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1. **Name of Department**
The Department of Health Sciences and Administration, hereafter referred to as the Department is a unit in the Usha Kundu, MD College of Health. The College was originated in Fall of 2015 and the Department was organized in 2016.

2. **Mission and Vision**

   **Mission statement**
The mission of the Department of Health Sciences and Administration is to develop professionals who are empowered to promote the health of the populations they serve. In support of the University mission, the faculty are committed to: enhancing access, transmission, application, and discovery of knowledge; and preparing students to respond to the health needs of their community.

   **Vision statement**
To be recognized as a department of excellence by health professionals, locally, regionally and nationally for community engagement, education and research.

3. **Values/Code of Ethics**
The Department of Health Sciences and Administration has embraced values to maintain the student-centered, benevolent spirit of the department. These values reflect the values of UWF. We are committed to:

   **CARING:** We provide a learning environment that encourages the development of individual potential for future health professionals and each other.

   **COLLABORATION:** We work together to promote a culture of supportive and cooperative interactions and communication to advance and achieve shared expectations and goals.

   **INCLUSIVENESS:** We welcome, respect, and celebrate the ways in which people and their ideas are different and the ways in which they are similar. We are committed to offering enhanced access for students.

   **INTEGRITY:** We believe in doing the right things for the right reasons. We conduct ourselves with competency, respect, accountability, and transparency.

   **QUALITY:** We believe that excellence in education leads to excellence in the practice of the health professions. We are committed to continuous improvement and alignment to national standards for excellence. We are dedicated to uncompromising excellence by matching talents to tasks.

   **CITIZENSHIP:** We strive to be a community of scholars which mean we encourage a physical presence on campus during the academic year, active participation in meetings, contribution to assessment, and communal celebration at the fall and spring commencement ceremonies.
4. Structure of the Department

Section 1. Members of the Department
The Department consists of a chairperson, faculty, adjuncts, administrative personnel and coordinators tailored to programmatic needs.

Section 2. Selection of Department Chair
The College Dean, with consideration of Department faculty recommendation, officially appoints the Chair. The Chair shall ordinarily serve a three-year term, which can be extended by the Dean upon consideration of the recommendation by the faculty. The faculty recommendation to the Dean shall be generated as follows:

During the fall semester of the third year of an incumbent’s tenure as Chair, the faculty will work to determine the individual’s preference for remaining Chair for another term. Faculty will then meet to discuss:

(a) whether there is any other member to be considered for the Chair position;
(b) the general level of satisfaction of the faculty with the incumbent;
(c) whether a search should be recommended for a candidate outside the Department.

Based on this discussion, the faculty will send a recommendation to the Dean.

Section 3. Eligibility in Governance
(a) Role of the Chair: Recognizing the Chair’s administrative responsibilities, it is the Department’s expectation that s/he shall seek the advice and consent of the Department faculty and strive to reach decisions by consensus.
(b) A shared governance model encourages all faculty to participate in Department discussions and vote on non-personnel matters. Administrative staff members may be invited to participate in discussions by the Department Chair or a majority of the faculty.
(c) On matters requiring a vote, no action shall be taken without a quorum participating. A quorum shall consist of a half plus one of the eligible voting members in the Department. All actions shall be based on the majority vote.
(d) By-laws may be amended at any regular or special faculty meeting as approved by the 2/3 rd vote of eligible voting members.
(e) The Department Chair, or designee, will officially represent the Department in its relationships across the University and throughout the community.
(f) All matters not covered by departmental by-laws will be governed by University or College by-laws
Section 4. Department Organizational Chart

Usha Kundu, MD College of Health Dean

Dept. of Health Sciences & Administration Chair

Office Admin

Internship Coordinator

Healthcare Administration Faculty

Health Sciences Faculty

5. Department Faculty Meetings

Faculty meetings will be scheduled during the regular academic year as requested by the Chair or the majority of the faculty. Department faculty on sabbatical or other authorized paid leave shall be informed of faculty meetings and shall be given opportunity to participate in discussions and votes. There will be at least two faculty meetings in each of the Fall and Spring semesters. A minimum of one weeks’ notice shall be given, with the exception of meetings called by the Chair to handle unforeseen issues. A reasonable effort will be made to accommodate all schedules. All departmental actions will be reported by email and discussed at the next scheduled regular meeting in case faculty are unavailable to attend.

The agenda for each meeting will be distributed electronically and faculty may add items to the agenda. The agenda will be available in advance when practical. Minutes will be taken by the administrative staff and available at least one week before the next meeting for review. One hard copy will be filed in the Departmental shared drive, and in an administrative notebook for this purpose. Minutes can be electronically recorded. A majority at the next faculty at the next meeting must approve the minutes. Robert’s Rules of Orders shall be followed. These rules can be accessed at http://www.robertsrules.com/authority.html.
For all faculty meetings, a simple majority of the eligible voting faculty members shall constitute a quorum. The Chair votes only in case of a tie among the voting faculty. Missing faculty may provide a proxy. In items relating to personnel matters, or when requested by at least one-third of the faculty present, the voting shall be by secret ballot. The Recorder shall tally the votes for recording in the minutes.

The individual programs within the Department may call ad hoc meetings to address issues that pertain exclusively to their program. These arise on a more informal schedule. The Department Chair should be appraised of the outcomes of those meetings.

6. Committee Structure

Section 1. Ad hoc committees/working groups
The Chair establishes ad hoc committees as the need develops, to carry out specific responsibilities (example: search committees, website review). These committees are disbanded following completion of assigned duties and submission of a written report to the faculty. The Chair shall serve as ex officio member to ad hoc committees. These committees serve as advisory bodies to the Chair.

Section 2. Standing committees
The Chair will serve as ex officio member to all standing committees.

BYLAWS COMMITTEE
The purpose of the Bylaws Committee is to establish and maintain governance of the Department or program, and to annually review the bylaws. The bylaws should be aligned to the bylaws of the Usha Kundu, MD College of Health, and reviewed by the faculty annually.

ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE
The purpose of the enhancement committee is to examine, develop, and recommend activities and ideas that foster a positive and supportive culture of work-life effectiveness.

CURRICULUM, ASSESSMENT AND TEXTBOOK COMMITTEE
The purpose of the Curriculum and Textbook Committee is to assess and evaluate the curriculum. The committee will also govern textbook adoption. This committee shall meet 60 days prior to each semester.

ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE
The purpose of the Admissions Committee is to make admission decisions for the department. The committee will meet within 1 week of the graduate school application deadline for Fall and Spring.

RESEARCH COMMITTEE
The purpose of the Research Committee is to strategically plan for research initiatives within the department.

Membership of the committees may vary from year to year. The composition of the committees should be stated in their minutes. Minutes will be emailed to faculty, and a hard copy filed in the Committee administrative notebook.
It is expected that all faculty with the exception of adjuncts serve on at least one departmental committee at all times as part of his/her service requirement.

7. Academic Policies

Section 1. Advising
Academic Advising will be carried out by the designated COH professional advisor who will also coordinate student progression to completion.

Section 2. Changes in Policies
All changes to academic and curricular policies must be approved by majority vote of all eligible unit faculty.

Section 3. Course Consistency Policies
Due to the need for standardized course content, assessment, and outcomes, all sections of department controlled courses will share a common syllabi and textbook. When a lead instructor has been identified for a course by 2/3 vote of the faculty, that lead instructor will be responsible for maintaining consistency between all sections of the course.

Section 4. Grading and Examination Policies
Grading and examination policies are set by the lead instructor for each course. Online examination policies must be in accord with university policies with respect to proctoring. Policies must be published in the course syllabi, which also reside at the university level in uwf.edu/acad. Syllabi must be posted by the end of the first week of class and preferably before the class begins. Controversy over grading practices should begin with the student and the instructor. Student grievances should proceed as outlined in the Student Handbook (found at the website for Academic Affairs).

Section 5. Late Policies
The faculty will develop and adopt a consistent late policy.

8. Personnel Policies/Procedures; Tenure and Promotion

Section 1. Recruitment/Selection of New Faculty
Faculty lines are allocated to academic units by Academic Affairs and the Dean of the College and usually when an existing position is vacated within the department. Advertising, recruiting, and selection of new faculty follow the established University procedures. When a faculty line is provided or becomes available to any of the programs, a faculty Search Committee is formed to screen all candidates' credentials. The Dean makes the formal offer of rank and salary to the successful applicant.

Each Search Committee will comply with the rules and regulations established by the Office of Human Resources at UWF. Guidelines for these regulations are available at http://uwf.edu/ohr/Employment/RecrSeleAppt.cfm.
Section 2. Annual Work Assignments

Annual Work Assignments shall be consistent with UWF-BOT/UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement 2010-2013. Section 10.3. The Department Chair will establish the faculty member’s assignments in teaching, research, and service for the upcoming academic year. These assignments are based upon the needs of the individual programs and the professional development of the faculty member. Faculty outside of the Department will be given teaching consideration on par with adjuncts.

Summer courses will be offered and scheduled on the basis of: (a) student program needs (b) enrollment projections. Faculty within the Department of Health Sciences and Administration will be offered supplementary contracts based on: (a) Area of specialization and qualifications to teach the courses offered. (b) If more than one faculty member within the Department of Health Sciences and Administration is qualified to teach a scheduled course, the supplementary appointments will be offered on a rotation basis. Priority will be based on two factors: the length of the time since the last summer appointment and the number (fewest) of appointments within the previous five years. Faculty within the Department of Health Sciences and Administration, rather than adjuncts, will have first consideration of appointment, within constraints of summer lines made available to the College and Department. Faculty outside of the Department of Health Sciences and Administration will have the same consideration of appointment as adjuncts.

Policy for overload teaching opportunities: No faculty member shall be forced to engage in overload teaching, but all faculty members who desire to do overload teaching shall have an opportunity to do so in their fields of expertise. Faculty members shall be encouraged to work through the Chair to promote their overload courses in order to secure the appropriate numbers of students. In those areas where more than one faculty member has expertise, the overload teaching shall be assigned on a rotational basis.

Section 3. Annual Evaluation Criteria and Procedures

Annual evaluations are conducted by the Department Chair. The evaluation is based on the annual work assignment letter written by the Chair and acknowledged by the faculty member. The assignment letter addresses expectations for teaching, research, and service.

The Chair and faculty member review and discuss the material submitted by the faculty member in the form of an updated CV, a statement of accomplishments, and student evaluations from all courses taught during the academic year under consideration. The Chair writes a letter of evaluation with a rating of Poor, Fair, Good, Excellent, or Distinguished in each area being evaluated based on assessment of the submitted materials. The letter of evaluation is reviewed together by both the faculty member and chair, signed by the faculty member and then forwarded to the Dean.

Section 3, Part A. Annual Evaluation of Teaching

Teaching: Activities

1. Courses
   - # Different courses taught
   - # Course sections taught
   - # Students taught
   - New courses developed and first offering

2. Graduate students
   - Thesis committees as chair
   - Thesis committees as member
3. Directed Studies
   • # Graduate or undergraduate directed studies or honor students
4. Record of Quality Improvement in Teaching
   • Participation in training, workshops, conferences on online teaching
   • Employment of innovative and new instructional strategies
   • Course development and assessment (where appropriate)
   • Course material effectively addresses programmatic competencies
5. Student Evaluations and Summary of Student Complaint/Compliment Log Entries
6. Awards and Honors Related to Teaching
7. Assessment planning and execution
8. High-Impact practices
9. Student advising
10. Curriculum development

Teaching: Department Standard
Category 1, 2 and 3 activities are performed based on assigned contact hours per individual contract. Individuals are also expected to address issues in Categories 4 and 5 and pursue demonstration of excellence in teaching with Category 6-9 activities. Student evaluations should document consistently positive impact on learning. Assessment, syllabi, curriculum development, etc. should be in compliance with Program policies.

Teaching: Ranking for Evaluation of Poor
This performance level demonstrates serious problems in attaining success in a teaching role as reflected either by (1) a combination of many of the negative indicators; or (2) fewer, but more extreme behaviors that produce substantial negative outcomes on students and their learning. In general, teaching performance is well below the programmatic standard.
Indicators:
   • Student evaluations document consistent and substantive problems (ratings well below the program average)
   • Student Complaint Log reflects consistent and substantive problems in performance
   • Teaching philosophy missing, poorly articulated or poorly expressed in course activities and planning
   • Syllabi fail to establish clear and relevant expectations
   • Assessment practices are inadequate to support student learning and program needs (e.g., competencies are inadequate, inappropriate, or missing; testing strategies are not effective or are unfair)
   • Goals and course content reflect no continuous improvement efforts; no assistance rendered for programmatic assessment plans
   • Pedagogical practices are unsound (e.g., disorganization; late, missing, unhelpful feedback; standards too lax or too challenging; routinely poor preparation; failure to master eLearning environment)
   • Student support practices are unsound (e.g., routine failure to respond to student queries in Discussion forums; routine failure to respond to emails from students)
   • Consistent and very negative ratings in advising, mentoring, and supervision of students in Directed Studies projects
   • Chronic academic integrity concerns identified including evidence of disrespect for students and their rights
Teaching: Ranking for Evaluation of Fair
This performance level demonstrates some positive teaching outcomes, but produces major areas for concern that have a moderately negative impact on students and their learning typically as reflected by a combination of several of the indicators below. In general, teaching performance is moderately below the programmatic standard.
Indicators:

- Student evaluations document areas of moderate concern (ratings below the program average)
- Teaching philosophy may not be clearly expressed in course planning and activities
- Syllabi need to provide clearer and more appropriate expectations
- Assessment practices show some difficulty in supporting student learning and meeting program needs
- Goals and course content reflect limited continuous improvement effort
- Some pedagogical practices need attention
- Some student support practices need improvement
- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices need improvement
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, general education) could be executed with greater competence
- Occasional challenges related to academic integrity, including disrespect for students and their rights

Teaching: Ranking for Evaluation of Good
This performance level demonstrates overall teaching effectiveness but some minor areas for concern, typically reflected by some combination of the indicators listed below. In general, teaching performance is mildly below the programmatic standard.
Indicators:

- Student evaluations document adequate impact on learning
- Teaching philosophy expressed in course planning and activities
- Syllabi provide reasonably clear and appropriate expectations
- Assessment practices support student learning and contribute to programmatic needs
- Goals and course content give evidence of continuous improvement effort
- Majority of pedagogical practices are appropriate and effective
- Majority of student support practices are appropriate and effective
- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices are appropriate and effective
- Maintains appropriate standards of academic integrity, including respect for students and their rights

Teaching: Ranking for Evaluation of Excellent
This performance level demonstrates consistent high quality teaching with positive outcomes for students as reflected by the indicators below. Excellence meets the program standard.
Indicators:

- Student evaluations document consistently positive impact on learning (above average)
- Teaching philosophy provides foundation for coherent course planning and activities
- Syllabi outlines comprehensive, clear, and appropriate performance expectations
- Assessment practices enhance student learning and contribute to programmatic needs
- Goals and course content routinely provide evidence of continuous improvement effort
- Pedagogical practices facilitate optimal learning conditions
- Student support practices facilitate optimal student development
- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices receive consistently favorable review
- Appropriate standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights

**Teaching: Ranking for Evaluation of Distinguished**
This performance level demonstrates unusually high degree of quality in teaching as shown by the following indicators that build upon indicators for excellence. In general, teaching contributions exceed the standards of excellence of the program.

Indicators:
- Numerical student evaluation data document clear statistical exceptionality
- Narrative statements emphasize powerful impact on learner or transformative learning experiences
- Teaching awards honor high caliber of performance
- Leadership evident in the promotion of high quality teaching and curriculum development in the program

**Section 3, Part B. Annual Evaluation of Scholarly Activity**
The University of West Florida is a regional, comprehensive university. The expectation for research (creative and scholarly activity) by tenure-earning faculty is guided by the university’s mission.

**Scholarly Activities:**
1. Publications (Refereed)
   - Journals: accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
   - Books as author: accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
   - Books as editor: accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
   - Chapters in books: accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
   - Proceedings full paper: accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
2. Publications (Non-refereed)
   - Books as author: accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
   - Books as editor: accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
   - Chapters in books: accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
   - Proceedings full paper: accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
3. Meeting/Conference Presentations: international, national, regional, local
4. External grants/contracts
   - Federal: submitted, new awards, continuing
   - State: submitted, new awards, continuing
   - Local: submitted, new awards, continuing
   - Private: submitted, new awards, continuing
5. Internal grants/contracts: submitted, new awards, continuing
6. Other Activities
   - Abstracts: accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
   - Patents on products related to field of study: filed, awarded
   - Consulting projects (paid) in area related to field of study
   - Workshops attended related to field of study
   - Technical reports: submitted, accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
   - Maintenance of professional licensure
7. Preparation of accreditation documents
8. Qualitative assessment by Director

- Citation index
- Impact factors
- Awards related to field of study

**Research: Department Standard**

Individuals in tenure-track positions in the Program are expected to participate in research-related activities. The following standard is based on a 3:3 fall:spring teaching load, which is adjusted for some faculty with significant service assignment. Two research activities (any combination from categories 1-7) should be accomplished each year. Tenure-earning faculty must choose activities that address the benchmarks for promotion.

**Research: Ranking for Evaluation of Poor**

This performance level demonstrates serious problems in developing scholarship and creative projects as reflected by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative production is well below the program standard.

Indicators:

- Scholarly agenda or creative plan has not been identified (e.g., central focus of career interest has not materialized)
- Minimal pursuit of scholarly and creative projects
- Avoidance of professional organization involvement that could help disseminate or display faculty work
- Failure to pursue expected professional enhancement activities (e.g., licensure, continuing education, technology training)
- Avoidance of grant exploration or pursuit
- Ethical regulations violated regarding scholarly or artistic production
- Poor time management strategies handicap work output

**Research: Ranking for Evaluation of Fair**

This performance level demonstrates only minor tangible progress toward executing a scholarly and creative agenda as shown by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative projects are moderately below the program standard.

Indicators:

- General focus of interest identified
- Evidence of some completion of beginning stages of scholarly or artistic process (e.g., data collection, manuscript outline, artistic plan)
- Exploration of possible scholarly collaboration or resource network to help with specific plan
- Professional organizations identified that will support scholarly and creative goals
- Appropriate professional educational opportunities (e.g., licensure, technology training, special educational opportunities) identified
- Sources of external support for scholarship or creative activities agenda identified and explored

- Judgment about ethical standards for scholarly and artistic production may be problematic at times
- Questionable time management strategies limit production

**Research: Ranking for Evaluation of Good**

This performance level demonstrates moderate tangible progress in scholarship or creative activity agenda as shown by the indicators below, but work falls mildly below the program standard.

Indicators:
• Specific scholarly agenda or creative plan identified, including appropriate timelines and preferred dissemination or display venues
• Scholarly and creative projects completed but falls short of rate of program standards related to the rate of completion or quality of dissemination venue
• Completed projects suggest the potential for significant, high quality scholarship over the candidate's career
• Appropriate professional educational opportunities pursued
• Involvement with professional organizations that will support scholarly or creative goals
• Grants developed and submitted to capture external support
• Adheres to relevant ethics conventions for scholarly and creative projects
• Reasonably effective time management strategies contribute to success

Research: Ranking for Evaluation of Excellent
This performance level demonstrates satisfactory execution of scholarship or creative activity agenda as shown by the indicators below. Excellence meets the program standard.
Indicators:
• Refined scholarly agenda or creative plan well suited to regional comprehensive university context
• Meets program production targets for both quantity and quality of scholarship
• Potential for wide recognition of quality outside of the University
• Completes appropriate schedule of professional educational opportunities (e.g., licensure, technology training, etc.) in a timely fashion
• External support captured to facilitate scholarship or creative activities agenda
• Highly skilled application of ethical conventions in discipline
• Skilled time management facilitates success of scholarly agenda or creative plan

Research: Ranking for Evaluation of Distinguished
This performance level demonstrates unusually high degree of skill in design and execution of scholarly and creativity projects as shown by the indicators below that build upon the indicators for excellence. In general, scholarly and creativity projects exceed the standards of excellence of the program.
Indicators:
• Both quantity and quality measures clearly exceed program expectations
• National or international audience
• National or international recognition earned for quality
• Awards received for scholarly or creative projects
• Achievements in continuing professional training show unusual merit
• Strong record of grant pursuit, grant awards, successful completion, and dissemination of results
• Campus and/or disciplinary leadership

Section 3, Part C. Annual Evaluation of Service
Service: Activities
1. Institution (program, college, university)
   • Committee/council/task force as member
   • Committee/council/task force as chair
   • Institution sponsored activities: open house, orientations, recruitment
   • Sponsorships for student organizations
2. Profession
- Associations/Societies: officer, committees, invited seminars
- Journals: editorships, reviewer
- Agencies: board memberships, reviewer
- Meeting/conference: hosting, chairing sessions
- Publishing houses: textbook reviews

3. Community
- Invited seminars
- Juror/Judge
- Sponsor/participant outreach activities

4. Qualitative Assessment by Chair
- Awards related to service

**Service: Department Standard**
Individuals in the department are expected to participate in service related areas including activities from all three of the first three categories listed above with at least four activities total. Two activities may be single events (such as an outreach activity related to health); two activities must be recurring events (such serving on a standing committee or sponsoring a student organization or serving on a standing committee). All tenure-earning lines must structure activities in line with goals for promotion and tenure. Faculty holding non-tenure-earning lines are expected to engage in service as indicated below.

**Service: Ranking for Evaluation of Poor**
This performance level demonstrates serious problems in fulfilling appropriate service role for faculty as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is absent.
Indicators:
- Service activity nonexistent or very poor in number/quality, producing a potentially adverse impact on the goals of the program
- Significance of the obligation of service in the faculty role in a regional comprehensive university not apparent (e.g., faculty seems resistant or oblivious to service needs)
- Community service, if any, does not in any way provide synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions

**Service: Ranking for Evaluation of Fair**
This performance level demonstrates only minor tangible progress in service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is moderately below the program standard.
Indicators:
- Appropriate arenas for service identified and explored
- Minimal contributions made in service role (e.g., "sits" on committees as compared to active participation)
- Recognition of service obligation in faculty role shapes consideration
- Over-commitment to service spreads faculty time and energy too thinly to facilitate effectiveness
- Community service provides limited, tangential synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and service functions
Service: Ranking for Evaluation of Good
This performance level demonstrates major tangible progress in relevant service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is somewhat below the program standard.
Indicators:
- Emerging service agenda reflects reasonable expectation for rank
- Selection of service activity expresses understanding of faculty service role in regional comprehensive university
- Usually participates actively and constructively in service activity
- Usually effective in service as citizen of program
- Balance across service obligations may be a struggle
- Community service provides reasonable synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions

Service: Ranking for Evaluation of Excellent
This performance level demonstrates satisfactory execution of service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service contributions meet the program standard.
Indicators:
- Scope and level of effort meet program standards
- Service agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university mission
- Service contributions represent strategic decisions that balance demands from the discipline, program, campus, and community
- Potential shown for wide recognition inside and outside of the university
- Community service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions

Service: Ranking for Evaluation of Distinguished
This performance level demonstrates a high degree of skill in service contributions as shown by the indicators below that build upon indicators for excellence. In general, service contributions exceed the standards of excellence of the program.
Indicators:
- Leadership demonstrated in targeted arenas of service (e.g., holds elected office; collaborates skillfully and innovatively)
- Problems solved proactively through vigorous contributions
- Wide external recognition (local, national or international audiences) or awards achieved for quality of service contributions
- Community service provides significant and measurable impact; service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions

Section 3, Part D: Adjunct assignment and evaluation
Adjunct instructors are required to pass the same credential review required for tenure-earning faculty, including submission of transcripts, letters of recommendation, and an updated CV. These items need only be submitted when a new adjunct is first hired into the UWF system. In following semesters, the same SACS form and supporting documentation can be used for subsequent appointments. Adjuncts are typically assigned on a term-by-term basis and an Adjunct Appointment Form is submitted for each adjunct instructor during the semester prior to their assigned
teaching. All faculty are required to pass a background check before the offer is made. The background check will be repeated annually unless the adjunct is employed on a continuous basis.

The Chair or Program Director informs the adjunct of the responsibilities of the position and the compensation. If the adjunct is teaching online, they also meet with the faculty coordinating online teaching and training and arrange for completion of online teaching training requirements. Adjuncts will be evaluated each semester using criteria that includes: student evaluations, student complaints and praise, responsiveness to students, and evidence of continuous improvement if appropriate. Repeated or excessive complaints from students regarding technical difficulties within the control of the adjunct to solve will be grounds for termination of appointment.

**Section 4. Merit Pay**

Merit pay decisions are made by the Dean upon consultation with the Chair based on the annual evaluation and the merit pay criteria negotiated by UFF.

**Section 5. Office Hours**

All full-time faculty are required to meet a posted schedule of a minimum of six office hours per week distributed over at least two days and several time blocks. Faculty may apportion part of the total to online office hours.

**Section 6. Allocation of Paid Overload Appointments**

No faculty member shall be forced to engage in overload teaching, but all faculty members who desire to do overload teaching shall have an opportunity to do so in their fields of expertise. Faculty members shall be encouraged to work through the Chair to promote their overload courses in order to secure appropriate numbers of students. In those areas where more than one faculty member has expertise, the overload teaching shall be assigned on a rotational basis. Compensation for teaching an overload assignment shall not be less than the compensation paid to an adjunct faculty member.

**Section 7. Multi-year Appointments for Instructors and Lecturers**

The UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement specifies the criteria for instructors and lecturers to qualify for three-year multi-year contracts. Individuals have completed the three year contract, and who have received an overall Dean’s rating of “excellent” or above in the six most recent annual evaluations qualify for a base wage increase. The CBA can be found at the website for Academic Affairs. [http://uwf.edu/offices/academic-affairs-division/](http://uwf.edu/offices/academic-affairs-division/)

**Section 8. Promotion and Tenure**

Upon arrival at UWF, untenured, tenure-track faculty will be assigned a mentoring committee from among the tenured faculty who will meet at least annually with the faculty to review his/her performance in the areas of teaching, research and service. A written evaluation will be provided to the faculty member and discussed with the candidate to inform him/her of his/her progress. A mid-term developmental tenure review occurs at the level of the department during the spring semester of the third year. The candidate will generate a mid-term tenure portfolio which will be viewed by the department members. Faculty members will discuss the mid-term portfolio at the final faculty meeting of the spring semester, and provide written feedback to the candidate. The goal of the feedback is to help the candidate focus on weaknesses of the packet in the next year. The mid-term portfolio should have the following subsections: the departmental bylaws, the most recent CV, all of the annual evaluation summaries, all of the results of student evaluations, and a statement of contributions with regards to teaching, research and service. It is preferable that the portfolio is also critiqued by a former member of the college or university personnel committee. The mid-tenure review does not progress beyond the level of the department.
After a period of 5 years, but no longer than the sixth year, the untenured, tenure-track faculty member will follow the University Guidelines for initiating the P&T process. After a minimum period of 5 years in-rank, a tenured Associate Professor can submit his/her credentials for consideration for promotion to Professor.

Promotion and tenure decisions are made at the Provost’s level. The Department specific guidelines are listed in the appendix. The criteria and timeline are found at the website for Academic Affairs. This section describes the university criteria for promotion and tenure for regular, full-time, tenure earning faculty, excerpted from that website.

Reflecting the mission of UWF as a regional comprehensive university, the university criteria emphasize teaching relative to scholarship/creative projects and service. A minimum of excellent teaching performance is required in all promotion and all tenure and promotion decisions. Favorable promotion decisions also require excellent performance in scholarship/creative projects and service for promotion decisions. However, faculty need not achieve excellent ratings in all three areas to achieve tenure. As shown in Table 1, good ratings in either service or scholarship/creative projects, combined with an excellent or distinguished rating in the other area and excellent or distinguished rating in teaching, should result in a favorable tenure decision. Except in unusual circumstances (e.g., egregious ethical violation), if faculty members meet the criteria described above, they should receive favorable decisions, but the meeting of such criteria cannot be construed as a guarantee of either tenure or promotion.

**University Criteria for Tenure and Promotion Decisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Decision</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Scholarship and Creative Projects</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>At least Excellent in one category and at least Good in the other category</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to Associate</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to Professor</td>
<td>Distinguished in at least one category and at least excellent in the other two categories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 9. Sustained Performance**

Faculty in the ranks of Associate Professor and Professor will undergo a Sustained Performance Evaluation SPE in the sixth year after receiving tenure and every sixth year thereafter. The SPE evaluates the previous six year period. The faculty member’s dossier is submitted to the Department Chair for review and recommendation. The College Personnel Committee makes a recommendation, and the Dean will review all materials and make a recommendation to the Provost for a final decision. Outcomes of a positive SPE are an increase in base salary, based on the individual’s rank and ratings. An unsatisfactory SPE review requires a Performance Improvement Plan to be developed and implemented. Details for the SPE are found in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 11.3 (b 1-9). The expectations for sustained
performance on the SPE are aligned to the tenure expectations of the department. In depth discussion of SPE can be found in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, found at the website for Academic Affairs http://uwf.edu/offices/academic-affairs-division/.

8. **Department Chair and Program Directors**

The Department Chair and Program Directors are faculty members in the department and serve at the pleasure of the Dean. Appointments are typically made after consultation with the faculty of the department and the Provost. Appointments may be made on a rotating or renewable basis.

The Chair must be familiar with the departmental by-laws and the governing laws of the university. Policies are found at the Academic Affairs website. Directors are not required to be tenure-track, or hold a terminal degree. They must be qualified to teach within their program and meet accreditation standards.

Department Chairs and Program Directors have a responsibility to students, faculty, and administration. The Chair and the Directors are responsible for overseeing the quality of instruction in the Department/Program, and oversight of accreditation standards. This includes curriculum planning and assessment, recruiting and developing faculty, and departmental resource management. Multiple processes are in place to ensure that academic standards are upheld. The Chair works with the Department faculty to complete these processes, however the Chair is responsible for the reporting of such. The Chair’s Handbook is an electronic resource to aid Chairs and Directors in completing their recurring duties. It can be found at the website for Academic Affairs.

9. **Cancellation of classes**

The minimum class size is determined by several characteristics. Graduate classes are expected to have fewer students than undergraduate classes. Classes that are electives and classes that are required for a degree have a minimum “make number” for undergraduates and for graduates as provided by the Dean. Exceptions to these are internships and directed studies. Enrollment should be monitored during registration, and the decision to cancel a class should be made before the previous semester ends. Full-time faculty should be reassigned to another class to maintain their contact hour requirement.

10. **Department Resources**

**Section 1. Budgeting**

The departmental/programmatic expense budgets are determined at the level of the College. Increased needs in this category should be conveyed to the Chair for presentation to the College Dean. 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 and strategic priorities. 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 when eligible. 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.

**Section 2. Equipment**
Operating Capital Outlay (OCO): The Chair and the Program Directors will maintain a list of capital equipment needs and keep requests for these updated through the College Resource Request web portal. Faculty input is necessary for prioritization.

**Section 3. Specialized fees: Material and Supplies fees and Equipment fees**
When M&S and equipment fees are collected they are spent on student consumables and equipment used by the students.

**Section 4. Foundation account**
Foundation accounts are funded by donations and may have specific goals. Foundation accounts in general can be used for faculty travel, professional development, refreshments, etc., and is the least restrictive of the accounts.

**Section 5. Carryforward account**
Carryforward accounts can be used at the discretion of the Chair with input from the faculty. Funds can be used for faculty research needs, travel, office furniture, etc.

11. **Faculty Development**
The Department is committed to assisting faculty and promoting excellence. Faculty requesting sabbaticals will notify the Chair at least two years in advance of the sabbatical year. Faculty requesting release time for curriculum and/or research development should present the plan to the Chair with sufficient time to find an alternate instructor. Sabbatical requests must be submitted to the Dean.

Faculty are encouraged to participate in UWF faculty training opportunities and at least one regional or national conference per year. Funding for faculty travel is available through the college and is competitive; tenure-track faculty have priority over non-tenure-track faculty. Faculty should discuss departmental funding for conferences with the Chair.

Faculty may be provided with additional space and a seed account for purposes of starting up new research projects. The seed account/startup funds are negotiated with the Dean during the hiring process.

12. **Curricular review and assessment protocols**

**Section 1. Accreditation review**
The MHA program is moving toward national accredited CAHME. Curricula, faculty credentials, and programmatic standards will be aligned to these standards.

**Section 2. UWF Program Review**
Each program at UWF undergoes a formal review process every seven years. The guidelines are provided by the Provost office a year prior to the review, and the program produces a self-study. A review team that consists of two UWF faculty
members from outside the department and an external reviewer who is expert in the field review all documents, meet with faculty and students, and provide peer recommendations for improvement.

Section 3. Assessment Review
Each program determines specific learning outcomes from its Academic Learning Compact or Academic Learning Plan to assess and improve. It is not necessary to assess every outcome every year, but each domain should be addressed during the seven year review cycle. The program faculty should determine the assessment plan for each year, and meet at least once at the year’s conclusion to review results and recommend changes to the curriculum based on the review. Faculty members should also participate in university-wide assessment review workshops offered by the Center for Undergraduate Teaching, Learning and Assessment (CUTLA).

Section 4. Annual Report
Each program determines its strategic goals and reports on progress annually. Annual reporting also includes reporting on assessment reviews.

All department faculty have the right to be informed and the responsibility to be involved in strategic planning, assessment, accreditation, curriculum review and execution of departmental and programmatic goals.
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Appendix I - Tenure and Promotion Criteria

Promotion & Tenure
The Promotion & Tenure (P&T) guidelines and criteria for the Department are modeled after those established by the University, but have been tailored to address the unique teaching, research and service needs of the program. The Promotion & Tenure process used is that established by the University.

Upon arrival at UWF, untenured, tenure-track faculty will be assigned a mentor from among the tenured faculty who, in collaboration with the Chair, will annually evaluate the faculty’s performance at the end of each year in the three areas of teaching, research and service. A written evaluation will be provided to the faculty member and discussed with the candidate to inform them of their progress. This will comprise the annual evaluation required by the University. A more extensive evaluation will be provided to the candidate at the mid-tenure point (year 3).

After a period of 5 years, but no longer than the sixth year, the untenured, tenure-track faculty member will follow the University Guidelines for initiating the P&T process. After a minimum period of 5 years in-rank, a tenured Associate Professor can submit their credentials for consideration for promotion to Professor.

The criteria established for evaluation of faculty within the CLS program are as follows:

Promotion and tenure decisions are made at the Provost’s level. The criteria and timeline are found at website for Academic Affairs. The Departmental guidelines are also listed here.

The first section describes the university criteria for promotion and tenure for regular, full-time, tenure earning faculty. This is excerpted from the website.

Reflecting the mission of UWF as a regional comprehensive university, the university criteria emphasize teaching relative to scholarship/creative projects and service. A minimum of excellent teaching performance is required in all promotion and all tenure and promotion decisions. Favorable promotion decisions also require excellent performance in scholarship/creative projects and service for promotion decisions. However, faculty need not achieve excellent ratings in all three areas to achieve tenure. As shown in Table 1, good ratings in either service or scholarship/creative projects, combined with an excellent or distinguished rating in the other area and excellent or distinguished rating in teaching, should result in a favorable tenure decision. Except in unusual circumstances (e.g., egregious ethical violation), if faculty members meet the criteria described above, they should receive favorable decisions, but the meeting of such criteria cannot be construed as a guarantee of either tenure or promotion.
University Criteria for Tenure and Promotion Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Decision</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Scholarship and Creative Projects</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure</strong></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>At least Excellent in one category and at least Good in the other category</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion to associate</strong></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion to professor</strong></td>
<td>Distinguished in at least one category and at least excellent in the other two categories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Program Criteria

**Teaching: The candidate ...**

1. Shows a record of participation in CUTLA, ATC, ITS, local/regional teaching related workshops or equivalent training approved by the Department Chair.
2. Participates in assessment planning and execution.
3. Has received student evaluations with a minimum average of 70% of rankings in all categories greater than or equal to Very Good in all courses taught.
4. Have fulfilled their assigned teaching responsibilities since the beginning of their employment at UWF.
5. Actively solicits input from hospital partners to update materials on a regular basis.

**Research: The candidate ...**

1. Has published an average of 1 paper/year in a peer-reviewed journal or presented an average of 1 presentation or poster/year in the health sciences arena since the beginning of their employment at UWF; a minimum of 3 papers in peer-reviewed journals must be published during their tenure as an Assistant Professor to be considered for promotion to Associate Professor. For promotion to Professor, the candidate must list at least 5 peer reviewed journal articles, book chapters, monographs or technical reports of studies carried out while employed at UWF that were published after promotion to Associate Professor. The department recognizes that books require significant effort, and 1 book can substitute for 3 papers.
2. Has attended an average of 1 local, regional, national or international professional event in health sciences/year since the beginning of their employment at UWF.

3. Has involved students in their research activities.

4. Has applied for external funding (this is required for tenure), and received external funding (this is required for promotion). Funding amount is not specified.

5. Maintains professional certification, and licensure if applicable, along with the associated requisite continuing education.

6. Participates in the authorship of accreditation documents. Primary authorship of the self-study document is equivalent to one peer-reviewed journal article.

**Service: The candidate ...**

1. Has served on all Program committees, including curriculum development, QEP, Assessment, Advisory and student selection. Serves on at least 1 College-level or University-level committee or Task Forces during their tenure as an Assistant Professor. For promotion to Professor, demonstrates leadership in committee work by chairing a college or university level committee or serving on a task force.

2. Has participated in or helped develop service events involving the student organization, and/or is the faculty advisor for a UWF student association.

3. Has engaged in student recruitment and progression.

4. Holds membership in at least 1 professional related organization during their tenure as an Assistant Professor.
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**Health Sciences Program**

Non-Tenure Earning (NTE) -- Clinical Practice/Specialist Track

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Practice (Specialist) Track Standards for Performance at Rank</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Assistant Professor (Clinical)</th>
<th>Associate Professor (Clinical)</th>
<th>Professor (Clinical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Qualifications</strong></td>
<td>Masters in a health sciences discipline area.</td>
<td>Masters in a health sciences discipline area. Doctorate Preferred</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates effective teaching skills and the potential for success in classroom, clinical, and seminar settings.</td>
<td>Demonstrates competency in teaching in area of expertise</td>
<td>Demonstrates continuous competency in teaching in area(s) of expertise.</td>
<td>Recognized for excellence in teaching related to area(s) of expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarship</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Develops a program of scholarly activity in at least one of the following areas: 1. a discipline in the health sciences, 2. the scholarship of teaching and learning, 3. program assessment.</td>
<td>Acquires stature in a program of scholarship in at least one of the following areas: 1. a discipline in the health sciences, 2. the scholarship of teaching and learning, 3. program assessment.</td>
<td>Sustains a program of scholarship in at least one of the following areas: 1. a discipline in the health sciences, 2. the scholarship of teaching and learning, 3. program assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service</strong></td>
<td>Participates in service related activities in the Health Sciences Program (or in the Usha Kundu, MD College of Health),</td>
<td>Provides service to the Health Sciences Program (or in the Usha Kundu, MD College of Health),</td>
<td>Assumes leadership positions in the Health Sciences Program (or in the Usha Kundu, MD College of Health),</td>
<td>Recognized as a leader in the University and among peers, locally and nationally/internationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Qualification</td>
<td>Masters in a health sciences discipline area.</td>
<td>Masters in a health sciences discipline area. Doctorate Preferred</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates effective teaching skills in classroom and clinical settings</td>
<td>a. Serves as course faculty</td>
<td>In addition to evidence cited under lecturer, the Clinical Assistant Professor:</td>
<td>In addition to evidence cited under Clinical Associate Professor (NTE), the Clinical Associate Professor (NTE):</td>
<td>In addition to evidence cited under Clinical Associate Professor (NTE), the Clinical Professor (NTE):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Develops and uses appropriately creative and evidence-based course related materials</td>
<td>a. Assumes leadership in teaching (e.g., lead instructor)</td>
<td>a. Utilizes new technologies in the teaching-learning process</td>
<td>a. Mentors junior faculty and graduate teaching assistants in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Demonstrates respect for students and their rights.</td>
<td>b. Develops, implements, and evaluates innovative methods for promoting student learning, demonstrating advancement while in rank.</td>
<td>b. Mentors and supervises novice teachers in the academic and clinical settings</td>
<td>b. Provides leadership in curriculum development in the Health Sciences Program as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Seeks out mentors from the faculty</td>
<td>c. Contributes to new course development, revision, and evaluation and program development and evaluation.</td>
<td>c. Leads theses and dissertation committees in area of specialty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Incorporates suggestions from peer evaluation.</td>
<td>d. Participates in writing accreditation and program</td>
<td>d. Develops, implements, and evaluates new courses in specialty area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Student evaluations document</td>
<td>e. Leads accreditation/program planning efforts</td>
<td>e. Leads curriculum development/program planning efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consistently positive impact on learning (above average)</td>
<td>f. Receives professional</td>
<td>f. Receives professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiates a program of scholarly activity within a defined health sciences’ area of expertise:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The Clinical Assistant Professor (NTE):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. a discipline in the health sciences, 2. the scholarship of teaching and learning, 3. or program assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Establishes opportunities for scholarship with mentors in specialty area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Initiates scholarly inquiry in a discipline in the health sciences, the scholarship of teaching and learning, or program assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Disseminates findings of scholarly inquiry on a regional and national level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d. Participates in scholarly projects and significant evidence based project development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e. Participates on grant-writing teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In addition to evidence cited for Clinical Assistant Professor (NTE), the Clinical Associate Professor (NTE):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Practices and participates in scholarly inquiry in a discipline in the health sciences, the scholarship of teaching and learning, or program assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Disseminates findings of scholarly inquiry on an international level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Serves as mentor for junior faculty who are writing for peer-reviewed publication(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Initiates grant writing as lead author, principle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In addition to evidence cited for Clinical Associate Professor (NTE), the Clinical Professor (NTE):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Mentors educators and/or clinicians in the scholarly inquiry of teaching and practice problems in their respective settings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Mentors faculty in dissemination of scholarly inquiry findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Mentors faculty in grant-writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participates in Service related activities</td>
<td>as appropriate.</td>
<td>investigator, or project director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Attends and contributes at Department and Program meetings</td>
<td>In addition to evidence cited under Lecturer, the Assistant Professor (NTE):</td>
<td>In addition to evidence cited under Assistant Professor (NTE), the Associate Professor (NTE):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Serves as a member of committees or boards of community and professional organizations</td>
<td>a. Serves as a member of committees or boards of community and professional organizations</td>
<td>a. Participates on University and College committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Participates in activities related to the Health Sciences Program’s mission and goals</td>
<td>b. Participates in activities related to the Health Sciences Program’s mission and goals</td>
<td>b. Provides leadership to Department and Program committees and committees, boards of community and professional organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Serves on national or state panels, committees, and task forces in area of expertise.</td>
<td>In addition to evidence cited under Associate Professor (NTE), the Professor (NTE):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Serves in leadership roles in University and College Committees</td>
<td>a. Serves in leadership roles in University and College Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Receives recognition through elected membership in professional organizations</td>
<td>b. Receives recognition through elected membership in professional organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Serves as a leader in professional organizations</td>
<td>c. Serves as a leader in professional organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>