

Department of Instructional Design and Technology
School of Education
University of West Florida
Bylaws
Approved by Department Faculty April 24, 2024

If there is a conflict between the language of these bylaws and Florida Statutes, the UFF-UWF Collective Bargaining Agreement or any UWF Policies, then the language of Florida Statutes, the UFF-UWF Collective Bargaining Agreement or UWF Policy shall prevail and all other portions of departmental bylaws remain intact.

UFF-UWF Collective Bargaining Agreement:

<https://uwf.edu/academic-affairs/resources/collective-bargaining/>

UWF Policies:

<https://uwf.edu/academic-affairs/resources/policies-procedures-resources/>

The Department of Instructional Design and Technology (IDT) is composed of faculty and professionals who support the mission of the School of Education (SOE) through teaching, scholarly activities, and service. The Department focuses on developing synergy between academic innovation and applied development as well as a strong research agenda in the support and preparation of empowered persons and professionals who serve our society.

1. Mission Statement:

The mission of the Department of Instructional Design and Technology (IDT) is to prepare qualified education, training, military, healthcare, and business and industry professionals to solve complex organizational problems through the application of education, training and/or technology-based solutions.

Membership in the Department consists of faculty who serve and support the goals and mission of the Department. Appointments are made in accordance with University and School Policies.

UWF Mission, Vision, and Values: <https://uwf.edu/about/mission-vision-values/>

SOE Mission, Vision, and Values: <https://uwf.edu/academic-affairs/departments/school-of-education/>

2. Governance: Department's structure, committees, policies and procedures.

3. 2.1 Governance - Structure

A. Department Chair

The Department Chair, or designee, will officially represent the Department in its relationship with the administration, other schools/colleges in the University, and the community at large.

B. Program Coordinators and Lead Instructors

The Department Chair will appoint a Program Coordinator for each of the programs. The Program Coordinators will serve as the first point of contact for their assigned programs and will assume responsibility for working with the Department Chair and faculty on curriculum development, recruitment and retention, and assessment activities for their assigned programs. The Department Chair will ensure that University and School procedures are followed accurately, faculty rights are respected, and student interests are represented.

Program coordinators will respond to all inquiries from prospective students. These include direct inquiries as well as those forwarded to the department by Undergraduate and Graduate Admissions.

The Department Chair and full-time faculty members will collaboratively identify lead instructors for all IDT courses. Lead instructors will assume responsibility for working with full-time faculty and adjunct instructors who have taught or expressed an interest in a given course to maintain currency of course materials, ensure course alignment with the overall curriculum, maintain the syllabi of record, and draft CCRs as needed.

C. Eligibility for Participation in Governance Activities

All full-time faculty members of the department are eligible to participate in votes relating to governance of the Department.

Voting members shall notify the Department Chair in a timely fashion if they cannot attend a scheduled meeting. Voting members who are unable to attend a scheduled meeting may not be represented by proxy. Agenda items requiring a vote will be tabled if a quorum is not present.

There will always be an attempt to reach consensus, but when a consensus cannot be reached on a given topic or when a vote is required, a formal vote will be taken from all eligible voting faculty. The bylaws may be amended with a 2/3 vote of eligible voting faculty. All other items requiring a vote will be decided with a simple majority ruling. If any member requests a secret ballot on any issue, a secret ballot will be conducted. The Chair votes whenever his/her vote will affect the result.

Faculty participation in voting procedures related to personnel matters will be governed by Department and University Tenure and Promotion Criteria.

D. Meetings

Departmental meetings will take place at least once each month. Barring extenuating circumstances, all departmental members are expected to attend meetings in person. Additional meetings may be scheduled at the discretion of the Chair. Upon the request of a majority of departmental members, the Chair will also convene additional departmental meetings in a timely and efficient manner. Announcements of the meetings will be distributed to the membership at least two (2) weeks prior to the scheduled meeting. A proposed agenda of each meeting will be posted by the Chair and available to the Department members at least two (2) days prior to any

meeting. Minutes of the meetings will be posted by the office administrator and available to the Department members within one (1) week of the meeting.

Meeting agendas will include standard items, including approval of prior meeting minutes, administrative updates, program updates (coordinators), department committee updates (committee chairs), and updates from SOE committees (department representatives). Additional meeting specific items will be added to the agenda under the headings Old Business and New Business as needed. Meetings will also include monthly advising updates and an open forum to allow attendees to address additional items of concern.

E. Budget Allocation

General accounting of department budgets/accounts will be shared annually by the Chair.

F. Committees

The Chair appoints members of all departmental committees. Appointments will align with faculty interests whenever possible.

1. Admissions Committee

The Chair of the Department shall appoint a minimum of three (3) department faculty to serve on the Admissions committee. The Admissions committee will consist of the program coordinator and the appointed faculty. The Admissions committee is responsible for reviewing and updating program admission requirements, policy and procedures for admissions, and communication to various departments regarding updates in Admission processes.

2. Assessment Committee

The Chair of the Department shall appoint a minimum of three (3) department faculty of varying ranks to serve on the Assessment committee. The Assessment committee is responsible for reviewing and program assessment data to determine if the program is consistent with the department's mission, goals, and objectives. Assessments are also utilized to make sure the program is in compliance with state and University accreditation standards.

3. Bylaws Committee

The Chair of the Department shall appoint a minimum of three (3) department faculty to serve on the Bylaws Committee. Appointees will be representative of the department make-up, including tenured, tenure-earning, and non-tenured faculty. The Bylaws Committee shall meet at least once each year to review the bylaws for currency, compliance with the UFF-UWF Collective Bargaining Agreement, UWF Policies, and any other matter which would improve the efficiency of the administration and functioning of the Department.

The departmental bylaws may be amended by a vote of two-thirds of the eligible voting members present at a meeting called for such purpose. Proposed changes to these bylaws must be

submitted in writing to the Department Chair and distributed to the eligible voting members at least ten (10) days prior to the meeting at which the proposed changes are to be considered.

Bylaws Review Process: <https://uwf.edu/academic-affairs/resources/by-laws/>

4. Task Forces

Task forces may be formed by the Chair of the Department for work within the Department on particular projects. Task forces will be dissolved upon completion of the assigned task.

G. Requests for Resources

Requests for the use of resources, not already assigned to an individual departmental member must align to the mission of the Department. Requests should be made in writing to the Department Chair, describing the request in light of the mission. The Department Chair must approve all requests.

Travel budgets are provided through the general department fund. Each year the Chair will notify Department faculty of the availability of travel funds for the upcoming year. Faculty are required to apply for travel match funding if eligible prior to requesting department funding.

Requests for graduate student assistants must be made prior to the beginning of a term, as early in advance of the term as possible. The Department Chair will assign graduate students and other support staff to department members based upon a consideration of faculty load (e.g., number of students and number of preparations), special needs (e.g., tenure and promotion, special projects), allocated funds and other Departmental requirements as outlined by the Department Chair.

H. Program Advisory Councils/Program Advisory Boards

Department programs are encouraged to have a Program Advisory Council/Program Advisory Board. Faculty of the Department may use the expertise drawn from representative constituency groups, including, but not limited to, regional school districts, the military, government, business and industry, to participate in the curriculum and to support and advise each Program in planning and implementation.

4. 2.2 Governance - Academic and Curricular Policies/Procedures

If there is a conflict between the language of these bylaws and the UFF-UWF Collective Bargaining Agreement, then the language of the UFF-UWF Collective Bargaining Agreement controls.

I. Academic Policy and Curricular Changes

1. All curricular and academic policy changes should originate at the Program level within the Department. However, the Board of Trustees, Provost and Dean may institute additional policy changes.
2. Curriculum Change Requests are developed by department faculty, approved by the Chair, and submitted through the Dean's Office to the School Program Review Committee, SOE Council and the Faculty Senate. The exact review process, including submission due dates and required levels of review, are dictated by the university and school and will be adhered to by the department.

J. Grading and Examination Policies

The Department of Instructional Design and Technology adheres to the grading and examination policies published in the UWF Catalog. Grading and examination policies are left to the professional judgment of the classroom instructor or faculty subject to University policies. See UWF Catalog. These policies must be made clear to students at the beginning of classes and must be in the course syllabi. Course syllabi must be distributed at or before the first class meeting for all courses and uploaded to the FACS system per the deadlines established by the school and university.

5. 2.3 Governance - Personnel Policies/Procedures

A. Rank Definitions and Criteria for Faculty

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Education and Experience Minimum Qualifications</i>
Instructor	Holds a degree with appropriate professional qualifications in the appropriate discipline. May be appointed by the Dean in consultation with the Department Chair to support Departmental and School needs.
Assistant Professor	Holds an earned terminal degree with appropriate professional qualifications in the appropriate discipline. Holds promise for or has proven track record of conducting research, excellence in teaching, and providing the department, school, university, community and appropriate profession with service.
Associate Professor	Holds an earned terminal degree with appropriate professional qualifications in the appropriate discipline. Has had at least four (4) years in rank as an Assistant Professor. Has produced scholarly work and published in the appropriate discipline. Displays excellent teaching skills and actively participates in service activities at the Department, School and University levels in addition to service to the community and appropriate profession.
Professor	Holds an earned terminal degree with appropriate professional requirements in the appropriate discipline and at least five (5) years in rank as an Associate Professor. Has produced a significant body of research. Displays excellent teaching skills and participates in service activities appropriate to the discipline at multiple levels which may include the university, the school, the region, the state, the nation and

	internationally. In addition, has provided service to the community and the appropriate profession.
Visiting and Clinical Status	Visiting and Clinical departmental members may be appointed by the Dean in consultation with the Department Chair to support Departmental and School needs.

B. Recruitment/Selection of Department Members

1. Permission to recruit/search for new Department members is derived from the Provost via the Dean to the Chair of the Department.
2. University recruitment/search procedures are to be followed and are based on the type of employee being hired. These procedures may include approval for specific search and advertising activities by the Provost and Equal Opportunity and Diversity Office prior to advertising.
3. Search committees with appropriate representation are organized by the Dean with input from the Department Chair. Search committees are responsible for conducting all searches in accordance with School and University policies and in accordance with the laws of the State of Florida. Search committees will review candidate credentials and, upon approval by the Department Chair and Hiring Official, schedule screening interviews, and on campus interviews. The Search Committee, in conjunction with the Department Chair, makes recommendations to the Dean and Hiring Official. The Dean confers with the Provost prior to making an offer of a position. The Dean and Chair collaboratively establish the offer package and make the formal offer to the candidate.
4. National searches are required for all tenured and tenure earning positions. The department, with the approval of the Dean, may request a waiver of the search requirement when filling instructor or visiting positions. Approval at all levels must be obtained prior to conducting interviews or making an offer of employment without a formal search.

C. Selection and Evaluation of Adjunct Faculty

1. Adjunct faculty shall be hired only after full-time faculty members' course loads have been filled. Adjuncts will be reviewed and hired on an ongoing basis by the Chair based on a review of all relevant data and the recommendations of faculty.
2. Adjuncts must meet accreditation guidelines (e.g., SACS).
3. Adjuncts who teach online must have prior experience teaching online or complete appropriate professional development in advance of the course start date as determined by the Chair.
4. Adjuncts shall be provided with a copy of the Annual Evaluation section of these Bylaws at the commencement of their contract and shall be evaluated at the end of each term during which they teach based on the achievement of student learning outcomes, student evaluations, and all other relevant indicators/evidence of teaching performance including, but not limited to the following list of indicators found in the Teaching section of the Annual Evaluation Indicators/Evidence of Performance.
 - a. Course Syllabi
 - b. Course Materials
 - c. Student Exams and Assignments
 - d. Integration of Technology

- e. Alignment to professional standards
 - f. Student Evaluations
 - g. Peer Evaluations
5. The Chair or designee will review and assist with course content and serve as resource persons as needed.

D. Work Assignments

The Department Chair will prepare an Assignment Letter for the individual faculty member for the academic year. The letter is generated electronically, signed by the Chair, forwarded electronically to the Dean for approval and signature, and then routed electronically to the faculty member for signature. The original is kept in the Dean's office in the faculty member's personnel file. All parties have access to the letter electronically. This letter serves as the foundation of the annual letter of evaluation which becomes the major documentation for tenure, promotion, salary allocations, and merit pay.

E. Summer Contracts

Summer contract opportunities for faculty will be based on programmatic needs and faculty areas of specialization, consistent with the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). Courses with low enrollment that do not meet the required minimum enrollment will be canceled and will not be reassigned to another faculty member unless an attempt is being made to balance teaching loads among department and program faculty.

F. Office Hour Policies

Each faculty member shall observe a minimum of 10 hours of regularly scheduled office hours per week, six of which will take place on campus, and be noticed by the department. Modifications to such a schedule should be approved in advance in writing by the Department Chair.

6. Mentoring:

A. Ad Hoc Faculty Mentoring Committee

Faculty Mentoring Committees will be formed to support all newly appointed departmental faculty, regardless of rank. The Mentoring Committee will consist of at least two full-time faculty members, a minimum of one of whom must be tenured, from within the department. Mentoring committees may be expanded to include additional faculty members, internal and/or external to the department, who are deemed to be appropriate based on the newly appointed individual's needs. The Mentoring Committee will serve as an advisory/supportive committee to help position the newly appointed individual to achieve success. The Mentoring Committee will meet with the assigned mentee a minimum of two times per year to discuss progress.

B. Student Mentoring Task Force

The Department of Instructional Design and Technology acknowledges and fully supports the role of mentoring in student success. Mentoring is recognized by the department as an indicator of teaching performance for the purposes of annual evaluations, and tenure, promotion, and post-tenure reviews of faculty.

The Student Mentoring Task Force is composed of faculty who have demonstrated the capacity and desire to serve as Purposeful Faculty Mentors. Participation is voluntary; however, in the event that there are insufficient numbers of volunteers to meet demand, the Chair may appoint additional faculty to serve on the task force.

Each student enrolled in an academic program offered by the department shall be assigned a Purposeful Faculty Mentor at the time of admission. The department will assign mentors purposefully, matching student interests and faculty expertise whenever possible. However, the department recognizes that this is an imperfect process and that on occasion a student might find another faculty member is a more natural fit for his or her needs. Therefore, mentors may be reassigned at any time upon request of the student.

The Purposeful Faculty Mentor will contact the student upon admission and at least twice during each subsequent semester. Faculty Mentors may choose to interact with their assigned mentees individually or collectively. The role of the Purposeful Faculty Mentor is to compliment the academic support provided by the student's professional academic adviser. Specific roles may include, but are not limited to, assisting students with:

- Career planning
- Conducting and disseminating research
- Engaging in local, national, and international professional organizations
- Locating internships
- Networking
- Selecting concentrations and elective courses

7. Annual evaluation for tenured, tenure-earning, and non-tenured faculty: Criteria, performance indicators, and procedures.

A. Introduction

Annual Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion criteria and guidelines will follow University and School submission guidelines.

B. Criteria – In general

Tenure, Promotion, and Evaluations: <https://uwf.edu/academic-affairs/resources/promotion-tenure/>

C. Procedures

Annual evaluation, tenure, and promotion procedures and timelines are distributed by the university administration each year.

D. Annual Evaluation

Each Department member will be evaluated on an annual basis by the Chair. Faculty will submit evaluation materials to the Chair electronically (ACRES). This evaluation is to be based on the assignment letter written by the Chair and acknowledged by the individual faculty member. IDT faculty are expected to demonstrate consistent annual progress towards meeting Department tenure, promotion and post tenure review recommendation guidelines for teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. Annual progress will be measured in terms of the four performance levels of Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, and Unsatisfactory.

The Chair must consider any evidence and materials relevant to the work assignment submitted by the faculty member as the basis for the Annual Evaluation Letter. Materials to be submitted include: (1) a statement of contributions with appendices detailing productivity in designated areas; (2) a current curriculum vitae with those items added since the last evaluation highlighted; and (3) accompanying materials supporting claims made in the statement of contributions (e.g., student assessment of instruction, published works). These materials must be submitted to the Department Chair within the timeline established by the University for Annual Evaluations. The Chair shall give an evaluation of Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, and Unsatisfactory for each category of Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Service, as well as an overall performance rating. The faculty member acknowledges receipt of the Evaluation Letter, which is then included in the Annual Evaluation packet.

Untenured, tenure-earning faculty are also evaluated by the Chair on their progress toward tenure, and faculty who are not yet full professors are evaluated by the Chair on their progress toward promotion.

Visiting faculty and instructors will also be evaluated by the Chair in this manner, although there will be no direct implication with regard to the tenure and promotion process. Adjunct faculty shall be evaluated based on the achievement of student learning outcomes, student evaluations, and all other relevant indicators/evidence of teaching performance including but not limited to Course Syllabi, Course Materials, Student Exams and Assignments, Integration of Technology, Alignment to professional standards, Student Evaluations, and Peer Evaluations.

E. Evidence of Scholarly and Creative Products

As in all disciplines, scholarship within Instructional Design and Technology includes a wide variety of research and scholarly activity as defined and judged within the academic discipline. For purposes of annual evaluations, tenure, promotion, and post tenure review, faculty should produce high quality scholarship related to their particular research agenda. The quality and impact of scholarly and creative publications, products, and activities is established by evidence provided by the faculty member, including but not limited to, acceptance rate, rejection rate, impact factor, the review process, or other indications of quality commonly used in the discipline.

There are a variety of tangible and public scholarly and creative activities and products that may be generated by IDT faculty. As is noted above, these may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Articles in journals
- Books
- Book reviews
- Building interdisciplinary partnerships for research
- Chapters in books
- Conference proceedings
- Developing and field-testing educational programs and products such as program guides, technical products, educational software, curricula, instructional materials guides, and others
- Funded grant proposals for research and development
- Invited talks, conference special sessions
- Originating and conducting basic and applied research or technological research
- Presenting at conferences
- Presenting workshops

F. Evidence of Teaching Activities

- Alignment to professional standards
- Collaboration with CTLT
- Course materials
- Course syllabi
- Course/curriculum design and revision
- Directed studies supervision
- Dissertation chair/committee member
- Feedback to students (consistent and constructive)
- High impact learning activities
- Initiation of new programs/certifications/degrees
- Innovative instructional strategies
- Integration of technology
- Internship coordination
- Mentor or participant in undergraduate research projects
- Mentoring
- Peer evaluations
- Professional development participation/activity
- Professional development of Graduate Assistants
- Purposeful mentoring
- Quality Matters certification
- Service-learning activity supervision
- Student evaluations
- Student exams and assignments

G. Evidence of Service Activities

Service is broadly defined and should include a wide range of activities. Service is most valued when there is a relationship between the activity and the faculty member's area of expertise. IDT strongly supports faculty service related to their area of expertise and in accordance with rank. Service includes, but is not limited to, the following activities:

- Academic organization service
- Accreditation activities
- Advisory council participation
- Building partnerships with business and industry that enhance or expand university relationships
- Career fairs
- Conducting workshops
- Consultancies
- Continuing education/lecturing
- Department chair, program chair, coordinator
- Department, school, university committees and governance
- Discipline-related community activities
- Editorial review board service
- Fundraising initiatives
- Journal reviewer
- Mentoring, students and/or faculty
- Professional organization service
- Program development/enhancement
- Public lectures, performances, exhibitions
- Purposeful mentoring
- Student organization advisement/sponsorship
- Recruitment of students
- University sponsored and/or endorsed activities/events

8. Mid-point review: Criteria, performance indicators, and procedures.

The purpose of the Mid-Point Review is to provide support and guidance in the areas of teaching, research, and service for tenure-track faculty in a timely fashion for faculty to continue or modify progress for a successful candidacy.

The Mid-Point Review for candidates on a standard six-year tenure clock will occur mid-semester spring of the third year. Candidates should submit a completed portfolio by March 1st. The SOE Dean will determine the appropriate term for candidates arriving with time towards tenure and promotion credit.

The Mid-Point Review Committee should include at least three tenured IDT and/or SOE faculty who are familiar with the university expectations for Tenure and Promotion. The faculty mentor for the

candidate is eligible to serve on this committee. The Chair selects the committee members from the tenured faculty.

The committee will evaluate the candidate using the standards for Tenure and Promotion in the IDT Bylaws under which the candidate was hired. Candidate strengths and weaknesses should be identified in this process, and after conferencing with the Chair, the candidate should develop a plan to address any deficiencies. If deficiencies exist, the committee will provide specific recommendations for successful tenure and promotion. If the committee affirms the candidate's progress, the committee will provide specific rationale for affirmation.

The committee will provide a formal letter to the Chair describing the candidate's progress towards promotion and tenure with advice and recommendations. Further use of these materials is at the discretion of the faculty member.

Tenure, Promotion, and Evaluations: <https://uwf.edu/academic-affairs/resources/promotion-tenure/>

9. Tenure and promotion: Criteria, performance indicators, and procedures.

Tenure procedures are governed by agreements and contracts between the BOT and the faculty union.

Tenure, Promotion, and Evaluations: <https://uwf.edu/academic-affairs/resources/promotion-tenure/>

Each year, the Dean shall provide each Chair in the School with a list of faculty members scheduled for tenure.

The Chair will request that all full-time faculty members submit a formal evaluation on tenure for each eligible faculty member within the appropriate unit. The evaluation shall be submitted to the Chair, who is obligated to maintain confidentiality about the evaluation. On a separate document, all tenured faculty in the department or unit shall vote regarding the acceptability of tenure for the candidate. The unsigned votes will be included in the tenure dossier in an envelope without disclosure of how individual faculty voted in the decision.

IDT affirms that a candidate for tenure and/or promotion must meet university, school, and departmental criteria for teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. All activities should be relevant to the candidate's discipline. The candidate for tenure must meet, as a minimum, the decision standards for tenure provided in this document and UWF tenure and promotion policies.

A. Tenure

The decision to recommend tenure is based upon a pattern of sustained performance of "Meets Expectations" as indicated by annual evaluations. The numbers that follow represent a minimum for consideration. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to provide sufficient context and/or explanation to clarify and justify the qualitative weight/impact that should be afforded to a particular piece of evidence.

B. Recommendations for Tenure (Tenure Only, No Promotion)

1. At least three scholarly works to include various evidence (see Bylaws for performance indicators for ratings). At least two of these scholarly works must be peer-reviewed journal articles.
2. At least two (2) of these must carry progressive publication dates subsequent to the candidate having joined The University of West Florida.

C. Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to associate professor is justified by a strong, consistent, and positive reputation within the university in teaching, service, and scholarship. A consistent record of significant tangible and public scholarship over time and recognized as such by peers is always a criterion. This scholarship should have earned acknowledgement in the discipline outside the university. The numbers that follow represent a minimum for consideration. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to provide sufficient context and/or explanation to clarify and justify the qualitative weight/impact that should be afforded to a particular piece of evidence.

D. Recommendations for Promotion to Associate Professor (Includes Tenure Requirements)

1. A total of at least five (5) scholarly works to include various evidence (see performance indicators for ratings within Bylaws). At least three (3) of these scholarly works must be peer-reviewed journal articles. Additionally, tangible evidence of the expression of creative and scholarly activity in other venues is required (see performance indicators for ratings within Bylaws). The decision to recommend promotion to associate professor is based upon sustained performance indicated by a minimum of annual evaluation ratings of “Meets Expectations” in teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service.
2. At least three (3) of these must carry progressive publication dates subsequent to the candidate having joined The University of West Florida.

E. Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion to the rank of professor is justified by superlative and consistent teaching, service, and scholarship, as measured by favorable recognition in the discipline outside the university. The numbers that follow represent a minimum for consideration. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to provide sufficient context and/or explanation to clarify and justify the qualitative weight/impact that should be afforded to a particular piece of evidence.

F. Recommendations for Promotion to Full Professor

1. A cumulative total of at least twelve (12) scholarly works to include various evidence (see performance indicators for ratings within Bylaws). At least six (6) of these scholarly works are peer-reviewed journal articles.
2. At least six (6) of these scholarly works must carry publication dates subsequent to the award of the candidate’s current rank, and during their tenure at The University of West Florida.

These are the minimum publication recommendations and do not guarantee support at the Department, School, and/or University level; quality, rigor, and impact will also be assessed in the evaluation of submitted materials. It is recommended that IDT faculty exceed these

recommendations to help facilitate a successful Promotion package at the SOE and University level.

G. Recommendations for Clinical Professors and Instructors

Promotion for Clinical Faculty and Instructors will follow the University Guidelines - UWF Post-Tenure Review Guidelines Website. The same key indicators used for tenure-track faculty for teaching and service will be used for clinical professors and instructors for annual evaluation and promotion.

H. Procedure for Applying for Promotion and Tenure

In addition to meeting the guidelines outlined herein, the Department will follow the promotion and tenure application procedures and calendars as outlined in the “Annual Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion Policy” packet provided annually by the Office of the Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs.

The information details submission and review dates, assembly and order of materials, and the content included in a Tenure and Promotion (T&P) electronic binder (Interfolio).

Candidates are encouraged to meet with the Chair early in the process to coordinate the selection of external reviewers. The Chair will include all solicited external letters of review.

Tenure and Promotion Process - The annual evaluation process for SOE faculty will adhere to the current approved CBA. All faculty will refer to the *UWF Policies and Procedures for Promotion, Tenure, and Annual Evaluation*. As stated in the SOE Bylaws, teaching effectiveness, service efforts, and scholarly activities are evaluated in terms of both quantity and quality. These individual accomplishments are intended to demonstrate high impact and quality, as well as quantity consistent with discipline standards. This approach necessitates that the applicant for tenure and promotion develop a well-crafted narrative statement with accompanying evidence to effectively make the case for the substantive effect of his or her efforts in teaching, scholarship, and creative projects, and service. This electronic binder (Interfolio), taken as a whole, should provide a compelling case that would be judged by professionals aligned to the candidate's discipline from a variety of academic institutions that include comprehensive regional universities as indicative of the candidate's competence.

Candidates are expected to use data and evaluative criteria identified in the *UWF Promotion and Tenure Guidelines* to support the case for tenure and promotion. It is the candidate's responsibility to prepare a credential file that provides compelling and convincing evidence to external reviewers of professional competence. This process recognizes that professional activities, such as journal articles, conference presentations, and grants, may differ significantly in elements, such as scholarly content, length, and research effort. It is the applicant's responsibility to review *UWF Promotion and Tenure Guidelines* and to build a credential file that meets or exceeds those criteria.

Appendix A: Evaluation Criteria

Department of Instructional Design and Technology faculty are expected to demonstrate consistent annual progress towards meeting department tenure and promotion recommendation guidelines for quantity, quality, and impact of teaching, scholarship and creative projects, and service. Annual progress will be measured in terms of the four performance levels of Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, and Unsatisfactory. Performance indicators for each of these four performance levels are provided below. The scale is based upon these definitions:

- Exceeds Expectations. The attainment of 'Exceeds Expectations' indicates a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the average performance of faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit.
- Meets Expectations. The attainment of 'Meets Expectations' shall satisfy the University and departmental standards and expectations in place at the time of the evaluation for excellence in quantity, quality or both. It indicates an expected level of accomplishment compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit.
- Does Not Meet Expectations. An evaluation that 'Does Not Meet Expectations' reflects performance that falls below the normal range of annual variation in performance compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit but is capable of improvement.
- Unsatisfactory. An 'Unsatisfactory' performance rating indicates failure to meet expectations that reflect disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in applicable University regulations and policies.

1. Teaching Activities Criteria

The University, School, and Department places a priority on teaching responsibilities and duties. The evaluation of teaching effectiveness is based on many considerations. Evidence of quality teaching may be found in many sources and must be tangible and measurable.

Key Indicators for a Performance Rating of "Meets Expectations"

Meets Expectations: Demonstrates consistent high-quality teaching with positive outcomes for students. The indicators below will help faculty build a case for Teaching that Meets Expectations.

- Student evaluations document consistent positive impacts on learning
- Syllabi outlines comprehensive, clear, and appropriate performance expectations
- Effectiveness of assessment and feedback practices
- Pedagogical and quality enhancement activities that improve learning (e.g., active learning, student engagement techniques, high-impact practices)
- Evidence of reflective teaching practices for continuous course/program improvement (e.g., accreditation, Quality Matters, peer review, and curriculum planning activities)
- Mentoring students in unscheduled teaching activities (e.g., the dissertation process, student research, high-impact practice activities, student support activities, etc.)
- Appropriate standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights (e.g., modeling and practicing professional communication, promoting civil discourse in class and online discussions, etc.)
- Effective and timely communication practices with the students inside and outside the classroom
- Peer observations or course reviews that focus on constructive feedback for instructional strategies

and/or course design.

- Participation in professional development activities that improve teaching
- Teaching awards and other accomplishments related to teaching

Teaching Performance Ratings:

Exceeds Expectations

An “Exceeds Expectations” rating demonstrates a high degree of quality in teaching. Performance indicators that may be used to support Exceeds Expectations ratings include:

- Leadership evident in the promotion of high-quality teaching and curriculum development;
- Teaching awards document high caliber of performance;
- Pedagogical and student support practices are innovative; and
- Demonstrates adherence to the needs of all students toward the goal of individual achievement.

Meets Expectations

A “Meets Expectations” rating reflects appropriate quality in teaching. Performance indicators that may be used to support Meets Expectations ratings:

- Student evaluations consistently document positive impact on learning;
- Peer evaluations indicate sound pedagogical practices;
- Syllabi outline comprehensive, clear, and appropriate performance expectations;
- Goals and course content routinely provide evidence of successful continuous improvement efforts;
- Pedagogical and student support practices are effective; and
- Applies learning from professional development activities to improve teaching.

Does Not Meet Expectations

A “Does not Meet Expectations” performance rating demonstrates some positive teaching outcomes but minor areas for concern are evident that may have a negative impact on students and their learning as reflected by a combination of indicators. Teaching performance is somewhat below the department norms. Performance indicators that may be used to support “Does not Meet Expectations” ratings include:

- Student evaluations document some consistent areas of concern;
- Syllabi do not provide clear and appropriate expectations;
- Assessment practices show some difficulty in supporting student learning and meeting department needs;
- Some pedagogical and student support practices need improvement (e.g., occasional disrespectful interactions with students); and
- Rarely participates in professional development activities to improve teaching.

Unsatisfactory

An “Unsatisfactory” performance rating demonstrates serious problems in attaining success in teaching as reflected by a combination of many of the negative indicators or fewer, but extreme behaviors that produce substantial negative outcomes on students and learning. Teaching performance is well below the SOE norms. Performance indicators that may be used to support Unsatisfactory ratings include:

- Student evaluations document multiple consistent problems;
- Syllabi are not current and/or fail to establish clear and relevant expectations;
- Assessment practices are inadequate to support student learning and department needs (e.g., learning outcomes are inadequate, inappropriate, or missing; testing strategies are not effective or fair);
- Pedagogical and student support practices are unsound (e.g., disrespectful, unorganized, unresponsive); and

- Lack of effort to improve quality of teaching (e.g., avoids professional development experiences).

2. Creative and Scholarly Activities Criteria

Creative and scholarly activities form the basis of Department of Instructional Design and Technology faculty interaction with students, peers, and community, as they search to extend their own knowledge, skills, and abilities.

Key Indicators for a Performance Rating of ‘Meets Expectations’

Meets Expectations: Demonstrates satisfactory execution of scholarship or creative activity agenda. The indicators below will help faculty build a case for Scholarly and Creative Activities that Meets Expectations.

- Refined scholarly agenda or creative plan well suited to regional comprehensive university context
- Meets department production targets for both quantity and quality of scholarly and creative products.
- Examples of evidence:
 - Peer-reviewed publications (i.e., journal articles)
 - Editorially reviewed publications (i.e., journal articles, book chapters)
 - Book(s) or book chapters
 - Book reviews
 - Convention and conference contributions (e.g. conference presentations, workshops, and proceedings)
 - Synopses of grants or contracts and the outcome of such applications (funded and non-funded)
 - Electronic outlets (e.g., blogs, vlogs)
 - Invited talks and conference special sessions
 - Developing and field-testing educational programs and products such as program guides, technical products, educational software, curricula, instructional materials guides, and others
 - Originating and conducting basic and applied research or technological research
- Evidence of recognition and/or references to research outside of the University (editorship, citation counts, press releases, etc.)
- Involvement of students in scholarly and creative activities
- Awards received for scholarly or creative activities

Research and Scholarly Activities Performance Ratings:

Exceeds Expectations

An “Exceeds Expectations” performance rating demonstrates a consistently high degree of skill in design and execution of scholarly and creativity projects. In general, the weight of evidence in this performance *exceeds department criteria for excellence*.

Performance indicators that may be used to support Exceeds Expectations ratings:

- Established scholarly agenda or creative projects toward publications with national or international recognition;

- Exceeds IDT expectations for quality and quantity in discipline-specific scholarship;
- Provides significant data or evidence of scholarly influence of research and creative projects;
- Achieved multiple funded grant proposals;
- Achieved high-caliber or significant scholarly activity awards, recognitions, etc.; and
- Demonstrated continuous collaboration with colleagues or student scholars (presentations, publications, etc.).

Meets Expectations

A “Meets Expectations” performance rating demonstrates well-developed execution of a scholarly or creative activity agenda as shown by the performance indicators below.

Performance indicators that may be used to support “Meets Expectations” ratings:

- Refined and advancing scholarly agenda or creative projects toward publication(s);
- Demonstrated quality and quantity in discipline-specific scholarship;
- Provides data or evidence of some scholarly significance of research and creative projects;
- Funded grant proposals; and
- Demonstrated collaboration with colleagues or student scholars (presentations, publications, etc.).

Does Not Meet Expectations

Scholarly and creative projects are somewhat below the IDT norms or expectations, and do not demonstrate adequate progress toward executing a scholarly or creative agenda as shown by the performance indicators below.

Performance indicators that may be used to support “Does Not Meet Expectations” ratings:

- Scholarly agenda or creative plan is somewhat developed, but lacks a clear focus or connection to the subject area leading to publications;
- Limited or lack of completion of scholarly or creative projects;
- Limited pursuit of grant proposals or funding opportunities; and
- Limited collaboration with colleagues or student scholars.

Unsatisfactory

An “Unsatisfactory” performance rating demonstrates serious problems in attaining success in developing a scholarly or creative agenda. Scholarly and creative projects are well below the IDT norms and expectations for success as shown by the performance indicators below.

Performance indicators that may be used to support “Unsatisfactory” ratings include:

- Scholarly agenda or creative plan has not been developed with a clear focus or connection to a discipline;
- Minimal pursuit of scholarly and creative projects;
- Lack of grant proposals or funding opportunities; and
- Lack of collaboration with colleagues or student scholars.

3. Service Activities Criteria

Service is broadly defined and should include a wide range of activities. Service that is most valued when it provides synergy between the activity and the faculty member’s area of expertise. The Department of Instructional Design and Technology strongly supports faculty service related to their area of expertise.

Key Indicators for a Performance Rating of ‘Meets Expectations’

Meets Expectations: Demonstrates satisfactory execution of service contributions. The indicators below will help faculty build a case for Service that Meets Expectations.

- Service to university, school, and department (i.e., committee participation and leadership)
- Discipline-related service to the community (i.e., grant development, teaching K-12 students, board member, workshops, student organizations, advisory councils)
- Service to academic or professional organizations (e.g., conference proposal reviewer, editorial review boards, organization leadership; conference organizer)
- Continuous improvement activities (program-level)

Service Performance Ratings:

Exceeds Expectations

An “Exceeds Expectations” performance rating demonstrates a consistently high degree of skill and leadership in service contributions to the field, the community, the university, the school, professional organizations, colleagues, and UWF students.

Performance indicators that may be used to support Exceeds Expectations ratings:

- Demonstrated leadership and participation in department, school, university, and community committees;
- Demonstrated leadership and participation in discipline-specific professional organizations;
- Leading professional development or continuing education; and
- Demonstrated leadership in support of continuous improvement activities.

Meets Expectations

A “Meets Expectations” performance rating demonstrates well developed execution of service contributions as shown by the performance indicators below.

Performance indicators that may be used to support Meets Expectations ratings:

- Consistent active and constructive participation in department, school, university, and community committees;
- Demonstrated involvement in discipline-specific professional organizations;
- Facilitating professional development or continuing education; and
- Active participation in continuous improvement activities.

Does Not Meet Expectations

A “Does Not Meet Expectations” performance rating demonstrates some positive, yet inconsistent, service contributions as shown by the performance indicators below.

Performance indicators that may be used to support Does Not Meet Expectations ratings:

- Limited participation in department, school, university, and community committees;
- Limited involvement in discipline-specific professional organizations;
- Limited participation in delivering professional development or continuing education; and
- Limited participation in continuous improvement activities.

Unsatisfactory

An “Unsatisfactory” performance rating demonstrates serious problems in fulfilling appropriate service roles for faculty.

Performance indicators that may be used to support Unsatisfactory ratings:

- Lack of participation in department, school, university, and community committees;
- Lack of involvement in discipline-specific professional organizations;

- Lack of participation in delivering professional development or continuing education; and
- Lack of participation in continuous improvement activities.

4. **Post-Tenure Review**

The University of West Florida adheres to Florida Board of Governors' Regulation 10.003, as well as Article 11 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, in all matters relating to post-tenure review

Each PTR packet submitted for review shall contain the following:

- A. Last five years of Chair and Dean Annual Performance Evaluation Letters and any and all faculty rebuttals;
- B. Last five years of Faculty Assignment Letters;
- C. Current Curriculum Vitae;
- D. Copy of Current Department Bylaws.
- E. A five-page statement of contributions provided by the faculty member, with the statement confined to the previous five years of work.
 1. The statement should build a case for the final rating based primarily upon the overall rating from annual evaluations in the previous five years and the annual performance expectations in the bylaws. It is expected that some fluctuations in rating are normal, and that the evaluation should be based upon the modal value, rather than on individual ratings.
 2. Annual performance ratings for individual categories (i.e. Instruction) can be used to further contextualize the statement. However, the overall ratings and bylaws should be the primary focus.
 3. Additional evidence of the quality or impact of efforts beyond that requested in the bylaws can be offered.

UWF Website - [UWF Post-Tenure Review Guidelines Website](#)

Tenure, Promotion, and Evaluations - <https://uwf.edu/academic-affairs/resources/promotion-tenure/>

Appendix B: Summary of Changes

Summarize the changes to the bylaws and dates the changes were made.

Date	Summary of Changes
September 1, 2022	Bylaws affirmed. No changes.
March 14, 2024	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Changed all references to the College of Education and Professional Studies and/or CEPS to School of Education (SOE). 2. Adjusted rating scales for annual evaluations and promotion and tenure decisions to align with new, four-point scale adopted by the university. 3. Removed information regarding Sustained Performance Evaluation (SPE) and replaced it with Post-Tenure Review (PTR) guidelines adopted by the university. 4. All changes reviewed and approved by department faculty during March 14, 2024 department meeting.
Apr 22, 2024	Removed “Sustained Performance Review” from “ <i>University of West Florida Policies...</i> ” (page 14).