

Approved March 27, 2015

# DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY BYLAWS

**Table of Contents**

<b><u>Topic</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
<b>MISSION</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>ETHICS</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>DEPARTMENT CITIZENSHIP</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>FACULTY MEETINGS</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>FACULTY VOTING PROTOCOL</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>SELECTION OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>COMMITTEE SERVICE</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>ANNUAL EVALUATIONS</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>MID-POINT REVIEW</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>TENURE AND PROMOTION</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>OFFICE HOURS</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>SUMMER TEACHING OPPORTUNITIES</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>OVERLOAD ASSIGNMENTS</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>REVISION OF DEPARTMENT BY-LAWS</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>ANNUAL EVALUATION CRITERIA (APPENDIX)</b>	<b>12</b>

**College of Health  
Department of Psychology  
By-Laws**

## **MISSION**

Through innovative teaching and research, the Department of Psychology challenges and inspires undergraduate and graduate students to apply psychological science to everyday life. We are also committed to service through the development of knowledge of human behavior and enhancement of quality of life, not only for our students, but also for the profession and broader communities at the local, state, regional, and global levels.

## **ETHICS**

One theme that unites faculty of the Department beyond individual discipline or licensure is that we are all faculty members. Thus, the [Statement on Professional Ethics](#) by the American Association of University Professors is adopted as our ethical guidelines. Those who are members of other professional organizations will be held to those standards as well. These standards apply to the use of technology and social media. Faculty are advised to exercise discretion in the use of technology and social media, as well as in their decisions to provide students access to their professional and private social media. In particular, faculty are cautioned to avoid unprofessional communication with and/or discussion of colleagues and students through technology and social media. Furthermore, it is expected and required that all faculty members adhere to university regulations, State laws, Federal laws and other required guidelines and regulations required by the State University System and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. Adherence to ethical standards does not supplant any obligation to comply with relevant legal regulations.

## **DEPARTMENT CITIZENSHIP**

To promote the optimal functioning of the Department, faculty members are expected to participate in a professional and collegial manner in professional activities that help the Department achieve its goals. These obligations include committee work within the Department, but also extend to other activities that strengthen the presence of the Department on campus. Attendance and collegial participation in Department meetings, assistance in outreach activities on behalf of the Department, participation in campus events sponsored by the Department, and presence at graduation represent effective and meaningful citizen contributions.

## **FACULTY MEETINGS**

Faculty shall meet at least 3 times during both the Fall and Spring semesters. Additional meetings may be called on an “as needed” basis as determined by the Chair. Any faculty member can request a meeting, but the final decision to hold one is that of the Chair, unless requested by a majority of the voting faculty. The Chair or Chair’s designee shall be present at all official meetings. The Chair shall make a reasonable effort to conduct the meeting in an effective and timely manner. Faculty shall make a reasonable effort to maintain a collegial and constructive atmosphere in all deliberations.

An agenda will be provided to the faculty at least one week prior to the meeting. Items to be placed on the agenda, therefore, must be submitted to the Chair at least 6 business days prior to the meeting. Any items submitted after the deadline will be included at the discretion of the Chair and identified as such. An item may be added to the agenda at the beginning of a faculty meeting with a majority vote of the present voting members. If an item is added to the agenda due to urgent circumstances, absent faculty will be notified and given an opportunity to cast a ballot if possible.

## **FACULTY VOTING PROTOCOL**

If a faculty member is unable to attend a meeting, that member may grant a written or electronic proxy to another member for the purpose of voting on specified items from the prepared agenda.

Also:

- A simple majority of the voting members in the Department shall constitute a quorum.
- Any voting member may make a motion and all motions must be seconded.
- Votes may be cast by hand or voice.
- A secret ballot shall be used if requested by any 2 or more voting members.
- Electronic, telephone or mail balloting may be conducted as appropriate.

### **Voting Members**

Members of the faculty who are tenured or in tenure-track lines and who hold the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor in the Department of Psychology are voting members. Voting members in phased retirement shall retain voting privileges until completion of the phased retirement period. Retired faculty members, including those with emeritus status, do not have voting privileges. Voting privileges may be granted to individuals in full-time, non-tenure track faculty lines for a determined period of time by a two-thirds majority vote of the voting members.

### **Non-voting Members**

The [UWF Faculty Handbook](#) defines ranked faculty, Adjunct Faculty Members and Faculty Associates. Faculty Associates are appointments that do not include compensation, but that may include special privileges and responsibilities. Persons with this status may or may not be otherwise affiliated with the University. Adjunct Faculty Members and Faculty Associates may participate in faculty meetings and discussions of key Department issues.

-

## **SELECTION OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR**

The College Dean, with consideration of Department faculty recommendation, officially appoints the Chair. The Chair shall ordinarily serve a three-year term, which can be extended by the Dean upon consideration of the recommendation by the faculty. The faculty recommendation to the Dean shall be generated as follows:

During the fall semester of the third year of an incumbent's tenure as Chair, the Executive Committee (EC) shall meet with the incumbent to determine that individual's preference for remaining Chair for another term. The EC will consult with the Dean regarding the viability of a 2<sup>nd</sup> term for the incumbent and/or the viability of other potential candidates. The EC will then seek input from the faculty regarding:

- whether there is any tenured member at or above the rank of associate professor to be considered for the Chair position for the next term.
- the general level of satisfaction with the incumbent.
- whether a search should be conducted for a candidate outside the Department.

If there is a member of the faculty who wishes to be considered as Chair, the EC will advise that person to meet with the Dean to discuss the viability of his/her candidacy. If the incumbent wishes to be considered for a second term and there is one or more other potential candidates, the EC will conduct an election to determine the faculty's preference. Each candidate, including the incumbent, will be asked to provide a written statement to the faculty describing

- a vision for the Department over the next 3 years,
- a description of areas in need of change, and
- potential strategies for accomplishing the changes and achieving the vision.

Voting members will review these statements and each candidate will be afforded an opportunity to meet with the voting members as a whole for open discussion of key issues. Following these steps, voting members will vote by secret ballot. The candidate who receives over 50% of the votes will be recommended to the Dean as Chair for the subsequent three-year term. For the purpose of selection of the Chair, two-thirds of the eligible voting members must cast a non-abstaining ballot for the election to be valid. If no candidate receives over 50% of the votes, a second election will be held one week later. If no candidate receives over 50% of the vote at that time, all candidate names will be forwarded to the Dean for consideration.

If the incumbent expresses a preference for remaining in the Chair position for an additional three-year term, and if no faculty member wishes to be considered in an election, the EC will provide feedback to the incumbent based on their survey of the faculty.

The EC will communicate the faculty's preference to the Dean. If the Dean concurs with the faculty's decision, the individual will be named Chair. If the Dean does not concur, the EC will request a meeting between the Dean and the faculty to address the issue and seek resolution prior to any appointment becoming formalized.

## **COMMITTEE SERVICE**

### **Standing Committees:**

There are two standing committees in the Department as described below. The Chair appoints members annually before the beginning of the Fall term.

*Graduate Admissions:* There is typically one member per graduate program concentration area and vote is by a simple majority system. The Graduate Admissions Committee must approve all students admitted, adhering to current UWF graduate admissions policies, ethical standards, and other university guidelines for fair practices.

*Executive Committee:* The Executive Committee serves as representatives of the faculty to the Chair to address and resolve issues deemed important for deliberation by the Chair. EC members

will consult with the Chair upon request or may receive specific assignments from the Chair to help the Department achieve its goals. The EC shall be comprised of at least three tenured or tenure-track faculty members who hold rank in the Department. The Chair shall make a concerted effort to appoint members to the Executive Committee to form a representative sample of the faculty while meeting the specific needs of the Chair and the Department.

### **Ad Hoc Committees:**

The Chair appoints ad hoc committees as the need arises. Examples and their respective objectives include:

*Graduate Education and Learning Committee:* To evaluate, develop, and enhance Psychology graduate programs at the University of West Florida.

*Undergraduate Education and Learning Committee:* To evaluate develop, and enhance the Psychology undergraduate programs at the University of West Florida.

*Faculty and Staff Enhancement Committee:* To examine, develop, and recommend policies and procedures that foster a positive and supportive culture of work-life effectiveness.

*Community Outreach Committee:* To facilitate Departmental capacity to create sustainable community outreach endeavors.

### **Search Committees:**

In the event a vacant or new faculty position is approved to be filled, the faculty shall have input regarding the type of applicant to be sought. The process for forming a search committee, conducting a search, and providing faculty input to be used to determine the ultimate hiring decision shall conform to the UWF policy and other regulations. Consideration will be given to recruiting individuals with needed expertise in content areas and abilities that will help the Department achieve its goals. The Department will also use the hiring process to achieve an optimal balance of representatives from diverse backgrounds as well as maintain appropriate generational cohorts of faculty within the Department.

A faculty search committee shall be formed consisting of members appointed by the Chair. In appointing members, the Chair shall strive for diverse representation across seniority, ethnicity, gender, etc. and knowledge of the field in which the search is being conducted. A member from outside the Department is appointed as appropriate. The Committee Chair must be a tenured faculty member of the Department (of any rank). The committee may include a graduate or advanced undergraduate student to represent the student perspective and also provide some professional experience to the student. The search committee responds and reports to the hiring official, who can be the College Dean or Department Chair.

The committee will adhere to all UWF policy and other pertinent regulations regarding the conduct of searches. For example, the committee's duties include following the procedures outlined for faculty hiring by the Office of Academic Affairs and shall be consistent with Sunshine Law. They will draft search materials, including advertisements and selection criteria, and submit these to faculty for approval prior to publication. The Department faculty values diversity in hiring and emphasizes the recruitment of minority members as a critical component of establishing an optimal candidate pool. The committee typically will

conduct phone/video interviews to identify finalists for the position. In ideal circumstances, up to three candidates will be invited for an on-campus interview. All candidates, regardless of prior history with Department, will complete the same protocol for the campus visit.

Department members shall participate in the on-campus interview by making reasonable efforts to attend the candidate's formal presentation, which allows Department members to assess the candidate's teaching and research potential. The search committee will also ask some Department members to participate more directly in interview groups or serve as escorts/participants during meals. The faculty will assess the strengths and limitations of all candidates and send their feedback to the search committee. At the conclusion of the review process, the search committee will forward a comprehensive list of strengths and weaknesses to the hiring official for final determination. The hiring official or designee (such as the chair) will enter negotiations with the preferred candidate. The hiring official or designee will notify the Department members when a candidate has accepted or rejected the Department's offer.

### **Mentoring Committees:**

The mentoring process is focused on both the *career/instrumental* functions and the *psychosocial* functions that have been identified as part of successful mentoring. Career functions involve such things as coaching, sponsoring, giving professional advice, introducing to others in the organization who can be of career assistance, explaining the typical routes to advancement, increasing positive exposure in work-related settings, and guiding the mentee through the process of annual evaluations, mid-point review, and preparation of the dossier to submit for tenure and promotion. Psychosocial functions include provision of friendship, role-modeling, confirmation and acceptance, and other supportive behaviors.

### **Guidelines for mentoring:**

1. Each untenured faculty member should be assigned a minimum of two mentors from among the tenured faculty in the Department. Visiting faculty and post-tenure Associate Professors may also be assigned a mentor from among senior faculty, if requested.
2. Mentor-mentee assignments should be limited to one academic year. The assignment can be extended by mutual agreement, but it should be recognized that over time a mentee's needs may change and therefore various senior faculty may be more helpful from one year to the next.
3. The mentors shall be appointed by the Department Chair, in consultation with the junior and senior faculty members, taking into consideration the unique needs of junior faculty, the other assignments of senior faculty, and other relevant factors.
4. Mentors' work assignments shall include the mentoring assignment as Department service.
5. Mentor-mentee pairs should agree to meet at regular intervals during the academic year for the purpose of discussing factors that will affect the professional growth and adaptation to the University of the junior faculty. Both partners should take the initiative in arranging these interactions. Although this is a formal mentoring program, it would be desirable for participants to try to develop the types of informal interactions that would occur had they chosen one another spontaneously.
6. At the end of the academic year (or other period of assignment) the Chair should solicit feedback from all participants about the perceived effectiveness of the relationship and areas in which further support would be useful.
7. Because the Chair is responsible for career development and evaluation for all faculty, she or he should not be assigned as a mentor during the Chair's term of service.

8. Topics and activities that could be part of such mentoring relationships:
- Go out for lunch and talk about informal topics.
  - Discuss both persons' teaching and research and share ideas to facilitate these activities.
  - Talk about time management and balancing of professional obligations.
  - Discuss routes to promotion and professional advancement.
  - Introduce the mentee to others on campus or elsewhere who could be helpful in various ways (e.g., as a research partner, someone to share leisure activities, or someone to provide information about campus and community events or organizations).
  - Discuss different types of service activities, their time demands and significance at various career levels.
  - Visit different parts of the campus or the local area that may be unfamiliar.
  - Celebrate "important" events (birthdays, manuscript submissions or acceptances, completion of the first semester, etc.).
  - Provide honest feedback on performance that does not automatically become part of the personnel record. If the mentor conducts a peer observation, the mentee may elect to include that report as evidence of effectiveness.
  - Invite the other person's involvement in research, committee work in professional organizations, community organizations, etc.
  - Check in periodically about how things are going in general.

## **ANNUAL EVALUATIONS**

In accordance with UWF and BOT policy, evaluations shall be conducted by the Chair annually at the end of the Spring term for all tenured and tenure earning faculty. Annual evaluation procedures must be consistent with the [UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement](#) and the [University of West Florida Academic Affairs Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion Policy](#). The Chair shall follow the criteria for evaluating faculty that are incorporated into these by-laws as Appendix A.

## **MID-POINT REVIEW**

The Departmental mid-point review (MPR) process conforms to the UWF policy. The junior faculty member will be informed of the time at which the MPR will take place at the time of initial appointment. The tenured faculty members who are currently serving as the junior faculty members' mentors at the time of his or her MPR will coordinate the process.

### **Materials:**

The mentors are responsible for guiding the candidate in preparing the MPR dossier, which will include the following materials:

Statement of Contributions

Current CV

Letter of Initial Appointment

Chair's Annual Evaluations for previous 2 years

Student Evaluations of Teaching as required for annual evaluations

Peer Evaluations of Teaching

(The mentee may elect which peer evaluations are most advantageous to use rather than including all peer reviews conducted during the probationary period).

## Examples of teaching materials, service activities, and scholarly contributions

Optional: If they believe their work is insufficiently known in the Department, the probationary faculty member may request to deliver a colloquium to present his/her dossier to available Department members, who can provide feedback and support.

### **Reviewers:**

All tenured faculty members will be required to review the dossier. The mentors may facilitate a meeting with all tenured faculty members to discuss strengths and weaknesses. The mentors will provide the feedback to the probationary faculty member with the Chair, including a performance improvement plan, if deemed necessary. The probationary faculty member may request to meet with the entire faculty for feedback.

The Chair will prepare a written summary of the evaluation for the personnel file and for the Dean's review and response to the probationary faculty member, as currently outlined in the UWF guidelines.

### **Use of Materials:**

Further use of MPR materials is at the discretion of the probationary faculty member. Inclusion of MPR materials in the tenure portfolio is not a requirement. The probationary faculty member may wish to include the MPR summary if the candidate earned a laudatory review or if the candidate can demonstrate successful efforts in remediating any deficiencies noted in the summary.

### **Timeline:**

The original letter of appointment identifies when the MPR is to take place. In that year, the probationary faculty member will submit the MPR dossier at the beginning of the Spring Semester. The faculty will review the dossier during Spring semester. The mentors may facilitate a meeting with the faculty for feedback in cases where additional group review will be helpful to the committee in completing their evaluation. Then, the mentors will meet with the probationary faculty member, and also provide their feedback to the Chair. The Chair will submit a written evaluation along with the annual evaluation, which will be submitted to the College Dean.

### Timeline for the Mid-Point Review

Fall Semester: Mentors meet with probationary faculty member to guide preparation of the dossier.

Spring Semester:

- Week 1: Probationary faculty member submits final dossier to mentors to assure it is in order.
- Week 3: Mentors inform tenured faculty that dossier is available for review.
- Week 4-6: Tenured faculty review dossier and complete tenure evaluation form presented in the Annual Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion Policy. The optional colloquium, if requested, can be scheduled during this time.
- Week 7-8: Mentors may facilitate a meeting with all tenured faculty to gather feedback.
- Week 9-10: Mentors meet with Chair to discuss feedback and

- prepare a performance improvement plan, if deemed necessary.
- Week 11-12: Mentors and Chair meet with probationary faculty member to give feedback.
- Week 15: Chair prepares written summary and submits to mentors to review. Written report is submitted to the candidate.

Post-Spring Semester: Chair submits written summary to the Dean with the annual evaluation.

## **TENURE AND PROMOTION**

Eligibility for tenure and promotion shall be consistent with the most recent revision of the [University of West Florida Academic Affairs Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion Policy](#).

The Chair is responsible for informing the faculty member of his/her eligibility and the requirements for tenure and promotion. The mentoring committee is responsible for guiding the probationary faculty member in preparation of the dossier. The Chair is responsible for conducting the formal polling of eligible faculty for decisions on tenure and promotion, according to university policy. The results of these procedures will then be forwarded to the Dean.

## **OFFICE HOURS**

During the fall and spring semesters, each faculty member shall hold four (4) physical office hours per week spread across at least two days and be available at other times by appointment. In addition, it is expected that faculty will respond to student electronic contact (e.g. email, phone) generally within two (2) business days.

## **SUMMER TEACHING OPPORTUNITIES**

The Department's first priority for summer teaching is to the students. Therefore, courses will be assigned to those faculty who have the expertise to teach those courses most needed by students. If funding permits, all faculty members who want to teach during the summer will be assigned to teach one course. If funding does not permit each faculty member to teach one course, priority for assigning courses shall be as follows:

- First, newly hired faculty members (within 2 years of hiring).
- Second, provided faculty have the expertise to teach the courses required that term, the remaining tenured and tenure-track faculty members will be given priority on a rotational system. Those receiving a course one year will be placed at the end of the list for the following year.

If funding is still available after all faculty who wish to teach have been assigned to teach one course, the assignment of a second course will follow the same order of priority.

Faculty are not contractually obligated to supervise students in unscheduled teaching (thesis, internship, directed studies) without compensation during the summer. When funding is available, such unscheduled teaching can be included in the summer work assignment for compensation. A faculty member may independently and voluntarily elect to engage in such activity without compensation. In such cases, the Chair will consider and include this activity in the annual evaluation.

## **OVERLOAD ASSIGNMENTS**

The Department typically does not encourage overload assignments in order to protect faculty time to ensure the fulfillment of teaching, research, and service obligations. However, when Departmental needs dictate, faculty members may be approached to accept an additional teaching assignment for overload compensation or future release time. The assignment of overload teaching shall follow the same priority order as summer teaching. Special care should be taken by the Department Chair and the mentoring committee of untenured faculty to protect the faculty member from pressure to seek or accept an overload assignment that will interfere with the faculty member's progress toward tenure and promotion.

## **REVISION OF DEPARTMENT BY-LAWS**

Amendments to Department by-laws may be proposed and voted on during any spring or fall semester faculty meeting. Approval of any amendment or revision requires a two-thirds majority of the voting members. The text and rationale of the proposed amendment must be submitted to the Chair and distributed to the voting membership at least 10 workdays prior to the meeting at which the change is to be considered. Full-time faculty members who are on sabbatical retain voting rights on by-laws change. However, the burden of staying current with the status of by-laws voting falls to the faculty member. The Chair shall not be obligated to provide special notice to those on sabbatical of potential changes beyond regular updates and notices forwarded to all faculty members. The current version of the by-laws will be distributed to all faculty and staff of the department and posted for public access on the department, college, and university websites.

**Appendix A**  
**Department of Psychology**  
**Faculty Annual Evaluation Criteria**  
**Faculty Approved 04-17-2009**  
**Faculty Approved Revision 02-18-2011**  
**Faculty Amended 04-13-2012**

**Annual Evaluation Criteria for *Teaching Activities***

Each faculty will be evaluated using the criteria in the “Course Plan and Organization,” “Execution,” and “Professional Responsibility and Academic Integrity” Sections listed below. Activities in other domains, although important, may vary on an annual basis. All domains should be addressed over the course of several years and especially by tenure and promotion consideration points. A faculty member may be evaluated using any of the other teaching domains as deemed appropriate by the faculty or the chair. It is assumed the chair will use this information to form a global rating of teaching, not merely a mathematical composite.

Teaching is a multifaceted activity and evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching activity will focus on a broad array of factors related to teaching. The department has identified five major categories under which various aspects of teaching are subsumed:

- Course Planning, Organization, and Execution
- Professional Responsibility and Academic Integrity
- Continuous Improvement Efforts
- Curriculum Revision and Assessment
- Unscheduled Teaching

These teaching activities are expected to be closely aligned with the department’s undergraduate Academic Learning Compact (ALC) and the graduate Academic Learning Plan (ALP) and represent a meaningful component of the program curricula of the department. The quality of a faculty member’s teaching is evaluated based on data provided by the faculty member documenting activities, outcomes, and achievements, as well as data made available from other sources (e.g. students, peers).

It is recognized that leadership in Curriculum Revision and Assessment activities may be limited early in one’s career.

The SPBS Executive Committee recommends that faculty may provide the following evidence to support their annual evaluation ratings for each of the 3 required major categories of teaching, but not limited to:

1. Category: **Course Plan and Organization** – Syllabus, assigned readings, tests and assignments, and comments and data from questions #1, #2, and #18 of the currently used SUSSAI report.
2. Category: **Execution** – Syllabus, PPT slides, screen prints, or other examples of technology use, teaching awards, letters from students (solicited or unsolicited), student complaints (or lack thereof), and comments and data from questions #4, #5, and #16 of the SUSSAI report.

3. Category: **Professional Responsibility and Academic Integrity** – Letters from students, self-report of office hours/advising, examples of feedback to students (e.g., rubrics, comments on papers/assignments), and comments and data from questions #6, #7, and #15 of the SUSSAI report.

**Tenure and Promotion Criteria: *Teaching***

	<b>Poor Performance</b>	<b>Fair Performance</b>	<b>Good Performance</b>	<b>Excellent Performance</b>	<b>Distinguished Performance</b>
<b>Course Planning, Organization, and Execution</b>	<p><b>Teaching Philosophy:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In teaching portfolio: teaching philosophy is missing, poorly articulated and/or poorly expressed in course activities and planning (in other words, one's view of teaching is not evident in course syllabus, objectives, materials, or activities).</li> </ul>		<p><b>Teaching Philosophy:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Articulated and expressed in course planning and activities.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Teaching Philosophy:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Well-articulated and provides foundation for coherent course planning and activities.</li> <li>• Incorporates teaching and learning scholarship in philosophy; revolves around effective pedagogical strategies.</li> <li>• Emphasizes impact on learner or transformative learning.</li> <li>• Student centered.</li> <li>• Promotion of high quality teaching in the department.</li> <li>• Passionate.</li> <li>• Engages in scholarship of teaching.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Course Plan and Organization:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Syllabi fail to establish clear and relevant expectations or SLO's.</li> <li>• Assessment practices of student learning are inadequate to support student learning.</li> <li>• Course content is outdated, or weak in rigor</li> <li>• Textbooks and other reading materials are irrelevant, outdated, and inappropriate.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Course Plan and Organization:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Syllabi provide reasonably clear and appropriate expectations and SLO's.</li> <li>• Assessment practices support student learning.</li> <li>• Course content is current.</li> <li>• Readings are appropriate.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Course Plan and Organization:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive syllabi that include all essential elements, SLO's, policies, procedures, timeline, readings, etc.</li> <li>• Well-organized and clearly understood by students.</li> <li>• Syllabi easily available via web page/site.</li> <li>• Performance expectations are clearly defined and understood.</li> <li>• Assessment/evaluation practices optimize learning.</li> <li>• Course content is inclusive, comprehensive, intellectually stimulating, current and varied sources.</li> <li>• Mastery of content.</li> <li>• Leadership in developing learning and student engagement opportunities within the department.</li> </ul>

<i>Teaching</i>	<b>Poor Performance</b>	<b>Fair Performance</b>	<b>Good Performance</b>	<b>Excellent Performance</b>	<b>Distinguished Performance</b>
<b>Course Planning, Organization, and Execution</b>	<p><b>Execution:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedagogical strategies are ineffective.</li> <li>• Disorganization and/or routinely poor preparation.</li> <li>• Standards are inappropriate.</li> <li>• Classroom is disorganized, hostile, or not well-managed.</li> <li>• Does not engage students through varied effective and creative pedagogical strategies.</li> <li>• Consistent and substantive problems with courses, as revealed by students.</li> <li>• Poor course management: confusing instruction and guidance.</li> <li>• Frequent complaints.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Execution:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Majority of pedagogical strategies are effective and appropriate.</li> <li>• Organized and prepared.</li> <li>• Routinely provide helpful feedback.</li> <li>• Standards are appropriate.</li> <li>• Classroom is organized and well-managed.</li> <li>• Engages students using selective pedagogical strategies.</li> <li>• Adequate impact on student learning, as revealed by students.</li> <li>• Good course management: provide clear guidance.</li> <li>• Few complaints.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Execution:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedagogical strategies optimize learning.</li> <li>• Always well-organized and prepared.</li> <li>• Standards are appropriate.</li> <li>• Classroom is always organized and well-managed.</li> <li>• Engages students broadly through varied and creative pedagogical strategies.</li> <li>• Exceptional impact on student learning, transformative experiences, as revealed by students.</li> <li>• Outstanding course management; consistently provides clear guidance.</li> <li>• Professional maturity in handling teaching situations.</li> <li>• Capitalizes upon instructional technology.</li> <li>• Receives teaching awards.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Student Support and Advising:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student support practices are ineffective.</li> <li>• Advising: Consistently poor advising.</li> <li>• Not responsive.</li> <li>• Not proactive in advising students.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Student Support and Advising:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Majority of student support practices are effective.</li> <li>• Advising: Consistently done well and few concerns with advising.</li> <li>• Consistently responsive to student.</li> <li>• Provides adequate information.</li> <li>• Primary focus on course planning.</li> <li>• Offers materials that may contain obsolete information.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Student Support and Advising:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student support practices are exceptional, above and beyond; and facilitate optimal student development.</li> <li>• Provides “multimodal advising opportunities to provide appropriate assistance for course planning, effective mentoring, and proper career guidance.”</li> <li>• Emphasizes student responsibility.</li> <li>• Provides “comprehensive advising materials that are targeted to help students at different phases of their education.”</li> </ul>

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Engages in discussions with students outside the classroom.</li></ul>
--	--	--	--	--	---

<i>Teaching</i>	<b>Poor Performance</b>	<b>Fair Performance</b>	<b>Good Performance</b>	<b>Excellent Performance</b>	<b>Distinguished Performance</b>
<b>Continuous Improvement Efforts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has not administered/evaluated student course evaluations as required.</li> <li>• Has not expressed any interest in improving or advancing teaching activities and has not developed a plan or taken any action to achieve this.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has regularly administered and evaluated student course evaluations for improvement.</li> <li>• Has developed a basic plan and/or taken limited action to improve or advance teaching activities, with modest or limited improvements or outcomes. Such efforts may include one of the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ requested/evaluated an in-class (peer) evaluation of his/her teaching,</li> <li>▪ participated in university workshops that promote pedagogical practices,</li> <li>▪ acted as a discussant or as a presenter at a regional, national, or international meeting to promote pedagogical practices, or</li> <li>▪ participated actively in department, college, or university curriculum decisions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has administered and evaluated student course evaluations for improvement per University policy.</li> <li>• Has implemented a clear and effective plan for improving or advancing teaching activities, with exceptional improvements and outcomes. Such efforts include more than one of the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ requested/evaluated an in-class (peer) evaluation of his/her teaching,</li> <li>▪ participated in university workshops that promote pedagogical practices,</li> <li>▪ acted as a discussant or as a presenter at a regional, national, or international meeting to promote pedagogical practices, or</li> <li>▪ participated actively in department, college, or university curriculum decisions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Professional Responsibility and Academic Integrity</b>	<p><b>Respect for Students:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One or more serious incidents or a consistent pattern of disrespect or disregard for students as evidenced by:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Being late or missing class,</li> <li>▪ hostile demeanor toward student(s),</li> <li>▪ inappropriate role boundaries or relationship with students</li> <li>▪ or inequitable treatment of students.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<p><b>Respect for Students:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent pattern of basic respect for students with no serious incidents and only infrequent, isolated occurrence of a minor incident of disrespect or disregard for students.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Respect for Students:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exemplary role model of highest respect for students as evidenced by:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consistent punctuality, respectful, supportive demeanor toward students, active engagement with students in a mentoring role,</li> <li>▪ clearly defined and implemented role boundaries in the mentoring role with students,</li> <li>▪ and highest standards for equitable treatment of students.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<i>Teaching</i>	<b>Poor Performance</b>	<b>Fair Performance</b>	<b>Good Performance</b>	<b>Excellent Performance</b>	<b>Distinguished Performance</b>
<b>Professional Responsibility and Academic Integrity</b>	<p><b>Accessibility to Students:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One or more serious incidents or a consistent pattern of inaccessibility to students as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ failure to keep required office hours,</li> <li>▪ failure to respond in timely fashion to student letters, e-mails, phone calls,</li> <li>▪ or failure to keep appointments with students.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<p><b>Accessibility to Students:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent pattern of required accessibility to students with no serious incidents and only infrequent, isolated occurrence of a minor incident of inaccessibility to students.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Accessibility to Students:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exemplary role model of high standards for accessibility to students as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consistent availability during posted office hours as well as other times,</li> <li>▪ consistent pattern of quick response to student communication, and</li> <li>▪ priority given to student appointments.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Provision of Evaluative Feedback on Student Work:</b> One or more serious incidents or a consistent pattern of inadequate or inappropriate feedback to students as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ failure to communicate grades in timely fashion,</li> <li>▪ failure to provide constructive feedback on student work,</li> <li>▪ or failure to provide guidance and expectations for student work.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<p><b>Provision of Evaluative Feedback on Student Work:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent pattern of adequate and appropriate feedback to students with no serious incidents and only infrequent, isolated occurrence of inappropriate feedback to students.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Provision of Evaluative Feedback on Student Work:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exemplary role model of high standards for providing thorough, constructive feedback to students as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ consistent communication of grades with no delays, provision of exceptionally clear and constructive feedback on student work, and</li> <li>▪ provision of exceptionally clear guidance and expectations for student work.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Unscheduled Teaching</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engages in no or minimal unscheduled teaching such as directed studies, internship and thesis committees.</li> <li>• Quality of mentoring process or student product is poor.</li> <li>• Fails to successfully guide students to degree completion.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engages in some unscheduled teaching activities.</li> <li>• Chairs at least one thesis (or thesis equivalent) or internship committee, but less than average/norm.</li> <li>• Most student products are in acceptable range of quality.</li> <li>• Successfully guides most students to degree completion.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Successfully mentors numerous students in unscheduled teaching activities.</li> <li>• Extended record of chairing more than the average number of thesis, (or thesis equivalent) and internship committees.</li> <li>• Consistently produces high quality internship portfolios and theses (or thesis equivalent) from students.</li> <li>• Consistently guides numerous students through thesis and internship process to degree completion.</li> </ul>

<i>Teaching</i>	<b>Poor Performance</b>	<b>Fair Performance</b>	<b>Good Performance</b>	<b>Excellent Performance</b>	<b>Distinguished Performance</b>
<b>Curriculum Revision and Assessment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constructs syllabi without SLOs.</li> <li>• Constructs syllabi with SLOs that are inappropriate for course or not assessed.</li> <li>• Does not participate in departmental discussions about curriculum revision and Assessment or data-based decision-making.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constructs syllabi with appropriate SLOs and assessments.</li> <li>• Participates in curriculum revision or departmental program assessment.</li> <li>• Participates in discussions about data-based decision-making at the departmental level.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implements course SLOs and assessments in integrated and creative ways; prepares syllabi with SLOs integrated with course assignments, assessments, and program SLOs.</li> <li>• Takes a leadership role and/or participates significantly in an aspect of curriculum revision or departmental assessment planning/implementation.</li> <li>• Takes a leadership role and/or participates significantly in data-based decision-making at the departmental level.</li> <li>• Contributes to the scholarship of curriculum or assessment.</li> </ul>

## Annual Evaluation Criteria for Scholarly Activities

The following activities are among the typical and relevant activities that are valued as scholarly work in the discipline of Psychology: write and publish a book; write and publish a chapter of a book; publish refereed journal articles and technical reports; present professional papers at conferences; write and/or obtain grants and/or contracts; develop, design and present new workshops; develop research instruments (e.g., paper and pencil tests, hardware, software, etc.); develop or continue an exemplary research program; give invited colloquia; submit an article or conference paper, book, workshop design, grant proposal; present at an organized professional or invitational scholarly panel, workshop, etc. These scholarly activities would be expected to yield tangible products or outcomes that have a measurable impact on the discipline of Psychology. The quality of the tangible product or outcome of the scholarly activity would be evaluated based on its relative impact in the discipline, as indicated by such things as citation rates; circulation; quality of the journal or publisher; funding source and amount; prominence, visibility, or recognition of the work; public recognition and awards; level of exposure (local, regional, national, international); and other relevant indicators of the impact.

### Poor

Demonstrates serious problems in developing scholarship as reflected by the indicators below.

#### Indicators:

- Scholarly agenda has not been identified
- Minimal pursuit of scholarly projects
- Ethical regulations violated regarding scholarly production

### Fair

Demonstrates only minor tangible progress toward executing a scholarly and creative agenda as shown by the indicators below.

#### Indicators:

- General focus of interest identified, but lacking effective organization and management to be fully productive.
- Evidence of completion of beginning stages of scholarly process (e.g., data collection, manuscript outline), but lacking final completion.
- Exploration of possible scholarly collaboration, but not yet in effect.
- Judgment about ethical standards for scholarly work questionable at times
- Efforts have yielded limited progress toward tangible products of limited impact

## Scholarly Activities, continued

### **Good**

Demonstrates tangible progress in scholarship as shown by the indicators below; meets SPBS expectations, but may not be sufficient for tenure.

#### Indicators:

- Organized program of research that demonstrates potential for patterns of productivity as indicated by presentations, internal grant submissions, conference submissions, and other such products in preparation
- Specific scholarly agenda identified, including appropriate timelines and preferred dissemination venues (effective organization and management for productivity)
- Establishment of scholarly collaboration to help with specific scholarly agenda

### **Excellent**

Demonstrates quality execution of scholarship with tangible products or outcomes that have a measurable impact on the discipline of Psychology as shown by the indicators below.

#### Indicators:

- Peer-reviewed manuscript submissions or publications, published or submitted book chapters, funded internal grants, external grant submissions
- Refined scholarly agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university context
- Highly skilled application of ethical conventions in discipline
- Publications or presentations co-authored with students

### **Distinguished**

Demonstrates unusually high degree of skill in design and execution of scholarly projects as shown by the indicators below that build upon the indicators for excellence.

#### Indicators:

- Scholarly productivity that clearly exceeds the standards of excellence
- Successful proposal for external funding
- Awards received for scholarly projects

## Annual Evaluation Criteria for Service Activities

The SPBS expectations are that:

1. All faculty will act as good departmental and university citizens by participating in cooperative efforts to foster the well-being of the organization.
2. All faculty will engage in professional service to promote the department, college, university, community, or profession.

Service is broadly defined including, but not limited to, the following.

- Service on university, college, and school/department governance
- Public lectures or local professional presentations
- Service as school director, department chair or program director
- Unremunerated consultancies
- Community activities related to one's discipline
- Advising student organizations
- Service to academic organizations
- Service to professional organizations
- Service on editorial review boards
- Service to the university in the form of travel to and from remote campus locations
- Reviewing papers and symposiums for conferences or grant proposals
- Service on personnel search committees and other ad hoc assignments

Faculty will vary in their execution of a service plan. For example, service may emphasize activity on the campus at the expense of the other options. In such a case, greater depth of service would be expected. Although there is no 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.

At the outset of employment, service activities are likely to be the relatively lowest priority of the three categories; however, service is essential to accomplish the various objectives of the regional comprehensive university. Service expectations should be somewhat lighter for new faculty who are establishing themselves as teachers and scholars, but new faculty should still be encouraged to render high quality service in their selected activities.

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).

Community service that is related to a faculty member's disciplinary background is more valuable than service that is not related to the faculty member's disciplinary background.

Service, continued

### **Poor**

Demonstrates *serious* problems in fulfilling appropriate service role for faculty as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is *well below* the SPBS expectations.

Indicators:

- Service activity nonexistent, extremely limited, or very poor in quality, producing a potentially adverse impact on the goals of the relevant organization
- Fails to participate effectively in SPBS service obligations

### **Fair**

Demonstrates only *minor* tangible progress in service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is *below* SPBS expectations.

Indicators:

- Appropriate arenas for service identified and explored, but limited involvement
- Minimal contributions made in service role (e.g. “sits” on committees as compared to active participation, lack of fulfilling obligations, tardiness or absence from meetings)
- Multiple service obligations are poorly managed

### **Good**

Demonstrates *adequate* tangible progress in relevant service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service *meets* SPBS expectation for rank.

Indicators:

- Selection of service activity expresses understanding of faculty service role in regional comprehensive university
- Usually participates actively and constructively in service activity
- Usually effective in service as citizen of SPBS
- Multiple service obligations are adequately managed

Service, continued

**Excellent**

Demonstrates *high* degree of skill in service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service contributions are *above* expectations of the SPBS.

Indicators:

- Scope and effort level are above SPBS standards
- Colleagues view contributions to SPBS as effective
- Service agenda is well suited to regional comprehensive university mission
- Multiple service obligations are managed effectively
- Recognition inside or outside of the university for service contributions

**Distinguished**

Demonstrates *very high* degree of skill in service contributions as shown by the indicators below that build upon indicators for excellence. In general, service contributions *clearly exceed* the expectations of the SPBS.

Indicators:

- Leadership demonstrated in targeted arenas of service (e.g., holds professional or university elected office; collaborates skillfully and innovatively)
- Extraordinary skill in accomplishing service tasks
- Wide external recognition (local, national or international audience) or award achieved for quality of service contributions

### **Amendment**

During the SPBS Faculty Meeting on April 13, 2012, the faculty voted to pilot revised criteria for Scholarly Activities and Service Activities. Given that the vote was to pilot the criteria for the 2011-2012 evaluation period, the criteria are included here as an Amendment. They do not replace the existing criteria.

### **Annual Evaluation Criteria for Scholarly Activities**

The following activities are among the typical and relevant activities that are valued as scholarly work in the discipline of Psychology: write and publish a book; write and publish a chapter of a book; publish refereed journal articles and technical reports; present professional papers at conferences; write and/or obtain grants and/or contracts; develop, design and present new workshops; develop research instruments (e.g., paper and pencil tests, hardware, software, etc.); develop or continue an exemplary research program; give invited colloquia; submit an article or conference paper, book, workshop design, grant proposal; present at an organized professional or invitational scholarly panel, workshop, etc. These scholarly activities would be expected to yield tangible products or outcomes that have a measurable impact on the discipline of Psychology. The quality of the tangible product or outcome of the scholarly activity would be evaluated based on its relative impact in the discipline, as indicated by such things as citation rates; circulation; quality of the journal or publisher; funding source and amount; prominence, visibility, or recognition of the work; public recognition and awards; level of exposure (local, regional, national, international); and other relevant indicators of the impact.

Scholarly activities are designated as Level I or Level II. A rating of Good requires evidence of one Level I activity. A rating of Excellent requires evidence of two Level I activities or one Level II activity. A rating of Distinguished requires evidence of two Level II activities or three of any combination of Level I or Level II activities.

#### Level I:

- Non-peer reviewed paper or book chapter
- Presentation (paper, poster, symposium) at a regional meeting
- Professional workshop or lecture
- Non-competitive or internal grant received
- Non-competitive contract received
- Submission of external grant proposal
- Submission of journal article
- Service on journal editorial board or as reviewer for journal

**Level II:**

- Peer reviewed paper or book chapter
- Presentation (paper, poster, symposium) at a national or international meeting
- Authored book
- Keynote speaker at international, national, or regional meeting
- Competitive external grant received
- Competitive external contract received
- Editor of journal or book
- Competitive award for scholarly activity

**Poor**

Demonstrates serious problems in developing scholarship as reflected by the indicators below.

**Indicators:**

- Scholarly agenda has not been identified
- Minimal pursuit of scholarly projects
- Ethical regulations violated regarding scholarly production

**Fair**

Demonstrates only minor tangible progress toward executing a scholarly and creative agenda as shown by the indicators below.

**Indicators:**

- General focus of interest identified, but lacking effective organization and management to be fully productive.
- Evidence of completion of beginning stages of scholarly process (e.g., data collection, manuscript outline), but lacking final completion.
- Exploration of possible scholarly collaboration, but not yet in effect.
- Judgment about ethical standards for scholarly work questionable at times
- Efforts have yielded limited progress toward tangible products of limited impact

**Good**

Demonstrates tangible progress in scholarship as shown by the indicators below; meets departmental expectations, but may not be sufficient for tenure.

**Indicators:**

- Organized program of research that demonstrates potential for patterns of productivity .
- Specific scholarly agenda identified, including appropriate timelines and preferred dissemination venues (effective organization and management for productivity)

- Establishment of scholarly collaboration to help with specific scholarly agenda.
- Evidence of one Level I activity.

**Excellent**

Demonstrates quality execution of scholarship with tangible products or outcomes that have a measurable impact on the discipline of Psychology as shown by the indicators below.

## Indicators:

- Refined scholarly agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university context
- Highly skilled application of ethical conventions in discipline
- Publications or presentations co-authored with students
- Evidence of two Level I activities or one Level II activity.

**Distinguished**

Demonstrates unusually high degree of skill in design and execution of scholarly projects as shown by the indicators below that build upon the indicators for excellence.

## Indicators:

- Scholarly productivity that clearly exceeds the standards of excellence.
- Successful proposal for external funding.
- Awards received for scholarly projects.
- Evidence of two Level II activities or three of any combination of Level I or Level II activities.

## Annual Evaluation Criteria for Service Activities

The Psychology departmental expectations are that:

1. All faculty will act as good departmental and university citizens by participating in cooperative efforts to foster the well-being of the organization.
2. All faculty will engage in professional service to promote the department, college, university, community, or profession.

Service is broadly defined including, but not limited to, the following.

- Service on university, college, and department governance
- Public lectures or local professional presentations
- Service as department chair or program director
- Unremunerated consultancies
- Community activities related to one's discipline
- Advising student organizations
- Service to academic organizations
- Service to professional organizations
- Service on editorial review boards
- Service to the university in the form of travel to and from remote campus locations
- Reviewing papers and symposiums for conferences or grant proposals
- Service on personnel search committees and other ad hoc assignments

Faculty will vary in their execution of a service plan. For example, service may emphasize activity on the campus at the expense of the other options. In such a case, greater depth of service would be expected. Although there is no 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.

At the outset of employment, service activities are likely to be the relatively lowest priority of the three categories; however, service is essential to accomplish the various objectives of the regional comprehensive university. Service expectations should be somewhat lighter for new faculty who are establishing themselves as teachers and scholars, but new faculty should still be encouraged to render high quality service in their selected activities.

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).

Community service that is related to a faculty member's disciplinary background is more valuable than service that is not related to the faculty member's disciplinary background.

In recognition of the differential effort required by various service activities, the appended matrix will be used to quantify service productivity. It is not intended to supersede qualitative judgment of performance of service activities. Faculty will calculate a service “score” according to the assigned values, but may advocate for higher values due to the nature of a particular service activity. For activities added to the list, the Director will determine the appropriate value.

After the summation of matrix points, the following minimum scores are expected for each evaluation category:

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Distinguished
Non-Tenured Faculty	0	1	2	3	4
Tenured Faculty	0	1	3	5	7

### **Poor**

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

#### Indicators:

- Service activity nonexistent, extremely limited, or very poor in quality, producing a potentially adverse impact on the goals of the relevant organization
- Fails to participate effectively in department service obligations.

### **Fair**

Demonstrates only *minor* tangible progress in service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is *below* department expectations.

#### Indicators:

- Appropriate arenas for service identified and explored, but limited involvement
- Minimal contributions made in service role (e.g. “sits” on committees as compared to active participation, lack of fulfilling obligations, tardiness or absence from meetings)
- Multiple service obligations are poorly managed.

**Good**

Demonstrates *adequate* tangible progress in relevant service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service *meets* department expectation for rank.

## Indicators:

- Selection of service activity expresses understanding of faculty service role in regional comprehensive university
- Usually participates actively and constructively in service activity
- Usually effective in service as citizen of department
- Multiple service obligations are adequately managed

**Excellent**

Demonstrates *high* degree of skill in service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service contributions are *above* expectations of the department.

## Indicators:

- Scope and effort level are above department standards
- Colleagues view contributions to department as effective
- Service agenda is well suited to regional comprehensive university mission
- Multiple service obligations are managed effectively
- Recognition inside or outside of the university for service contributions

**Distinguished**

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

## Indicators:

- Leadership demonstrated in targeted arenas of service (e.g., holds professional or university elected office; collaborates skillfully and innovatively)
- Extraordinary skill in accomplishing service tasks
- Wide external recognition (local, national or international audience) or award achieved for quality of service contributions

<b><u>University Standing Committees</u></b>	<b>Committee Rank</b>
<u>Academic Misconduct Committee</u>	1
<u>Academic Programs Assessment Council</u>	1
<u>Campus Alcohol Coalition</u>	1
<u>Campus Safety and Security Council</u>	1
<u>Continuity of Operations Committee</u>	1
<u>Employee Benefits Committee</u>	1
<u>Facilities Planning Advisory Committee</u>	1
<u>FPAC Environmental Conservation and Beautification Committee</u>	1
<u>FPAC Space Utilization Committee</u>	1
<u>Faculty Personnel Committee</u>	1
<u>Faculty Senate</u>	
<u>Academic Council</u>	2
<u>Executive Committee</u>	2
<u>Faculty Sponsored Merit Scholarship Committee</u>	1
<u>General Studies Committee</u>	1
<u>Governance Committee</u>	1
<u>Planning and Special Issues Committee</u>	1
<u>Fee Appeals Committee</u>	1
<u>Graduate Council</u>	2
<u>Growth and Development Committee</u>	1
<u>HIV/AIDS Committee</u>	1
<u>Homecoming Steering Committee</u>	1
<u>Honorary Awards and Recognition Committee</u>	1
<u>Information Technology Planning and Advisory Committee</u>	1
<u>Information Technology Project Prioritization Committee</u>	1
<u>Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee</u>	1
<u>Intercollegiate Athletic Advisory Committee</u>	1
<u>Compliance Committee</u>	1
<u>Executive Committee</u>	1

<u>Head Coaches Committee</u>	1
<u>Student-Athlete Advisory Committee</u>	1
<u>Title IX Committee</u>	1
<u>International Affairs Committee</u>	1
<u>Library Committee</u>	1
<u>Parking and Transportation Advisory Committee</u>	1
<u>Parking Violations Appeal Board</u>	1
<u>Professional Education Council</u>	1
<u>Program of Incentive for Efficiency</u>	1
<u>Property Control Board</u>	1
<u>Scholarly and Creative Activities Committee</u>	1
<u>Sick Leave Pool</u>	1
<u>Sponsored Research Advisory Committee</u>	1
<u>Staff Senate</u>	1
<u>Student Fee Committee</u>	1
<u>Student Life and Services Facility Committee</u>	1
<u>Technology Fee Committee</u>	1
<u>Undergraduate Admissions Committee</u>	1
<u>University Honors Program Committee</u>	1
<u>University Public Health Committee</u>	1
<u>University Risk and Compliance Council</u>	1
<u>University Student Conduct Committee</u>	1
<u>USPS Educational Leave with Pay</u>	1
<u>UWF Institutional Review Board for Human Research Participant Protection</u>	1
<u>Web Advisory Committee</u>	1
Chair of any University Committee (#) (in addition to membership)	1
<b><u>College Councils &amp; Committees</u></b>	
<u>College of Arts and Sciences Council</u>	1
<u>CAS Academic Standards Committee</u>	1
<u>CAS Curriculum and Planning Committee</u>	1

<u>CAS Elections Committee</u>	1
<u>CAS Faculty Personnel Committee</u>	2
<u>CAS Governance Committee</u>	1
<u>CAS Resource Allocation Committee</u>	1
<u>CAS Steering Committee</u>	2
Chair of any College Committee (#) (in addition to membership)	1
<b><u>Other Councils &amp; Committees</u></b>	
<u>Academic Appeals Committee</u>	1
<u>Emerald Coast Council</u>	1
<u>Library Faculty Council</u>	1
<u>West Florida Historic Preservation Inc. Board of Directors</u>	1
<b><u>Task Forces</u></b>	
<u>Campus Master Plan Task Force 2006-2016</u>	1
<u>Campus Master Plan - Business and Technology West Campus Subgroup</u>	1
<u>Campus Master Plan - Downtown Historic Pensacola Campus Subgroup</u>	1
<u>Campus Master Plan - Emerald Coast Campus Subgroup</u>	1
<u>Campus Master Plan - Main Campus Subgroup</u>	1
<u>Campus Master Plan - Student Housing and Residence Life.</u>	1
<u>Campus Master Plan Task Force Update: 2011 - 2021</u>	1
<u>Consultant Recommending Committee</u>	1
<u>General Education Assessment and Reform Task Force</u>	1
<u>Recruitment Committee Task Force</u>	1
<u>Student Assessment of Teaching and Learning Task Force</u>	1
Chair of a Task Force (#) (in addition to membership)	1
<b><u>Ad Hoc Committees</u></b>	
<u>Energy Management Ad Hoc Committee</u>	1
<b><u>School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences</u></b>	
Executive Committee	2
Graduate Admissions Committee	1
Graduate Program Coordination (I-O, C-Track, Gen)	1

Human Resource Certificate Program	1
Center for Applied Psychology Executive Committee	1
Faculty and Staff Enhancement Committee	1
Graduate Education and Learning Committee	2
Health Psychology Certificate Program Advisor	1
Interdisciplinary Studies Coordination	1
Psi Chi/SPA	1
Society for Human Resource Management	1
Undergraduate Journal	1
Undergraduate Education and Learning Committee	2
Center on Aging Executive Committee	1
Search Committee	1
Chair of EC, GEC, CAP, CoA, UELC, Search Committees (in addition to membership)	1
<b>Professional</b>	
Ad Hoc Reviewer Services (one point total regardless of number)	1
Editorial Board Membership (one point total regardless of number)	1
Editorial Services (Editor/Associate Editor) (one point each journal)	2
Professional Organization Executive Committee (Reg., Nat., Int.)	1
Professional Org Officer (Regional, National, International) (additional)	1
<b>Other Relevant Service:</b>	