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UWF Values
- Caring
- Integrity
- Quality
- Innovation
- Teamwork
- Stewardship
- Courage

A Brief History…
- 2005 → Provost and Senate President jointly appoint T&P Committee
- 2006 → faculty surveys and reviews of other models
- 2007 → overarching university principles
- 2008 → “retrofit” to departments/administrative guidelines
- 2009 → use of terms in annual evaluations
- 2010 → roll out for T&P decisions
- 2011 → some digitization of annual evaluations begins

Existing Problems
- Irregularity across units
- Expectations inconsistent with public comprehensive context
  - Too easy for tenure decisions
  - Too hard for professor promotions
- Questionable review practices
- Vagueness produces angst and ordeal

Workshop Objectives
- Review overarching principles for applicant, chair/dean/provost, and personnel committees
- Identify specific changes in new guidelines
- Address specific application problems anticipated with future candidates
- Begin to develop list of “concerns” for next round of revisions

CAVEAT: It is NOT a checklist!
Intended to provide guidance regarding how smoothly review decision will unfold
- Legitimate extenuating circumstances may support success when criterion performance hasn’t been achieved
- Collegiality problems can always “trump” strong performance
Principles Driving Design

- "Excellence" = UWF standard; "Distinction" goes well beyond the standard
- Teaching remains predominant activity
- Boyer's influence broadens research
  - Applied and SOTL "count" along with basic
  - Artistic activities require different measures
- Service obligations must be better articulated and credited for impact
  - "sitting on" committees not good enough
- Design must include flexibility
  - Diversity across programs
  - Divergence within career

Terminology

- Adopted standard ratings:
  - Distinguished, Excellent (the UWF standard)
  - Good, Fair, Poor
- Displaces a range of old ratings:
  - Outstanding
  - Outstanding / Excellent
  - Exemplary
  - Satisfactory
  - Unsatisfactory

Guidance for Applicants

- Your dossier should be selective/strategic, not “kitchen sink.”
- You should go up "early" only if the decision produces little debate. A record of a failure to earn tenure in an "early" submission must be included in the dossier the for the next review.
- You are ultimately responsible for dossier status.

Guidance for Chairs

- You are stewards of process, including providing translation of old to new ratings.
- You are responsible for securing external letters of evaluation.
- You need to show courage about making tough decisions to uphold equitable standards.

Recommendations to Chairs

- Enact the spirit of university guidelines in labeling distinction in annual evaluation
- Do ensure the department's standards can be easily interpreted by outsiders
- Don’t “bridge” the ratings in the label
  - You may talk about high end performance in excellent range in the evaluation narrative, but don’t produce “excellent/distinguished” labels due to complications down the road

Guidance for Reviewers

- You are elected evaluators, not advocates or saboteurs. You must adhere professionally to published standards, not enact personal agenda.
- You must maintain confidentiality and should not communicate directly to candidates.
- You must provide a rationale for rejection.
Guidance for Deans/Provost

- You must make an independent, grounded judgment.
- You may also have to show courage, if your view is in minority.
- If you differ from your council, you must provide your rationale.

Tenure Decisions

Excellence required in Teaching. In remaining two areas, one must be at least excellent and the other at least good.

Departments may require all areas to be excellent, but this requirement must be spelled out clearly in bylaws.

Tenure Decision Timeline

- Must submit in the fall of 6th year
- May submit in the fall of 5th year, if quality produces no debate
- For those in-unit who transfer in credit, maximum 2 years tenure credit
  - Normal schedule: submit in 4th year
  - Accelerated schedule: submit in 3rd year

Tenure Process

- Only tenured faculty may vote
- Identities are kept confidential by chair
- Actual evaluations are forwarded in dossier
- Alternate evaluation procedure must be developed when unit has fewer than three tenured (not counting chair)

Promotion Readiness

- Candidates are “ready” when they can demonstrate sustained performance for the three years prior to dossier submission corresponding to the decision goal.
  - E.g., Candidates for associate professor with at least excellent ratings in all three areas for three years should have less difficulty in the process.
- Most candidates should have three years at UWF before submitting for promotion; those with two years tenure credit and exceptionally strong performance may go up after two years.

Promotion to Associate Professor

Requires a minimum of “Excellent” ratings across the board.

Evaluations can be submitted by all full-time (non-visiting) faculty; no vote is required.
### Promotion to Professor
- Distinguished ratings in one category but at least excellent in other two
  - Does not have to be in same category for all three years
- Evaluations can be submitted by all full-time (non-visiting) faculty; no vote is required.
- Typical seat time = 5 years (3 at UWF)
  - May submit after 4 years in strong cases
  - Submission after 3 years is discouraged

### Key Changes from the Old
- Strong annual evaluations do not guarantee success or support
- Don’t go up early to “test the waters;” a record of unsuccessful attempts go forward in future years
- Candidate is ultimately responsible, but chair needs to oversee fair evaluation process

### Key Changes from Old
- College and University Personnel Committee activities are independent and advisory
- Departments must offer mentoring plan
- Mid-point review must be articulated in department bylaws
  - Faculty member may choose to incorporate mid-point review in dossier or not

### Key Changes from Old
- INTERNAL letters of Recommendation
  - Limited to three
  - Chosen by candidate
  - Should not come from department colleagues who participate in formal department review/voting

### Key Changes from Old
- EXTERNAL letters of Evaluation
  - Limited to 3
  - Chosen by chair and faculty member to ensure judgment objectivity & independence (Hint: Don’t use co-authors, grad school advisors, or others with personal agenda).
  - Invitations may be extended to more than 3 to ensure completion, but only 3 can be included in binder; extras bump to bucket.
  - May attach brief rebuttal to external evaluations but must not omit the letters.

### Key Changes from Old
- UPC review no longer needed when
  - Department endorses by majority;
  - Chair endorses;
  - CPC endorses with no negative conclusions at prior levels;
  - Dean endorses.
- UPC reviews in all other cases.
- UPC review may also occur
  - When provost believes extenuating circumstances transpired;
  - When candidate requests review.
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Key Changes from Old

**Teaching** includes F2F, online, distance, mentorship, studio teaching, CE, advising. Criteria also address involvement in honors, assessment activity, student engagement, active learning.

Key Changes from Old

**Scholarly and Creative Projects** must be externally reviewed and publicly available; departments must specify which formats count and what their relative value should be.

Key Changes from Old

**Service** includes traditional service types
- community
- disciplinary
- campus
- and travel to and from remote campus
excludes remunerated activity and activity unrelated to disciplinary expertise

Key Changes from Old

- Departments *may* be more stringent than university standards as long as consistent with CBA
- Binder and “bucket” are now standard for all three colleges
- College “custodian” must manage late additions to file (e.g. late arriving letters of evaluation) with full notification to candidate of changes

Key Changes from Old

**Student Evaluation Data:** *Numerical Data*

“Candidates must submit numerical results of all student course evaluations that have been conducted during the 3 years preceding the review. Those who have been on sabbatical or leave during the preceding 3 years should submit all student course evaluations conducted over the 4 years preceding the review. Ideally, the 3 most recent years of student evaluation data should be considered. If any data are missing for any other reason, the candidate shall offer an explanation.”

Key Changes from Old

**Student Evaluation Data:** *Narrative Statements*

“Candidates have some flexibility regarding the submission of narrative student evaluations until August 2013. Ideally, candidates should submit 3 years’ worth of student narrative that correspond to the numerical information discussed in the prior paragraph. Candidates must submit narrative comments from courses, effective August 2010. For student evaluations secured prior to August 2010, faculty may elect not to submit comments, but when candidates choose to include narratives prior to this date, they must not do so selectively.”
Commitment for Future Actions

- Digitize!: CAS is experimenting with digital reporting formats
- Establish college protocols for departments with fewer than 3 tenured faculty
- Senior Lecturer promotion must be bargained to go into effect
- Faculty Senate has been charged with redesigning student evaluation of teaching
- T&P may be “reconvened” to identify (and fix) unanticipated gaps in current policy

Controversial Areas

- Stronger standards
  - Departments can opt for stronger standards but must be spelled out in bylaws so reviewers can implement fair review
- Linkage of tenure and promotion
  - Not a university requirement but departments may opt to link to produce higher quality standards
- Future changes to standards
  - Must be reviewed by UPC

Controversial Areas

- Service as legitimate basis for professor (when other areas are at least Excellent)
- UPC’s role in review and approval:
  - Not everyone favors more limited power
- Should remunerated activity always be excluded from service?
- Tenure credit can’t be withdrawn once review process has begun

Here’s hoping...

Questions?
Please contact
CAS Dean Jane Halonen
(T&P Committee Scribe)
jhalonen@uwf.edu