

**Usha Kundu, MD College of Health
Department of Psychology
By-Laws**

MISSION

Through innovative teaching and research, the Department of Psychology challenges and inspires undergraduate and graduate students to apply psychological science to everyday life and the pursuit of a healthier society. We are also committed to evidence-based practice and service through the development of knowledge of human behavior and enhancement of quality of life, not only for our students, but also for the profession and broader communities at the local, state, regional, and global levels.

ETHICS

One theme that unites faculty of the department beyond individual discipline or licensure is that we are all faculty members. Thus, the [Statement on Professional Ethics](#) by the American Association of University Professors is adopted as our ethical guidelines. Those who are members of other professional organizations will be held to those standards as well. These standards apply to the use of technology and social media. Faculty are advised to exercise discretion in the use of technology and social media, as well as in their decisions to provide students access to their professional and private social media. In particular, faculty are cautioned to avoid unprofessional communication with and/or discussion of colleagues and students through technology and social media. Furthermore, it is expected and required that all faculty members adhere to university regulations, State laws, Federal laws and other required guidelines and regulations required by the State University System and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. Adherence to ethical standards does not supplant any obligation to comply with relevant legal regulations.

DEPARTMENT CITIZENSHIP

To promote the optimal functioning of the department, faculty members are expected to participate in a professional and collegial manner in professional activities that help the department achieve its goals. These obligations include committee work within the department, but also extend to other activities that strengthen the presence of the department on campus. Attendance and collegial participation in department meetings, assistance in outreach activities on behalf of the department, participation in campus events sponsored by the department, and presence at college and university functions (e.g., campus and community-based colloquia and talks; award ceremonies; college-wide meetings; graduation) represent effective and meaningful citizen contributions.

FACULTY MEETINGS

Faculty shall meet at least 3 times during both the Fall and Spring semesters. Additional meetings may be called on an "as needed" basis as determined by the Chairperson. Any faculty member can request a meeting, but the final decision to hold one is that of the Chairperson,

unless requested by a majority of the voting faculty. The Chairperson or Chairperson's designee shall be present at all official department-wide meetings. The Chairperson shall make a reasonable effort to conduct the meeting in an effective and timely manner. Faculty shall make a reasonable effort to maintain a collegial and constructive atmosphere in all deliberations.

An agenda will be provided to the faculty at least one week prior to the meeting. Items to be placed on the agenda, and sufficient information about any items requiring a vote, must be submitted to the Chairperson at least 6 business days prior to the meeting. Any items submitted after the deadline will be included at the discretion of the Chairperson and identified as such. An item may be added to the agenda at the beginning of a faculty meeting with a majority vote of the present voting members. If an item is added to the agenda due to urgent circumstances, absent faculty will be notified and given an opportunity to cast a ballot if possible.

FACULTY VOTING PROTOCOL

If a faculty member is unable to attend a meeting, that member may grant a written or electronic proxy to another member for the purpose of voting on specified items from the prepared agenda.

Also:

- A simple majority of the voting members in the department shall constitute a quorum.
- Any voting member may make a motion and all motions must be seconded.
- Votes may be cast by hand or voice.
- A secret ballot shall be used if requested by any 2 or more voting members.
- Electronic, telephone, or mail balloting may be conducted as appropriate.

Voting Members

Members of the faculty who are tenured or in tenure-track lines and who hold the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor in the Department of Psychology are voting members. Voting members in phased retirement shall retain voting privileges until completion of the phased retirement period. Retired faculty members, including those with emeritus status, do not have voting privileges. Voting privileges may be granted to individuals in full-time, non-tenure track faculty lines for a determined period of time by a two-thirds majority vote of the voting members.

Non-voting Members

The UWF Faculty Handbook defines ranked faculty, Adjunct Faculty Members and Faculty Associates. Faculty Associates are appointments that do not include compensation, but that may include special privileges and responsibilities. Persons with this status may or may not be otherwise affiliated with the University. Adjunct Faculty Members and Faculty Associates may participate in faculty meetings and discussions of key department issues.

SELECTION OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR

The College Dean, with consideration of department faculty recommendation, officially appoints the Chairperson. The Chairperson shall ordinarily serve a three-year term, which can be extended

by the Dean upon consideration of the recommendation by the faculty. The faculty recommendation to the Dean shall be generated as follows:

During the fall semester of the third year of an incumbent's tenure as Chairperson, the Executive Committee (EC) shall meet with the incumbent to determine that individual's preference for remaining Chairperson for another term. The EC will consult with the Dean regarding the viability of a 2nd term for the incumbent and/or the viability of other potential candidates. The EC will then seek input from the faculty regarding:

- whether there is any tenured member at or above the rank of associate professor to be considered for the Chairperson position for the next term.
- the general level of satisfaction with the incumbent.
- whether a search should be conducted for a candidate outside the department.

If there is a member of the faculty who wishes to be considered as Chairperson, the EC will advise that person to meet with the Dean to discuss the viability of his/her candidacy. If the incumbent wishes to be considered for a second term and there is one or more other potential candidates, the EC will conduct an election to determine the faculty's preference. Each candidate, including the incumbent, will be asked to provide a written statement to the faculty describing

- a vision for the department over the next 3 years,
- a description of areas in need of change, and
- potential strategies for accomplishing the changes and achieving the vision.

Voting members will review these statements and each candidate will be afforded an opportunity to meet with the voting members as a whole for open discussion of key issues. Following these steps, voting members will vote by secret ballot. The candidate who receives over 50% of the votes will be recommended to the Dean as Chairperson for the subsequent three-year term. For the purpose of selection of the Chairperson, two-thirds of the eligible voting members must cast a non-abstaining ballot for the election to be valid. If no candidate receives over 50% of the votes, a second election will be held one week later. If no candidate receives over 50% of the vote at that time, all candidate names will be forwarded to the Dean for consideration.

If the incumbent expresses a preference for remaining in the Chairperson position for an additional three-year term, and if no faculty member wishes to be considered in an election, the EC will provide feedback to the incumbent based on their survey of the faculty.

The EC will communicate the faculty's preference to the Dean. If the Dean concurs with the faculty's decision, the individual will be named Chairperson. If the Dean does not concur, the EC will request a meeting between the Dean and the faculty to address the issue and seek resolution prior to formalizing any appointment.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Standing Committees:

There is one standing committee in the department as described below. The Chairperson appoints members annually before the beginning of the Fall term.

Executive Committee: The Executive Committee serves as representatives of the faculty to the Chairperson to address and resolve issues deemed important for deliberation by the Chairperson. EC members will consult with the Chairperson upon request or may receive specific assignments from the Chairperson to help the department achieve its goals. The EC shall be comprised of at least three tenured or tenure-track faculty members who hold rank in the department. The Chairperson shall make a concerted effort to appoint members to the Executive Committee to form a representative sample of the faculty while meeting the specific needs of the Chairperson and the department.

Ad Hoc Committees:

The Chairperson appoints ad hoc committees as the need arises. Examples and their respective objectives include:

Graduate Admissions: To evaluate and approve all students admitted, adhering to current UWF graduate admissions policies, ethical standards, and other university guidelines for fair practices. This committee may also evaluate applications for financial assistance and departmental assistantships.

Graduate Education and Learning Committee: To evaluate, develop, and enhance Psychology graduate programs at the University of West Florida.

Undergraduate Education and Learning Committee: To evaluate, develop, and enhance the Psychology undergraduate programs at the University of West Florida.

Faculty and Staff Enhancement Committee: To examine, develop, and recommend policies and procedures that foster a positive and supportive culture of work-life effectiveness.

Community Outreach Committee: To facilitate departmental capacity to create sustainable community outreach endeavors.

Search Committees:

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

optimal balance of representatives from diverse backgrounds as well as maintain appropriate generational cohorts of faculty within the department.

A faculty search committee shall be formed consisting of members appointed by the Chairperson. In appointing members, the Chairperson shall strive for diverse representation across seniority, ethnicity, gender, etc. and knowledge of the field in which the search is being conducted. A member from outside the department is appointed as appropriate. The Committee Chairperson must be a tenured faculty member of the department (of any rank). The committee may include a graduate or advanced undergraduate student to represent the student perspective and also provide some professional experience to the student. The search committee responds and reports to the hiring official, who can be the College Dean or department Chairperson. The committee will adhere to all UWF policy and other pertinent regulations regarding the conduct of searches. For example, the committee's duties include following the procedures outlined for faculty hiring by the Office of Academic Affairs and shall be consistent with Sunshine Law. They will draft search materials, including advertisements and selection criteria, and submit these to faculty for approval prior to publication. The department faculty values diversity in hiring and emphasizes the recruitment of minority members as a critical component of establishing an optimal candidate pool. The committee typically will conduct phone/video interviews to identify finalists for the position. In ideal circumstances, up to three candidates will be invited for an on-campus interview. All candidates, regardless of prior history with department, will complete the same protocol for the campus visit.

Department members shall participate in the on-campus interview by making reasonable efforts to attend the candidate's formal presentation, which allows department members to assess the candidate's teaching and research potential. The search committee will also ask some department members to participate more directly in interview groups or serve as escorts/participants during meals. The faculty will assess the strengths and limitations of all candidates and send their feedback to the search committee. At the conclusion of the review process, the search committee will forward a comprehensive list of strengths and weaknesses to the hiring official for final determination. The hiring official or designee (such as the Chairperson) will enter negotiations with the preferred candidate. The hiring official or designee will notify the department members when a candidate has accepted or rejected the department's offer.

Mentoring Committees:

The mentoring process is focused on both the *career/instrumental* functions and the *psychosocial* functions that have been identified as part of successful mentoring. Career functions involve such activities as coaching, sponsoring, giving professional advice, introducing to others in the organization who can be of career assistance, explaining the typical routes to advancement, increasing positive exposure in work-related settings, and guiding the mentee through the process of annual evaluations, mid-point review, and preparation of the dossier to submit for tenure and promotion. Psychosocial functions include provision of friendship, role-modeling, confirmation and acceptance, and other supportive behaviors.

Guidelines for mentoring:

1. Each untenured faculty member should be assigned a minimum of two mentors from among the tenured faculty in the department. Visiting faculty and post-tenure Associate Professors may also be assigned a mentor from among senior faculty, if requested.
2. Mentor-mentee assignments continue at the discretion of the involved faculty members and Chairperson. The assignment can be extended by mutual agreement, but it should be recognized that over time a mentee's needs may change and therefore various senior faculty may be more helpful from one year to the next.
3. The mentors shall be appointed by the department Chairperson, in consultation with the junior and senior faculty members, taking into consideration the unique needs of junior faculty, the other assignments of senior faculty, and other relevant factors.
4. Mentors' work assignments shall include the mentoring assignment as department service.
5. Mentor-mentee pairs should agree to meet at regular intervals during the academic year for the purpose of discussing factors that will affect the professional growth and adaptation to the University of the junior faculty. Both partners should take the initiative in arranging these interactions. Although this is a formal mentoring program, it would be desirable for participants to try to develop the types of informal interactions that would occur had they chosen one another spontaneously.
6. At the end of the academic year (or other period of assignment) the Chairperson should solicit feedback from all participants about the perceived effectiveness of the relationship and areas in which further support would be useful.
7. Because the Chairperson is responsible for career development and evaluation for all faculty, she or he should not be assigned as a mentor during the Chairperson's term of service.

ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

In accordance with UWF and BOT policy, evaluations shall be conducted by the Chairperson annually at the end of the Spring term for all tenured and tenure earning faculty. Annual evaluation procedures must be consistent with the [UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement](#) and the [University of West Florida Academic Affairs Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion Policy](#). The Chairperson shall follow the criteria for evaluating faculty that are incorporated into these by-laws as Appendix A.

MID-POINT REVIEW

The departmental mid-point review (MPR) process conforms to the UWF policy. The junior faculty member will be informed of the time at which the MPR will take place at the time of initial appointment. The tenured faculty members who are currently serving as the junior faculty members' mentors at the time of his or her MPR will coordinate the process.

Materials:

The mentors are responsible for guiding the candidate in preparing the MPR dossier, which will include the following materials:

Statement of Contributions

Current CV

Letter of Initial Appointment

Chairperson's and Dean's Annual Evaluations for previous 2 years

Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) data as required for annual evaluations

Peer Evaluations of Teaching

(The mentee may elect which peer evaluations are most advantageous to use rather than including all peer reviews conducted during the probationary period).

Examples of teaching materials, service activities, and scholarly contributions

Optional: If they believe their work is insufficiently known in the department, the probationary faculty member may request to deliver a colloquium to present his/her dossier to available department members, who can provide feedback and support.

Reviewers:

All tenured faculty members will be required to review the dossier. The mentors shall facilitate a meeting with all tenured faculty members to discuss strengths and weaknesses. The mentors will provide the feedback to the probationary faculty member with the Chairperson, including a performance improvement plan, if deemed necessary. The probationary faculty member may request to meet with the entire faculty for feedback.

The Chairperson will prepare a written summary of the evaluation for the personnel file and for the Dean's review and response to the probationary faculty member, as currently outlined in the UWF guidelines.

Use of Materials:

Further use of MPR materials is at the discretion of the probationary faculty member. Inclusion of MPR materials in the tenure portfolio is not a requirement. The probationary faculty member may wish to include the Chairperson's MPR summary if the candidate earned a laudatory review or if the candidate can demonstrate successful efforts in remediating any deficiencies noted in the summary.

Timeline:

The original letter of appointment identifies when the MPR is to take place. In that year, the probationary faculty member will submit the MPR dossier at the beginning of the Spring Semester. The faculty will review the dossier during Spring semester. The mentors shall facilitate a meeting with the faculty for feedback in cases where additional group review will be helpful to the committee in completing their evaluation. Then, the mentors will meet with the probationary faculty member, and also provide their feedback to the Chairperson. The Chairperson will submit a written evaluation along with the annual evaluation, which will be submitted to the College Dean.

Timeline for the Mid-Point Review

Fall Semester: Mentors meet with probationary faculty member to guide preparation of the dossier.

Spring Semester:

- Week 1: Probationary faculty member submits final dossier to mentors to assure it is in order.
- Week 3: Mentors inform tenured faculty that dossier is available for review.
- Week 4-6: Tenured faculty review dossier and complete tenure evaluation form presented in the Annual Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion Policy. The optional colloquium, if requested, can be scheduled during this time.
- Week 7-8: Mentors shall facilitate a meeting with all tenured faculty to gather feedback.
- Week 9-10: Mentors meet with Chairperson to discuss feedback and prepare a performance improvement plan, if deemed necessary.
- Week 11-12: Mentors and Chairperson meet with probationary faculty member to give feedback.
- Week 15: Chairperson prepares written summary and submits to mentors to review. Written report is submitted to the candidate.

Post-Spring Semester: Chairperson submits written summary to the Dean with the annual evaluation.

TENURE AND PROMOTION

Eligibility for tenure and promotion shall be consistent with the most recent revision of the [University of West Florida Academic Affairs Annual Evaluation, Tenure, & Promotion Policy](#). The Chairperson is responsible for informing the faculty member of his/her eligibility and the requirements for tenure and promotion (see criteria in attached appendix). The mentoring committee is responsible for guiding the probationary faculty member in preparation of the dossier. The Chairperson is responsible for conducting the formal polling of eligible faculty for decisions on tenure and promotion, according to university policy. The results of these procedures will then be forwarded to the Dean.

SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Excerpts from Collective Bargaining Agreement (2020-2023 Article 11.3(b))

(1) The University shall conduct Sustained Performance Evaluations (SPE) on tenured faculty in the ranks of Professor and Associate Professor. The purpose of the Sustained Performance Evaluation is to assess the faculty member's sustained performance and professional growth as of the date of the evaluation. The expectations for sustained performance shall be aligned with the qualifications for tenure in place at the time of the evaluation.

(2) The Sustained Performance Evaluation shall be conducted in the tenured faculty member's sixth (6th) year after receiving tenure and every sixth (6th) year thereafter and will evaluate the faculty member on his or her performance over the previous six (6) year period. Each faculty member may elect a one (1) year deferral once in his or her career at UWF. This would allow the sustained performance evaluation to be conducted in the seventh (7th) year. When a faculty member elects to utilize the one-time, one-year postponement of the SPE, the faculty member's next, and all subsequent, SPEs will follow a six-year schedule from the one-year postponement.

The Sustained Performance Evaluation Schedule can be found using the following link:
<https://uwf.edu/academic-affairs/resources/sustained-performance-evaluation//>.

OFFICE HOURS

During the fall and spring semesters, each faculty member shall hold four (4) physical office hours per week spread across at least two days and be available at other times by appointment. In addition, it is expected that faculty will respond to student electronic contact (e.g. email, phone) generally within two (2) business days.

SUMMER TEACHING OPPORTUNITIES

The department's first priority for summer teaching is to the students. Therefore, courses will be assigned to those faculty who have the expertise to teach those courses most needed by students. If funding permits, all faculty members who want to teach during the summer will be assigned to teach one course. If funding does not permit each faculty member to teach one course, priority for assigning courses shall be as follows:

- First, newly hired full-time faculty members (within 2 years of hiring).
- Second, provided faculty have the expertise to teach the courses required that term, the remaining tenured and tenure-track faculty members will be given priority.

If funding is still available after all faculty who wish to teach have been assigned to teach one course, the assignment of a second course will be based on student needs and at the discretion of the Chairperson. Full-time faculty requests shall be given priority over adjuncts whenever possible.

Faculty are not contractually obligated to supervise students in unscheduled teaching (thesis, internship, directed studies) without compensation during the summer. When funding is available, such unscheduled teaching can be included in the summer work assignment for compensation. A faculty member may independently and voluntarily elect to engage in such activity without compensation. In such cases, the Chairperson will consider and include this activity in the annual evaluation.

OVERLOAD ASSIGNMENTS

The department typically does not encourage overload assignments in order to protect faculty time to ensure the fulfillment of teaching, research, and service obligations. However, when departmental needs dictate, faculty members may be asked to accept an additional, voluntary teaching assignment for overload compensation or future release time. Special care should be taken by the department Chairperson and the mentoring committee of untenured faculty to protect the faculty member from pressure to seek or accept an overload assignment that will interfere with the faculty member's progress toward tenure and promotion.

REVISION OF DEPARTMENT BY-LAWS

Amendments to department by-laws may be proposed and voted on during any spring or fall semester faculty meeting. Approval of any amendment or revision requires a two-thirds majority of the voting members. The text and rationale of the proposed amendment must be submitted to the Chairperson and distributed to the voting membership at least 10 workdays prior to the meeting at which the change is to be considered. Full-time faculty members who are on sabbatical retain voting rights on by-laws change. However, the burden of staying current with the status of by-laws voting falls to the faculty member. The Chairperson shall not be obligated to provide special notice to those on sabbatical of potential changes beyond regular updates and notices forwarded to all faculty members. The current version of the by-laws will be distributed to all faculty and staff of the department and posted for public access on the department, college, and university websites.

Psychology Department Annual Evaluation/Promotion & Tenure/ Sustained Performance Evaluation Guidelines

Table of Contents

Annual Evaluation Guidelines	12
Tenure and Promotion Guidelines	19

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Developmental Model & University T&P Guidelines	24
Appendix B. Frequently Asked or Anticipated Questions about T&P	27
Appendix C. Exemplars of Successful Annual Evaluation for Early Assistant Professors	31
Appendix D. Exemplars of Profiles of Successful Promotion to Associate Professor	32
Appendix E. Additional Notes for Preparing for Personnel Decisions	33
Appendix F. Sustained Performance Evaluation Guidelines	36

Annual Evaluation Guidelines

Guidance for Assembling Annual Evaluation Statement of Contribution

Note: Each rank builds on expectations from the prior rank.

Faculty members develop a reflective narrative to make the claim that evidence exists to support a specific target of performance (e.g., excellent, distinguished) in their annual evaluation statement of contribution. Faculty members still retain the right not to self-assess the category of performance (i.e., labeling one's own performance as excellent or distinguished).

TEACHING

All ranks are expected to fulfill a basic core of teaching responsibilities, including accessibility through observed office hours, responding to student emails, punctually tracking and reporting student performance, and reporting misconduct.

The department standard for teaching is excellence. Regardless of rank, distinguished performance needs to reflect sustained high levels of achievement that set the person's performance apart from and above departmental expectations for excellence.

In general, making the case for teaching excellence/distinction can be accomplished by developing a narrative and supplying selected artifacts that reflect some of the following elements:

- Description of student achievements in course outcomes (assessment data, not grade distributions)
- Well-designed and engaging syllabi
- Evidence of creative instructional, assignment, or assessment design (e.g., Powerpoints, handouts, assignments, group projects, study guides, rubrics, exam design, access to canvas course infrastructure, or other instructional artifacts)
- Evidence of high-impact practices (e.g., learning communities, service learning, research with faculty, internship/field experience, study abroad, culminating senior experience)
- Evidence of continuous improvement efforts, such as:
 - Revised syllabi, assessments, or assignments
 - Responses to constructive feedback from SAI narratives or numbers, peer observations, or chair recommendations
 - Participation in professional development
- External validations of quality (e.g., peer observations that highlight teaching strengths, teaching award nominations)

University guidelines obligate us to reflect on and report results of Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI). Faculty should appropriately interpret numeric data and student comments and discuss how major themes/patterns identified in these have led to improvements in courses. We believe the best use of the SAI is in helping faculty determine strategies for improvement.

We support the value of incorporating peer observations as part of the department's process. Although not a requirement, peer reviews can bolster annual evaluation claims made for excellence or distinction.

Mitigating factors in interpreting annual SAI results should take into account assignments or activities that may suppress ratings. These higher-risk challenges can include online course assignments, teaching classes that are less popular (e.g., research methods), incorporating high-impact practices that tend not to be appreciated by students who dislike the workload, or other mitigating factors, such as weather or health challenges. These risk factors should be reflected in appropriate performance designations in the annual review. When students provide narrative complaints that are clearly outlying from the majority opinion of teacher performance, reviewers should be cautious about evaluative tendencies to pay too much attention to negative information in their review decisions unless the complaint involves an egregious concern (e.g., harassment, hostile climate). Under no circumstance should a teaching evaluation rating be based solely on SAI results.

The following provides guidance on assessing Excellence and Distinction in each rank for annual evaluations.

EARLY ASSISTANT PROFESSOR (PRE-MIDPOINT REVIEW)

Excellence can be documented using selections from the following options:

- Well-designed syllabi with measurable student learning outcomes
- Assessment results of active learning strategies (e.g., tracking improvement of analytic skills over the course of the semester, students meet established performance benchmark)
- Peer reviews that attest to observed teaching strengths (includes internal Quality Matters [QM] review of online courses)
- Pursuit of continuous improvement (e.g., attending local teaching development activities, teaching conferences, goals derived from student assessment of instruction, meetings with mentors)
- Well-articulated teaching philosophy with clear evidence of how the philosophy was implemented in classroom strategies
- SAI reflection statement with an emphasis on the overall pattern of feedback along with suggestions for improvement
- Graph of selective SAI ratings across all courses (faculty should select appropriate indices to support narrative claims)
- Absence of a *pattern* of complaints about teaching performance

Distinction can be documented using selections from the following:

- External validation of high-quality teaching (e.g., teaching nominations and awards, external QM certification, publication of teaching practices)
- Evidence of providing transformational student experience (derived from patterns of transforming claims from narrative teaching evaluations or exceptional course design)

LATE ASSISTANT PROFESSOR/ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR/PROFESSOR

Since excellence in teaching is the department standard, the indicators below build on the performance characteristics described at the Assistant level. Teaching distinction should reflect exemplary practices. Distinguished performance should demonstrate broader impacts in teaching, such as mentoring of other faculty in teaching, in addition to strong performance in the classroom.

Excellence can be documented using selections from the following (in addition to the items above):

- Clear pattern of effective teaching over the academic year (allowing for some variation in getting the rare clunky class)
- Clear evidence of incorporating high-impact practices (e.g., capstone projects, service-learning, written or oral communication experiences, collaborative projects, in-class research, portfolios)
- Successful mentorship of students using intentional strategies through teaching or research (e.g., unscheduled teaching at graduate or undergraduate levels, mentoring teaching apprentices, managing student research teams)
- Willingness to take risks in the spirit of continuous improvement (e.g., teaching less popular courses that may have potential for predictable lower student assessment of instruction, incorporating a new higher-risk, high-impact practice)

Distinction can be documented using selections from the following (in addition to the distinguished items above):

- External validation of high-quality teaching
 - Local, national teaching awards
 - Invited addresses related to teaching
 - Grant pursuits that improve teaching
 - Quality Matters or other external certification
- High-quality management of productive research teams, with activities such as the following:
 - Didactic, weekly meetings to discuss articles
 - Invited speakers to engage students in the community
 - Career connection for students (e.g., resume development, graduate school mentorship)
 - Student research presentations in conference venues (e.g., Student Scholars Symposium)
 - Mentorship on independent projects (e.g., Honors Theses and Summer Undergraduate Research Program projects)
- Claims related to tangible successful student performance outcomes, such as:
 - Coaching for graduate school and successful admittance
 - Preparing successful students for competitions
- Sharing teaching expertise formally with colleagues (e.g., at college events, teaching conference presentations)
- Providing leadership in curriculum redesign
- Reliable and helpful mentorship of colleagues that may include conducting peer observations

SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

All ranks are expected to engage in research at a level that justifies the portion of workload that is set aside for scholarship/service activities. Typically, scholarly/creative activities and service activities should account for approximately 25% of our professional time.

We broadly define scholarship to include traditional peer-reviewed research, scholarship of teaching and learning, community-based action research, and scholarship of interpretation (e.g., textbook writing). Dissemination should clearly align with the scholarly agenda set forth and, where possible, the author should be able to provide evidence of impact (e.g., quality of journal, citation capture, community impact, etc.).

The scholarship environment currently includes publishing opportunities in “for profit” journals that are characterized as predatory. As such, faculty should be aware that context matters in choices for dissemination of ideas. We discourage faculty from publishing in these venues and endorse the right of reviewers to question the reputation of journals or ask for documentation of journal quality, because it will have a bearing on the reputation of the department.

We encourage collaboration and student involvement in research, although faculty should still be mindful to maintain a program of scholarship that follows a clear, individual research agenda, even if faculty engage in other collaborative projects. Faculty should develop a research agenda that demonstrates ongoing pursuit of ideas that can be disseminated.

We recognize that some projects may require protracted time to complete. Evidence of activity needs to show progress on an annual basis for progress to be credited. In addition, some traditional peer-reviewed research projects may not lead to acceptance. Faculty should broaden the scope of their efforts to provide other sources of evidence of scholarly impact if rejected manuscripts point toward diminished impact of the work.

In the absence of actual dissemination of scholarly work in the evaluation year, faculty should provide evidence of actively pursuing research agenda (e.g., evidence of ongoing data collection for long-term research projects, documenting progress on project, expected timeline, and how the work supports progress towards tenure and/or promotion). Failure to convert ongoing projects into tangible outcomes has the potential to jeopardize tenure and promotion decisions.

EARLY ASSISTANT PROFESSOR (PRE-MIDPOINT REVIEW)

Prior to midpoint tenure review, the assistant professor should concentrate on establishing a viable, intentional, and sustainable research agenda that demonstrates promising scholarship. Evidence for success which warrants an excellent rating at this level includes selections from the following:

- Submit an article or grant proposal
- Translate dissertation work into forms that can be disseminated
- Present a poster as a significant contributor at a regional/national/international conference

- Submit scholarly work to less selective outlets (e.g., lower-tiered journals, regional conferences)

To inform the scholarly agenda, faculty should:

- Consult with the chair and mentors
- Identify preferred outlets for scholarly products
- Attend conferences to enrich scholarly background

Prior to the mid-point tenure review, faculty should strive to publish at least two scholarly works. Wrapping up graduate school projects is likely to constitute the earliest activities related to scholarly dissemination. However, the research agenda should stabilize as an independent function post-midpoint review. Following midpoint tenure review, departmental standards for excellence should apply.

LATE ASSISTANT PROFESSOR/ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR/PROFESSOR

Excellence can be documented using selections from the following (in addition to the items pertaining to excellence above):

The goal in a given academic year is to make definitive forward progress on a scholarly research agenda. The goal should be one good scholarly effort per academic year. This expectation does not necessarily have to result in dissemination during the reporting year, but faculty should report what kind of progress has been achieved to claim annual credit for projects that are protracted. One good scholarly work can be represented in the following ways:

- Book chapter
- Review paper submission/in-press/published
- Peer-reviewed article submission/in-press/published
- Peer-reviewed conference proceeding paper
- Competitive grant/contract submission (external)
- Community-based action research (e.g., white papers, technical reports, issue briefs)
- Presentations (e.g., symposia, panels, posters) at regional/national/international conferences as significant contributor

Additional supporting evidence that reinforces claims for excellence but do not substantiate excellence claims by themselves include:

- Regional poster presentations alone would require a strong rationale in order to be considered excellent
- Research mentorship of and co-authorship with students on conference presentations or papers led by students
- Blogs or podcasts

Distinguished can be documented using selections from the following (in addition to the distinguished items above):

Scholarly outputs generate greater than one good piece of scholarly work per year or an equivalent large scale/high-impact output, for example:

- Two or more peer-reviewed publications or equivalent (published, in-press or revise and resubmit status; at least one should be published or in-press)
- Publication in a top-tier journal
- Book/textbook publication
- Successful competitive grant/contract capture (external)
- Invited research presentations in national/international venues
- Invited scholarship in selective journals and book projects
- Research awards

Additional supporting evidence that reinforces claims for distinction but do not substantiate distinguished claims by themselves include:

- Testimony from students that research influence has been transformational
- Facilitating research opportunities for colleagues

SERVICE

Faculty should engage in effective departmental citizenship, including attending and participating in department meetings, contributing to the department assessment plan, rendering service to assist departmental work, and attending graduation ceremonies.

EARLY ASSISTANT PROFESSOR (PRE-MIDPOINT REVIEW)

We acknowledge that activities in service need to be chosen carefully, with an eye toward preserving time to get new faculty properly launched in their teaching and research obligations. As such, beginning assistant professors should concentrate on service assignments within the department and should work directly with mentors and the chair to navigate wise service choices. This strategy facilitates learning the department culture and getting better known among the colleagues who will ultimately be responsible for tenure and promotion support. Chairs should adopt a protective strategy about allocating service assignments to those ends. Early assistant professors should work with their mentors and the chair to begin to formulate a service agenda (i.e., identifying the kinds of service that will be most appealing in campus, citizen, and professional contexts).

Assuming the midpoint review is favorable, the service agenda should expand to include college and university assignments. Participation at the college level will be especially helpful in connection with the eventual T&P review.

Early assistant professors should be cautious about engaging in activities that might be construed as distinguished service, since the primary expectation is to focus on research and teaching in the early years.

Excellence can be documented by the following:

- Serves on at least one *active* department, college, or university committee or task force (provide tangible outcome of committee work where appropriate, e.g., completed curriculum map, program recommendations, number of IRB proposals reviewed)

- Participates in one-time essential service activities (e.g., OUR proposal reviewer, science fair judge, student recruitment)
- Editorial services (e.g., serving as journal or text reviewer)
- Serves professional associations on task forces or committees
- Provides discipline-related service to community organizations

Distinguished can be documented by the following:

- Engages in substantial, high-impact community service/outreach
- Engages in substantial service to discipline beyond editorial work or peer-review (e.g., serves on APA committee)

LATE ASSISTANT PROFESSOR/ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR/PROFESSOR

Expectations for excellence in service involve more than just participation in committees. Quality contributions should be the focus of the case being made while recognizing that differentiating one's impact in group projects may not be easy to do. Standards for excellence and distinction are comparable in most cases for faculty who have passed the mid-point review. The service agenda at the associate level can be regarded as more exploratory and the goal of the Associate Professor should be supporting the effectiveness of the organization through their service. In contrast, Professors' service agenda should clearly reflect their professional and personal values. Professors should pursue higher profile service obligations, taking on more difficult challenges whether on or off campus. Leadership is expected, as well as mentoring of others in regard to service execution.

Associate professors should start assuming leadership positions to demonstrate greater influence and impact, although we recognize that leadership opportunities may not be available each year.

Excellence can be documented using selections from the following (in addition to the excellence items above):

- Serves effectively on UWF committees or task forces (demonstrates reasonable flexibility about serving departmental needs, while taking into account other professional demands)
 - Late Assistant and Associate Professors should participate in at least two UWF committees (in the absence of other external service obligations)
 - Professors should participate in at least three UWF committees (in the absence of other external service obligations)
- Advises an active, high quality student organization (e.g., Psi Chi)
- Participates in essential institutional service activities (e.g., OUR proposal reviewer, science fair judge, recruitment activity)
- Serves effectively as a formal mentor for one or more assistant or associate professors
- Serves effectively on discipline-related service assignments for professional or community organizations
- Serves effectively as an ad-hoc reviewer or a journal for grant agency

Distinguished status can be documented using selections from the following (in addition to the distinguished items above):

- Provides effective leadership role on a committee or for a program (e.g., chair, vice chair, secretary, program coordinator, etc.)
- Serves effectively on a high impact, highly active UWF committee or work group (e.g., search committee for university leader, IRB or IACUC, college council, faculty senate)
- Provides effective leadership on discipline-related service assignments for professional or community organizations
- Renders effective high-impact editorial work (e.g., journal editor)

Tenure & Promotion Guidelines

Overview

In the 3 years prior to tenure and/or promotion, a faculty member should have the following annual evaluation ratings as a minimum:

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

Note this is a higher bar than the university guidelines, in which a faculty member can achieve tenure with a good rating in service but will not earn a promotion to Associate. **To earn tenure in Psychology, you must also meet the requirements for promotion to Associate Professor.** Refer to Appendices C and D for several examples of successful pathways for tenure and/or promotion. Appendix E provides additional notes. See Frequently Anticipated Questions for details on specific situations (e.g., going up early, tenure clock extensions, etc.).

Key Benchmarks

TENURE/PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Successful applicants should achieve at least excellent ratings in all three categories for the three years prior to tenure and/or promotion. In general, faculty should meet the following performance benchmarks.

Teaching	Scholarship	Service
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Absence of a <i>pattern</i> of student complaints ● At least 1 peer review of teaching 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clear evidence of a research agenda that drives scholarly effort ● 4 peer-reviewed works or equivalent (e.g., book chapters)* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Regular and effective service on department assigned committees ● Effective service on at least one college or university level committee/task force

*Faculty should take responsibility for explaining extenuating circumstances that might influence how their efforts have been distributed over the review period. For example, studies that involve more than average complexity or significant coordinating efforts (e.g., special populations, EEG work, longitudinal studies) may need further justification in the narrative to address meeting minimum expectations. We offer this suggestion to encourage faculty to take on complex questions with a compelling rationale rather than amassing less impactful research to meet the criterion.

CUMULATIVE SCHOLARSHIP FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE

Successful candidates should average one peer-reviewed work per year. We recognize that publication cycles must be taken into account since peer-reviewed work is likely to take more than one year to produce. However, allowing for a start-up year, successful candidates should have the equivalent of 4 peer-reviewed works with other projects in process. Promotion to associate professor can be justified when the corpus of scholarship accumulated during the academic career regardless of context reaches 4 peer-reviewed works. The 4 works can be derived from any publication/grant capture that has transpired in professional academic roles. This target can include works published and works in press. For example, publications released while a graduate student should not count, but publications released during post-docs or other academic appointments may be counted. For faculty who join UWF after working elsewhere, we recommend that a minimum of two publications should be accomplished during UWF affiliation.

The successful candidate should demonstrate the emergence of a viable, autonomous research agenda with promise of high-impact contributions in the future. We recognize that some research is time-intensive, whereas other scholarship may not require as much time. The candidate must make clear the time demands in their contribution statements if extra time is needed to produce a high-quality work of scholarship or fewer works are achieved in the specified timeframe.

PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Successful applicants will have a minimum of excellence in 2 categories and a rating of distinction in one category for the three years prior to promotion application. The matrix below represents what the expectation is for excellence rating in each category. The timeline represents accomplishments throughout the academic career, whether these transpire at UWF or another academic context. We follow this discussion with what patterns should transpire for a distinguished rating.

Key benchmarks for excellence:

Teaching	Scholarship	Service
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Absence of a pattern of student complaints ● Evidence of effective teaching strategies and outcomes (e.g., high-impact practices, positive assessment results, student post-graduate success) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clear evidence of a research agenda that drives scholarly effort ● a minimum of 10 peer-reviewed articles or equivalent in various contexts across the academic career (or 6 since promotion to Associate) ● First, second, or anchor¹ authorships present 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Regular and effective service on department assigned committees ● Evidence of effectiveness in service roles on college of university committees (e.g., IRB, College Council) ● Effectively assumes leadership roles

¹As one's career progresses, being the anchor author (i.e., last author listed) becomes more important for certain fields, such as neuropsychology. It indicates seniority as a lab PI, but also indicates a high level of mentorship on the project. This also allows for students to be first authors, with the PI receiving credit for the intense contributions required (e.g., EEG projects require a lot of guidance from the lab PI).

CUMULATIVE SCHOLARSHIP FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Promotion to professor can be justified when the corpus of scholarship accumulated during the academic career, regardless of context, reaches 10 peer-reviewed works. The 10 works can be derived from any publication/dissemination/grant capture that has transpired in professional academic roles. For example, publications as a graduate student should not count, but publications during post-docs or other academic appointments may be counted. The work does not have to take place during UWF years to be counted. Over the course of the research plan, the successful applicant will increase in impact of work; selectivity of venue; or first, second, or anchor authorships. Anchor authorship is the last author listed on a paper. For certain fields (e.g., neuropsychology), this placement of authorship is more important than first or second authorships as one's career progresses. The target number of publications increases from 10 to 15 if the area of distinction being claimed for promotion to professor is in scholarship.

PATHWAYS TO DISTINGUISHED RATINGS TO QUALIFY FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Individuals can gain recognition as full professors in this environment by distinguished performance in any of the three pillars that constitute academic work, as long as performance in the remaining two areas is sustained at an excellent level. Candidates who apply for Promotion based on distinction in either Teaching or Service must maintain scholarly productivity at an excellent level to qualify (i.e., produce the equivalent of ten peer-reviewed works).

In the rare circumstance where candidates apply for Professor on the basis of Distinguished Service, the candidate must be able to justify claims for sustained extraordinary service. Promotion decisions related to service as administrators can be controversial. We are recommending that truly distinguished service as a chair (or in some other out of unit capacity)

could justify promotion to Professor, as long as both teaching and research remain excellent and the gains demonstrated by their leadership are substantial. To qualify for consideration, we recommend that administrators teach a minimum of one course per semester to justify a rating in the Teaching category and to reflect commitment to the teaching mission of the department.

Our rationale for recommending the controversial Service pathway is that it provides multiple pathways to achieve professor status which we think is consistent with the distinctive, intensive workload demands in a regional comprehensive context. Many individuals decline leadership in the department under the assumption that department demands will obviate research opportunities so they won't actively be able to build a compelling case for Professor if they take on this challenge. We argue that as long as a Chair of other exemplary out-of-unit performer maintains scholarly excellence (the equivalent of one publication per year) and maintains excellence as a teacher in at least one course per semester, then a truly distinguished performance in an administrative role could legitimately qualify for promotion to Professor. This strategy expands the number of faculty who might be willing to serve as chair before Promotion to Professor.

Here are how areas of distinction that qualify for promotion to Professor might look:

	The Distinguished Teaching Professor	The Distinguished Research Professor	The Distinguished Service Professor
Teaching	<p>DISTINCTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develops or leads in successful high impact practices • History of successful mentoring of students in research or teaching • History of teaching/mentoring awards or award nominations • History of strong student assessment of instruction, with modal response of "excellence" • Student narratives emphasize transformative influence 	<p>EXCELLENCE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of use of successful high-impact and/or evidence-based excellent teaching strategies • Evidence using feedback to improve teaching or implementing strategies to improve from feedback (e.g., SAI's, peer-evaluations, continuous improvement efforts from mentors) • Clear discussion of teaching philosophy implementation • Modal response of at least "very good," with evidence of positive narrative comments 	<p>EXCELLENCE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of use of successful high-impact and/or evidence-based excellent teaching strategies • Evidence using feedback to improve teaching or implementing strategies to improve from feedback (e.g., SAI's, peer-evaluations, continuous improvement efforts from mentors) • Clear discussion of teaching philosophy implementation • Modal response of at least "very good," with evidence of positive narrative comments

<p>Scholar-ship</p>	<p>EXCELLENCE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clear evidence of a research agenda that drives scholarly effort ● 10 peer-reviewed articles or equivalent in various contexts over academic career (at least 5 should be peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, or external grants/contracts, with at least 6 earned post-tenure) ● First, second, or anchor authorships present 	<p>DISTINCTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clear evidence of a high-impact research agenda (e.g., strong impact factor, selective outlets, and/or high number of citations) ● 15 peer-reviewed articles, including book chapters, books, successful grant captures, invited addresses on research over academic career (at least 7 should be peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, or grants, with at least 6 earned post-tenure) ● External recognition for high-quality research (e.g., research awards, keynote speaker invitations) 	<p>EXCELLENCE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clear evidence of a research agenda that drives scholarly effort ● 10 peer-reviewed articles or equivalent in various contexts over academic career (at least 5 should be peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, or grants, with at least 6 earned post-tenure) ● First, second, or anchor authorships present
----------------------------	--	---	---

Service	EXCELLENCE	EXCELLENCE	DISTINCTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Regular and effective service on department assigned committees ● Evidence of effectiveness in service roles on college or university committees (e.g., IRB, College Council) ● Effectively assumes leadership roles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Regular and effective service on department assigned committees ● Evidence of effectiveness in service roles on college or university committees (e.g., IRB, College Council) ● Effectively assumes leadership roles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Robust pattern of recognition for extraordinary service (e.g., community, national, professional awards) ● Exemplary leadership demonstrated in administrative capacity that contributes to the success of the mission of the department/college/university/discipline ● Actively contributes to the life of the department (e.g., attends faculty meetings)

In Appendix B, we offer a “Frequently Asked Questions” document to assist with high-stakes personnel decisions. In Appendix C-E, we provide models of successful tenure/promotion candidates to illustrate that multiple pathways can result in successful transitions. In Appendix F, we offer some final considerations for high-stakes personnel decisions.

Appendix A

Developmental Model

<i>Trajectory over time</i>					
Emerging	Excellence expected in all areas		High Impact Expected in a Selected Area		Sustained Performance at Excellent
Assistant <i>Pre-Midterm Evaluation</i>	Assistant <i>Post-Midterm evaluation</i> Should look like Associate Professor Level	<i>Early</i> Associate	<i>Late</i> Associate Should look like Professor level	Professor	Associate & Full Sustained Performance <i>Maintain effort at least at the tenure level</i>

These guidelines represent a developmental framework designed to cohere with the University Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion.

University Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

REMINDER: University Tenure and Promotion Document Designations:

Distinguished performance clearly exceeds department expectations for excellence.

Excellent performance is defined as meeting department expectations; no major areas of weakness exist.

Good performance indicates *moderate* progress in a given area but one or more weaknesses render the performance not quite to the expectations of *excellence* in the department.

Fair performance suggests minor progress in an evaluation area because one or more major weaknesses exist in performance. Although there may be one or more strengths as well, the performance clearly is not consistent with the department's expectations for excellence. Performance at this level warrants remediation planning.

Poor performance is characterized as having substantial weaknesses that jeopardize professional progress as a UWF faculty member. Performance at this level requires remediation activity. In extreme cases, out-counseling may be the most appropriate course of action to assist the faculty to find an institution that will be a better match for the faculty member's abilities, values, and/or work ethics.

University Criteria for Tenure and Promotion Decisions

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

TEACHING

Department performance indicators for teaching *should* include student evaluations of teaching. Conclusions drawn about teaching performance *may* also be influenced by the following indicators:

- a. Teaching awards and other accomplishments related to teaching
- b. Peer evaluations of teaching
- c. Pedagogical and quality enhancement activities that improve learning (e.g., active learning and student engagement techniques)
- d. Participation in professional development activities that improve teaching

- e. Respect for students and their rights
- f. Quality of teaching philosophy
- g. Quality of syllabi and course goals
- h. Effectiveness of assessment practices
- i. Evidence of student support practices
- j. Effectiveness of advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices
- k. Quality of execution of special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, General Studies)
- l. Quality of supervision of thesis, dissertations, or field experiences
- m. Other relevant performance indicators specified by the department

SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

Conclusions drawn about the quality of scholarly and creative projects **may** be influenced by the following performance indicators:

- a. Recognition or awards earned
- b. Scholarly or creative projects agenda or creative plan
- c. Peer reviews or other evidence of quality
- d. Adherence to ethical standards
- e. Professional development activity (e.g., licensure, technology training, etc.)
- f. External grants or other support to facilitate scholarship or creative activities
- g. Time management skills
- h. Skilled use of collaboration as demonstrated by the commitments proposed, accepted, and fulfilled (e.g., group projects, creative activities, and grants)
- i. Other relevant performance indicators specified by the department

SERVICE

Service activities may include the following:

- Service to university or college or department
- Discipline-related service to the community
- Service as Department Chair or Program Director
- Unremunerated consultancies
- Community activities related to one's discipline
- Advising student organizations
- Service to academic or professional organizations (e.g., editorial review boards, organization leadership; conference organizer)
- Travel time to and from remote campuses locations

Although there is no specific requirement about the balance of service activities that faculty should select, there is an expectation that the faculty member will function effectively as a department citizen, assisting in completing the work of the department's programs.

Appendix B

Frequently Asked or Anticipated Questions about T&P

How do I know when a tenure process should be undertaken?

Typically, you will be expected to go up for review during your sixth year of employment unless you have been granted credit on the tenure clock for prior work. Your tenure clock will be specified in your initial contract. The timeline for actions that need to be taken to prepare for the review is posted on the Academic Affairs website. The Dean's office typically notifies the candidate that the preparation should get underway in early July, prior to the academic year in which the review will take place. The Dean's office will provide a "binder" for print materials and a "bin" for larger artifacts that won't fit in the binder. The review materials will be initially housed in the department so colleagues can review and vote on candidate status. The materials will be moved to the Dean's Office for the Dean's review. The college personnel committee may also review the documents to weigh in on special cases (e.g., early decisions, conflicting opinions among prior reviewers).

What happens if tenure is granted?

The successful tenure/promotion candidate receives a 13% raise, effective in the following academic year. The increase is in addition to across-the-board salary adjustments distributed by UWF.

What happens if tenure is denied?

An unsuccessful candidate is provided a final year on the UWF faculty in which to find a new position. Employment on the tenure track will not be an option at UWF following that final year.

If I suspect my tenure bid will be unsuccessful due to insufficient scholarship, can I arrange to move to a non-tenure track, teaching-focused position?

Some faculty in other departments have successfully negotiated that change in status, but it may not be in the department's best interest to sacrifice a tenure-track position. Such an option is likely to be extended only if the faculty member's contributions in teaching and service are exemplary and if the department agrees to losing a valuable tenure track line.

Under what circumstances can tenure be postponed?

A delay on tenure can be negotiated due to extenuating circumstances. For example, parental leave can sometimes be used to justify adding time to the tenure clock. Similarly, environmental challenges (e.g., severe weather, public health crises) justify extending the decision timeframe. Candidates should initiate this conversation with the chair who will need to advocate permission to extend with the Dean. This extension must be secured in writing, with an official memo.

Under what circumstances can candidates submit for an early tenure decision?

It is possible to submit early. Early submission means that reviewers will be making two decisions: whether tenure and promotion are appropriate and whether the achievements are

sufficient for an early decision. Therefore, candidates should have achievements that far exceed minimum qualifications to elect early submission.

If an early submission is unsuccessful, the results of that review will become part of the next and final attempted tenure and promotion application, which will be submitted in the next academic year.

In general, the less risky course of action is to go up for review as scheduled unless the case for early recognition is compelling. Faculty should consult with their mentors and chair about the wisdom of submitting an early application.

If I meet the recommended pattern of success for the three years prior to the review at the level I am aspiring to achieve, does that guarantee successful application to the next level?

No. The guidelines about a three-year record of performing “at the next level” were intended as a means of helping candidates understand if they were building a potentially successful record. However, other factors can intervene, such as local sentiments regarding collegiality that can trump annual evaluation performance. As such, the guidelines represent a recommended course of action to build confidence about the success of application but do not guarantee a successful tenure decision.

If the recommended pattern for tenure/promotion quality is not met at some point during the prior three years, is the candidate’s application doomed to be unsuccessful?

Not necessarily. Life circumstances (e.g., public health crises, dramatic weather interruptions, family emergencies) can interfere with achievement. Extenuating circumstances need to be explained in the contribution statement, however, we would expect extenuating circumstances to influence and moderate annual evaluation judgments, which would help to solidify the claims being made.

If my application to Professor is denied, can I reapply in the future?

Yes. However, the deficiencies that prompted the denial must clearly be addressed.

How are external evaluators selected?

External evaluators who will be asked to weigh in on the quality of scholarship of candidates should be experts in the field but should not have a vested interest in the success or failure of candidates. Former advisors and co-authors should not be considered. The candidate and chair should collaborate on the selection of appropriate evaluators. The chair should initiate the request, supplying tenure and promotion standards related to scholarship. Evaluators should be at least at the rank to which the candidate aspires. Ideally, evaluators should also be familiar with the demands made of faculty in a regional comprehensive context. Reviewers should be recruited by the chair once the Dean’s announcement of candidacy takes place.

What is the difference between external evaluations and letters of recommendation?

Letters of recommendation are internal and are not held to the same objective standards as external evaluators. The candidate selects those whom they believe will write strong letters of support in favor of a positive decision. Since department members will have voting obligations,

people outside the department would be the best candidates to ask for letters. (This reality explains why assistant professors need to branch out beyond the department to do service in the college and university to help identify potential recommenders in the future.) It is strategically better to ask people who are more experienced in the culture of UWF than those who are relatively new.

What factors threaten a successful tenure/promotion outcome?

Teaching:

- If your teaching tends to produce a pattern of complaints from students
- If you abuse your power as a teacher by exploiting, harassing, or harming students
- If you engage in unethical academic behavior (e.g., inequitable grading practices, FERPA violations)

Scholarship:

- If your scholarly activity is invisible (in the absence of extenuating circumstances)
- If you claim scholarly activity but have nothing concrete to show for the effort
- If your scholarship agenda does not demonstrate autonomy (e.g., you are a supporting author to your graduate advisor)
- If your local and regional presentations don't at some point get translated into print dissemination
- If your work gets consistently rejected from publication/presentation
- If you engage in unethical behavior (e.g., plagiarism, data fabrication, IRB violation, conducting research in the absence of required IRB approval)

Service:

- If you are not constructive, reliable, or collegial in your approach to service

What's the best way to construct the Statement of Contribution?

Your narrative and supporting materials must document how you meet the university and department criteria for tenure and promotion. Your colleagues will need to evaluate your achievements using a university-based form, so it may be the most helpful to organize your statement with headings that correspond to that form. On that basis, we recommend the following structure and supportive content for your statement of contribution:

Teaching Effectiveness:

- What classes have you taught?
- How do you implement your teaching philosophy?
- What is the impact of your teaching? (e.g., Teaching Awards, SAI results)
- How do you pursue continuous improvement? (e.g., assessment involvement, professional development workshops)

Scholarship and Creative Projects:

- Articulation of research agenda
- Catalog of what has been produced
- Evidence of impact

- Funded research track record

Service Effectiveness

- Contributions/impact at different levels of university service
- Contribution/impact of professional or community service
- Leadership

Academic Advising (Psychology does not provide technical course advising):

- Career advising
- Research team supervision
- Mentorship
- Graduate application coaching
- Club advising

Interactions with students:

- Examples of handling of academic integrity issues
- Ratings regarding respect for students
- Mentorship in research and teaching
- Unscheduled teaching

Disciplinary expertise:

- Expertise should be established by external evaluations

Works constructively/overall contributions in department:

- Regular attendance in department meetings
- Participation in assessment and curriculum revision
- Active and constructive participation in departmental committees

Overall contributions to college/university:

- Active and constructive participation in relevant service committees
- Discussion of impact of service (where impact will be less visible than at the department level)

What is the recommended length for the statement of contribution?

Building the contribution narrative should be a reflective process that fairly captures the true achievement of the candidate for the scope of work being required. Candidates are encouraged to avoid redundant entries out of respect for the reviewers' time. The most compelling cases should not be protracted writing exercises.

Appendix C

Exemplars of Successful Annual Evaluation for Early Assistant Professors

All of these example assistant professors would receive a rating of Excellent in each category. Any work above and beyond that listed year could be considered Distinguished.

	Early Assistant A	Early Assistant B	Early Assistant C
Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SAI shows some room for improvement in the classroom (graph provided); faculty provided a reflection on how to improve ● Solicited a peer-review of face-to-face teaching (includes letter from reviewer) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SAI shows overall positive pattern with some areas of improvement (graph provided) ● Attended 2 CUTLA workshops and reflects on how they plan on incorporating what they learned into their class 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SAI shows clear positive pattern with (graph provided) ● Completed the designing a quality online course workshop
Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Submitted dissertation/graduate work to a peer-reviewed journal as sole author ● Lab setup ongoing (e.g., ordering equipment) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Previously submitted dissertation data were published in a mid-tier journal ● Presented at a national conference 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Published a peer-reviewed proceedings paper as a 2nd author ● Data collection in lab on going
Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Served on the graduate admissions committee ● Served as a panelist on a department getting into graduate school event 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Served on the graduate admissions committee ● Reviewed OUR grant proposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Served on an undergraduate psychology curriculum committee ● Served as an ad-hoc reviewer for a journal

Appendix D

Exemplars of Profiles of Successful Promotion to Associate Professor

	Associate Professor A	Associate Professor B	Associate Professor C
Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence of high-impact practices ● Three years of strong student assessment of instruction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence of seeking feedback to improve from SAI/chair/mentors ● Clear discussion of teaching philosophy implementation in class design ● Three years of strong student assessment of instruction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence of effective assessment practices ● Exemplars of successful management of student challenges ● Three years of strong fairly strong student assessment of instruction, with no pattern of complaints
Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clear evidence of a research agenda that drives scholarly effort ● Four labor-intensive peer-reviewed articles or equivalent ● First, second, or anchor authorships present 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clear evidence of a research agenda that drives scholarly effort ● Two peer-reviewed articles ● Two successful grant capture ● 5 regional presentations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clear evidence of a research agenda that drives scholarly effort ● Five peer-reviewed articles or equivalent ● Three regional presentations ● Evidence of establishing student research team
Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Regular and effective service on department assigned committees ● Three years' service on college of university committees (e.g., IRB) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Regular and effective service on department assigned committees ● Three years' service on college of university committees (e.g., College Council) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Regular and effective service on department assigned committees ● Three years' service on college of university committees (e.g., IACUC)

Appendix E

Additional Notes for Preparing for Personnel Decisions

ADDITIONAL NOTES FOR ASSISTANT PROFESSOR PREPARATION

- **Achieving Distinction.** Although it is possible for an early assistant professor to achieve a distinguished rating, it is not typical. External validation of high-quality teaching would be essential to making this argument (e.g., SGA teaching nomination, confirming peer review).
- **Achieving Less Than Department Standard.** A rating of “good” in early years of assistant professor teaching indicates potential to develop new strategies that will optimize getting excellent ratings in the future. This outcome should be regarded as “promising” and the faculty member should work closely with the chair and mentors to remediate any concerns. In later years of the assistant professor appointment, “good” ratings compromise getting a favorable tenure and promotion review. A rating of “fair” or “poor” indicates that the difficulties reported require remediation and may place assistant professors at risk for nonrenewal before a tenure decision is made.
- **Deficiency Consequences.** Early assistant professors who demonstrate deficiencies in teaching (e.g., a pattern of problematic teaching evaluation narratives, documented pattern of complaints to chair) can expect a rating of less than excellent. Chairs should pay attention to patterns of concern rather than isolated problems unless the problem is especially egregious. For example, hostile climate concerns, abusive treatment, or harassment challenges should be investigated by the chair who may need to work with university officials to resolve the problem.
- **Response to Deficiency Rating.** New faculty need an opportunity to grow into their teaching skills, so minor deficiencies may be present in the early phase without necessarily sacrificing an excellent rating. How the faculty member addresses or plans to address the deficiencies can help determine the appropriate rating. For example, if a pattern of student complaints about accessibility shows up in narrative teaching evaluations, the faculty member can actively discuss a plan for improving this problem as evidence of using feedback for continuous improvement about accessibility issues.

ADDITIONAL NOTES FOR ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR PREPARATION

Although excellence is expected as a minimum, associate professors wanting to go up for promotion to full should consider that they will need at least one area of distinction in at least one area in the 3 years prior to promotion to full.

ADDITIONAL NOTES FOR PROFESSOR PREPARATION

Promotion to Professor requires distinguished performance in at least one area of function and excellent performance in the other two areas. To become a professor, one doesn't necessarily need to achieve distinction in teaching but must show sustained excellence in teaching.

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON CREATIVE AND SCHOLARLY PROJECTS PREPARATION

- **Impact of Scholarly Activities:**
 - A high volume of lower-impact, lower-effort dissemination activities (e.g., newsletters, blogs, podcasts) cannot replace high-impact scholarship but can reinforce a researcher's profile.
 - First, second, or anchor author positions should be regarded as higher impact than multiple authorship.
 - No specific indicator of quality (e.g., H index, Research Gate, journal rejection rate) is required, but these can be used to support claims for impact; should you use an external validation of impact, you should explain your choice of the index.
 - Collaborations are highly valued but submitting just one work that represents a large collaboration does not provide the most effective evidence of high-impact, independent scholarly function unless the faculty is a primary/anchor author. Faculty should provide a narrative of the portion of the work executed to justify the excellence of their contribution. In general, collaborations with former graduate advisors should reduce over time; first/second/anchor authorships should strengthen as faculty members become independent in research agenda.
 - Under most circumstances, a book revision will not be as high-impact as a first edition (i.e., it would "count" as a peer-reviewed publication rather than a high-impact publication at the distinguished level).
 - Competitive external grant preparation is a high-impact activity that should count as similar to the submission of a peer-reviewed article.

- **Long-term Projects and/or Repeated Presentations:**
 - Evidence of annual progress must be clear cut, if credit is claimed for more than one year; progress must be documented to support performance claims. For example, major revisions may allow counting project again; submitted vs. accepted vs. published.
 - Repeated presentations on the same work at different conferences should count just once in terms of scholarly production. Presentations that are later translated to publications may count as an additional product, especially if these occur in different reporting years. However, if the work results in an invited address, that can be counted separately as a second work since it reflects greater impact.
 - Credit should be elected in the year of presentation or publication. (The current three-year reporting cycle in the evaluation simply reinforces the pattern of production and helps address credit for large scale products.) Large scale projects (e.g., writing a book) should generally not be credited for greater than three years of work without clear justification.

- **Student Research Collaboration.** Research conducted with students provides value added that can be reflected in either the Teaching or Scholarship category, but not both. Faculty should be consistent in how student-focused research is addressed in their own contributions.

- **SOTL Clarification.** Scholarship of teaching and learning may be credited either in Teaching or Research, but not both. Faculty are advised to use SOTL credit where it produces the greatest strategic gain.

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON SERVICE PREPARATION

- **Service Justification.** Taking credit for service requires a brief explanation of what the faculty member accomplished in the service role. It is insufficient just to be appointed to a committee; faculty must make clear what their impact was in their service role.
- **Claims for Activity Level.** Service claims are presumed to involve active service assignments. If a service assignment appears to be ineffective or inactive, faculty are encouraged to discuss alternatives with mentors and the chair to avoid having little to report. Alternatively, mentors may be able to assist the faculty member in getting the assignment to be more functional by figuring out how to get the committee moving.
- **Evidence Clarity.** Provide tangible outcome of committee work where appropriate (e.g., completed curriculum map, program recommendations, number of IRB proposals reviewed).
- **Collegiality Impact.** The pattern of collegiality can influence peer judgments regarding quality of service. Faculty should strive to work in a manner that doesn't generate additional work for others and should be receptive to feedback on the quality of their service work. Constructive collaboration should be the goal in all service assignments.

Appendix F

Sustained Performance Evaluation Guidelines

Tenured faculty at the rank of Professor and Associate Professor undergo sustained performance evaluation (SPE) every six years following the granting of tenure. These faculty will undergo a process of review that is similar to tenure, entailing the development of a statement of contributions that covers the six-year review period. To facilitate positive outcomes from the SPE process, these faculty should perform at the level of criteria for tenure (i.e., at least excellent in all categories during each year of the review period).

The Provost will rank SPE's in one of three categories:

Tier One: Distinguished

Clearly exceeds university and department tenure standards for quantity, quality, or both. Tier 1 performance leads to \$6000 increase for Professors and \$3000 for Associate Professors in base salary in next contract year.

Tier Two: Satisfactory

Performance meets excellence standards. Tier 2 performance receives \$4000 for Professors and \$2000 for Associate Professors.

Tier Three: Unsatisfactory

Performance does not meet expectations. No merit salary is provided and a performance improvement plan is established. If the details of the plan are fulfilled in two years, the faculty member will achieve a merit increase consistent with Tier Two performance.