

## **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 professorships, faculty fellowships, and similar distinctions will be made in accordance with the terms of the gift and applicable UF Foundation, UF, College, and Department policies.

### *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 candidate's 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 mini symposia, 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**

Faculty annual performance evaluations shall be conducted in accordance with the corresponding articles of the then-applicable Collective Bargaining Agreement.

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.

#### *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 during the preceding year. However, the department chair and faculty member may agree to an evaluation period for research of up to three years. 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 performance period under consideration. 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 SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

The University CBA (collective bargaining agreement) stipulates that there will be a defined SPE (sustained performance evaluation) process in each department's bylaws. The process for the Department is based on the SPE criteria presented in the tenure and promotion guidelines (Article 18, Section 8) for the University. The criteria state that tenured faculty will receive a SPE once every 7 years following tenure or their most recent promotion. The evaluation is based on progress in the prior 6 years of performance. There is a requirement for an overall "satisfactory" annual evaluation during 4 or more years, including at least one of the previous 2 years, for a "satisfactory" SPE. The annual evaluation files are the sole basis for the SPE. As part of the SPE process, a committee composed of all tenured Department faculty of equal or higher rank will initially review the faculty member's annual evaluations. The committee will provide a recommendation to the Department Chair. This information will be considered advisory by the Chair in review and evaluation of the faculty annual performance evaluations. In the case that the Chair determines a satisfactory outcome, the result will be submitted to the College of Engineering Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. A performance improvement plan resulting from a Sustained Performance Evaluation shall be developed only for those faculty members whose performance is identified through the sustained performance evaluation as being consistently unsatisfactory in one (1) or more areas of assigned duties. A meeting will be scheduled with the faculty member to review the overall evaluation. The faculty member under review can prepare a response to the evaluation to be attached to the SPE for submission to the College of Engineering Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. An initial performance improvement plan will be drafted by the faculty member. This information shall be considered advisory by the Chair and used in finalizing with the faculty member under review those details of the performance improvement plan. If the faculty member and chair are unable to reach an agreement, the Dean shall resolve any issues in dispute. The department chair will meet periodically with the faculty member to monitor any required performance improvement and to evaluate whether prescribed performance standards are met.

## **ARTICLE 6 PROMOTION CRITERIA FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY**

### *6.1 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. The metrics used in evaluating faculty



members in the Engineer Series will be the same as those used for tenure track faculty (Article 1), taking into consideration their assigned duties.

### *6.2. 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. The metrics used in evaluating faculty members in the Research Scientist Series will be the same as those used for tenure track faculty (Article 1), taking into consideration their assigned duties.

### *6.3. Lecturer Series*

Promotion criteria for faculty in the Lecturer Series is described in Article 7.

## **ARTICLE 7 PROMOTION CRITERIA FOR LECTURER SERIES FACULTY**

### *7.1 General Considerations*

Full-time Lecturers in the Herbert Wertheim College of Engineering at the University of Florida are members of the faculty and share all the associated rights and responsibilities but are not eligible for tenure. The Lecturer Series is intended for faculty who typically have a significant effort in teaching (usually  $\geq 0.75$  FTE). Evaluation of faculty members in the Lecturer Series for promotion and salary increases is generally focused on identifying distinctive performance in the primary areas of assignment. This document is intended to provide clarification regarding criteria for distinction and procedures for promotion of eligible Lecturers.

Promotion procedures for full-time Lecturers follow the University guidelines and Article 19 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Candidates complete the university's standard promotion packets and follow the university's promotion guidelines in conjunction with Article 19. Candidates determine the timing of promotion applications in collaboration with their department chair or the Dean of the College. Accomplishments required for promotion are typically achieved across six or more years of continuous, in-rank, full-time service, similar to promotion of tenure-track faculty.

### *7.2 Criteria for Promotion of Lecturers.*

In the case in which a non-tenure accruing faculty member's assignment is exclusively or almost exclusively in one category, distinction must be demonstrated in this category alone. Otherwise promotion is based upon distinction in two areas of assignment. The candidate's performance requires at least satisfactory performance in any other assigned areas.

*Distinction* is characterized by performance that is well above the expected, typical performance of a candidate of equivalent rank and assignment in the candidate's field. For example, to be promoted to the Senior Lecturer level, individuals need to demonstrate performance that is consistently above satisfactory expectations of the Lecturer position. Promotion candidates will need to show evidence of scholarship which may include the scholarship of teaching and learning or service. Activities that contribute to the mission of the College, and the advancement of the candidate's discipline, will also be important considerations. The sources of evidence will be evaluated on the quality of the evidence rather than quantity.

#### 7.2.1 Overall Criteria

- a) A candidate applying for promotion from **Lecturer to Senior Lecturer** is expected to have demonstrated sustained distinction in the primary assigned area, and at least emerging leadership with respect to assigned areas or duties.
- b) A candidate applying for promotion from **Senior Lecturer to Master Lecturer** is expected to demonstrate a continuing level of productivity that merits distinction in the primary assignment, as well as a high level of leadership in the assigned areas or duties.

#### 7.2.2 Major Sources of Evidence

- a) **Teaching.** The candidate will be evaluated on their overall teaching. The evaluation of teaching can be categorized into three areas: teaching quality, innovation in approaches to enhance student learning, and professional development. Individual evidence presented, as part of the comprehensive evidence package for teaching evaluation, should be given equal weight when applicable. Depending on the nature of the candidate's teaching assignment, possible sources of evidence to demonstrate distinction in teaching may include, but are not limited to:
  - Evidence of a submitted teaching portfolio that may include self-reflection including teaching approach, educational goals, teaching philosophy, and development / improvement of teaching performance.
  - Publications related to teaching and professional practice.
  - Student and chair evaluations of the candidate's teaching and advising performance.
  - Peer evaluation(s) of teaching, including visitations to classes and review of syllabi, examinations and other instructional materials are required for candidates with a teaching assignment. Frequency of peer evaluation(s) should be determined in consultation with the chair based on teaching assignment of faculty member.
  - Receipt of awards for teaching and/or advising.
  - Evidence of exemplary development and/or implementation of new courses, use of innovative teaching methods, instructional materials,

curriculum design, novel delivery methods, technological innovations, and syllabi.

- Demonstration of the ability to adapt to the changing demands of the discipline by participating in continuing professional development activities. Including new technical content arising from advances in the discipline, including other appropriate content innovations such as new technologies and current research topics, attending workshops & seminars, developing courses in new discipline areas, and addition of new materials.
- Evidence of professional mentoring of 1) undergraduate students, 2) novice or developing teachers, 3) graduate students, and/or 4) colleagues.
- Evidence of other instructional activities such as international teaching activities, undergraduate advising, or student organization advisement.

b) **Service.** Service focuses on activities that support the broad missions of the department, the Herbert Wertheim College of Engineering, and the University of Florida, and any other activity in the community outside the university. Service will also include service to the community, local or national professional organizations, activities for the advancement of the profession, international activities, and other service activity that requires the use of knowledge that results from one's role as a faculty member. Depending on the nature of the candidate's service assignment, possible sources of evidence to demonstrate distinction in service may include, but are not limited to:

- Presentations/publications about service activities or programs.
- Supervisor or peer evaluations or other evaluative evidence indicating exemplary performance in service.
- Evidence of efforts for continued professional development and improvement in service/administrative performance.
- Awards for service.
- Demonstrated service in an editorial capacity for the profession (e.g., journals, textbooks).
- Evidence of program evaluation reports, technical reports, monographs, accreditation reports.
- Evidence of service to support research activities and other service activities that will assist the department, college and university in achieving its goals.
- Evidence of exemplary service or consultation to public/private schools, community colleges, department, college or university committees; community-based organizations, and the profession including outreach activities.
- Evidence of providing exemplary professional development for practicing professionals with appropriate follow-up support beyond delivery of professional development.
- Evidence of exemplary contributions or leadership on committees related to teaching.

- Evidence of exemplary collaboration with UF faculty to translate traditional university-based coursework to apply to job-embedded programs.
  - Evidence of leadership roles related to teaching in one's discipline.
  - Leadership of an institute or centre, or leadership on college and university committees.
  - Leadership roles in professional organizations as evidenced by election or appointment to offices or committees, and leadership in conference organization.
  - Leadership roles in shaping educational policy at the local, state, and/or national level.
- c) **Research.** Although Lecturers in the Herbert Wertheim College of Engineering are typically assigned primary duties in the area of teaching and service, they may also have assigned duties in research or professional service.

Research activity, as part of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) and the Scholarship of Discovery, includes, but is not limited to any systematic investigation of questions, or various approaches, related to student learning and/or another engineering discipline field. The outcomes and applications of research activity can be used to improve the faculty member's own teaching activities, as well as advancing the discipline beyond the individual's practice. Activities defined as scholarship are expected to be reviewed, evaluated, and accessible to others. Depending on the nature of the candidate's research assignment, possible sources of evidence to demonstrate distinction in research may include, but are not limited to:

- Supervisor evaluations or other evaluative evidence indicating exemplary performance in research/scholarship.
- Leadership roles in appropriate research-oriented professional associations.
- Evidence of development of research line and most significant contributions.
- Established regional/national/international reputation based on research and/or expertise.
- Awards for scholarly activity.
- Publications that are appropriate to the candidate's field, such as, articles in peer reviewed periodicals, conference proceedings, books, monographs, chapters, bibliographies, codes, catalogues, abstracts, reviews, media releases, creative works, educational manuals, activities, patents, or copyrights, and other miscellaneous publications (e.g., non-refereed publications, non-traditional avenues).
- Lectures, speeches, workshops, or papers presented at state, regional, national, or international meetings.
- Documented leadership roles on grant proposals submitted and grant proposals funded. The candidate's role, e.g., PI, Co-PI, Co-Investigator,

Director, Coordinator, Co-Author, Senior Personnel, Project Manager, Evaluator, and associated accountability and responsibilities on the grant, or grant proposal will be taken into consideration.

- Grant funding proposal development and submission.
- Grant funding received.

### *7.3 Letters of Evaluation*

- a) Letters of evaluation may come from internal or external faculty in the candidate's field, industry, government agencies most capable of an informed, objective evaluation of the candidate. The evaluator must be of higher rank than the candidate. If the evaluator is from industry or a governmental agency, this person should hold standing at least equivalent to that of the candidate.
- b) The College expects 5 (five) letters of evaluation for promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, with at least half of the letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate and the remaining half from evaluators suggested by the chair. The request of additional letters beyond the required five is at the discretion of the chair. For promotion to Master Lecturer, external letters must be included. The candidate shall submit a list of names to the chair. The chair shall be responsible for choosing the individuals who will be requested to submit letters of evaluation, provided that at least one-half of the evaluators who agree to write letters come from the candidate's list. If an insufficient number of individuals agree to serve as evaluators, the candidate shall submit additional names, as necessary.

## **ARTICLE 8 PROGRESS-TO-PROMOTION REVIEW FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY**

The purpose of this appraisal shall be to assess the non-tenure track faculty member's progress toward meeting the criteria for promotion and to provide assessments, suggestions, and guidance to assist the faculty member in fulfilling the University's, College's, and Department's criteria.

- (1) By mid-December: Department chair notifies non-tenure track faculty who are in their third year at the University of Florida about the Progress-to-Promotion process detailed below.
  - a. The office of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs will inform non-tenure track faculty who are in their third year at the University of Florida and their respective Department Chairs about the Progress-to-Promotion process.
  - b. The Associate Dean will provide guidance on the preparation of the appraisal dossier containing the same kind of information as would be included in the promotion dossier minus external letters of evaluation.

- c. The Department Chair will share the following materials for inclusion in the dossier:
  - i. Annual Assigned Activity, including the proportions of the faculty member's assignments, reported on the annual activities report that have been devoted to teaching, scholarship, and service which should be auto-populated in the OPT template packet and should be reviewed by the candidate and the department chair;
  - ii. Departmental criteria for promotion;
  - iii. Peer evaluations (if applicable); and
  - iv. The faculty member's Annual Evaluations.
- (2) A faculty member who declines to be reviewed under this PtP process must do so in writing by submitting a letter to their chair/director by January 10th.
- (3) The faculty member will compile a dossier utilizing the same template used for promotion, but without letters of evaluation.
- (4) First Monday in February: Faculty member sends completed PtP dossier to Department Chair.
  - a. This dossier will be reviewed by those faculty eligible to vote on promotion, who will meet with the Department Chair to discuss whether the faculty member being reviewed is making appropriate progress towards promotion.
  - b. The Department Chair will prepare a letter that notes the findings of the departmental review concerning the faculty member's progress toward meeting promotion criteria. The letter will also document the department chair's review and assessment of the candidate's progress to promotion. The Department Chair will provide a copy of the letter to the faculty member.
- (5) Second Monday in March: The dossier including the Department Chair's letter will be submitted to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.
  - a. The received dossiers will be reviewed by the College T&P committee which will be joined by a representative from among the most senior rank of each non-tenure track faculty series being reviewed. The Dean or Dean's designee will attend the meeting and will be briefed on the findings.
  - b. The Dean of the college will prepare a letter that notes the findings of the college review concerning the faculty member's progress toward meeting promotion criteria.
- (6) No later than six months after the start of the process, the results of this review shall be shared with the faculty member, who will, upon request, be provided the opportunity to meet with the dean.

## **ARTICLE 9 MERIT RAISE CRITERIA FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY**

### *9.1 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

### *9.2 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 6 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.

Non tenure track faculty will be evaluated for merit pay raises using the same criteria as tenure track faculty (Article 2). The weightings used for research, teaching and service (Article 2.4) shall be 75% for their primary responsibility and 25% for the others (e.g., for a Lecturer it would be 75% teaching and 25% service and research based on their activity).

## **ARTICLE 10 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 11 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY**

Faculty annual performance evaluations shall be conducted in accordance with the corresponding articles of the then-applicable Collective Bargaining Agreement. 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.

### *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 during the preceding year. However, the department chair and faculty member may agree to an evaluation period for research of up to three years. 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 performance period under consideration.

Examples of Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory performance in teaching, research, and service are similar to those for tenure-track faculty (Article 4.2), taking into consideration their assigned duties.

## **ARTICLE 12 AMENDMENT OF THE BYLAWS**

### *12.1 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 and non tenure track faculty with a primary appointment in the Dept., with the exception that only tenure track faculty shall vote on amendments to Articles 1 through 4. Emeritus faculty and faculty holding, affiliate, 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.

### *12.2 Amendment Process*

These bylaws may be amended following the procedures stipulated in the applicable Collective Bargaining Agreement between the University of Florida Board of Trustees and the United Faculty of Florida. For example, Article 9, Bylaws Governing Terms and Conditions of Employment, in the 2021-2024 CBA.

## **ARTICLE 13 PRACTICES FOR CONDUCTING BALLOTS**

Most faculty decisions within the Dept. of Chemical Engineering will be made during regular faculty meetings by show of hands voting, in accordance with Florida Sunshine Law. Exceptions include votes that evaluate faculty or candidate performance, such as promotion and tenure decisions and votes related to candidates under consideration for a position. Faculty will be notified of upcoming issues that may require a vote.

For decisions that require an anonymous ballot, faculty who are eligible to vote on the matter under consideration will do so using the online UF Voting system. The voting period shall be announced to all faculty eligible to vote via official UF electronic mail. The total vote for each category on the ballot shall be announced to all eligible voting faculty.

## **ARTICLE 14 FACULTY HIRING**

Faculty hiring shall be governed by the applicable article within the Collective Bargaining Agreement (e.g., Article 12 in the 2021-2024 CBA), as well as university and college policies and regulations.

A search committee shall be established by the department chair for all tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty appointments. No less than three-fourths of the committee's members shall be primary faculty in the Department. No less than three-fourths of the members of a search committee for a tenure-track faculty appointment shall be faculty with tenure-track appointments. It is encouraged that the search committee include members from different ranks. In all cases, the search committee chair shall be a Tenured Professor.

The faculty and the Faculty Search Committee shall have a clearly stated mandate, provided by the Department Chair, 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, hosting the candidates, and obtaining faculty input in accordance with the applicable articles in the CBA. The following procedure is suggested:

1. Within one week of a candidate's interview, the faculty will meet to discuss the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, followed by a 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 relative strengths and weakness of the remaining candidates.
3. The faculty discussion shall guide the faculty search committee's recommendations to the Chair.