DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK
GOVERNANCE BYLAWS

Introduction:
If there is a conflict between the language of these bylaws and Florida Statutes, the UFF-UWF Collective Bargaining Agreement or any UWF Policies, then the language of Florida Statutes, the UFF-UWF Collective Bargaining Agreement or UWF Policy shall prevail and all other portions departmental bylaws remain intact.

Documents:
Current UFF-UWF Collective Bargaining Agreement
UWF Division of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures / Annual Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion

Article I. Name:
The name shall be the Department of Social Work.

Article II. Location:
The unit is housed in the College of Education and Professional Studies (CEPS) of the University of West Florida.

Article III. Mission & Goal Statements:

Mission of the Department of Social Work:
The mission of the social work program is to prepare social work practitioners who demonstrate and practice the critical thinking skills, values, ethics, and knowledge delineated by the Council of Social Work Education (CSWE) guidelines and the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) Code of Ethics.

Goals of the Department of Social Work
1. Maintain excellent BSW and MSW programs that provide an educational program which prepares generalist practitioners at the BSW level and prepares MSW graduates to work with individuals, families, groups, communities, and organizations within medical and behavioral health settings, with a special focus on military populations.

2. Continue to promote a culturally diverse, student-centered, learning environment devoted to the needs and interests of our student body where students can integrate the knowledge, values, ethics and skills of the profession into their practice and to assume positions of leadership.

3. Collaborate with and serve the region, the university, the public, voluntary agencies, and the global community as a resource for current, relevant and quality social work education.

4. Contribute to the development and application of knowledge in social work practice by supporting the teaching, scholarship and community service of the faculty.

Article IV. Department Governance:
Section 4.1. Voting Membership: For general departmental matters, excluding tenure & promotion, voting membership shall consist of all full time, social work tenured, tenure-seeking, all non-tenure faculty including visiting professors, instructors, and the field director.

Section 4.2. Curriculum issues: On issues pertaining to the social work curriculum, the department voting membership shall consist of all social work tenured, tenure-seeking and non-tenure faculty; including field office positions. Adjuncts present shall be invited to participate in discussion and excused from voting.

Section 4. 3. Tenure and Promotion issues: Consistent with UWF Academic Affairs Tenure and Promotion guidelines and the United Faculty of Florida Collective Bargaining Agreement (UFF CBA), the department chair will request all full-time faculty members complete an evaluation on the candidate's eligibility for tenure and/or promotion. Tenured faculty and the Chair of the department shall vote for tenure by secret ballot.

Section 4.4 Office Hours: Faculty office hours are clearly stated on each course syllabus describing office location with the days and times faculty will be available to meet with students to discuss the course or provide professional mentoring activities. The Department of Social Work faculty shall observe a minimum of six regularly scheduled office hours per week during the academic year, either online or face-to-face based on course mode, and shall post a schedule accordingly on office doors.

Section 4.5 Graduate Assistants: Graduate Assistants (GAs) will be assigned with a faculty member(s) to assist with course preparation, grading and research. Assignments will be made based on availability of funding. Attempts will be made to match students to faculty member's areas of expertise. To qualify as a GA, students must be fully admitted to the Department of Social Work graduate program and registered for at least 6 semester hours. "A Graduate Assistant (GA) appointed under the 9186 designation is an admitted master's-level, specialist-level, or doctoral-level student providing support for academic departments, programs, faculty, or personnel. Compensation for a student employed under this designation is **hourly,** so an electronic timesheet (in MyUWF) reporting the hours of work completed must be submitted on a biweekly basis. This timesheet is reviewed and approved by the supervisor, who maintains regular supervision of the GA. A GA may be employed in a college or department office that performs professional or service duties outside of teaching or research. In the case that a GA is assigned to a nonacademic university office, the student's duties are not required to correspond directly to her/his graduate program. Department heads and supervising faculty are responsible for assuring that a Graduate Assistant receives ample opportunities to make continuing progress toward her/his degree completion" (UWF Graduate Assistant Handbook).

Article V. Committee Structure
Section 5.1. Standing Committees: Committee chairs and members are identified in August (annually) by the Department chair. Student representation is invited and encouraged as appropriate and consistent with FERPA guidelines. Standing departmental committee meeting minutes shall be shared on the shared electronic drive for the Department of Social Work.

The committees meet at least once per semester and include:

Admissions Committee
The admissions committee oversees the Master of Social Work Program admission process, develops and revises graduate admission policies and procedures. The department follows policies of UWF on matters of academic misconduct and an ad hoc committee shall be called for matters pertaining to the Student Code of Academic Conduct.

Curriculum Committee
The Curriculum Committee discusses and proposes the Curriculum Change Requests (CCRs), syllabi, course sequences for both the Bachelor and Master level programs, and various other issues related to curriculum.

Assessment Committee
Assessment matters are program specific and the Assessment Committee examines program data and proposes changes designed to improve program outcomes in accordance with CSWE accreditation guidelines and SACS criteria.

High Impact Practice Committee
The High Impact Practice Committee supports student experiential learning opportunities through various activities at the local, state, regional, national and international levels which promote and enhance social work knowledge, skills and values.

Bylaws Committee
The bylaws committee is responsible for maintaining the bylaws that govern all departmental interactions. This committee meets regularly to modify and/or revise the document as needed.

Professional Success Committee
The Professional Success Committee is responsible for promoting professional development and behavior among social work students across the program. The department follows policies of UWF on matters of academic misconduct and an ad hoc committee shall be called for matters pertaining to the Student Code of Academic Conduct.

Section 5.2: Faculty Development Committee
Tenured faculty serve as an advisory/supportive group to help mentor tenure-seeking faculty for success in the tenure and promotion process. The Faculty Development Committee will meet once a semester with tenure-seeking faculty in the Department. Faculty mentor responsibilities may include giving professional advice, assistance with goal setting, role modeling, teaching observations, and engaging in other supportive behaviors as necessary with the mentee. The Mid-Point Review is a function of members from the Faculty Development Committee.

Section 5.3: Professional Advisory Board
The professional advisory board serves as an advisory committee to the social work department. This committee is comprised of individuals from the local community that are committed to ensuring the success of our social work program and students.

Section 5.4: Ad-Hoc Committees: As circumstances may require, the chair is empowered to

constitute ad-hoc committees that will be subject to ratification by the faculty.

Article VI. Departmental Meetings:

The Chair will convene departmental meetings at least once (1) each Fall and Spring semester.

A majority (50% +1) of the voting membership (See Article IV) may direct the Chair to convene a department meeting at times other than the Fall and Spring semester in a timely and efficient manner.

An agenda will be distributed to all in attendance. Although most of the work can be accomplished in an informal manner, when necessary Robert's Rule of Order will prevail.

A voting member shall notify the Departmental Chair if they are unable to attend a scheduled meeting. The member may provide a written or verbal proxy within two (2) days of the scheduled meeting. Proxies shall be in-unit faculty and shall announce their proxy role prior to any vote.

A majority (50% +1) of the voting members will constitute a quorum at any faculty meeting. A quorum is required for any vote (in-person and proxy voters).

Voting will normally be conducted by "voice" or show of hands. If any member requests a secret ballot on any issue, a secret ballot will be conducted and counted by two in-unit voting members present. In the event of a tie, the vote shall be retaken. In the event of a second tie on revote, the matter shall be tabled until the next faculty meeting.

For departmental and curriculum matters, excluding bylaws, majority vote (50% + 1) shall prevail. Departmental bylaws alterations or amendment(s) require two-thirds majority vote, with proper notice and distribution of proposed bylaws changes, according to Article IX.

Minutes of each meeting will be recorded and distributed by the Office Administrator or other designee and will be stored on the network shared drive.

Student representation is invited and encouraged as appropriate and consistent with FERPA guidelines. Students are non-voting participants. Student participants will be the first item on the agenda.

Article VII: Summer Appointments:

Available supplemental appointments will be offered equitably as appropriate to qualified faculty, in accordance with written criteria (Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 9.4b).

Summer schedules and the assignment of summer teaching lines will be built with consideration of three factors: (1) courses which fulfill the greatest programmatic need; (2) courses which are likely to produce high student credit hours; and (3) courses which guarantee the fair distribution of summer teaching lines. Adjunct faculty will be given consideration for summer employment on a secondary priority basis. Further, each academic year, the chair will request summer course teaching preferences from full-time faculty.

Assignment of summer courses will use the following guidelines:

- Full-time in-unit faculty members shall receive priority for supplemental summer teaching assignments. Summer appointments must be offered to full-time faculty prior to adjuncts.

- Full-time faculty members have the right of first refusal for any courses offered by the Department. If there are an inadequate number of courses to provide one course to all faculty desiring to teach in the summer, then rotation will be allocated based on in-unit longevity to allocate the first course assigned with subsequent rolling assignment.

- Following the initial allocation of supplemental summer teaching assignments, no summer course or courses of a full-time faculty member will be reallocated to another faculty member without the consent of the full-time faculty member to whom the course or courses were initially assigned.

- Faculty should be assigned courses matching the faculty member's content expertise and qualifications.

- The salary amount a faculty member receives for teaching a summer course or courses shall not be a consideration in the prioritization or allocation of supplemental summer teaching assignments.

Article VIII: Annual Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion:

Teaching, research and scholarly activity, and service are interdependent. As social work is a practice-based discipline as defined by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) and the National Association of Social Workers (NASW), we value all three areas equally. Our service extends beyond the university into the community setting. The quality of performance in teaching and service is shaped to a large degree by the research and scholarly activity of our faculty.

It is the responsibility of the candidate to describe the scope and impact of their teaching, service and research. Candidates submitting their portfolios are encouraged to include as many of the indicators as possible to strengthen the quality of their submission. Inclusion of State University System Student Assessment of Instruction (SUSSAI) is required.

Department Statement on Teaching:

The Department encourages excellence in teaching that may be demonstrated or evidenced through a combination of any of the following:
- Teaching materials including course syllabi, handouts, reading materials, tests, course preparation/adaptation, and alteration of medium of instruction (i.e. face-to-face to online).
- Quality of directed studies, theses, and supervision of interns.
- Quality of tests and other assignments.

- Appropriate use of multiple methods of assessment in the assessment of student learning and assignment of course grades.
- Evidence of course revisions to reflect current knowledge in academic area.
- Peer observation from other faculty, inside and outside the Department.
- Self-evaluation.
- Professional activities related to enhancement of teaching.
- Demonstration of high-impact learning practices.
- New course development.

Department Statement on Scholarly and Creative Activity:
Consistent with the University's mission, vision and resources in combination with the values of the social work profession, the Department recognizes and promotes collaborative research and scholarly activity towards that objective. Each faculty member is expected to provide evidence of scholarly and creative work **every year** and use the following recommendations as a guideline.

The Department encourages the expression of creative and scholarly activity evidenced through the following items ranked by order of importance:
1. authorship or co-authorship of accepted or published peer-refereed journal articles;
2. authorship or co-authorship of submitted peer-refereed journal articles under review;
3. authorship or co-authorship in whole or in part of accepted or published books whose primary audience is composed of academics or practitioners;
4. authorship or co-authorship in whole or in part of submitted books under review whose primary audience is composed of academics or practitioners;
5. authorship or co-authorship of academic accepted or published peer-reviewed conference proceeding(s);
6. authorship or co-authorship of academic conference peer-reviewed presentations (oral, poster, roundtables, workshops or electronic formats);
7. Principal Investigator (PI) or Co-PI of awarded external grants for projects that will advance knowledge in the candidate's field;
8. PI or Co-PI of submitted external grants for projects that will advance knowledge in the candidate's field;
9. PI or Co-PI of awarded internal grants for projects that will advance knowledge in the candidate's field;
10. PI or Co-PI of submitted internal grants for projects that will advance knowledge in the candidate's field;
11. authorship or co-authorship in whole or in part of work relevant to the candidate's field disseminated via film or electronic media;

1. peer-refereed journal articles;
2. authorship or co-authorship of submitted peer-refereed journal articles;

3. authorship or co-authorship of academic peer-reviewed conference proceeding;

4. authorship or co-authorship of academic conference peer-reviewed presentations (oral, poster, roundtables, workshops & electronic formats)
5. authorship or co-authorship of academic conference proceeding;
6. authorship or co-authorship of academic conference oral or poster presentations

7. authorship or co-authorship in whole or in part of books whose primary audience is composed of academics;
8. authorship or co-authorship in whole or in part of books or journals whose primary audience is composed of practitioners;
9. authorship or co-authorship in whole or in part of work relevant to the candidate's field disseminated via film or electronic media;
10. Principal Investigator (PI) or Co-PI of awarded external grants for projects that will advance knowledge in the candidate's field;
11. PI or Co-PI of submitted external grants for projects that will advance knowledge in the candidate's field;
12. PI or Co-PI of awarded internal grants for projects that will advance knowledge in the candidate's field;
13. PI or Co-PI of submitted internal grants for projects that will advance knowledge in the candidate's field;
14. refereeing or reviewing articles, books and/or grants whose primary audience is composed of academics;
15. refereeing or reviewing articles, books and/or grants whose primary audience is composed of practitioners

Department Statement on Service

Social workers are expected to be active in communities, working with individuals, families, groups and organizations. As social workers we must adhere to our Code of Ethics and our ethical responsibilities to the broader society. We are also expected to empower and encourage our students to engage and serve their communities.

The Department of Social Work encourages the following service activities through a combination of any of the following:

Department
- Accreditation/reaffirmation
- Mentoring activities with students, faculty or community members consistent with furthering the profession
- Development of Departmental materials/facilities
- Active service on Departmental committees
- Active service on special Departmental assignments/projects
- Assuming temporary administrative assignments
- Attending assigned University functions
- Administration of student clubs/organizations
- Professional presence in professional organizations
- Recruitment, liaison activities, or advising of students in professional and pre-professional organizations

School/University
- Serving on committees
- Serving on special School/University assignments/projects
- Assuming administrative assignments
- Attending assigned functions/events
- Representing the department, college and/or university in professional activities, outreach

endeavors and events inside or outside the university

Professional/Local/State/Regional/National/International
- Professional presence in professional organizations
- Serving in an administrative role on committees, boards, workshops, etc.
- Serving as a consultant to a social services organization or entity relating to area of research, practice or expertise
- Serving as a liaison for the Department/School/University
- Presenting papers, or other public presentations, not based on original research
- Attending assigned functions/events
- Sponsoring/developing University events
- Assigned student recruitment at events/organizations
- Active volunteer in community service organizations/events and/or community service opportunities
- Refereeing or reviewing peer-refereed articles, books and/or grants whose primary audience is composed of academics or practitioners;

Non-Tenure Faculty Appointments

Except in unusual circumstances, faculty members lacking an acceptable degree defined as the highest degree one can normally receive in a given field, may not be tenured and may be appointed only at the rank of instructor or Lecturer. The letter of appointment and the promotion and/or tenure files shall include such a statement as approved by the Provost.

"All but Dissertation" (ABD) candidates hired with the intention of obtaining a tenure track position would hold the title "instructor" until such time that an official transcript is received from the degree-granting university stating that all criteria for the acceptable degree, as defined herein, have been satisfied. At that time, the title is automatically changed to that of Assistant Professor. This procedure, as well as any difference in salary arising as a result of an appointment to Assistant Professor, should be clearly stated in the letter of appointment.

Annual Evaluation

The following sections provide guidelines for Department of Social Work annual evaluations. Annual evaluations pertain to full active semesters taught as consistent with the current Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

The Social Work Department will evaluate based on the following guidelines. Faculty are to submit their statement of contribution and supporting documentation to the chair annually based on the guidelines described below. A rating of "Excellent" is the expected standard for annual evaluations.

Faculty members are responsible for completing a statement of contribution that reflects their work assignments of teaching, research and service. Teaching and service faculty should prepare a statement that demonstrates their contribution in both of those areas. Reporting of faculty contributions should reflect their contracts and work assignment as stated in the CBA.

Adjuncts with teaching-only course loads should demonstrate quality teaching. This will be evaluated on a semester-to-semester basis by the department chair using a variety of evaluative methods.

For Non-Tenure Track Contract Faculty not required to conduct Scholarly and Creative Activities –

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to present supporting materials that provide compelling evidence of having met the specified criteria for the self-rating in each of the designated areas of responsibility for the respective faculty member. Under the purview of departmental governance, non-tenured track faculty members shall be acknowledged/recognized and evaluated based on the criteria detailed in employment documents.

When a non-tenure track contract faculty member engages in scholarly and creative endeavors, they shall integrate such activities describing enhancement of teaching and how activities inform pedagogical content. Service contributions will be highlighted to describe and enhance the interactive nature between policy and practice reinforcing CSWE EPAS

EVALUATION OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE
The Department of Social Work uses the following guidelines for annual evaluation of teaching.

Distinguished Performance - Distinguished performance demonstrates high degree of skill in design and execution of teaching as shown by the performance indicators below that build upon and exceed the performance indicators for the rating of excellent.

Performance indicators to support distinguished ratings may include the following after having met excellent (benchmark) performance indicators:

a. Numerical student evaluation data document clear statistical exceptionality. Exceptionality is partially reflected in SUSSAI data for "overall instruction" and "overall course organization" with greater than 70% rating of "good" or better averaged for all courses taught as demonstrated and contextualized in the faculty annual statement of contribution. For example, context considerations may be taken for SUSSAI ratings in courses which require extensive writing, perceived difficult content on the part of students enrolled, or external factors beyond faculty control. In accordance with the current CBA, SUSSAI data cannot be the sole determination for evaluation of performance.

b. Narrative SUSSAI statements, students' reflection papers, or other supporting documentation emphasize powerful impact on learner or transformative learning experiences

c. In accordance with the current CBA, "faculty are required to submit at least one exemplar of teaching quality in addition to the standard university teaching assessment material. Exemplars should be consistent with indicators identified in the Tenure and Promotion guidelines, such as outcome assessment data, peer review observations, syllabi, assessment samples, etc." In the Department of Social Work, acceptable supplemental high quality exemplars may include but are not limited to: Creative quality student assignments; high impact practice (HIP) student learning experiences; curriculum

development; new course development; enhanced teaching strategies; assignment examples; changes in teaching delivery platform; assignment expectations; quality exams & quizzes; creative class exercises; assignment rubrics; homework examples; examples of lecture content and student integration of knowledge; student feedback provided; online content examples; creative online projects, impromptu student learning experiences; etc.

d. Recognition/Award earned at the local, regional, state, national or international level.

e. Appropriate professional educational advancement opportunities identified, sought and completed in a timely fashion (e.g., licensure & continuing education experiences, technology training, special educational opportunities, etc.).

f. Collaborative partnerships with internal or external colleagues that are skillful and innovative.

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

Performance indicators to support excellent ratings may include:

a. Student evaluations document consistently positive impact on learning (above average). SUSSAI data for "overall instruction" and "overall course organization" of 70% rating of "good" or better averaged for all courses taught as demonstrated and contextualized in the faculty annual statement of contribution. For example, context considerations are taken for SUSSAI ratings in courses which require extensive writing, perceived difficult content on the part of the students enrolled, or external factors. In accordance with the current CBA, SUSSAI data cannot be the sole determination for evaluation of performance.

b. In accordance with the current CBA, "faculty are required to submit at least one exemplar of teaching quality in addition to the standard university teaching assessment material. Exemplars should be consistent with indicators identified in the Tenure and Promotion guidelines, such as outcome assessment data, peer review observations, syllabi, assessment samples, etc." In the Department of Social Work, acceptable supplemental exemplars may include but are not limited to: Creative quality student assignments; high impact practice (HIP) student learning experiences; new course development strategy/assignment examples; changes in teaching delivery platform and/or course teaching strategies; assignment expectations; exams & quizzes; class exercises; assignment rubrics; homework examples; examples of lecture content and student integration of knowledge; student feedback provided; online content examples; creative online projects, impromptu student learning experiences; etc.

c. Teaching philosophy provides foundation for coherent course planning and activities

d. Syllabi outlines comprehensive, clear, and appropriate performance expectations

e. Assessment practices enhance student learning and contribute to department needs

f. Goals and course content routinely provide evidence of successful continuous improvement effort

g. Pedagogical practices facilitate optimal learning conditions

h. Student support practices facilitate optimal student development

i. Appropriate standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights as demonstrated by diversity of course assessment measures, content including evidence-based practice approaches to social work practice, accommodations for special needs, and abiding by the NASW Code of Ethics

j. Completes appropriate schedule of professional educational opportunities in a timely fashion (e.g., licensure & continuing education experiences, technology training, special educational opportunities, etc.).

Good performance
Good performance demonstrates overall teaching effectiveness but some minor areas for concern. In general, the supporting evidence suggests that teaching performance is below what is required.

Performance indicators to support good ratings may include:

a. Student evaluations data document adequate impact on learning as evidenced by majority of SUSSAI data for "overall instruction" and "overall course organization" rating of "good" or better averaged for all courses taught as demonstrated and contextualized in the faculty annual statement of contribution. For example, context considerations are taken for SUSSAI ratings in courses which require extensive writing, perceived difficult content on the part of the students enrolled, or external factors. In accordance with CBA, SUSSAI data cannot be the sole determination for evaluation of performance

b. In accordance with CBA, "faculty are required to submit at least one exemplar of teaching quality in addition to the standard university teaching assessment material. Exemplars should be consistent with indicators identified in the Tenure and Promotion guidelines, such as outcome assessment data, peer review observations, syllabi, assessment samples,

etc." In the Department of Social Work, acceptable supplemental exemplars may include but are not limited to: Creative quality student assignments; high impact practice (HIP) student learning experiences; new course development strategy/assignment examples; changes in teaching delivery platform and/or course teaching strategies; assignment expectations; exams & quizzes; class exercises; assignment rubrics; homework examples; examples of lecture content and student integration of knowledge; student feedback provided; online content examples; creative online projects, impromptu student learning experiences; etc.

c. Teaching philosophy expressed in course planning and activities

d. Syllabi provide reasonably clear and appropriate expectations

e. Assessment practices support student learning and contribute to department needs

f. f. Goals and course content give evidence of continuous improvement effort

g. Majority of pedagogical practices are appropriate and effective

h. Majority of student support practices are appropriate and effective

i. Maintains some standards of academic integrity, including respect for students and their rights

j. Participates in teaching development activities when directed to do so.

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

Performance indicators to support fair ratings may include:

a. Student evaluations data document areas of moderate concern below department expectations of SUSSAI data for "overall instruction" and "overall course organization" ratings of "good" or better averaged for all courses.

b. In accordance with the current CBA, "faculty are required to submit at least one exemplar of teaching quality in addition to the standard university teaching assessment material. Exemplars should be consistent with indicators identified in the Tenure and Promotion guidelines, such as outcome assessment data, peer review observations, syllabi,

assessment samples, etc." In the Department of Social Work, acceptable supplemental exemplars may include but are not limited to: Creative quality student assignments; high impact practice (HIP) student learning experiences; new course development strategy/assignment examples; changes in teaching delivery platform and/or course teaching strategies; assignment expectations; exams & quizzes; class exercises; assignment rubrics; homework examples; examples of lecture content and student integration of knowledge; student feedback provided; online content examples; creative online projects, impromptu student learning experiences; etc.

   c. Teaching philosophy may not be clearly expressed in course planning and activities

   d. d. Syllabi need to provide clearer and more appropriate expectations

   e. Assessment practices show some difficulty in supporting student learning and meeting department needs

   f. Goals and course content reflect limited continuous improvement effort

   g. g. Some pedagogical practices need attention

   h. h. Some student support practices need improvement

   i. Occasionally demonstrates a lack of appropriate standards of academic integrity including respect for students and their rights

   j. Does not typically participate in teaching development activity.

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

Performance indicators to support poor ratings may include:

   a. Student evaluations data document consistently inadequate and substantive problems - (ratings well below the department expectations of SUSSAI data for "overall instruction" and "overall course organization" ratings of "good" or better averaged for

all courses. In accordance with the current CBA, SUSSAI data cannot be the sole determination for evaluation of performance

b. In accordance with the current CBA, "faculty are required to submit at least one exemplar of teaching quality in addition to the standard university teaching assessment material. Exemplars should be consistent with indicators identified in the Tenure and Promotion guidelines, such as outcome assessment data, peer review observations, syllabi, assessment samples, etc." In the Department of Social Work, acceptable supplemental exemplars may include but are not limited to: Creative quality student assignments; high impact practice (HIP) student learning experiences; new course development strategy/assignment examples; changes in teaching delivery platform and/or course teaching strategies; assignment expectations; exams & quizzes; class exercises; assignment rubrics; homework examples; examples of lecture content and student integration of knowledge; student feedback provided; online content examples; creative online projects, impromptu student learning experiences; etc.

c. Teaching philosophy lacking substance, poorly articulated or poorly expressed in course activities and planning

d. Syllabi fail to establish clear and relevant expectations

e. Goals and course content reflect no continuous improvement efforts

f. Pedagogical practices are unsound (e.g., disorganization; late; missing; standards too lax or too challenging; routinely poor preparation; poor classroom management practices)

g. Student support practices are unsound (e.g., late or absent for class, not responding to email, not available to students, not keeping office hours, showing favoritism)

h. Chronic academic integrity concerns identified including evidence of disrespect for students and their rights.

i. Course assessment measures are inadequate to support student learning outcomes and department goals (e.g., learning outcomes are inadequate, inappropriate, or missing; testing strategies are not effective or fair).

EVALUATION OF SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES The Department of Social Work uses the following guidelines for annual evaluation of scholarship and creative activity. Tenure track faculty should also review departmental tenure and promotion criteria to ensure progress and contract faculty may elect to include scholarly and creative activities in either Teaching or Service performance category in order to receive Distinguished annual

performance rating in either category as these contributions are above and beyond the written contract.

Distinguished Performance
Distinguished performance demonstrates high degree of skill in design and execution of scholarly and creative activities as shown by the performance indicators below that build upon and exceed the performance indicators for the rating of excellent.

Performance indicators to support distinguished ratings may include the following after having met excellent (benchmark) performance indicators:

a. The publication of one article in a refereed journal

b. The publication of a peer reviewed book(s) or edited book(s)

c. Authorship or co-authorship of a chapter(s) in a peer reviewed book(s)

d. Recognition/Award earned at the local, regional, state, national or international level

e. Strong record of external grant awards, successful completion, and dissemination of results

f. Collaborative partnerships with internal or external colleagues in scholarship and creative activities which are skillful and innovative.

Excellent Performance
Excellent performance demonstrates satisfactory execution of scholarship or creative activity agenda as shown by the performance indicators below.

Performance indicators that may be used to support excellent ratings:

a. Refined scholarly agenda or creative plan well suited to regional comprehensive university context

b. The submission of an article in a refereed journal

c. Published complete paper in refereed conference proceeding

d. Refereed conference paper, workshop, or poster presentation

e. Strong record of internal grant pursuit

f. Strong record of external grant pursuit

g. External collaboration efforts to facilitate scholarship or creative activities agenda

h. Internal collaboration efforts within the University to facilitate scholarship or creative activities agenda

i. Potential for wide recognition of quality beyond the University

Good Performance

Good performance demonstrates below average progress in scholarship or creative activity agenda as shown by the performance indicators below but the supporting evidence suggests that work falls slightly below the department standard of excellent.

Performance indicators that may be used to support good ratings:

a. Specific scholarly agenda or creative plan identified, including appropriate timelines and preferred dissemination venues but not implemented

b. Scholarly and creative projects completed but falls short of excellent criteria

c. Internal and/or external grant pursuit falls short of excellent criteria

d. Fails to regularly adhere to relevant ethical conventions for scholarly and creative projects

e. Ineffective time management strategies may create barriers to success proportional to projects initiated individually and/or collaboratively

Fair performance

Fair performance demonstrates only minor progress toward executing a scholarly and creative agenda. In general, the supporting evidence suggests that scholarly and creative projects are moderately below the department norms. This level of performance offers minimal support for departmental criteria but provides some evidence of promise for future productivity. Remediation is recommended.

Performance indicators that may be used to support fair ratings:

a. General focus of interest identified, but falls short of the rate of production required by department

b. Some evidence of partial completion of scholarly or creative activities (e.g., data collection, manuscript outline) but falls short of the production required by department

c. Some evidence of scholarly collaboration or resource network development toward identifying a specific scholarly agenda or creative plan

d. Identification of scholarly and creative goals, but not actively involved at this time

e. Commitments inconsistently made and fulfilled in collaborative activity (e.g., group projects, and grants)

f. Not consistent in adhering to ethical standards for scholarly and creative activities

g. Ineffective time management and inconsistent performance may create barriers to success proportional to projects initiated individually and/or collaboratively

Poor performance
Poor performance demonstrates serious problems in developing a scholarship or creative agenda. The supporting evidence suggests that scholarly and creative production is well below the department norms attributed to inactivity or avoidance, absence of planning, poor time management, problematic collaborative behavior, or ethical challenges. In such circumstances, remediation is required.

Performance indicators that may be used to support poor ratings:

a. Scholarly agenda or creative plan has not been identified (e.g., central focus of career interest has not materialized)

b. Minimal pursuit of scholarly and creative projects

c. Not engaged with professional organization(s) which disseminate faculty scholarly and creative (work) products

d. Not engaged in scholarly or creative activities (e.g., grants, research collaboration, projects)

e. Not adhering to ethical standards for scholarly or creative activities

f. Poor time management strategies negatively impact completion of projects

g. Unreliability and problematic collaborative skills negatively impact project completion and quality.

EVALUATION OF SERVICE

In accordance with the NASW Code of Ethics, the Department of Social Work strongly values service. Service contributions will be highlighted to describe and enhance the interactive nature between policy and practice reinforcing CSWE EPAS. Service includes contributions at all levels of the university, the community, and the profession. The department uses the following guidelines for rating service in annual evaluations.

Distinguished Performance

Distinguished performance demonstrates an unusually high degree of skill in design and execution of service activities as shown by the performance indicators below that build upon and exceed the performance indicators for the rating of excellent.

Performance indicators to support distinguished ratings may include the following after having met excellent performance (benchmark) indicators defined by the Department of Social Work, service leadership in depth and breadth of involvement for rank is demonstrated in targeted areas of service, which may include, but not limited to, departmental level, college level, university level, and/or community.

a. Collaborative partnerships in service endeavors with internal or external colleagues that are skillful and innovative.

b. Needs addressed through active contributions in the areas of engagement, assessment, intervention, and/or evaluation.

c. Recognition/Award earned at the local, regional, state, national or international level

d. Community service that provides significant and measurable impact; service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service function

e. Mentoring activities and practices receive consistent favorable review. Examples may include but not limited to peers, students, and/or administrators.

Excellent Performance

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

Performance indicators that may be used to support excellent ratings:
defined by the Department of Social Work, service involvement for rank is demonstrated by active participation in targeted areas of service, which may include, but not limited to, departmental level, college level, university level, and/or community level.

    a. Service agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university mission

    b. Service contributions represent strategic decisions that balance demands from the discipline, department, campus, and community

Good Performance

Good performance demonstrates below-average evidence of service contributions but may reflect minor challenges that interfere with excellent performance. The supporting evidence suggests that work falls slightly-below department criteria of excellent.

Performance indicators that may be used to support good ratings: defined by the Department of Social Work, service involvement for rank is demonstrated by limited participation in areas of service, which may include departmental level, college level, university level, and/or community level.

    a. Limited selection of service interest/activity expressed for rank.

    b. Limited active and constructive participation in service activity

    c. Limited effectiveness in service as citizen of department

    d. Unbalanced service obligations

        Limited synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service function.

Fair Performance

Fair performance demonstrates minimal evidence of service contributions. In general, the supporting evidence suggests that service is moderately below department norms.

Performance indicators that may be used to support fair ratings: defined by the Department of Social Work, service involvement for rank is demonstrated by insufficient participation in areas of service, which may include departmental level, college level, university level, and/or community level.

a. Appropriate arenas for service not actualized

b. Minimal contributions made in service role

c. Selection of service interest/activity expressed for rank is insufficient

Untimeliness or unresponsiveness in expression of service interest/activity for rank hinders effectiveness

Poor Performance

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

Performance indicators that may be used to support poor ratings:

a. Service interest/activity for rank not demonstrated

b. b Obligation of service interest/activity for rank in the faculty role in a regional comprehensive university not evident

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

Process for promotion and tenure shall abide by Division of Academic Affairs Tenure, Promotion, Annual Evaluation, and Sustained Performance Guidelines and calendar for mid-point review, promotion and tenure within the Department of Social Work.

Candidates for tenure and promotion will submit evidence of teaching, scholarly activity and service for midpoint review by the Faculty Development Committee. The department chair in accordance with the offer letter and/or date of hire will schedule the review.

Mid-Point Review

All tenure-seeking tenure-track faculty shall undergo a mid-point review of their progress toward promotion and tenure during the fall semester of the third year toward tenure at UWF. The Chair will select three (3) faculty members from the Faculty Development Committee, with possibly one tenured faculty member from an outside department when necessary, to perform the mid-point review.

The Chair shall inform the mid-point candidate of UWF Academic Affairs calendar for tenure and promotion dates for the review no later than ten (10) business days after the Dean provides the list of those faculty scheduled for mid-point review. The candidate shall then prepare and submit a midpoint review dossier to the Chair that parallels the format required by the

University's application for tenure/promotion, excluding letters of recommendation. The Chair and/or Developmental Committee may provide guidance to the candidate in the preparation of the dossier.

Upon submission of the dossier, the candidate will then meet with the selected members of the Faculty Development Committee, within one month, for mid-point review and recommendations. The Committee will then provide its review, in writing within 10 business days, to the mid-point candidate and to the Chair. The Chair will then review the dossier and Committee's letter and prepare a written review of the candidate's progress, which will be provided to the candidate and forwarded to the Dean of the College according to the Division of Academic Affairs Tenure, Promotion, Annual Evaluation, and Sustained Performance Guidelines calendar. The final step in this process is the Dean's review and written letter of the candidate's progress toward tenure. Candidates have the option of incorporating mid-point review materials into their promotion and tenure dossier.

Promotion & Tenure
The decision to recommend tenure is a vote of confidence in the candidate's demonstrated capacity for scholarly and professional growth. Candidates are encouraged to pursue promotion and tenure at the same time. Thus, the department will not ordinarily recommend an assistant professor for tenure unless the candidate holds the appropriate terminal degree and has accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service, which warrant a simultaneous recommendation of promotion. Candidates considering a submission for tenure and promotion should submit in accordance with the university guidelines.

Criteria at all levels are considered the minimum publication recommendations and do not guarantee support at the Department, College and/or University level; quality and rigor will also be assessed in the evaluation of submitted materials. It is recommended that Department of Social Work faculty exceed these recommendations to help facilitate a successful Tenure and Promotion package at the Department, College and University level.

Tenure
The decision to recommend tenure is based upon sustained performance indicated by a minimum of annual evaluation ratings of excellent in teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service.

Recommendations for Tenure (Tenure Only, No Promotion)
    a. At least three (3) scholarly, peer-reviewed academic non-predatory journal articles in the candidate's discipline (broadly defined by research interests)

    b. A book chapter, or book published through a reputable non-predatory publisher in the candidate's discipline (broadly defined by research interests) may be substituted for one of the three (3) scholarly, peer-reviewed academic journal articles

    c. At least two (2) of the three (3) total publications must carry progressive publication dates after the candidate joined The University of West Florida

    d. At least one (1) of the three (3) must be a first author publication

e. Tangible evidence of additional creative and scholarly activity in other venues (oral, poster conference presentations, roundtables, workshops and electronic formats).

Promotion to Associate

Promotion to associate professor is justified by a strong positive reputation within the university in teaching, service, and scholarship.

"A candidate being reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor should be expected to have at least excellent ratings in all 3 categories of review for 3 years at UWF prior to submission of the dossier" (Division of Academic Affairs, 2020-2021 Promotion, Tenure & Annual Evaluation, p. 13-14).

Significant tangible and public scholarship recognized as such by peers is always a criterion. This scholarship should have earned acknowledgment in the discipline outside the university.

Recommendations for Promotion to Associate Professor (Includes Tenure Requirements) a. At least five (5) total scholarly, peer-reviewed academic non-predatory journal articles in the candidate's discipline (broadly defined by research interests)

b. A book chapter, or book published through a reputable non-predatory publisher in the candidate's discipline (broadly defined by research interests) may be substituted for one of the five (5) scholarly, peer-reviewed academic journal publications

c. At least three (3) of the five (5) must carry progressive publication dates after the candidate joined The University of West Florida

d. At least two (2) of the five (5) must be first author publications

e. Tangible evidence of additional creative and scholarly activity in other venues (oral, poster conference presentations, roundtables, workshops and electronic formats).

The decision to recommend promotion to associate professor is based upon sustained performance indicated by minimum annual performance ratings of excellent in teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service.

Promotion to Full

Promotion to the rank of professor is justified by excellent teaching, excellent service, and by very substantial tangible and public contributions to scholarship measured by favorable recognition in the discipline outside the university.

"A candidate being reviewed for promotion to Professor should demonstrate at least excellent ratings in all areas of review (teaching, scholarly and creative projects, and service) and at least 1 area should be rated as distinguished in the 3 years immediately preceding submission of the dossier. The distinguished rating can be in different areas over the course of the 3 years but a minimum of one distinguished rating each year must be reflected in the evaluation" (Division of

Academic Affairs, 2020-2021 Promotion, Tenure & Annual Evaluation, p. 13-14).

Recommendations for Promotion to Full Professor

    a. A cumulative total of at least twelve (12) scholarly, peer-reviewed academic non-predatory journal articles in the candidate's discipline (broadly defined by research interests)

    b. A book chapter, or book published through a reputable non-predatory publisher in the candidate's discipline (broadly defined by research interests) may be substituted for one of the six (6) scholarly, peer-reviewed academic journal publications

    c. At least six (6) of the twelve (12) must carry progressive publication dates after the candidate's promotion to Associate Professor rank. A candidate hired at Associate Professor rank, must have six (6) progressive publication dates after the candidate joined the University of West Florida.

    d. At least five (5) of the twelve (12) total must be first author publications, three (3) of which must be at Associate Professor rank.

    e. Tangible evidence of additional creative and scholarly activity in other venues (oral, poster conference presentations, roundtables, workshops and electronic formats).

Sustained Performance Evaluation
Sustained Performance Evaluation process shall abide by Division of Academic Affairs Tenure, Promotion, Annual Evaluation, and Sustained Performance Guidelines and adhere to CBA, Article 11.

All tenured professors and associate professors shall undergo a sustained performance evaluation. Each tenured faculty member shall submit to a sustained performance evaluation in the sixth (6th) year after receiving tenure and every sixth (6th) year thereafter where the faculty member's previous six (6) years of performance will be evaluated. The Department will adhere to the specific decision-making protocols and guidelines for sustained performance evaluations established by the University of West Florida's annual evaluation, tenure, and promotion policies. The dossier will then be reviewed by the faculty member's Chair, College Personnel Committee, and Dean who in turn submit their recommendations to the Provost for final review and decision.

Procedure for Applying for Promotion and Tenure
In addition to meeting the guidelines outlined herein, the department will follow the promotion and tenure application procedures and calendars as outlined in the "Annual Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion Policy" packet provided annually by the Office of the Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs.

The information details submission and review dates, assembly and order of materials, and the content included in Promotion and Tenure notebooks and file boxes (buckets). Candidates are encouraged to meet with the department chair early in the process to coordinate selection of internal and external reviewers. Candidates will include all solicited external letters of review.

Article IX. Amendments

Departmental Bylaws may be altered or amended by a two-thirds majority of the faculty present at any meeting, at which there is a quorum. Any member wishing to propose alteration, amendment, or adoption of Bylaws must provide written notice to the Department chair and Bylaws Committee chair detailing proposed changes at least one month prior to the meeting at which such changes are to be considered. The Departmental chair or Bylaws Committee chair shall distribute proposed changes to the voting membership at least ten (10) business days prior to the meeting at which the proposed change(s) are to be considered.

Bylaws initially adopted on <u>October 20, 2020</u> with CEPSDean Recommendations Approved on <u>April 15, 2022</u>   (Month) (Date) (Year)
(Month) (Date) (Year)

Appendix A: Change Index
- Bylaws initially adopted by the Social Work Faculty on October 20, 2020 and submitted to CEPSDean in October, 2020.
- CEPSDean Recommendations for Bylaws Revisions Received (verbal feedback only) on October 28, 2021 & November 12, 2021.
- Recommendations Addressed per Bylaws Committee from October 28, 2021 - March 24, 2022 and Approved by Unanimous Vote of Social Work Faculty on April 15, 2022.

Article III – Mission & Goals	04/15/2022
Article V – Committee Structure	04/15/2022
Article VI – Departmental Meetings	04/15/2022
Article VII – Summer Appointments	04/15/2022
Article VIII – Annual Evaluations, Tenure & Promotion	04/15/2022