

# Department of Movement Sciences & Health

## Bylaws

**Bylaws for Department Governance  
Department of Movement Sciences and Health**

**Table of Contents**

Article I. Name	3
Mission Statement	3
Article II. Voting Membership	3
Article III. Meeting Structure	3
Article IV. Committee Structure	4
Standing Committees	4
By-laws committee	4
Faculty Development Committee	4
Faculty mentorship program	5
Mid-Point Review	5
Graduate Program Committee	5
Ad-Hoc Committee (s)	5
Article V. Annual Evaluation Criteria	6
Performance Standards for Evaluation	6
Criteria to Evaluate Teaching	6
Criteria to Evaluate Scholarly and Creative Activities	10
Criteria to Evaluate Service	12
Annual Evaluation Process	15
Full-Time Faculty	15
Part-Time Faculty (Faculty Associates and Adjuncts)	17
Article VI. Tenure and Promotion Evaluation and Mid-Point Review	18
Tenure and Promotion Evaluation	18
Mid-Pint Review Process	18
Article VII. Annual Work Assignments	19
Article VIII. Amendments	19
APPENDIX I: MSH Clinical Practice Tracks	20

**Article I. Name:**

The name of this unit is the Department of Movement Sciences and Health. The unit is housed in the Usha Kundu, MD College of Health of the University of West Florida.

**Mission Statement**

The mission of the Department of Movement Sciences and Health is to build a foundation of MSH knowledge and to prepare students with professional skills and analytical abilities to assume prominent positions in MSH across the state and nation

**Article II. Voting Membership:**

The Department's voting membership shall consist of all full-time faculty eligible for annual contract.

**Article III. Meeting Structure**

- The chair will convene departmental meetings at least once in each Fall and Spring semesters.
- A majority of the voting membership may direct the chair to convene a department meeting in a timely and efficient manner.
- An agenda will be distributed at least two days prior to a scheduled meeting.
- Although most of the work can be accomplished in an informal manner, when necessary the Department Chair will institute Robert's Rule of Order to move forward meetings business.
- A majority of the voting members will constitute a quorum.
- Voting membership shall notify the Departmental chair in a timely fashion if they cannot attend a scheduled meeting. The member who is unable to attend a meeting may give a written proxy to another faculty member.
- Voting will normally be by "voice" or show of hands. If any member requests a secret ballot on any issue, a secret ballot will be conducted.
- The chair votes whenever his/her vote will affect the result. He/she can vote as any other faculty member when the vote is by ballot.
- Minutes of each meeting will be recorded and distributed by the Office Manager or other designee.

## Article IV. Committee Structure

### *Standing Committees*

#### 1) By-Laws Review Committee

- Chair: Assistant Chair of MSH or a faculty member appointed by the Chair.
- Membership: Members will be appointed by the chair and should include a representative from each discipline in MSH.
- Responsibilities – The By-Laws Review Committee is charged with an annual review of departmental by-laws. The responsibilities of the by-laws committee include the following.
  - Convene in January to review and update MSH by-laws
  - Draft recommended changes to the MSH by-laws
  - Provide a copy of proposed changes to all faculty members for a 30 day review period (February)
  - Conduct an approval/disapproval vote, requiring only a simple majority approval, on all changes in March
  - In the event a proposed change is disapproved, the by-laws will remain unchanged
  - The Chair of MSH may call a special meeting(s) of the by-laws committee to resume or continue revision of the by-laws

#### 2) Faculty Development Committee

- Chair – A faculty member appointed by the Chair of MSH.
- Membership – Members will be appointed by the Chair of MSH and should include a representative from each discipline within the department.
- Responsibilities – The Faculty Development Committee is charged with facilitating the continuous development of faculty through mentorship and support. The committee will oversee the: 1) faculty mentorship program; and 2) participate in the Mid-point Review under the guidance of the department chair.
- *Faculty Mentorship Program* includes the assigning of mentors, adherence to program guidelines, and providing resources or opportunities to enhance the mentor-mentee relationship. Mentorship and support should focus on career development. Career mentoring may include coaching, professional advising, networking assistance, explaining typical routes to advancement, and facilitating positive professional exposure. The following are proposed guidelines for a mentorship program.
  - Each untenured faculty member (visiting or tenure track) should be assigned a mentor from among the tenured faculty.

Post-tenure Assistant Professors should also be assigned a mentor from among senior faculty.

- Mentor-mentee assignments should be time limited; one academic year is suggested. Longer pairings should be possible by mutual agreement.
- The Chair of MSH should ultimately determine faculty pairings, based on committee recommendations, faculty workloads, and other relevant factors.
- Faculty pairs should agree to meet at regular intervals to discuss factors that may affect the mentee's professional growth. Both partners should show initiative in arranging these meetings. Although this is a formal mentoring program, it is desirable for faculty to develop the type of informal relationship that could occur naturally.
- At the end of the academic year, the Chair of the Faculty Development Committee should report to the MSH Chair on the effectiveness of the program.
- *Mid-point Review* provides untenured faculty with formative feedback to enhance faculty success in the tenure and promotion process. The review should encourage faculty who are making solid progress toward tenure and promotion by highlighting achievements, notify faculty who may need to improve in certain areas of performance, and inform faculty where lack of progress could jeopardize a favorable outcome. Guidelines for the Mid-point Review process are covered in *Article VI. Tenure and Promotion Evaluation and Mid-point Review*.

### 3) Graduate Program Committee

- Chair: A faculty member appointed by the Chair of MSH.
- Membership: Members will be appointed by the chair and should include a representative from each graduate program offered in MSH.
- Responsibilities – The Graduate Committee is a department level group that serves as an advisory body to the graduate programs within the MSH Department.
- Activities include but are not limited to: 1) review graduate programs application criteria and procedures; 2) oversee Express admissions procedures to encourage successful MSH undergraduates to matriculate into MSH graduate programs; 3) oversee MSH thesis and dissertation policies and procedures; and 4) contribute to the selection of graduate assistants and the awarding of graduate scholarships.

### 4) Ad-Hoc Committee(s):

- As circumstance may require, the chair is empowered to constitute ad hoc committees.

## **Article V. Annual Evaluation Criteria**

### ***Performance Standards for Evaluation***

For the purpose of evaluating faculty members, the Department of Movement Sciences and Health, has adopted a set of standards for the assessment of a faculty member's performance of assigned duties and responsibilities.

Part-time faculty, faculty associates, and adjunct faculty will be evaluated using the following criteria that are specific to their assigned contract.

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

- **Distinguished:** Exceeds department standards for professional performance. Exceeds the standard for excellence in quality or quantity or both.
- **Excellent:** Meets department standards for professional performance. No areas of weakness exist.
- **Good:** Moderate progress toward long-term professional goals, but one or more minor weaknesses exist.
- **Fair:** Overall performance includes some strengths, but one or more major weaknesses exist.
- **Poor:** Unacceptable level of performance. Major areas of weakness require remediation.

### ***Recommendations to Faculty in Achieving These Standards***

#### (1) Statement on Teaching

##### ***CRITERIA THAT MAY BE USED IN THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING***

- Teaching awards and other accomplishments related to teaching.
- Peer evaluations of teaching, such as those of department chair or department mentor.
- Supervision of theses and/or dissertations.
- Supervision of undergraduate and graduate capstone projects and internships.
- Service on thesis or dissertation committees.
- Supervision of honors' theses.
- Supervision of graduate/undergraduate internships/field studies or directed studies.
- Participation in Department's assessment plan and curriculum mapping
- Participation in teaching development programs, including conference, workshop, or seminars related to subject areas taught.
- Design of new courses and programs.
- Organization and planning of courses.
- Evidence of course revisions to reflect current knowledge in area.
- Punctuality in classroom attendance, grading assignments, etc.
- Clear and effective communication in the classroom or online environment.

- Syllabi, course assignments, testing procedures, attendance requirements, grading standards, and record-keeping that adhere to rigorous academic standards and University requirements and ensure the equitable treatment of students.
- Maintenance of adequate office hours and student records and timely response to student inquiries in advising and mentoring.
- Student evaluations of teaching that demonstrate the ability to challenge students and stimulate student learning.
- Evidence of scholarship and currency in subject area in selection of topics, resource materials, and content of lectures.
- Self-evaluations, observations from other faculty, inside or outside the Department arranged by the faculty member.

### ***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:

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

#### **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:

- Teaching philosophy provides foundation for coherent course planning and activities.
- Syllabi outline comprehensive, clear, and include appropriate performance expectations.
- Assessment practices enhance student learning and contribute to department needs.
- Goals and course content routinely provide evidence of successful continuous improvement effort.
- Pedagogical practices facilitate optimal learning conditions.
- Student support practices facilitate optimal student development.
- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices receive consistent favorable review.

- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, General Studies) executed with expert skill.
- Appropriate standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights.
- Participates voluntarily in professional development activities to improve teaching quality and flexibility.
- Student evaluations document consistently positive impact on learning (above average).

### **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:

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

### **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:

- Teaching philosophy may not be clearly expressed in course planning and activities.
- Syllabi need to provide clearer and more appropriate expectations.
- Assessment practices show some difficulty in supporting student learning and meeting department needs.
- Goals and course content reflect limited continuous improvement effort.
- Some pedagogical practices need attention.
- Some student support practices need improvement.

- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices need improvement.
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, general education) could be executed with greater competence.
- Occasional challenges related to academic integrity.
- Some indications of disrespect for students and their rights.
- Does not typically participate in teaching development activity.
- Student evaluations data document areas of moderate concern (ratings below the department average).

### **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:

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

## (2) Statement on Scholarly and Creative Activities

### ***CRITERIA THAT MAY BE USED IN THE EVALUATION OF SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE PROJECTS***

The Department of Movement Sciences and Health **should** consider a broad range of activities that express our mission and vision. Moreover, we 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, including projects involving the creation, production, exhibition, presentation, or publication of works by one or more individuals demonstrating originality in design or execution. MSH will consider and address a wide range of venues for disseminating scholarly and creative projects, including the following:

- Peer-reviewed publications (e.g., journal, book, book chapter)
- Editorially reviewed publications
- Convention and conference contributions
- Grant activity (intramural/extramural)
- Electronic outlets
- Development of curriculum
- Other performance indicators for scholarly and creative activities *deemed acceptable to the department*

## **SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE PROJECTS PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

### **Distinguished Performance**

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

Performance indicators that may be used to support distinguished ratings:

- Peer-reviewed original research publications (first author)
- Funding of a significant peer-reviewed research grant from a nationally recognized granting agency
- Book authorships in related academic discipline/area of expertise.

### **Excellent Performance**

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

Performance indicators that may be used to support excellent ratings:

- Peer-reviewed original research publications (first author/non-first author)
- Peer-reviewed publications (first author)

- Funding of a significant peer-reviewed research grant
- Book chapter authorships in related academic discipline/area of expertise.

### **Good Performance**

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

Performance indicators that may be used to support good ratings:

- Peer-reviewed original research publications (non-first author)
- Significant progress on the development and/or publication of original research
- Submitting a research grant (non-funded or waiting review) to any source outside the University

### **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:

- No peer-reviewed original research publications
- Little or lack of progress on the development and/or publication of original research
- Significant contributions to original research grant proposals of other faculty members in the University
- Significant assistance in administering large grants of another faculty members in the University

### **Poor Performance**

Poor performance demonstrates *serious* problems in attaining success in scholarship.

Performance indicators that may be used to support poor ratings:

- No peer-reviewed original research publications
- No progress on the development and/or publication of original research
- No contribution to any research projects
- No contributions to grant proposals or grant administration/operations

## (3) Statement on Service

### ***CRITERIA THAT MAY BE USED IN THE EVALUATION OF SERVICE***

The Department of Movement Sciences and Health **may** use following service activities but not limited to:

#### Department

- Curriculum development
- Advising students

- Developing Departmental materials/facilities
- Serving as Department Chair, Associate Chair, Program Director or Program Coordinator
- Serving on Department committees
- Serving on special Departmental assignments/projects
- Assuming temporary administrative assignments
- Attending assigned University functions
- Advising student clubs/organizations
- Maintaining a professional presence in professional organizations
- Recruiting of students in professional organizations

#### School/University

- Serving on committees
- Curriculum development
- Serving on special School/University assignments/projects
- Assuming administrative assignments
- Attending assigned functions/events

#### Local/State/Regional/National/International

- Serving in an administrative and/or discipline-specific professional role on committees, boards, workshops, etc.
- Serving as a liaison for the Department/School/University
- Presenting papers, or other public presentation, not based on original research
- Attending assigned functions/events
- Sponsoring/developing University events
- Engaging in student recruitment at events/organizations
- Providing unremunerated consultancies

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

### ***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

### **Annual Evaluation Process:**

#### ***Full-time Contracted Faculty***

Each faculty member will provide the Department Chair hardcopies of the following information by the announced date.

- A. A **complete** updated Vita
- B. Separate list of items added to Vita during the previous academic year

- C. CAERS reports for the previous academic year
- D. A “statement of contributions”

Refer to the information below from the Provost regarding statement of contributions:

- *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.*

E. Copies of any original research publication submitted for consideration for evaluation of your research (NOTE: research submitted this year will not be considered in subsequent years. For example, if you submit that an article is “in press” this year, it will not also be considered “published” for next year’s evaluation since it is only one piece of original research). The Chair will review last year’s evaluation submission with regards to this request. If it is in press, please provide a copy of the acceptance notification from the editor. If it is an online journal, please provide an active link.

F. MSH Annual Evaluation Overview Matrix (will not be forwarded to Dean and Provost)

G. Submission of any evidence of effective teaching:

It is incumbent upon the faculty member to make a case for the quality of their teaching. Faculty should review the Annual Evaluation Overview Matrix to assist them in preparing this section of their evaluation packet.

Following the submission and review of submitted materials, the Chair will evaluate each faculty member’s annual performance. The Chair will inform the faculty member of the results of their evaluation. Each faculty member will also be informed of the timeline and process to appeal the results of their evaluation. For specific deadlines, faculty members and Chairs should refer to the Provost’s current academic year calendar for completion of annual evaluations.

May: Faculty member provides evaluation file to Chair.

June: 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.

- Chair adds evaluation and forwards evaluation file, including faculty rebuttal to the Dean.

July: 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

July: Dean forwards to the Provost the evaluation file, including the faculty member's rebuttal (if any)

August: Provost reviews annual evaluations and returns evaluation file to Dean.

- Dean makes available to faculty member contents of evaluation file for inspection.
- Faculty member has the right to write a rebuttal letter, if he/she chooses, which must be included in the evaluation file.

### ***Part-time Faculty, Faculty Associates and Adjunct Faculty***

The Department Chair will oversee the evaluation process for Part-time Faculty, Faculty Associates and Adjunct Faculty. This process is initiated in the beginning of the semester with faculty posting their current syllabi and curriculum vitae to the UWF Faculty Academic Credentials System (FACS). At the end of the semester, the Department Chair will meet with faculty to review course evaluations and/or other contracted duties not related to course instruction.

## **Article VI. Tenure and Promotion Evaluation and Mid-point Review**

### **Tenure and Promotion Evaluation**

Tenure and Promotion Evaluation and Third-Year Reviews should be based upon Departmental teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service criteria. The criteria and performance indicators used in the tenure and promotion evaluation and mid-point review are covered in *Article V. Annual Evaluation Criteria*. Additionally, the following guidelines along with university criteria for tenure and promotion decisions as outlined in Table 1 in *UWF Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion 2013-2014* document form the basis for decisions related to reemployment, promotion, and tenure.

1. Excellent teaching and promising signs of good scholarship and service justify a period of yearly reappointment at the Assistant Professor level.
2. Excellent teaching, significant evidence of scholarship and service, including a measure of tangible and public evidence, justify the decision to grant tenure. Service must include membership on college and/or university committees.
3. A strong positive reputation within the University as teacher and scholar justifies the decision to promote to Associate Professor. Substantial tangible and public scholarship, recognized as such by colleagues, is always a criterion, and this scholarship usually signifies the potential for recognition outside the University. Substantial contributions in the area of service, including membership on college and/or university committees, are required.
4. Very substantial, tangible, and public contributions to the profession measured by favorable acknowledgment in the disciplines outside the University – and excellent teaching – justify promotion to the rank of Professor. As a general guideline, a faculty member normally would not apply for promotion to the rank of Professor without five years of service at the rank of Associate Professor.

Refer to the *UWF Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion 2014-2014* document for the Administrative Guidelines related to the T & P process.

### **Mid-point Review Process**

All untenured assistant professors shall undergo a mid-point review of their progress toward promotion and tenure during the fall/spring semester of the third year of employment at UWF.

- The Chair will convene the Department's Faculty Development Committee plus at least one tenured faculty member from an outside department and establish the appropriate dates for the review.
- The Chair must inform the untenured assistant professor of the dates for the review no later than the second week of the contract year during which the review will take place.
- The untenured assistant professor shall prepare and submit a mid-point review dossier that parallel's the format required by the College for application for tenure/promotion, excluding letters of recommendation.
- The Chair and/or faculty mentor will provide guidance to the untenured faculty member in the preparation of the review materials.

The Department's Faculty Development Committee will provide its review, in writing, to the untenured faculty member and to the Chair using the criteria on the *Evaluation Form for Department Colleague Review in Tenure and Promotion Decisions*.

- The Chair will review the dossier and Faculty Development Committee letter and prepare a written review of the untenured assistant professor's progress, which will then be provided to the untenured assistant professor and forwarded to the Dean of the College.
- The Dean will review the department's written mid-point review and respond to the department and the faculty member in writing.

An untenured assistant professor may request an earlier review upon giving reasonable advance notice to allow for a review committee to be formed. A tenured faculty member may request the Committee to review his/her progress toward promotion upon giving reasonable advance notice to allow for a review committee to be formed.

### **Article VII. Annual Work Assignments**

MSH Policy on Supplementary Summer Contract Opportunities

1. Summer courses will be offered and scheduled on the basis of:
  - (a) Student program needs
  - (b) Enrollment projections meeting University and College of Health enrollment standards for offering a course
2. Faculty will be offered supplementary contract based on:

- (a) Faculty area of specialization
- (b) Faculty qualifications to teach the course
- (c) Faculty experience teaching a course

**Article VII. Amendments:**

These bylaws may be changed or amended at any regular faculty meeting by a simple majority vote of members present, provided that proposed change(s) have been submitted in writing to the Departmental chair and distributed to the voting membership at least 30 days prior to the meeting at which the proposed change(s) are to be considered.

Rev. January 7, 2019

**APPENDIX I**

**Department of Movement Sciences and Health  
Clinical Practice Track – Non-Tenure Earning**

---

<b>Clinical Practice Track Standards for Performance at Rank</b>				
	<b>Lecturer</b>	<b>Clinical Assistant Professor</b>	<b>Clinical Associate Professor</b>	<b>Clinical Professor</b>
<b>Academic Qualifications</b>	Masters in MSH discipline specialty area	Masters in MSH Discipline specialty area. Doctorate Preferred	Doctorate	Doctorate
<b>Teaching</b>	Demonstrates effective teaching skills and the potential for success in classroom, clinical, and seminar settings.	Demonstrates competency in teaching in area of expertise	Demonstrates continuous competency in teaching in area(s) of expertise.	Recognized for excellence in teaching related to area(s) of expertise
<b>Scholarship</b>	Initiates a program of scholarly activity in specialty area	Develops a program of scholarship in specialty area	Acquires stature in a program of scholarship in specialty area	Sustains a program of scholarship in specialty area
<b>Service</b>	Participates in service related activities at the MSH Dept.	Provides service to MSH, the community, and the profession	Assumes leadership positions in service to the MSH dept., community, and profession	Recognized as a leader in the University and among peers in specialty area, locally and nationally/ internationally
<b>Clinical Leadership</b>	Demonstrates competence and leadership within clinical settings related to a defined MSH Discipline	Demonstrates competence and leadership within clinical settings related to a defined MSH Discipline	Demonstrates competence and leadership within clinical settings related to a defined MSH Discipline	Demonstrates competence and leadership within clinical settings related to a defined MSH Discipline
<b>Types of Evidence in Rank by Criterion</b>				
<b>Academic Qualification</b>	Masters in MSH discipline specialty area	Masters in MSH Discipline specialty area.	Doctorate	Doctorate

		Doctorate Preferred		
<b>Demonstrates effective teaching skills in classroom and clinical settings</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Serves as course faculty</li> <li>b. Develops and uses appropriately creative and evidence-based course related materials</li> <li>c. Demonstrates qualities desired in a program and course team member</li> <li>d. Demonstrates respect for students and their rights.</li> <li>e. Seeks out mentors from the faculty</li> <li>f. Incorporates suggestions from peer evaluation.</li> <li>g. Recognizes the value of the student/teacher relationship</li> <li>h. Receives student evaluations with an average of 3.0 or greater across years in rank</li> <li>i. Receives positive annual evaluations</li> </ul>	<p>In addition to evidence cited under lecturer, the Clinical Assistant Professor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Assumes leadership in teaching (e.g., course coordinator, course co-coordinator, team leader) with advancing years in rank.</li> <li>b. Develops and implements, and evaluates innovative methods for promoting student learning, demonstrating advancement while in rank.</li> <li>c. Contributes to new course development, revision, and evaluation and program development and evaluation.</li> <li>d. Participates in writing</li> </ul>	<p>In addition to evidence cited under Clinical Assistant Professor, the Clinical Associate Professor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Utilizes new technologies in the teaching-learning process</li> <li>b. Mentors and supervises novice teachers in the academic and clinical settings</li> <li>c. Leads theses and dissertation committees in area of specialty.</li> <li>d. Develops, implements, and evaluates new courses in specialty area across academic and clinical settings</li> <li>e. Leads curriculum development/program planning efforts</li> <li>f. Receives awards or</li> </ul>	<p>In addition to evidence cited under Clinical Associate Professor, the Clinical Professor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Mentors junior faculty and graduate teaching assistants in clinical teaching and field supervision of students</li> <li>b. Provides leadership in curriculum development across all MSH programs as appropriate</li> </ul>

		<p>accreditation and program review reports.</p> <p>e. Participates as a member on theses and dissertation committees</p>	<p>commendations in specialty area.</p> <p>g. Serves as a manuscript reviewer or as a member of editorial review board in specialty area</p>	
<p><b>Initiates a program of scholarly activity in specialty area</b></p>	<p>a. Establishes opportunities for scholarship with mentors in specialty area</p>	<p>In addition to evidence cited for Lecturer the Clinical Assistant Professor:</p> <p>a. Practices and participates in scholarly inquiry in area of expertise</p> <p>b. Disseminates findings of scholarly inquiry in practice area of expertise on a regional and national level</p> <p>c. Participates in scholarly projects and significant evidence based project development</p> <p>d. Participates on grant-writing teams as appropriate.</p>	<p>In addition to evidence cited for Clinical Assistant Professor, the Clinical Associate Professor:</p> <p>a. Initiates scholarly inquiry in area of expertise</p> <p>b. Disseminates findings of scholarly inquiry in practice area of expertise on an international level.</p> <p>c. Serves as mentor for junior faculty who are writing for peer-reviewed publication(s)</p> <p>d. Initiates grant writing as lead author, principle investigator, or project director</p>	<p>In addition to evidence cited for Clinical Associate Professor, the Clinical Professor:</p> <p>a. Mentors educators and clinicians in the scholarly inquiry of teaching and practice problems in their respective settings.</p> <p>b. Mentors faculty in dissemination of scholarly inquiry findings</p> <p>c. Mentors faculty in grant-writing</p>

		<p>e. Contributes to continuing education programs in area of focus/ expertise as appropriate</p>	<p>e. Contributes to continuing education programs in area of focus/ expertise as appropriate</p>	
<p><b>Participates in Service related activities</b></p>	<p>a. Attends and contributes at MSH meetings</p>	<p>In addition to evidence cited under Lecturer, the Clinical Assistant Professor:</p> <p>a. Serves as a member of committees or boards of community and professional organizations</p> <p>b. Participates in activities related to the MSH’s mission and goals</p>	<p>In addition to evidence cited under Clinical Assistant Professor, the Clinical Associate Professor:</p> <p>a. Participates on University and College committees</p> <p>b. Provides leadership to MSH committees and committees, boards of community and professional organizations</p> <p>c. Serves on national or state panels,</p>	<p>In addition to evidence cited under Clinical Associate Professor, the Clinical Professor:</p> <p>a. Serves in leadership roles n University and College Committees</p> <p>b. Receives recognition through elected membership in professional organizations</p> <p>c. Serves as a leader in professional organizations</p>

			committees, and task forces in area of expertise.	
<b>Demonstrates Competence and Leadership within a defined MSH practice area</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Holds or maintains appropriate certification or credentials as defined by MSH discipline area</li> <li>b. Participates in practice in area of expertise</li> <li>c. Applies practice expertise to classroom and clinical teaching</li> <li>d. Is recognized by colleagues for expertise in a particular area of practice</li> </ul>	<p>In addition to evidence cited under Lecturer, the Clinical Assistant Professor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Participates in practices in area of expertise</li> <li>b. Applies practice expertise to classroom and clinical teaching</li> <li>c. Is recognized by colleagues for expertise in a particular area of practice</li> <li>d. Develops presentations related to practice</li> <li>e. Submits peer reviews of practice</li> <li>f. Develops reports of clinical demonstration of practice</li> </ul>	<p>In addition to evidence cited under Clinical Assistant Professor, the Clinical Associate Professor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Consults in focus area</li> <li>b. Receives awards or commendations for focus area</li> <li>c. Serves as manuscript reviewer or as members of editorial review boards</li> </ul>	<p>In addition to evidence cited under Clinical Associate Professor, the Clinical Professor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Presents at national or international meetings or conferences</li> <li>b. Consults nationally and internationally regarding scholarly work</li> <li>c. Receives invitations for lectureships and visiting professorships (scholarships)</li> </ul>