

DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH AND ADVANCED STUDIES
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA

BYLAWS
2014-2015

I. INTRODUCTION

The Department of Research and Advanced Studies (DRAS) is comprised of faculty and professionals who support the mission of the College of Education and Professional Studies (CEPS) through teaching, scholarly activities, and service. To fulfill the mission and to support the mission and vision of the College of Education and Professional Studies, the Department focuses on developing synergy between teaching and service as well as a strong research agenda in the support and preparation of empowered persons and professionals who serve key roles within the military, business, industry, government, education, and human and social service agencies. The Department supports the vision of the CEPS to provide knowledge and skills, based on theories, research, and a common body of best practices, enabling professionals to engage in innovative and effective actions in their organizations.

II. MISSION

The mission of the department is to educate and train community professionals using the most advanced theoretical, managerial, and technological knowledge, skills, and abilities available. Toward this goal, the Department is synergistic, providing training for a wide range and variety of professional careers. In support of this mission, department, faculty and staff provide for the development of regional community and educational partnerships that assist and benefit students. Thus, a major emphasis is:

- To provide foundation courses for graduate students.
- To complement each student's general education background with a strong professional program;
- To involve students in creative and meaningful activities that enhance their overall educational experiences at UWF;
- To engage students in meaningful community service; and
- To include students in appropriate joint faculty/student practical and/or applied research provided by strong academic programs;

III. GOALS

The department has varied goals. The goals are to:

- Prepare professionals to work in the military, business and industry, government, education, human and social services agencies as well as other organizations at the masters, specialist and doctoral levels through innovative programs;
- Provide research-based education and training services to the community, including PK-20 schools, human and social service agencies, government, the military, and business and industry;

- Originate and conduct cutting-edge academic and practitioner oriented research;
- Develop and administer research grants;
- Support and guide reflective practitioners who articulate and apply assumptions and theories that inform individuals' daily practices;
- Apply theories in government, the military, business and industry, educational organizations, and human and social service agencies;
- Critically discover and challenge trends and issues embedded within political contexts;
- Model a critical stance toward educational, political and professional practices by encouraging students and colleagues to become change agents;
- Design and deliver academic and professional programs that promote the inclusion of *best practices* in institutional visions and planning;
- Apply theories to researching, writing and teaching; and
- Maintain and provide intellectual autonomy.

IV. GOVERNANCE

A. *Officers*

Faculty shall abide by the collective bargaining agreement. Nothing in this section will supersede any provision of the collective bargaining agreement.

The Department Chair, or designee, will officially represent the department in its relationship with the administration, other colleges in the University, and the community at large. Whenever practicable the Chair will seek the advice of faculty in developing department and programmatic policies and procedures.

The Department Chair may appoint a Coordinator for each department program. Coordinators will seek the advice and consent of the program faculty in developing program policies and procedures. To the extent possible each of the **programs** in the department must enjoy considerable autonomy in the development of curriculum and program related matters. However, program coordinators must appropriately coordinate with faculty and the Department Chair to ensure that university and college procedures are correctly followed, faculty rights are respected, and student interests are represented. All changes to existing programs must be approved by a 2/3 vote of the faculty. All new programs must be approved by a 2/3 vote of the faculty.

B. *Voting Eligibility and Procedures*

1. On all voting issues to come before the department, all tenure line and research faculty members of the department will have right to vote.
2. A written proxy may be given to another member or an absentee ballot may be marked and given to the Chair if a member is unable to be present (proxies may only be given to others who meet the established criteria above).
3. A quorum shall consist of 2/3 of the eligible voting members plus one of the eligible voters.
4. The bylaws may be amended with a 2/3 vote of eligible faculty.

C. *Department Committees*

The Department Chair appoints members to all department committees. All ad hoc committees are dissolved at the completion of the assigned task.

V. **ACADEMIC/CURRICULAR POLICIES/PROCEDURES:**

A. *Changes:*

- All curricular and academic policy changes originate at the department level except those superimposed by changes in College and University governance structures that will be automatic.
- Curriculum Change Requests (CCRs) are completed in the department, approved by the Chair, and submitted through the dean's office to the College Program Review Committee, and/or the Professional Education Council (PEC), and the Faculty Senate.

B. *Grading Policies*

Grading and examination policies are left to the professional judgment of the instructor. These policies must be made clear to the students at the beginning of classes and must be printed in the course syllabi. Student concerns about the fairness or appropriateness of an examination should follow the grievance process outlined by the university. The DRAS adheres to the grading policies published in the *UWF Catalog*.

C. *Examination Policies*

The university final examination schedule is to be maintained. . Necessary exceptions policy may be applied for through the Dean of the College.

D. *Dissertation Chair and Committees*

All dissertation chair and committee assignments are to be reviewed and approved by the Ed.D. Program Committee. Selection for membership on dissertation committees should be based upon a review by the unit faculty and follow University and College Guidelines.

VI. **PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

A. *Recruitment and Selection of Faculty*

1. Permission to recruit/search for new faculty members is derived from the Provost via the Dean to the Chair of the department.
2. University recruitment/search procedures are to be utilized. These include approval for specific search and advertising activities by the Provost and HR prior to advertising.
3. Search committees with appropriate representation are organized by the hiring official in consultation with the department faculty. After a review of all candidates' credentials, the

search committee, consulting with the hiring official, recommends a list of candidates to be invited to the campus to be interviewed. This list is forwarded to HR for approval. Following campus visits and after a full and frank discussion, the final recommendation to HR will be made by the hiring official as defined above.

4. The hiring official confers with the Provost prior to making an offer of a position. The hiring official offers the position to the applicant and establishes salary.

B. *Selection of Adjunct Faculty*

1. Adjuncts will be reviewed and hired on an ongoing and regular basis by the Department Chair in consultation with department faculty members.
2. Adjunct faculty shall have the same credentials as tenure line faculty members, except in critical areas in which the department chair and faculty members will confer.
3. Faculty members will assist adjuncts and serve as resource persons as needed and will work with adjunct faculty to meet their needs and ensure compliance with programmatic needs, College and University policies and procedures.

C. *Annual Evaluation Procedures*

1. Faculty of the department are expected to meet the standards set forth in Florida statutes, UWF Board of Trustees rules, the UWF Board of Trustees-UFF agreement, the UWF Faculty Handbook, and the bylaws and mission statement of the Department.
2. Faculty assigned responsibilities in teaching, research, and service and will be evaluated in those three areas, if applicable.
3. The faculty member's annual work assignment will identify specific responsibilities for each evaluation period. Meeting of responsibilities outlined in the work assignment will serve as the basis for evaluation.
4. The Department Chair will evaluate individual faculty members and adjuncts on an annual basis in accordance with established College and University policies and procedures.

D. *Procedures for Making Annual Work Assignments*

The Chair will confer with the individual faculty member to plan the annual work assignment related to teaching, research, service, advising, or other kinds of assignments based on the needs of the department. Following this conference, the Chair will prepare a letter stating the assignment for the academic year (or the summer term), sign the letter, refer to the Dean for approval and signature, and submit to the faculty member for signature (in that order). The original is kept in the Dean's office in the faculty member's personnel file, a copy is kept in the Chair's office, and the faculty member receives a copy.

VII. TENURE AND PROMOTION

Decisions related to granting of tenure and granting of promotion to Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor at The University of West Florida are based on the general university criteria and standards at <http://uwf.edu/academic/pte/packet.htm#gencriteria>

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 qualifies for the decision to promote to Associate Professor. Significant 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. Persons who develop the means of scholarship within the University are often honored by this rank. 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.

The department values the variety of faculty contributions within its disciplines and recognizes the importance of the many different roles that faculty play and their contributions to their respective professions. Faculty contributions in DRAS are traditionally categorized into the triad of teaching, research, and service. However, the Department recognizes that the evaluation of faculty at all levels should take into consideration that the value of each of the three elements is intertwined, is not static, and will fluctuate based on the needs of the University, the College, the department, and the faculty member. For example, services that are valuable to the College also make contributions to and complement teaching and research and creative activities. Activities that interweave the three areas should be given the most weight in the evaluation process. The department provides a framework under which those who participate in the evaluation process may judge the diverse contributions of faculty.

A. *Teaching*

The University is a comprehensive regional institution and places a priority on teaching responsibilities and duties. The evaluation of teaching effectiveness is to be based on many considerations. Evidence of quality teaching may be found in many sources and must be tangible and measureable. Examples of achievements in the area of teaching and advising are included in the following list. This list is not considered definitive but rather is representative of the factors to be considered in the evaluation process for documentation of performance by discipline members.

- Course Syllabi
- Course Materials
- Student Exams and Assignments
- Use of Technology in Instructional Settings
- Design and Revise Courses/Curriculum
- Developing and Utilizing Student Learning Outcomes
- Demonstrating Understanding of State Standards and Other Discipline-Specific Standards
- Consistently Giving Constructive Detailed Feedback
- Demonstrates Innovative Practices
- Student Evaluations
- Peer Evaluations
- Academic and Professional Advising
- Directed Studies Supervision
- Participation in Professional Development Activities
- Dissertation Chair/Thesis Chair
- Dissertation Committee Member
- Internship Coordination and Service Learning Activities
- Establishing and Utilizing Professional and Educational Goals
- Establishing and Utilizing Philosophy of Teaching and Learning
- CCR Development and Adjustments

The following scale is to be implemented:

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

The following rankings/ descriptors and their indicators are being proposed in conjunction with the defining elements above in assessing level of performance in teaching.

Poor

This performance level demonstrates *serious* problems in attaining success in teaching role as reflected either by (1) a combination of *many* of the negative indicators, or (2) fewer but more *extreme* behaviors that produce substantial negative outcomes on students and their learning. In general, teaching performance is *well below* the department norms.

Indicators:

- Student evaluations document consistent and substantive problems (ratings well below the department average)
- 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 and/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 education) avoided or poorly executed
- Chronic academic integrity concerns identified including evidence of disrespect for students and their rights
- Avoids teaching developmental experiences

Implication: Requires major remedial work.

Fair

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

Indicators:

- Student evaluations document areas of moderate concern (ratings below the department average)
- 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, including disrespect for students and their rights
- Does not typically participate in teaching development activity

Implication: Some remediation is necessary. Change will need to be substantial to qualify for tenure and promotion.

Good

Demonstrates overall teaching effectiveness but some *minor* areas for concern, typically reflected by some combination of the indicators listed below. In general, teaching performance is *mildly below* the norms of excellence for the department.

Indicators:

- Student evaluations document adequate impact on learning
- 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, general education) 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

Implication: Performance at this level suggests positive potential but does not justify tenure or promotion at this stage of development.

Excellent

Demonstrates *consistent high quality* teaching with positive outcomes for student as reflected by the indicators below. In general, excellence *meets* all or almost all the standard expectations for faculty who are successful in tenure and promotion decisions.

Indicators:

- Student evaluations document consistently positive impact on learning (above average)
- Teaching philosophy provides foundation for coherent course planning and activities
- Syllabi outlines comprehensive, clear, and appropriate performance expectations

- Assessment practices enhance student learning and contribute to department needs
- Goals and course content routinely provide evidence of 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 education) 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

Implication: Performance at this level qualifies for favorable tenure and promotion decision.

Distinguished

Demonstrates *unusually high degree of quality* in teaching as shown by the following indicators that *build upon indicators for excellence*. In general, performance at this level exceeds department expectations for excellence.

Indicators:

- Numerical student evaluation data document clear statistical exceptionality
- 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

Implication: Performance at this level qualifies for favorable tenure and promotion decision.

B. Scholarship and Creative Projects

The traditional view of activities that constitute research and creative activity must be broadened to continue to meet the College and University's mission of being a comprehensive regional university. Because of the department mission, research and creative activities are often integrated into teaching and scholarly service. Scholarship includes all varieties of research and creative activity as they are defined by academic disciplines. These may include contribution to the discovery of new knowledge, the development of new education techniques, and other forms such as ideas, theories, products, criticisms, techniques, data and works of art. Publications, performances, and exhibits are powerful but not exhaustive ways to display the result of scholarship.

In a professional college, the development of new curriculum, technological delivery method, or problem solving systems in collaboration with practicing professionals is acceptable creative activity. When warranted, consideration can be given to products and activities

completed as a practitioner in a discipline rather than as a faculty member. Whatever its form, scholarship is evident, useful, educative, and testable only when it has become tangible and public as in, for example, books, monographs, papers at professional meetings, publications in refereed journals, and funded grants and contracts. Scholarship and creative projects consist of creative works that are externally reviewed and publicly available, including, but not limited to the following:

1. Discovery of new knowledge.
2. Development of new technologies, pedagogy, methods, materials, or uses.
3. Integration of knowledge leading to new understanding.
4. Application of knowledge to consequential problems.

Examples of achievements in the area of research and creative activity are included in the following list. This list is not considered definitive but rather is representative of the elements to be considered in the evaluation process for documentation of performance by faculty in the division.

- Journal articles
- Book chapters
- Books
- Monographs
- Book reviews
- Conference proceedings
- Funded grant and contract proposals for research and development activities
- Presenting workshops or refereed papers at local, regional, national, and international conferences/meetings
- Originating and conducting basic and applied research or technological research that is used or implemented in collaboration with a local, regional, state, or national organization/agency
- Developing and field testing educational programs and products such as program guides, multimedia programs, educational software, curriculum, instructional material guides, and others
- Participating/collaborating in implementation of a considerable number of research projects with consideration for chairing theses and doctoral committees that are brought to completion

The following table represents the proposed model for teaching faculty utilized for annual evaluations and evaluations for promotion and tenure

Table 1

	Teaching	Scholarship & Creative Projects	Service
Annual reappointment at untenured rank (Assistant)	Good	Good	Good
Tenure	Excellent	At least excellent in on category and at least good in the other category	
Promotion to Associate	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
Promotion to Professor	Distinguished in at least one category and at least excellent in the other two categories		

Utilizing the above framework requires qualification of with regard to scholarship and creative projects to distinguish levels of performance. The following scale is being implemented:

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

In the area of scholarship and creative projects the specific and measurable criteria utilized to distinguish the above levels of performance address the following:

- 1. Priority and value of different activity outcomes reflecting the mission and goals of the unit.
- 2. Quality standards required of each activity and how quality is assured.
- 3. The quality and frequency of activities and outcomes expected within review period.

The department values many different types of activity within scholarship and creative projects. The highest value is placed on those activities that have been placed in the **public domain and reviewed** as they allow for the added measure of quality assurance. *Public domain and reviewed products* can take on many forms as noted in the list above. Other categories of activity within scholarship and creative projects are *published, non-peer reviewed products*, and *unpublished works or works in progress*. **Faculty members are responsible for clearly communicating the products they put forth for review in terms of the requirements of ‘public domain and reviewed’ and are encouraged to articulate their reasoning for placing their products in any of the above categories. Faculty members’ articulation should address one or more of the following (1) venue for dissemination or performance and review process, (2) requirements for continuing professional education and certification, and (3) value or expected impact of sponsored research activity.**

The department must articulate expectations related to quantity. The following table has been provided with regard to quantity of products presented in the representative list above:

Table 2

RANK	ASSISTANT/ YEARLY APPT	TENURE	ASSOCIATE	FULL
public domain and reviewed products	1 per year or equivalent	5-7 or equivalent	7-10 or equivalent	12+ or equivalent

Notwithstanding the above delineation of the quantity and quality of products presented for evidence of scholarship and creative projects, faculty **must also be able to clearly communicate their process and progress in establishing a scholarly agenda and participating in professional scholarly and creative activities.** The following rankings/descriptors and their indicators are being proposed in conjunction with the defining elements above in assessing level of performance on scholarship and creative projects.

Poor

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

Indicators:

- Interest has not materialized)
- Scholarly agenda or creative plan has not been identified (e.g., central focus of career) Minimal pursuit of scholarly and creative projects – no evidence of published, peer-reviewed works and/or little definition of works in progress and their potential for publication.
- Avoidance of professional organization involvement that could help disseminate or display faculty work
- Ethical regulations violated regarding scholarly or artistic production
- Poor time management strategies handicap work output

Implication: Major remedial work is required. Scholarship and creative projects mentor should be considered

Fair

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

Indicators:

- General focus of interest identified
- Evidence of some completion of beginning stages of scholarly or artistic process (e.g., data collection, manuscript outline, artistic plan) that could result in publication.
- Evidence of unpublished works or works in progress that are promising.
- Exploration of possible scholarly collaboration or resource network to help with specific plan
- Professional organizations identified that will support scholarly and creative goals
- Sources of external support for scholarship or creative activities agenda identified and explored
- Judgment about ethical standards for scholarly and artistic production may be problematic at times
- Questionable time management strategies limit production

Implication: No support for tenure/promotion but shows future productivity promise.

Good

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

Indicators:

- Specific scholarly agenda or creative plan identified, including appropriate timelines and preferred dissemination or display venues
- Scholarly and creative projects completed but falls short of rate of department standards related to the rate of completion or quality of dissemination venue (see Table 2 above)
- Completed projects suggest the potential for significant, high quality scholarship over the candidate's career.
- Involvement with professional organizations that will support scholarly or creative goals
- Grants developed and submitted to capture external support
- Adheres to relevant ethics conventions for scholarly and creative projects
- Reasonably effective time management strategies contribute to success

Implication: May qualify for tenure if other effort areas are at least excellent but does not qualify for promotion.

Excellent

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

Indicators:

- Refined scholarly agenda or creative plan well suited to regional comprehensive university context
- Meets department production targets for both quantity and quality of scholarship (see Table 2)
- Favorable review by and respect from majority of colleagues in the department for scholarly and creative works
- Potential for wide recognition of quality outside of the University
- External support captured to facilitate scholarship or creative activities agenda
- Highly skilled application of ethical conventions in discipline
- Skilled time management facilitates success of scholarly agenda or creative plan

Implication: Performance at this level facilitates favorable promotion/tenure decisions

Distinguished

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

Indicators:

- Both quantity and quality measures clearly exceed department expectations (see Table 2)
- National or international audience
- National or international recognition earned for quality
- Awards received for scholarly or creative projects
- Achievements in continuing professional training show unusual merit
- Strong record of grant pursuit, grant awards, successful completion, and dissemination of results
- Campus and/or disciplinary leadership in promoting scholarly and creative projects

Implication: For *regular* faculty appointment, easily qualifies for favorable promotion and tenure decisions. For *research* faculty appointment, distinguished performance is required for appointment to professor.

C. *Service*

The UWF Tenure and Promotion Guidelines recognize that service is broadly defined, and should include a wide range of activities including, but not limited to, the following.

- Service on University, college, and department governance
- Public lectures, performances, or exhibitions
- Service as department chair, program director or coordinator
- 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 campuses

In general, other things being equal, service is more valuable when it provides synergy between the service activity and the faculty member's area of expertise.

Faculty members will vary in the execution of their service plan. For example, service may emphasize activity on the campus instead 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 a faculty member 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.

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

At the outset of employment, service activities are likely to be the relatively lowest priority of the three categories; however, service is essential to accomplish the various objectives of a regional comprehensive university. As such, department chairs and program directors should advise new faculty about the necessity of service, and how these activities can be incorporated strategically into their work assignments. Service expectations should be somewhat lighter for new faculty members who are establishing themselves as teachers and scholars/artists, but new faculty members should still be encouraged to render high quality service in their selected fields of expertise.

The UWF Tenure and Promotion Guidelines conclude that community service related to a faculty member's field(s) of expertise is more valuable than service which is not related to the faculty member's field(s) of expertise. The department strongly supports faculty member service related to their field(s) of expertise. The department mission emphasizes the preparation of graduates capable of conducting and evaluating applied research at the local, regional, state, national or international level. Service external to the University requires contributions of value to the community, state (including public education), national and international community, scholarly and professional organizations, governmental boards, agencies, and commissions that are beneficial to such groups and individuals. Evidence of quality service may be found in many sources. Examples of achievements in the area of service are included in the following list. This list is not considered definitive but rather is representative of the factors to be considered in the evaluation process for documentation of performance by departmental/divisional members.

- Participation/Leadership in departmental/divisional, college, and university committees
- Participation/Leadership in local and regional schools and classrooms
- Participation/Leadership in advisory boards
- Participation/Leadership with social service agencies
- Participation/Leadership in external funding at the local, regional, state, national or international level
- Participation/Leadership in local, regional, state, national and international professional organizations/committees

The following rankings and their indicators are being proposed in conjunction with defining the assessment of the level of performance on service projects:

Poor:

- No service involvement

Fair:

- Minimal involvement in categories listed above
- Participation in 1-2 departmental committees or task forces per year
- Does not volunteer unless requested by others

Good:

- Moderately active participation in categories listed above
- Participation on at least two departmental/divisional level committees or task forces, and on one or more college and/or university committees

- Participation on no more than one professional organization/committee outside of UWF

Excellent:

- Broad participation in categories listed above with faculty member volunteering for service and leadership roles

Distinguished:

- Unusually high degree of involvement and leadership across any or all of the categories listed above or other appropriate service related activities.

Revised, 2014