

**UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS
DEPARTMENTAL BYLAWS**

1. Name of Department

Department of Physics

2. Vision

To distinguish the Physics Department as a dynamic teaching and research center, which provides students with a challenging, strongly personalized training program while caring for their needs and aspirations, and maintains a creative research environment with significant contributions to the field.

3. Mission and Purpose

To provide high-quality instruction in Physics and to train competent physicists who can contribute significantly to the physics, scientific, and engineering environment in the country.

To develop and maintain a high standard of research by the faculty, and to involve and motivate the students in research activities.

To promote awareness of the physics program in the community through outreach and cooperative activities with local schools, community colleges, industries, and defense establishments.

4. Definition of Departmental Members

- (a) Permanent faculty are defined as tenured, tenure-track, instructors, and lecturers.
- (b) All faculty (including visiting and adjunct) may participate in departmental discussions. Visiting faculty are expected to participate in departmental discussions. Staff members and adjunct faculty may be invited by the Chairperson or a majority of the faculty. The Chairperson, or a faculty member designated by the Chairperson, will issue the invitation.
- (c) All permanent faculty members may vote on non-personnel matters. Visiting faculty may vote by invitation of the Chairperson or a majority of the permanent faculty.
- (d) Only tenured and tenure-track faculty members may vote on personnel decisions. Only tenured faculty members may vote on tenure decisions.

5. Departmental Meetings

The Department Chairperson serves ex officio as presiding officer at department meetings.

- (a) The department will hold faculty/staff meetings only during the regular academic year as requested by the Chairperson or by a majority of the faculty. The department will meet at a minimum of once per month during the academic year. All academic and student-related matters requiring departmental action shall be discussed at the faculty meetings.
- (b) The department will hold faculty/staff meetings only during the academic year as requested by the Chair or by a majority of the faculty. All academic and student-related matters requiring departmental action shall be discussed at the faculty meetings. During the summer, the Chairperson and the available faculty may make decisions and take action on an emergency basis; any decisions and actions will not be binding until approved by the faculty during the next academic year. Even if there is a quorum of faculty members available, a review of the decisions made by the department will occur at the first departmental meeting of the academic year.

- (c) The agenda for each meeting will be included in the meeting announcement in hard-copy and/or through e-mail. The agenda for meetings will be distributed two working days in advance, when practical, by the Chairperson or his/her designee. Any faculty may request that an agenda item be added at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. In the event that the agenda item cannot be discussed during the next available meeting, then it will be addressed during the next meeting. If necessary, a special meeting can be called to address agenda items that are not addressed in the available time frame.
- (d) As far as practicable, department faculty on sabbatical or other authorized paid leave shall be informed of faculty meetings and shall be given opportunity to participate in discussions and votes.
- (e) For all faculty meetings, a simple majority of the eligible voting faculty members shall constitute a quorum. If all faculty members are not present at a meeting, the required votes to approve any measures are a simple majority of the entire faculty, not just a majority of the faculty members that are present.
- (f) In the event that a faculty member is unable to be present at a meeting, the faculty member may provide a proxy vote to a faculty member of his/her choosing.
- (g) All votes will be by show of hands. In items relating to personnel matters, or when requested by at least one-third of the faculty present, the voting shall be by secret ballot. The Chairperson shall tally the votes for recording in the minutes.
- (h) Committee recommendations and/or decisions shall be based on simple majority rule. If a committee recommendation or decision has an impact on the majority of the department faculty, it should come for a vote from all faculty.
- (i) In the event a vote ends in a tie, the Chairperson holds the deciding vote.
- (j) Different opinions and views are encouraged. All members shall have equal opportunity to participate in discussions and to express their views and opinions. Members may need to agree on how to share the floor to ensure broad input.
- (k) If requested by any faculty member, the minutes of the faculty meeting shall be audio recorded, typed, and circulated (in hard-copy or through e-mail). The minutes must be approved by a two-thirds majority at the next faculty meeting. The tape may be used only for verification of the minutes; it must be erased after the minutes have been approved.
- (l) Robert's Rules of Order will be followed when requested by one-third of the faculty present.

6. Collegiality

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 in a department environment. Such an atmosphere makes both faculty members as well as students feel more welcome, and helps them better achieve their academic objectives. Therefore, regarding collegiality at the department level, a faculty member is expected to:

- (a) Treat colleagues with respect in all dealings, being verbal or written,
- (b) Undertake all activities with openness and fairness, and respond to concerns raised by colleagues with respect,
- (c) Deal with conflicts and disagreements among colleagues in a professional manner, and
- (d) Bring unresolved conflicts/disagreements to the attention of the Chairperson. The Chairperson shall attempt to resolve the conflict with the parties involved.

All faculty members shall also abide by the university guidelines related to collegiality and faculty cooperation.

7. Professional Integrity

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.

8. Faculty Mentoring

Mentoring new faculty is an important task and is critical to the success of the department. A committee of at least three faculty will be appointed by the Chairperson in consultation with the concerned faculty member. At least once a semester, the Chairperson will meet with untenured faculty to help assess progress.

9. Committee Structure

Ad hoc committees will be appointed by the Chairperson as needed and membership shall be shared fairly by all faculty members. The scope and composition of departmental committees are determined by the Chairperson in consultation with the faculty members.

10. Policies and Procedures

(a) Annual Faculty Evaluation

The criteria for annual evaluations are in Appendix A. Tenure-track faculty will be evaluated in all three areas, while lecturers and instructors shall be evaluated based on teaching and service. The criteria of evaluation in these two areas shall be the same as those used to evaluate tenure-track faculty.

(b) Tenure and Promotion

The department will follow the procedures described in the [Collective Bargaining Agreement](#) (CBA) established between the United Faculty of Florida (UFF) and the university. In addition, the department will follow the [Tenure and Promotion Criteria](#) established by the university. If there are any conflicts between the two, the CBA will take precedence. The criteria for Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review are in Appendix B.

When a faculty member has reached the mid-point of their probationary period, he/she will undergo a mid-point review. The Dean will 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). Faculty under a mid-point review will submit to the Chairperson a packet containing all materials that the faculty member wishes to be assessed for evaluation. The Chairperson will review the materials and will appoint a committee to review the packet. Both the committee and the Chairperson will provide an assessment of the packet to the faculty member for review. The Chairperson will discuss the assessment with the faculty member and guide the faculty member on how to improve the portfolio.

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 will 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 will 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/peer 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.

When a faculty member becomes eligible for tenure and/or promotion, the faculty member will submit a portfolio for evaluation. The Chairperson will disseminate the portfolio to all eligible voting faculty, who will meet to discuss the portfolio. The eligible faculty will provide a report to the Chairperson and vote as to whether the faculty member is deserving of tenure and/or promotion. The eligible faculty are as follows:

- For tenure and for Associate Professor, all faculty that have a rank of Associate Professor or higher are eligible.
- For Professor, all faculty that have a rank of Professor are eligible.
- In the event that there are no faculty of the required rank to serve, a report will be prepared by the Chairperson unless he/she is not of sufficient rank. In such cases, the Dean will appoint a committee to review the portfolio.
- In the event that the Chairperson is untenured or is seeking promotion, his/her portfolio will be evaluated by a committee appointed by the Dean unless the Chairperson has negotiated a different arrangement upon being offered the position (see Section 11 below).

The Chairperson will provide a report to the Dean. The faculty member will be judged in accordance with the criteria established by the CBA and the departmental tenure and promotion guidelines described in Appendix I, which are consistent with the university's tenure and promotion criteria.

(c) Allocation of Summer Supplemental Lines

The Chairperson will endeavor to balance FTE assignments among faculty. The average FTEs from the previous three (3) summer assignments determine priority in teaching assignment. New faculty will start with an FTE average that will be negotiated during the hiring process. If the contract does not explicitly state the starting FTE for a new faculty member, the default will be an FTE of 0.00. Tenure-track faculty and lecturers will automatically receive preference over adjunct faculty for summer positions. Assignments will be given to faculty members with the lowest average FTE first. Any specialty courses that are offered will be prioritized to the faculty members that are most qualified to teach said courses. The department shall keep a record of summer assignments.

(d) Allocation of Paid Overload Appointments

Each opportunity will be reviewed by the Chairperson, subject to approval by the Dean, on its merit and subject to state regulations.

(e) Requests for Use of Departmental Resources

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

(f) Allocation of Departmental Travel Resources

Travel resources will be fairly distributed among faculty as available.

(g) Requests 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.

(h) Office Hours/Availability to Students

Each faculty will make him/herself available to students either in person or digitally. The time that a faculty member makes him/herself available shall be referred to as office hours, which shall be maintained using the following guidelines:

- A minimum of two (2) hours for every 3-hour lecture course

- A minimum of one (1) hour for every 3-hour lab

With a normal teaching load of 9 credit hours, the minimum number of office hours will be six (6) for a fulltime faculty without any scholarly and creative activity or other release time. If someone is teaching an overloaded schedule, then the maximum number required of office hours to be held is six (6).

(i) **Student Advising**

The department shall provide two types of advising for its students: faculty advising (performed by a faculty advisor), and academic advising (performed by an academic advisor). The purpose of the faculty advisor is to answer general questions concerning the profession of physics research, teaching and other career opportunities, to serve as a mentor, and to assist students in selecting specific technical elective courses that will meet the student's professional goals and interests. All teaching faculty members will serve as faculty advisors. The academic advisor will provide academic advising.

(j) **Annual Work Assignments**

The work assignment will be made by the Chairperson in consultation with the faculty and subject to UWF guidelines.

(k) **Grade Appeal Procedure**

The department will follow the university guidelines and procedures.

(l) **Canceling of Classes**

In the event of an illness or emergency, the instructor must contact the chair at the earliest possible time. The Chairperson will attempt to arrange for a suitable substitute. If one cannot be found, the instructor should hold one or more make-up sessions as needed to bring the class in line with the course schedule. In the event that a make-up session cannot be held, the instructor should formulate a revision statement to the syllabus to be approved by the Chairperson of the department.

In the event of a planned absence, such as for a conference, the instructor must either arrange for a substitute or provide make-up classes. The instructor can provide a digital lecture in place of a face-to-face. This should be done in consultation with the Chairperson.

(m) **Substitute Teaching of Classes**

A suitable substitute is one of the permanent faculty. If the missing class is a review session, the teaching assistant for the class is acceptable.

(n) **Use of Undergraduate Teaching Assistants**

Teaching assistants may be used to grade homework, quizzes, and laboratory reports. They cannot be used to teach a class without the instructor present or grade any tests or examination (including the final exam). They may teach a review session before an exam as well as hold tutoring sessions.

(o) **Curricular Review**

All faculty members are expected to participate in outcome assessment and accreditation activities as assigned by the Chairperson. A curricular review meeting must be held at least once a year. The Chairperson may appoint a Curricular Review Committee that will formulate suggested changes and present them to the department for approval. The department will assess the timeline for implementation of any approved changes.

(p) **Assessment Protocols**

In order to appropriately compare courses from one year to the next, the department will use a combination of national standard established through Physics Education Research and departmentally generated pre- and post-tests to assess learning gains. The department will use common final exams for any course with multiple sections and/or instructors. The information gained from these tests is for departmental self-assessment and cannot be used towards one instructor's annual evaluation, tenure, or promotion unless the instructor wishes to include it.

(q) **Others**

- All departmental matters that need to be addressed to the Dean of the College, Provost, and President shall be routed through the Chairperson.
- All interdepartmental matters shall be routed through the Chairperson.
- The request for university support through OCO/expense accounts shall be prepared by the Chairperson in consultation with the faculty.
- Program revisions, course development, and curriculum design for new tracks shall be done by one or more faculty appointed by the Chairperson. All program revisions shall be subject to a vote by the faculty.
- A merger with another university unit must require a 2/3 majority vote in each unit.

11. Selection of the Department Chairperson

- (a) The Chairperson shall be selected from the permanent faculty of the Department by a majority vote of all tenured and tenure-track faculty, subject to approval by the Dean of the college. If no permanent faculty of the Department are willing or able to serve as Chair, the faculty will request that the Dean allow an external search.
- (b) The term of service for the Chairperson is three academic years.
- (c) No faculty member may serve more than two terms consecutively as Chairperson unless required by extenuating circumstances.
- (d) The position of the Chairperson is expected to rotate among the tenured faculty, but a tenure-track faculty member is eligible to serve.
- (e) If a non-tenured faculty member is required or elected to serve, the faculty member will receive an evaluation of no less than Excellent in the Service category and the criteria for Scholarly and Creative Activity may be reevaluated in light of the extra service duties required of the Chairperson. Any non-tenured faculty member has the right to negotiate with the Dean the details of the promotion procedure.
- (f) In the event of the absence of the Chairperson for any reason, the Chairperson shall designate one of the faculty as acting Chairperson to fulfill the duties of the Chairperson.
- (g) If circumstances require that the Chairperson be selected from a permanent faculty of another Department, the term of service shall be considered interim only and consequently reduced to one academic year and it is expected that an external search is conducted. If an external search cannot be mounted, then a current member of the should serve as Chairperson.

12. Responsibilities of the Department Chairperson

- (a) The daily operation of the Department.
- (b) All requests by the Dean's office.
- (c) Annual review of the faculty, including observation of classroom instruction as part of the review process.
- (d) Meet with each faculty at least once per semester.
- (e) Hold faculty meetings at a minimum of once per month.
- (f) Arrange substitutes for absent faculty and staff.
- (g) Implementing all duties outlined in these Bylaws.

13. Review/Revision of these bylaws

- (a) The Department shall review these bylaws at least once every two years. Proposed amendments will be posted to the faculty at least one week before the recommendations are brought to a vote.
- (b) Dates of approval of each current version of this document shall be appended below the document title and annotated at the end.
- (c) A candidate for tenure/promotion shall elect the set of bylaws in use at the point of employment offer or any set of a later year.

Date of Adoption: Approved by the Physics Faculty UNANIMOUSLY on April 12, 2024. Approved by the Office of the Provost on April 21, 2024.

APPENDIX A

ANNUAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

It is expected that all faculty will conduct themselves in accordance with the policies outlined in the UWF Professional Standards and the UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement. A candidate for tenure and/or promotion should have demonstrated collegiality and a willingness to work with colleagues in supporting the goals and mission of the department, college, and university. The Department has a set of criteria and standards for the assessment of a faculty member's performance of assigned duties and responsibilities. There are three performance categories: teaching; scholarship and creative activities; and service. These assessment criteria form the basis for promotion and tenure decisions. The standards stated here are from the Tenure and Promotions Guidelines document from 2023-2024 and may change over time per the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the UFF and the university. If there are any discrepancies between the following standards and the CBA, the CBA takes precedence.

The following criteria categories will be used in evaluating faculty quality of performance:

- **Exceeds Expectations:** Exceeds Department standards for professional performance, in quality or quantity or both.
- **Meets Expectations:** Meets Department standards for professional performance.
- **Does Not Meet Expectations:** Does not meet Department standards for professional performance.
- **Unsatisfactory:** Disregard or failure to address remediation efforts by the university to provide correction or assistance for performance that does not meet expectations, or performance involving incompetence or misconduct as defined in the collective bargaining agreement and applicable university regulations and policies.

Criteria evaluating teaching, scholarship and creative projects, and service are described in the following sections. The order of the listing does not reflect relative importance and are not limited to the following: (The order of the listing does not reflect relative importance.)

1.1. Teaching

For tenure and promotion, an average record of excellent in teaching is required. Teaching effectiveness can be demonstrated with, but not limited to:

- Updating course material to reflect advancements in the field.
- Design of new or redesign of outdated courses, laboratories, and/or programs.
- Management of teaching laboratories.
- Documentation of pedagogical practices in support of student learning.
- Participation in teaching development programs.
- Peer evaluations of teaching.
- Organization and planning of courses.
- Clear and definitive explanation of assignments.
- Scholarship in teaching areas.
- Engaging students in research projects.
- Satisfactory student evaluations, to be collected every semester included in the period of evaluation.
- Teaching awards.
- Teaching specialty topics in seminars, discussion groups, and other student-centric delivery forums.
- Mentoring students in directed studies, capstone or honors projects or theses.

1.2. Scholarship and Creative Projects

Scholarship and creative projects can be demonstrated with, but not limited to:

- Peer reviewed scientific or educational journal publications.
- Peer reviewed scientific or educational conference publications.
- Externally funded scientific or educational research.
- Internally funded scientific or educational research.

- Submission of proposals to funding agencies.
- Invited talks.
- Chapters or books on scientific or educational subjects.
- Presentations of scientific or educational research at local, regional, national, or international conferences.
- Writing of technical reports.
- Research awards in scientific or educational areas.
- Patents.
- Mentoring of capstone projects, undergraduate research, and/or independent studies.
- Evidence of significant instrumentation, experimental method, or software development.
- Other scholarly and creative activities.

1.3. Service

Service is broadly defined and includes a wide range of activities including but not limited to:

- Service to university or college or department.
- Discipline-related service to the community.
- Service as Department Chair or Program Director.
- Advising student organizations.
- Community activities related to one's discipline.
- Service to academic, professional, or student organizations.
- Services related to recruitment and retention of students.
- Articulation efforts at various levels.
- Outreach activities that promote the department and/or university.
- Service on conference committees.
- Participation with local professional organizations.
- Assisting in organizing district wide activities such as science fairs and competitions.
- Textbook, manuscript and grant reviewing activity.
- Management of teaching laboratories.
- Curriculum development to meet the needs of the community and to keep abreast of the rapidly evolving fields of physics.
- SACSCOC or any discipline-related accreditation activity.
- Program evaluation.
- Mentoring and assisting new faculty.
- Student advising.

2. Departmental Criteria for Evaluation

The criteria categories Unsatisfactory, Does Not Meet Expectations, Meets Expectations, Exceeds Expectations will be used in evaluating efforts in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service.

2.1. Teaching

The rating of Meets Expectations in teaching is required for tenure. Excellence in teaching and a strong positive reputation within the University as a teacher are required for promotion to associate professor or professor. In this performance area, the ratings in the first two performance categories (Unsatisfactory/Does Not Meet Expectations) do not facilitate favorable tenure and promotion decisions. A faculty member on an overloaded teaching schedule will have their annual evaluation for teaching increased by one level due to the additional work load, provided that the faculty member has demonstrated that the standards for syllabi and academic integrity of the higher rating are met.

For the purpose of assigning a numerical value to rating in teaching evaluation

- A POOR is assigned 0 points, FAIR is 1 point, GOOD is 2 points, VERY GOOD is 3 points, EXCELLENT is 4 points.

2.1.1. Unsatisfactory

This performance level demonstrates serious problems in attaining success in the teaching role as reflected by teaching performance that is well below the department standards of excellence.

Indicators:

- Pedagogical practices are unsound (e.g., disorganization; late, missing, unhelpful feedback; standards too lax; routinely poor preparation; disengaging, chaotic, or hostile classroom environment).
- Student evaluations document consistent and substantive problems (ratings well below the department average).
- Syllabi fail to establish clear and relevant expectations.
- Assessment practices 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).
- Student support practices are unsound (e.g., late or absent for class, not responding to email, not keeping office hours, showing favoritism).
- Consistent and very negative ratings in advising, mentoring, and supervision of students' scholarly or creative activities.
- Chronic academic integrity concerns identified including evidence of disrespect for students and their rights.

2.1.2. Does Not Meet Expectations

Demonstrates some positive teaching outcomes but produces major areas for concern that have a moderately negative impact on students and their learning, typically as reflected by a combination of several of the indicators below. In general, teaching performance is moderately below the department standards of excellence.

Indicators:

- Some pedagogical practices need attention.
- Student evaluations document areas of moderate concern.
- Syllabi need to provide clearer and more appropriate expectations.
- Assessment practices show some difficulty in supporting student learning and meeting department needs.
- Some student support practices need improvement.
- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices need improvement.
- Occasional challenges related to academic integrity, including disrespect for students and their rights.

2.1.3. Meets Expectations

Demonstrates consistent high-quality teaching with positive outcomes for students. For this rating, the faculty member must demonstrate the following:

- Syllabi outline comprehensive, clear, and appropriate performance expectations.
- Appropriate standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights.

Demonstration of the above and two (2) of the following indicators would merit Meets Expectations.

- Pedagogical practices facilitate learning conditions.
- Documented course folders to demonstrate the achievement of student learning outcomes.
- Student support practices facilitate student development.
- Goals and course content provide evidence of continuous improvement effort.
- Curriculum development for courses or labs.
- Participates voluntarily in professional development activities to improve teaching quality and flexibility.
- Student evaluations document consistently positive impact on learning.
- Mentoring of undergraduate research projects, and capstone and honors projects resulting in a conference presentation or publication.

2.1.4. Exceeds Expectations

Demonstrates unusually high degree of quality in teaching. The performance at this level exceeds department standards of excellence. For this rating, the faculty member must demonstrate the following:

- Syllabi outline comprehensive, clear, and appropriate performance expectations.
- Appropriate standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights.

Demonstration of the above and four (4) of the following indicators would merit an Exceeds Expectations.

- Pedagogical practices facilitate optimal learning conditions.
- Documented course folders to demonstrate the achievement of student learning outcomes.
- Teaching awards – internal and external.
- Goals and course content provide evidence of continuous improvement effort.
- Leadership evident in the promotion of high-quality teaching and curriculum development for courses and laboratories.
- Participates voluntarily in professional development activities to improve teaching quality and flexibility.
- Student evaluations document consistently positive impact on learning.
- Mentoring of undergraduate research projects, and capstone and honors projects resulting in a conference presentation or publication.

2.2. Scholarship and Creative Projects

Table 1. Scholarship and Creative Project Types and Weights

Scholarly and Creative Activity Type	Weight
PI or Co-PI of a UWF research funding proposal	0.5
Author or Co-Author of a presentation at a local conference	0.5
Invited colloquium or seminar at UWF	0.5
Submission of external research proposal with documented efforts to make the proposal competitive.	1
PI or Co-PI of a UWF funded research project between \$2k and \$19k	1
Publishing a non-refereed conference paper	1
Author or Co-Author of a presentation at a regional, national, or international conference	1
PI or Co-PI of an external funded research project of \$10k or less	1
Invited lecture, seminar, or colloquium at another institution	1.5
Refereed conference publication	2
Edited Book	2
PI or Co-PI of an external funded research project between \$10k and \$50k	2
PI or Co-PI of a UWF funded research project of \$20k or more	2
Submitting an external grant proposal < \$100k (as PI or co-PI)	2
Editor for a journal*	3
Author or Co-Author of a peer reviewed scientific or educational conference paper with acceptance rate of 35% or less	3
Submitting an external grant proposal ≥ \$100k (as PI or co-PI)	3
Securing external funding < \$100k	3
Securing a US patent	3
Author or Co-Author of a refereed or invited book chapter	3
Author or Co-Author of a peer reviewed scientific or educational journal article	3
Author or Co-Author of a peer-reviewed scientific or educational journal article in a journal with impact factor above 3**	5
Securing external funding ≥ \$100k	6
Author or Co-Author of a published book	6

NOTES:

- *Before undertaking an editorial role with a journal, Faculty are expected to document the proposed role with the Chair in consultation with the Dean before accepting the position to ensure that it will count.
- **In the fields of Physics and Astronomy, there are roughly non-predatory 1500 journals, conference proceedings, and book series (according to the Scimago Journal Rank) at the time these Bylaws were drafted. The top 17% of these journals have an impact factor of 3.00 or higher.
- The rating categories below utilize the items from Table 1 as indicators.
- Single academic year or 3-year cumulative weights may be used as indicators.
- Articles that receive 6 or more citations in a 2-year period from publication (excluding self-citations) will be considered as equivalent to an article published in a high-impact journal for the purposes of the annual evaluation accumulated weight over a 3-year period. Faculty members who wish to claim this must demonstrate the citations in order to claim credit.
- The Physics Department values scholarship activity on educational topics, as reflected in Table 1.
- If the faculty member has evidence of significant instrumentation, experimental method, or software development that has resulted an outcome of Weight 3 from Table 1, it may be regarded as a single weight 5 item. The faculty member must clearly document evidence of time spent building and maintaining instrumentation/software.
- Physics research is often carried out in teams and therefore it is understood that publications and grant proposals may have multiple co-authors. Some teams prefer to list coauthors alphabetically, while others list in descending order based on the amount contributed, other teams always place student authors first, and others always place the most senior person first (or last). There is no commonly accepted standard for co-author lists. Thus, faculty members must describe their level of contribution toward each of his or her co-authored publications and grants.

2.2.1. Unsatisfactory

Demonstrates serious problems in developing scholarship and creative projects as reflected by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative productive is well below department expectations.

Indicators:

- Scholarly agenda or creative plan has not been identified (e.g., central focus of career interest has not materialized)
- Minimal pursuit of scholarly and creative projects
- Failure to pursue expected professional enhancement activities (e.g., licensure, continuing education, technology training)
- Ethical regulations violated regarding scholarly or artistic production
- Poor time management strategies handicap work output

2.2.2. Does Not Meet Expectations

Demonstrates only *minor* tangible progress toward executing a scholarly and creative agenda as shown by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative projects are *moderately below* the department expectations.

Indicators:

- Cumulative scholarship activity of weight 1 in the current academic year OR a three-year total weight of 3 as listed in Table 1.
- General focus of interest identified
- Evidence of some completion of beginning stages of scholarly or artistic process (e.g., data collection, manuscript outline, artistic plan)
- Exploration of possible scholarly collaboration or resource network to help with specific plan
- Judgment about ethical standards for scholarly and artistic production may be problematic at times
- Questionable time management strategies limit production

2.2.3. Meets Expectations

Demonstrates *satisfactory* execution of scholarship or creative activity agenda as shown by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative projects *meet* the department's expectations of excellence.

Indicators:

- Cumulative scholarship activity of weight 3 in the current academic year OR a three-year total weight of 9 as listed in Table 1.
- Refined scholarly agenda or creative plan well suited to regional comprehensive university context
- Meets department production targets for both quantity and quality of scholarship
- Potential for wide recognition of quality outside of the University
- External support captured to facilitate scholarship or creative activities agenda
- Highly skilled application of ethical conventions in discipline
- Skilled time management facilitates success of scholarly agenda or creative plan

2.2.4. Exceeds Expectations

Demonstrates *high degree* of skill in design and execution of scholarly and creativity projects as shown by the indicators below *that build upon the indicators for excellence*. In general, this performance *exceeds* department expectations for excellence.

Indicators:

- Cumulative scholarship activity of weight 5 in the current academic year OR a three-year total weight of 12 as listed in Table 1.
- Refined scholarly agenda or creative plan well suited to regional comprehensive university context
- Both quantity and quality measures clearly exceed department expectations
- High profile journal articles
- National or international recognition earned for quality
- Awards received for scholarly or creative projects
- Strong record of grant pursuit, grant awards, successful completion, and dissemination of results
- Campus and/or disciplinary leadership in promoting scholarly and creative projects

2.3. Service

In this performance area, the ratings in the first two performance categories (Unsatisfactory, Does Not Meet Expectations) do not facilitate favorable tenure or promotion decisions.

The candidate for tenure and/or promotion should show evidence of at least FOUR years of service to the department, college, university and the professional community while in rank.

2.3.1. Unsatisfactory

Demonstrates serious problems in fulfilling appropriate service role for faculty as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is well below the department standards for excellence.

Indicators:

- 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 functions, for example, serving as the director of a local church choir.

2.3.2. Does Not Meet Expectations

Demonstrates only minor tangible progress in service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is moderately below department standards for excellence.

Indicators:

- Minimal contributions made in service role (e.g., "sits" on committees as compared to active participation).

- Over-commitment to service spreads faculty time and energy too thinly to facilitate effectiveness.
- Community service, if applicable, provides limited, tangential synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and service functions.

2.3.3. Meets Expectations

Demonstrates satisfactory execution of service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service contributions meet the department standards for excellence.

Indicators:

- Participates effectively in the service activities listed in Section 2.3 of this appendix.
- Demonstrates leadership in departmental, college or university committees.
- Community service, if applicable, provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions. For example, serving as a judge in a science competition or in a mathematics competition.

2.3.4. Exceeds Expectations

Demonstrates high degree of skill in service contributions as shown by the indicators below that build upon indicators for excellence. In general, service contributions exceed the department standards for excellence.

Indicators:

- Participates effectively in the service activities listed in Section 2.3 of this appendix.
- Leadership demonstrated in key college or university committees.
- Community service, if applicable, provided significant and measurable impact; service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions.

APPENDIX B

PROMOTION, TENURE, AND POST-TENURE CRITERIA

1. Tenure

To be granted tenure, a faculty member must demonstrate at least majority of Meets Expectations/Excellent rating in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service over the pre-tenure window. In addition, the faculty must have at least two (2) scholarship items of weight 3 or more as listed in Table 1, at least one of which must be a refereed publication during the last five years at UWF.

2. Promotion to Associate Professor

To be promoted associate professor, a faculty member must demonstrate Meets Expectations/Excellent performance in all three categories of review over the promotion window. In addition, the faculty must have at least two (2) scholarship items of weight 3 or more as listed in Table 1, at least one of which must be a refereed publication during the last five years at UWF. The faculty member must have a total weight of 12 during the last five years at UWF.

3. Promotion to Professor

To be promoted to professor, a faculty member must demonstrate a Meets Expectations/Excellent rating in all three categories and at least one area should be rated as Exceeds Expectations/Distinguished in at least three of the five years immediately preceding submission of the dossier. The Exceeds Expectations/Distinguished rating can be in different areas over the course of the three years. In addition, the faculty member must have at least two (2) scholarship items of weight 3 or more as listed in Table 1 from the date of the faculty member achieved the rank of associate professor. At least one of the items must be a refereed publication during the last five years at UWF. The faculty member must have a total weight of 12 during the last five years at UWF.

The performance levels are expected as an average with sustained effort throughout the decision period. Performance in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service will be evaluated according to the criteria listed below, which constitute minimum expectations. Faculty members may negotiate up to two years of credit toward tenure and/or promotion based on past performance. A maximum of two (2) scholarship items of weight 3 or more as listed in Table 1 may be included. Any credit for past performance must be specified in the initial appointment letter.

4. Promotion to the Ranks of Senior Instructor or Senior Lecturer

The UWF guidelines for promotion to the ranks of Senior Instructor and Senior Lecturer state that UWF departments should develop departmental criteria for promotion to the ranks of Senior Lecturer and Senior Instructor in addition to the minimum University criteria for promotion to these positions. The Department of Physics requires that successful candidates for promotion to the ranks of Senior Instructor or Senior Lecturer meet at least one of the following additional departmental criteria:

- The candidate has an established record of annual evaluation ratings where a majority of the ratings (inclusive of all Dean and Chair annual ratings) are at the level of “Exceeds Expectations/Distinguished.” This level of evaluation is an enhancement of the University standard for promotion; or
- The candidate has an established and documented record of incorporating high impact practices into their teaching and service. The University provides examples of the types of practices that qualify as HIPs here: <https://uwf.edu/academic-engagement-and-student-affairs/departments/career-development-and-community-engagement/students-and-alumni/gain-relevant-experience/high-impact-practices/>. This list should not be seen as an exhaustive list of HIPs. However, the scope and spirit of the activities identified by the University should guide an understanding of what constitutes a HIP; or
- The candidate has an established and documented record of service at the Department and College level with additional service initiatives that impact the University, community, and/or the faculty member’s academic, creative, and scholarly discipline(s). The department extends the annual evaluation guidelines’ service activity examples in the Department of Physics Bylaws to the eligible service activities for promotion review to the ranks of Senior Instructor or Senior Lecturer; or
- The candidate has an established and documented record of administrative work at the “Meets” or “Exceeds Expectations” level at UWF (in addition to the candidate’s teaching and service expectations). These administrative activities may be in a formalized role such as Coordinator, Director, or Assistant/Associate Chair, or in another recognized administrative role that emphasizes the oversight, direction/coordination, and/or mentorship of faculty peers or students. These types of administrative duties should be reflected in the candidate’s work assignments and annual evaluations during some or all the pre-promotion window of employment. These activities should contribute to the functional success of the Department, College, and/or University.

A candidate for promotion to the ranks of Senior Instructor or Senior Lecturer in the Department of Physics should clearly document evidence for these Departmental Criteria in the candidate’s application for promotion to the ranks of Senior Instructor or Senior Lecturer."

5. Post-Tenure Review

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. Additionally, the Department of Physics endorses the University standard that 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:

5.1. Scholarship and Creative Activity Post-Tenure Review Criteria

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:

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

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

In order to be ranked Exceeds Expectations, at least one of the scholarly activities over the five years must have a weight of three (3) or more.

5.2. Teaching and Service Criteria

The Department of Physics extends the annual evaluation criteria defined herein for a faculty member's teaching and service to the evaluation of a faculty member's teaching and service over the five-year post-tenure review period. A faculty member's comprehensive post-tenure review rating in service and teaching shall reflect the annual evaluation ratings (inclusive of both the Dean and Chair ratings) received by the faculty member in each category of teaching and service over the five-year post-tenure review window. Over the five-year period of post-tenure review, a faculty member's receiving of consistent "Meets Expectations" annual evaluation ratings in teaching and/or service shall constitute the PTR rating standard of "Meets Expectations" for teaching and/or service for the post-tenure review. Over the five-year period of post-tenure review, a faculty member's receiving of consistent "Exceeds Expectations" annual evaluation ratings in teaching and/or service shall constitute the PTR rating standard of "Exceeds Expectations" for teaching and/or service for the post-tenure review.