<td>$111,540</td>
<td>$87,035</td>
<td>$27,851</td>
<td>$114,886</td>
<td>$89,646</td>
<td>$28,687</td>
<td>$118,333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>$84,500</td>
<td>$27,040</td>
<td>$111,540</td>
<td>$87,035</td>
<td>$27,851</td>
<td>$114,886</td>
<td>$89,646</td>
<td>$28,687</td>
<td>$118,333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory manager</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$17,600</td>
<td>$72,600</td>
<td>$56,650</td>
<td>$18,128</td>
<td>$74,778</td>
<td>$58,350</td>
<td>$18,672</td>
<td>$77,021</td>
<td>$60,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office staff</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$9,600</td>
<td>$39,600</td>
<td>$30,900</td>
<td>$9,888</td>
<td>$40,788</td>
<td>$31,827</td>
<td>$10,185</td>
<td>$42,012</td>
<td>$32,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adviser</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$9,600</td>
<td>$39,600</td>
<td>$30,900</td>
<td>$9,888</td>
<td>$40,788</td>
<td>$31,827</td>
<td>$10,185</td>
<td>$42,012</td>
<td>$32,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense Budget</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABET Accreditation</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$12,800</td>
<td>$152,800</td>
<td>$327,900</td>
<td>$69,728</td>
<td>$397,628</td>
<td>$458,637</td>
<td>$98,764</td>
<td>$557,401</td>
<td>$717,896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# UWF BSME CURRICULUM
*(DRAFT)*

## LOWER DIVISION COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits / min</th>
<th>grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENC1101 and ENC1102</td>
<td>English Composition I and II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Studies Social Science/humanities – only required for students entering without having earned AA degree from a State of Florida institution or a BS degree from an accredited institution.</td>
<td>See latest catalog for details and your advisor for suggested courses.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>min grade varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHM2045, 2045L</td>
<td>Chemistry I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC2311,2312,2313</td>
<td>Analytic Geometry and Calculus</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>C*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP2302</td>
<td>Elementary Differential Equations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHY 2048/L,2049/L</td>
<td>Physics with Calculus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>C*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EGM 2500 (P: PHY2048)</strong></td>
<td>Elements of Statics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGS 1006</td>
<td>Introduction to Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEG 2200 (P:MAC2311)</td>
<td>Computational Modeling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## UPPER DIVISION COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits / min</th>
<th>grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EEL 3111/3117 (P: MAC 2313, PHY2049/L)</td>
<td>Circuits 1 with lab</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EEL 3211 (P: EEL3111)</strong></td>
<td>Basic Electric Energy Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGN 3001(P/C: EGN 2001),ENG 3002(P:ENG 3001)</td>
<td>Engineering Design III, Engineering Design IV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGN 4001 (Advisor Approval)</td>
<td>Engineering Design V</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGN 4002 (P: EGN 4001)</td>
<td>Engineering Design VI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EGM 3041 (P: EGM 2500)</strong></td>
<td>Dynamics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGS 4032 (P: Jr. Standing, ENC 1002)</td>
<td>Professional Ethics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEG 3100 (P:MAC2312,CHM2045)</td>
<td>Engineering Materials</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEG 3400 (P:C:MAP2302)</td>
<td>Numerical Methods</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEG 3500/3501 (P: EGN 2500, MEG 2200)</td>
<td>Mechanics of Materials/Lab</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEG 3550 (P:MEG 3500,3501)</td>
<td>Machine Design</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEG 3600 (P:PHY2048)</td>
<td>Thermodynamics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEG 3650/3651 (P: MAP2302,MEG 3600)</td>
<td>Fluids and Heat Transfer / Lab</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEG 4400 (P:MAP 2302,EGM 3041)</td>
<td>Dynamic Systems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEG 4600/4601 (P:EEL 3211, EGM 2500, MAP 2302)</td>
<td>Mechatronic Systems/Lab</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA 4321 (P:MAC 2312)</td>
<td>Mathematical Statistics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering electives (any 3000 or higher MEG or EEL course, as well other approved courses, at least 2 courses must be in Thermal Systems or Mechanical Systems)</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Upper Division</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Lower Division</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BSME Total Credits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Pre-Mechanical Engineering Curriculum (DRAFT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSES</th>
<th>CREDITS/MIN&lt;br&gt;GRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENC1101 and ENC1102</td>
<td>6 / C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Studies Social Science/humanities – only required for students entering without having earned AA degree from a State of Florida institution or a BS degree from an accredited institution.</td>
<td>See latest catalog for details and your advisor for suggested courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHM2045, 2045L</td>
<td>4/C*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC2311, 2312, 2313</td>
<td>12/C*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP2302</td>
<td>3/C*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHY 2048/L, 2049/L</td>
<td>8/C*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGM 2500 (Pre-req: PHY2048)</td>
<td>3/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGS 1006</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGN 2001, 2002 (Pre-req: ENG 2001)</td>
<td>2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEG 2200 (Pre-req: MAC2311)</td>
<td>3/C**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Need an average of C+ combined in these courses.

** Courses not in UWF catalog yet.
UWF Board of Trustees  
Academic Affairs Committee  
May 21, 2015

**Issue:** Tenure

**Proposed Action:** Approve

**Background Information:** The University of West Florida Board of Trustees tenure approval procedure contemplates that the Board of Trustees award tenure based on the President’s recommendation. The University's current collective bargaining agreement with the faculty also requires that tenure be awarded by the Board following the specified process.

The procedure reads as follows:

**BOT Tenure Approval Process**
- The UWF BOT considers all nominations for tenure at its (June) meeting. Tenure nominations as a condition of employment will be considered as needed.
- The University President submits to the BOT a list of those faculty nominated for tenure for approval by the BOT. The President's transmittal certifies that each nominee has met the requirements necessary to be granted tenure and will continue to contribute to the University. Any request for tenure as a condition of employment also includes a statement justifying the special circumstances including a brief summary of the nominee's academic credentials.

Five individuals were nominated for tenure having fulfilled all necessary requirements. These faculty were nominated for approval in accordance with the requirements of the tenure approval procedure. This recommendation constitutes the Presidents certification concerning the nominee in accordance therewith.

**Recommendation:** That the Board approves the grant of tenure for the following faculty:

**College of Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities**
- 1. **Sheila Dunn,** *Assistant Professor*  
  *Music*
- 2. **Joseph Herring,** *Assistant Professor*  
  *Art*

**College of Business**
- 3. **Eric Bostwick,** *Assistant Professor*  
  *Accounting & Finance*
- 4. **Blaine Lawlor,** *Assistant Professor*  
  *Management and MIS*

**College of Education and Professional Studies**
- 5. **John Pecore,** *Assistant Professor*  
  *Teacher Education and Educational Leadership*

**Implementation Plan:** Tenure grant to be effective August 8, 2015.
Fiscal Implications: None

Supporting documents:

2014-15 Tenure and Promotion Criteria

Prepared by: Martha Saunders, Provost and Executive Vice President
474-2035, msaunders@uwf.edu

Presented by: Martha Saunders, Provost and Executive Vice President
474-2035, msaunders@uwf.edu
University of West Florida
Division of Academic Affairs

Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion Policy
2014-2015

Part I: Framework for Decisions
Part II: Administrative Guidelines
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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.

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Decision</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Scholarship and Creative Projects</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>At least Excellent in one category and at least Good in the other category</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to associate</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to professor</td>
<td>Distinguished in at least one category and at least excellent in the other two categories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. Materials from the candidate should be presented in digital format, when possible.

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 Personnel Committee (CPC);
   - the Dean;
   - the University Personnel Committee (UPC); and
   - the Provost.

Each review judgment should be regarded as independent and advisory.

A review by the UPC will be required if there are any negative reviews from any prior reviewing bodies. Additionally, the Provost may request a UPC 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 UPC.

A review by the UPC 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 CPC 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 UPC unless extenuating circumstances prompt to the Provost to ask for additional assistance from the UPC.
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 CPC and UPC 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUL 10</td>
<td>The Dean shall provide to each Chair a list of faculty members eligible to apply for tenure and promotion in the Chair’s department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP 5</td>
<td>Deadline for those faculty members with credit towards tenure to withdraw all or a portion of such credit. (may only be withdrawn once)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP 8</td>
<td>Candidate provides curriculum vitae (CV) update and other materials as set out in II. F. Annual Evaluation Procedures (page 21).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCT 3</td>
<td>Chair requests peer evaluations and confers with candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCT 31</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOV 7</td>
<td>Candidate adds rebuttal letter (if he/she chooses) to the dossier. Chair forwards dossier to the Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOV 10</td>
<td>Dean forwards the dossier to the College Personnel Committee (CPC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC 3</td>
<td>CPC adds its recommendation and returns the dossier to Dean. CPC must assure that a copy of the recommendation be in the hands of the candidate and the Chair no later than the following Monday.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Candidate provides a rebuttal letter (if he/she chooses). The Dean includes the rebuttal in the dossier.

**2015**

JAN 7  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 CPC regarding his/her recommendation and sends a copy of decision to the candidate’s Chair.

JAN 14  Candidate provides a rebuttal letter (if he/she chooses). The Dean includes the rebuttal in the dossier.

JAN 15  Dean forwards complete dossier to Provost who forwards dossier to University Personnel Committee (UPC), when necessary.

FEB 13  UPC adds its recommendation and forwards complete dossier to Provost. UPC sends a copy of the recommendation to the candidate, Chair, and Dean.

FEB 20  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 17  Provost adds his/her recommendation and sends a copy to candidate, Chair, Dean, and members of the CPC and UPC.

MAR 24  Candidate provides a rebuttal letter (if he/she chooses). The Provost includes the rebuttal in the dossier.

MAR 25  President receives complete dossier.

APR 28  President informs the candidate of the promotion recommendation, in writing, with copies to Chair, Dean, Provost, and the Chairs of the CPC and UPC. 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 UPC 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. Electronic Review of Portfolio

Faculty members may be asked to assemble their review materials electronically to the extent that this can be accomplished. Artifacts that do not lend themselves easily to electronic capture (e.g., books, book chapters, musical compositions) should be submitted to a central location identified by the respective department and college as supplemental to the digital portfolio.

6. 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. Where electronic display of basic materials has been made available, candidates are encouraged to organize their materials comparable to the format described below. In the absence of digital support, candidates are limited to only one, 3-inch binder 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 CPC (including the vote tally). (Any rebuttal letter.)

m. Recommendation of Dean. (Any rebuttal letter.)

n. Recommendation of UPC (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, CPC, Dean, UPC, 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. 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAY 11</td>
<td>Faculty member provides evaluation file to Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUN 8</td>
<td>Chair shares evaluation with faculty member; Faculty member may rebut Chair’s statement and should have one week to complete rebuttal before packet goes forward to the Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUN 15</td>
<td>Chair adds evaluation and forwards evaluation file, including faculty rebuttal, to the Dean.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 23 -
JUL 13  By this date, the following must take place:
   • Dean provides his/her written evaluation to the faculty member;
   • Faculty member is provided the opportunity to submit a rebuttal to Dean’s evaluation and should have one week to complete the rebuttal before the packet goes forward to the Provost.

JUL 20  Dean forwards to the Provost the evaluation file, including the faculty member’s rebuttal (if any)

AUG 10  Provost reviews annual evaluations and returns evaluation file to Dean.

AUG 17  Dean makes available to faculty member contents of evaluation file for inspection.

AUG 24  Faculty member has the right to write a rebuttal letter, if he/she chooses, which must be included in the evaluation file.

G. SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

1. Process

Tenured faculty members shall receive a sustained performance evaluation (SPE) once every 7 years following the award of tenure or their most recent promotion. The purpose of this evaluation is to document sustained performance during the previous 6 years of assigned duties and to encourage continued professional growth and development. The faculty member is to be evaluated based on overall performance consistent with the Work Assignment Letter. Only those documents contained in the annual evaluation file are to be used for the sustained performance evaluation.

Each area of effort (teaching, scholarly and creative projects, and service) is evaluated separately by examining the annual evaluation ratings that have transpired during the period. Faculty members will be rated as either “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory” based on their ratings in each area. Faculty members who achieve area ratings within good, excellent, or distinguished ratings shall be rated as “satisfactory.” An unsatisfactory area rating will be triggered when two or more of the six ratings from that category are either fair or poor. When deemed unsatisfactory in any area, the Chair will initiate a Performance Improvement Plan.

2. Order of Materials for Sustained Performance Review

a. Annual evaluations for the past 6 years.
b. Faculty member’s statement of contributions (optional).
c. Chair’s evaluation.
d. Performance Improvement Plan, if any.
e. Appeal.
f. Dean’s decision on appeals, if needed. If a faculty member does not agree with the sustained performance evaluation provided by the Chair, the faculty member may appeal to the Dean of the College.
g. Provost’s decision on appeal, if needed. If a faculty member does not agree with the Dean’s determination, the faculty member may appeal to the Provost. The Provost’s decision is final and binding.

3. Performance Improvement Plan

If the ratings in one or more areas of assigned duties on two or more annual evaluations are unsatisfactory, the faculty member must develop with their Chair a performance improvement plan. The Plan must include a specific performance targets for the areas identified as Unsatisfactory and a time frame for achieving the targets. If specific resources are identified in an approved Plan, the University must provide those resources.

In keeping with the purpose to the SPE process, each department should maintain a mentoring program for faculty with Unsatisfactory ratings in one or more areas of assigned duties so problems can be addressed with each annual evaluation without waiting for the end of a 6-year cycle. The Chair will take responsibility for meeting periodically with the faculty member to review progress toward meeting any performance targets. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to attain the performance targets specified in the Plan.

4. Calendar (Actions must be completed by dates shown)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEP 5, 2014</td>
<td>Dean’s office receives list of faculty that require a Sustained Performance Evaluation during current academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCT 3</td>
<td>Chair prepares written Sustained Performance Evaluation using the previous annual evaluations and identifying whether Performance Improvement Plan is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCT 31</td>
<td>Chair reviews the Sustained Performance Evaluation with the faculty member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAN 5, 2015</td>
<td>Written Sustained Performance Evaluation and Performance Incentive Plan sent to the Dean with copy to Provost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the event of an appeal, the following calendar is in effect.
JAN 12, 2015  Written appeal of Chair's Evaluation and Performance Improvement Plan, if applicable, submitted to Dean.

FEB 6  Dean communicates decision about appeal in writing and forwards copy faculty member, Chair, and Provost.

FEB 20  Written appeal of Dean’s response, if applicable, submitted to the Provost.

MAR 16  Provost communicates final decision about appeal in writing, if applicable, to faculty member, Chair, and Dean. No further appeal of Performance Improvement Plan permitted.
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 violated regarding scholarly or artistic production
   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: ________________________________

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

Please attach additional comments if needed.

EVALUATOR: _______________________________________________

DATE: _________________________________________________
APPENDIX C

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

DEPARTMENT OF:  ________________________________

COLLEGE OF:  ________________________________

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:  ________________________________

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

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
Issue: Facts & Figures Web Links

Proposed Action: Informational

Background Information:

Several important documents have been placed in one, easily accessible location: Performance Funding Metrics, Key Performance Indicators, Enrollment Headcount, Tuition and Fees, and Interactive Fact Book, and more. They can be accessed via the UWF Home Page by linking onto "About UWF" and clicking on Facts & Figures.

Recommendation: None

Implementation Plan: None

Fiscal Implications: None

Supporting documents:

None

Prepared by: Martha Saunders, Provost and Executive Vice President 474-2035, msaunders@uwf.edu

Presented by: Martha Saunders