

BYLAWS FOR DEPARTMENTAL GOVERNANCE
DEPARTMENT OF MOVEMENT SCIENCES AND HEALTH

Article I. Name

The name of this unit is the Department of Movement Sciences and Health. The unit is housed in the Usha Kundu, MD College of Health at the University of West Florida.

Mission Statement

The Department of Movement Sciences and Health provides student-centered quality education in a transdisciplinary learning environment through innovative teaching and research, high impact experiences, professional preparation, and community engagement.

Article II. Voting Membership

The Department's voting membership shall consist of all full-time faculty eligible for an annual contract.

Faculty holding a non-visiting line at the rank of instructor, lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor are eligible to participate in departmental governance activities and to vote on non-personnel matters. The eligibility to vote on faculty personnel matters is restricted to full-time tenured/tenure earning faculty in a manner consistent with University and college guidelines. The faculty may, by majority vote, extend voting rights to other individuals associated with the Department.

Article III. Meeting Structure

- The chair will convene departmental meetings at least once in each Fall and Spring semester.
- A majority of the voting membership may direct the chair to convene a department meeting in a timely and efficient manner.
- An agenda will be distributed at least two days prior to the scheduled meeting.
- Although most of the work can be accomplished in an informal manner, when necessary, the Department Chair will institute Robert's Rule of Order to move forward the meeting's business.
- A majority of the voting members will constitute a quorum.
- Voting membership shall notify the Departmental chair in a timely fashion if they cannot attend a scheduled meeting. The member who is unable to attend a meeting may give a written proxy to another faculty member.

- Voting will normally be by “voice” or show of hands. 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. He/she can vote as any other faculty member when the vote is by ballot.
- Minutes of each meeting will be recorded and distributed by the Office Administrator or other designees.

Article IV. Committee Structure

Standing Committees

1) Visiting Line Faculty Committee Participation

- Visiting line faculty are invited to participate at their own discretion with the understanding that any committee involvement is voluntary that is not a part of their assigned responsibilities.

2) Bylaws Review Committee

- Chair: A MSH faculty member appointed by the Department Chair of MSH.
- Membership: Members will be appointed by the chair and should include, from each discipline in MHS, a representative who is qualified to vote.
- Responsibilities – The Bylaws Review Committee is charged with an annual review of departmental Bylaws. The responsibilities of the bylaws committee include the following:
 - Convene within the first two months of the fall semester to determine the meeting schedule for the academic year. These include but are not limited to review/update MSH bylaws and faculty development.
 - MSH Bylaw review
 - Draft recommended changes to the MSH bylaws.
 - Provide a copy of proposed changes to all faculty members for a 30 calendar day review period.
 - Conduct an approval/disapproval vote, requiring only a simple majority approval, on all changes.
 - In the event a proposed change is disapproved, the bylaws will remain unchanged.
 - The Chair of MSH may call a special meeting(s) of the bylaws committee to resume or continue revision of the bylaws.
 - Faculty Development Committee
 - A sub-committee will be formed to oversee the process identified in bylaws *Article VI. Tenure and Promotion Evaluation, Mid-point Review, and Sustained Performance* for Tenure & Promotion and Mid-point Review. The subcommittee should include a tenured faculty member, the chair of the bylaws committee, and/or representative of non-tenure faculty.

- Faculty Mentorship Program
 - The Faculty Mentorship Program includes assigning mentors, adhering to program guidelines, and providing resources or opportunities to enhance the mentor-mentee relationship. Mentorship and support should focus on career development. Career mentoring may include professional advising, networking assistance, explanation of typical routes to advancement, and facilitation of positive professional exposure. The following are proposed guidelines for a mentorship program.
 - Each full-time untenured faculty member (visiting, non-tenure or tenure track) should be assigned a mentor from among the tenured faculty. Post-tenure Assistant Professors should also be assigned a mentor from among the senior faculty.
 - Mentor-mentee assignments should be time-limited; one academic year is suggested. Longer pairings should be possible by mutual agreement.
 - The Chair of MSH should ultimately determine faculty pairings, based on committee recommendations, faculty workloads, and other relevant factors.
 - Faculty pairs should agree to meet at regular intervals to discuss factors that may affect the mentee's professional growth. Both partners should show initiative in arranging these meetings. Although this is a formal mentoring program, it is desirable for faculty to develop the type of informal relationships that could occur naturally.
 - At the end of the academic year, the Chair of the Faculty Development Committee should report to the MSH Chair on the effectiveness of the program.

3) Graduate Program Committee

- Chair: A MSH faculty member appointed by the Department Chair of MSH.
- Membership: Members will be appointed by the chair and should include a representative currently teaching or eligible to teach in a graduate degree from a graduate program offered in MSH (one per graduate program).
- Responsibilities: The Graduate Committee serves as an advisory body to the graduate programs within the MSH Department.
- Activities include but are not limited to: 1) reviewing graduate programs application criteria and procedures; 2) overseeing express admissions procedures to encourage successful MSH undergraduates to matriculate into MSH graduate programs; 3) supervising the policies and procedures of MSH thesis and dissertation; and 4) contributing to the selection of graduate assistants and the awarding of graduate scholarships.

3) Ad-Hoc Committee(s):

- As circumstances may require, the chair is empowered to constitute ad hoc committees.

Article V. Governance and Policies

Search Committees:

In the event a vacant or new faculty position is approved to be filled, the faculty shall have input regarding the type of applicant to be sought. The process for forming a search committee, conducting a search, and providing faculty input to be used to determine the ultimate hiring decision shall conform to the UWF policy and other regulations. Consideration will be given to recruiting individuals with needed expertise in content areas and abilities that will help the Department achieve its goals.

Office Hours:

During the fall and spring semesters, each full-time faculty member shall hold six (6) physical office hours per week spread across at least two days and be available at other times by appointment. This requirement applies whether courses are taught face-to-face or online. Alternative office hours must be pre-approved by the department chair on a case-by-case basis.

Department Citizenship:

To promote the optimal functioning of the Department, faculty members are expected to participate in a professional and collegial manner in professional activities that help the Department achieve its goals. These obligations include attendance at spring and fall graduation, committee work within the Department, and attendance and collegial participation in Department, College, and University level communications including emails and meetings.

The Curriculum Changes and Assessment:

Program faculty shall be responsible for developing curriculum for degrees, tracks, or options, and shall review and approve new course proposals, texts, and changes of current course descriptions. Prior to changes being submitted, proposed course modifications and other degree recommendations shall be presented to the full Faculty for discussion.

Article VI. Annual Evaluation Criteria

Performance Standards for Evaluation

For the purpose of evaluating faculty members, the Department of Movement Sciences and Health has adopted a set of standards for the assessment of a faculty member's performance of assigned duties and responsibilities.

Part-time faculty, faculty associates, and adjunct faculty will be evaluated using the following criteria that are specific to their assigned contract.

The following categories will be used in evaluating faculty efforts in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service for the purposes of Annual Evaluation.

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

Recommendations to Faculty in Achieving These Standards

(1) Statement on Teaching

CRITERIA THAT MAY BE USED IN THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING

- Teaching awards and other accomplishments related to teaching.
- Peer evaluations of teaching, such as those of department chair or department mentor.
- Supervision of theses and/or dissertations.
- Supervision of undergraduate and graduate capstone projects and internships.
- Service on thesis or dissertation committees.
- Supervision of honors' theses.
- Supervision of graduate/undergraduate internships/field studies or directed studies.
- Participation in the Department's assessment plan and curriculum mapping.
- Participation in teaching development programs, including conferences, workshops, or seminars related to subject areas taught.
- Design of new courses and programs.
- Organization and planning of courses.
- Evidence of course revisions to reflect current knowledge in the area.
- Punctuality in classroom attendance, grading assignments, etc.
- Clear and effective communication in the classroom or online environment.
- Syllabi, course assignments, testing procedures, attendance requirements, grading standards, and record-keeping that adhere to rigorous academic standards and University requirements and ensure the equitable treatment of students.
- Maintenance of adequate office hours and student records and timely response to student inquiries in advising and mentoring.
- Student evaluations of teaching that demonstrate the ability to challenge students and stimulate student learning.
- Evidence of scholarship and currency in subject area in selection of topics, resource materials, and content of lectures.
- Self-evaluations, observations from other faculty, inside or outside the Department arranged by the faculty member.

TEACHING PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Distinguished Performance

Distinguished performance demonstrates that the weight of evidence supports an unusually high degree of quality in teaching as shown by the following indicators that build upon performance indicators for excellence.

Performance indicators that may be used to support distinguished ratings:

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

Excellent Performance

Excellent performance represents consistent high quality teaching with positive outcomes for students as reflected by the performance indicators below.

Performance indicators that may be used to support excellent ratings:

- Teaching philosophy provides a foundation for coherent course planning and activities.
- Syllabi outline comprehensive, clear, and include appropriate performance expectations.
- Assessment practices enhance student learning and contribute to department needs.
- Goals and course content routinely provide evidence of successful continuous improvement effort.
- Pedagogical practices facilitate optimal learning conditions.
- Student support practices facilitate optimal student development.
- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices receive consistent favorable review.
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, General Studies) executed with expert skill.
- Appropriate standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights.
- Participates voluntarily in professional development activities to improve teaching quality and flexibility.
- Student evaluations document consistently positive impact on learning (above average).

Good Performance

Good performance demonstrates overall teaching effectiveness but some minor areas for concern. In general, the weight of evidence suggests that teaching performance is below what is required for tenure and promotion decisions.

Performance indicators that may be used to support good ratings:

- Teaching philosophy expressed in course planning and activities.
- Syllabi provide reasonably clear and appropriate expectations.
- Assessment practices support student learning and contribute to department needs.
- Goals and course content give evidence of continuous improvement effort.
- Majority of pedagogical practices are appropriate and effective.
- Majority of student support practices are appropriate and effective.
- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices are appropriate and effective.
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, gen ed) executed with reasonable skill.
- Maintains appropriate standards of academic integrity, including respect for students and their rights.
- Participates in teaching development activities when directed to do so.
- Student evaluations data document adequate impact on learning.

Fair Performance

Fair performance demonstrates some positive teaching outcomes but produces major areas for concern for the department. The weight of evidence suggests that teaching performance in this performance category is below what is required for tenure and promotion decisions.

Performance indicators that may be used to support fair ratings:

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

Poor Performance

Poor performance demonstrates serious problems in attaining success in the teaching role as reflected either by (1) a combination of many negative indications, or (2) fewer but more extreme behaviors that produce substantial negative outcomes on students and their learning. In general, the weight of evidence suggests teaching performance is well below the department norms. Because of the high priority placed on teaching at UWF, this level of performance requires major remedial work.

Performance indicators that may be used to support poor ratings:

- Teaching philosophy missing, poorly articulated or poorly expressed in course activities and planning.
- Syllabi fail to establish clear and relevant expectations.
- Assessment practices are inadequate to support student learning and department needs (e.g., learning outcomes are inadequate, inappropriate, or missing; testing strategies are not effective or fair).
- Goals and course content reflect no continuous improvement efforts.
- No assistance rendered for the department assessment plan.
- Pedagogical practices are unsound (e.g., disorganization; late, missing, unhelpful feedback; standards too lax or too challenging; routinely poor preparation; disengaging, chaotic, or hostile classroom environment).
- Student support practices are unsound (e.g., late or absent for class, not responding to email, not keeping office hours, showing favoritism).
- Consistent and very negative ratings in advising, mentoring, and supervision of students' scholarly or creative activities.
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, General Studies) avoided or poorly executed.
- Chronic academic integrity concerns identified including evidence of disrespect for students and their rights.
- Student evaluations data document consistent and substantive problems (ratings well below the department average).

(2) Statement on Scholarly and Creative Activities

CRITERIA THAT MAY BE USED IN THE EVALUATION OF SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE PROJECTS

The Department of Movement Sciences and Health *should* consider a broad range of activities that express our mission and vision. Moreover, we recognize that regional comprehensive universities have limited resources that may constrain scholarly expectations (e.g., relatively limited travel support diminishes the opportunity for international participation).

Scholarship and creative projects *must be* externally reviewed and publicly available, including projects involving the creation, production, exhibition, presentation, or publication of work by one or more individuals demonstrating originality in design or execution. MSH will consider and address a wide range of venues for disseminating scholarly and creative projects, including the following:

- Peer-reviewed publications (e.g., journal, book, book chapter).
- Editorially reviewed publications.
- Convention and conference contributions.
- Grant activity (intramural/extramural).
- Contracts (government or private industry).
- Development of publicly accessible instruction and curriculum.

- Other performance indicators for scholarly and creative activities deemed *acceptable to the department* (invited presentations at national/international/regional conferences, manuscript submission to special issue, etc.).

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE PROJECTS PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Distinguished Performance

Distinguished performance demonstrates that the weight of evidence supports an unusually high degree of quality in scholarship as shown by the following indicators that build upon performance indicators for excellence.

Performance indicators that may be used to demonstrate a refined scholarly agenda to support distinguished ratings:

- Peer-reviewed original research or review article publications (first author or corresponding author).
- Invited or peer-reviewed presentation for a national or international audience as appropriate for the field of study.
- National or international awards recognizing individual contribution to research or scholarship.
- Writing and submitting an external grant or contract above \$15,000 (with review as appropriate to the funding agency).
- Funding of a significant peer-reviewed research grant from a recognized granting agency, private agencies, external funding (endowment).
- Book authorships in related academic discipline/area of expertise.

Excellent Performance

Excellent performance represents consistent high quality scholarship as reflected by the performance indicators below.

Performance indicators that may be used to support excellent ratings:

- Multiple co-authored peer-reviewed original research publications.
- Awards recognizing individual contribution to research or scholarship.
- Peer-reviewed publications (first author/non-first author).
- Funding of a significant peer-reviewed research grant or contract.
- Writing and submitting an external grant with review.
- Book chapter authorships in related academic discipline/area of expertise.

Good Performance

Good performance demonstrates overall scholarship effectiveness but some minor areas for concern. In general, the weight of evidence suggests that scholarship performance is below what is required for tenure and promotion decisions.

Performance indicators that may be used to support good ratings:

- Peer-reviewed original research publications (non-first author).

- Significant progress on the development and/or publication of original research.
- Submitting a research grant or contract (non-funded or waiting review) to any source outside the University.

Fair Performance

Fair performance demonstrates some positive scholarship outcomes but produces major areas for concern for the department. The weight of evidence suggests that scholarship in this performance category is below what is required for tenure and promotion decisions.

Performance indicators that may be used to support fair ratings:

- No peer-reviewed original research publications.
- Little or lack of progress on the development and/or publication of original research.
- Minimal contributions to original research grant proposals of other faculty members in the University.
- Minimal assistance in administering large grants of other faculty members in the University.

Poor Performance

Poor performance demonstrates serious problems in attaining success in scholarship.

Performance indicators that may be used to support poor ratings:

- No peer-reviewed original research publications.
- No progress on the development and/or publication of original research.
- No contribution to any research projects.
- No contributions to grant proposals or grant administration/operations.

(3) Statement on Service

CRITERIA THAT MAY BE USED IN THE EVALUATION OF SERVICE

The Department of Movement Sciences and Health may use following service activities but not limited to:

Department

- Curriculum development.
- Advising students.
- Developing Departmental materials/facilities.
- Serving as Department Chair, Associate Chair, Program Director or Program Coordinator.
- Serving on Department committees.
- Serving on special Departmental assignments/projects.
- Assuming temporary administrative assignments.
- Attending assigned University functions.
- Advising student clubs/organizations.
- Maintaining a professional presence in professional organizations.

- Recruiting of students in professional organizations.

College/University

- Serving on committees.
- Curriculum development.
- Serving on special School/University assignments/projects.
- Assuming administrative assignments.
- Attending assigned functions/events.

Local/State/Regional/National/International

- Serving in an administrative and/or discipline-specific professional role on committees, boards, workshops, etc.
- Serving as a liaison for the Department/College/University.
- Presenting papers, or other public presentation, not based on original research.
- Professional service (e.g. manuscript reviewer, editorial board of journals, conference planning committee, etc.).
- Attending assigned functions/events.
- Sponsoring/developing University events.
- Engaging in student recruitment at events/organizations.
- Providing unremunerated consultancies.
- Volunteer with community service in a capacity in which the university is represented.

Conclusions drawn about the quality of service *may* be influenced by the following performance indicators:

- A. A measure of the scope of service activities.
- B. Peer evaluation of contributions to the service mission.
- C. Quality of service leadership.
- D. Service agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university mission.
- E. Service contributions represent strategic decisions that balance demands from the discipline, department, campus, and community.
- F. Recognition for service inside or outside of the university or both.
- G. Synergy between faculty member's area of expertise and service function.
- H. Other service activities defined by the department.

SERVICE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Distinguished Performance

Distinguished performance demonstrates a high degree of skill in service contributions as shown by the performance indicators below that build upon performance indicators for excellence. In general, the weight of evidence in the faculty service contributions *exceeds* the criteria for excellent.

Performance indicators that may be used to support distinguished ratings:

- A. Leadership demonstrated in targeted arenas of service (e.g., holds elected office).
- B. Collaboration is skillful and innovative.
- C. Problems solved proactively through vigorous contributions.
- D. Wide external recognition (local, national or international audiences) or awards achieved for quality of service contributions.
- E. Community service, if applicable, provides a significant and measurable impact; service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service function.

Excellent Performance

Excellent performance demonstrates satisfactory execution of service contributions as shown by the performance indicators below.

Performance indicators that may be used to support excellent ratings:

- A. Scope and effort level meet department criteria.
- B. Colleagues view contributions to the department as effective.
- C. Service agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university mission.
- D. Service contributions represent strategic decisions that balance demands from the discipline, department, campus, and community.
- E. Potential shown for wide recognition inside and outside of the university.

Good Performance

Good performance demonstrates moderate tangible progress in service contributions but may reflect some minor challenges that interfere with excellent performance. The weight of evidence suggests that work falls mildly below department criteria of excellent.

Performance indicators that may be used to support good ratings:

- A. Emerging service agenda reflects reasonable expectations for rank.
- B. Selection of service activity expresses understanding of faculty service roles in regional comprehensive universities.
- C. Usually participates actively and constructively in service activity.
- D. Usually effective in service as a citizen of the department.
- E. Balance across service obligations may be a struggle.
- F. Community service, if applicable, provided reasonable synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service function.

Fair Performance

Fair performance demonstrates only minor tangible progress in service contributions that can be the result of many factors, including limited pursuit of service, passive participation, or inability to manage obligations. In general, the weight of evidence suggests that service is moderately below department norms. Remediation is recommended to assist the faculty member to come to terms with the service obligations and appropriate behaviors to achieve positive outcomes in the regional comprehensive university context.

Performance indicators that may be used to support fair ratings:

- A. Appropriate arenas for service identified and explored.
- B. Minimal contributions made in service role (e.g., "sits" on committees as compared to active participation).
- C. Recognition of service obligation in faculty role shapes consideration.
- D. Over-commitment to service spreads faculty time and energy too thinly to facilitate effectiveness.

Poor Performance

Poor performance demonstrates serious problems in fulfilling appropriate service role for faculty. In general, the weight of evidence suggests that service is well below the department norms. Remediation should be required to help the faculty member develop an appropriate orientation to service in a regional comprehensive university context and strategic plan to accomplish that objective.

Performance indicators that may be used to support poor ratings:

- A. Service activity nonexistent or very poor in quality, producing a potentially adverse impact on the goals of the relevant organization.
- B. 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).
- C. Community service, if applicable, does not in any way provide synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service function.

Annual Evaluation Process:

Full-time Contracted Faculty

Each faculty member will complete an Annual evaluation in agreement with the university requirements. For the evaluation period the faculty member will prepare the following for submission to the Chair:

Faculty Prepared Materials

- Updated CV
- Letter of Assignment or other indication of distribution of effort
- At least one exemplar of teaching quality in addition to the standard university teaching assessment material. Exemplars should be consistent with indicators identified in the Tenure and Promotion guidelines, such as outcome assessment data, peer review observations, syllabi, assessment samples, etc. Acceptable supplemental exemplars may also be outlined in department/unit bylaws. CBA 11.2(b)(2)d
- Statement of contribution. The purpose of the statement is to highlight noteworthy achievements of the year. Any extenuating circumstances that should be considered in rendering judgment about unusual constraints should also be articulated in the

statement. The contribution form may include a self- assessment of quality where endorsed by the department or college. The statement of contribution should not merely repeat or list data provided in either the vita or Letter of Assignment. Instead, the emphasis should be on quality of effort and scope of impact. Chairs, Deans, and the Provost may require specific forms or narrative formats for the statement of contribution.

Examples of appropriate contributions may include the following:

- a) indication of high quality of course- related student contacts, including advising, counseling, student conferences, and thesis and/or intern supervision;
- b) high quality of course syllabi that provide appropriate and clear direction, including articulation of student learning outcomes;
- c) evidence of appropriately rigorous intellectual demands made upon students, including examples of high quality of test design or assignments;
- d) peer or Chair classroom evaluation;
- e) assessment data reflecting appropriate student progress in mastering course content and achieving course outcomes;
- f) description of substantial revision of established courses or development and teaching of new courses;
- g) description of professional growth that will enhance the faculty member's value as a teacher;
- h) peer evaluations that identify progress made toward achieving pedagogical goals;
- i) evidence of quality derived from peer reviewed process related to a performance or scholarly work;
- j) a formal note of appreciation for service that emphasizes scope of impact or significance of service; and
- k) self- assessment that highlights how submitted material supports success in fulfilling course objectives and achievement at a particular performance level.

Student Evaluation Data

- Student evaluations will be conducted on all courses and all sections for the contract period. The faculty member has access to the evaluations only after grades in the courses have been assigned.

- Candidates must submit numerical and narrative student comments on all courses conducted during the regular academic year. Candidates may choose to submit additional evaluation material from the summer session, but it is not required.

Following the submission and review of submitted materials, the Chair will evaluate each faculty member's annual performance. The Chair will inform the faculty member of the results of their evaluation. Each faculty member will also be informed of the timeline and process to appeal the results of their evaluation. For specific deadlines, faculty members and Chairs should refer to the Provost's current academic year calendar for completion of annual evaluations.

Part-time Faculty, Faculty Associates and Adjunct Faculty

The Department Chair will oversee the evaluation process for Part-time Faculty, Faculty Associates and Adjunct Faculty. This process is initiated in the beginning of the semester with faculty posting their current syllabi and curriculum vitae to the UWF Faculty Academic Credentials System (FACS).

Article VII. Tenure and Promotion Evaluation, Mid-point Review, and Sustained Performance

Tenure and Promotion Evaluation

Tenure and Promotion Evaluation and Third-Year Reviews should be based upon Departmental teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service criteria. The criteria and performance indicators used in the tenure and promotion evaluation and mid-point review are covered in *Article VI. Annual Evaluation Criteria*. Additionally, the following guidelines along with university criteria for tenure and promotion decisions as outlined in Table 1 in *UWF Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion 2020-2021* document form the basis for decisions related to reemployment, promotion, and tenure.

Table 1. University Criteria for Tenure and Promotion Decisions

	<i>For a favorable personnel decision the weight of evidence must show sustained performance at these levels</i>		
Personnel Decision	Teaching	Scholarship and Creative Projects	Service
Tenure	Excellent	At least Excellent in one category and at least Good in the other category	
<i>Promotion to associate</i>	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
<i>Promotion to professor</i>	<i>Distinguished</i> in at least one category and at least excellent in the other two categories		

1. Excellent teaching and promising signs of good scholarship and service justify a period of yearly reappointment at the Assistant Professor level.
2. Excellent teaching, significant evidence of scholarship and service, including a measure of tangible and public evidence, justify the decision to grant tenure. Service must include membership on college and/or university committees.
3. A strong positive reputation within the University as a teacher and scholar justifies the decision to promote to Associate Professor. Substantial tangible and public scholarship, recognized as such by colleagues, is always a criterion, and this scholarship usually signifies the potential for recognition outside the University. Substantial contributions in the area of service, including membership on college and/or university committees, are required.
4. Very substantial, tangible, and public contributions to the profession measured by favorable acknowledgment in the disciplines outside the University – and excellent teaching – justify promotion to the rank of Professor. As a general guideline, a faculty member normally would not apply for promotion to the rank of Professor without five years of service at the rank of Associate Professor.

Refer to the *UWF Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion 2020-2021* document for the Administrative Guidelines related to the T & P process.

Mid-point Review Process

All untenured assistant professors shall undergo a mid-point review of their progress toward promotion and tenure during the fall/spring semester of the third year of employment at UWF. The Mid-point Review provides untenured faculty with formative feedback to enhance faculty success in the tenure and promotion process. The review should encourage faculty who are making solid progress toward tenure and promotion by highlighting achievements, notify faculty who may need to improve in certain areas of performance, and inform faculty where lack of progress could jeopardize a favorable outcome.

- The Chair will convene the Department's Faculty Development Committee plus at least one tenured faculty member from an outside department and establish the appropriate dates for the review.
- The Chair must inform the untenured assistant professor of the dates for the review no later than the second week of the contract year during which the review will take place.
- The untenured assistant professor shall prepare and submit a mid-point review dossier that parallels the format required by the College for application for tenure/promotion, excluding letters of recommendation.
- The Chair and/or faculty mentor will provide guidance to the untenured faculty member in the preparation of the review materials.

The Department's Faculty Development Committee will provide its review, in writing, to the untenured faculty member and to the Chair using the criteria on the *Evaluation Form for Department Colleague Review in Tenure and Promotion Decisions*.

- The Chair will review the dossier and Faculty Development Committee letter and prepare a written review of the untenured assistant professor's progress, which will then be provided to the untenured assistant professor and forwarded to the Dean of the College.
- The Dean will review the department's written mid-point review and respond to the department and the faculty member in writing.

An untenured assistant professor may request an earlier review upon giving reasonable advance notice to allow for a review committee to be formed. A tenured faculty member may request the Committee to review his/her progress toward promotion upon giving reasonable advance notice to allow for a review committee to be formed.

Sustained Performance

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/>.

Article VIII. Annual Work Assignments

Change in Instructional Assignment

As per Article 10.3 (e) of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, should it become necessary to make changes in an instructional member assignment less than six week before the start of classes, the supervisor will notify the faculty member prior to making the assignment changes. The late assignment changes can be identified by the faculty member as an extenuating circumstance in interpreting their performance evaluation data. Supervisors will take the late assignment into consideration in interpreting the results of student evaluations from those classes.

MSH Policy on Supplementary Summer Contract Opportunities

All regular full-time faculty are given priority in the opportunity to teach during the Summer term, contingent upon the allocation of sufficient lines and programmatic needs. Eligible faculty must

accept their supplemental summer contracts within 7 days of receipt of the offer. Adjunct faculty will be given consideration for summer employment on a second priority basis.

1. Summer courses will be offered and scheduled on the basis of:
 - (a) Student program needs
 - (b) Enrollment projections meeting University and College of Health enrollment standards for offering a course

2. Faculty will be offered supplementary contract equitably based on the following order:
 - (a) Faculty in the Department of Movement Sciences and Health
 - (b) Faculty qualifications (according to AC-39.02-12/16) to teach the course
 - (c) Faculty experience teaching the course
 - (d) Faculty departmental rank/seniority

Article VIV. Amendments:

These bylaws may be changed or amended at any regular faculty meeting by a simple majority vote of members present, provided that proposed change(s) have been submitted in writing to the Departmental chair and distributed to the voting membership at least 30 days (calendar days) prior to the meeting at which the proposed change(s) are to be considered.

Rev. 2015, 2022