UWF Guidelines for Annual Evaluations and Promotion for Instructors and Lecturers

2023-2024

Table of Contents

I. FRAMEWORK FOR DECISIONS

A. DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. "Regional Comprehensive University"

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

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

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

2. Compliance Levels

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

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

3. Criteria and Performance Indicators

   - "University promotion criteria" addresses expectations about aspects of performance for major personnel decisions that are common across departments and programs.
   - "Department promotion criteria" refers to the expectations departments develop for purposes of promotion decisions.
   - "Department annual evaluation performance indicators" describes how departments adapt university criteria to fit their disciplines. Performance indicators reflect activities that faculty must have actually accomplished so that personnel committees can fairly evaluate whether a candidate satisfies the university and department expectations. These indicators might also be viewed as outcome measures, as they capture the outcomes that are expected for achieving a given performance rating.

4. Categories of Performance

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

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

B. PROMOTION CRITERIA

1. University Criteria

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

2. Departmental Criteria

In addition to the University Criteria for promotion, departments **should** adopt additional departmental criteria for promotion. Departments should strive to create promotion evaluation criteria that are as straightforward and transparent as possible. Department promotion criteria must clearly state how ordinal annual evaluation rankings (along with other factors the department determines are important) translate to the conclusions drawn in promotion decisions. 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 sustained performance. For example, departments may require a specific level of achievement for two or three years as evidence of readiness for promotion.

Where departments/units are directed to create departmental criteria for promotion to the ranks of Senior Instructor or Senior Lecturer, such criteria shall apply to both in-unit and out-

of-unit departmental/unit faculty. However, if an out-of-unit Instructor or Lecturer does not have a teaching or service obligation as part of the out-of-unit faculty member's work assignment, any enhanced criteria, whether created on the departmental or university level, shall be aligned with the performance expectations associated with the out-of-unit faculty member's work assignment.

C. DEPARTMENT ANNUAL EVALUATION PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

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

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

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

1. Performance Indicators for Teaching

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

- Face-to-face classroom teaching at Pensacola or branch campuses
- Online teaching
- Teaching in distance learning circumstances
- Mentoring and supervision of research groups and independent studies
- Studio teaching in group or one-on-one formats
- Continuing education assignments
- Advising/Mentoring

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

- Teaching awards and other accomplishments related to teaching
- Peer evaluations of teaching
- Pedagogical and quality enhancement activities that improve learning (e.g., active learning and student engagement techniques)
- Participation in professional development activities that improve teaching
- Respect for students and their rights
- Quality of teaching philosophy
- Quality of syllabi and course goals
- Effectiveness of assessment practices
- Evidence of student support practices

- Effectiveness of advising/mentoring and student supervision practices
- Quality of execution of special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, General Studies, international programs)
- Quality of supervision of thesis, dissertations, or field experiences
- Other relevant performance indicators specified by the department

2. Performance Indicators for Service

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

   Service activities may include the following:

   - Service to university, college or department
   - Discipline-related service to the community
   - Service as Department Chair or Program Director
   - Unremunerated consultancies
   - Community activities related to one's discipline
   - Advising student organizations
   - Service to academic or professional organizations (e.g., editorial review boards, organization leadership; conference organizer)
   - Travel time to and from remote campuses locations

   Although there is no specific requirement about the balance of service activities that faculty should select, there is an expectation that the faculty member will function effectively as a department citizen, assisting in completing the work of the department's programs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

II. ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDELINES

A. PROMOTION

1. Eligibility for Promotion

Candidates for Senior Lecturer/Instructor will complete at least 5 years of employment at the lecturer/instructor level before submitting a dossier for review in the fall of the 6th year.

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

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

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

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

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

B. GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND PROCESSES FOR PROMOTION

1. Confidentiality

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

2. Preparing the dossier

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

3. Levels of Review

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

   - the 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.

   Each review judgment should be regarded as independent and advisory.

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

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

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

   The President is the final authority in promotion decisions.

4. Review Decisions.

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

5. 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.

6. Promotion Review Calendar.

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

2024

JUN 28 (Fri)	The Dean shall provide to each Chair a list of faculty members eligible to apply for promotion in the Chair's department.
SEP 3 (Tue)	Candidate provides curriculum vitae (CV) update and other materials as set out in Section II.D, Materials in Promotion Dossiers.
SEP 27 (Fri)	Chair confers with candidate.
OCT 28 (Mon)	The Chair adds their evaluation to the dossier and must assure that a copy of their evaluation is accessible by the candidate no later than this date.
NOV 4 (Mon)	Candidate adds rebuttal letter (if they choose) to the dossier. Chair forwards dossier to the Dean.
NOV 5 (Tue)	Dean forwards the dossier to the College Faculty Personnel Committee (CFPC).
DEC 2 (Mon)	CFPC adds its recommendation and returns the dossier to Dean. CFPC must ensure that a copy of the recommendation is accessible by the candidate no later than this date.
DEC 10 (Tue)	Candidate provides a rebuttal letter (if they choose). The Dean includes the rebuttal in the dossier.

2025

JAN 9 (Thu)	Dean adds their recommendation to the dossier and must assure that a copy of the recommendation is accessible by the candidate no later than this date. The Dean also informs the members of CFPC regarding their recommendation and sends a copy of recommendation to the candidate's Chair.

JAN 21 (Tue) Candidate provides a rebuttal letter (if they choose). The Dean includes the rebuttal in the dossier.

JAN 22 (Wed) Dean forwards complete dossier to Provost who forwards dossier to University Faculty Personnel Committee (UFPC), when necessary.

FEB 10 (Mon) UFPC adds its recommendation and forwards complete dossier to Provost. UFPC sends a copy of the recommendation to the candidate, Chair, and Dean.

FEB 17 (Mon) Candidate provides a rebuttal letter to Provost, if they choose, to be included in dossier.

MAR 17 (Mon) Provost adds their recommendation and sends a copy to candidate, Chair, Dean, and members of the CFPC and UFPC.

MAR 24 (Mon) Candidate provides a rebuttal letter (if they choose). The Provost includes the rebuttal in the dossier.

MAR 25 (Tue) President receives complete dossier.

APR 21 (Mon) President informs the candidate of the promotion decision, in writing, with copies to Chair, Dean, Provost, and the Chairs of the CFPC and UFPC.

C. SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. Enhanced Department Requirements

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

2. Changing Department Standards

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

3. 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. 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.

4. 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's designee will perform the Chair level evaluation.

D. MATERIALS IN PROMOTION DOSSIERS

1. Format, Scope, and Custody of Dossier Materials

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

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

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

2. Dossier Materials

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

   a. A copy of the approved departmental promotion criteria.

      Changes to promotion criteria (CBA 15.3f): If a faculty member makes application for promotion within three (3) years following the effective date of changes in promotion criteria, such faculty member will be evaluated under the previous criteria unless they have notified the University in writing at least thirty (30) days prior to commencement of the promotion review process of a choice to be evaluated under the new criteria.

      If the faculty member chooses to be evaluated under new criteria, a statement should be included indicating that choice.

   b. 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.
   c. Curriculum Vitae (CV).
      The CV should clearly define teaching and service activities. Please ensure the CV included is current and up to date.
   d. Letter of initial appointment.

e. Annual work assignments and annual evaluations of the candidate's performance since joining UWF or since their last promotion. Annual evaluation documentation should include both the Chair and Dean's evaluations plus any rebuttal letters.

f. Student evaluation data. Candidates must submit numerical results of all student course evaluations that have been conducted during the 3 years preceding the review. Those who have been on sabbatical or leave during the preceding 3 years should submit all student course evaluations conducted over the 4 years preceding the review. Ideally, the 3 most recent years of student evaluation data should be considered. If any data are missing for any other reason, the candidate shall offer an explanation.

   As a result of the disruptions caused by COVID-19, faculty have the option of excluding Fall 2020 student evaluation data. Faculty electing to do so should substitute a previous semester evaluation data in its place. For example, if you are excluding Fall 2020, you would then include data from either Spring or Summer 2020 (depending on when you last taught).

g. 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.

h. List of supporting materials. Examples of Teaching, Advising/Mentoring, and Professional Service should be included here.

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

- Recommendation of the Chair (Any rebuttal letter.)
- Recommendation of the CFPC, including the vote tally. (Any rebuttal letter.)
- Recommendation of the Dean (Any rebuttal letter.)
- Recommendation of the UFPC, including the vote tally. (Any rebuttal letter.)
- Recommendation of the Provost (Any rebuttal letter.)
- Decision of the President

E. ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES

1. Evaluation Period

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

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

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

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

2. Materials

   a. Faculty Prepared Materials

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

      - Updated Curriculum Vitae (CV)
      - ACRES forms or other indication of distribution of effort
      - At least one exemplar of teaching quality in addition to the standard university teaching assessment material. Exemplars should be consistent with indicators identified in the Promotion guidelines, such as outcome assessment data, peer review observations, syllabi, assessment samples, etc. Acceptable supplemental exemplars may also be defined in department/unit bylaws. CBA 11.2(b)(2)d
      - Statement of contribution. The purpose of the statement is to highlight noteworthy achievements of the year. Any extenuating circumstances that should be considered in rendering judgment about unusual constraints should also be articulated in the statement. The contribution form may include a self-assessment of quality where endorsed by the department or college. The statement of contribution should not merely repeat, or list, data provided in either the vita or ACRES form. Instead, the emphasis should be on quality of effort and scope of impact. Chairs, Deans, and the Provost may require specific forms or narrative formats for the statement of contribution. If ACRES information is not available at the time, please provide other documentation indicating distribution of effort.

        Examples of appropriate contributions may include
        - indication of high quality of course-related student contacts, including advising/mentoring, counseling, student conferences, and thesis and/or intern supervision.
        - high quality of course syllabi that provide appropriate and clear direction, including articulation of student learning outcomes.
        - evidence of appropriately rigorous intellectual demands made upon students, including examples of high quality of test design or assignments.
        - peer or Chair classroom evaluation.
        - assessment data reflecting appropriate student progress in mastering course content and achieving course outcomes.
        - description of substantial revision of established courses or development and teaching of new courses.
        - description of professional growth that will enhance the faculty member's value as a teacher.
        - peer evaluations that identify progress made toward achieving pedagogical goals.

- evidence of quality derived from peer reviewed process related to a performance or scholarly work.
- a formal note of appreciation for service that emphasizes scope of impact or significance of service.
- self-assessment that highlights how submitted material supports success in fulfilling course objectives and achievement at a particular performance level.

b. Student Evaluation Data

Student evaluations will be conducted on all courses and all sections for the contract period. The faculty member has access to the evaluations only after grades in the courses have been assigned.

Candidates must submit numerical and narrative student comments on all courses conducted during the regular academic year. Candidates may choose to submit additional evaluation material from the summer session, but it is not required.

3. The Chair's Review

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

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

4. Faculty Rebuttal to Chair's Review

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

5. Dean's Review

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

6. Faculty Rebuttal to Dean's Review

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

7. Review Calendar for Annual Evaluations

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

2024

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

III. Document History

2024-02-23: Original Document

APPENDIX A

GUIDELINES FOR DEPARTMENTAL ANNUAL EVALUATION PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

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

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

I. TEACHING PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

A. "Exceeds Expectations" Performance

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

Performance indicators that may be used to support "Exceeds Expectations" ratings:

- Numerical student evaluation data document clear statistical exceptionality.
- Narrative statements emphasize powerful impact on learner or transformative learning experiences.
- Teaching awards honor high caliber of performance.
- Leadership evident in the promotion of high-quality teaching and curriculum development in the department.
- Completion of an external course evaluation and certification through organizations such as Quality Matters.

B. "Meets Expectations" Performance

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

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

- Student evaluations document consistently positive impact on learning (above average).
- Teaching philosophy provides foundation for coherent course planning and activities.
- Syllabi outlines comprehensive, clear, and appropriate performance expectations.
- Assessment practices enhance student learning and contribute to department needs.
- Goals and course content routinely provide evidence of successful continuous improvement effort.

- Pedagogical practices facilitate optimal learning conditions.
- Student support practices facilitate optimal student development.
- Advising/mentoring, and student supervision practices receive consistent favorable review.
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, General Studies) executed with expert skill.
- Appropriate standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights.
- Participates voluntarily in professional development activities to improve teaching quality and flexibility.
- Implementation of high-impact practices defined by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (https://www.aacu.org/trending-topics/high-impact).
- The adaptation or creation of open educational resources to meet a course's needs.

C. "Does Not Meet Expectations" Performance

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

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 service, if applicable, provided significant and measurable impact; service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member’s area of expertise and the service function.

B. “Meets Expectations” Performance

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

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

- Scope and effort level meet department criteria
- Colleagues view contributions to department as effective
- Service agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university mission
- Service contributions represent strategic decisions that balance demands from the discipline, department, campus, and community
- Potential shown for wide recognition inside and outside of the university
- The adaptation or creation of open educational resources to meet a department’s needs.

C. “Does Not Meet Expectations” Performance

Does Not Meet Expectations performance demonstrates only minor tangible progress in service contributions that can be the result of many factors, including limited pursuit of service, passive participation, or inability to manage obligations. In general, the weight of evidence suggests that service is moderately below department norms. Remediation is required to assist the faculty

member to come to terms with the service obligations and appropriate behaviors to achieve positive outcomes in the regional comprehensive university context.

Performance indicators that may be used to support does not meet expectations ratings:

- Service activity nonexistent or very poor in quality, producing a potentially adverse impact on the goals of the relevant organization
- Significance of the obligation of service in the faculty role in a regional comprehensive university not apparent (e.g., faculty seems resistant or oblivious to service needs)
- Community service, if applicable, does not in any way provide synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service function
- Over-commitment to service spreads faculty time and energy too thinly to facilitate effectiveness

D. "Unsatisfactory" Performance

Unsatisfactory performance is demonstrated by

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

APPENDIX B

UWF INTERFOLIO

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

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

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

Please visit the UWF Interfolio webpage for more details, including how to access this new system.