

UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA
DR. MUHAMMAD HARUNUR RASHID DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRICAL AND COMPUTER
ENGINEERING
DEPARTMENTAL BYLAWS

1. Name of Department

Dr. Muhammad Harunur Rashid Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering is a unit of the Hal Marcus College of Science and Engineering at the University of West Florida.

2. Vision

The vision of Dr. Muhammad Harunur Rashid Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering (MHR-ECE) is to be recognized in the state of Florida and the nation for its outstanding teaching and for the quality, character, and integrity of its graduates and faculty.

3. Mission

The mission of the MHR-ECE Department is to offer undergraduate and graduate programs of excellence in engineering that serve the needs of the West Florida region, the state, and the nation. The goal of these programs is to prepare students for a successful professional career in their respective chosen discipline of study. All programs shall be revised continuously to improve quality and respond to current workforce needs.

4. Department Structure

4.1 Department Members

The Department shall be composed of a chair, an associate chair, faculty members, visiting instructors/lecturers/professors, adjunct faculty, and support staff.

4.2 Eligibility in Governance

Faculty holding the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, senior instructor, senior lecturer, instructor, and lecturer are eligible to participate in departmental governance activities and to vote on non-personnel matters. Eligibility to evaluate and to vote on tenure and promotion cases shall be consistent with University guidelines.

4.3 Department Chair

The Department Chair is the administrative and executive officer of the Department and its spokesperson to the university administration and communities outside the University. Specific duties include but are not limited to scheduling of courses, management of departmental financial resources, assignment of

duties to faculty and staff including committee appointments, annual evaluations of faculty and staff, initial adjudication of grievances filed by faculty, staff, and students, scheduling of departmental meetings, and other administrative activities as events warrant.

The following outline specific rules regarding the appointment of the Department Chair.

- **Eligibility:** Any full-time faculty member (excluding visiting) may be nominated. Faculty members may self-nominate. If there are no nominations, the faculty refers the matter to the College Dean for guidance on how to proceed.
- **Term of office:** The term of office of the Department Chair shall be three (3) years. There is no limit to the number of terms a faculty member may serve as chair. An election shall be conducted at the end of each term.
- **Voting procedure:** All Department members eligible to vote in non-personnel matters are eligible to vote for the Department Chair except for visiting members. Voting will be done with secret ballots. The nominee that receives a simple majority of the votes will be submitted to the College Dean as the Department's nominee. In the event of a tie, all tied names will be submitted to the College Dean. Eligible faculty who are unable to attend the election may vote by proxy.

4.4 Department Associate Chair

The Department Associate Chair (hereafter known as the Associate Chair) is nominated by the Department Chair to the College Dean. The term of office for the Associate Chair shall be three (3) years, renewable at the discretion of the Department Chair and College Dean. All full-time faculty members, with the exclusion of visiting, are eligible to be the Associate Chair. The Associate Chair will be based at the campus at which the Department Chair is not located.

5. Departmental Meetings

The Department shall hold meetings during the regular academic year as requested by the Department Chair or by a majority of the faculty. There shall be at least one Department meeting during each of the fall and spring semesters. All academic and student-related matters requiring departmental action shall be discussed at these meetings. During the summer, the Department Chair (or Associate Chair) and the faculty present may make decisions and take action on an emergency basis; however, such action will not be binding until approved by the faculty during the next Department meeting during the academic year.

The following are general rules for departmental meetings:

- The Department Chair serves as the presiding officer at meetings.
- The agenda for each meeting will be distributed two working days prior (when practical). Any faculty member may request an agenda item be added.
- As far as practical, faculty on sabbatical or other authorized paid leave shall be informed of departmental meetings and shall be given opportunity to participate in discussions and votes.

- A simple majority of faculty members eligible to vote on departmental governance items shall constitute a quorum.
- All members shall have equal opportunity to participate in discussions and to express their views and opinions.
- All votes will be by a show of hands, or if requested by at least one-third of the faculty present, the voting shall be by secret ballot. In such circumstances, the Department Chair shall tally the votes.
- The Department Chair will only vote when there is a tie among the voting faculty.
- The Department Chair will designate a Department member to keep minutes during all departmental meetings. Following each meeting, minutes will be typed and shared with all Department members.
- Meeting minutes will be approved by a two-thirds majority vote at the next departmental meeting.
- Robert's Rules of Order will be followed when requested by one-third of the faculty present.

6. Department Committees

6.1 *Ad Hoc Committees*

Ad hoc committees will be appointed by the Department Chair as needed. Membership shall be shared fairly by all faculty members. The scope and composition of these committees are determined by the Department Chair in consultation with the faculty.

6.2 *Standing Committees*

Each standing committee will consist of faculty and/or staff members and will include a committee chair. Department standing committees will be the Graduate Admissions Committee, the Scholarship Committee, and the Programs Assessment and Accreditation Committee. The roles and responsibilities of each committee are outlined below:

Graduate Programs Committee: The Graduate Programs Committee (GPC) will consist of three faculty members appointed by the Department Chair. The GPC will review applications and make recommendations regarding admission into graduate programs. Additionally, the GPC will provide input to the Department Chair regarding general graduate program policies and administration to include recommended course offerings and sequences, development of research assistant and teaching assistant programs, and reviewing applications for scholarships within the graduate college.

Scholarship Committee: The Scholarship Committee will consist of faculty and/or staff members appointed by the Department Chair. The Scholarship Committee will make the recommendations to the Chair regarding the award of undergraduate scholarships.

Program Assessment and Accreditation Committee: The Program Assessment and Accreditation Committee (PAAC) will consist of three faculty members appointed by the Department Chair. The PAAC will ensure all course and program data required for assessment and accreditation purposes (e.g. ABET) are collected and documented following each academic year. Additionally, the PAAC will ensure

Department assessment and continuous improvement processes are in place that meet or exceed expectations for accreditation purposes.

7. Academic Policies

7.1 Curricular Review and Assessment Protocols

All faculty members are required to participate in the program outcome assessments and accreditation activities as assigned by the Department Chair. This includes but is not limited to providing various data on student performance with respect to course goals; providing feedback, discussion, and collecting course materials to facilitate continuous improvement to programs and courses following each academic year; and participating in the ABET evaluation cycle as deemed necessary by the Department Chair.

7.2 Student Advising

The Department shall provide two types of advising for its students: faculty advising, which is performed by a faculty advisor; and academic advising, which is performed by an academic advisor. The purpose of the faculty advisors is to answer general questions concerning the profession of engineering, to serve as a mentor, and to assist students in selecting specific technical courses that will meet the students' professional goals and interests. All teaching faculty members will serve as faculty advisors. The Department Chair will assign advising duties equally among all faculty.

7.3 Office Hours

Each faculty member will maintain a minimum of two (2) office hours for every three (3) teaching contact hours. When practicable, the office hours will be offered on multiple days and/or at different times of the days.

7.4 Cancellation of Classes

In the event of a planned or unplanned absence, the course instructor must contact the Department Chair at the earliest possible time. The course instructor will be responsible for arranging a make-up session. The instructor must either arrange for a substitute, provide a make-up class, or provide a pre-recorded lecture.

7.5 Course Policies

Grading and examination policies are made at the discretion of the course instructor. The policies are to be published in class syllabi. Controversy over grading practices should begin with the concerned parties and follow the grievance process outlined by the University. Attendance policies for financial aid verification must be performed per University guidelines. Course attendance policies are to be determined by the instructor and published in class syllabi.

8. Personnel Policies and Procedures

8.1 New Faculty

Advertising, recruiting, and selection of new faculty shall follow the established university procedures. The Chair will work with the new faculty member to assign a faculty member(s) as a mentor(s).

8.2 Annual Work Assignments

Work assignments will be done by the Department Chair in consultation with the faculty and will adhere to university guidelines.

8.3 Annual Evaluation Procedures

Annual evaluations are made by the Department Chair. The evaluation is based on the annual assignment letter written by the Department Chair and acknowledged by the faculty member. The assignment letter addresses teaching, scholarship and creative projects, and service. Annual evaluation procedures shall follow the established University procedures and time table.

Criteria for annual evaluation ratings can be found in Appendix I.

Adjustments to this criteria will be made in the annual assignment letter for faculty with a course release or on sabbatical.

8.4 Tenure Evaluation

The Department will follow the University guidelines for tenure evaluations. Criteria for tenure evaluations can be found in Appendix II.

During the tenure earning years, the faculty member, in pursuing activities listed in Appendices I and II, should seek critiques and guidance from the assigned mentors as well as other colleagues within the university.

A mid-tenure review will take place at the end of the spring semester in the third year of a faculty member seeking tenure. An ad hoc committee will be formed to review and evaluate the tenure-seeking member's dossier and provide feedback to the Department Chair. The candidate will supply the Department Chair and the committee with a dossier documenting accomplishments (CV, student evaluations, publications, etc.).

8.5 Promotion Evaluation

The Department will follow the University guidelines for promotion evaluations. Criteria and expectations for promotion can be found in Appendix III.

8.6 Post-Tenure Review

The Post-Tenure Review shall be conducted in accordance with the University procedure. The University of West Florida adheres to Florida Board of Governors' Regulation 10.003, as well as Article 11 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, in all matters relating to post-tenure review. Criteria and expectations for Post-Tenure Review can be found in Appendix IV.

8.7 Faculty Development

The Department is committed to assisting faculty development. To facilitate planning, faculty requesting sabbaticals will notify the Department Chair. Faculty requesting release time for curriculum and/or research development should present the plan to the Department Chair for review. Release time can only be granted by the College Dean or the University Provost.

9. Departmental Resources

9.1 Requests for Use of Departmental Resources

Requests for use of departmental resources must be made with proper justification to the Department Chair. Each request will be reviewed on its merit and subject to state regulations. Disputes will be resolved by the faculty and Department Chair.

9.2 Allocation of Departmental Travel Resources

Travel resources will be fairly distributed among faculty and staff as available.

9.3 Allocation of Paid Overload Appointments

Each opportunity will be reviewed by the Department Chair on its merit and is subject to state regulations.

9.4 Allocation of Summer Assignments

The Department Chair will distribute summer assignments among the faculty while considering the needs of the Department.

9.5 Merit Pay

Distribution of merit pay will be based on the annual evaluations of each faculty member and will take into consideration the salary level, compression, and inversion.

9.6 Request for Release time

Un-sponsored professional development opportunities will be shared equally over time. Requests for additional release time must be made as far as possible before the end of the previous semester. Release time for sponsored service and scholarly and creative activity will be consistent with contract or grant funds. The faculty requesting the release time must teach at least one three-credit hour course or its FTE equivalent per semester.

10. Professional Integrity and Collegiality

Faculty members commit to observing the highest standards of ethical and professional conduct. They must adhere to university and state guidelines related to this area.

Collegiality, in the sense of collaboration and constructive cooperation between academic colleagues, identifies important aspects of a faculty member's overall performance. A collegial atmosphere is essential to the Department's environment. Such an atmosphere makes both faculty members as well as students feel welcome and helps everyone achieve their personal and professional objectives. All faculty members are expected to:

- Treat colleagues and students with respect in all dealings, whether it be verbal or written.
- Undertake all activities with openness and fairness and respond to concerns raised by colleagues with respect.
- Deal with conflicts and disagreements among colleagues in a professional manner.
- Bring unresolved conflicts to the attention of the Department Chair, who shall attempt to resolve the conflict.
- Abide by university guidelines related to collegiality and faculty cooperation.

11. Amendments to Bylaws

These bylaws will be reviewed annually, and updated as needed.

12. Revision History

Date of Adoption: December 1997

First Revision: Initiated December 2000. The bylaws were approved by the ECE faculty on February 23, 2001.

Second Revision: Initiated January 2002. The bylaws were approved by the ECE faculty on March 4, 2002 by a majority vote of 3 "YES" votes and 1 "NO" vote.

Third Revision: Initiated December 1, 2003. The bylaws were approved unanimously by the ECE faculty on October 29, 2004.

Fourth Revision: Initiated December 1, 2007. The bylaws were approved unanimously by the ECE faculty on February 22, 2008.

Fifth Revision: Initiated February 7, 2014. The bylaws were approved unanimously by the ECE faculty on February 13, 2015.

Sixth Revision: Initiated September 28, 2015. The bylaws were approved by the ECE faculty via email vote on December 4, 2015. There were seven “YES” votes, one “NO” vote, and one abstention.

Seventh Revision: Initiated August 2019. The bylaws were approved by the ECE faculty on April 2, 2021

Eighth Revision: Initiated January 2024. The bylaws were approved unanimously by the MHR-ECE faculty via email on March 20, 2024.

APPENDIX I

DR. MUHAMMAD HARUNUR RASHID DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRICAL AND COMPUTER ENGINEERING

ANNUAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Faculty members are required to submit a statement of contributions and documentation of accomplishments by the University prescribed deadline for annual review and evaluation by the Department Chair. Faculty members are evaluated and receive rankings in three areas: teaching, scholarship and creative activities, and service.

The following document lists activity categories for each of the three areas and describes the indicators of each of the rank levels. Definitions for the rank levels are shown below and are consistent with the university policy.

- **Exceeds Expectations** performance clearly exceeds Department expectations in quantity and/or quality.
- **Meets Expectations** performance meets Department expectations; no major areas of weakness exist.
- **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 advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in applicable university regulations and policies.

The overall combined ranking is made by the Department Chair based on all three areas. The overall ranking is determined by considering the degree of accomplishment in each area as it relates to the others as well as the weight of each area. The Department Chair will assess the faculty member based on their performance according to the annual letter of assignment and will include the faculty member's contributions to the Department.

Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching

Listed below are acceptable areas and actions which can be used to justify a faculty member's teaching rating for an annual evaluation. This list is not meant to be all-inclusive, and other activities can be used to justify a faculty member's rating if the chair and faculty member think they are appropriate.

Teaching: Activity Categories

1. Course Execution

- Student evaluations
- Peer evaluations
- Clear and well-defined syllabi
- Incorporating scholarship in teaching areas
- Special teaching assignments including distance learning

2. Course Development

- Development of a new course
- Significant course update or revamping
- Independent study course
- Quality certifications

3. Student Research

- Graduate thesis/project advisor
- Graduate thesis committee member
- Capstone project mentor
- Independent research mentor
- Summer research program

4. Professional Development

- Participation in teaching development programs
- Participation in assessment, recruitment, diversity, and/or other professional development programs

5. Teaching Awards

- University-level award
- College-level award
- External award

6. Assessment and Accreditation Activities

- Completing outcome assessment

Teaching: Evaluation Rankings

Meets Expectations

This performance level demonstrates consistent high-quality teaching with positive outcomes for students. This performance level is the expected performance level for all faculty. Performance at this level meets most indicators below.

- A minimum of 2.7 yearly average of all reported sections taught on items covering instructor's command of the subject, overall assessment of instructor, and overall course organization on the Student Assessment of Instruction. If an instructor teaches more than one section of the same course in a semester, the instructor may choose to report only one of those sections.
- Student evaluation comments document consistently positive impacts on learning.
- Mentoring of capstone and/or thesis projects (when available).
- Syllabi are comprehensive, clear, and include appropriate performance expectations.
- Providing data and evaluation of student learning outcomes for ABET accreditation.
- Assessment practices enhance student learning.
- Course content provides evidence of continuous improvement effort.
- Pedagogical practices facilitate optimal learning environments.
- Maintains appropriate office hours and is responsive to student communications.
- Promotes appropriate standards of academic integrity.
- Treats all students with respect and promotes positive learning environments.
- Participates in professional teaching development activities (when available).
- Maintains great communication with students and is prompt in responding to their inquiries.

All other evaluation levels are measured relative to the Department standard for Meets Expectations. These relative levels are described below.

Exceeds Expectations

This performance level demonstrates high degree of quality teaching that exceeds the Department standard for Meets Expectations ranking.

Does Not Meet expectations

This performance level produces major areas for concern that have a negative impact on students and their learning typically as reflected by a combination of several indicators. In general, teaching performance is below the Department standard for Meets Expectations ranking.

Unsatisfactory

This performance level demonstrates serious problems in attaining success in the teaching role as reflected either by (1) a combination of many negative indicators, or (2) fewer but more extreme behaviors that produce substantial negative outcomes on students and their learning.

Criteria for Evaluation for Scholarship and Creative Projects

Listed below are acceptable areas and actions which can be used to justify a faculty member's scholarship and creative projects rating for an annual evaluation. This list is not meant to be all-inclusive, and other activities can be used to justify a faculty member's rating if the chair and faculty member think they are appropriate.

Scholarship and Creative Projects: Activity Categories

1. Publications (Refereed)

- Journals: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
- Technical reports: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
- Proceedings full paper: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
- Books as author: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
- Books as editor: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
- Chapters in books: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)

2. Publications (Non-refereed)

- Technical reports: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
- Proceedings full paper: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
- Books as author: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
- Books as editor: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
- Chapters in books: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)

3. Meeting/Conference: international, national, regional, local

- Presentations
- Invited speaker

4. External grants/contracts (Reviewed)

- Federal: submitted, new awards, continuing
- State: submitted, new awards, continuing
- Local: submitted, new awards, continuing
- Private: submitted, new awards, continuing

5. Internal grants/contracts: submitted, new awards, continuing

6. Other Activities

- Abstracts: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
- Patents on products related to field of study: filed, awarded

- Workshops attended related to field of study

7. Awards related to field of study

Faculty in tenured/tenure earning positions are expected to participate in research related activities. Table 1 lists the weights for various scholarly and research activities. For annual evaluations, faculty members are responsible for justifying their proposed ranking including addition of activities not listed above.

Table 1. Scholarly activities types and weights.

Scholarly Activity Type	Weight
Committee member graduate project/thesis/dissertation	0.5
Attending a professional development event	0.5
Submitting a UWF grant proposal	1
Giving an invited lecture	1
Mentoring a capstone project	1
Publishing a non-refereed conference paper	1
Securing UWF funding < \$10K	1
Securing UWF funding \geq \$10K and <\$50k	2
Mentoring a Master's/PhD thesis/dissertation/Project	2
Submitting an external grant proposal < \$100K (as PI or co-PI)	2
Publishing a refereed conference paper	2
Securing UWF funding \geq \$50k	3
Publishing an edited book	3
Submitting an external grant proposal \geq \$100K (as PI or co-PI)	3
Publishing a refereed conference paper in a proceeding with acceptance rate < 35%	3
Publishing a refereed journal paper	3
Publishing a refereed or invited book chapter	3
Securing a US patent	3
Securing external funding < \$50K	3
Securing external funding \geq \$50k and <\$100k	4
Securing external funding \geq \$100K	6
Publishing a book	6

Scholarship and Creative Projects: Evaluation Rankings

Meets Expectations

This ranking level demonstrates performance in scholarship and creative activity suited to regional comprehensive university as shown by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative projects meet the department standards for excellence in both quality and quantity.

Indicators:

- Minimum of two (2) points earned from activities shown in Table 1.

- Evidence of continued work towards publication of research and/or securing grants.

All other evaluation levels are measured relative to the Meets expectations ranking. Other rankings are described below.

Exceeds Expectations

This performance level demonstrates a high degree of skill in design and execution of scholarly and creativity projects. In general, this performance exceeds Department standard in both quality and quantity. A total of four (4) points earned from the activities shown in Table 1 in addition to evidence of continued work towards publication of research and/or securing grants.

Does Not Meet Expectations

This performance level demonstrates only minor tangible progress toward executing a scholarly and creative agenda. In general, scholarly and creative projects are moderately below the Department standard for Meets Expectations ranking. An inability to produce one (1) scholarship activity item of weight 1 (Table 1) or higher will result in this ranking.

Unsatisfactory

This performance level demonstrates serious problems in developing scholarship and creative projects. In general, scholarly and creative production is well below the department standard for Meets Expectations ranking. Anything less than 1 from Table 1 will result in this ranking.

Criteria for Evaluation for Service

Listed below are some of acceptable areas and actions which can be used to justify a faculty member's service rating for an annual evaluation. This list is not meant to be all-inclusive, and other actions can be used to justify a faculty member's rating if the chair and faculty member think they are appropriate.

Service: Activity Categories

1. Institution

- Committees at University, College, and Department levels
- Administrative positions
- Institution sponsored activities
- Advising student organization
- Advising student curricula
- Service to student organizations
- ABET support
- SACSCOC accreditation activity
- Recruiting and community outreach activities
- Articulation efforts at various levels
- Serving on search committees

2. Profession

- Associations/Societies: officer, committees, invited seminars
- Journals: editorships, reviewer
- Conference technical/organizing committees
- Agencies: board memberships, reviewer
- Meeting/conference: hosting, chairing sessions
- Publishing houses: textbook reviews
- Obtaining professional licensing
- Service to professional organizations
- Participation with local professional organizations

3. Community

- Invited seminars
- Juror/Judge
- Sponsor/participant outreach activities
- Community service related to one's discipline.

4. Awards related to service

For Lecturers and Instructors, activities listed under Scholarship and Creative Projects will count toward Service.

Service: Evaluation Rankings

Meets Expectations

This ranking level demonstrates excellent service performance as listed by the indicators below:

- Participate effectively in four (4) service activities listed above
- Scope and effort level meet Department standards
- Colleagues view contributions to the Department as effective.
- Service agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university mission.
- Service contributions represent strategic decisions that balance demands from the discipline, Department, College, University, and community.
- Community service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions.

All other evaluation levels are measured relative to the Department Meets expectations ranking. These levels are described below.

Exceeds expectations This performance level demonstrates high service contributions that build upon indicators for Meets expectations with at least six (6) service activities from the categories above. In general, service contributions exceed the Department standard for Meets Expectations ranking.

Does not meet expectations

This performance level demonstrates only a minor service contributions. In general, service is moderately below the Department standard for Meets expectations ranking. A total of one (1) service activity but less than 4 will be considered as a Does not meet expectations ranking

Unsatisfactory

This performance level demonstrates serious problems in fulfilling appropriate service role for faculty. In general, service is well below the Department standard for Meets Expectations ranking.

APPENDIX II
DR. MUHAMMAD HARUNUR RASHID DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRICAL AND COMPUTER
ENGINEERING

TENURE EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Department will follow the University guidelines for tenure. To qualify for tenure, a faculty must earn a minimum of Meets Expectations in teaching, scholarship and creative projects, and service for 4 out of the last 5 years.

In addition, at the end of the five years, candidates have at least three (3) scholarly activities of weight three or more, of which one (1) must be a refereed journal publication (predatory journal publications will not be considered).

The decision to award tenure to a faculty member will be a result of meritorious performance and will be based on established criteria specified in writing by the University. The decision will consider annual performance evaluations; the needs of the Department and College; the contributions of the faculty member to the Department and College; and the contributions the faculty member is expected to make to the institution.

Special Circumstances

- With fewer opportunities for research collaboration, limited resources and additional challenges inherent with working at a remote location, the scholarly-activities-of-weight-three-or-more requirement above will be reduced by one (1) item for faculty members based at the Fort Walton Beach campus. In exchange, increased emphasis will be placed on the faculty member's teaching and/or service performance to the department.
- Scholarly work produced prior to joining the University that was not used in previous promotion can be used in tenure provided the work was completed within five (5) years of joining the Department. Additionally, candidates using previous work must have at least two scholarly activities of weight three or more and at least one refereed journal publication while at the University.

APPENDIX III
DR. MUHAMMAD HARUNUR RASHID DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRICAL AND COMPUTER
ENGINEERING

POST-TENURE REVIEW

The Department will follow the University guidelines for post-tenure review. The purpose of the Post-Tenure Review is to ensure high standards of quality and productivity among the tenured faculty in the State University System. Post-tenure review is intended to recognize and honor exceptional achievement, affirm continued academic professional development, enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a performance improvement plan and return to expected levels of productivity, and identify faculty members whose pattern of performance is unacceptable and inconsistent with professional standards. BOG Reg. 10.003 (1)

Each tenured faculty member shall have a comprehensive post-tenure review of five years of performance in the fifth year following the last promotion or the last comprehensive review, whichever is later. For faculty hired with tenure, the hire date shall constitute the date of the last promotion. A faculty member may not elect a deferral apart from extenuating or unforeseen circumstances without approval of the Provost prior to the submission date. BOG Reg. 10.003 (2.c)

Post-tenure review criteria should consider the faculty member's performance holistically over the five-year post-tenure review period and not solely over the period of a single annual assignment or evaluation. With this standard in mind, the department endorses the following post-tenure review criteria for teaching, service, and scholarship/creative activity:

A. Scholarship and Creative Activity:

A faculty member's comprehensive post-tenure review rating in scholarship and creative activity shall reflect the annual evaluation ratings and contributions over the five-year period. Scholarship and creative activity will be based on cumulative contributions over the five-year period and will be ranked according to Table 2:

Ranking	Scholarly activities as defined in Table 1
Exceeds Expectations	16 and above point of scholarly
Meets Expectations	10 to < 16 point of scholarly
Does not meet expectations	6 to < 10 points
Unsatisfactory	Less than 6 points

Table 2: Total Scholarship and Creative Activity Points Required to Determine PTR level

B. Teaching Post-Tenure Review Criteria

A faculty member's comprehensive post-tenure review rating in teaching shall reflect the annual evaluation ratings and contributions over the five-year period. Teaching will be based on cumulative contributions over the five-year period and will utilize the total points received in the annual evaluation. Weight for calculating total points is based on weight given for each annual evaluation ranking as shown in Table 3. Teaching ranking will be based on Table 4.

Category Based on Annual Evaluation	Points
Exceeds Expectations (Distinguished)	4
Meets Expectation (Good or Excellent)	3
Below Expectations	2
Unsatisfactory	1

Table 3: Annual Evaluation Weights

Ranking	Total Point over 5 years period
Exceeds Expectations	16+ points
Meets Expectations	13-15 points
Does not meet expectations	Between 8 and 12 points
Unsatisfactory	Less than 8 points

Table 4: Teaching Ranking

C. Service Post-Tenure Review Criteria

A faculty member's comprehensive post-tenure review rating in service shall reflect the annual evaluation ratings and contributions over the five-year period. Service will be based on cumulative contributions over the five-year period and will utilize the total points received in the annual evaluation. Service will be ranked according to Table 5 based on weights given in Table 3.

Ranking	Total Point over 5 years period
Exceeds Expectations	16+ points
Meets Expectations	13-15 points
Does not meet expectations	Between 8 and 12 points
Unsatisfactory	Less than 8 points

Table 5: Service Evaluation

APPENDIX IV
DR. MUHAMMAD HARUNUR RASHID DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRICAL AND COMPUTER
ENGINEERING

PROMOTION EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Department will follow the University guidelines for promotions. The Department criteria for promotions emphasize the three areas of teaching, scholarship/creative projects, and service equally.

Promotion to Associate Professor

To be promoted to Associate Professor, a faculty member must:

- Complete at least five years of employment at the Assistant Professor level, at least three of which should transpire at UWF.
- Earn at least Meets Expectations rating in at all areas of review (teaching, scholarly and creative projects, and service) for 4 out of the last 5 years.
- Have at least three (3) scholarship items of weight three (3) or more as listed in Table 1, at least one (1) of which must be a refereed journal article.

Promotion to Professor

To be promoted to Professor, a faculty member must:

- Complete at least five years of employment at the Associate Professor level, at least three of which should transpire at UWF.
- In exceptional cases where annual evaluations point to success in meeting performance expectations, a candidate may submit for review after the completion of only four years of employment at the Associate Professor level, at least three of which should transpire at UWF.
- Earn at least Meets Expectations ratings in all areas of review (teaching, scholarly and creative projects, and service)
- Earn Exceeds Expectations at least 6 times in Teaching and/or Scholarly Activities in the last five years prior to the submission of the promotion dossier. The Exceeds Expectations rating can be in Teaching and/or Scholarly Activities over the course of the evaluation years.
- Have at least four (4) scholarship items of weight three (3) or more as listed in Table 1, at least one (1) of which must be a refereed journal article.

Promotion to Senior Lecturer/Instructor:

To be promoted to Senior Instructor/Lecturer, a faculty member must earn at least Meets Expectations rating in both areas of review (teaching and service) during at least four out of the last five years at UWF with no Unsatisfactory during the remaining year of the 5 year period.

Special Circumstances

- With fewer opportunities for research collaboration, limited resources and additional challenges inherent with working at a remote location, the publication requirement mentioned above will be reduced by one (1) item for faculty members based at the Fort Walton Beach campus. In exchange, increased emphasis will be placed on the faculty member's teaching and/or service performance to the department.
- Scholarly work produced prior to joining the University that was not used in previous promotion can be used in promotion provided the work was completed within five (5) years of joining the Department.