

UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA

School of Allied Health and Life Sciences

Master of Public Health Faculty Bylaws and Standing Rules

Dr. George Stewart, Director
Bldg. 58, Rm 79A
11000 University Parkway
University of West Florida
Pensacola, FL 32514
Phone: (850) 473-7226
Fax: (850) 474-2749

MASTER OF PUBLIC HEALTH FACULTY BYLAWS AND STANDING RULES

1. Name of Unit

The name, the Master of Public Health Program, hereafter referred to as the MPH, is a unit of the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) within the School of Allied Health and Life Sciences (SAHLS) at The University of West Florida (UWF).

2. MPH: Mission, Goals, Objectives, and Values

The mission, goals, and objectives of the MPH program are those adopted by the MPH Steering Committee and published electronically on the MPH website:

<http://uwf.edu/sahls/masters-ph/mission/>

The values that guide the MPH program are those adopted by the School of Allied Health and Life Sciences and published electronically on the SAHLS website:

<http://uwf.edu/sahls/mission/>

3. Structure of the Unit

Section 1. Members of the Unit

The Unit shall be composed of a director, faculty members, joint faculty members, adjuncts, associates, visiting instructors/professors, and staff who direct students seeking the MPH degree.

Section 2. Eligibility in Governance

Faculty holding the rank of instructor, lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor are eligible to participate in unit governance activities and to vote on non-personnel matters. The eligibility to vote on faculty personnel matters is restricted to full-time tenured/tenure earning/non-tenure earning faculty in a manner consistent with University guidelines. The faculty may, by majority vote, extend voting rights to other individuals associated with the Unit.

Section 3. Role of the Director

It is expected that the Director will perform all responsibilities in the best interests of the Unit by taking into account the wisdom and advice of faculty colleagues.

4. Program Meetings

Faculty meetings will be scheduled as needed, concurrent with MPH Steering Committee meetings. This arrangement is critical to involving our community partnerships in the conduct of the program. Additional separate program meetings of the Unit faculty only will be scheduled as needed. Need shall be determined by the Director or by request of a majority of Unit faculty. A majority of eligible faculty must be present to carry out official Unit business. Parliamentary procedures, order of business and voting procedures, etc., will be carried out according to Robert's Rules. At least one week's notice shall be given, excepting emergency situations, for scheduling or cancelling a faculty meeting. Faculty may place items on the agenda through the Unit Director. The agenda will circulate one day prior to the meeting. Minutes will be taken by a Unit staff member and distributed to the faculty no later than one week following the meeting.

5. Committee Structure

Section 1. Ad Hoc Committees/Working Groups

Ad hoc committees/working groups are formed by the Director as the need develops to carry out specific responsibilities. At the discretion of the Director, these committees/working groups may be disbanded following completion of assigned duties. The current charge, composition, and membership of each ad hoc committee/working group are published electronically on the MPH website here:

<http://uwf.edu/sahls/masters-ph/committees.cfm>

Section 2. Standing Committees

Each standing committee will consist of at least two faculty members, including a committee chair. Standing committees of the Unit shall be:

MPH Steering Committee

MPH Admission Committee

MPH Curriculum Committee

MPH Internship Coordination Committee

Ad Hoc committees of the Unit shall be:

Ad Hoc Search Committee

Ad Hoc MPH CEPH Self-Study/On-Site Resource File Committee

The current charge, composition, and membership of each standing committee are published electronically on the MPH website here:

<http://uwf.edu/sahls/masters-ph/committees.cfm>

6. Academic Policies

Section 1. Advising

Advising will be carried out by the designated Unit advisor (as the Academic Advisor and Program Coordinator) who will also coordinate student recruitment and retention.

Section 2. Changes in Policies

All changes to academic and curricular policies must be approved by majority vote of eligible faculty and forwarded by the Director for consideration at a Program Meeting.

Section 3. Grading and Examination Policies

Grading and examination policies are made at the discretion of the instructor. These policies are to be published on class syllabi. Disputes over grading practices should begin with the concerned parties and follow the grievance process outlined by the University. Faculty are expected to engage in practices that promote exam security and academic integrity, choosing from the following practices:

Exam Security / Academic Integrity Strategies Employed in Online Courses and Programs

Key	Exam Security / Academic Integrity Strategy
D2L Exam Launch/Submission Security Settings	
1	Disable right click - do not allow usage of right-click when taking course exams
2	Disable pager access - do not allow the sending or reception of pager messages while taking exams
3	Respondus lockdown browser required to take exams (restricts browsing/opening software outside the exams)
4	Respondus lockdown browser required to view exam feedback and results (restricts running other software while viewing)
5	Notification email upon exam completion (to confirm timing of submission of exam and IP address of exam)
6	IP address restriction for exam launching
7	Password protection on exam launching
8	Use Elluminate sessions and confirm student identity as part of exams
D2L Exam Setup Strategies	
9	Randomize the questions on each exam
10	Randomize the answers to the questions on each exam
11	Use expanded Question Library - pull a subset of questions different for each student for each exam
12	Change exams each semester
13	Use proctored exams
Program-level Strategies	
14	Honor Code: have students sign upon admission to course or program ¹
15	Proctored Comprehensive Exam: with required photo identification
16	Internship Requirement: use activities under the guidance of a local preceptor as part of academic integrity strategies in program
17	Identity checks: use Elluminate sessions and randomly confirm student identity as part of academic integrity strategies in courses
18	Plagiarism tutorial: provide online training of expectations and hold students accountable with an associated quiz/exam on material

Section 4. Training Requirements for Online Teaching

All individuals teaching online courses in the MPH program are required to meet minimum SAHLS-required online teaching training requirements, as summarized at the site:

<http://uwf.edu/sahls/elearning/>

These requirements include:

1. Completion of ATC's Studio e training program in face-to-face or digital format.
2. Review of the eTutorials provided by SAHLS on basic skills needed to teach online.
3. Review of currently open sessions (e.g., Module 1) of the Academic Technology Center's (ATC) Certified Online Instructor course prior to the first time teaching online and successful completion of all sessions of this online course within the first 3 times teaching online within the MPH program.

¹A copy of the Honor Code for the UWF MPH program is provided in Appendix C.

4. Attendance in face-to-face or via Web conferencing of “eJam” sessions in which online teaching techniques and problems encountered by faculty and adjuncts are shared under the guidance of faculty and UWF staff coordinating online teaching and training in the MPH program.
5. Extensions to the above requirements as deemed necessary by the MPH Director to ensure a high quality course is developed and delivered.

Substitutions to these requirements for equivalent training qualifying an individual for successful online teaching must be submitted to the MPH Director. Approved substitutions for training requirements will only be made by the Director following consultation with faculty coordinating online teaching and training in the MPH program to ensure consistency of high quality online course delivery across the program. Faculty members must complete the above training requirements and consistently demonstrate translation of best practices in online teaching in their courses.

Section 5. Role of Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct faculty can serve in any capacity within the program approved by the Director and a majority of the Unit faculty. Vita to be considered for adjunct teaching opportunities in the online MPH program are forwarded to and maintained by the MPH Director. As appropriate, the Director schedules and conducts an initial interview to determine the extent of an applicant’s qualifications for future online teaching opportunities. When the services of an adjunct are required for a particular course, an adjunct’s background and experience is matched to the specific teaching needs of the MPH program at that time, and the adjunct is contacted for a second interview with the MPH Director.

The Director informs the adjunct of the responsibilities of the position and the compensation. If the adjunct agrees to accept the teaching assignment they must also meet with faculty coordinating online teaching and training in the MPH program to arrange for completion of SAHLS-required online teaching training requirements.

Adjuncts will be evaluated each semester using criteria that includes: student evaluations, student complaints received, and responsiveness to students. Repeated and/or excessive complaints from students regarding technical difficulties within the control the adjunct to solve will be grounds for a terminated appointment.

7. Personnel Policies/Procedures

Section 1. Recruitment/Selection of New Faculty

Faculty lines are allocated to academic units by Academic Affairs and the Dean of the College, or when an existing position is vacated within the Program. Advertising, recruiting, and selection of new faculty follow the established University procedures. When a faculty line is provided or becomes available to the MPH program, a faculty Search Committee is formed to screen all candidates' credentials and recommend campus visits by selected applicants. The Search Committee is composed of the following:

- Director of the MPH program
- Two core faculty elected by the Unit faculty
- President of the Student Association for Public Health (an office to which the student is elected by all students within the program)
- One member selected by the Director of SAHLS from an outside academic unit within SAHLS
- One member of the MPH Steering Committee elected by the membership of that committee

Each Search Committee must include one minority member and must comply with the rules and regulations established by the Office of Human Resources at UWF. Guidelines for these constraints are available here:

<http://uwf.edu/ohr/Employment/RecrSeleAppt.cfm>.

The general process includes the following steps:

- The pool of candidates is narrowed down to three candidates by the Search Committee through evaluation of credentials and phone interviews.
- The narrowed list of candidates is given to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences for approval.
- Following approval of the candidate list by the Dean, each of the three candidates is invited to campus for interviews with the Search Committee, the Directors of the MPH program and of SAHLS, representative students, the MPH Steering Committee, the Dean and the Provost.
- Each of the candidates presents a seminar on their area of public health expertise to the faculty, representatives from among students and the MPH Steering Committee.
- The Search Committee, based on input from the above stakeholders will list the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate and present this information to the Dean who is the final hiring authority.
- Based on input from the Search Committee and stakeholders, the Dean will approve the list or meet with the Search Committee and the Director of the MPH program and discuss any objections to the list.
- Once the list is approved, the Search Committee will meet to choose the candidate to which the job offer will be extended.
- The MPH Director will contact the selected candidate and discuss details of the job offer.
- The Dean makes the formal offer of rank and salary to the successful applicant and sends the chosen candidate a letter of offer which must be signed and returned within a stated time.
- Receipt of a signed letter of offer from the candidate will complete the process.

When the newly hired faculty member arrives at UWF, the Director will assign the new faculty member one or more senior colleagues who will serve as mentors during the tenure earning years for tenure-earning lines, or during an equivalent window of time for non-tenure-earning lines. If a candidate has limited experience in teaching online, the Director will work with the candidate to ensure the training outlined in Section 4 is completed within the first year of employment to ensure high quality program delivery.

Section 2. Annual Work Assignments

The Director will establish the faculty member's assignments in teaching, research, and service for the upcoming academic year. These assignments are based upon the needs of the Program and the professional development of the faculty member. The Director prepares and signs the letter of assignment and refers to the Dean for further processing.

Section 3. Annual Evaluation Criteria and Procedures

Annual evaluations are made by the Director. The evaluation is based on the annual work assignment letter written by the Director and acknowledged by the faculty member. The assignment letter addresses expectations for teaching, research, and service.

The Director and faculty member review and discuss the material submitted by the faculty member in the form of an updated CV, a statement of accomplishments, and student evaluations from all courses taught during the academic year under consideration. The Director writes a letter of evaluation with a rating of Poor, Fair, Good, Excellent, or Distinguished in each area being evaluated based on assessment of the submitted materials. An overall evaluation is also provided based on the results of assessing the submitted materials. The letter of evaluation, signed by the faculty member, is forwarded to the Dean for further evaluation. The criteria for each area are as follows:

Section 3, Part A. Annual Evaluation of Teaching

Teaching: Activities

1. Online Courses
 - # Different courses taught
 - # Course sections taught
 - # Students taught
 - New courses developed and first offering
2. Directed Studies
 - # Graduate directed studies
3. Record of Quality Improvement in Teaching
 - Participation in training, workshops, conferences on online teaching
 - Employment of innovative and new instructional strategies
 - Course assessment (where appropriate)
 - Course material effectively addresses programmatic competencies
4. Student Evaluations and Summary of Student Complaint Log Entries
5. Awards and Honors Related to Teaching

Teaching: Programmatic Standard

Individuals in the MPH program are expected to participate in online teaching related activities. Category 1 and 2 activities are performed based on assigned contact hours per individual contract. Individuals are also expected to address issues in Categories 3 and 4 and pursue demonstration of excellence in teaching with Category 5 activities. Student evaluations should document consistently positive impact on learning. Assessment, syllabi, curriculum development, etc. should be in compliance with Program policies.

Teaching: Ranking for Evaluation of Poor

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

Indicators:

- Student evaluations document consistent and substantive problems (ratings well below the program average)
- Student Complaint Log reflects consistent and substantive problems in performance
- Teaching philosophy missing, poorly articulated or poorly expressed in course activities and planning
- Syllabi fail to establish clear and relevant expectations
- Assessment practices are inadequate to support student learning and program needs (e.g., competencies are inadequate, inappropriate, or missing; testing strategies are not effective or are unfair)
- Goals and course content reflect no continuous improvement efforts; no assistance rendered for programmatic assessment plans
- Pedagogical practices are unsound (e.g., disorganization; late, missing, unhelpful feedback; standards too lax or too challenging; routinely poor preparation; failure to master eLearning environment)
- Student support practices are unsound (e.g., routine failure to respond to student queries in Discussion forums; routine failure to respond to emails from students)
- Consistent and very negative ratings in advising, mentoring, and supervision of students in Directed Studies projects
- Chronic academic integrity concerns identified including evidence of disrespect for students and their rights

Teaching: Ranking for Evaluation of Fair

This performance level 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 programmatic standard.

Indicators:

- Student evaluations document areas of moderate concern (ratings below the program average)
- Teaching philosophy may not be clearly expressed in course planning and activities
- Syllabi need to provide clearer and more appropriate expectations
- Assessment practices show some difficulty in supporting student learning and meeting program needs
- Goals and course content reflect limited continuous improvement effort
- Some pedagogical practices need attention
- Some student support practices need improvement
- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices need improvement
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, general education) could be executed with greater competence
- Occasional challenges related to academic integrity, including disrespect for students and their rights

Teaching: Ranking for Evaluation of Good

This performance level demonstrates overall teaching effectiveness but some minor areas for concern, typically reflected by some combination of the indicators listed below. In general, teaching performance is mildly below the programmatic standard.

Indicators:

- Student evaluations document adequate impact on learning
- Teaching philosophy expressed in course planning and activities
- Syllabi provide reasonably clear and appropriate expectations
- Assessment practices support student learning and contribute to programmatic needs
- Goals and course content give evidence of continuous improvement effort
- Majority of pedagogical practices are appropriate and effective
- Majority of student support practices are appropriate and effective
- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices are appropriate and effective
- Maintains appropriate standards of academic integrity, including respect for students and their rights

Teaching: Ranking for Evaluation of Excellent

This performance level demonstrates consistent high quality teaching with positive outcomes for students as reflected by the indicators below. Excellence meets the program standard.

Indicators:

- 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 programmatic needs
- Goals and course content routinely provide evidence of continuous improvement effort
- Pedagogical practices facilitate optimal learning conditions
- Student support practices facilitate optimal student development
- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices receive consistently favorable review
- Appropriate standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights

Teaching: Ranking for Evaluation of Distinguished

This performance level demonstrates unusually high degree of quality in teaching as shown by the following indicators that build upon indicators for excellence. In general, teaching contributions exceed the standards of excellence of the program.

Indicators:

- 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 program

Section 3, Part B. Annual Evaluation of Research

The University of West Florida is a regional, comprehensive university. The expectation for research (creative and scholarly activity) by tenure and non-tenure track faculty is guided by the university's mission.

Research: Activities

1. Publications (Refereed)
 - Journals: submitted, accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
 - Books as author: submitted, accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
 - Books as editor: submitted, accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
 - Chapters in books: submitted, accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
 - Proceedings full paper: submitted, accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
2. Publications (Non-refereed)
 - Books as author: submitted, accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
 - Books as editor: submitted, accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
 - Chapters in books: submitted, accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
 - Proceedings full paper: submitted, accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
3. Meeting/Conference Presentations: international, national, regional, local
4. External grants/contracts
 - Federal: submitted, new awards, continuing
 - State: submitted, new awards, continuing
 - Local: submitted, new awards, continuing
 - Private: submitted, new awards, continuing
5. Internal grants/contracts: submitted, new awards, continuing
6. Other Activities
 - Abstracts: submitted, accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
 - Patents on products related to field of study: filed, awarded
 - Consulting projects (paid) in area related to field of study
 - Workshops attended related to field of study
 - Technical reports: submitted, accepted, published (in press, online, in print)
7. Qualitative assessment by Director
 - Citation index
 - Impact factors
 - Awards related to field of study

Research: Programmatic Standard

Individuals in tenure and non-tenure track positions in the Program are expected to participate in research-related activities. The following standard is based on a 3:3 fall:spring teaching load, which is adjusted for some faculty with significant service assignment. Two research activities (any combination from categories 1-7) should be accomplished each year. Tenure-earning faculty and non-tenure-earning lines must choose activities that address the benchmarks for promotion.

Research: Ranking for Evaluation of Poor

This performance level demonstrates serious problems in developing scholarship and creative projects as reflected by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative production is well below the program standard.

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
- Avoidance of professional organization involvement that could help disseminate or display faculty work
- Failure to pursue expected professional enhancement activities (e.g., licensure, continuing education, technology training)
- Avoidance of grant exploration or pursuit
- Ethical regulations violated regarding scholarly or artistic production
- Poor time management strategies handicap work output

Research: Ranking for Evaluation of Fair

This performance level 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 program standard.

Indicators:

- 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
- Professional organizations identified that will support scholarly and creative goals
- Appropriate professional educational opportunities (e.g., licensure, technology training, special educational opportunities) identified
- Sources of external support for scholarship or creative activities agenda identified and explored
- Judgment about ethical standards for scholarly and artistic production may be problematic at times
- Questionable time management strategies limit production

Research: Ranking for Evaluation of Good

This performance level demonstrates moderate tangible progress in scholarship or creative activity agenda as shown by the indicators below, but work falls mildly below the program standard.

Indicators:

- Specific scholarly agenda or creative plan identified, including appropriate timelines and preferred dissemination or display venues
- Scholarly and creative projects completed but falls short of rate of program standards related to the rate of completion or quality of dissemination venue
- Completed projects suggest the potential for significant, high quality scholarship over the candidate's career
- Appropriate professional educational opportunities pursued
- Involvement with professional organizations that will support scholarly or creative goals
- Grants developed and submitted to capture external support
- Adheres to relevant ethics conventions for scholarly and creative projects
- Reasonably effective time management strategies contribute to success

Research: Ranking for Evaluation of Excellent

This performance level demonstrates satisfactory execution of scholarship or creative activity agenda as shown by the indicators below. Excellence meets the program standard.

Indicators:

- Refined scholarly agenda or creative plan well suited to regional comprehensive university context
- Meets program production targets for both quantity and quality of scholarship
- Potential for wide recognition of quality outside of the University
- Completes appropriate schedule of professional educational opportunities (e.g., licensure, technology training, etc.) in a timely fashion
- External support captured to facilitate scholarship or creative activities agenda
- Highly skilled application of ethical conventions in discipline
- Skilled time management facilitates success of scholarly agenda or creative plan

Research: Ranking for Evaluation of Distinguished

This performance level demonstrates unusually 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, scholarly and creativity projects exceed the standards of excellence of the program.

Indicators:

- Both quantity and quality measures clearly exceed program expectations
- National or international audience
- National or international recognition earned for quality
- Awards received for scholarly or creative projects
- Achievements in continuing professional training show unusual merit
- Strong record of grant pursuit, grant awards, successful completion, and dissemination of results
- Campus and/or disciplinary leadership

Service: Activities

1. Institution (program, college, university)
 - Committee/council/task force as member
 - Committee/council/task force as chair
 - Institution sponsored activities: open house, orientations, recruitment
 - Sponsorships for student organizations
2. Profession
 - Associations/Societies: officer, committees, invited seminars
 - Journals: editorships, reviewer
 - Agencies: board memberships, reviewer
 - Meeting/conference: hosting, chairing sessions
 - Publishing houses: textbook reviews
3. Community
 - Invited seminars
 - Juror/Judge
 - Sponsor/participant outreach activities
4. Qualitative Assessment by Director
 - Awards related to service

Service: Program Standard

Individuals in the MPH program are expected to participate in service related areas including activities from all three of the first three categories listed above with at least four activities total. Two activities may be single events (such as an outreach activity related to community public health); two activities must be recurring events (such as serving on a standing committee or sponsoring a student organization or serving on a standing committee). All tenure-earning and non-tenure earning lines must structure activities in line with goals for promotion and tenure.

Service: Ranking for Evaluation of Poor

This performance level demonstrates serious problems in fulfilling appropriate service role for faculty as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is absent.

Indicators:

- Service activity nonexistent or very poor in number/quality, producing a potentially adverse impact on the goals of the program
- 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 any, does not in any way provide synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions

Service: Ranking for Evaluation of Fair

This performance level demonstrates only minor tangible progress in service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is moderately below the program standard.

Indicators:

- Appropriate arenas for service identified and explored
- Minimal contributions made in service role (e.g., "sits" on committees as compared to active participation)
- Recognition of service obligation in faculty role shapes consideration
- Over-commitment to service spreads faculty time and energy too thinly to facilitate effectiveness
- Community service provides limited, tangential synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and service functions

Service: Ranking for Evaluation of Good

This performance level demonstrates major tangible progress in relevant service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is somewhat below the program standard.

Indicators:

- Emerging service agenda reflects reasonable expectation for rank
- Selection of service activity expresses understanding of faculty service role in regional comprehensive university
- Usually participates actively and constructively in service activity
- Usually effective in service as citizen of program
- Balance across service obligations may be a struggle
- Community service provides reasonable synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions

Service: Ranking for Evaluation of Excellent

This performance level demonstrates satisfactory execution of service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service contributions meet the program standard.

Indicators:

- Scope and level of effort meet program standards
- Service agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university mission
- Service contributions represent strategic decisions that balance demands from the discipline, program, campus, and community
- Potential shown for wide recognition inside and outside of the university
- Community service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions

Service: Ranking for Evaluation of Distinguished

This performance level demonstrates a 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 standards of excellence of the program.

Indicators:

- Leadership demonstrated in targeted arenas of service (e.g., holds elected office; collaborates skillfully and innovatively)
- Problems solved proactively through vigorous contributions
- Wide external recognition (local, national or international audiences) or awards achieved for quality of service contributions
- Community service provides significant and measurable impact; service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions

Section 4. Merit Pay

Unit faculty shall be assessed for merit pay criteria based on two factors:

- 50% of funds available awarded for the overall evaluation from the most recent annual evaluation. Because of the fluctuating nature of funds available from the State of Florida, the rankings of Poor and Fair shall receive no merit pay increase. Rankings of Good, Excellent, and Distinguished will receive ratings of one, two, and three units respectively in terms of weighting for distribution of funds available under this category
- 50% of funds available based on assessment by the Director of faculty performance in areas not covered by the annual evaluation or for outstanding performance on special assignments.

Section 5. Promotion & Tenure

The Promotion & Tenure (P&T) guidelines and criteria for the MPH program are modeled after those established by the University, but have been tailored to address the unique teaching, research and service needs of the MPH. The Promotion & Tenure process used is that established by the University.

Upon arrival at UWF, untenured, tenure-track faculty will be assigned a mentor from among the tenured faculty who, in collaboration with the Director, will annually evaluate the faculty's performance in the three areas of teaching, research and service. A written evaluation will be provided to the faculty member and discussed with the candidate to inform them of their progress. This will comprise the annual evaluation required by the University.

After a period of 5 years, but no longer than the sixth year, the untenured, tenure-track faculty member will follow the University Guidelines for initiating the P&T process. After a minimum period of 5 years in-rank, a tenured Associate Professor can submit their credentials for consideration for promotion to Professor.

The criteria established for evaluation of faculty within the MPH program are as follows:

For promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor and the awarding of tenure:

Teaching:

1. Has completed all formal training in online teaching offered by SAHLS and the MPH program, in addition to any ATC, CUTLA, or ITS-sponsored trainings related to online teaching suggested by the Director.
2. Has routinely employed the latest available online teaching technologies in their courses during their tenure as an Assistant Professor.
3. Has received student evaluations with a minimum average of 70% of rankings in all categories greater than or equal to Good in all courses taught.
4. Have fulfilled their assigned teaching responsibilities since the beginning of their employment at UWF.

Research:

1. Has published an average of 1 paper/year in a peer-reviewed journal or presented an average of 1 paper or poster/year in the public health arena since the beginning of their employment at UWF (a minimum of 3 papers in peer-reviewed journals must be published during their tenure as an Assistant Professor).
2. Has attended an average of 1 local, regional, national or international professional event in public health/year since the beginning of their employment at UWF.
3. Holds membership in at least 1 professional public health organization and participated in some capacity within that organization during their tenure as an Assistant Professor.
4. Has been awarded 1 extramural grant during their tenure as an Assistant Professor that focuses on a project that promotes public health practice.
5. Has involved students in their research activities.
6. Has collaborated with regional public health organizations in ways that promote the practice of public health and broaden their knowledge of public health.

Service:

1. Has served on 5 different Program, College-level or University-level committees or Task Forces during their tenure as an Assistant Professor.
2. Has a clearly defined and robust record of service on behalf of public/community health.
3. Has participated in or helped develop service events involving the student organization, the Student Association for Public Health (SAPH).
4. Has engaged in marketing the MPH program and in recruiting and advising MPH students.

For promotion from Associate Professor to Professor:

Teaching:

1. Has completed all formal training in online teaching offered by SAHLS and the MPH program, in addition to any ATC, CUTLA, or ITS-sponsored trainings related to online teaching suggested by the Director.
2. Has routinely employed the latest available online teaching technologies in their courses during their tenure as an Associate Professor.
3. Has received student evaluations with a minimum average of 70% of rankings in all categories greater than or equal to Good in all courses taught.
4. Has fulfilled their assigned teaching responsibilities during their tenure as an Associate Professor.

Research:

1. Has published an average of 2 papers/year in peer-reviewed journals or presented an average of 2 papers or posters/year in the public health arena during their tenure as an Associate Professor at UWF (a minimum of 5 papers in peer-reviewed journals must be published during their tenure as an Associate Professor).
2. Has attended an average of 2 local, regional, national or international professional events in public health/year during their tenure as an Associate Professor.
3. Holds membership in at least 2 professional public health organizations and participated through service on a committee, as an officer, or on a task force or participated in some capacity in meeting organization during their tenure as an Associate Professor.
4. Has been awarded 1 extramural grant during their tenure as an Associate Professor that focuses on a project that promotes public health practice.
5. Has involved students in their research activities.
6. Has collaborated with regional public health organizations in ways that promote the practice of public health and broaden their knowledge of public health.

Service:

1. Has served on 5 different Program, College-level or University-level committees or Task Forces during their tenure as an Associate Professor.
2. Has a clearly defined and robust record of service on behalf of public/community health.
3. Has participated in or helped develop service events involving the student organization, the Student Association for Public Health (SAPH), and has served as an Advisor to SAPH during their tenure as an Associate Professor.
4. Has assumed a leadership role in marketing the MPH program and in recruiting and advising MPH students.

Section 6. Summer Supplemental Contract Opportunities

All regular full-time faculty are given the opportunity to teach during the summer term, contingent upon the allocation of sufficient lines and programmatic needs.

Section 7. Office Hours

All full-time faculty are required to meet a posted schedule of online “office” hours per week.

Section 9: Allocation of Paid Overload Appointments

Paid overload appointments will be granted contingent upon rotation through a list showing faculty/adjunct expertise in the area of need.

8. Unit Resources

Section 1. Budgeting

Program Expense Budget: Data gathered by the Director on baseline budgetary needs of the Unit will be the basis upon which the Director will seek appropriate funding from the Dean each Spring in preparation for the beginning of the new fiscal year. The Director will provide information on allocations from general categories of expense at the end of the fiscal year.

Section 2. Equipment

Operating Capital Outlay (OCO): The Director will maintain an OCO list of capital equipment needs which will be periodically updated and prioritized through input from the faculty.

Request for Use of Unit Resources: Any request to use equipment and other Unit resources for purposes external to the academic/scholarly mission of the MPH program must be submitted in written form to the Director for review and decision.

9. Faculty Development

The Unit is committed to assisting faculty development. To facilitate planning, faculty requesting sabbaticals will notify the Director. Faculty requesting release time for curriculum and/or research development should present the plan to the Director for review. Based on Unit needs, the Director will determine the appropriateness of such requests.

10. Amendment

Any amendment to the MPH Bylaws and Standing Rules must come through petition of a faculty member and subsequent discussion and approval by the Unit as a whole.

ⁱ A typical work assignment for tenure-earning and non-tenure lines is: 50% teaching, 25% research, and 25% service.