



**UWF Guidelines for Annual Evaluations,
Tenure, and Promotion
2023-2024**

Table of Contents

I.	FRAMEWORK FOR DECISIONS	4
A.	DEFINITION OF TERMS.....	4
1.	“Regional Comprehensive University”	4
2.	Compliance Levels	4
3.	Criteria and Performance Indicators.....	4
4.	Categories of Performance	5
B.	TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA	5
1.	University Criteria for Tenure and Promotion.....	5
2.	Departmental Criteria	6
C.	DEPARTMENT ANNUAL EVALUATION PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	6
1.	Performance Indicators for Teaching.....	6
2.	Performance Indicators for Scholarship and Creative Projects	7
3.	Performance Indicators for Service	8
II.	ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDELINES	10
A.	TENURE.....	10
1.	Eligibility for Tenure	10
2.	The Role of Chair’s Annual Evaluation in Tenure Review	10
3.	The Department’s Role in Preparation of Tenure-Track Faculty.....	10
4.	The Role of the Department in Tenure Evaluation	11
B.	PROMOTION.....	11
1.	Eligibility for Promotion	11
2.	The Role of the Chair’s Annual Evaluation in Promotion Decisions	12
3.	The Role of the Department in Promotion Evaluation	12
C.	GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND PROCESSES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION.....	13
1.	Confidentiality.	13
2.	Securing colleague supporting materials.....	13
3.	Preparing the dossier.....	13
4.	Levels of Review.	13
5.	Review Decisions.	14
6.	Department Procedures and/or Bylaws.	14
7.	Tenure and Promotion Review Calendar.....	14
D.	SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS	16
1.	Linkage of Tenure and Promotion	16
2.	Enhanced Department Requirements	16
3.	Changing Department Standards	16
4.	Early Review Considerations	16
5.	Joint Appointment	16
6.	The Candidate is the Chair	17
E.	MATERIALS IN TENURE AND PROMOTION DOSSIERS	17
1.	Format, Scope, and Custody of Dossier Materials	17
2.	Dossier Materials.....	17
F.	ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES	19
1.	Evaluation Period	19
2.	Materials	20
3.	The Chair’s Review	21
4.	Faculty Rebuttal to Chair’s Review.....	21
5.	Dean’s Review	22
6.	Faculty Rebuttal to Dean’s Review	22
7.	Provost’s Review	22
8.	Review Calendar for Annual Evaluations.....	22

III. DOCUMENT HISTORY	22
APPENDIX A	23
I. TEACHING PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	23
A. "Exceeds Expectations" Performance.....	23
B. "Meets Expectations" Performance	23
C. "Does Not Meet Expectations" Performance.....	24
D. "Unsatisfactory" Performance	25
II. SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE PROJECTS PERFORMANCE INDICATORS.....	25
A. "Exceeds Expectations" Performance.....	25
B. "Meets Expectations" Performance	25
C. "Does Not Meet Expectations" Performance.....	26
D. "Unsatisfactory" Performance	27
III. SERVICE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	27
A. "Exceeds Expectations" Performance.....	27
B. "Meets Expectations" Performance	27
C. "Does Not Meet Expectations" Performance.....	28
D. "Unsatisfactory" Performance	28
APPENDIX B	29
APPENDIX C	30

I. FRAMEWORK FOR DECISIONS

A. DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. “Regional Comprehensive University”

Henderson (2007) elaborated the following unique features of the regional comprehensive university. Such institutions

- democratize education, making a college education broadly available to students with diverse preparation and motivation;
- focus specific attention on meeting the workforce needs of the region;
- emphasize the importance of effective teaching over research productivity;
- range from medium to large in size;
- concentrate on undergraduate education but offer selected graduate courses at the master’s level and a limited number of doctorates;
- are primarily supported through state funding and tuition.

The term “comprehensive” does not imply that the university will offer every conceivable university program, but instead connotes that the university is multi-purpose and selective in its goals. As such, faculty roles can be diverse in the regional comprehensive university, including those entirely committed to teaching and others whose primary focus is research. However, the majority of faculty will strive to balance commitments across teaching, scholarly and creative projects, and service in accordance with their departments’ mission.

2. Compliance Levels

When describing procedures and requirements, this policy document uses the verbs **must**, **should**, and **may**. The meanings follow:

- **Must** implies that the department must comply in all cases, without exception.
- **Should** implies a presumptive requirement, and the department is expected to comply in all cases. However, when “should” is used, the department may, in certain limited circumstances, deviate from the requirement. Deviations should be the exception, not the rule, and should be justified by the department during the review process.
- **May** indicates a polite suggestion that departments are encouraged to address, if appropriate.

3. Criteria and Performance Indicators

- “University tenure and promotion criteria” addresses expectations about aspects of performance for major personnel decisions that are common across departments and programs.
- “Department tenure and promotion criteria” refers to the expectations departments develop for purposes of tenure and promotion decisions.

- “Department annual evaluation performance indicators” describes how departments adapt university criteria to fit their disciplines. Performance indicators reflect activities that faculty **must** have actually accomplished so that personnel committees can fairly evaluate whether a candidate satisfies the university and department expectations. These indicators might also be viewed as outcome measures, as they capture the outcomes that are expected for achieving a given performance rating.

4. Categories of Performance

These adjectives are ordinal rankings of the department annual evaluation performance criteria: “Exceeds Expectations”, “Meets Expectations”, “Does Not Meet Expectations,” and “Unsatisfactory.” Departments **must** use performance criteria that reflect the same ordinal scale and the same adjectives to depict that scale. These ordinal rankings are defined in the Florida Board of Governors’ Regulation 10.003.

- **Exceeds Expectations:** a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the average performance of faculty across the faculty member’s discipline and unit.
- **Meets Expectations:** expected level of accomplishment compared to faculty across the faculty member’s discipline and unit.
- **Does Not Meet Expectations:** performance falls below the normal range of annual variation in performance compared to faculty across the faculty member’s discipline and unit but is capable of improvement.
- **Unsatisfactory:** performance fails to meet expectations that reflect disregard, or failure to follow previous remediation efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in applicable university regulations and policies.

B. TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA

1. University Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

The University extends the annual evaluation criteria defined in Department/Unit bylaws for a faculty member’s teaching, scholarly/creative projects, and service, to the evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching, scholarly/creative projects, and service for consideration of tenure and promotion. A faculty member’s eligibility for tenure or promotion in teaching, scholarly/creative projects, and service **shall** reflect the annual evaluation ratings (inclusive of both the Dean and Chair ratings) received by the faculty member in each category of teaching, scholarly/creative projects, and service over the evaluation window. To meet the University criteria minimum standard for tenure or promotion, a faculty member **should** demonstrate no less than a majority of "Meets Expectations"/"Excellent" annual evaluation ratings in teaching, scholarly/creative projects, and service over the pre-tenure/promotion window.

2. Departmental Criteria

In addition to the University Criteria for tenure and promotion, departments **may** adopt additional departmental criteria for tenure and promotion. Departments **should** strive to create tenure and promotion evaluation criteria that are as straightforward and transparent as possible. Department tenure and promotion criteria **must** clearly state how ordinal annual evaluation rankings (along with other factors the department determines are important) translate to the conclusions drawn in tenure and promotion decisions. Candidates for tenure and promotion are responsible for assembling portfolios in which the weight of evidence documents sustained performance at the appropriate levels required for favorable decisions. Departments **should** provide guidance to faculty on what constitutes acceptable sustained performance. For example, departments **may** require a specific level of achievement for two or three years as evidence of readiness for tenure or promotion.

C. DEPARTMENT ANNUAL EVALUATION PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Departments **should** devise Annual Evaluation Performance Indicators that reflect the mission of the university and department. In each of the three areas (teaching, scholarly/creative projects, and service) departments **must** develop specific and measurable performance indicators that address the following:

- Quality criteria relevant to each activity;
- The frequency of activities and outcomes expected within review period, where relevant.

Performance indicators **must** clearly distinguish the differences between and among performance criteria (ordinal rankings: “Exceeds Expectations”, “Meets Expectations”, “Does Not Meet Expectations”, and “Unsatisfactory”). Appendix A provides university-level behavioral criteria for the four levels of performance that guide department discussions of their criteria.

1. Performance Indicators for Teaching

Because high-quality teaching is critical to the university’s regional comprehensive mission and vision, “Meets Expectations” performance is **required** for all tenure and promotion decisions. Teaching includes all teaching and learning activities in and out of the classroom that result in relevant, appropriate course learning outcomes, including the following:

- Face-to-face classroom teaching at Pensacola or branch campuses
- Online teaching
- Teaching in distance learning circumstances
- Research group and one-on-one supervision and mentoring
- Studio teaching in group or one-on-one formats
- Continuing education assignments

- Advising/Mentoring

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

- Teaching awards and other accomplishments related to teaching
- Pedagogical and quality enhancement activities that improve learning (e.g., active learning and student engagement techniques)
- Participation in professional development activities that improve teaching
- Respect for students and their rights
- Quality of teaching philosophy
- Quality of syllabi and course goals
- Effectiveness of assessment practices
- Evidence of student support practices
- Effectiveness of advising/mentoring and student supervision practices
- Quality of execution of special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, General Studies)
- Quality of supervision of thesis, dissertations, or field experiences
- Other relevant performance indicators specified by the department

2. Performance Indicators for Scholarship and Creative Projects

Departments **must** adopt performance indicators for scholarship and creative projects, taking into consideration issues of both quality and frequency of production, where relevant, that are consistent with the university's mission, vision, and resources to support scholarly and creative work. Accordingly, departments **should** consider a broad range of activities that express their mission and vision. Moreover, departments **should** recognize that regional comprehensive universities have limited resources that may constrain scholarly expectations (e.g., relatively limited travel support diminishes the opportunity for international participation).

Scholarship and creative projects **must** be externally reviewed and publicly available. These projects include the following:

- Creation, production, exhibition, artistic performance, or publication of works by one or more individuals demonstrating originality in design or execution
- Discovery of new knowledge
- Development of new technologies, pedagogy, methods, materials, or uses
- Integration of knowledge leading to new understanding
- Application of knowledge to consequential problems

Departments **should** consider and address a wide range of venues for disseminating scholarly and creative projects, including the following:

- Peer-reviewed publications

- Editorially reviewed publications
- Convention and conference contributions
- Grant activity
- Electronic outlets
- Broad performance venues for the creative and performing arts
- Other performance indicators for service deemed acceptable to the department

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

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

3. Performance Indicators for Service

Departments **must** adopt performance indicators for service, taking into consideration issues of both quality and frequency, which are consistent with the university's mission and vision. Moreover, departments **should** recognize that service is relatively more important in a regional comprehensive university than what might be expected at a research-intensive university.

- 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.

Faculty will vary in their execution of a service plan. For example, service may reasonably emphasize activity on the campus at the expense of the other options where that plan works with the university and department missions. In such a case, greater depth of service would be expected.

As faculty progress in their service commitments, the general trend is to move from less involved participation (e.g., "sitting" on a committee and being reactive to emerging plans) through more intense investment (e.g., exercising leadership and solving service problems proactively).

At the outset of employment, service activities are likely to be the relatively lowest priority of the three categories. As such, department Chairs and Program Directors should advise new faculty about the necessity of service in a regional comprehensive university and how these activities can be incorporated strategically into their work assignments. Service expectations should be somewhat lighter for new faculty who are establishing themselves as teachers and scholars/artists, but new faculty should ultimately be encouraged to render high quality service in their selected activities. Departments should provide equitable access to service opportunities for all members and be reasonable in making service assignments that fit with other faculty responsibilities.

Community service is more valuable when it is related to a faculty member's disciplinary background. For example, a biology professor serving as the director of a local church choir would not represent service contributions for the purpose of promotion and tenure evaluation. However, such service for a music professor probably would. Departments' performance indicators may address how compensated service should be evaluated in the context of their discipline and department.

Conclusions drawn about quality of service may be influenced the following performance indicators:

- A measure of the scope of service activities
- Quality of service leadership
- Service agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university mission
- Service contributions represent strategic decisions that balance demands from the discipline, department, campus, and community
- Recognition for service inside or outside of the university or both
- Synergy between faculty member's area of expertise and service function
- Other service activities defined by the department

II. ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDELINES

A. TENURE

1. Eligibility for Tenure

- a. Faculty beginning careers at UWF. Candidates for tenure **must** submit for tenure review no later than the fall of the 6th year of employment. Candidates for tenure with unusually strong performance records may submit for review no earlier than the fall of the 5th year.
- b. Faculty transferring to UWF. Faculty members may negotiate up to 2 years of credit toward tenure based on past performance. The initial appointment letter **must** clearly identify the number of years of credit toward tenure. When the Dean grants 2 years of credit toward tenure, regular consideration for tenure will transpire in the fall of the 4th year of employment. Early consideration for tenure, in cases where candidates demonstrate unusually strong performance, will initiate tenure review in the fall of the 3rd year. In cases for which service outside UWF produced credit toward tenure, a copy of the initial appointment letter documenting this credit **must** be included in the portfolio. Any subsequent changes to years of credit toward tenure also **must** be documented and included in the portfolio.

2. The Role of Chair's Annual Evaluation in Tenure Review

The Chair's annual evaluations provide systematic feedback to the faculty member over the course of employment. The Chair **shall** evaluate each faculty member annually in writing, assess progress toward tenure and promotion, give the faculty member a copy of the written evaluation, and discuss the written evaluation with the faculty member. If the evaluation reflects deficiencies in the faculty member's performance, the Chair **shall** make specific suggestions to give the faculty member an opportunity to improve performance, thereby enhancing the likelihood of successful tenure and/or promotion. The faculty member may submit a rebuttal to the annual evaluation that will become part of the official file.

The Chair's annual evaluations should carry some degree of weight in tenure and promotion decisions; however, this perspective represents just one component of the formal review process. At each level of review, the candidate's accomplishments are subject to professional and peer evaluations of the dossier. Therefore, strong annual evaluations represent summative feedback about faculty performance but cannot be construed as a guarantee of either tenure or promotion.

3. The Department's Role in Preparation of Tenure-Track Faculty

Departments **must** have a procedure devoted to mentoring new faculty. Departments have the responsibility for designing and maintaining a mentoring program that facilitates new faculty members' professional growth and adaptation to the university.

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

The mid-point review is intended to provide formative feedback to optimize faculty success in the tenure decision. The review should corroborate success and encourage faculty who are making solid progress toward tenure, inform faculty who may need to improve in selected areas of performance, and warn faculty where lack of progress could jeopardize a favorable outcome. Faculty members may elect to include a copy of the mid-point review in the tenure portfolio; however, inclusion is not required.

All mid-point reviews should address the performance of annual assignments including teaching, scholarly and creative projects, and service occurring during the preceding tenure-earning years of employment. In addition, all reviews should assess overall performance and contributions critically in light of mid-point expectations. The mid-point review will not be as extensive as the formal tenure review that occurs toward the end of the probation period, but should be based on a set of documents, including a current vita; annual evaluations; student evaluation of teaching; selected examples of teaching materials and scholarship; and a self-evaluation by the faculty member. The Dean will review the department's written mid-point review and respond to the department and the faculty member in writing. Further use of these materials is at the discretion of the faculty member.

4. The Role of the Department in Tenure Evaluation

All tenured faculty in the department or unit **shall** vote regarding the acceptability of tenure for the candidate. The unsigned votes will be included in the tenure dossier in an envelope without disclosure of how individual faculty voted in the decision. (See Appendix B for the form on which to record the results of the secret ballot.)

In cases where there are fewer than three tenured faculty to assist in making the tenure evaluation decisions, the respective college council **shall** develop a procedure to provide an additional evaluation method. Chairs **shall** notify the college council at the start of the academic year when an alternative needs to be implemented.

B. PROMOTION

1. Eligibility for Promotion

The faculty member and the Chair **shall** confer about the readiness of the faculty member as a candidate for promotion. The process of submitting a dossier for consideration for promotion **shall** be initiated upon request of the faculty member or upon agreement between the faculty member and Chair. The Chair will forward the request to the Dean.

Eligibility for promotion involves both quality of performance and time served in existing rank. Candidates will typically be considered worthy of promotion consideration when their annual evaluations demonstrate quality in performance consistent with the expected level of performance for the rank to which the candidate aspires as indicated in departmental bylaws. Candidates will also have to achieve any specific targets for production of scholarly and creative projects that are identified in department by-laws, criteria, or policies.

If candidates do not succeed in their bid for promotion, they should refrain from immediate resubmission unless the intervening changes show substantial improvements. Results of all prior unsuccessful reviews **shall** be required in subsequent promotion reviews.

- a. **Promotion to Professor.** Candidates for Professor will typically complete at least 5 years of employment at the associate level, 3 of which should transpire at UWF. Candidates may submit for review after the completion of 4 years of employment at the associate level, at least 3 years of which have transpired at UWF, in exceptional cases where annual evaluations point to success in meeting performance expectations.
- b. **Promotion to Associate.** Candidates for Associate Professor will typically complete 5 years of employment at the assistant professor level before submitting a dossier for review in the fall of the 6th year. Candidates may submit for review after the completion of 4 years of employment in exceptional cases where annual evaluations point to success in meeting performance expectations.
- c. **Promotion to Senior Research Associate.** Candidates for Senior Research Associate will complete 5 years of employment at the research associate level before submitting a dossier for review in the fall of the 6th year.

2. The Role of the Chair's Annual Evaluation in Promotion Decisions

The Chair **shall** be responsible for keeping the faculty member informed about the Chair's assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments and progress towards promotion. Candidates and administrators should refer to relevant articles in the Collective Bargaining Agreement for guidance.

3. The Role of the Department in Promotion Evaluation

The department **shall** set their own policies and procedures for providing input on a candidate's readiness for promotion. If an out-of-unit Associate Professor does not have a teaching obligation as part of the out-of-unit faculty member's work assignment, any enhanced criteria, whether created on the departmental or university level, shall be aligned with the performance expectations associated with the out-of-unit faculty member's work assignment.

C. GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND PROCESSES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

1. Confidentiality.

All evaluators, including faculty, Chairs, Deans, and committee members as well as staff members who assist in the process **shall** keep all recommendations and committee deliberations in strict confidence.

2. Securing colleague supporting materials.

In consultation with the candidate, the Chair **must** secure 3 evaluation letters for personnel decisions (tenure and/or promotion) from knowledgeable peers outside the university who have expertise in the candidate's discipline. For these letters, peers should be in a position to make independent judgments. The evaluators should specify how long and in what capacity they have known the candidate and include an abbreviated curriculum vita. Prior to the consideration of the faculty member's candidacy, the candidate should review the contents of the relevant file and may attach a brief response to any materials therein.

3. Preparing the dossier.

Faculty members are encouraged to consult with the Chair as a mentor to facilitate the smoothest preparation process possible; however, ultimately the candidate **shall** be responsible for including all pertinent information in the dossier in the recommended order and meeting appropriate deadlines. The Chair **shall** assist the candidate with preparation of the dossier and **shall** make available to the candidate all necessary materials, information, and forms.

4. Levels of Review.

Before the President makes a final decision on the status of the application, the candidate's dossier will undergo sequential review by the following entities:

- the department and Chair;
 - if the candidate is the Chair of the unit, the dossier will be forwarded to the next level of review;
- the College Faculty Personnel Committee (CFPC);
- the Dean;
- the University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC); and
- the Provost.

Each review judgment should be regarded as independent and advisory.

A review by the UFPC will be required if there are any negative reviews from any prior reviewing bodies. Additionally, the Provost may request a UFPC review if they believe that further deliberation and input will facilitate the most defensible decision. Any candidate may also request a review by the UFPC.

A review by the UFPC will not be required under the following conditions:

- a) The departmental faculty render majority support, or tie vote, in favor of the candidate; and
- b) The Chair agrees with the majority (or breaks the tie) in favor of the candidate; and
- c) The CFPC agrees in favor of the candidate, with no negative opinions; and
- d) The Dean agrees in favor of the candidate.

In summary, a candidate whose dossier produces no negative feedback through the Dean's level of review should not expect to be reviewed by the UFPC unless extenuating circumstances prompt the Provost to ask for additional assistance from the UFPC.

The President **shall** recommend to the University Board of Trustees on all tenure matters, taking into account the recommendations of all groups or individuals described in this statement. Promotion decisions do not go before the Board for confirmation, which means the President is the final authority in these decisions.

5. Review Decisions.

All reviewers **shall** exercise independent judgment. Each decision, starting with the decision rendered by the Chair, **must** be accompanied by a rationale for the decision rendered. When a decision is unfavorable, the rationale should provide sufficient detail to enable the candidate to address the concerns in a rebuttal. The conclusions of the CFPC and UFPC committee **must** reveal the vote tally; however, the decision **must** not disclose how individual committee members voted in the decision.

6. Department Procedures and/or Bylaws.

Departments **shall** ensure that relevant department procedures and/or bylaws are in accord with the principles outlined in this document.

7. Tenure and Promotion Review Calendar.

The following represents the schedule by which the various levels of decisions will be rendered for promotion and tenure.

2023

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| JUN 30 (Fri) | The Dean shall provide to each Chair a list of faculty members eligible to apply for tenure and promotion in the Chair's department. |
| SEP 1 (Fri) | Deadline for those faculty members with credit towards tenure to withdraw all or a portion of such credit (may only be withdrawn once). |
| SEP 5 (Tue) | Candidate provides curriculum vitae (CV) update and other materials as stated in Section II.E, Materials in Promotion and Tenure Dossiers. |

- SEP 29 (Fri) Chair receives external letters, adding them to the dossier, and confers with candidate. Secret ballots for tenure cases should also be added.
- OCT 30 (Mon) Chair adds their evaluation to the dossier and **must** assure that a copy of their evaluation is accessible by the candidate no later than this date.
- NOV 6 (Mon) Candidate adds rebuttal letter (if they choose) to the dossier. Chair forwards dossier to the Dean.
- NOV 7 (Tue) Dean forwards the dossier to the College Faculty Personnel Committee (CFPC).
- DEC 4 (Mon) CFPC adds its recommendation and returns the dossier to Dean. CFPC **must** assure that a copy of the recommendation is accessible by the candidate no later than this date.
- DEC 11 (Tue) Candidate provides a rebuttal letter (if they choose). The Dean includes the rebuttal in the dossier.

2024

- JAN 9 (Tue) Dean adds their recommendation to the dossier and **must** assure that a copy of the recommendation is accessible by the candidate no later than this date. Dean also informs the members of CFPC regarding their recommendation and sends a copy of recommendation to the candidate's Chair.
- JAN 16 (Tue) Candidate provides a rebuttal letter (if they choose). The Dean includes the rebuttal in the dossier.
- JAN 17 (Wed) Dean forwards complete dossier to Provost who forwards dossier to University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC), when necessary.
- FEB 12 (Mon) UFPC adds its recommendation and forwards complete dossier to Provost. UFPC sends a copy of the recommendation to the candidate, Chair, and Dean.
- FEB 19 (Mon) Candidate provides a rebuttal letter to Provost, if they choose, to be included in dossier.
- MAR 15 (Fri) A Faculty Member being considered for tenure prior to the sixth (6th) Year may withdraw from consideration on or before March 15 without prejudice. (CBA 16.2e)**
- MAR 18 (Mon) Provost adds their recommendation and sends a copy to candidate, Chair, Dean, and members of the CFPC and UFPC.
- MAR 25 (Mon) Candidate provides a rebuttal letter (if they choose). The Provost includes the rebuttal in the dossier.

MAR 26 (Tue) President receives complete dossier.

APR 22 (Mon) President informs the candidate of the promotion decision and/or tenure recommendation, in writing, with copies to Chair, Dean, Provost, and the Chairs of the CFPC and UFPC.

D. SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. Linkage of Tenure and Promotion

Many candidates will go up for promotion to associate and tenure at the same time; however, that linkage is not a university requirement. Reviewers should recommend tenure, but not promotion, only when they have confidence that the candidate is close to qualifying for promotion. Otherwise, departments may end up with the challenge of having made a career commitment to a faculty member who will be unable to realize the full range of faculty demands during their careers at the university, perhaps having an adverse long-range impact on the quality or scope of what the department can accomplish.

2. Enhanced Department Requirements

Departments can exercise more stringent performance requirements than the university standards as described in Part I, as long as they are consistent with the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Such enhancements **must** be clearly identified in department bylaws as enhancements beyond university standards so reviewers who do not share the department's disciplinary orientation can understand and support the department's standards.

3. Changing Department Standards

Changes in department standards **must** be consistent with the applicable provisions in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Changes are considered finalized when posted to the Academic Affairs website.

4. Early Review Considerations

Some candidates for tenure and/or promotion may be inclined to take advantage of the option to go up early for review for tenure or promotion. In general, candidates should only go up early when the history of work supports a favorable and easy decision at all levels of review. If the candidate is unsuccessful in an early bid for tenure and/or promotion, the results of the first review along with any recommendations made by the reviewing body will be included in any subsequent review.

5. Joint Appointment

If a faculty member is hired as a joint appointment, the Chairs of the respective departments will confer at the time of the appointment to determine which department will serve as the primary for administrative purposes. The Chair of the primary department **shall** be responsible for personnel decision processes, but is obliged to

confer with the Chair of the secondary department before rendering judgment. The relevant departments **shall** confer regarding how the faculty member's scholarly or creative agenda should relate to relevant evaluation criteria. If an existing faculty member's status is changed to a joint appointment, the administrative responsibilities between the departments should be determined at the point the change in status transpires. In a joint appointment, the standard for scholarly production should be a hybrid of the two departments' expectations; the faculty in a shared appointment should not be expected to meet separate production targets for both departments.

6. The Candidate is the Chair

There will be cases where the faculty member being considered for tenure and/or promotion is the Chair of the department. In these cases, the Dean, or designee, will collect external letters of support, and secret ballots for tenure to add to the dossier. The Chair's dossier will be forwarded to the next level of review once these documents have been procured.

E. MATERIALS IN TENURE AND PROMOTION DOSSIERS

1. Format, Scope, and Custody of Dossier Materials

To facilitate the work of review committees and responsible University officials, candidates applying for tenure and/or promotion should arrange their documentation and supporting material in the order listed below.

Candidates should restrict the inclusion of materials in their evaluation files to those that are germane to fair consideration of candidate's contributions. Evaluation files that include irrelevant or redundant materials inhibit the work of committees and administrators and are inimical to the best interests of the faculty member and the institution.

Once the candidate submits the dossier, the custody of the dossier moves from Chair to Dean to Provost, in accordance with the tenure and promotion schedule. Should the candidate wish to include additional material after submitting the dossier, the custodian of the dossier will indicate date of receipt on the added materials. The custodian **must** notify the candidate if materials (e.g., late-arriving evaluations) are added to the file after submission. A copy of the materials will be sent to the faculty member within 5 days. See the Collective Bargaining Agreement for additional detail. Materials added after submission **shall** not trigger reevaluation from reviewers who have already rendered judgment.

2. Dossier Materials

Faculty will no longer submit printed materials ("binders and buckets") but will upload their files into a new digital system. (see Appendix C, UWF Interfolio)

- a. A copy of the approved departmental promotion and tenure criteria.

- Changes to promotion criteria (CBA 15.3f) If a faculty member makes application for promotion within three (3) years following the effective date of changes in promotion criteria, such faculty member will be evaluated under the previous criteria unless they have notified the University in writing at least thirty (30) days prior to commencement of the promotion review process of a choice to be evaluated under the new criteria.
 - Changes to tenure criteria (CBA 16.4e) If a faculty member has at least three (3) years of tenure-earning credit as of the date on which the tenure criteria are adopted (under CBA section 16.4(a) through (d)), the faculty member will be evaluated for tenure under the criteria as they existed prior to modification unless the faculty member has notified the University at least thirty (30) days prior to commencement of the tenure consideration that they have chosen to be evaluated under the newly-adopted criteria.
 - If the faculty member chooses to be evaluated under new criteria, a statement should be included indicating that choice.
- b. Statement of contributions justifying tenure and/or promotion. This statement should include the candidate's self-evaluation concerning teaching, creative and scholarly activities, and service. The candidate should address not only the quantity but the quality and significance of their work.
 - c. Curriculum Vitae (CV). The CV should clearly define publication headings; e.g., books and other monographs, journal articles, conference proceedings, and technical reports. Published items and items forthcoming should be clearly distinguished and separately listed. The CV should also distinguish work that is peer reviewed. Please ensure the CV included is current and up to date.
 - d. Letter of initial appointment.
 - e. Annual work assignments and annual evaluations of the candidate's performance since joining UWF or since their last promotion. Annual evaluation documentation should include both the Chair and Dean's evaluations plus any rebuttal letters. Candidates may initially choose to redact the Chair's statements regarding progress toward tenure; however, the candidate **must** honor a request from any reviewer to submit the statements of progress.
 - f. Student evaluation data. Candidates **must** submit numerical results of all student course evaluations that have been conducted during the 3 years preceding the review. Those who have been on sabbatical or leave during the preceding 3 years should submit all student course evaluations conducted over the 4 years preceding the review. Ideally, the 3 most recent years of student evaluation data should be considered. If any data are missing for any other reason, the candidate **shall** offer an explanation.

As a result of the disruptions caused by COVID-19, faculty have the option of excluding Fall 2020 student evaluation data. Faculty electing to do so should

substitute a previous semester evaluation data in its place. For example, if you are excluding Fall 2020, you would then include data from either Spring or Summer 2020 (depending on when you last taught).

- g. External evaluation letters (3 letters).
- i. Secret ballot results (in the case of tenure).
- j. Documentation of special circumstances. Any situations that require a departure from expected procedure should be documented in this section.

Examples include:

- If a candidate has been unsuccessful in a prior application for tenure and/or promotion, the candidate **must** include the judgments and recommendations (Chair, CFPC, Dean, UFPC, Provost, and President) from the prior deliberation in this section of the current dossier.
 - If a candidate or Chair has requested materials to be included after the dossier has been submitted, the cover letter making the request should be included in this section of the current dossier.
- k. List of supporting materials. Examples of Teaching and Advising/Mentoring, Scholarship and/or Creative Activity, and Professional Service should be included here.

During the course of review, the following documents will be added to the packet and shared with the candidate.

- Recommendation of Chair (Any rebuttal letter.)
- Recommendation of CFPC (including the vote tally). (Any rebuttal letter.)
- Recommendation of Dean (Any rebuttal letter.)
- Recommendation of UFPC (including the vote tally). (Any rebuttal letter.)
- Recommendation of Provost. (Any rebuttal letter.)
- Recommendation of President. (Regarding Tenure)
- Decision of President. (Regarding Promotion)
- Confirmation of Tenure by the UWF Board of Trustees.

F. ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES

1. Evaluation Period

The evaluation period should correspond to the type of appointment. For example, 12-month faculty should be evaluated over the entire year whereas 9-month faculty should be evaluated only for those semesters included in the regular contract; summer teaching for 9-month faculty members should not be included.

Faculty retiring at the end of the fall or spring semesters are not required to undergo an annual evaluation for that academic year period. Faculty should confer with their

department Chair and College Dean's Office to ensure that the appropriate paperwork has been filed to confirm the planned retirement date. A letter of intent to retire will not suffice.

Should a faculty member later decide not to retire as originally planned, the annual evaluation **must** be completed for that academic year.

2. Materials

a. Faculty Prepared Materials

For the evaluation period, the faculty member will prepare the following for submission to the Chair:

- Updated Curriculum Vitae (CV)
- ACRES forms or other indication of distribution of effort
- 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. Acceptable supplemental exemplars may also be outlined in department/unit bylaws. CBA 11.2(b)(2)d
- Statement of contribution. The purpose of the statement is to highlight noteworthy achievements of the year. Any extenuating circumstances that should be considered in rendering judgment about unusual constraints should also be articulated in the statement. The contribution form may include a self-assessment of quality where endorsed by the department or college. The statement of contribution should not merely repeat or list data provided in either the vita or ACRES form. Instead, the emphasis should be on quality of effort and scope of impact. Chairs, Deans, and the Provost may require specific forms or narrative formats for the statement of contribution. If ACRES information is not available at the time, please provide other documentation indicating distribution of effort.

Examples of appropriate contributions may include the following:

- indication of high quality of course-related student contacts, including advising/mentoring, counseling, student conferences, and thesis and/or intern supervision.
- high quality of course syllabi that provide appropriate and clear direction, including articulation of student learning outcomes.
- evidence of appropriately rigorous intellectual demands made upon students, including examples of high quality of test design or assignments.
- peer or Chair classroom evaluation.
- assessment data reflecting appropriate student progress in mastering course content and achieving course outcomes.

- description of substantial revision of established courses or development and teaching of new courses.
- description of professional growth that will enhance the faculty member's value as a teacher.
- peer evaluations that identify progress made toward achieving pedagogical goals.
- evidence of quality derived from peer reviewed process related to a performance or scholarly work.
- a formal note of appreciation for service that emphasizes scope of impact or significance of service.
- self-assessment that highlights how submitted material supports success in fulfilling course objectives and achievement at a particular performance level.

b. Student Evaluation Data

Student evaluations will be conducted on all courses and all sections for the contract period. The faculty member has access to the evaluations only after grades in the courses have been assigned. Candidates **must** submit numerical and narrative student comments on all courses conducted during the regular academic year. Candidates may choose to submit additional evaluation material from the summer session, but it is not required.

3. The Chair's Review

The Chair and faculty member discuss the evidence the faculty member has submitted. The Chair considers and weighs all evidence relevant to the decision and produces a defensible judgment that is subsequently reported to the faculty member. The Chair may propose that judgment as tentative and request further feedback and discussion from the faculty member. The Chair's judgment will include both quality of performance during the academic year as well as estimate progress, or lack thereof, toward relevant tenure and promotion decisions.

Both the Chair and the faculty member sign the evaluation. Faculty signature signifies that the discussion has been conducted. It does not connote agreement with the Chair's conclusions. The Chair submits to the Dean the total annual evaluation file on which the Chair's judgment was based.

4. Faculty Rebuttal to Chair's Review

A faculty member who is convinced that the Chair has rendered judgment that underestimates performance is encouraged to submit a written rebuttal to the Chair's evaluation, which becomes an official part of the annual evaluation file.

5. Dean's Review

The Dean's judgment about both annual performance and progress of tenure and promotion decisions **must** be rendered in writing. Any unresolved differences between Chair and Dean evaluations **shall** be discussed concurrently among the Chair, Dean, and faculty member. Either the Chair or Dean can initiate a meeting to address and resolve the difference in opinion.

6. Faculty Rebuttal to Dean's Review

A faculty member who is convinced that the Dean has rendered judgment that underestimates performance is encouraged to submit a written rebuttal to the Dean's evaluation, which becomes an official part of the annual evaluation file.

7. Provost's Review

Generally, only those annual evaluations for tenure-earning faculty will be forwarded to the Provost for review. This review is informational only and does not result in a response on the part of the Provost.

8. Review Calendar for Annual Evaluations

The calendar governing annual evaluations should be followed by all parties involved in the process and should reflect the general targets below:

2024

- MAY 24 (Fri) Faculty member provides evaluation file to Chair.
- JUN 17 (Mon) Chair shares their written evaluation with faculty member.
- JUN 24 (Mon) Faculty provides a rebuttal letter (if they choose) which is added to the evaluation file. The complete file is then forwarded to the Dean.
- JUL 22 (Mon) Dean provides their written evaluation to the faculty member.
- JUL 29 (Fri) Faculty provides a rebuttal letter (if they choose) which is added to the evaluation file. After this date the annual evaluation process is complete. Evaluation files for tenure-earning faculty are shared with the Provost.

III. DOCUMENT HISTORY

- 2024-02-23 Revisions made for Florida Board of Governors' Regulation 10.003. SPE for Librarians moved to its own document.

APPENDIX A

GUIDELINES FOR DEPARTMENTAL ANNUAL EVALUATION PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Departments **must** use scaled performance indicators that clearly delineate the differences between the performance levels of “Exceeds Expectations,” “Meets Expectations,” “Does Not Meet Expectations,” and “Unsatisfactory.” Departments **must** not merely list the performance indicators without providing guidance about the relative importance of the indicators that are required for each performance level. Moreover, those indicator measures **must** both cohere with university criteria described in this document and fairly capture unique characteristics of their disciplinary and departmental cultures.

The following sections provide guidelines for departments on how to make appropriate judgments for tenure and promotion recommendations on quality of performance (i.e., “Exceeds Expectations”, “Meets Expectations”, “Does Not Meet Expectations”, and “Unsatisfactory”).

I. TEACHING PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

A. “Exceeds Expectations” Performance

“Exceeds Expectations” performance demonstrates that the weight of evidence supports an unusually high degree of quality in teaching as shown by the following indicators that build upon performance indicators for excellence.

- Performance indicators that may be used to support “Exceeds Expectations” ratings:
- Numerical student evaluation data document clear statistical exceptional
- Narrative statements emphasize powerful impact on learner or transformative learning experiences
- Teaching awards honor high caliber of performance
- Leadership evident in the promotion of high-quality teaching and curriculum development in the department
- Completion of an external course evaluation and certification through organizations such as Quality Matters.

B. “Meets Expectations” Performance

“Meets Expectations” performance represents consistent high-quality teaching with positive outcomes for students as reflected by the performance indicators below.

Performance indicators that may be used to support “Meets Expectations” ratings:

- Student evaluations document consistently positive impact on learning (above average)

- Teaching philosophy provides foundation for coherent course planning and activities
- Syllabi outlines comprehensive, clear, and appropriate performance expectations
- Assessment practices enhance student learning and contribute to department needs
- Goals and course content routinely provide evidence of successful continuous improvement effort
- Pedagogical practices facilitate optimal learning conditions
- Student support practices facilitate optimal student development
- Advising/mentoring, and student supervision practices receive consistent favorable review
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, General Studies) executed with expert skill
- Appropriate standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights
- Participates voluntarily in professional development activities to improve teaching quality and flexibility
- Implementation of high-impact practices defined by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (<https://www.aacu.org/trending-topics/high-impact>)
- The adaptation or creation of open educational resources to meet a course's needs.

C. "Does Not Meet Expectations" Performance

"Does Not Meet Expectations" performance demonstrates some positive teaching outcomes but produces major areas for concern for the department. The weight of evidence suggests that teaching performance in this performance category is below what is required for tenure and promotion decisions. Remediation is required.

Performance indicators that may be used to support "Does Not Meet Expectations" ratings:

- Student evaluations data document areas of moderate concern (ratings below the department average) or consistent and substantive problems (ratings well below the department average)
- Teaching philosophy may not be clearly expressed, missing, poorly articulated or poorly expressed in course planning and activities
- Syllabi need to provide clearer and more appropriate expectations or fail to establish clear and relevant expectations
- Assessment practices show some difficulty in supporting student learning and meeting department needs, or are inadequate to support student learning and department needs (e.g., learning outcomes are inadequate, inappropriate, or missing; testing strategies are not effective or fair)
- Goals and course content reflect limited or no continuous improvement effort
- Some pedagogical practices need attention or are unsound (e.g., disorganization; late, missing, unhelpful feedback; standards too lax or too challenging; routinely poor preparation; disengaging, chaotic, or hostile classroom environment)

- Some student support practices need improvement or are unsound (e.g., late or absent for class, not responding to email, not keeping keep office hours, showing favoritism)
- Advising/mentoring and student supervision practices need improvement, or consistent and very negative ratings in advising/mentoring
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, General Studies) could be executed with greater competence, or special teaching assignments are avoided or poorly executed
- Occasional or chronic challenges related to academic integrity
- Evidence of disrespect for students and their rights

D. “Unsatisfactory” Performance

“Unsatisfactory” performance is demonstrated by

- Failure to meet expectations that reflect disregard or failure to follow previous remediation efforts to provide correction or assistance, including failure to make improvements for a rating of “Does Not Meet Expectations” as stated in Annual Evaluations or a Performance Improvement Plan
- Performance involving incompetence or misconduct as defined in applicable university regulations and policies.

II. SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE PROJECTS PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

A. “Exceeds Expectations” Performance

“Exceeds Expectations” performance demonstrates unusually high degree of skill in design and execution of scholarly and creativity projects as shown by the performance indicators below that build upon the performance indicators for excellence. In general, the weight of evidence in this performance exceeds department criteria for excellence.

- Performance indicators that may be used to support “Exceeds Expectations” ratings:
 - Both quantity and quality measures clearly exceed department expectations
 - Wide national or international audience
 - National or international recognition earned for quality
 - Awards received for scholarly or creative projects
 - Achievements in continuing professional training show unusual merit
 - Strong record of grant pursuit, grant awards, successful completion, and dissemination of results

B. ”Meets Expectations” Performance

”Meets Expectations” 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 "Meets Expectations" ratings:

- Refined scholarly agenda or creative plan well suited to regional comprehensive university context
- Meets department production targets for both quantity and quality of scholarship
- Favorable review by and respect from majority of colleagues in the department for scholarly and creative works
- Potential for wide recognition of quality outside of the University
- Completes appropriate schedule of professional educational opportunities (e.g., licensure, technology training, etc.) in a timely fashion
- External support captured to facilitate scholarship or creative activities agenda
- Adheres to relevant ethics conventions for scholarly and creative projects
- Skilled time management facilitates success of scholarly agenda or creative plan
- Skilled use of collaboration as demonstrated by the commitments proposed, accepted, and fulfilled (e.g., group projects, creative activities, and grants)

C. "Does Not Meet Expectations" Performance

"Does Not Meet Expectations" performance demonstrates only minor tangible progress toward executing a scholarly and creative agenda. In general, the weight of evidence suggests that scholarly and creative projects are moderately below the department norms. This level of performance offers no immediate support for tenure or promotion decisions but provides evidence of some promise for future productivity. Remediation is required.

Performance indicators that may be used to support "Does Not Meet Expectations" ratings:

- General focus of interest identified, but falls short of rate of production required for promotion and tenure decisions, or scholarly agenda or creative plan has not been identified (e.g., central focus of career interest has not materialized)
- Evidence of some completion of beginning stages of scholarly or artistic process, (e.g., data collection, manuscript outline, artistic plan), but falls short of the production required for tenure and promotion decisions
- Minimal pursuit of scholarly and creative projects
- Avoidance of professional organization involvement that could help disseminate or display faculty work
- Failure to pursue expected professional enhancement activities (e.g., licensure, continuing education, technology training)
- Judgment about ethical standards for scholarly and artistic production may be problematic or violated at times
- Questionable or poor time management strategies limit production
- Erratic, unreliable, or problematic performance in collaborative activities (e.g., grants, research collaborations, creative performance) negatively influences project quality or completion

D. "Unsatisfactory" Performance

"Unsatisfactory" performance is demonstrated by

- Failure to meet expectations that reflect disregard or failure to follow previous remediation efforts to provide correction or assistance, including failure to make improvements for a rating of "Does Not Meet Expectations" as stated in Annual Evaluations or a Performance Improvement Plan
- Performance involving incompetence or misconduct as defined in applicable university regulations and policies.

III. SERVICE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

A. "Exceeds Expectations" Performance

"Exceeds Expectations" performance demonstrates a high degree of skill in service contributions as shown by the performance indicators below that build upon performance indicators for excellence. In general, the weight of evidence in the faculty service contributions exceeds the criteria for meets expectations. Performance indicators that may be used to support "Exceeds Expectations" ratings:

- Leadership demonstrated in targeted arenas of service (e.g., holds elected office)
- Collaboration is skillful and innovative
- Problems solved proactively through vigorous contributions
- Wide external recognition (local, national or international audiences) or awards achieved for quality of service contributions
- Community service, if applicable, provided significant and measurable impact; service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service function
- Leading program assessment activities

B. "Meets Expectations" Performance

"Meets Expectations" performance demonstrates satisfactory execution of service contributions as shown by the performance indicators below.

- Performance indicators that may be used to support "Meets Expectations" ratings:
- Scope and effort level meet department criteria
- Colleagues view contributions to department as effective
- Service agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university mission
- Service contributions represent strategic decisions that balance demands from the discipline, department, campus, and community
- Potential shown for wide recognition inside and outside of the university
- The adaptation or creation of open educational resources to meet a department's needs.
- Effective participation in program assessment activities

C. “Does Not Meet Expectations” Performance

“Does Not Meet Expectations” performance demonstrates only minor tangible progress in service contributions that can be the result of many factors, including limited pursuit of service, passive participation, or inability to manage obligations. In general, the weight of evidence suggests that service is moderately below department norms. Remediation is required to assist the faculty member to come to terms with the service obligations and appropriate behaviors to achieve positive outcomes in the regional comprehensive university context.

- Performance indicators that may be used to support “Does Not Meet Expectations” ratings:
- Service activity nonexistent or very poor in quality, producing a potentially adverse impact on the goals of the relevant organization
- Significance of the obligation of service in the faculty role in a regional comprehensive university not apparent (e.g., faculty seems resistant or oblivious to service needs)
- Community service, if applicable, does not in any way provide synergy between the faculty member’s area of expertise and the service function
- Over-commitment to service spreads faculty time and energy too thinly to facilitate effectiveness

D. “Unsatisfactory” Performance

“Unsatisfactory” performance is demonstrated by

- Failure to meet expectations that reflect disregard or failure to follow previous remediation efforts to provide correction or assistance, including failure to make improvements for a rating of “Does Not Meet Expectations” as stated in Annual Evaluations or a Performance Improvement Plan
- Performance involving incompetence or misconduct as defined in applicable university regulations and policies.

APPENDIX B

**SECRET BALLOT BY *TENURED* MEMBERS OF DEPARTMENT FOR NOMINEES
BEING CONSIDERED FOR TENURE**

DEPARTMENT OF: Insert name

COLLEGE OF: Insert name

SECRET BALLOT FOR: Insert name

_____ **YES**

_____ **NO**

APPENDIX C

UWF INTERFOLIO

Beginning in the fall of 2023, the Division of Academic Affairs will be utilizing Interfolio's Review, Promotion & Tenure (RPT) service to manage submission and review of packets for Tenure, Promotion, Post-Tenure Review, and Sustained Performance Evaluation.

When the new service is live, faculty will no longer submit printed materials ("binders and buckets") but will upload their files into this new digital system. Interfolio will be used for the following application and review processes.

- Tenure
- Promotion to Associate Professor
- Promotion to Professor
- Promotion for Library Faculty
- Promotion for Professional/Clinical Practice Positions
- Promotion for Lecturer, Instructor, and Research Associate Positions
- Post-Tenure Review
- Sustained Performance Evaluation for Library Faculty

Please visit the [UWF Interfolio](#) webpage for more details, including how to access this new system.