

BYLAWS GOVERNING CRITERIA USED FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY

ARTICLE 1 TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

The Dept. of Chemical Engineering criteria statement is as follows:

As a major unit of the College of Engineering of the University of Florida, the Dept. of Chemical Engineering pursues the same mission as the university and the college, and promotes excellence in teaching, research, and service.

1.1 Criteria for Tenure and Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty

Evaluation of faculty for promotion to tenure focuses on performance in teaching, research, and service.

a) To be recommended for promotion to Assoc. Professor or for tenure, a faculty member is expected to have an outstanding record in two of these areas. Since the principal responsibilities of each department are teaching and research, performance in these areas is emphasized unless the candidate's service contributions are extraordinary in significance, impact, and visibility. Evidence of teaching effectiveness, success in securing funded research, publications in scholarly journals, honors and awards, national recognition, Ph.D. production, and potential for long term success will be taken into consideration. Further examples of information that is to be considered for evaluation are given in Article 1.3.

b) For promotion to Professor, the candidate must have established a distinguished record in his/her field with evidence of national and international recognition. He/she must have excelled in teaching and scholarship and have a substantive record of service to the profession at both national and international levels. Excellence in scholarship can be demonstrated in the following areas – discovery, application, integration, and engineering education. Discovery is the traditional route of discipline-based investigation in science and engineering. Application is taking engineering research to the marketplace. Integration is taking basic research and applying it to critical problems. Engineering education is research on pedagogy, retention, and techniques to improve learning outcomes. Collaborative work is highly encouraged, as long it is clear how the nominee distinctly contributed. The quality as well as the quantity of technical contributions will be judged.

Further examples of information that is to be considered for evaluation are given in Article 1.3.

1.2 Criteria for other awards and promotions

Evaluation of faculty for salary adjustment via the salary pay plan and for other awards focuses on performance in teaching, research, and service. Similar metrics to those employed in tenure and promotion review will be used to evaluate performance in the individual areas (see section 1.3), but the weights attached to the different areas will depend on the award.

a) Evaluations of faculty for awards such as the Salary Pay Plan (SPP), University of Florida Research Foundation Professor (UFRF) and the Charles. A. Stokes Professor will be made by an appropriate faculty committee, reporting to the chair.

b) Salary Pay Plan (SPP): In evaluating a Professor for the salary pay plan, due consideration will be given to the candidate's assigned duties.

c) Evaluations of faculty for the Charles. A. Stokes Professor will be made in accordance with the terms of the gift.

1.3 Metrics To Be Used for Evaluation of Tenure Track Faculty

a) Research:

1. The candidate is expected to develop a scholarly, sustainable, and visible research program, resulting in a substantive body of work published in leading journals. Letters from external reviewers are an important indicator of the quality, originality, and impact of the candidate's work.
2. Letters should be solicited by the chair in consultation with the candidate and senior faculty knowledgeable in the candidate's area of research. Approximately one-half of the letters should be elicited from reviewers selected by the candidate. Referees should be acknowledged experts in the candidate's research area and need not be chemical engineers. The qualifications and reputation of the reviewers are given considerable weight and therefore should be selected with attention to quality, standing, and impact.
3. Invited seminars and papers presented by the candidate at national or international conferences are important evidence of the visibility of the candidate's research program.
4. It is recognized that in some disciplines refereed conference proceedings are an important component of the literature, and in such cases will be accorded appropriate stature.
5. For promotion to full professor, the candidate must demonstrate a broad recognition of their scholarship within their discipline. External letters should point to specific and significant contributions made by the candidate to their field.

Impact in scholarship can be demonstrated through items such as:

- Publications in scholarly journals
- Graduate student mentoring (especially of doctoral students)
- Textbooks

- Patents and copyrights
 - Invited presentations
 - Honors and awards for contributions
 - External support for graduate students
 - External support for engineering education
 - Leadership on team proposals
 - Licensing income
 - Economic impact on local, state, and/or national industry
 - Citation analysis
 - Publications in the popular press
6. Candidates at all levels should demonstrate an ability to attract sufficient external funding to sustain their research program over time.

b) Graduate student mentoring:

Candidates at all levels should demonstrate that they can successfully promote the intellectual development of graduate students. The ability to attract, support, and mentor students through the Ph.D program is an essential component of the candidates profile. While it is recognized that the ability of students varies widely, faculty must assist their graduate students to develop skills in oral and written presentation of their work. Consequently the record of papers published with students and student presentations at conferences will be given careful scrutiny.

c) Teaching:

A commitment to teaching at both the graduate and undergraduate level is required of all faculty under consideration for promotion and tenure. Factors that will be taken into account in assessing the candidates teaching record include evaluations by students and peers, teaching awards, class size, introduction of new course content, classroom innovation, participation in teaching workshops, textbook publication, education related grants and journal publications.

d) Service:

1. A commitment of service to the department, the university and the profession is expected of all faculty. An appropriate level of service is necessary for a successful case for tenure and promotion.
2. For promotion to Associate Professor, service activity should focus on service to the profession. Suitable activities include chairing sessions at conferences, organizing sessions and minisymposia, and refereeing of journal articles conference proceedings, and proposals. Department and university service is expected to be limited to serving on committees, organizing the seminar program, and other tasks of a similar level of commitment.
3. More extensive service is expected for promotion to professor. Professional service might include journal editing or meeting organization and holding office in professional societies. A lead role in university and departmental service would also be expected.

4. Service to the larger academic community is encouraged and will be recognized. Examples of such service include working with the public school sector, and minority advising and recruitment.

1.4 Mentoring During Tenure Probationary Period

The department will establish a mentoring program for faculty during their tenure probationary period. The program will include consultation assessing the faculty member's progress toward tenure. Mentors will be required to provide yearly written assessments, but these will not be maintained in the personnel file. The criteria and metrics described in previous sections will be used to advise faculty with regards to their performance.

1.5 Mid-tenure Review

During March or April of the third year of the probationary period, faculty will participate in a special midterm review. The purpose of this review shall be to assess the faculty member's progress toward meeting the criteria for tenure and to provide thoughtful and constructive guidance to assist the faculty member in fulfilling the tenure criteria. Faculty undergoing this review must prepare a packet using the current tenure template, but without the external letters of evaluation. Members of the department's mentoring committee shall review the packet and meet with the department chair to assess whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure, according to the criteria described in previous sections, and at a rate appropriate for a faculty member in their third year. The appraisal process shall be confidential. Results of the evaluation shall not be placed in the faculty member's evaluation file, shall not be included in the subsequent tenure packet and shall not be used in any way in any future evaluation of the faculty member for tenure.

ARTICLE 2 MERIT RAISE CRITERIA FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

2.1 Purpose of Merit Based Pay Raises

Pay raises based on merit may be used to promote and further various goals of the Dept. of Chemical Engineering, including:

1. Advance departmental mission
2. Improve the quality of department programs
3. Recognize and reward meritorious performance and sustained excellence of faculty
4. Promote retention of the most valuable and productive faculty
5. Improve faculty morale
6. Provide incentives for future faculty efforts
7. Improve department reputation in national surveys

2.2 Criteria for Award of Merit Pay Raises

Merit-based pay raises should be based on the quality and quantity of faculty activities in the areas of research, teaching, and/or service. Merit-based raises should generally reflect a continuous trend of productivity and excellence over a period of several years, as opposed to being based on achievements during a single academic year. Merit evaluations should be based on standardized activity reports submitted by the faculty member over the evaluation period, which will serve as the faculty member's 'case for merit'. In addition, merit deliberations may also consider other formal documents prepared during the evaluation period such as: promotion folders including external letters, and recent memoranda of understanding written by the chair following an extended discussion with the faculty member.

2.3 Metrics for Award of Merit Pay Raises

The metrics considered by the chair as evidence of meritorious performance will be largely the same as for tenure and promotion at the rank of the faculty member.

2.4 Implementation

The chair shall rate each faculty member in the four categories (research, teaching, professional service, and university, college and departmental service) and calculate a weighted average rating with weights 0.50 for research, 0.25 for teaching, 0.10 for professional service, and 0.15 for university, college, and departmental service. In the case of especially onerous departmental service, such as successful stewardship of ABET or SACS accreditation, graduate recruiting, undergraduate coordinator, or graduate coordinator, the chair will allocate additional weight to the departmental service category, up to the 25% , by allowing departmental and professional service categories to be merged. The chair should take into account extenuating circumstances (e.g., new appointment, NSF rotator, sabbaticals). Raises shall be allocated in proportion to the weighted average rating.

ARTICLE 3 MARKET EQUITY RAISE CRITERIA FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

An individual faculty member may make a request to the department chair to have his/her salary reviewed for consideration of a market equity increase. The chair will assign the review to the appropriate departmental committee. The committee will compare the faculty member's salary with the Oklahoma State University Salary Survey and consider such factors as the faculty member's value and productivity to the department in developing a recommendation. The committee's recommendation will be sent to the chair. The Chair will evaluate the committee's recommendation and make a decision regarding the recommendation.

ARTICLE 4 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

Performance evaluations are intended to communicate to a faculty member a qualitative assessment of that faculty member's performance of assigned duties by providing written constructive feedback that will assist in improving the faculty member's performance and expertise. Faculty shall be evaluated according to the approved standards and procedures that were in place prior to the beginning of the evaluation period. The faculty member's annual evaluation shall also consider, where appropriate and available, information from the following sources: immediate supervisor, peers, students, faculty member/self, other university officials who have responsibility for supervision of the faculty member, and individuals to whom the faculty member may be responsible in the course of a service assignment. Any materials to be used in the evaluation process submitted by persons other than the faculty member shall be shown to the faculty member, who may attach a written response.

4.1 University Level Criteria

The annual performance evaluations shall be based upon assigned duties, and shall carefully consider the nature of the assignments and quality of the performance in terms, where applicable, of:

- a. Teaching effectiveness, including effectiveness in presenting knowledge, information, and ideas by means or methods such as lecture, discussion, assignment and recitation, demonstration, laboratory exercise, practical experience, student evaluations, assessment of and engagement with student work, and direct consultation with students.
 - 1) The evaluation shall include consideration of effectiveness in presenting knowledge and skills, and effectiveness in stimulating students' critical thinking and/or creative abilities, the development or revision of curriculum and course structure, and adherence to accepted standards of professional behavior in meeting responsibilities to students.
 - 2) The evaluation shall include consideration of other assigned university teaching duties, such as advising, counseling, supervision of interns, or duties of the position held by the faculty member.
 - 3) The evaluator shall take into account any relevant materials submitted by the faculty member such as class notes, syllabi, student exams and assignments, a faculty member's teaching portfolio, results of peer evaluations of teaching, and any other materials relevant to the faculty member's instructional assignment.
 - 4) The chair shall consider all information available in forming an assessment of teaching effectiveness.
- b. Contribution to the discovery of new knowledge, development of new educational techniques, and other forms of research/scholarship/creative activity.

- 1) Evidence of research/scholarship/creative activity, either print or electronic, shall include, but not be limited to, published books, chapters in books; articles and papers in professional journals; musical compositions, paintings, sculpture; works of performing art; papers presented at meetings of professional societies; reviews, and research and creative activity that has not yet resulted in publication, display or performance.
 - 2) The evaluation shall include consideration of the quality and quantity of the faculty member's research/scholarship and other creative programs and contributions during the evaluation period, and recognition by the academic or professional community of what has been accomplished.
- c. Service within the university and public service that extends professional or discipline-related contributions to the community; the State, including public schools; and the national and international community. Such service includes contributions to scholarly and professional conferences and organizations and unpaid positions on governmental boards, agencies, and commissions that are beneficial to such groups and individuals.
 - d. Participation in the governance processes of the institution through significant service on committees, councils, and senates, and the faculty member's contributions to the governance of the institution through participation in regular departmental or college meetings.
 - e. Service as the UFF/UF President, service on the UFF bargaining team, or service as an official UFF grievance representative shall be considered significant service for the purposes of this subsection.
 - f. Other assigned university duties, such as advising, counseling, supervision of interns, and academic administration, or as described in a Position Description, if any, of the position held by the faculty member.

4.2 Departmental Clarification of University Criteria

Faculty in the Dept. of Chemical Engineering shall be evaluated annually according to the criteria listed in Article 1.2 and rated as either Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory in Teaching, Research and Service based on their performance in each of those areas. Their overall rating of Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory will be based upon consideration of their assignment and their rating in each of the three primary categories over the previous two years. The chair will provide a qualitative evaluation of the faculty member's performance over the evaluation period, and an overall assessment of Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory.

Examples of Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory performance in each of the three primary categories are given below. These are not intended to be inclusive, they are merely examples.

Satisfactory research:

1. Publications in high quality, peer reviewed journals or prestigious conference proceedings
2. Participation in conferences through contributed or invited presentations by faculty and their students
3. Research funding that will sustain a vibrant research program including support of graduate students
4. Supervision and mentoring of Ph.D. students

Unsatisfactory research:

1. Sustained periods without significant journal publications
2. Lack of participation in conferences through presentations by faculty and their students
3. Lack of research funding and poor proposal generation rate
4. Inadequate mentoring of Ph.D. students

Satisfactory teaching:

1. Evaluations
 - a. Student evaluations near or above departmental averages
 - b. Other positive feedback from students, e.g. during exit interviews
 - c. Awards for excellence in teaching
 - d. Satisfactory peer evaluation from observation and analysis arranged by dept. chair
2. Level of Effort
 - a. Course content kept up to date
 - b. Introduction of new approaches and new initiatives in existing courses or development of new courses
 - c. Timely fulfillment of ABET assessment requirements

Unsatisfactory teaching:

1. Evaluations
 - a. Student evaluations well below departmental averages
 - b. Other negative feedback from students, e.g. during exit interviews
2. Level of Effort
 - a. Course content not kept up to date
 - b. Lack of introduction of new approaches and new initiatives in existing courses and no development of new courses
 - c. Late or incomplete reporting of assigned ABET assessments

Satisfactory service:

1. Service to profession through participation as member or chair of professional or technical committee Editor or Associate Editor of Archival Journal
2. Service to department, college or university through participation in faculty meetings and departmental, college or university committees

Unsatisfactory service:

1. No service to the profession
2. Poor performance of duties as member of department, college or university committees

ARTICLE 5 PROMOTION CRITERIA FOR NON TENURE TRACK FACULTY

5.1 Engineer Series

Evaluation of faculty members in the Engineer Series for promotion is generally focused primarily on performance in service. Performance in either teaching or research may also be considered depending upon the faculty member's assignment. Engineer Series faculty are expected to excel in their assigned areas. The quality of performance must be consistent with that of the Professional Series for the equivalent rank taking the more applied nature of the research into account. In this track, research is usually considered to be related to professional activities and very applied research. Areas like professional education, educational research, applied research, and non-traditional teaching (short courses, professional development, etc.) are also to be considered. The percentage assignment of their duties must be taken into consideration. Further description of metrics that can be considered for evaluation is given in Article 5.4.

5.2. Research Scientist Series

Evaluation of faculty members in the Research Scientist Series for promotion is generally limited to performance in research. If service or teaching activities are part of the faculty member's assignment, they must also be included in the evaluation. Performance in research is the driver for promotion and salary decisions, however, and faculty are expected to excel in research. The quality of their research performance must be consistent with that of the Professorial Series for the equivalent rank. Further description of metrics that can be considered for evaluation is given in Article 5.4.

5.3. Lecturer Series

Evaluation for promotion in the Lecturer series is primarily for faculty involved in teaching, thus promotion in the lecturer track requires demonstrating excellence in teaching. Performance in service or research may also be considered depending on the faculty assignment. Teaching is evaluated in three areas: teaching quality, innovation in approaches to enhance student learning and professional development. Service is

evaluated on quality and benefit to the goals of the department, college and university. Further description of metrics that can be considered for evaluation is given in Article 5.4.

5.4 Metrics To Be Used for Evaluation of Non Tenure Track Faculty

The Dept. of Chemical Engineering does not typically employ personnel from the Lecturer or Engineers categories. The following departmental metrics apply to Research Scientist positions only:

1. Research scientists will normally be evaluated on the basis of their research alone.
2. The metrics used in evaluating candidates for promotion will be the same as the research metrics for tenure-track faculty (Article 1.1).
3. In cases where the candidate's assignment contains a significant teaching or service component this will be taken into consideration, using the same metrics as for tenure-track faculty.

ARTICLE 6 MERIT RAISE CRITERIA FOR NON TENURE TRACK FACULTY

6.1 Purpose of Merit Based Pay Raises

Pay raises based on merit may be used to promote and further various goals of the Dept. of Chemical Engineering, including:

1. Advance departmental mission
2. Improve the quality of department programs
3. Recognize and reward meritorious performance and sustained excellence of faculty
4. Promote retention of the most valuable and productive faculty
5. Improve faculty morale
6. Provide incentives for future faculty efforts
7. Improve department reputation in national surveys

6.2 Criteria for Award of Merit Pay Raises

Merit-based pay raises should be based on the quality and quantity of faculty activities in the areas of research, teaching, and service. Merit-based raises should generally reflect a continuous trend of productivity and excellence over a period of several years, as opposed to being based on achievements during a single academic year. Merit evaluations should be based on standardized activity reports submitted by the faculty member over the evaluation period, which will serve as the faculty member's 'case for merit'. In addition, merit deliberations may also consider other formal documents prepared during the evaluation period such as: promotion folders including external letters, and recent memoranda of understanding written by the chair following an extended discussion with the faculty member.

The same metrics described in Article 5.4 should be used by the department to determine meritorious performance. The relative importance of the metrics will vary among the ranks. Faculty in the Research scientist track, for example will be evaluated using the Research criteria, while those in the Lecturer track will be judged using the Teaching criteria. Those faculty whose assignments encompass more than one area will be evaluated using the relevant metrics.

Research scientists will be evaluated for merit pay raises using the same criteria as tenure track faculty. The weightings used for research, teaching and service (article 2.3) should effect the different assignment of research faculty.

ARTICLE 7 MARKET EQUITY RAISE CRITERIA FOR NON TENURE TRACK FACULTY

An individual faculty member may make a request to the department chair to have his/her salary reviewed for consideration of a market equity increase. The chair will assign the review to the appropriate departmental committee. The committee will compare the faculty member's salary with the Oklahoma State University Salary Survey and consider such factors as the faculty member's value and productivity to the department in developing a recommendation. The committee's recommendation will be sent to the chair. The Chair will evaluate the committee's recommendation and make a decision regarding the recommendation.

ARTICLE 8 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR NON TENURE TRACK FACULTY

Performance evaluations are intended to communicate to a faculty member a qualitative assessment of that faculty member's performance of assigned duties by providing written constructive feedback that will assist in improving the faculty member's performance and expertise. Faculty shall be evaluated according to the approved standards and procedures that were in place prior to the beginning of the evaluation period. The faculty member's annual evaluation shall also consider, where appropriate and available, information from the following sources: immediate supervisor, peers, students, faculty member/self, other university officials who have responsibility for supervision of the faculty member, and individuals to whom the faculty member may be responsible in the course of a service assignment. Any materials to be used in the evaluation process submitted by persons other than the faculty member shall be shown to the faculty member, who may attach a written response.

8.1 University Level Criteria

The annual performance evaluations shall be based upon assigned duties, and shall carefully consider the nature of the assignments and quality of the performance in terms, where applicable, of:

- a. Teaching effectiveness, including effectiveness in presenting knowledge, information, and ideas by means or methods such as lecture, discussion, assignment and recitation, demonstration, laboratory exercise, practical

experience, student evaluations, assessment of and engagement with student work, and direct consultation with students.

- i. The evaluation shall include consideration of effectiveness in presenting knowledge and skills, and effectiveness in stimulating students' critical thinking and/or creative abilities, the development or revision of curriculum and course structure, and adherence to accepted standards of professional behavior in meeting responsibilities to students.
 - ii. The evaluation shall include consideration of other assigned university teaching duties, such as advising, counseling, supervision of interns, or duties of the position held by the faculty member.
 - iii. The evaluator shall take into account any relevant materials submitted by the faculty member such as class notes, syllabi, student exams and assignments, a faculty member's teaching portfolio, results of peer evaluations of teaching, and any other materials relevant to the faculty member's instructional assignment.
 - iv. The chair shall consider all information available in forming an assessment of teaching effectiveness.
- b. Contribution to the discovery of new knowledge, development of new educational techniques, and other forms of research/scholarship/creative activity.
- i. Evidence of research/scholarship/creative activity, either print or electronic, shall include, but not be limited to, published books, chapters in books; articles and papers in professional journals; musical compositions, paintings, sculpture; works of performing art; papers presented at meetings of professional societies; reviews, and research and creative activity that has not yet resulted in publication, display or performance.
 - ii. The evaluation shall include consideration of the quality and quantity of the faculty member's research/scholarship and other creative programs and contributions during the evaluation period, and recognition by the academic or professional community of what has been accomplished.
- c. Service within the university and public service that extends professional or discipline-related contributions to the community; the State, including public schools; and the national and international community. Such service includes contributions to scholarly and professional conferences and organizations and unpaid positions on governmental boards, agencies, and commissions that are beneficial to such groups and individuals.
- d. Participation in the governance processes of the institution through significant service on committees, councils, and senates, and the faculty member's contributions to the governance of the institution through participation in regular departmental or college meetings.

- e. Service as the UFF/UF President, service on the UFF bargaining team, or service as an official UFF grievance representative shall be considered significant service for the purposes of this subsection.
- f. Other assigned university duties, such as advising, counseling, supervision of interns, and academic administration, or as described in a Position Description, if any, of the position held by the faculty member.

8.2 Departmental Clarification of University Criteria

Faculty in the Dept. of Chemical Engineering shall be evaluated annually according to the criteria listed in Article 1.2 and rated as either Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory in Teaching, Research and Service based on their performance in each of those areas. Their overall rating of Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory will be based upon consideration of their assignment and their rating in each of the three primary categories over the previous two years.

Examples of Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory performance in research are similar to those for tenure-track faculty (article 4.2). If a research faculty member takes on significant teaching or service, their performance in those areas will be evaluated using the same metrics as for tenure-track faculty.

ARTICLE 9 AMENDMENT OF THE BYLAWS

9.1 Voting Faculty

For purposes of adopting or amending this set of bylaws, the Voting Faculty of the Dept. of Chemical Engineering shall consist of all tenure track faculty who are employed by the Dept. In addition, faculty in the Engineer, Research Scientist and Lecturer tracks shall have voting privileges on Articles 5, 6, 7 and 8 only. Emeritus faculty and faculty holding , visiting, adjunct, or courtesy appointments shall not have voting privileges on any of the articles. The Chair or representative shall prepare and maintain a roster of the eligible Voting Faculty and update the list as necessary to reflect additions and deletions as they occur.

9.2 Amendment Process

These bylaws may be amended by the following procedure:

a) The proposed amendment(s) shall be submitted in writing to the faculty at least two (2) weeks before a regular or special Faculty meeting. Bylaws amendments may only be considered at meetings scheduled during the academic year.

b) Upon an affirmative vote by a majority of voting members present at said meeting, the Departmental Representative to the Tenure and Promotion Committee shall conduct, at the earliest opportunity, a mail (or electronic) ballot of the Voting Faculty of the department regarding the proposed amendment(s) to the Bylaws. The faculty in attendance may, by majority vote, revise the proposed amendment(s) prior to proffering them for a ballot.

- c) The deadline for return of the ballots shall be no sooner than five business days from the date of ballot distribution.
- d) The Department Chair and the Dept. Representative to the College T&P Committee or their representatives shall count the ballots promptly upon expiration of the return deadline.
- e) In general amended Bylaws shall take effect immediately. The exceptions are: 1) changes to tenure and promotion criteria (Articles 1 and 5), which will take effect one year following the start of the next academic year, and 2) changes to annual evaluations and merit raises (Articles 2, 4, 6, 8, which will take effect from the beginning of the next performance review period.

ARTICLE 10 PRACTICES FOR CONDUCTING BALLOTS

Most faculty decisions within the Dept. of Chemical Engineering will be made during regular faculty meetings. Faculty will be notified of upcoming issues that may require a vote. In some instances a double blind ballot of the whole faculty will be taken; the decision as to whether a specific issue needs a double blind ballot can be taken at a faculty meeting. In some instances a double blind ballot must be used. These issues include:

Department Name Change, Faculty Hiring, Chair's Advisory Committee, Departmental Representative to the Tenure and Promotion Committee, Curriculum Changes.

In addition, any ballot of the faculty of the Dept. of Chemical Engineering that is required by university or college regulations will be conducted according to the process laid down in these bylaws.

1. Each vote will be cast using a two-envelope system.

The outer envelope bears the name of the voter. It may also include the issue being voted on, as well as other information such as a due date.

The inner envelope contains the ballot and must not have any distinguishing marks.

2. After voting, the ballot is sealed inside the inner envelope, and the inner envelope is placed inside the outer envelope, which is then sealed and signed.
3. The Department Chair shall designate a ballot collector, preferably the top-ranking administrative secretary in the department, who will keep the unopened outer envelopes in a secure place.
4. The counting of the votes shall be done in the presence of a tenured faculty member, who is not an administrator and who acts as an observer. In addition to the observer, two other individuals, either faculty or staff shall be present. The Chair will designate all three participants.
5. The counting of the votes will be done as soon as possible after the announced deadline.

The sealed inner envelopes must be randomized, so that they cannot be identified as coming from a particular outer envelope.

The votes must be tallied, in the presence of the observer.

6. All qualifying faculty shall be given a reasonable opportunity to vote whenever a double blind ballot is needed. In particular, those who are absent on travel, sabbatical leave, or are otherwise unable to be physically present, must be notified that a vote is being taken, and shall be given a reasonable opportunity to cast their vote.
7. No faculty shall be asked to cast a vote under conditions that do not protect his/her right to secrecy.
8. The total vote for each category on the ballot shall be announced to all qualified voting faculty.

ARTICLE 11 FACULTY HIRING

11.1 On the constitution of the faculty-search committee

- 1a. The Faculty Search Committee Chair shall be appointed by the chair.
- 1b. The department Chair may appoint committee members, subject to confirmation by a faculty vote.
- 1c. The Faculty Search Committee shall include members from different ranks. The Faculty Search Committee Chair shall be a Tenured Professor.

11.2. On the role and mandate of the faculty-search committee

The faculty and the Faculty Search Committee shall have a clearly stated mandate setting out the parameters of the search.

The search committee will be proactive in pacing advertisements in a timely fashion, contacting candidates, and encouraging applications. Members of the search committee should plan to attend the AIChE meeting to make contact with potential candidates.

The search committee should present their recommendations for candidates to be interviewed to the faculty by the first week of the Spring semester

The search committee is responsible for arranging the interviews and hosting the candidates.

11.3. On the selection process

11.3 Faculty input on the candidates will be obtained by the following process.

1. Within one week of a candidate's interview, the faculty will vote on the acceptability of the candidate by secret ballot (options are "Acceptable", "Not Acceptable", "Abstain"). Any candidate with greater than 1/3 of the faculty voting "Not Acceptable" will be considered to be not acceptable by the faculty as a whole and will not be considered further.
2. After interviews are completed, the faculty will meet to discuss the strengths and weakness of the remaining candidates. The discussion will also seek a consensus on each candidate's rank upon hire.
3. The faculty will vote to register their recommendations on the candidates by secret ballot. Each faculty member allocates up to $2n$ votes, where n is the number of candidates under consideration; no more than n votes can be allocated to any individual candidate.
4. The outcome of the faculty vote should help guide the faculty search committee's recommendations to the Chair, and the results will be provided to the Chair and to the Dean.