

**PROMOTION, TENURE,  
ANNUAL EVALUATION,  
SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION,  
AND MERIT INCREASES**

**CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES PACKET**

**2009-2010**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	General Criteria and Standards Which Apply to Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Decisions at The University of West Florida .....	3
II.	Promotion Procedures.....	4
	A. UWF Guidelines for Promotion Recommendation .....	4
	B. Promotion Calendar .....	5
III.	Tenure Procedures .....	6
	A. UWF Guidelines for Tenure Recommendation.....	6
	B. Tenure Calendar .....	8
IV.	Annual Evaluation Procedures.....	9
	A. UWF Model for Annual Faculty Evaluation.....	9
	B. Annual Evaluation Calendar .....	12
V.	Sustained Performance Evaluations.....	13
	A. UWF Guidelines for Sustained Performance Evaluations .....	13
	B. Sustained Performance Evaluation Calendar .....	15
VI.	Suggested Ordering of Materials in Dossiers .....	16
VII.	FBOE Criteria Used Re: Departmental Merit Salary Increases.....	17
	ATTACHMENTS.....	18
	A. Student Assessment of Instruction Report Form	
	B. Samples of Peer Evaluation Forms	
	C. Sample Curriculum Vita and Vita Update	

## I. GENERAL CRITERIA AND STANDARDS WHICH APPLY TO REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION DECISIONS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA

For the purpose of evaluating faculty members, The University of West Florida has adopted a set of general criteria and standards for the assessment of a faculty member's performance of assigned duties and responsibilities. These criteria form the basis for decisions related to reemployment, promotion, and tenure.

1. Excellent teaching and promising signs of good scholarship and service justify a period of yearly reappointment at the Assistant Professor level.
- \*2. Excellent teaching, significant evidence of scholarship and service, including a measure of tangible and public evidence, justify the decision to grant tenure. Service must include membership on college and/or university committees.
- \*3. A strong positive reputation within the University as teacher and scholar justifies the decision to promote to Associate Professor. 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.

Except in unusual circumstances, faculty members lacking an acceptable degree defined as the highest degree one can normally receive in a given field, may not be tenured, and may be appointed only at the rank of Instructor or Lecturer. Each discipline is responsible for adhering to the said policy and informing the Dean and Provost of what is to be considered an acceptable degree as defined herein. The letter of appointment and the promotion and/or tenure files shall include such a statement as approved by the Provost.

A.B.D. candidates hired with the intention of obtaining a tenure track position would hold the title "Instructor" until such time that a letter is received from the degree-granting university stating that all criteria for the acceptable degree, as defined herein, have been satisfied. At that time, the title is automatically changed to that of Assistant Professor. This procedure, as well as any difference in salary arising as a result of an appointment to Assistant Professor, should be clearly stated in the letter of appointment.

Tenure and/or promotion shall not be awarded partly or solely for duties which were part of assigned administrative duties.

---

\* Sheer volume of evidence in support of an application is not important. The quality of the evidence presented is essential.

## II. PROMOTION PROCEDURES

### II.A. UWF GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION

The faculty member and the Chairperson shall confer about the readiness of the faculty member as a candidate for promotion. Upon request of the faculty member or upon agreement of the faculty member and Chairperson, the process shall be initiated for submitting the dossier of the faculty member for consideration for promotion. The Chairperson shall write a letter to the Dean indicating his/her recommendation for promotion along with a brief rationale for the decision. In making such a recommendation, the Chairperson shall consider the faculty member's contributions to the University in teaching, research, advising, and intramural and extramural service.

All full-time faculty in the department or unit shall be requested by individual letter from the Chairperson to submit an evaluation\* on promotion for each faculty member being considered within the unit. The evaluation, which must be signed, shall be submitted to the Chairperson. The Chairperson shall solicit at least three additional evaluation letters for promotion candidates from knowledgeable peers.

The list in Section VI., "Suggested Ordering of Material in Dossiers," describes the items to be included in the dossier and the order in which those items should be presented.

This document is intended to be consistent with, and a supplement to, the provisions of the FBOE and other relevant statutes, rules, and regulations.

1. 6C-5.935, Promotion, Change in Assignment, Demotion, and Transfer:  
<https://www.flrules.org/gateway/readFile.asp?sid=0&tid=1138797&type=1&file=6C-5.935.doc>
2. F.S. 1012.94 Evaluation of faculty members; report;  
[http://www.flsenate.gov/Statutes/index.cfm?App\\_mode=Display\\_Statute&Search\\_String=&URL=Ch1012/SEC94.HTM&Title=-%3E2006-%3ECh1012-%3ESection%2094#1012.94](http://www.flsenate.gov/Statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&Search_String=&URL=Ch1012/SEC94.HTM&Title=-%3E2006-%3ECh1012-%3ESection%2094#1012.94)

The Chairperson shall be responsible for keeping all faculty members informed about the Chairperson's assessment of their accomplishments and progress toward promotion. Prior to the completion date of the academic contract year, the Chairperson shall evaluate each faculty member, discuss the written evaluation with the faculty member, and shall give the faculty member a copy of the evaluation. If the evaluation reflects deficiencies in the faculty member's performance, the Chairperson shall make specific suggestions for improvement to give the faculty member an opportunity to improve his/her success of a promotion. See Section IV.A., "UWF Model for Annual Faculty Evaluation."

At the Chairperson's initiative, or upon receiving written notification of candidacy from a faculty member eligible for tenure or promotion, the Chairperson shall assist the candidate with preparation of the dossier and shall make available to the candidate all necessary materials, information, and forms. The candidate, in consultation with the Chairperson, shall be responsible for seeing that all pertinent information is included in the dossier. (See Section VI., "Suggested Ordering of Materials in Dossiers," for contents of material and order of dossier.)

---

\* Should a faculty member decline to submit an evaluation, the faculty member should be instructed to return the letter to the Chairperson with the notation that he/she declined to do an evaluation. This letter should be placed in the file.

## II.B. PROMOTION CALENDAR

(Actions must be completed by dates shown)

September 11, 2009	Faculty member provides vitae update and other materials* as set out in UWF Model for Annual Faculty Evaluation - Step 1.
September 18, 2009	Chairperson requests peer evaluations and confers with department member as outlined in UWF Model for Annual Faculty Evaluation - Step 3.
October 23, 2009	Chairperson adds his/her evaluation and forwards dossier including department member's rejoinder, if any, to Dean.
October 26, 2009	Dean forwards the dossier to the College Faculty Personnel Committee.
November 20, 2009	College Faculty Personnel Committee adds its recommendations and returns the dossier to Dean.
November 23, 2009	Dean makes available to faculty member contents of his/her own dossier for inspection.
December 1, 2009	Faculty member provides a rejoinder letter (if he/she chooses) which the Dean will include in dossier.
December 23, 2009	Dean adds recommendation.
January 6, 2010	Dean makes available to faculty member contents of his/her own dossier for inspection.
January 13, 2010	Faculty member provides a rejoinder letter (if he/she chooses) which the Dean will include in dossier.
January 14, 2010	Dean forwards complete dossier to Provost. Provost forwards dossier to University Faculty Personnel Committee.
February 19, 2010	University Faculty Personnel Committee adds its recommendation and forwards complete dossier to Provost. A copy of the University Faculty Personnel Committee's recommendation is sent to faculty member.
February 26, 2010	Faculty member provides a rejoinder letter to Provost (if he/she chooses) to be included in dossier.
<b>March 15, 2010</b>	<b>Deadline for withdrawal for promotion consideration.</b>
March 19, 2010	Provost adds his/her evaluation and sends a copy to faculty member. Copy of Provost's evaluation is also sent to the University Faculty Personnel Committee.
March 26, 2010	Faculty member provides a rejoinder letter (if he/she chooses) which the Provost will include in dossier.
March 29, 2010	Complete dossier is turned over to the President.
April 26, 2010	President informs the candidate, in writing, of the final promotion decision. Dossier returned to Deans' Offices.

\* Please note that any materials (e.g., letters of evaluation) received from external sources which the affected faculty member could not normally anticipate, should be copied as received and provided to the faculty member so that he/she may provide written rebuttal in a timely fashion.

Veterans Day	November 11, 2009	Martin Luther King Day	January 18, 2010
Thanksgiving	November 26-27, 2009	Spring Break	March 8-12, 2010
Holiday Break	December 24, 2009 – January 1, 2010		

### III. TENURE PROCEDURES

#### III.A. UWF GUIDELINES FOR TENURE RECOMMENDATION

The Dean shall provide to each Chairperson in his/her College a list of faculty members eligible for tenure. The Chairperson shall, upon receipt of this list, write a letter recommending tenure, deny, or defer and a brief rationale for such recommendation to the Dean for each eligible member of the faculty. In making said recommendation, the Chairperson shall consider the faculty member's contribution to the University in teaching, research, advising, and intramural and extramural service.

The Chairperson shall be responsible for keeping all faculty members informed about their eligibility for tenure well in advance of important deadlines and about the Chairperson's assessment of their accomplishments and progress toward tenure. Prior to the completion date of each academic contract year, the Chairperson shall evaluate each faculty member, discuss the written evaluation with the faculty member, and shall give the faculty member a copy of the evaluation. If the evaluation reflects deficiencies in the faculty member's performance, the Chairperson shall make specific suggestions for improvement to give the faculty member an opportunity to improve by the time the faculty member becomes eligible for tenure. See Section IV.A., "UWF Model for Annual Faculty Evaluation" for more information.

It is the responsibility of the department peer committee and department chair or other appropriate administrator to include a progress toward tenure review as part of the annual evaluation for all faculty in the probationary period for tenure. It is also the responsibility of the department to require a pre-tenure review during the individual's third year or mid-point of the probationary period. This mid-point review is at the department level.

All mid-point reviews should address the performance of annual assignments including teaching, research/creative activity, and service occurring during the preceding tenure-earning years of employment. In addition, all reviews should critically assess overall performance and contributions in light of mid-point expectations. The mid-point review will not be as extensive as the formal tenure review that occurs later but should be based on a set of documents which would include a current vita; annual evaluations; student/peer evaluation of teaching; selected examples of teaching materials and scholarship; and a brief self-evaluation by the faculty member.

The mid-point review is intended to be informative, and to be encouraging to faculty who are making solid progress toward tenure, instructional to faculty who may need to improve in selected areas of performance, and cautionary to faculty where progress is significantly lacking.

At the Chairperson's initiative, or upon receiving written notification of candidacy from a faculty member eligible for tenure, the Chairperson shall assist the candidate with preparation of the dossier and shall make available to the candidate all necessary materials, information, and forms. The candidate, in consultation with the Chairperson, shall be responsible for seeing that all pertinent information is included in the dossier. (See Section VI., "Suggested Ordering of Materials in Dossiers," for contents of material and order of dossier.)

All full-time tenured faculty members (including DROP participants) in the department or unit shall complete a secret vote. All faculty members shall be requested by individual letter from the Chairperson to submit an evaluation\* on tenure for each eligible faculty member within the appropriate unit. The evaluation, which must be signed, shall be submitted to the Chairperson.

The Chairperson shall solicit at least three evaluation letters for tenure-eligible candidates from knowledgeable peers.\*\* Each faculty member eligible for tenure will be informed by the Chairperson in writing whether he/she will be recommended for tenure.

---

\* Should a faculty member decline to submit an evaluation, the faculty member should be instructed to return the letter to the Chairperson with the notation that he/she declined to do an evaluation. This letter should be placed in the file.

\*\* Persons who are being considered for tenure themselves should not be asked to write letters for others who are currently being considered for tenure.

Candidates' portfolios should clearly document that the terminal degree has been attained. In cases where a faculty member being recommended for tenure does not hold the terminal degree in the field of tenure, the highest degree in field should be clearly documented as well as the Dean's and Provost's approval upon hire that another degree or set of experiences is to substitute for the terminal degree in field.

The number of years of credit toward tenure should be clearly identified in the Chairperson's and Dean's letters. In cases for which credit toward tenure was awarded for service outside UWF, a copy of the letter to the candidate from the dean at the time of hire which documents this credit should be included in the portfolio. Likewise, any subsequent changes to years of credit toward tenure should be documented and such documentation included in the portfolio.

The President shall recommend to the University Board of Trustees on all tenure matters, taking into account the recommendations of all groups or individuals described in this statement.

Evaluators, Chairpersons, Deans, and Committee members shall keep all recommendations and Committee deliberation in strict confidence. The President shall notify in writing each tenure-eligible faculty member of the final tenure decision in his/her case immediately following appropriate action by the University Board of Trustees.

This document is intended to be consistent with and a supplement to the provisions of the FBOE and other relevant statutes, rules, and regulations.

1. 6C-5.940 Tenure and Permanent Status :

<https://www.flrules.org/gateway/readFile.asp?sid=0&tid=1138894&type=1&file=6C-5.940.doc>

2. F.S. 1012.94 Evaluation of faculty members; report;

[http://www.flsenate.gov/Statutes/index.cfm?App\\_mode=Display\\_Statute&Search\\_String=&URL=Ch1012/SEC94.HTM&Title=-%3E2006-%3ECh1012-%3ESection%2094#1012.94](http://www.flsenate.gov/Statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&Search_String=&URL=Ch1012/SEC94.HTM&Title=-%3E2006-%3ECh1012-%3ESection%2094#1012.94)

### III.B. TENURE CALENDAR

(Actions must be completed by dates shown)

September 11, 2009	Faculty member provides vitae update and other materials* as set out in UWF Model for Annual Faculty Evaluation - Step 1.
September 18, 2009	Chairperson requests peer evaluations and confers with department member as outlined in UWF Model for Annual Faculty Evaluation - Step 3.
October 23, 2009	Chairperson adds his/her evaluation and forwards dossier including department member's rejoinder, if any, to Dean.
October 26, 2009	Dean forwards the dossier to the College Faculty Personnel Committee.
November 20, 2009	College Faculty Personnel Committee adds its recommendations and returns the dossier to Dean.
November 23, 2009	Dean makes available to faculty member contents of his/her own dossier for inspection.
December 1, 2009	Faculty member provides a rejoinder letter (if he/she chooses) which the Dean will include in dossier.
December 23, 2009	Dean adds recommendation.
January 6, 2010	Dean makes available to faculty member contents of his/her own dossier for inspection.
January 13, 2010	Faculty member provides a rejoinder letter (if he/she chooses) which the Dean will include in dossier.
January 14, 2010	Dean forwards complete dossier to Provost. Provost forwards dossier to University Faculty Personnel Committee.
February 19, 2010	University Faculty Personnel Committee adds its recommendation and forwards complete dossier to Provost. A copy of the University Faculty Personnel Committee's recommendation is sent to faculty member.
February 26, 2010	Faculty member provides a rejoinder letter to Provost (if he/she chooses) to be included in dossier.
<b>March 15, 2010</b>	<b>Deadline for withdrawal for tenure consideration.</b>
March 19, 2010	Provost adds his/her evaluation and sends a copy to faculty member. Copy of Provost's evaluation is also sent to the University Faculty Personnel Committee.
March 26, 2010	Faculty member provides a rejoinder letter (if he/she chooses) which the Provost will include in dossier.
March 29, 2010	Complete dossier is turned over to the President.
April 26, 2010	President informs the candidate, in writing, of the tenure recommendation. Dossier returned to Deans' Offices. <i>(Tenure recommendations are submitted to the UWF Board of Trustees for final approval at their next scheduled meeting.)</i>

\* Please note that any materials (e.g., letters of evaluation) received from external sources which the affected faculty member could not normally anticipate, should be copied as received and provided to the faculty member so that he/she may provide written rebuttal in a timely fashion.

Veterans Day	November 11, 2009	Martin Luther King Day	January 18, 2010
Thanksgiving	November 26-27, 2009	Spring Break	March 8-12, 2010
Holiday Break	December 24, 2009 – January 1, 2010		

## IV. ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES

### IV.A. MODEL FOR ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION

#### I. Process

- 1) Each faculty member provides the Chairperson with an update of his/her vitae,\* and also supplies not more than a two-page draft statement of contributions and performances during the period since the last evaluation.\*\* The faculty member also submits any additional evidence bearing on achievements in the areas of performance being evaluated. The Chairperson and faculty member discuss the evidence the faculty member has submitted, plus any further evidence the Chairperson wishes to introduce and consider.
- 2) The Chairperson reviews with the faculty member the summary of data from the student assessment of instructor forms and solicits the faculty member's assistance in interpreting their meaning. Lest the Chairperson be tempted to lapse into passive reliance on consumer opinion in judging teaching performance, the faculty member should be invited to submit for discussion with the Chairperson any hard evidence bearing on the following considerations:
  - a) quality of course-related counseling, including student conferences, DIS, theses, and supervision of interns;
  - b) quality of course syllabi and other handouts, if the nature of a particular course makes the latter useful;
  - c) intellectual demands made upon students, including quality of tests and other assignments;
  - d) students' progress in mastering course content;
  - e) faculty member's estimate of his/her success in fulfilling course objectives;
  - f) revision of established courses, and development and teaching of new courses; and,
  - g) activity undertaken for professional growth that will enhance the faculty member's value as a teacher.

The above list does not pretend to be exhaustive. The Chairperson may solicit or introduce and the faculty member may submit any evidence either considers relevant to the evaluation of the faculty member's teaching. Evidence bearing on these matters is to be invited, not subpoenaed.

- 3) Peer evaluations are encouraged and may be requested by the Chairperson or the affected faculty member and are submitted to the Chairperson and considered prior to this evaluation. The Chairperson considers all evidence discussed with all faculty members in the department, *weighs* that evidence, and reaches tentative recommendations which he/she reports to the affected faculty member. A faculty member who is convinced that he/she has been underrated, is invited to submit a written rejoinder or rebuttal to the Chairperson's evaluation.

---

\* Lists of publications in curriculum vitae submitted in promotion and/or tenure dossiers must include the names of all co-authors in the same order appearing in such publications. Dossiers must include a signed statement indicating adherence to the said policy.

It is suggested that vitae and vitae updates have clearly defined publication headings; e.g., books and other monographs, journal articles, conference proceedings, and technical reports. Items which are in print or forthcoming should be listed in a separate category.

\*\* Since vitae updates are submitted in January and the Chairperson's evaluations rendered in May, the period covered by the annual evaluation and thus the vitae updates and statements of contribution should ordinarily be the preceding calendar year. In the case of consideration for promotion and/or tenure, the vitae submitted should be complete and fully up-to-date.

The rejoinder may be part of the faculty member's statement of his/her contributions and performance, which he/she now submits in final form.

- 4) Department Chairperson's evaluation is based on the data made available to him/her, including student evaluations and peer evaluations. Both the Chairperson and the faculty member sign the evaluation. The Chairperson submits to the Dean the total dossier of data, including vitae, faculty member's statement, and summaries of student evaluations of teaching.
- 5) Following review of the Chairperson's recommendation, the Dean discusses with each Chairperson any substantive variations between their evaluations. The Dean evaluates in writing, using information provided in 1-2-3-4 above, as well as any other information available, and proceeds as follows:
  - a) For tenured faculty members (Also see Section V. Sustained Performance Evaluation)
    - (i) The Dean sends each faculty member a copy of the Dean's evaluation and makes available to the faculty member for inspection the contents of the evaluation file.
    - (ii) The faculty member may submit a rebuttal letter, which must be included in the evaluation file.
    - (iii) The file is retained in the Dean's office.
  - b) For tenured-earning faculty members\*
    - (i) Dossier forwarded to Provost.
    - (ii) The Provost receives and reviews annual evaluations and returns complete dossier to Dean.
    - (iii) Faculty member may examine his/her file under procedures established by Dean.
- 6) The following steps supersede step #5 for faculty members being considered for promotion and tenure:
  - a) Faculty member given opportunity to submit rebuttal letter before dossier sent to College Faculty Personnel Committee.
  - b) The College Faculty Personnel Committee is provided the dossiers of those being considered for promotion and tenure. Committee adds its recommendations and forwards dossiers to Dean.
  - c) Dean adds his/her recommendations.
  - d) Faculty member given opportunity to submit rebuttal letter before dossier sent to University Faculty Personnel Committee.
  - e) Dean submits dossier to University Faculty Personnel Committee via Provost.
  - f) Provost turns dossier over to University Faculty Personnel Committee. Committee submits its recommendations via letter to Provost.
  - g) Faculty member may submit a rebuttal letter, if any, to be included in the dossier.
  - h) Provost makes his/her recommendations and sends copies to faculty member and University Faculty Personnel Committee.
  - i) Faculty member may submit a rebuttal letter, if any, to be included in the dossier.

---

\* Evaluations for non-tenure earning faculty except Librarians are not required to be reviewed by the Provost.

- j) Complete dossier then sent to President.
- k) President apprises faculty member of recommendation to the FBOE regarding tenure or, in the case of promotion, notifies faculty member in writing of promotion.
- l) All files returned to Dean.

## II. Timing

- 1) The calendar in Section IV.B. should be strictly adhered to.
- 2) Evaluations will normally occur once a year, but in special circumstances may be employed at other times.
- 3) Students' evaluations of teaching included in an evaluation must be from the twelve-month period immediately preceding the beginning of the process in which the faculty member is being evaluated. The faculty member has access to the evaluations only after grades in the courses have been assigned.\*\*

## III. Instruments

- 1) The official forms (Attachment A) must be used for student evaluation of teacher effectiveness.
- 2) The peer evaluation form, which must include the signature of the evaluator (Attachment B), may be used if the faculty so desire or upon request of the Chairperson. (Departmental peer evaluations are required for candidates for promotion and tenure.)
- 3) Chairpersons, Deans, and the Provost may use forms or narratives for their evaluations, as may be appropriate to their needs.

This document is intended to be consistent with and a supplement to the provisions of the rules of the FBOE and other relevant statutes, rules, and regulations.

1. 6C-5.925 Evaluation and Recognition:  
<https://www.flrules.org/gateway/readFile.asp?sid=0&tid=1138603&type=1&file=6C-5.925.doc>
2. F.S. 1012.94 Evaluation of faculty members; report:  
[http://www.flsenate.gov/Statutes/index.cfm?App\\_mode=Display\\_Statute&Search\\_String=&URL=C1012/SEC94.HTM&Title=-%3E2006-%3ECh1012-%3ESection%2094#1012.94](http://www.flsenate.gov/Statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&Search_String=&URL=C1012/SEC94.HTM&Title=-%3E2006-%3ECh1012-%3ESection%2094#1012.94)

---

\*\* If the faculty member's teaching has been evaluated by students in both the Fall and Spring Semesters, the Chairperson may require only one semester be submitted as part of the evaluation process except that student evaluation summary reports must be included for at least one section of each different course taught (summers excepted) in the preceding twelve-month period.

## IV.B. ANNUAL EVALUATION CALENDAR

(Actions must be completed by dates shown)

May 17, 2010	Faculty member provides to Chairperson a vitae update and other materials* as set out in UWF Model for Annual Faculty Evaluation-Step 1.
May 25, 2010	Peer Evaluations**, as requested by the Chair are due. Chair confers with faculty member as outlined in UWF Model for Annual Faculty Evaluation – Step 3. Faculty member provided opportunity to submit rejoinder.
June 2, 2010	Chairperson adds his/her evaluation and forwards dossier, including faculty member's rejoinder, if any, to Dean.
July 1, 2010	By this date, the following must take place: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Dean provides his/her written evaluation to the faculty member</li><li>• Faculty member is provided the opportunity to submit a rejoinder to Dean's evaluation</li><li>• Dean forwards to the Provost the total dossier, including the faculty member's rejoinder (if any) ***</li></ul>
July 30, 2010	Provost receives and reviews annual evaluations and returns complete dossier to Dean.
August 13, 2010	Dean makes available to faculty member contents of his/her own dossier for inspection.
August 20, 2010	Faculty member has the right to write a rebuttal letter, if he/she chooses, which must be included in the dossier.
Memorial Day	May 24, 2010
Independence Day	July 5, 2010
(Observed)	

---

\* Please note that any materials (e.g., letters of evaluation) received from external sources which the affected faculty member could not normally anticipate, should be copied as received and provided to the faculty member so that he/she may provide written rebuttal in a timely fashion.

\*\* Not a required step; peer evaluations may be used at the discretion of the individual departments. Such evaluations should be used if department member or Chairperson requests them.

\*\*\* Dossiers for tenure-earning, untenured department members are forwarded to the Provost for review. For tenured faculty members, unless the faculty member is being considered for promotion, the annual evaluation is not reviewed by the Provost.

## **V. SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

### **V.A. UWF GUIDELINES FOR SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS**

#### **Introduction**

Tenured faculty members shall receive a sustained performance evaluation once every seven years following the award of tenure or their most recent promotion. The purpose of this evaluation is to document sustained performance during the previous six years of assigned duties and to encourage continued professional growth and development.

The Sustained Performance Evaluation Guidelines emphasize timely and reliable evaluation, congruent with annual evaluations. The three categories for which sustained performance evaluation (SPE) must be used are:

Outstanding  
Satisfactory  
Below Satisfactory

The individual college sustained performance evaluation committees must identify any other adjectives used in annual evaluations in their respective colleges, and equate them to the above three categories. The three SPE categories must be defined so equivalence with annual evaluation criteria can be determined for the purpose of sustained performance evaluations.

In keeping with the purpose to the SPE process, each department should maintain a mentoring program for faculty with “Below Satisfactory” ratings in one or more areas of assigned duties so problems can be addressed with each annual evaluation without waiting for the end of a six-year cycle.

#### **Faculty Subject to Sustained Performance Evaluation**

Faculty who have been tenured and had assigned duties for six years are subject to sustained performance evaluation.

Once the initial group of faculty was evaluated in 1998, faculty members must be evaluated in the seventh year following their most recent 1) award of tenure, 2) promotion, or 3) sustained performance evaluation (whichever is last).

#### **Sustained Performance Evaluation Criteria**

Sustained performance evaluations are based on the compilation of annual evaluations from the most recent award of tenure, promotion, or last sustained performance evaluation.

The faculty member is to be evaluated based on overall performance consistent with the Work Assignment Letter. Only those documents contained in the annual evaluation file are to be used for the sustained performance evaluation.

If the ratings on one or more areas of assigned duties on three or more annual evaluations are Below Satisfactory, the faculty member is subject to a performance improvement plan, unless evaluations during the two years preceding the sustained performance evaluation have been Satisfactory or Outstanding.

If a faculty member has received three Outstanding overall ratings on the annual evaluations during the three years preceding the sustained performance evaluation, the faculty member cannot be rated below Outstanding for the sustained performance evaluation.

## **Performance Improvement Plans**

If a faculty member is subject to a performance improvement plan (Plan), the Plan must be developed by the faculty member in cooperation with the department chair. The Plan must include 1) specific performance targets for those areas evaluated as being consistently Below Satisfactory, and 2) a time frame for achieving the targets.

The Plan must be approved by the President or the President's representative. If specific resources are identified in an approved Plan, those resources must be provided by the University.

The chair must meet periodically with the faculty member to review progress toward meeting the performance targets. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to attain the performance targets specified in the Plan.

## **Awards for Outstanding Performance**

If SPE awards are funded by the legislature, a faculty member whose performance is evaluated as Outstanding in the sustained performance evaluation is eligible to be considered for an increase in salary according to the terms of the rules of the FBOE And other relevant statutes, rules, and regulations.

## **Appeals**

If a faculty member does not agree with the sustained performance evaluation provided by the chair, the faculty member may appeal to the Dean of the College. If a faculty member does not agree with the Dean's determination, the faculty member may appeal to the University Faculty Personnel Committee. The University Faculty Personnel Committee shall review the evaluation appeal and forward its recommendation to the Provost. The Provost's decision is final and binding.

If the faculty member and the chair cannot agree on the components of a Plan, the faculty member may appeal to the Dean. If the faculty member does not agree with the Dean's decision, the faculty member may appeal to the University Faculty Personnel Committee. The University Personnel Committee shall review the Plan and forward its recommendation to the Provost. If the faculty member does not agree with the Provost's decision, the faculty member may appeal to the President, or the President's representative. The President or the President representative's decision is final and binding.

This document is intended to be consistent with and a supplement to the provisions of the rules of the FBOE and other relevant statutes, rules, and regulations.

1. 6C-5.925 Evaluation and Recognition:  
<https://www.flrules.org/gateway/readFile.asp?sid=0&tid=1138603&type=1&file=6C-5.925.doc>
2. F.S. 1012.94 Evaluation of faculty members; report  
([http://www.flsenate.gov/Statutes/index.cfm?App\\_mode=Display\\_Statute&Search\\_String=&URL=C%20h1012/SEC94.HTM&Title=-%202006-%20Ch1012-%20Section%2094#1012.94](http://www.flsenate.gov/Statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&Search_String=&URL=C%20h1012/SEC94.HTM&Title=-%202006-%20Ch1012-%20Section%2094#1012.94))

---

Note: Each College and the Library have an approved set of Sustained Performance Evaluation policies and procedures which must be followed. These policy/procedures document are on file in the respective Deans Offices.

## V.B. SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CALENDAR

(Actions must be completed by dates shown)

September 8, 2009	Deans office receive list of faculty that require a Sustained Performance Evaluation during current academic year.
October 9, 2009	Chairperson prepares written Sustained Performance Evaluation utilizing the previous annual evaluations consistent with University and college guidelines and procedures. Chairperson identifies whether Performance Improvement Plan is required based on the results of the Evaluation.
October 30, 2009	Chairperson reviews the Evaluation with the faculty member.  If a Performance Improvement Plan is required, faculty member develops the Plan in cooperation with the Chairperson.
January 8, 2010	Written Sustained Performance Evaluation and Performance Incentive Plan sent to the Dean of the College with copy to Provost.

**In the event of an appeal, the following calendar is in effect.**

January 15, 2010	Written appeals of Chairperson's Evaluation and Performance Improvement Plan due to Dean.
January 22, 2010	Dean's written response to appeal provided to faculty member.
January 29, 2010	Written appeals of Dean's decision due to University Faculty Personnel Committee.
February 26, 2010	University Faculty Personnel Committee written recommendation due to Provost with copy to faculty member.
March 5, 2010	Faculty member's rebuttal of University Faculty Personnel Committee's recommendation due to Provost.
March 19, 2010	Provost communicates in writing final decision on Evaluation appeal and decision on Performance Improvement Plan appeal, if applicable, to faculty member.
March 26, 2010	Appeal of Provost's decision on appeal of Performance Improvement Plan due to President (or representative).
April 9, 2010	President (or representative) communicates in writing final decision on appeal of Performance Improvement Plan. No further appeal of Performance Improvement Plan permitted.

---

Veterans Day	November 11, 2009
Thanksgiving	November 26-27, 2009
Holiday Break	December 24, 2009 – January 1, 2010
Martin Luther King Day	January 18, 2010
Spring Break	March 8-12, 2010

## VI. SUGGESTED ORDERING OF MATERIALS IN PROMOTION, TENURE, AND ANNUAL EVALUATION DOSSIERS

To facilitate the work of review committees and responsible University officials, faculty applying for promotion and/or tenure should arrange their binder and supporting material in the order listed below.

Only one, 3-inch binder, plus one box for supporting materials (primarily the candidate's publications) is permitted.

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

### Order of Promotion and Tenure Dossiers

1. Forms signed by the candidate giving his/her consent to include student comments in the portfolio and attesting that the order in which the names of authors of publications shown in his curriculum vitae conform to those in the publication.
2. Candidate's letter of appointment.
3. Curriculum Vita\*. The vitae should clearly define publication headings; e.g., books and other monographs, journal articles, conference proceedings, and technical reports. Items which are in print, or forthcoming, should be listed in a separate category.
4. Statement of contributions justifying tenure and/or promotion. This statement should include the candidate's self-evaluation concerning teaching, research, and service. In the area of research, the candidate should address not only the quantity but the quality and significance of his/her work. For example, the ranking and acceptance rate of the journals in which the work is published, number of citations to the candidate's work, and related measures.
5. A copy of the approved departmental scholarly activities statement.
6. Chairperson's evaluations of the candidate's performance since joining UWF or since his/her last promotion.
7. Official letters of recommendation for promotion or tenure on the part of the candidate's departmental colleagues (e.g., secret ballot in the case of tenure), chair, college personnel committee (including the vote), and dean. (Departmental peer evaluations are required.) (Any rebuttal letter)
8. The last three to five years of course evaluation summaries, prefaced by the candidate's listing, by semester, of all courses taught during that period, and explanation of the criteria for including or excluding student ratings, if any are missing.
9. Letters of Recommendation, not to exceed ten (10), from within and without UWF. Off-campus letter writers should specify how long and in what capacity they have known the candidate, and include an abbreviated curriculum vitae. Letters to be arranged by: (a) peers outside the department; and (b) peers with similar expertise outside the University.
10. The latest promotion file, if any (to be provided by the Dean's office).
11. Recommendation of Chairperson. (Any rebuttal letter.)
12. Recommendation of College Faculty Personnel Committee (including the vote). (Any rebuttal letter.)
13. Recommendation of Dean. (Any rebuttal letter.)
14. Recommendation of University Faculty Personnel Committee (including the vote). (Any rebuttal letter.)
15. Recommendation of Provost. (Any rebuttal letter.)
16. List of supporting materials, e.g., books, reprints, and research reports. (Examples of research and/or creative activity should be submitted in a separate container.)
17. One (1) box of supporting documentation. It should include all of the candidate's publications and selected materials addressing teaching, research, and service. ***Note: Sheer volume of evidence in support of an application is not in itself sufficient. The quality of the evidence presented is essential.***

---

\* List of publications in curriculum vitae submitted in promotion and/or tenure dossiers must include the names of all co-authors in the same order appearing in such publications. Dossiers must include a signed statement indicating adherence to the said policy. (*Faculty Senate, 1/8/88*)

Aspirants for promotion and/or tenure are urged not to include irrelevant materials from earlier attempts in which they were previously unsuccessful in a promotion or tenure bid. Also, please include only materials germane to promotion or tenure consideration.

#### Annual Evaluation Dossiers

1. Vitae update and annual statement of professional contributions; i.e., include only accomplishments during the review period.
2. Department statement on creative/scholarly activities.
3. Summaries of Student Evaluations of Instructor/Course including summary reports
4. Any other tangible examples of accomplishment; e.g., books, reprints, or other examples of research and/or creative activity.
5. Chairperson's evaluation.
6. Chairperson's appraisal of progress toward tenure (for non-tenured, tenure-earning faculty only).
7. Dean's evaluation.
8. Provost's evaluation in those cases where the faculty member is not tenured, or where the tenured member is being considered for promotion.
9. Rebuttal letters, if any, should be placed immediately following the rebutted evaluation.

It is important to restrict dossiers to those materials germane to fair consideration of the faculty member's contributions. Dossiers which include irrelevant or redundant materials inhibit the work of committees and administrators and are inimical to the best interests of the faculty member.

#### Sustained Performance Evaluation Dossier

1. Annual evaluations for the past six years.
2. Faculty member's statement of contributions (optional).
3. Chairperson's evaluation.
4. Performance Improvement Plan, if any.
5. Appeal letters, if any.
6. Dean's decision on appeals, if any.
7. Appeal of dean's decision, if any.
8. Faculty Personnel Committee's recommendation, if any.
9. Provost's decision on appeal, if any.
10. Appeal of Provost's decision on Performance Improvement Plan, if any.
11. President's decision on Performance Improvement Plan, if any.

## **VII. FBOE CRITERIA RE: DEPARTMENTAL MERIT SALARY INCREASES**

Salary increases in recognition of merit represent a significant, tangible way in which special contributions to the University may be acknowledged. Although we dwell in a community of devoted teachers and scholars, it is appropriate and important that we recognize those among us who have distinguished themselves in their professional activities. Further, in this way, we encourage efforts to excel, and to attract and retain those who are willing and able to make those special efforts.

This document is intended to be consistent with and a supplement to the provisions of the rules of the FBOE and other relevant statutes, rules, and regulations.

FAC 6C-5.925 Evaluation and Recognitions:

<https://www.flrules.org/gateway/readFile.asp?sid=0&tid=1138603&type=1&file=6C-5.925.doc>

# ATTACHMENTS

**ATTACHMENT A -- STUDENT ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTION REPORT FORM**

**THE UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA  
STUDENT ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTION**

**INSTRUCTOR'S NAME**

**YEAR/TERM**

**DEPARTMENT**

**COURSE-SECTION NUMBER**

**COURSE NAME**

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED**

**NUMBER-RESPONDING**

**% OF RESPONSE**

ITEMS	STUDENT RESPONSES (PERCENTAGES) SEE KEY BELOW					
	E	VG	G	F	P	NR
(1) EXPRESSION OF EXPECTATIONS FOR PERFORMANCE IN THIS CLASS						
(2) DESCRIPTION OF COURSE OBJECTIVES AND ASSIGNMENTS						
(3) COMMUNICATION OF IDEAS AND INFORMATION						
(4) STIMULATION OF INTEREST IN THE COURSE						
(5) FACILITATION OF LEARNING						
(6) RESPECT AND CONCERN FOR STUDENTS						
(7) AVAILABILITY TO ASSIST STUDENTS IN OR OUT OF CLASS						
(8) OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTOR						

KEY TO RESPONSES: E = EXCELLENCE; VG = VERY GOOD; G = GOOD; F = FAIR; P = POOR; NR = NO RATING

**THE UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA  
STUDENT ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTION  
GUIDE FOR INTERPRETING RESULTS**

**CAVEAT:** These student assessments are not validated measures of teacher effectiveness; comparisons and conclusions about the relative skill of different instructors should never be based solely on this limited information.

**WHAT IS THIS REPORT?** This report contains results of student assessments of instruction for one instructor for one course section taught by that instructor. This information provides you with one source of information for selecting courses. Also helpful in your decision-making would be a meeting with your academic advisor, examining course syllabi, and talking with instructors.

**WHICH COURSES WERE EVALUATED?** The full report includes all courses taught during the spring and fall semesters in one calendar year. Certain courses were excluded based upon their nontraditional structures and limited enrollment. Please note that if an instructor taught more than one section of the same course, results need to be reported for only one of those sections.

**HOW ARE THE TABLES INTERPRETED?** Tables in this report contain the following course information: Department, Course Title and Number, Section Number, Instructor Name, Semester and Year, and Course Enrollment. In addition, they summarize students' responses to the eight items for which results are provided.

For each course listed, the percent of students reporting Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair or Poor are shown for each item, as well as the percent not responding to each item. The numbers appearing below each option show the percentage of students selecting each option, NOT the number of students.

**HOW CAN THESE DATA BE USED?** Students should be careful and thoughtful when interpreting these data. First, enough students must respond to provide an adequate representation of all students enrolled in a class for data to be meaningful. Further, these data may reveal as much about diversity of learning style preferences found in university classrooms as they reveal about the diversity of student reactions to instructors' different teaching styles.

Though students are good sources of some types of information about instructors, research has also shown that students' assessments of instructors can be influenced by a number of factors outside of an instructor's immediate control. These factors can include class size (small classes tend to be rated higher than large classes), course level (upper level courses may be rated higher than lower-level courses), discipline (courses in the Humanities and Social Sciences tend to receive higher ratings than courses in Engineering, Math, and the Sciences), instructor rank (faculty tend to receive higher ratings than graduate teaching assistants), and students' reasons for enrolling in the course (elective courses tend to receive higher ratings than required courses). Readers should consider such influences on published data when reviewing these tables.

Most important, readers should remember that simplistic numerical comparisons between courses or instructors are not recommended. For example, in a class having 20 respondents, each student's opinion will have a weight of 5%; in a class with 200 respondents, however, each student's opinion will have a weight of only one-half of 1%. Similarly, one instructor may be rated Excellent by 74% of his or her students and a second instructor may be rated Excellent by 68%-, this difference may not have statistical significance or practical importance when selecting courses. In short, as noted above, these student assessments are not validated measures of teacher effectiveness comparisons and conclusions about the relative skill of different instructors should never be based solely on this limited information.

CAB:rvm  
6/6/96

**ATTACHMENT B -- SAMPLES OF PEER EVALUATION FORMS**

**PEER EVALUATION FOR NOMINEES FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE**

**DEPARTMENT OF** \_\_\_\_\_  
**COLLEGE OF** \_\_\_\_\_

**NOMINEE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**TITLE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROMOTION**  **TENURE**

**EVALUATOR:** \_\_\_\_\_

**TITLE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**DATE:** \_\_\_\_\_

As you may know, \_\_\_\_\_ is presently being considered for \_\_\_\_\_. UWF policy provides that each nomination for promotion or tenure shall be acted upon, with careful consideration being given to the qualifications of the faculty member, including evaluations by colleagues.

I would appreciate it if you would fill in the following questionnaire which will help us evaluate the candidate who is now under consideration.

Please keep in mind that promotion or tenure should be granted for teaching performance, contributions to the University, research, etc. I hope you can get to this within the next several days and request that you deliver your reply to your Chairperson by \_\_\_\_\_, for inclusion in the dossier being assembled.

In addition to rating your colleague's performance for each of the categories below, you are asked to state your level of confidence in each rating you give. If you feel you have insufficient information upon which to base a rating in any given category, check only the "Insufficient Information" space; otherwise, you should check two spaces beside each question ("Level of Confidence" and "Evaluation").

	Level of Confidence				Evaluation				
	High	Moderate	Low	Insufficient Information	Outstanding	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor
1. Teaching Effectiveness									
2. Research Effectiveness									
3. Academic Advising Effectiveness									
4. Overall Contribution to your Faculty									
5. Overall Contribution to the University									
6. Knowledge of the Entire Field in which He/She Works									
7. Knowledge of the Specific Area(s) in which He/She Works									
8. Efforts to Keep Abreast of New Developments in this Discipline									
9. Interactions with Students									
10. Overall Ranking of this Individual									

Please attach additional comments if needed.

**ATTACHMENT C -- SAMPLE CURRICULUM VITA AND VITA UPDATE**

**SAMPLE CURRICULUM VITAE**

**CURRICULUM VITAE**

**PERSONAL DATA**

**Name**

**Date of Birth** (optional)

**Place of Birth** (optional)

**Marital Status** (optional)

**Present Address**

**Telephone**

**EDUCATION**

**MILITARY SERVICE**

(optional)

**PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE** (with dates)

**FELLOWSHIPS, SCHOLARSHIPS, AND AWARDS**

**PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS** (Past and Current)

**BIOGRAPHICAL LISTINGS**

**PUBLICATIONS** (List names of authors in the same order of appearance on publications)

**Books and Monographs**

**Articles in Referred Journals; Articles in Proceedings**

**Other Publications**

**ATTACHMENT C (continued):**

**GRANTS AND CONTRACTS**

**PAPERS READ AND SPEECHES GIVEN**

**COURSES TAUGHT**

**THESES/DISSERTATIONS DIRECTED**

**PUBLIC SERVICE ACTIVITIES**

**MISCELLANEOUS**

**Curriculum Vita Update  
Service Activities  
Calendar Year \_\_\_\_\_**

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**College:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_

Please identify "service activities in which you were engaged during the \_\_\_\_\_ calendar year by providing the name of the agency served, a brief description of the activity, the inclusive dates, and whether the service was paid or unpaid.

**1. Educational Institutions**

**a. Public Schools (K-12)**

School/School District	Activity	Inclusive Dates	Paid/Unpaid
------------------------	----------	-----------------	-------------

**b. The University of West Florida**

Activity	Inclusive Dates	Paid/Unpaid
----------	-----------------	-------------

**c. Other Higher Education Institutions**

Institution	Activity	Inclusive Dates	Paid/Unpaid
-------------	----------	-----------------	-------------

**2. Agencies**

Agency Name	Activity	Inclusive Dates	Paid/Unpaid
-------------	----------	-----------------	-------------

**a. International**

**ATTACHMENT C (continued):**

**b. Federal**

**c. State**

**d. Local**

**3. Business/Industry**

Business/Industry Name            Activity                                    Inclusive Dates Paid/Unpaid

**4. Peer Reviews**

Agency Name                            Activity                                    Inclusive Dates Paid/Unpaid

**a. Grant/Contract Proposals**

**b. Publications**

**c. Accreditation Visits**

**5. Professional Organization Leadership Roles**

Organization Name                    Leadership Role                            Inclusive Dates Paid/Unpaid

**6. Citizen Groups**

Organization Name                    Activity                                    Inclusive Dates Paid/Unpaid

**7. Other Public/Professional Service**

Organization Name                    Activity                                    Inclusive Dates Paid/Unpaid