

# **BYLAWS**

## **DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY**

### **Mission**

The Department of Anthropology is one of several complementary units that focus on anthropology and archaeology at the University of West Florida. This document pertains to the Department of Anthropology.

### **Department**

The mission of the Department of Anthropology is to expose our students to the human experience through the disciplinary lenses of anthropology and related fields including sociology and maritime studies. This department communicates, interprets, and adds to the knowledge of the roles that socio-cultural and biological forces play in the development of human social groups and individuals. The Department of Anthropology provides a high-impact learning environment where both faculty and students can excel at research and creative activities at the University, within the community, and in other settings around the world. The cross-disciplinary and collaborative nature of anthropology, maritime studies, and sociology helps prepare students to be thoughtful citizens and sets them up for success in any career they may choose.

To these ends, we teach students, enhance their learning, and assist them in meeting their educational and career goals by:

1. Offering bachelor's and master's degrees in Anthropology to meet student, university, and public needs. In addition, the department hosts a bachelor's in Maritime Studies and offers a variety of minors including sociology, maritime studies, medical humanities, and anthropology. The degrees and minors prepare:

A. Those desiring to enter the workforce with a bachelor's degree the ability to apply the insights of the discipline as they find their place in an increasingly competitive workforce that values cultural and historical competency;

B. Those desiring to enter the workforce with a master's degree the academic preparation and experience enabling them to compete for professional positions with graduates from other colleges and universities, and to succeed as a working professional;

C. Those desiring a master's degree or doctorate to be well grounded in the discipline's core concepts, theories, and methodologies and to be competitive with students from other colleges and universities and to succeed in the next phase of their academic life.

2. Conducting research in anthropology (cultural, biological, and archaeological), sociology, and related fields, and disseminating the results in publications and public presentations.

3. Providing service to organizations of the discipline, as well as to the communities we engage at the local, regional, national, and international levels.

## **Departmental Structure**

**Voting Rights:** Faculty who participate in the academic program and hold the working titles of lecturer, instructor, clinical professor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor are eligible to participate in department meetings and, when appropriate, vote on all departmental matters submitted to a vote. The department may, by majority vote, extend voting privileges to other persons associated with the department. A quorum shall be a simple majority of the voting faculty. Any faculty person may submit their vote on specific issues in writing to the department chair in advance of a meeting. The department will observe college, university, and Board of Governors (BOG) rules and regulations in matters of tenure and promotion.

Graduate students may participate in department meetings by sending a representative from the Graduate Anthropology Association. The graduate student representative may not be present when matters pertaining to individual students are discussed.

**Role of the Chair:** The chair of the Department of Anthropology is the administrative head of that unit. Recognizing the administrative responsibilities of the chair to the dean and UWF administration, the department expects the chair to seek from and give advice to the faculty and strive to reach decisions by consensus. The duties of the chair are outlined in the Chair Handbook maintained in the Division of Academic Affairs. The chair shall be a tenured or tenure-track faculty member in the department. The chair may be recommended to the Dean by a majority of the voting faculty within the department.

An elected chair serves a term of three consecutive years. If a chair takes leave, that interlude shall be considered part of the chair's elected term. By April 1st in the third year of a term, the voting members anonymously will submit nominations, together with a nominee's stated agreement to serve if elected. No later than April 14th, the voting members will vote upon the nominees by secret ballot in a department meeting. An incumbent chair may be nominated for re-election.

**Committees:** Ad hoc committees may be elected by the faculty as a whole or appointed by the chair as appropriate. Ad hoc committees may include graduate admissions, bylaws revisions, curriculum revisions, search committees, etc. Recommendations of ad hoc committees will be reviewed and approved by the faculty.

**Meetings of the Faculty:** The chair shall call at least one faculty meeting in each of the fall and spring semesters. Any two faculty may call a special faculty meeting on their own motion at any time, with said meeting to be scheduled by the chair for optimum faculty attendance. Roberts' Rules of Order shall govern when necessary.

## **Departmental Academic Policies**

All proposed changes in academic policies and curricula must be reported by the appropriate ad hoc committee and approved by the department as a whole.

Course objectives, grading criteria, and examination policies are left to the professional judgment of the classroom instructor within the bounds of college, university, and BOG rules and regulations. These policies are expected to be made clear to students at the beginning of the course.

Student concerns about the fairness of grading, the fairness or appropriateness of an examination, or other conduct of a course shall follow the grievance policy of the University.

### **Personnel Policies and Procedures**

It is the intent that all personnel policies and procedures contribute to the collegial well-being of the department and division. The BOT-UFF collective bargaining agreement shall be implemented in the spirit of collegial relationships.

**Recruitment/Selection of New Faculty:** Recruitment and selection of new faculty, including adjuncts, shall follow established policies and procedures of the college and the university.

**Annual Evaluation Criteria and Procedures:** Annual evaluations are the responsibility of the chair. The chair shall follow university and college policies and consider an annual vita update, student evaluations, course syllabi, and other materials the faculty member shall submit.

**Merit Pay Criteria and Procedures:** If merit pay becomes available, the chair will follow university procedures in its allocation.

**Tenure and Promotion Criteria and Review Processes:** The chair shall be responsible for advising faculty to facilitate their movement toward meeting tenure or promotion criteria and to assist those faculty concerned with meeting the criteria.

Untenured, tenure-track faculty will be mentored by a mentoring committee constructed for each faculty member in accordance with the current UWF Chair Handbook. Each mentoring committee will be composed of tenured faculty within the department and may include an external member from another unit or department. The chair of the committee will ensure that the committee meets with the faculty member at least once a year in order to advise them and facilitate their movement toward meeting tenure or promotion criteria. A more comprehensive mid-point review will be conducted during the third year or at the midpoint if the faculty member is on an advanced or delayed tenure clock.

**Work Assignment Procedures:** While the chair is responsible for making the annual work assignment in the Department, input from each faculty member shall be requested and considered prior to its development. A draft work assignment shall be submitted to the faculty persons for review and response prior to the final document.

Not all faculty will necessarily have comparable assignments across all categories. Some may have a lesser research load in order to accomplish a more demanding teaching or advising assignment, while others may have a reduced teaching load and a greater research or service

load. These work assignments will be regarded as the joint product of the chair and the individual faculty member.

**Summer Supplemental Contract Opportunities Policy:** Summer teaching assignments will be based on programmatic needs and the availability of funding. Courses will be assigned to those faculty who have the expertise to teach those courses most needed by students. If funding permits, all faculty members who want to teach during the summer will be assigned to teach one course. If funding does not permit each faculty member to teach one course, priority for assigning courses shall be as follows:

First, newly hired faculty members (within 2 years of hiring).

Second, provided faculty have the expertise to teach the courses required that term, the remaining tenured and tenure-track faculty members will be given priority on a rotational system based on their date of hire. The rotation list will be populated with newly hired as per the above followed by the most senior faculty by date of hire.

Third, visiting faculty and adjunct faculty.

Those receiving a course one year will be placed at the end of the list for the following year. After 2 years from their date of hire, junior faculty will be placed at the bottom of the rotation. If funding is still available after all faculty who wish to teach have been assigned to teach one course, the assignment of a second course will follow the same order of priority.

**Office Hour Policy:** Full-time teaching faculty shall be available to students during posted office hours as specified in the faculty handbook. Part-time faculty will be reasonably available to students depending on their workload. Both part- and full-time faculty will be available at other times by appointment.

### **Student-Related Policies and Procedures**

This department recognizes that its primary role is to teach students, to enhance their learning, and to assist them in meeting their educational and workforce or career goals.

The department advisor and faculty will help students plan their course of study in accordance with the student's ultimate educational and career goals. Students and the advisor should meet each semester.

The department shall follow college and university policies regarding student grievances and complaints.

### **Planning and Budgeting of Resources**

The chair shall keep the faculty informed of planning and budgetary information as it becomes available.

Faculty shall submit to the chair requests for needed equipment, graduate assistants, or special resources in a timely manner fitting the university budgeting process.

### **Program Review**

The Department may be required to undertake a program review as a necessary part of accreditation or to evaluate the status of our academic programs. The Department relies upon policy and guidelines for program review supplied by Academic Affairs. The Department faculty will assist the Chair and the Dean of the College of Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities in identifying internal and/or external reviewers. Initial communication with reviewers will be made by the Dean. The final determination of reviewers will be made by the Dean from the list provided by the Department and in consultation with the Chair.

### **Changes in the Bylaws**

These bylaws may be changed by a majority vote of the faculty attending any faculty meeting, provided that at least one week's notice shall be provided to all faculty that such a specific change is contemplated.

### **Performance Standards for Evaluation**

The following categories shall be used in evaluating faculty efforts in teaching, scholarly and creative activities ("scholarship"), and service for the purposes of Annual Evaluation and Tenure and Promotion.

- Exceeds Expectations: Exceeds Department standards for professional performance in quality and/or quantity.
- Meets Expectations: Meets Department standards for professional performance in quantity and/or quality.
- Does Not Meet Expectations: Does not meet Department standards for professional performance in quantity and/or quality
- Unsatisfactory: Disregard or failure to address remediation efforts by the university to provide correction or assistance for performance that does not meet expectations, or performance involving incompetence or misconduct as defined in the collective bargaining agreement and applicable university regulations and policies.

### **Tenure, Promotion, and Post Tenure Review Guidelines**

#### **Tenure:**

To be granted tenure, a faculty member must exceed expectations in teaching or scholarship and meet expectations in two other categories of scholarship, teaching, or service.

#### **Promotion to Associate Professor:**

To be promoted to associate professor, a faculty member must meet expectations of department standards for professional performance in all three categories.

**Promotion to Professor:**

To be promoted to professor, a faculty member must exceed expectations of department standards for professional performance in at least one category and meet expectations in each of the other two categories.

**Post Tenure Review:**

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

**ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND RUBRICS****1. TEACHING****a. Criteria for assessing teaching contributions.**

Teaching effectiveness may be demonstrated by, but is not limited to:

- a) Department chairperson's annual evaluations and recommendations
- b) Satisfactory student evaluations
- c) Organization and planning of courses
- d) Clear and definitive explanation of assignments
- e) Engaging students in research projects
- f) Scholarship of teaching, in pedagogical journals, for example
- g) Updating course material to reflect advancements in the field
- h) Design of new courses and/or programs
- i) Conference, workshop, or seminar participation related to teaching in specialized area
- j) Teaching awards and other outstanding accomplishments in teaching
- k) Participation in teaching development programs
- l) Teaching specialty topics in seminars, discussion groups, and other student-centric delivery forums
- m) Directing students in directed studies, honors projects, and internships
- n) Supervising graduate student research and serving on thesis and/or dissertation committees
- o) Incorporating university priorities such as active learning and student engagement.

**b. Rubrics for evaluating teaching performance.****UNSATISFACTORY**

This performance level demonstrates serious problems in attaining success in teaching as reflected either by (1) a combination of many of the negative indicators, and/or (2) fewer but more extreme behaviors that produce substantial negative outcomes on students and their learning. In general, teaching performance is well below department expectations for professional performance in teaching effectiveness.

***Indicators:***

- a) Student evaluations document consistent and substantive problems (ratings well below the department average)
- b) Syllabi fail to establish clear and relevant expectations
- c) 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)
- d) Goals and course content reflect no continuous improvement efforts; no assistance rendered for department assessment plan
- e) 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)
- f) Student support practices are unsound (e.g., late or absent for class, not responding to email, not keeping keep office hours, showing favoritism or discrimination)
- g) Consistent and very negative ratings in advising, mentoring, and supervision of students' scholarly or creative activities
- h) Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, general education) avoided or poorly executed
- i) Chronic academic integrity concerns identified including evidence of disrespect for students and their rights
- j) Avoids teaching developmental experiences

**Implications:** Requires major remedial work.

### **DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS**

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 department expectations for professional performance in teaching effectiveness.

#### **Indicators:**

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

**Implications:** Performance at this level suggests positive potential but does not justify tenure or promotion at this stage of development

### **MEETS EXPECTATIONS**

Demonstrates overall teaching effectiveness with some minor areas for improvement, typically reflected by some combination of the indicators listed below. In general, teaching performance is in accordance with department expectations for professional performance in teaching effectiveness.

#### **Indicators:**

- a) Student evaluations document adequate impact on learning as indicated by a minimum of 2.5 yearly average of all reported sections taught on each of the following Student Assessment of Instruction items: overall assessment of instructor; instructor's command of the subject; and overall course organization. If an instructor teaches more than one section of the same course in a semester, the instructor may choose to report only one of those sections
- b) Syllabi outline comprehensive, clear, and appropriate performance expectations
- c) Assessment practices support student learning and contribute to department needs
- d) Goals and course content give evidence of continuous efforts to improve teaching effectiveness
- e) Pedagogical practices facilitate optimal learning conditions
- f) Majority of student support practices are appropriate and effective
- g) Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices are appropriate and effective
- h) Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, general education) executed with reasonable skill
- i) Maintains appropriate standards of academic integrity, including respect for students and their rights
- j) Participates in teaching development activities when directed to do so

**Implication:** Performance average at this level over the period of employment at UWF justifies favorable tenure and promotion decisions.

### **EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS**

Demonstrates consistent high-quality teaching with positive outcomes for students as reflected by the indicators below. In general, performance at this level exceeds department standards for professional performance in teaching effectiveness.

#### **Indicators:**

- a) Student evaluations document consistently positive impact on learning as indicated by a minimum of 2.8 yearly average of all reported sections taught on each of the following Student Assessment of Instruction items: overall assessment of instructor; instructor's command of the subject; and overall course organization. If an instructor teaches more than one section of the same course in a semester, the instructor may choose to report only one of those sections
- b) Narrative statements emphasize positive impact on learners and/or transformative learning experiences

- c) Teaching awards or recognition that reflects a high caliber of performance in teaching effectiveness and/or design to benefit student experiences
- d) Syllabi outline comprehensive, clear, and appropriate performance expectations
- e) Assessment practices enhance student learning and contribute to department needs
- f) Goals and course content routinely provide evidence of continuous improvement effort
- g) Pedagogical practices facilitate optimal learning conditions.
- h) Student support practices facilitate optimal student development.
- i) Mentoring of capstone and honors projects.
- j) Appropriate standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights
- k) Participates voluntarily in professional development activities to improve teaching quality and flexibility

**Implications:** Performance average at this level easily justifies favorable tenure and promotion decisions.

Faculty who perceive that their student evaluations do not accurately reflect their teaching performance, or faculty who wish to demonstrate successful or innovative teaching not revealed with student evaluations, may provide additional documentation to consider for evaluating their teaching performance, such as, but not limited to:

- a) Quality of directed studies, thesis, and supervision of interns
- b) Quality of tests and other assignments
- c) Appropriate use of discriminatory techniques in the assignment of course grades
- d) Evidence of course revisions to reflect current knowledge in area
- e) Observations from other faculty, inside and outside the Department, arranged by the faculty member on an annual basis
- f) Self-evaluation
- g) Professional activities related to enhancement of teaching

## **2. SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY**

### **a. Criteria for assessing scholarly/creative contributions**

Scholarly contributions in the field of anthropology and sociology include peer-reviewed journal articles; non-peer reviewed journal articles; books; book chapters; book reviews; forensic reports; osteological reports; archaeology reports; peer reviewed proceedings chapters; non-peer reviewed proceedings chapters; encyclopedia entries; edited volumes; professional paper/poster presentations; panel or symposium discussant; museum exhibits; online or electronic format writings; popular press items; videos; grants written; grants received. Each category can be further subdivided according to criteria such as author's contribution (e.g., sole author, second author); report complexity (Phase I, II, or III, or comparable levels, archaeology reports); and significance (e.g., international, national, or regional journal). In terms of explicit criteria for weighing relative contributions, we have adopted a "currency" of one peer-reviewed journal article and have compiled a list of equivalencies in three tiers of significance, as follows:

Tier One exemplars include:

Peer-reviewed article in journal of international/national/regional significance = 1

Editor-reviewed article in journal of international/national/regional significance = 0.5

Book

Peer-reviewed book = 4

Peer-reviewed book in top press = 5

Co-Authored Book = half-to-whole of value of equivalent single author book

Grants/Contracts:

External, competitive, institutional grant (e.g. NSF, Fulbright) proposed, received, and administered = 2

External, competitive, society grant (e.g. Soc. for Applied Anthropology, RPA) proposed, received, and administered = 1

External contract proposed, received, and administered = 1-2

Tier Two exemplars include:

Peer-reviewed article in journal of sub-regional or state-level significance = 1

Editor of Edited Volume = 2

Book Chapter = 1

Peer-reviewed Proceedings Chapter = 1

Exhibit = up to 1, depending on venue and complexity

Grants/Contracts and Grant/Contract Writing:

External proposed = 0.75

Internal proposed, received, and administered = 0.5

Tier Three exemplars include:

Non-peer-reviewed journal article = 0.5

Forensic Report

Peer Review = 0.1

Individual Case Analysis = 0.25

Commingle or Complex Case Analysis (e.g., burned and fragmented case requiring extensive sorting and reconstruction) = 0.5-1

Expert Witness Testimony = 0.5

Multiple Cases = 1

Osteology/Bioarchaeology Report

Single individual = 0.25

Two to nine individuals and/or primary field excavation = 0.5

More than ten individuals and/or primary field excavation = 1

Archaeology Technical Report

Phase I (survey or initial exploration) = 0.25

Phase II (excavation) = 0.5

Phase III (excavation, mitigation, and/or preservation) = 1

Book Review = 0.25

Letter Report = 0.1

Non-Peer reviewed Proceedings chapter = 0.5

Encyclopedia Articles = 0.5

Popular Press Items

Local = 0.1  
National = 0.25  
International = 0.5  
Online or electronic format writing/media = up to 1 depending on complexity  
Symposium/Conference organization  
    Symposium organization = 0.5  
    Conference organization = 1  
Conference presentations  
    Volunteered Paper/Poster Presentation = 0.1  
    Invited Paper/Poster Presentation = 0.25  
    Invited Panelist on Organized Panel = 0.25  
    Invited Symposium Discussant = 0.25  
Grants/Contracts and Grant/Contract Writing:  
    Internal proposed = 0.25

### ***Regarding Annual Evaluations***

Contributions completed in the course of one academic year that in sum are equivalent to one peer-reviewed journal article (i.e., combine for 1 point or greater) are considered to be rated as exceeding expectations of departmental standards for professional performance for that year.

Tier One: Refereed contribution. We recognize that the efforts that go into substantive Tier One contributions may be “invisible” in the annual evaluations leading up to the actual publication date. Therefore, a monograph of original research that is published with a respected university or trade publisher warrants 3 years designated as exceeding expectations, 4 years if award winning (in instances of co-authorship, the faculty member must clarify their role).

Tier One or Two: Refereed/Peer Reviewed Scholarly Article. Warrants 1 year designated as exceeding expectations, 2 years if award winning.

### **b. Rubrics for evaluating scholarly/creative contributions**

#### **UNSATISFACTORY**

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 well below the department expectations for professional performance in scholarship in quality and/or quantity.

#### ***Indicators:***

Summary score for scholarly/creative contributions between 2 and 2.99, even if of a Tier One level of significance.

***Implications:*** No support for tenure/promotion. Assignment of a scholarship and creative projects mentor for the candidate should be considered.

### **DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS**

Demonstrates moderate tangible progress in scholarship or creative activity agenda as shown by the indicators below but work falls mildly below the department expectations for professional performance in scholarship in quality and/or quantity.

***Indicators:***

Summary score for scholarly/creative contributions between 3 and 3.99, with at least 1 of those points earned at the Tier 2 level or above.

***Implications:*** No support for tenure/promotion but candidate shows promise of future productivity. Assignment of a scholarship and creative projects mentor for the candidate should be considered.

### **MEETS EXPECTATIONS**

Demonstrates satisfactory execution of scholarship or creative activity agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university context, as shown by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative projects meet department standards for professional performance in scholarship in quality and/or quantity.

***Indicators:*** Summary score for scholarly/creative contributions between 4 and 4.99, with at least 1 point earned at the Tier One level.

***Implications:*** Performance at this level facilitates favorable promotion/tenure decisions.

### **EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS**

Demonstrates a high degree of skill in design and execution of scholarly and creative projects as shown by the indicators below that build upon the indicators for excellence. In general, this performance exceeds department standards for professional performance in scholarship in quality and quantity.

***Indicators:*** Summary score for scholarly/creative contributions equal to or greater than 5, with at least 1 point earned at the Tier One level and at least 3 points between the Tier One and Tier Two levels.

***Implications:*** Easily qualifies for favorable tenure decisions and promotion to Associate and Full professorship. Decisions on promotion to Full professorship facilitated favorably when candidate has more than 1 point earned at the Tier One level.

## **3. SERVICE**

### **a. Criteria for assessing service contributions**

Along with teaching and scholarship, service is an important part of one's responsibility as a university faculty member. At the outset of their employment, the department chair will advise new faculty members about how this activity can be incorporated strategically into their work

assignments. Although service may be somewhat lighter for new faculty members in the process of establishing themselves as teachers and scholars/artists than for experienced faculty members, new faculty should be encouraged to render high-quality service. As is the case with scholarship, some service activities are more meritorious than others. Most meritorious are those that involve major time commitments and contribute to the well-being of the department, college, university or profession. Service activities will be assessed annually.

Service is broadly defined and includes a wide range of activities including, but not limited to the following categories. All service activities must be linked to the discipline in order to contribute to tenure and promotion, and faculty are expected to participate in at least two of the three categories.

### 1. Service to the Institution

- a) Service on university or college, and department committees
- b) Service as Department Chair, Program Director, or Program Coordinator
- c) Service on Department, College or University Committees
- d) Service to the university in the form of delivering courses to remote locations
- e) Advising students and/or student organizations
- f) Service related to recruitment and retention of students
- g) Articulation efforts at various levels
- h) Outreach activities that promote the department, college, or university
- i) Textbook, manuscript, and grant reviewing activities
- j) Curriculum development to meet the needs of the community
- k) Department accreditation activities
- l) Mentoring and assisting new faculty
- m) Obtaining professional licenses or certifications in one's discipline
- n) Preparing students for professional conferences or publications
- o) Pursuing continuing education and personal development

### 2. Service to the Profession

- a) Service to professional and student organizations
- b) Service on editorial review boards, advisory committees, grant review panels
- c) Editing a scholarly journal
- d) Organizing conferences or serving on conference committees
- e) Chairing panels or participating in roundtable discussions at conferences
- f) Serving as a reviewer/referee on textbooks, monographs, journal articles or grants
- g) Offering courses or trainings that may support certification in one's discipline (e.g. RPA-certified course)

### 3. Service to the Community

- a) Community service related to one's discipline
- b) Participation with local professional organizations
- c) Public lectures, performances, or exhibitions
- d) Unremunerated consultancies
- e) Providing information when requested by the media, public, or grade school students

**b. Rubrics for evaluating service contributions.**

**UNSATISFACTORY**

Demonstrates serious problems in fulfilling appropriate service roles for faculty as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is well below the department expectations for professional performance in service quality and/or quality.

***Indicators:***

- 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 any, does not in any way provide synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions, for example, serving as the director of a local choir.

***Implications:*** Remedial work is required; May include recommendation to find a context that is a better match to the individual's service values than the substantial service needs relevant to the regional comprehensive context. No support for tenure or promotion.

**DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS**

Demonstrates only minor tangible progress in service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is moderately below the department expectations for professional performance in service quality and/or quality.

***Indicators:***

- a. Minimal contributions made in service role (e.g., "sits" on committees as compared to active participation)
- b. Over-commitment to service spreads faculty time and energy too thinly to facilitate effectiveness
- c. Community service, if applicable, provides limited, tangential synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and service functions.

***Implications:*** No support for tenure/promotion

**MEETS EXPECTATIONS**

Demonstrates major tangible progress in relevant service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service meets department expectations. In general, service meets the department expectations for professional performance in service quality and/or quality.

***Indicators:***

- a. Participates effectively in at least six of the service activities listed above
- b. Selection of service activity expresses understanding of faculty service role in regional comprehensive university
- c. Usually participates actively and constructively in service activity

- d. Usually effective in service as citizen of department
- e. Balance across service obligations may be a struggle
- f. Community service, if applicable, provides reasonable synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions.

**Implications:** Performance at this level qualifies for favorable promotion/tenure decisions.

### **EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS**

Demonstrates high degree of skill in service contributions as shown by the indicators below that build upon indicators that exceed expectations. In general, service exceeds department expectations for professional performance in service quality and quality.

**Indicators:**

- a. Participates effectively in at least eight of the service activities listed above
- b. Leadership demonstrated in targeted arenas of service (e.g., holds elected office; collaborates skillfully and innovatively)
- c. Scope and effort level meet department standards
- d. Colleagues view contributions to department as effective
- e. Wide external recognition (local, national, or international audiences) or awards achieved for quality of service contributions
- f. Service agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university mission
- g. Service contributions represent strategic decisions that balance demands from the discipline, department, campus, and community
- h. Community service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions.

**Implications:** Performance easily qualifies for favorable tenure and promotion decisions.

### **Regarding Annual Evaluations**

The Division will use the following criteria for annual evaluation of members' service:

**Unsatisfactory:** No current, consistent support of University/College committees/assignments, OR Department committees/assignments, OR Community/Professional organizations.

**Does not meet expectations:** Lack of current, consistent support of University/College committees/assignments, OR Department committees/assignments, OR community/Professional organizations.

**Meets expectations:** Current, consistent support of University/College committees/assignment, OR Department committees/assignments, OR Community/Professional organizations.

**Exceeds expectations:** Current, consistent membership and some leadership in University/College committees/assignments, OR Department committees/assignments, OR Community/Professional organizations.

LAST UPDATE: January 2025