# UWF Guidelines for Annual Evaluations and Promotion for Clinical Faculty

## 2025-2026

**Table of Contents**


I. PROFESSIONAL/CLINICAL PRACTICE POSITIONS ..... 3
A. Job Summary ..... 3
B. Minimum Qualification Requirements for Assigning Rank ..... 3
1. Assistant Professors of Professional/Clinical Practice ..... 3
2. Associate Professors of Professional/Clinical Practice ..... 3
3. Professors of Professional/Clinical Practice ..... 4
II. ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDELINES ..... 4
A. Compliance Levels ..... 4
B. Confidentiality ..... 4
C. Department Procedures and/or Bylaws ..... 4
D. Changing Department Standards ..... 4
E. Role of the Chair's Annual Evaluation in Promotion Decisions ..... 5
F. The Candidate is the Chair ..... 5
G. Securing Colleague Supporting Materials ..... 5
H. Preparing the Dossier ..... 5
I. Levels of Review ..... 5
J. Review Decision ..... 6
K. Joint Appointment ..... 6
III. PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION. ..... 7
A. Department Criteria for Promotion ..... 7
B. Eligibility for Promotion ..... 7
C. Early Review Considerations ..... 8
D. Teaching Criteria for Promotion ..... 8
E. Teaching Exemplars ..... 9
F. Professional Service Criteria ..... 9
G. Professional Service Exemplars ..... 10
IV. PROMOTION REVIEW CALENDAR ..... 11
V. FORMAT, SCOPE, AND CUSTODY OF DOSSIER MATERIALS ..... 12
A. Order of Dossier Materials ..... 12
B. Adding Documents ..... 13
VI. CALENDAR FOR ANNUAL EVALUATIONS ..... 13
VII. DOCUMENT HISTORY ..... 14
APPENDIX A ..... 15
I. TEACHING PERFORMANCE INDICATORS ..... 15
A. "Exceeds Expectations" Performance ..... 15
B. "Meets Expectations" Performance ..... 15
C. "Does Not Meet Expectations" Performance ..... 16
D. "Unsatisfactory" Performance ..... 17
II. SERVICE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS ..... 17
A. "Exceeds Expectations" Performance ..... 17
B. "Meets Expectations" Performance ..... 17
C. "Does Not Meet Expectations" Performance ..... 17
D. "Unsatisfactory" Performance ..... 18
APPENDIX B ..... 19
APPENDIX C ..... 20

# I. PROFESSIONAL/CLINICAL PRACTICE POSITIONS

## A. Job Summary

Faculty **may** receive a title of Professional Practice or Clinical Practice depending upon the nature of the discipline.

Professional/Clinical practice faculty are appointed in non-tenure track positions at the ranks of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor based on the qualifications of the Candidate.

Professional/Clinical practice faculty ordinarily have a terminal degree, current certification and/or licensure, and experience in clinical or professional practice, as specified by the department of appointment, regional-specific qualifications, and disciplinary-specific qualifications.

In some cases, individuals with substantial professional level experience or expertise that equates to the typical degree and/or certification/licensure **may** be considered.

Clinical faculty are not eligible for tenure and typically do not receive course reassignments for scholarship.

Clinical faculty are typically assigned duties in two areas: teaching and professional service.

## B. Minimum Qualification Requirements for Assigning Rank

### 1. Assistant Professors of Professional/Clinical Practice

Assistant Professors of Professional/Clinical Practice are ordinarily expected:

- to hold the doctorate or terminal master's degree in the discipline,
- to have current certification and/or licensure as specified by the department of appointment,
- to have experience in clinical or professional practice,
- to show promise of excellence in teaching and in clinical supervision and/or direction (as appropriate to the discipline), and
- to show promise of excellence in professional productivity and service including, but not limited to, clinical service.

### 2. Associate Professors of Professional/Clinical Practice

Associate Professors of Professional/Clinical Practice are ordinarily expected:

- to hold the doctorate or terminal master's degree in the discipline,
- to have current certification and/or licensure as specified by the department of appointment
- to have an established record of sustained success in clinical or other professional practice
- to have an established record of sustained success in teaching and/or in clinical supervision at the undergraduate and/or the graduate levels and/or in clinical direction (as appropriate to the discipline), and
- to have an established record of success in professional productivity and service (as appropriate to the discipline), and

- to have an established record of effective participation in departmental service and in service to state, regional, and/or national professional organizations and, where specified by the department, in professional service in the community (Appendix C).

3. Professors of Professional/Clinical Practice

Professors of Professional/Clinical Practice are ordinarily expected:

- to hold the doctorate or terminal master's degree in the discipline,
- to have current certification and/or licensure as specified by the department of appointment
- to have an established record of sustained success and excellence in clinical or other professional practice,
- to have an established record of sustained success and excellence in teaching and/or in clinical supervision at the undergraduate and/or the graduate levels and/or in clinical direction (as appropriate to the discipline), and
- to have achieved unmistakable recognition for professional contributions, and
- to have a substantial and sustained record of effective participation in service to the department, the institution, and to the profession at the regional, and/or national level and, where specified by the department, a sustained record of effective professional service in the community (Appendix C).

## II. ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDELINES

### A. 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.

### B. 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.

### C. 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.

### D. Changing Department Standards

Changes in department standards **must** be consistent with the applicable provisions in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

## E. Role of the Chair's Annual Evaluation in Promotion Decisions

Department Chairs should advise all Professional/Clinical faculty members of all promotion requirements. To this end, they should provide Professional/Clinical faculty members with copies of the appropriate department, college, and University promotion policies and discuss the contents of these documents. It is the responsibility of the promotion Candidate to know and follow the guidelines set forth in these documents. Furthermore, the Candidate **must** present a clear and accurate professional record and allow the reviews to proceed according to the established procedures.

The Chair **shall** be responsible for keeping the Professional/Clinical faculty member informed about the Chair's assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments and progress toward promotion. The Department and/or Chair **may** form a committee that includes both internal and external mentors for the purpose of providing feedback on the Candidate's progress toward promotion. Candidates and administrators should refer to relevant articles in the Collective Bargaining Agreement for guidance.

## F. The Candidate is the Chair

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

## G. Securing Colleague Supporting Materials

Professional/Clinical promotion Candidates will be required to submit external letters of support as defined by department bylaws. The number of letters will be determined by the department bylaws.

## H. Preparing the Dossier

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

## I. Levels of Review

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

- the 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)

- the Provost.

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.

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 he or she believes 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 Chair agrees with the majority (or breaks the tie) in favor of the Candidate; **and**
b) The CFPC agrees in favor of the Candidate, with no negative opinions; **and**
c) The Dean agrees in favor of the Candidate.

In summary, a Professional/Clinical promotion 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 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.

The President **shall** review the advisory committees' recommendations and **shall** make a final and binding determination regarding the success of the faculty member's application for promotion.

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

## J. Review Decision

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.

## K. 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.

## III. PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION.

### A. Department Criteria for Promotion

Departments should strive to create Professional/Clinical faculty promotion evaluation criteria that are as straightforward and transparent as possible. Candidates for 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 and consistent performance. For example, departments **may** require a specific level of achievement for a specific amount of time as evidence of readiness for promotion. Departments **may** also establish a target number of activities or exemplars that **must** take place during the evaluation period.

Departments can exercise more stringent performance requirements for Professional/Clinical faculty than the university standards, 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.

Changes in department standards **must** be consistent with the applicable provisions in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

### B. Eligibility for Promotion

The Professional/Clinical faculty member and the Chair **shall** confer about the readiness of the faculty member as a Candidate for promotion. Promotion within the Professional/Clinical ranks is elective (not mandatory). The process of submitting a dossier for consideration for promotion **shall** be initiated upon request of the faculty member or upon agreement between the faculty member and Chair. The Chair will forward the request to the Dean.

Eligibility for promotion involves both quality of performance and time in rank. Candidates for promotion will have to achieve any specific targets for production of teaching and professional service that are identified in department bylaws, criteria, or policies. 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 promotion attempts in the previous three years from the current submission reviews **shall** be required to be included in a current promotion review submission in subsequent promotion reviews. Unsuccessful attempts at promotion more than three years prior to the current submission, and promotion attempts while in a different position do not have to be documented in the current submission.

For Assistant Professors of Professional/Clinical Practice seeking promotion to the rank of Associate Professor of Professional/Clinical Practice, the minimum time in rank is five (5) years prior to making application for consideration for promotion. For Associate Professors of Professional/Clinical Practice seeking promotion to the rank of Professor of Professional/Clinical Practice, the minimum time in rank is five (5) years prior to application for consideration for promotion. The promotion application should begin after five years in the current position and

rank. Time spent in previous faculty positions or rank (e.g., Visiting Professional/Clinical Professor) **may** count toward promotion in current rank.

## C. Early Review Considerations

Professional/Clinical faculty Candidates for promotion are not eligible to submit an application for early review for promotion.

Professional/Clinical Practice faculty will be evaluated by the department promotion committees, department Chairs, the College Faculty Personnel Committee, the Dean of the College, the University Faculty Personnel Committee, and the Provost. They will consider each set of materials individually using the following guidelines based on the quality, scope, and impact of the Candidate's teaching and service.

Achieving promotion **must** reflect a demonstrated and consistent high level of performance in the Professional/Clinical faculty member's scope of responsibilities that clearly demonstrates increasing activity within quality:

- Teaching
- Professional service
  - Professional practice expertise
  - Appropriate University, college, and/or unit level service.

In addition to these broad guidelines, individual academic units **may** highlight additional expectations of their Professional/Clinical faculty. Professional/Clinical faculty **must** stay current in their discipline. Therefore, departments are expected to present different and more advanced expectations in their bylaws for promotion between assistant to associate and associate to full.

## D. Teaching Criteria for Promotion

Teaching is typically the primary responsibility for Professional/Clinical Practice Faculty. It represents professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge and involves teaching in the university setting. Teaching for Professional/Clinical Practice Faculty can include one or more of the following criteria, depending upon the teaching assignment:

- Teaching courses related to professional practice
- Providing practical instruction and application of practical knowledge
- Supervising and teaching in a professional/clinical or practice setting
- Providing academic instruction in skills relevant to the practice of a specific discipline
- Supporting the acquisition of professional/clinical skills for the profession
- Coordinating and supervising professional/clinical practice, student field experiences, and internship
- Advising/mentoring students in professional/clinical academic programs
- Providing services or out-of-class educational opportunities for students
- Community-engaged teaching with organizations/community partners to enhance student learning and community outcomes (Appendix C)

## E. Teaching Exemplars

Candidates for Professional/Clinical promotion **must** submit exemplars that support teaching activities defined by the teaching assignment. Exemplars should include examples of innovative practice, teaching effectiveness, and positive learning outcomes. Any exemplar of teaching effectiveness submitted by the Candidate should be related to teaching, advising/mentoring, curriculum development, and/or instructional development.

Exemplars **may** include:

- Student evaluations of instruction
- Peer evaluation(s) of their teaching effectiveness by someone outside of the Candidate's academic department
- Selected examinations and quizzes
- Students' passing rates on licensure/certification examinations with a curriculum map showing how course level outcomes map to licensure/certification learning measures
- Teaching portfolio
- Evidence of effective advising/mentoring and student supervision
- Narrative statements
- Teaching philosophy
- New course and/or program development
- Leadership in teaching
- Leadership in curriculum development in department and/or discipline
- Effective use of technology for teaching
- Program accreditation review results
- Assessment practices
- Teaching professional development
- Evidence of teaching effectiveness as defined in the department bylaws
- Teaching awards received
- Student accomplishments as they relate to course outcomes and objectives
- Impact and outcomes of community-engaged projects and partnerships
- Internal or external recognition and awards for community-engaged teaching initiatives

Acceptable supplemental exemplars **may** also be outlined in department/school bylaws (UWF-UFF CBA 11.2(b)(2)d)

## F. Professional Service Criteria

Professional/Clinical Practice Faculty are required to engage in professional service as defined by department bylaws on workload and on promotion. Though teaching is the main expectation of the Professional/Clinical Practice Faculty member, professional service and current expertise is what makes them unique from other types of faculty. Professional/Clinical Practice Faculty who choose to work toward promotion have the opportunity, over time, to maintain and enhance expertise through multiple areas of service and/or research. Service activities can occur in many different contexts that allow the Professional/Clinical faculty to demonstrate professional experience.

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

- Discipline-related service
- Professional organizations
- Licensure or certification in discipline
- Discipline-related advocacy
- Applied research in discipline
- Internal and/or external grants
- Community engagement related to one's discipline including initiating, sustaining, and assessing community partners/partnerships in collaboration or with reciprocity (e.g., community outreach projects, public lectures and presentations, etc.) See Appendix C.
- Public service
- University, college or department service

## G. Professional Service Exemplars

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

- Service or work in field to maintain credential
- Service that reflects contractual assignment
- Obtaining new / maintaining current professional or clinical licenses and/or certifications
- Active roles / leadership in professional organizations
- Service that is consistent with activities defined in the department bylaws
- Scholarship that supports advancements in their area of expertise
- Grants and technical reports that support advancements in their area of expertise
- Publications that support advancements in their area of expertise
- Presentations that support advancements in their area of expertise
- Activities that support advancements in their area of expertise
- Professional development leadership in their area of expertise
- Activities that support advancement in the community relative to the area of expertise
- Leadership in the University, college, or unit
- Administration in the University, college, or unit
- Impact of mutually beneficial community partnerships- the extent to which the partnership addresses a community need, creates geographic impact, and fosters reciprocity from the community partner (e.g., contributions that benefit the university, faculty, or students). See Appendix C.

Acceptable supplemental exemplars **may** also be outlined in department/school bylaws (UWF-UFF CBA 11.2(b)(2)d.

## IV. PROMOTION REVIEW CALENDAR

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

**2025**

| | |
|---|---|
| JUN 27 (Fri) | The Dean **shall** provide to each Chair a list of faculty members eligible to apply for promotion in the Chair's department. |
| SEP 2 (Tue) | The Candidate provides an updated curriculum vitae (CV) update and other materials as set out in Section V.A, Order of Dossier Materials. |
| SEP 26 (Fri) | The Department Chair receives external letters, adding them to the dossier, and confers with the Candidate. |
| OCT 27 (Mon) | The Department Chair adds their recommendation letter to the dossier and **must** ensure that a copy of their recommendation letter is accessible by the Candidate no later than this date. |
| NOV 3 (Mon) | Candidate adds rebuttal letter (if they choose) to the dossier. Chair forwards dossier to the Dean. |
| NOV 4 (Tue) | The Department Chair forwards the dossier to the College Faculty Personnel Committee (CFPC). |
| DEC 1 (Mon) | The CFPC adds its recommendation letter and **must** ensure that a copy of the recommendation letter is accessible by the Candidate no later than this date. The CFPC also sends a copy of their recommendation letter to the Department Chair. |
| DEC 8 (Mon) | The Candidate adds a rebuttal letter to the dossier (if they choose). |
| DEC 9 (Tue) | The CFPC Chair forwards the dossier to the Dean. |

**2026**

| | |
|---|---|
| JAN 12 (Mon) | The Dean adds their recommendation letter to the dossier and **must** ensure that a copy of the recommendation letter is accessible by the Candidate no later than this date. Dean also sends a copy of the recommendation letter to the Candidate's Department Chair and the CFPC. |
| JAN 20 (Tue) | The Candidate provides a rebuttal letter (if they choose). |
| JAN 21 (Wed) | The Dean forwards the dossier to the Provost who forwards the dossier to the University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC), when necessary. |
| FEB 9 (Mon) | The UFPC adds its recommendation letter and **must** ensure that a copy of the recommendation letter is accessible by the Candidate no later than this date. UFPC sends a copy to the Department Chair, Dean, and Chair of the CFPC. |
| FEB 16 (Mon) | The Candidate adds a rebuttal letter to the dossier (if they choose). |
| FEB 17 (Tue) | The UFPC Chair returns the dossiers the UFPC reviewed to the Provost. All dossiers are available for the Provost to review. |

MAR 16 (Mon) The Provost adds their recommendation letter and **must** ensure that a copy of the recommendation letter is accessible by the Candidate no later than this date, and sends a copy to the Department Chair, Dean, and Chair of the CFPC. A copy will only go to the Chair of UFPC if the UFPC wrote a recommendation.

MAR 23 (Mon) The Candidate adds a rebuttal letter to the dossier (if they choose).

MAR 24 (Tue) The Provost forwards all dossiers to the President.

APR 20 (Mon) The President informs the Candidate of the promotion decision, in writing, with copies to the Department Chair, Dean, Provost, and the Chairs of the CFPC and UFPC.

## V. FORMAT, SCOPE, AND CUSTODY OF DOSSIER MATERIALS

To facilitate the work of review committees and responsible University officials, Candidates applying for Professional/Clinical promotion should arrange their promotion packets 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 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.

### A. Order of Dossier Materials

Faculty will upload their files to the Interfolio digital system. (see Appendix B, UWF Interfolio)

1. A copy of the approved departmental Professional/Clinical promotion criteria.
2. Statement of contributions justifying promotion. This statement should include the Candidate's self-evaluation concerning teaching and service. The Candidate should address not only the quantity but the quality and significance of their work.
3. Curriculum Vitae (CV). The CV should clearly define all teaching and service activities. Please ensure the CV included is current and up to date.
4. Letter of initial appointment.
5. 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 evaluation plus any rebuttal letters that were submitted. Candidates **may** initially choose to redact the Chair's statements regarding progress toward promotion; however, the Candidate **must** honor a request from any reviewer to submit these statements of progress.

6. 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.
7. External letters of support (as defined by department bylaws).
8. 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 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.
9. List of supporting materials. Examples of Teaching and Professional Service should be included here.

### B. Adding Documents

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.)

## VI. CALENDAR FOR ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

**2026**

| | |
|---|---|
| MAY 29 (Fri) | The Faculty member provides an evaluation file to their Department Chair. |
| JUN 22 (Mon) | The Department Chair shares their written evaluation with the Faculty member. |
| JUN 29 (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 27 (Mon) | Dean provides their written evaluation to the faculty member. |
| AUG 3 (Mon) | Faculty provides a rebuttal letter (if they choose) which is added to the evaluation file. After this date the annual evaluation process is complete. |

## VII. DOCUMENT HISTORY

2024-02-23: Original Document

2024-07-10: Modified for 2024-2025 Academic Year

2025-04-24: Modified for 2025-2026 Academic Year

## 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 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:

- Student evaluation data document exceptional impacts on learning.
- 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.
- Evidence of reciprocal benefits from community engagement activities for both students and community partners (Appendix C).

#### 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.
- 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 promotion decisions.

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.
- Failure to maintain or renew licensure for clinical practice if required for teaching.

## II. 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 engagement or service, if applicable, provided significant and measurable impact; service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service function (Appendix C).

### 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,
- 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.
- Evidence of ongoing specialty clinical practice,
- Maintains valid licensure to meet practice requirements.

### 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,
- Failure to maintain or renew licensure for clinical practice.

## 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

## UWF INTERFOLIO

The Division of Academic Affairs utilizes Interfolio's Review, Promotion & Tenure (RPT) service to manage submission and review of packets for Tenure, Promotion, Post-Tenure Review, and Sustained Performance Evaluation.

Faculty will upload their files into this 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.

# APPENDIX C

## RECOGNITION OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

UWF is committed to collaborating with regional and state partners to improve the quality of life in the region. In 2015 and again in 2024, UWF received the Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement. This classification is the leading framework for recognition of community-engaged work by higher education institutions. UWF has adopted the following Carnegie definition and purpose statement for community engagement.

> Community engagement describes the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.
>
> The purpose of community engagement is the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching, and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.
>
> carnegieclassifications.acenet.edu/elective-classifications/community-engagement/how-to-apply/

Community engagement is inherently collaborative, requiring active participation from the community in the design, implementation, and evaluation of various academic outcomes. These partnerships are mutually beneficial, ensuring that the community is not only involved but also directly contributes to and benefits from the academic work.

While community engagement often naturally occurs within the Service Performance Indicator, it can also be integrated into the Teaching and Scholarship and Creative Projects Indicators.

To be considered community engaged teaching, the community engagement must be designed to "enhance curriculum, teaching, and learning" in support of "preparing educated, engaged citizens" and "strengthening democratic values and civic responsibility." UWF defines community engaged teaching as, a pedagogical approach that integrates academic learning with real-world community involvement, allowing students to apply their knowledge to address societal issues in collaboration with local, regional, or global partners. This may include activities such as service learning/community-based projects, community-based research projects, study abroad, collaborative creative projects, and internships.*

To be considered community engaged scholarship, the community engagement must "enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity" in support of "addressing critical societal issues" and "contributing to the public good." UWF defines community engaged scholarship as, scholarly work that involves collaboration between academics and communities to address societal challenges, applying research, creative activities, and/or knowledge to generate mutual benefits and measurable impact beyond academia. This may include activities such as collaborative research projects, community-based participatory research, applied research, public scholarship, creative works and performances that involve community collaboration and/or reflect community themes, policy analysis and advocacy, service learning projects with scholarly output, and other relevant activities.

UWF defines community engaged service as, the collaboration between academic institutions and external partners to address public issues, applying university resources and knowledge to improve community well-being and create meaningful societal impact.

Acceptable evidence of community engaged teaching, scholarship, and service are detailed in their respective sections

*Practicum, clinicals/clinical placement, preceptorship, student teaching, co-op, and field experience/placement are terms used in various disciplines that are synonymous with "internship."