Contents

The Department of Commerce is governed by the following by-laws, consisting of the following sections:

Approval chronology (MSCLE/Commerce By-Laws)

Sections 1-3: approved November 20, 2009
Section 4: approved October 1, 2015
Section 5: approved September 17, 2010
Section 6: updated October 7, 2014
Section 7: approved November 20, 2009
Merger and comprehensive revision of MSCLE and GHTM By-Laws: approved October 15, 2021
Merger and comprehensive revision: 100% yes vote on March 8, 2024
Minor update: 12/15 voting, unanimous yes vote on April 12, 2024

Department of Commerce By-Laws

1. Preamble

These by-laws offer guidelines for department operations, promotion, tenure, annual evaluations, vetting journals, assessing the status of journals, and changing the by-laws themselves. The by-laws differ at times on key words like 'shall', 'may', 'must', and 'should.' These differences are intentional and the use of these words is important to the meaning of the by-law. 'Shall' and 'must' are restrictive, leaving little or no room for interpretation. 'May' and 'should' mean that the by-law is more guideline than law, and so is subject to judgment as well as measurement.

These by-laws start with two important statements.

The Department endorses the Mission statement of the University and the College of Business. Issues not covered in these by-laws will be governed by the College of Business by-laws.

A faculty member having served in an administrative position (out-of-unit) who then returns to the faculty (in-unit) shall be granted the appropriate time according to the College of Business By-Laws to regain productivity in research and teaching. Upon reaching the allotted time, the faculty member may ask that they be evaluated using the standards that were in effect when they entered into the administrative position if the by-laws were updated within the last 3-years, or that they be evaluated with those that are in effect at the time of tenure, promotion, or consideration.

2. Department Operations

Faculty Meetings
The Chair or the Chair's designee shall preside in all meetings of the Department faculty as a whole. Department faculty meetings shall be conducted as follows:

a. The Department faculty shall meet at least once during the Fall semester and once during the Spring Semester to carry out the necessary business of Departmental operations. Five days notice shall be given in calling all meetings, except as noted in subsection (c) of this section or if the purpose of meeting is strictly to give or receive information; that is, no votes or other actions are taken. Department meetings (for information sharing and/or formal voting) may be conducted in-person, via electronic media, such as in using Zoom, or a combination of these methods.

b. The Office Administrator, or designee thereof, shall be responsible for taking minutes and keeping a permanent record of Department faculty meetings. The Office Administrator is

responsible for keeping and distributing the minutes as required by these by-laws. The minutes are to be distributed to the members of the faculty within ten working days of the meeting for which the minutes were taken. Department meeting minutes will be electronically stored and shared with faculty within a folder in UWF's Google Drive for the Department.

c. The Chair shall convene special meetings of the Department faculty if petitioned by 25% or more of the tenured and tenure-earning faculty members, when required by the College of Business Council, or when required by the Dean.

d. A quorum is defined differently, depending on these circumstances:
> i. For matters regarding tenure, promotion, evaluation standards, and changes to the by-laws:
> A quorum shall be 75 percent of the voting members of the department.
> ii. For all other matters:
> A quorum shall be 50 percent of the voting members of the department.

e. A voting member of the department is defined differently, depending on these circumstances:
> i. For matters regarding tenure, promotion, evaluation standards, and changes to the by-laws, voting members shall be:
>> Full-time tenured faculty members
>> Full-time tenure-track faculty members
>> Faculty on phased retirement
>> The Department Chair is a voting member of the faculty, but only votes in the case of a tie.
>
> Excluded: faculty members with visiting appointments, faculty with adjunct appointments, non-teaching advisers, and instructors.
>
> Written Proxies may be submitted to the Chair prior to the faculty meeting. These must designate the procurator and be signed by the absentee voting member. Such proxies will be counted as present for purposes of determining a quorum.
>
> ii. For all other matters, voting members of the faculty shall be:
>> Full-time tenured faculty members
>> Full-time tenure-track faculty members
>> Faculty on phased retirement
>> The Department Chair
>> Full-time instructors
>> Excluded: faculty with adjunct appointments and non-teaching advisers.

f. A faculty vote also differs depending on these circumstances.

> i. For matters regarding tenure, promotion, evaluation standards, and changes to the by-laws, a vote shall carry if:

75% of the present (including proxies) voting members of the Department vote in favor of the matter before the faculty. If less than 75% of all eligible voting members of the faculty favor the matter, the matter fails.

For calculating these percentages, rounding up and rounding down to the nearest full faculty member will be: .5 and above, round up; .49 and below, round down. For example, if 75% of the voting members is 11.25, then 11 votes would carry the matter (15 voting members); if 75% of the voting members is 13.5, then 14 votes would carry the matter (18 voting members).

ii. For all other matters, a vote shall carry if:

A simple majority of voting members vote in favor of the matter before the faculty, then the matter shall pass, whether the vote is in person or by email or other electronic means. If less than a majority of voting members favor the matter, then the matter fails. If the vote is tied, the matter fails.

g. If a proposed motion affects the educational policy or operations of the Department, then it must be submitted in writing to the Chair at least seven working days prior to the meeting at which the motion will be considered. Electronic or paper copies of the motion shall be distributed to faculty members at least five working days in advance of the meeting, unless the requirement for advance notification is waived by consent of three-fourths of the voting members of the faculty. This vote may be taken electronically.

j. The Chair shall prepare and distribute an agenda for each meeting called by the Chair. If the majority of voting members at the meeting vote to add an item, then it may be added to the agenda for discussion and action, including voting. However, in matters of extreme urgency, such submission and notification may be waived by a three-fourths vote of the voting faculty present at such meeting, if a quorum is present. This vote may be taken electronically.

Office Space
Occasionally, the Department may move from one building to another, a building may be modified, or there may be a change in personnel within the Department through new hires, retirements, and so on. If possible, and not otherwise required by administration, the available office space will be allocated to faculty who want the available space based on seniority and length of service at UWF. For example, a full professor who has 25 years of service at UWF will have priority over a full professor who has been onboard only 15 years. Full professors will have first choice on available office space, associate professors second choice, assistant professors third choice, and instructors fourth choice. Available office space for visiting faculty, adjuncts, and support personnel will be assigned by the Chair.

Faculty Mentorship Program
The Faculty Mentorship Program includes the assigning of mentors, adherence 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 coaching, professional advising, networking assistance, explaining typical routes to

advancement, and facilitating positive professional exposure. The following are guidelines for the mentorship program.

a. Each untenured faculty member (visiting or tenure track) should be assigned a mentor from among the tenured faculty.

b. The Chair should ultimately determine faculty pairings, based on faculty workloads and other relevant factors. Faculty mentors, mentees, and the Chair shall meet annually to discuss the progress and needs of the mentee.

c. Faculty pairs should agree to meet at regular intervals to discuss factors that may affect the mentee's professional growth and preparedness for the mid-point review. Both partners should show initiative in arranging these meetings. Although this is a formal mentoring program, faculty relationships should develop as naturally as possible.

d. At the end of the academic year, the Faculty Mentors should report to the Chair on the effectiveness of the program.

e. A formal review of the tenure-track faculty (mentee) shall be conducted to assess his or her progress at the mid-point of the probationary period leading up to tenure and promotion review. The Chair will arrange for the formal review to take place using an individual reviewer or review committee to assess the progress.

1. The mid-point review will provide feedback for the mentee with the goal to assist the mentee in ultimately achieving a successful tenure review.

2. Results of the review will conclude and inform that the mentee has achieved success in progressing towards tenure, has specific areas of performance in need of attention, effort, and improvement, or has demonstrated a lack of progress in critical areas important for progress toward tenure.

3. Mid-point reviews will address performance in the areas of teaching, scholarly activities, and service during the probationary period. The mentee will provide the Chair with a dossier containing current vita, copies of annual evaluations, student assessment of instruction (teaching evaluations), and evidence of quality and innovative teaching and scholarly activities. The mentee will summarize his or her teaching, research, and service contributions through self-evaluation.

4. The Chair will provide the Dean with the mentee's complete dossier and the mid-term evaluation (provided by the chair, assigned mentor, or review committee).

Teaching Schedules

To help faculty with scholarly and creative activity, the Department should try to give every member of the faculty a teaching schedule that is either two days per week (MW or TR) or three consecutive (MTW or TWR) days per week. Course demand and classroom availability will also be considered. The Chair should accommodate scheduling requests where possible. Scheduling preference will be granted to faculty based upon rank and longevity (based upon the same system used for office space). Faculty members may also request to teach a course that meets one day per week on any day of the week. Faculty members may request a specific instructional method (e.g., online, face-to-face) of a course as well.

Proposed Summer Line Allocation Plan

a. Summer courses will be offered and scheduled on the basis of:

        i.   student program needs
        ii.   enrollment projections
    b. Faculty will be offered supplementary contracts based on:
        i.   area of specialization and qualifications to teach the courses offered
        ii.   if more than one faculty member is qualified to teach a scheduled course, the supplementary appointments will be offered on a rotation basis. Priority will be based on two factors: length of time since the last summer appointment or the number (fewest) of appointments within the previous five years.

3. Process for the Determination of Vetted and Top-tier Journals

These bylaws consider journals in two categories: 1) vetted; and 2) top-tier.
Faculty are encouraged to publish their work in high quality outlets. Journals which have achieved national or international recognition as outlets for high quality scholarly or creative products shall be classified as a "vetted" journal. Vetted journals include those on the current lists in these bylaws, those that have gone through the vetting process described below, and those on the designated lists like the Australian Business Dean's List (ABDC), Journal of Economic Literature (JEL), and the North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM) journal list.

Additionally, for disciplines that do not have recognized discipline-specific lists, vetted journals are those in the top half of the discipline-filtered quality rankings of the general academic journal databases and lists of journals. For example, for pedagogical journals, automatically vetted are journals that appear in the top half of the education-filtered lists of such databases as Cabells Directories of Publishing Opportunities (based on its Classification Index), Scimago (based on its quality assessment report), Eigenfactor (its own score), the Observatory of International Research (citation count), and others. It is a faculty member's responsibility to document the journal's ranking. A detailed screenshot image is sufficient.

Sport Management faculty that entered the department for the fall 2023 semester will have academic journals listed on their curriculum vitae (with the status of under review, accepted, or published) at the time of the first annual evaluation in Commerce "grandfathered in" and counted as a vetted journal upon publication. The department will evaluate future publications based on the criteria for determining vetted and top-tier journals as noted in these bylaws.

3.1 A Journal May be Added to the Department List of Vetted Journals Through the Following Process

a. The faculty member wishing to add a journal to the vetted journal list must submit a request to the Department Chair. The request should include the following information:
    1. Journal Name
    2. List of Review Board members
    3. Published or Open-Source
    4. Review process information

5. Affiliation and/or association with any organizational conference
6. Is the journal independent of conference presentations, proceedings, etc.
7. Impact factor if available (Journal provided, Scimago and Scijournal), but required for pedagogical and case journals
8. Acceptance rate if available
9. Sample issue or article from the journal (include URL for the website)
10. Statement by the faculty member summarizing the case for inclusion as a vetted journal

b. The Department Chair will circulate the request to the department faculty via email and request a "yes" or "no" response. If a response is "no" the faculty member responding "no" is required to indicate a reason.

c. Inclusion of a journal in the department's list of quality journals shall require a positive vote of the majority of the voting faculty. This is in accord with Section 2 (f) of these by-laws.

d. If the Chair receives a positive vote, according to c., the journal is added to the vetted list and the Chair will notify the faculty that the journal has been approved. It should also then be added to the list on Sedonaweb.com or other technology in use at the time of the addition.

Top-tier journals usually have low acceptance rates, carry high levels of prestige, and long periods to publication, so they deserve extra recognition as addressed later in section (3.2). They are also usually defined by discipline, so a top-tier journal in one of our disciplines may be unrecognized in another. Top-tier journals include those meeting the criteria shown below.

3.2 A Journal will be Classified as a Top-tier by the Department if it Meets any of the Following Criteria.

a. First, if the journal is classified as "A" or "A*" in the ABDC list of journals, it will be considered top-tier.
b. Second, if it ranks in Q1 on Scimago or has an impact factor above 4 on Scijournal, then it will be considered a top-tier publication.
c. Third, if it is listed as a top-tier research journal for at least two R1/Doctoral Universities: High Research Activity, then it will be considered a top-tier journal publication.

Faculty who publish in journals that meet any of the criteria listed in 3.2 should identify them in their annual evaluation statement of contributions.

3.3 Adding a Top-tier Journal
The faculty may also vote to have a journal added to the top-tier list, but the voters should consider the standards in the lists mentioned above in 3.2. See section 8 for the list of journals added to the top-tier list in this manner.

Evidence of top-tier status can include impact factors from Scimago, Scijournal, or other recognized listings of journals. The bylaws from R1/Doctoral Universities: High Research Activity may also be used.

The faculty member wishing to add a journal to the departmental top-tier list must submit a request to the Department Chair. The request should include all of the items from the vetted journal standards plus the following two items.

1. Evidence the journal is valued as a top-tier publication in at least two Universities classified as R1/Doctoral Universities: High Research Activity
2. Evidence of top-tier status from other respected journal ranking organizations

a. The Department Chair will circulate the request to the department faculty via email and request a "yes" or "no" response. If a response is "no" the faculty member responding "no" is required to indicate a reason.

b. Inclusion of a journal in the department's list of top-tier journals will require a positive vote of the majority of the voting faculty.

c. If the Chair receives a positive vote, the journal will be added to the departmental top-tier list and the Chair will notify the faculty that the journal has been approved. It should also then be added to the list on Sedonaweb.com or other technology in use at the time of the addition.

4. Annual Faculty Evaluation Standards

This document supersedes all previous documents.

The following standards for annual evaluation are likely to change as the mission of the department, the college, and the university change. This is a living document that will adapt to changing circumstances. Regardless of those circumstances, it remains the duty of the Department Chair to evaluate individual faculty performance on an annual basis. This will be done in keeping with the mission statement of the College of Business.

Faculty members will be evaluated on Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Projects, and Service. The Department Chair will review the documentation presented by the faculty member, and in consultation with the faculty member, arrive at an agreed descriptor for performance in each of the three areas evaluated. These evaluations form the foundation for continued employment, the allocation of departmental merit money, and the Post-Tenure Review.

The following categories shall be used in evaluating faculty efforts in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service for the purposes of annual evaluation and tenure and/or promotion.

- Exceeds Expectations: Exceeds Department standards for professional performance in quality or quantity or both.
- Meets Expectations: Meets Department standards for professional performance.
- Does Not Meet Expectations: Does not meet Department standards for professional performance.
- Unsatisfactory: Professional performance well below the expected standard. Additionally, this could include 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.

"Beginning with the 2018–2019 Academic Year, Faculty are required to submit at least one example of teaching quality in addition to the standard university teaching assessment material. Examples 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 examples may also be outlined in Department/Unit bylaws. "[1]

4.1. Evaluation Standards for Teaching

The department places importance upon superior classroom instruction and this is reflected in the standards for the teaching evaluation. Efforts to create innovative course content and experiences that provide engaging learning experiences for students and that help to prepare students for careers in business are highly-valued. High-impact practices (HIP) are encouraged, for example, that provide collaborative opportunities for students, faculty, industry, and other community organizations. Such experiential learning opportunities will be recorded annually within the departmental Google Drive folder. Evaluation of teaching may include, but is not limited to, the following list:
1. Student evaluations - SAI results (quantitative statistics and qualitative comments)
2. Major involvement in assurance of learning measurement and/or reporting
3. Teaching overloads
4. Evaluations of the individual from continuing education courses and/or professional seminars
5. Teaching awards
6. Peer review, especially by faculty colleagues familiar with the candidate's teaching
7. Attendance at workshops, seminars, short courses, and continuing professional in one's area of specialization
8. Cumulative professional judgment by the department chair
9. Administrative evaluation at the dean, vice-president, and president levels
10. Type of class (MBA, online, new prep, quantitative, elective, etc.)
11. Willingness to assist the department and college in offering the courses needed for their programs throughout the academic year.
12. Collaborative teaching and interdisciplinary development.

13. The difficulty of the courses taught (including grade distribution)
14. Development of new courses or significant revision of existing courses
15. Use of technology in face-to-face or online courses
16. Anecdotal evidence from students, faculty, staff, and others both from within and outside of the University
17. Class size
18. Assumption of a number of directed studies and/or participation in one or more graduate thesis committees
19. A course load requiring multiple preps
20. Quality of course syllabi, course objectives, and other instructional materials created by and/or used by the instructor
21. Quality of assessment practices
22. Quality of advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices
23. Accomplishment of special teaching assignments (e.g., capstone course, honors course)
24. Evaluation of the level of standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights
25. Participation in professional development activities to specifically improve teaching quality and flexibility
26. Teaching philosophy
27. Availability to students and other instructional support practices
28. Use of high-impact practices
29. Development and validation of high-quality online courses and programs that support the mission of the College

4.1.1 Assessment of SAI Results

Assessment of SAI results includes both quantitative and qualitative data. Student evaluations, including narrative comments, will be provided to the Chair to be included in the material considered for the faculty member's annual evaluation of teaching.

The average value of the two 'overall' questions on the SAI results for all in-load course assignments during the Fall and Spring semesters will serve as the base quantitative assessment of teaching quality. The faculty member may elect to include over-load assignments in this calculation. If a faculty member elects to exclude over-load courses from this quantitative assessment, the Chair should still consider the qualitative indicators of teaching quality for over-load courses during his/her evaluation process. The questions are:

Overall Assessment of Course Organization
and
Overall Assessment of Instructor

The overall quantitative score shall be the combined weighted (based on number of students in each course) average of these two quantitative measures across all assessed courses. The following ranges provide guidance for interpreting the quantitative score that will be used as one factor (among several others) for the assessment of teaching:

Evaluative Ratings	Translation into Student Evaluation from Scores
Exceeds Expectations	From/to 3.9 to 5 with significant positive comments
Meets Expectations	From/to 2.9 to 3.89 with positive comments
Does Not Meet Expectations	From/to 1.9 to 2.89 with negative comments
Unsatisfactory	Below 1.9 with significant negative comments

4.1.2 Overall Assessment of Teaching

As stated above, SAI results for all in-load course assignments will serve as the base assessment of teaching quality. However, the Chair should also consider the other quantitative and qualitative factors listed in section 4.1. The Chair may adjust the faculty member's base rating derived from the SAI results in section 4.1.1 by +/- .25 points to arrive at an overall assessment of teaching based on the Evaluative Rating ranges in section 4.1.1.

Example one: If a faculty member earned a base rating of 3.0 but primarily outsourced his/her teaching and grading to automated courseware purchased by the students with limited added value from the faculty member, the Chair may adjust that faculty member's base rating down to 2.75 for an overall rating of "Does Not Meet Expectations."

Example two: If a faculty member earns a base rating of 3.75 but includes high-impact practices in his/her teaching and demonstrates major involvement in assurance of learning measurement, the Chair may adjust that faculty member's base rating up to 4.0 for an overall rating of "Exceeds Expectations."

---

[1] Source: https://uffuwf.org/cba/

4.2 Annual Evaluation Standards for Scholarship and Creative Projects

Scholarly and creative activities may be demonstrated in a variety of ways. For the purposes of the annual evaluation, all published scholarly and creative products during the evaluation period will be included. Faculty members may choose to have considered accepted but not yet published scholarly and creative products for annual evaluation in a specific year. However, for annual evaluations, scholarly and creative output may only be counted in one year. It is up to the faculty member to *specify the specific year of evaluation for the publication*. If they are counted on acceptance, they will not be counted again on final publication.

Examples of scholarly and creative activities include but are not limited to:

- Peer-reviewed publications (i.e., journals, books, book chapters)
- Editorially reviewed or invited publications (i.e., journals, trade journals, proceedings, and/or periodicals)
- Convention and conference contributions (i.e., presentations and proceedings)
- Grant awards or submissions
- Computer simulations/software published nationally and accepted and used by an institution other than UWF
- Business cases published in a case book, textbook, or online case repository (i.e., Harvard Business Review), accepted and used at an institution other than UWF

4.2.1 Annual Evaluation Rating Guidelines

The following guidelines are offered for evaluating scholarly and creative activities. If a faculty member reaches or exceeds the output measure shown in the second column of this table, then the faculty member's evaluation rating for research is shown in the first column. A faculty member may exceed the minimum level for an evaluative rating without reaching the next level on the evaluation scale. For example, a faculty member might have three publications in refereed conference proceedings, but that would still mean an annual rating of Meet Expectations. That does not meet the minimum standard required for Exceeds Expectations. If the outlet for a scholarly or creative product is sufficiently prestigious, then the Chair may make exceptions to these guidelines to award a higher evaluative rating than suggested in the table. A faculty member should provide support to justify such a rise in evaluation.

Evaluative Ratings	Output Measures of Scholarly and Creative Productivity
Exceeds expectations Publish, produce, or achieve:	Two peer reviewed or editorially reviewed journal articles (from the "vetted" journal list) over the last five-year period. This requirement only applies to faculty qualified as a scholarly academic, with five continuous years in unit at the university. AND one of the following in the current evaluation period: 1. A peer reviewed or editorially reviewed journal article (from the "vetted" journal list) 2. Two (or more) peer reviewed or editorially reviewed journal articles (from the "vetted" journal list) published within the current evaluation period and/or within the most recent previous year's evaluation period. 3. Three (or more) peer reviewed or editorially reviewed journal articles (from the "vetted" journal list) published in the current evaluation period and/or within the most recent two previous years' evaluation periods 4. A monetary award for a funded grant as a principal or co-investigator linked to a scholarly project 5. Finish a dissertation (first year only)

	6. The first edition of a peer reviewed nationally distributed textbook, accepted and used at an institution other than UWF 7. The first edition of a popular press book, published by a recognized national publisher (not self-published or published by a "vanity publisher,") related to the faculty's area of scholarship
Meets expectations Publish, produce, or achieve:	Two peer reviewed or editorially reviewed journal articles (from the "vetted" journal list) over the last five-year period. This requirement only applies to faculty qualified as a scholarly academic, with five continuous years in unit at the university. AND one of the following in the current evaluation period: 1. A refereed proceedings 2. A refereed presentation at a conference 3. A presentation at the UWF Scholar Symposium 4. An published invited editorial in an academic or professional journal 5. A non-refereed proceedings 6. The first edition of a peer reviewed book chapter, in a nationally distributed textbook, accepted and used at an institution other than UWF 7. A business case published in a case book, textbook, or online case repository (i.e., Harvard Business Review), accepted and used at an institution other than UWF 8. The first edition of a computer simulation/software published nationally and accepted and used by an institution other than UWF. 9. A peer reviewed or editorially reviewed journal article (from outside the "vetted" journal list) 10. An update to a peer reviewed book chapter, in a nationally distributed textbook, accepted and used at an institution other than UWF 11. An update to a computer simulation/software published nationally and accepted and used by an institution other than UWF 12. One peer-reviewed State, Federal, or external association grant submission (regardless of funding status) 13. Significant tangible work in progress (with a first active submission or active revision offer) 14. An invited presentation at an international, national, regional, or local conference 15. A presentation at a UWF COB Research Colloquium or similar COB Research event 16. Creating and disseminating collaborative research projects with students, faculty, and industry.

Does not meet expectations Publish, produce, or achieve:	1. Tangible work in progress in the current evaluation period. (without a first active submission or active revision offer)
Unsatisfactory	No tangible scholarly/creative activity in the current evaluation period.

Option to Delay a Journal Article
1. Since the publication process can be volatile, each faculty member has an option to delay one vetted journal article one year. The delay must be announced in the annual evaluation for the publication year and reiterated in the following annual evaluation.
2. A different publication can be delayed in the evaluation for the following year and the faculty acknowledge the possibility of a series of one-year delays for separate publications.

Productivity Reporting Requirement
1. Faculty shall specify if/how they have achieved the publication of two peer reviewed or editorially reviewed journal articles (from the "vetted" journal list) over the last five-year period in his/her statement of contribution.
2. Faculty shall specify if/how a given publication is qualified as a vetted journal in his/her statement of contribution.
3. Faculty shall specify if/how a given publication is qualified as a top-tier journal in his/her statement of contribution.

Special Annual Evaluation Criterion
1. Publication in top-tier journals are the equivalent of two publications in journals that are regarded as vetted, but not top-tier.
2. As with any productivity benchmark, outlets not mentioned here can potentially substitute for two vetted journal articles in five years and boost the rating. The burden is on the faculty member to convince the Chair, the Dean, and the Provost that any substation is appropriate.
3. There can be additional elements of contributions which warrant review by the Department Chair during the annual evaluation process. This can include justification that a certain publication or artifact is exceptional. One such example could be a subsequent edition of a well regarded textbook where significant work went into ancillaries and related case studies for the text. This is just one example, but the burden of proof is on the faculty member to show the tangible value of the publication/artifact.

Tenure and promotion requirements for Wglspev)rhvviexzi$Productivity are addressed in section 5.

4.3 Evaluation Standards for Service

Service is an area where performance in a number of varied activities is expected and evaluated. Faculty members are expected to contribute to the progress of their department,

college, university, and in furthering their discipline through professional community contributions.

Evaluation on service is based on the depth and mixture of service in various areas. The mixture of service activities may change over time as faculty members accept new service responsibilities. The depth of service toward a single activity may also change as faculty members provide greater depth of service in new areas. While the mixture and depth may change, it is important to understand that each area of service to the department, college, university, and to the faculty member's professional discipline community is important. Major deviations in service areas and depth should be discussed and agreed upon between the faculty member and the Department Chairperson through the annual planning process, prior to execution.

In the Department of Commerce, service is divided into major service activities and minor service activities. A major service activity requires greater commitment of time and effort. In addition, it should also have a greater impact on the department, college, university, or discipline. In contrast, a minor service activity will require less commitment of time and effort. While it is expected that the minor activity results in value for the department, college, university, or discipline, the value is expected to be to a lesser degree than that of a major service activity. Examples are provided to illustrate for faculty and administration the activities that may be categorized as major or minor services for faculty evaluation. The list is not exhaustive, but provides for a better understanding of what constitutes major and minor service effort, time, and result.

Major Service Examples

Example #1: Serving on the editorial review board of a peer-reviewed journal. By accepting an appointment to serve as a member of the editorial review board of a peer-reviewed journal, a faculty member commits time and effort to review multiple manuscripts over the course of a 12-month term.

Example #2: Serving as the faculty advisor for a highly active student group or organization that is associated with the Department of Commerce. The faculty advisor should actively assist student officers in goal setting, program planning, mentoring, and helping to facilitate interactions between the student organization and external professionals.

Example #3: Serving on a faculty search committee. Since hiring, along with tenure and promotion, is 'one of the most important things we do' (Ron Bush, paraphrased), faculty should spend a considerable amount of time reviewing candidate materials and developing a list of strengths and weaknesses.

Example #4: Serving as a faculty mentor. The faculty mentor should spend a considerable amount of time advising the mentee with the goal to assist the mentee in achieving a successful mid-point review and ultimately a successful tenure/promotion decision.

Minor Service Example

Example #1: Serving as faculty marshal for graduation. This is a commitment which requires approximately a half day for each ceremony. This service is valuable, but does not meet the standard for major service.

Department policy is not to compile the definitive list of Major and Minor activities, but rather to give faculty and administrators guidance on separating the activities by effort, time, and contribution. Ultimately, faculty are responsible for making the case that an activity should count as a minor or as a major service activity. The overriding principle is that major service requires a significant time commitment and, if well executed, will generate a direct productive return to the department, college, university, and/or discipline. Again, major deviations should be agreed upon through the annual planning process. Xli$mrxmrgxmsr$fix{iir$e$q ersverhq rsv$wivzmgi$ egxmzmx}gerfi$q rsv$nr$ettievergi$fyxxliksep$w$s$wls{$q tegxerhlrkekiq irx$n$e$wyfwxerxmzi$q erriverhxli$fyvhir$wsrxli$jegyp}$q iq fiv$s$tvsvixlizepyisjxli$wivzmgi$gsrxvmfyxmsr$s$xli$hitevxq irx$Cgspiki$Cyrmziwmx}$Csvfvsehiv$gsq q yrmx}2

4.3.1 Standards for Untenured Assistant Professors in their First Four Academic Years

Evaluative Ratings - Output Measures of Service Productivity:

Exceeds Expectations - At least 1 Minor activity

Unsatisfactory - No visible (tangible) service activity

4.3.2 Standards for all Other Faculty

Evaluative Ratings - Output Measures of Service Productivity:

Exceeds Expectations - At least 1 Major activity AND 1 Minor activity OR 4 Minor activities

Meets Expectations - At least 3 Minor activities

Does Not Meet Expectations - At least 2 Minor activities

Unsatisfactory - One Minor activity or no visible (tangible) service activity

5. Tenure Decisions and Promotion Decisions

5.1 Tenure and Promotion to Associate

A faculty member applying for tenure and/or promotion must be academically qualified at the time of application.

The Department of Commerce expectations for tenure for all ranks and for promotion to associate professor are as follows.

5.1.1 Teaching

For all ranks, a majority of the department chair's annual evaluations of teaching must be "meets expectations" or higher for the period since the candidate's hire date. At least one of those annual ratings must be "exceeds expectations."

5.1.2 Scholarship and Creative Projects:

For all ranks, a candidate must have at least four articles published or accepted for publication in peer reviewed or editorially reviewed journals. These articles must also be in journals that have been vetted
- Only two of these articles may be replaced by equivalent publications. The list of substitutions is detailed in section 5.7., Equivalents for a Vetted Journal Publication.
- At least three of these articles must have been published since appointment to UWF. One of these three articles may be replaced by equivalent publications. The list of substitutions is detailed in section 5.7., Equivalents for a Vetted Journal Publication.

5.1.3 Service

For all ranks, a majority of the department chair's annual evaluations of service must be 'meets expectations'" or better for the period since the candidate's hire date. At least two of those annual ratings must be "exceeds expectations."

5.2 Promotion to Professor Decision

The Department of Commerce standards for promotion to Professor are as follows:

5.2.1 Teaching

For promotion to Full Professor, a majority of the department chair's annual evaluation of teaching ratings must be "meets expectations" or better in the period since the candidate's award of current rank. At least two of these annual evaluations must be "exceeds expectations."

5.2.2 Scholarship and Creative Projects

For promotion to Full Professor, a candidate must have at least ten articles published or accepted for publication in peer reviewed or editorially reviewed journals. These articles must be in journals that have been vetted.
- Only four of these articles may be replaced by equivalent publications. The list of substitutions is detailed in section 5.7., Equivalents for a Vetted Journal Publication.

- At least three of these articles must have been published since appointment to UWF (one of these three articles may be replaced by equivalent publications). The list of substitutions is detailed in section 5.7., Equivalents for a Vetted Journal Publication.
- At least four of these articles must have been published at the rank of Associate Professor (one of these four articles may be replaced by equivalent publications). The list of substitutions is detailed in section 5.7., Equivalents for a Vetted Journal Publication.

Also, the candidate for Full Professor must have at least one of the following:
- An internal award recognizing the faculty member's scholarship or creative projects
- An external award recognizing the faculty member's scholarship or creative projects
- A prestigious or "top-tier" publication
- A publication with a major impact in their field. The faculty member must present evidence in support of this point.
- A peer-reviewed state, federal, or external association funded grant. Any investigator status will qualify.
- A peer reviewed nationally distributed textbook, accepted and used at an institution other than UWF.

5.2.3 Service

A majority of annual evaluations of service ratings (in the period since the candidate's award of current rank), must at least "Meets Expectations." A minimum of two annual evaluations in this period must be "Exceeds Expectations."

5.3 Promotion for Instructors and Lecturers

In addition to the guidelines set forth by the University of West Florida, the Department of Commerce expectations for promotion to Senior Lecturer/Instructor are as follows:

5.3.1 Teaching

Majority of the department chair's annual evaluations of teaching must be "meets expectations" or higher for the period of review. At least two of those annual ratings must be "exceeds expectations."

5.3.2 Service

For all ranks, a majority of the department chair's annual evaluations of service must be 'meets expectations"' or better for the period since the candidate's hire date. At least two of those annual ratings must be "exceeds expectations."

5.4 Post-Tenure Review (PTR)

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 (PTR).

5.4.1 Timing

Each tenured faculty member shall have a comprehensive post-tenure review of five years of performance in the fifth year following the last promotion or the last comprehensive review, whichever is later. For faculty hired with tenure, the hire date shall constitute the date of the last promotion. On an annual basis the Provost shall issue a memorandum identifying the Faculty that will undergo post-tenure review for the following Academic Year. The Provost's memorandum will describe the process and timeline for the submission of materials by the Faculty Member. See section 2 of BOG regulation 10.003 for additional details.

5.4.2 Evaluation Criteria

Each PTR packet submitted for review shall contain the following:
   A. Last 5 years of Chair and Dean Annual Performance Evaluation Letters and any and all faculty rebuttals.
   B. Last 5 years of Faculty Assignment Letters.
   C. Current Curriculum Vitae.
   D. Copy of Current Department Bylaws.
   E. A 1-4 page statement of contributions provided by the faculty member, with the statement confined to the previous 5 years of work.
      The statement should build a case for the final rating based primarily upon the overall rating from annual evaluations in the previous five years and the annual performance expectations in the bylaws. It is expected that some fluctuations in rating are normal, and that the evaluation should be based upon the modal value, rather than on individual ratings.
         1. Annual performance ratings for individual categories (e.g. Instruction) can be used to further contextualize the statement. However, the overall ratings and bylaws should be the primary focus.
         2. Additional evidence of the quality or impact of efforts beyond that requested in the bylaws can be offered.

5.4.3 Calculation of the 5-Year PTR Rating

The faculty member's 5-year PTR rating shall be based on the modal (most frequent) category of the previous five years' overall annual evaluation ratings.

For example. If a faculty member received the following distribution of overall annual evaluation ratings, he/she would receive a 5-year PTR rating of "Meets Expectations."

Year 1 – Meets Expectations

Year 2 – Does Not Meet Expectations

Year 3 – Meets Expectations

Year 4 – Meets Expectations

Year 5 – Exceeds Expectations

If the previous five years of overall annual evaluation ratings have a bimodal distribution, the faculty member shall receive a 5-year PTR rating based on the highest modal value.

5.5 Evaluation Rating Conversion

For calculating the overall annual evaluation rating for years that used the previous 5-point rating system of performance (Distinguished, Excellent, Good, Fair, and Poor), the following process shall apply:

Evaluations of "Distinguished" and "Excellent" shall be converted to evaluations of "Exceeds Expectations." Evaluations of "Good" shall be converted to evaluations of "Meets Expectations." Evaluations of "Fair" shall be converted into evaluations of "Does Not Meet Expectations." Evaluations of "Poor" shall be converted into evaluations of "Unsatisfactory."

5.5.1 Evaluation Rating Conversion for Individual Ratings

The conversion process detailed in 5.5 shall also apply when any individual (scholarship, teaching, or service) performance rating from the previous 5-point rating system needs to be converted to the new 4-point rating system for any reason. For example, evaluating teaching and service expectations for promotion to full or associate professor.

5.6 Changes to Tenure, Promotion, or PTR Standards

Standards for promotion, tenure and PTR may change. If they do, then a faculty member may choose the standards that should be applied to their evaluation. They may ask that they be evaluated using the standards that were in effect at the start of the three year period, or that they be evaluated with those that are in effect at the time of tenure and promotion or ~~SPE~~ PTR consideration. If the faculty member does not express a preference, then the standards in effect at the time of consideration will be used.

5.7 Equivalents for a Vetted Journal Publication:

The following achievements shall be valued as the equivalent of one vetted journal publication for the purposes of tenure and/or promotion.
1. One peer-reviewed, externally funded state or federal grant.
2. The first edition of a peer reviewed nationally distributed textbook, accepted and used at an institution other than UWF
3. One research monograph with a vetted publisher
4. One first edition of a computer simulation/software published nationally and accepted and used by an institution other than UWF
5. One top-tier research point (see section 6)
6. Any combination of two of the following:

    a. Textbook revisions of a peer reviewed nationally distributed textbook, accepted and used at an institution other than UWF

    b. New textbook chapters in a nationally distributed textbook, accepted and used at an institution other than UWF

    c. One peer-reviewed proceedings from regional, national or international meetings, including conference-based summary briefs

    d. One peer-reviewed State, Federal, or external association grant submission (regardless of funding status)

    e. Book chapter revisions in a nationally distributed textbook, accepted and used at an institution other than UWF.

    f. One peer-reviewed presentation, regional, national, or international, but without publication.

    g. UWF COB Research Colloquium presentations or the equivalent.

    h. Presentations at the UWF Scholar Symposium.

    i. Manual/teacher's guides, published or PAM.

7. Other scholarship or creative projects that are equivalent may be added to this list by a departmental voting process

5.7.1 Process for Adding/Removing Alternatives to the Vetted Journal Publication Equivalent List

The chair will facilitate the process of amending the peer reviewed journal equivalent list, including additions to it and removal from it. To add to the equivalent list, a faculty member may petition the departmental faculty through the chair's office. It is up to the faculty member to offer evidence of the substitute's quality as scholarship or a creative project, and to explain its contribution to the body of knowledge. The evidence should show that it deserves the same standing as journals already included in the existing lists. A majority of voting faculty must approve adding an equivalent to the list or removing it from the list.

6. Valuing "Top-tier" Publications for Tenure, Promotion, and Annual Evaluations

Promotion to Full Professor requires at least one publication in a top-tier journal or an equivalent outcome.

For tenure and/or promotion, we will value a publication in a top-tier journal on this basis; one "vetted" journal publication plus one top-tier research point (see section 5.7). In doing so, top-tier journals are granted extra weight for tenure and/or promotion decisions while recognizing the faculty are still expected to produce a certain number of journal publications even if they are all of exceptional quality.

For annual evaluations, we will value publication in top-tier journals as the equivalent of two publications in journals that are regarded as vetted, but not top-tier.

7. Additions to the Department List of Vetted and Top-Tier Journals

Sedona is used to store the vetted and top-tier journals lists. A journal that needs to be added to either list should be petitioned through Sedona.