

# Department of Communication Bylaws

## I. Department Policy

---

### 1. Voting Rights

All full-time faculty members who are tenured, tenure-earning or non-tenure earning are eligible to vote on matters pertaining to the department other than promotion and tenure. A 2/3 vote is required. Proxies will be accepted in all matters, except for personnel decisions.

Please refer to Section 1.3 under “II. Tenure, Promotion and Annual Evaluation Guidelines” for tenure and promotion voting procedures.

### 2. Department Meetings

The Department meets at least once a semester during the academic year. Meeting dates and times are set at least two weeks in advance of the meeting. Requests for agenda items are announced the week before the meeting. Minutes will either be recorded or extensive notes taken and filed.

### 3. Office Hours

Full-time teaching faculty shall be available to students during posted office hours as specified in the university 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.

### 4. Departmental Committee Duties

Committees may be formed at the request and discretion of the Chair to study the feasibility of certain projects, to review curriculum, to plan recruitment efforts, or to attend to similar departmental needs. Committees may be project-specific or standing. Committee members will be informed about the nature and length of their membership before agreeing to serve. These duties will count under service for the purposes of annual evaluations.

### 5. Departmental Program Review

The Department understands that Program Review is a necessary part of the accreditation process and of gauging the status of the program. The Department relies upon the policy and guidelines for Program Review supplied by Academic Affairs. Additionally, the faculty will identify appropriate reviewers in consultation with the Chair and the Dean of the College of Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities. Initial communication with external reviews will be undertaken by the Dean of CASSH. The final decision of reviewers is made by the Dean, from the list provided by the department and after consultation with the Chair.

### 6. Bylaw Review

All full-time faculty members will vote annually to either: 1) reaffirm the existing bylaws of the department, or 2) undertake review and revision of Department bylaws during that year. If review is recommended, the Chair will appoint a Bylaw Committee to undertake such duties. The bylaw vote will take place during the first faculty meeting of the Fall semester, each year.

## II. Tenure, Promotion and Annual Evaluation Guidelines for Full-Time Faculty Members

---

This section provides guidelines for promotion, tenure and annual evaluation for all full-time faculty members in the Department of Communication.

UWF has adopted a set of criteria and standards for the assessment of a faculty member's performance of assigned duties and responsibilities. There are three performance categories: teaching; scholarship and creative projects; and service. These assessment criteria form the basis for promotion and tenure decisions, as well as post-tenure review. UWF relies on well-vetted department bylaws, which are reviewed by the Deans of each College, to set the basis for

Revised January 2025

meeting and exceeding the expectations of each department and discipline.

**TENURE-LINE FACULTY:** Teaching, Service, and Scholarship sections apply for promotion, tenure, post-tenure review, and annual evaluations.

**NON-TENURE EARNING FACULTY:**

For faculty members who do not have scholarship requirements (Instructors and Clinical faculty), only the Teaching and Service sections apply for annual evaluations and promotion.

For promotion-seeking Clinical Line Faculty, additional teaching and service components apply. See Section IV for Clinical guidelines.

**PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION**

The following categories shall be used in evaluating faculty efforts in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service for the purposes of Annual Evaluation, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review.

- **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:** 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.

In evaluating a faculty member’s eligibility for tenure and promotion, the following table will be used as a guideline.

Promotion and tenure numerical ratings will be based on the average of the Chair’s annual evaluation rankings through the entirety of the candidate's promotional period. Each evaluation category is assigned a numerical value: Exceeds Expectations=4, Meets Expectations=3, Does Not Meet Expectations=2, and Unsatisfactory=1.

|   |   |  |                |
|---|---|--|----------------|
|   | <i>For a favorable personnel decision, the weight of evidence should show sustained performance at these levels</i>   |  |                |
| <b>Personnel Decision</b>               | <b>Teaching</b>   | <b>Scholarship and Creative Projects</b> | <b>Service</b> |
| <i>Promotion to Associate Professor</i> | An average of at least <b>Meet</b> in all three categories of the Chair’s annual evaluations, across the promotional/tenure period  |  |                |
| <i>Promotion to Full Professor</i>      | <b>An average of Exceed</b> in at least one category and at least <b>Meet</b> in the other two categories of the Chair’s annual evaluations, across the promotional/tenure period |  |                |

**1. The Department’s Role  
in Preparation of Tenure-Track Faculty**

**1.1 Mentoring Committee**

The department chair is responsible for assigning a mentoring committee of three members, at least one of which should be a tenured communication faculty member. The Mentoring Committee is expected to review progress toward tenure and promotion annually.

**1.2 Annual Evaluation of Progress**

Each year, the chair evaluates faculty members’ performance toward achieving Meeting or Exceeding Expectations ratings under each applicable evaluation category. In doing so, the chair considers documented evidence produced by

Revised January 2025

faculty to evaluate how their activities across the evaluation year demonstrate a trajectory supportive of tenure or promotion, in accordance with their line and rank.

### 1.3 Mid-point Review

#### 1.31 Purpose

UWF Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion Policy, 2023-2024 states:

“It is also the responsibility of the department to conduct a review during the midpoint of the probationary period. The Dean must identify the approximate date of the mid-point review in the initial appointment letter. The Chair shall take responsibility for ensuring that the department completes the review, whether the Chair provides the evaluation or delegates the responsibility (e.g., mentoring committee). The procedure for the review shall be described in departmental by-laws.

The mid-point review is intended to provide formative feedback to optimize faculty success in the tenure decision. The review should corroborate success and encourage faculty who are making solid progress toward tenure, inform faculty who may need to improve in selected areas of performance, and warn faculty where lack of progress could jeopardize a favorable outcome. Faculty members may elect to include a copy of the mid-point review in the tenure portfolio; however, inclusion is not required. All mid-point reviews should address the performance of annual assignments including teaching, scholarly and creative projects, and service occurring during the preceding tenure-earning years of employment. In addition, all reviews should assess overall performance and contributions critically in light of mid-point expectations.

The mid-point review will not be as extensive as the formal tenure review that occurs toward the end of the probation period, but should be based on a set of documents, including a current vita; annual evaluations; student/peer evaluation of teaching; selected examples of teaching materials and scholarship; and a self-evaluation by the faculty member. The Dean will review the department’s written mid-point review and respond to the department and the faculty member in writing. Further use of these materials is at the discretion of the faculty member.”

#### 1.32 Content

*In addition to the preceding information, the mid-point review should include a*

- a. Statement of Contributions (self-evaluation).
- b. Current CV.
- c. Annual Evaluations.
- d. Student/Peer Evaluation of Teaching.
- e. Select Examples of Teaching Materials.
- f. Select Examples of Scholarship.
- g. Select Examples of Service.
- h. Letter of Initial Appointment.
- i. Letter of Evaluation by the Chair.

#### 1.33 Preparation

- a. It is the responsibility of the faculty member’s mentors to guide the faculty member in preparing the mid-point review.
- b. All tenured faculty will be required to review the dossier and provide feedback directly to the Chair.
- c. The mentors will provide feedback to the faculty member, which will include a performance improvement plan, if necessary.
- d. The Chair will prepare a written summary of the evaluation that will go in the faculty member’s personnel file and for the Dean’s review.
- e. The Dean will review the Department’s written mid-point review and respond to the Department and the faculty member in writing.
- f. Faculty members may elect to include a copy of the mid-point review in their tenure portfolio; however, inclusion is not required.

#### 1.34 Timeline

- a. The faculty member will submit the mid-point review at the beginning of the spring semester during the third year, unless otherwise indicated in the faculty’s appointment letter.
- b. Faculty will review the dossier during the Spring semester and provide feedback within an agreed upon amount of time, set by the Chair and confirmed by the mentors.

Revised January 2025

- c. The mentors will have a meeting with the faculty member before the end of the spring semester and provide feedback to the faculty member as well as the Chair.
- d. The Chair will submit a written evaluation, along with the annual evaluation, to be submitted to the College Dean.

## 1.4 Voting

The Chair will request all tenured full-time faculty members to submit a formal evaluation on tenure for each eligible faculty member within the appropriate unit. The evaluation form should be completed and signed by each faculty member and submitted to the Chair. Other full-time faculty (excluding visiting faculty) may provide the Chair with opinions of the candidate's dossier. On a separate document, all tenured faculty in the department or unit shall vote regarding the acceptability of tenure for the candidate. The unsigned votes will be included in the tenure dossier in an envelope without disclosure of how individual faculty voted in the decision.

# 2. Teaching

## 2.1 General Guidelines

2.11. In this performance area, the ratings in the first two performance categories (Unsatisfactory and Does Not Meet Expectations) do not facilitate favorable tenure and promotion decisions.

2.12. SAIs with a response rate of less than 60% should be interpreted with caution as they may not be reflective of a professor's performance in the classroom.

2.13. In calculating Student Teaching Evaluation averages, faculty may either provide an average of student responses on all evaluation categories, or a calculated average of the two items: "Overall, assessment of instructor" and "Overall, I would rate the course organization". Depending on the design of the SAI questionnaire, these two items may be at different locations within the questionnaire from semester to semester.

2.14. All Student Teaching Evaluations for a given semester must be calculated the same way (i.e. a faculty member may not select to calculate all items for one course and only "Overall, assessment of instructor" and "Overall, I would rate the course organization" for another course in the same semester).

2.15. The SAI evaluation scores for each course will be calculated on a 5-point scale where a ranking of excellent = 5.0, very good = 4.0, good = 3.0, fair = 2.0 and poor = 1.0. The overall SAI evaluation score for an academic year will be calculated by averaging all of a faculty member's courses for that year. For example, a faculty member teaching three fall courses with SAI scores of 4.3, 4.5 and 4.7 and three spring courses with SAI scores of 4.6, 4.8, and 3.9 would have a total SAI evaluation score of 4.46 for that academic year. **NOTE:** a faculty member may choose, but is not required, to include summer session SAI evaluation scores in their overall calculations.

2.16. Course teaching evaluation averages may also be weighted at the discretion of the Department Chair in consideration of variables such as courses noted for their difficulty, graduate courses, major courses with an unusually high number of non-majors, etc.

## 2.2 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.

## 2.3 Does Not Meet Expectations

Demonstrates some positive teaching outcomes but includes major areas for concern that have a moderately negative impact on students and their learning typically as reflected by several of the indicators below. In general, teaching performance is below the department standards of excellence, or teaching evaluations average below 3.5.

*Additional Indicators:*

- Student evaluations document consistent and substantive problems.
- Syllabi fail to establish clear and relevant expectations.

Revised January 2025

- Course fails to meet objectives established in syllabi.
- Assessment practices are inadequate to support student learning and department needs (e.g., learning outcomes are inadequate, inappropriate or missing; testing strategies are ineffective or unfair).
- Goals, course content, and/or performance reflect a lack of consistent improvement efforts.
- Pedagogical practices are unsound (e.g. consistent lack of preparation or organization, frequent absences or tardiness, unhelpful feedback, weak standards, chaotic or hostile classroom environment).
- Student support practices are unsound (e.g. not responding to student inquiries, not keeping office hours, documented incidents of favoritism).
- Consistent and very negative ratings in advising, mentoring, and/or supervision of students' scholarly or creative activities.
- Special teaching assignments (e.g. honors, capstone, practicums, field experiences) avoided or poorly executed.
- Ample evidence of disrespect for students and their rights.

## 2.4 Meets Expectations

Demonstrates consistent quality teaching with positive outcomes for students as reflected by the indicators below. In general, performance at this level meets department standards of excellence.

To receive a Meets Expectations teaching evaluation, a faculty member must have an overall SAI evaluation score of 3.75 or greater and one additional performance indicator from the list below, or an overall SAI evaluation score of 3.5 or greater and three or more additional performance indicators listed below:

*Additional Indicators:*

- Student evaluation narratives document adequate impact on learning.
- Syllabi provides reasonably clear and appropriate expectations.
- Assessment practices support student learning and contribute to department SLOs.
- Course content shows evidence of continuous improvement efforts in quality control.
- Special teaching assignments (e.g. honors, capstone, practicums, field experiences) are executed with reasonable skill.
- Maintains appropriate standards of academic integrity, including respect for students and their rights.
- Participation in professional development activities focused on improving teaching quality.
- Participation in a conference presentation focused on pedagogical issues.
- Development of a new course or evidence of significant revision of an existing course
- Participation in the promotion of high-quality teaching and curriculum development in the department.
- Consistent usage and evidence of High Impact Practices in assigned coursework.
- Peer teaching evaluations assessed at the Meets Expectation level.
- Other evidence of advanced pedagogical practices and/or student impact as identified by the department chair.

## 2.5 Exceed Expectations

Demonstrates the highest degree of quality in teaching as shown by the following indicators below. In general, performance at this level exceeds department standards of excellence and is viewed as a significant departmental factor for tenure and promotion.

To receive an Exceed Expectations teaching evaluation, a faculty member must have an overall SAI evaluation score of 4.25 and one additional performance indicator from the list below, or an overall SAI evaluation score of 4.00 and five or more additional performance indicators listed below:

*Additional Indicators:*

- 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.
- A majority of student evaluation narrative statements emphasize powerful impact on learner or transformative learning experiences.
- Voluntary participation in professional development activities focused on improving teaching quality.
- Participation in a conference presentation focused on pedagogical issues.
- Course director or course lead for a regularly offered course taught by more than one faculty member (with evidence provided of course lead initiatives)
- Directing a large lecture course (50+ students)
- Development of a new course or evidence of significant revision of an existing course

Revised January 2025

- Leadership evident in the promotion of high-quality teaching and curriculum development in the department.
- Recognition by the University or a professional communication association of excellence in teaching
- Consistent usage and evidence of High Impact Practices in assigned coursework
- Course officially badged for a High Impact Practice by the UWF HIP Review Committee
- Consistent and very high ratings in advising, mentoring, and/or supervision of students' scholarly or creative activities or special teaching assignments (e.g. honors, capstone, practicums, field experiences).
- Peer teaching evaluations assessed at the Exceed Expectation level.
- Other evidence of advanced pedagogical practices and/or student impact as identified by the department chair.

## 3. Scholarship and Creative Projects

### 3.1 General Guidelines

3.11. In this performance area, the ratings in the first two performance categories (Unsatisfactory and Does Not Meet Expectations) do not facilitate favorable tenure decisions.

3.12. In assigning a scholarship rating in the annual evaluation, the chair should use the trajectory of the faculty member's scholarship activities, up to two years prior to the evaluation period. This is to capture the trajectory of longer-term projects such as books, archival scholarship, revise-and-resubmit processes, and transitioning from completed projects to new scholarship production.

3.13. In assessing scholarly and creative work, the greatest emphasis will be given to the following:

- A. (order as value criteria) Single-authored work, followed by
  - a. First-authored work
  - b. Multiple-authored work
- B. Peer reviewed work
- C. Citation of work by other scholars
- D. Awards or recipient of published critical acclaim

3.14. Scholarly achievement is divided into three tiers, with descending importance from Tier 1 to Tier 3. Faculty members will be evaluated based on the total points they earn and the distribution of the points among the three tiers.

#### Tier 1:

- a. Books published with an academic press of which the faculty member is the first or single author (3-5 points depending on the prestige of the press and impact, such as winning an award and book reviews published by an academic journal.)
- b. Books published with an academic press of which the faculty member is not the first or single author (1-2 points depending on the prestige of the press and impact, such as winning an award and book reviews published by an academic journal.)
- c. First or solo authored peer-refereed journal articles (1.5-2 points depending on the prestige<sup>1</sup> of the journal)
- d. Second or third authored peer-refereed journal articles (1 point)
- e. Published textbooks (2-3 points depending on the contribution of the faculty member<sup>2</sup> and the book's impact, demonstrated by factors such as the number of adoptions, prestige of the press, support letters from the publisher, winning an award and so on.)

#### Tier 2:

- a. Peer-Refereed Conference Presentation of original research which has been blind reviewed (.5-1 point depending on the prestige of the conference and requirement of a fully-developed paper vs abstract)
- b. Proposal writer of peer-reviewed conference panel presentation when accepted (.5 point)
- c. Invited (non-refereed) or editorial reviewed journal articles & book chapter in a scholarly book (1 point)

---

<sup>1</sup> Indicators of journal prestige include, but not limited to the following: 1. The journal is indexed in SSCI (Social Sciences Citation Index) and H-index; 2. Number of citations; 3. International, national or regional journal; 4. Award-winning. The exact points awarded to a journal publication can be determined by members of the mentoring committee who are experts in the specific research field.

<sup>2</sup> The order of authors for a textbook may not reflect the actual contribution of the individual author. For example, one may have written the majority of chapters in a textbook but is listed as the third author because he/she joined writing the textbook long after the textbook was established.

Revised January 2025

- d. Grants and research contracts (.5-1.5 points depending on the prestigious of the granting organization and amount; more points should be assigned if the faculty member is the principal or co-investigator)
- e. Public-facing scholarship projects, such as digital editions of primary source collections with editorial/scholarly notes to aid the reader in interpreting the materials (.5-1 point depending on the scope and impact of the work; more points should be assigned if the faculty is a principal investigator, editor, or director)
- f. Invited scholarly presentation at an academic setting (.5-1 point depending on the prestige of the event, )
- g. Third author and beyond journal articles (.5 point)
- h. Book chapter in a scholarly book (1 point)
- i. Academic books published with a respected trade press, of which the faculty member is the first or single author (1-2 points depending on the prestige of the press and impact, such as winning an award, book reviews published by an academic journal.)
- j. Editor of a book volume with an academic press (.5-2 points depending on the prestige of the press and impact, such as winning an award, book reviews published by an academic journal)
- k. Invited (non-refereed) journal articles and articles in conference proceedings (including proceedings journal, i.e., the paper is competitively selected and editorially reviewed after it is presented at an academic conference (2.5-1 point), depending on the prestige of the journal, authorship order, online only (vs. print publication) and whether it is competitively selected and editorially reviewed.

**Tier 3:**

- a. Contribution to a textbook, such as excerpt or an exercise/case study in a textbook (.5 point)
- b. Encyclopedia Entries (.5 point)
- c. Published book review (.25 point)
- d. Invited scholarly presentation and speaking engagements at venues other than an academic setting (.25-.5 point depending on the prestige of the event)
- e. Non-refereed conference presentations (.25 point)
- f. Member of peer-reviewed conference panel presentation (.25 point)
- g. External grants and research contracts applied for (.25-.5 points depending on the prestige of the granting organization and amount requested; more points assigned if the faculty is principal or co-investigator)

### **3.2 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.

### **3.3 Does Not Meet Expectations**

A faculty earned fewer than 3.5 points.

### **3.4 Meets Expectations**

A faculty member must earn at least 3.5 points, spread among no fewer than 2 publications. At least 2 points should be from Tier 1, with at least one journal article or book being first or solo-authored [with the exception of a textbook\*].

*\*For textbooks, the faculty member does not have to be the first or solo author. Please refer to 3.14 Tier 1.e. and Footnote 2 on Page 6.*

### **3.5 Exceeds Expectations**

A faculty member must earn 5 or more, with at least 3 points from Tier 1.

## **4. Service**

### **4.1 General Guidelines**

4.11. 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

Revised January 2025

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.

4.12 Service is broadly defined and includes a wide range of activities including, but not limited to (all service activities must be linked to the discipline in order to contribute to tenure and promotion):

- Service on university, college, and department governance.
- Service as Program Director or Coordinator.
- Community service related to one's discipline.
- Service to the university in the form of delivering courses to remote locations.
- Advising student organizations.
- Service to student organizations.
- Services related to recruitment and retention of students.
- Service on editorial review boards.
- Service on conference committees.
- Articulation efforts at various levels.
- Outreach activities that promote the department, college and/or university.
- Participation with the local professional organizations.
- Textbook, manuscript and grant reviewing activity.
- Mentoring and assisting new faculty.
- Student mentoring (including sustained graduate capstone or assistantship).
- Regional or national consultancy related to a faculty member's area of expertise.
- Service to professional/academic organizations.
- Active leadership in regional or national professional/academic organizations.
- Director of multi-section course (unless position is attached to release time).
- Involvement in speaking engagements.
- Commentary for civic groups and media outlets.
- Securing funding that directly support ongoing activities of the department or university.

4.13. In general, more weight should be given to services where a faculty member holds a leadership role and services that require significant time involvement.

## **4.2 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.

## **4.3 Does Not Meet Expectations**

Demonstrates only minor tangible progress in service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is moderately below department standards for excellence.

*Indicators:*

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

## **4.4 Meets Expectations**

Demonstrates major tangible progress in relevant service contributions as shown by the indicators below.

*Indicators:*

- Selection of service activity expresses understanding of faculty service role in a regional comprehensive university.
- Participates actively and constructively in service activity.
- Effective in service as a citizen of the department.
- Community service, if applicable, provides reasonable synergy between the faculty member's area of



expertise and the service functions.

#### 4.5 Exceeds Expectations

Demonstrates high degree of skill in service contributions as shown by the indicators below that build upon indicators for excellence. In general, service contributions exceed the department standards for excellence.

*Indicators:*

- Leadership demonstrated in targeted areas of service (e.g., holds elected office; collaborates skillfully and innovatively).
- Problems solved proactively through vigorous contributions.
- Wide external recognition (local, national or international audiences) or awards achieved for quality of service contributions.
- Community service provided significant and measurable impact; service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member’s area of expertise and the service functions.

## II. Evaluation Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review (PTR)

The University of West Florida adheres to the 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.

Post-tenure review numerical ratings will be based on the average of five years’ annual evaluations before the evaluation year on a scale of one to four. A numerical value is assigned to each of the four ratings: Exceed=4, Meet=3, Does not meet =2, and Unsatisfactory=1. The average runs up to the nearest 10<sup>th</sup> using the half-round-up rule. For example, if a person’s teaching evaluations are Exceed (4), Exceed (4), Meet (3), Meet (3), and Meet (3), the average would be  $(4+4+3+3+3)/5 = 3.4$ , which will be translated into Meets for teaching.

In evaluating a faculty member’s eligibility for tenure and promotion, the following table will be used as a guideline.

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| <i>Post-Tenure Review-Exceed</i>         | <b>3.5-4.0</b> |
| <i>Post-Tenure Review-Meet</i>           | <b>2.6-3.4</b> |
| <i>Post-tenure review-Does not meet</i>  | <b>1.5-2.5</b> |
| <i>Post-tenure review-Unsatisfactory</i> | <b>1-1.5</b>   |

## III. Promotion and Evaluation Guidelines for Instructors

Annual Evaluation Guidelines for Instructors follow the same guidelines for tenure-track faculty members excluding the requirements for Scholarship and Creative Activities. All faculty are evaluated using the “Performance Standards of Evaluation” listed on page 2 of this document.

### Departmental Criteria for Promotion to the Ranks of Senior Instructor or Senior Lecturer

The UWF guidelines for promotion to the ranks of Senior Instructor and Senior Lecturer state that UWF departments should develop departmental criteria for promotion to the ranks of Senior Lecturer and Senior Instructor in addition to the minimum University criteria for promotion to these positions. The Department of Communication requires that successful candidates for promotion to the ranks of Senior Instructor or Senior Lecturer meet at least one of the following additional departmental criteria:

- The candidate has an established record of annual evaluation ratings where a majority of the ratings (inclusive of all Dean and Chair annual ratings) are at the level of “Exceeds Expectations/Distinguished.” This level of evaluation is an enhancement of the University standard for promotion; *or*
- The candidate has an established and documented record of incorporating high impact practices into their teaching and service. The University provides examples of the types of practices that qualify as HIPs here: <https://uwf.edu/academic-engagement-and-student-affairs/departments/career-development-and-communication-engagement/students-and-alumni/gain-relevant-experience/high-impact-practices/>. This list should not

Revised January 2025

be seen as an exhaustive list of HIPS. However, the scope and spirit of the activities identified by the University should guide an understanding of what constitutes a HIP; *or*

- The candidate has an established and documented record of service at the Department and College level with additional service initiatives that impact the University, community, and/or the faculty member’s academic, creative, and scholarly discipline(s). The department extends the annual evaluation guidelines’ service activity examples in the Department of Communication bylaws to the eligible service activities for promotion review to the ranks of Senior Instructor or Senior Lecturer; *or*
- The candidate has an established and documented record of administrative work at the “Meets” or “Exceeds Expectations” level at UWF (in addition to the candidate’s teaching and service expectations). These administrative activities may be in a formalized role such as Coordinator, Director, or Assistant/Associate Chair, or in another recognized administrative role that emphasizes the oversight, direction/coordination, and/or mentorship of faculty peers or students. These types of administrative duties should be reflected in the candidate’s work assignments and annual evaluations during some or all the pre-promotion window of employment. These activities should contribute to the functional success of the Department, College, and/or University.

A candidate for promotion to the ranks of Senior Instructor or Senior Lecturer in the Department of Communication should clearly document evidence for these Departmental Criteria in the candidate’s application for promotion to the ranks of Senior Instructor or Senior Lecturer.

## IV. Promotion and Evaluation Guidelines for Clinical Professors

**4.1 Annual Evaluation Guidelines for Clinical Faculty** will follow the same guidelines for tenure-track faculty members, excluding the requirements for Scholarship and Creative Activities. All faculty are evaluated using the “Performance Standards of Evaluation” listed on page 2 of this document.

According to UWF guidelines, “promotion within the professional/clinical ranks is elective (not mandatory). The process of submitting a dossier for consideration for promotion shall be initiated upon request of the faculty member or upon agreement between faculty member and Chair.” For additional details on preparing the dossier and university processes and timelines, please see “Clinical Promotion Guidelines 2024-25” on the UWF website.

### 4.2 Departmental Criteria for Promotion to the Ranks of Associate or Full Professor of Clinical Practice

If a faculty member wishes to be promoted to the rank of associate clinical professor or full clinical professor, the guidelines below will be used.

|   | For a favorable personnel decision the weight of evidence should show sustained performance at these levels |                      |                    |
|---|---|----------------------|--------------------|
| Personnel Decision                                    | Teaching  | Professional Service | University Service |
| Promotion to Associate Professor of Clinical Practice | At least Meet in all three categories   |                      |                    |
| Promotion Professor of Clinical Practice              | Exceed in at least one category and at least meet in the other two categories                               |                      |                    |

### General Performance Criteria for Promotion in a Clinical Faculty Line

According to UWF Clinical Promotion Guidelines, 2024-25, “Eligibility for promotion involves both quality of performance and time in rank. Candidates for promotion will have to achieve any specific targets for production of teaching and professional service that are identified in department bylaws, criteria, or policies. ...Achieving promotion must reflect a demonstrated and consistently high level of performance in the Professional/Clinical faculty member’s scope of responsibilities that clearly demonstrates increasing activity within quality:

- Teaching;

Revised January 2025

- Professional practice expertise;
- Professional service;
- Appropriate University, college, and/or unit level service.” (pp. 5-6)

The following performance criteria are defined by UWF Clinical Promotions Guidelines, 2023-24, and adopted by the Department of Communication:

#### **4.21 Teaching Criteria for Promotion in a Clinical Line**

Teaching is typically the primary responsibility for Professional/Clinical Practice Faculty. It represents professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge and involves teaching in the university setting. In addition to the promotion and evaluation guidelines established in Section 2 of these bylaws, evidence of teaching excellence for Professional/Clinical Practice Faculty under consideration for promotion **should** include one or more of the following criteria, depending upon the teaching assignment:

- Teaching courses related to professional practice;
- Providing practical instruction and application of practical knowledge;
- Supervising and teaching in a professional/clinical or practice setting;
- Providing academic instruction in skills relevant to the practice of a specific discipline;
- Supporting the acquisition of professional/clinical skills for the profession;
- Coordinating and supervising professional/clinical practice, student field experiences, and internship;
- Advising/mentoring students in professional/clinical academic programs;
- Providing services or out-of-class educational opportunities for students.

#### **4.22 Professional Service Criteria for Promotion in a Clinical Line**

Professional/Clinical Practice Faculty are required to engage in professional service as defined by department bylaws on workload and on promotion. Though teaching is the main expectation of the Professional/Clinical Practice Faculty member, professional service and current expertise is what makes them unique from other types of faculty.

Professional/Clinical Practice Faculty who choose to work toward promotion have the opportunity, over time, to maintain and enhance expertise through multiple areas of service and/or research. Service activities can occur in many different contexts that allow the Professional/Clinical faculty to demonstrate professional experience.

Service for Professional/Clinical Practice Faculty should be related to one or more of the following:

- Discipline-related service
- Professional organizations
- Licensure or certification in discipline
- Discipline-related advocacy
- Applied research in discipline
- Internal and/or external grants
- Recruitment efforts within the community/professions
- Community service
- Public service
- University service
- College service
- Department service

#### **4.23 Professional Service Exemplars for Clinical Faculty**

Candidates for Professional/Clinical promotion must submit exemplars that support professional service activities defined by the service assignment. Exemplars may include activities performed that support the discipline or area of expertise, and the University, college, and/or unit. Exemplars may include:

- Service or work in field to maintain credential;
- Service that reflects contractual assignment;
- Obtaining new / maintaining current professional or clinical licenses and/or certifications;
- Active roles / leadership in professional organizations;
- Service that is consistent with activities defined in the department bylaws;
- Scholarship that supports advancements in the area of expertise;
- Grants and technical reports that support advancements in the area of expertise;
- Publications that support advancements in the area of expertise;
- Presentations that support advancements in the area of expertise;
- Activities that support advancements in the area of expertise;
- Professional development leadership in the area of expertise;
- Activities that support advancement in the community relative to the area of expertise;
- Leadership in the University, college, or unit;
- Administration in the University, college, or unit.

Revised January 2025

## **Appendix 1: Revision and Ratification History**

2010 – Bylaws ratified

2016-2017 – Teaching section of bylaws was revised and approved at the department level only

2020 – Service, scholarship, and teaching sections revised and approved; mid-point review and mentoring responsibilities added; clarity on voting rights added. All changes voted and approved by department

2021 – redlined version reaffirmed, minor changes made to bring bylaws into compliance with new UWF bylaw review process. Department members voted to approve [12-10-21]

2022 – Revised bylaws [redline changes and clean copy] submitted to CASSH Dean’s Office and CASSH Council [Jan. 27, 2022]

2022 – Bylaw revisions approved by Provost’s Office for posting on website [correspondence, Brian Whitney, July 28, 2022]

2023 – 3x3 “checker box” promotion and tenure grid removed from bylaws, as per mandate from Provost’s Office [June 2023]

2024 – New performance standards of evaluation added to comport with BOG regulation 10.003 (pg.2); all evaluation criteria converted from 5-category scale (Distinguished - Poor) to a 4-category scale (Exceeds Expectations - Unsatisfactory) to align with BOG regulation 10.003, across teaching, service, and scholarship categories; clarification added for annual evaluation of progress (1.2); evaluation guidelines added for post-tenure review (formerly sustained performance evaluation) (Section II, pg. 9); evaluation and promotion guidelines added for Instructor/Lecturer line faculty (Section III, pg. 9); evaluation and promotion guideline added for Clinical faculty (Section IV, pg. 10). [Faculty voted to approve April 11, 2024]

2024 - Revised bylaws submitted to Brian Whitney, Office of the Provost [April 11, 2024]

2024 – Bylaws approved by Office of the Provost [email correspondence, Dallas Snider, April 19, 2024]

2024 – Updated bylaws voted on by faculty [email correspondence, May 7, 2024] and submitted to Brian Whitney, Office of the Provost [May 7, 2024]

2025 - Proposed revisions for bylaws submitted to voting faculty [January 30, 2025]. Approved by faculty Jan 31, 2025

2025 - Approved by CASSH Dean, Jan 31, 2025. Sent to Provost’s Office