

BYLAWS GOVERNING CRITERIA USED FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY

ARTICLE 1 TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

The Dept. of Civil and Coastal Engineering criteria statement is as follows:

As a major unit of the College of Engineering of the University of Florida, the Dept. of Civil and Coastal 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, tenure and salary adjustment via the salary pay plan focuses on performance in teaching, research, and service.

a) To be recommended for promotion to Associate 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. Service to the public school sector is considered to be important and will be considered in the evaluation process. 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 1.2.

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 research and have an impressive record of service to the profession at both national and international levels. Further examples of information that is to be considered for evaluation are given in Article 1.3.

Teaching

Teaching excellence is demonstrated by factors such as development of new courses, student and peer evaluation of teaching, student mentoring, and honors and awards. Excellence in the teaching of undergraduate courses must be demonstrated. Engagement of undergraduates in research is also an expectation.

Scholarship

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.

Service

Service excellence is demonstrated by an impressive record of leadership in the professional community, including service to the university, college, and department. Service distinction is demonstrated by long-term commitment to service assignments in a department that have greatly impacted students, staff, and curricula. Leadership in the profession through service as a journal editor, editorial board member, national committee member, conference or symposium chair, or professional society leader is an expectation.

1.2 Metrics To Be Used for Evaluation of Tenure Track Faculty for Promotion to Associate Professor

The following are examples of activities and accomplishments that will be considered for evaluation of faculty under consideration for promotion to Associate Professor:

Research:

1. Publications
 - a. Peer reviewed
 - i. Journal papers
 1. Journal quality
 2. Journal impact factor
 - ii. Papers in conference proceedings and other refereed volumes
 1. Acceptance rate
 2. Quality
 3. Number of reviewers per paper
 - b. Not peer reviewed
 - i. Advanced level books, texts, and monographs
 - ii. Patents and copyrights
 - iii. Conference papers
 - iv. Other scholarly works
2. Originality and relevance of research
 - a. Citation indices generated by ISI without self-citations
 - b. External letters
3. Recognition and stature in profession
 - a. Awards, Fellowships, etc.
 - b. Invited talks, Keynote talks
 - c. Other honors
4. Research funding

- a. Source and type
 - i. Grant vs. contract
 - ii. Research vs. infrastructure
 - iii. Type of peer review
 - iv. Interdisciplinary vs. disciplinary
 - b. Amount
- 5. Graduate student supervision
 - a. Number and quality of Ph.D supervised/graduated
 - b. Number and quality of Engineer supervised/graduated
 - c. Number and quality of M.S. supervised/graduated
 - d. Student placement

Teaching:

- 1. Evaluations
 - a. Student
 - b. Peer
 - c. Awards
- 2. Level of Effort
 - a. Class size
 - b. Updating of course content
 - c. Laboratory/facilities development
 - d. Introduction of new approaches and new initiatives
- 3. Innovation
 - a. New course development
 - b. Undergraduate and beginning graduate textbook publication
 - c. Other teaching related materials, tools or content
- 4. Funding
 - a. Teaching related grants
 - i. Source and type
 - ii. Type of review
- 5. Student Advising
 - a. Competition teams
 - b. Advisor for student societies
 - c. Other student-oriented extra-curricular activities

Service:

- 1. Teaching
 - i. Professional education
 - ii. Educational research
 - iii. Non-traditional teaching
- 2. Publications
 - i. Journals
 - ii. Conference Proceedings
 - iii. Manuals
 - iv. Codes
 - iii. Non-traditional media

3. External service recognition, commendations, awards
4. Exceptional internal service activities with the potential for significant institutional impact.
5. Professional Service
 - i. Advisor to student society
 - ii. Member, Chair, or Officer of professional committees or societies
 - iii. Other service activities
6. Coordination of teaching or research programs

1.3 Metrics To Be Used for Evaluation of Tenure Track Faculty for Promotion to Professor

The following are examples of activities and accomplishments that will be considered for evaluation of faculty under consideration for promotion to Professor:

Research:

1. Publications
 - a. Peer reviewed
 - i. Journal papers
 1. Journal quality
 2. Journal impact factor
 - ii. Papers in conference proceedings and other refereed volumes
 1. Acceptance rate
 2. Quality
 3. Number of reviewers per paper
 - b. Not peer reviewed
 - i. Advanced level books, texts, and monographs
 - ii. Patents and copyrights
 - iii. Conference papers
 - iv. Publications in the popular press
 - v. Other scholarly works
2. Originality and relevance of research
 - a. Citation indices generated by ISI without self-citations
 - b. External letters
3. Recognition and stature in profession
 - a. Awards, Fellowships, etc.
 - b. Invited talks, Keynote talks
 - c. Other honors
4. Research funding
 - a. Source and type
 - i. Grant vs. contract
 - ii. Research vs. infrastructure
 - iii. Type of peer review
 - iv. Interdisciplinary vs. disciplinary
 - b. Amount
 - c. Support of graduate students

5. Graduate student supervision
 - a. Number and quality of Ph.D supervised/graduated
 - b. Number and quality of Engineer supervised/graduated
 - c. Number and quality of M.S. supervised/graduated
 - d. Student placement
6. External funding and support for engineering education
7. Leadership on team proposals.
8. Licensing income
9. Economic impact on local, state and/or national industry

Teaching:

1. Evaluations
 - a. Student
 - b. Peer
 - c. Awards
2. Level of Effort
 - a. Class size
 - b. Updating of course content
 - c. Laboratory/facilities development
 - d. Introduction of new approaches and new initiatives
3. Innovation
 - a. New course development
 - b. Undergraduate and beginning graduate textbook publication
 - c. Other teaching related materials, tools or content
4. Funding
 - a. Teaching related grants
 - i. Source and type
 - ii. Type of review
5. Student Advising
 - a. Competition teams
 - b. Advisor for student societies
 - c. Other student-oriented extra-curricular activities

Service:

1. Teaching
 - i. Professional education
 - ii. Educational research
 - iii. Non-traditional teaching
2. Publications
 - i. Journals
 - ii. Conference Proceedings
 - iii. Manuals
 - iv. Codes
 - iii. Non-traditional media
3. External service recognition, commendations, awards

4. Exceptional internal service activities with the potential for significant institutional impact.
5. Professional Service
 - i. Advisor to student society
 - ii. Member, Chair, or Officer of professional committees or societies
 - iii. Other service activities
6. Coordination of teaching or research programs

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. No mentors will be required to provide written assessments. 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. Tenured faculty members of the department 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 Civil and Coastal 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

Faculty in the Dept. of Civil and Coastal Engineering shall be evaluated for meritorious performance using the same metrics, listed in Articles 1.2 and 1.3, for the evaluation of tenure track faculty for tenure and promotion.

2.4 Implementation

Consistent with the Department merit pay criteria adopted December 13, 2005 and the College of Engineering criteria that appear in the June 11, 2004 Report of the Ad Hoc Merit Pay Committee, no priority is implied with the numbers listing activities under Articles 1.2 and 1.3. The Department Chair shall provide as much guidance as possible regarding the priority on activities listed under Articles 1.2 and 1.3 in merit pay considerations. Guidelines and weighting of metrics should be reviewed periodically by faculty to ensure continued relevance and congruence with the department's goals and objectives.

Final Evaluation: A merit based pay raise system requires comparative evaluation of departmental faculty. The final evaluation is the responsibility of the Department Chair, who should give due consideration to the guidelines established by the department faculty and may choose to solicit help (i.e., peer evaluation) from the faculty.

Distribution of Merit Pay: After cost-of-living adjustments to all those with satisfactory service reviews, raises must reward merit. The following provides recommendations for the distribution of merit pay.

1. It is recommended that monies available for merit raises not be distributed "across-the-board" to departmental faculty, as this defeats the purpose of such raises.
2. In making merit pay decisions, the Chair should follow the guidelines established by the department faculty, but may also consider the

- productivity/merit of faculty members relative to their current level of pay, as well as relative to national norms.
3. Eligibility for, and decisions on merit pay raises should not be influenced by other pay increases due to bonus programs, promotions, or other special programs.
 4. In the interests of transparency, it is recommended that the chair inform the faculty regarding the distribution of merit pay. This could be accomplished in the form of a histogram showing the numbers of faculty receiving raises in various ranges of dollar amounts, while still protecting the privacy of individuals.

ARTICLE 3 MARKET EQUITY RAISE CRITERIA

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

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 Civil and Coastal Engineering shall be evaluated annually according to the metrics listed in Articles 1.2 and 1.3 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. Typically, the period over which a faculty member's performance is evaluated is the preceding year. However, the department may allow for an evaluation period for research/scholarship/creative activity of up to 3 years.

Examples of Satisfactory Performance in each of the three primary categories are given below. These are not intended to be exhaustive, they are merely examples.

Teaching:

Satisfactory

1. Evaluations

- a. Student evaluations near or above departmental averages and/or
- b. Other positive feedback from students, e.g. during exit interviews and/or
- c. Awards for excellence in teaching and/or
- 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

1. Evaluations

- a. Student evaluations well below departmental averages and/or
- 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

Research:

Satisfactory

1. Publications in quality, peer reviewed journals or conference proceedings at a rate in keeping with departmental averages
2. Participation in conferences through contributed or invited presentations by faculty and/or their students
3. Research funding at a level appropriate to the discipline and sufficiently adequate to fund a vibrant research program including support of graduate students
4. Supervision of a number of Ph.D. students in keeping with the departmental average

Unsatisfactory

1. Publications in poor quality journals or conference proceedings or at a rate well below departmental averages
2. Little or no participation in conferences through contributed or invited presentations by faculty and/or their students
3. Little or no research funding or poor proposal generation rate
4. Supervision of few or no Ph.D. students

Service:

Satisfactory

Service to profession through participation as member or chair of professional or technical committee

Editor or Associate Editor of archival Journal

Service to department, college or university through participation in faculty meetings and departmental, college or university committees

Unsatisfactory

No service to the profession

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 following are examples of activities and accomplishments that will be considered for evaluation of faculty:

Research:

1. Publications

a. Peer reviewed

i. Journal papers

1. Journal quality

2. Journal impact factor

ii. Papers in conference proceedings and other refereed volumes

1. Acceptance rate

- 2. Quality
- 3. Number of reviewers per paper
- b. Not peer reviewed
 - i. Advanced level books, texts, and monographs
 - ii. Patents and copyrights
 - iii. Conference papers
 - iv. Other scholarly works
- 2. Originality and relevance of research
 - a. Citation indices generated by ISI without self-citations
 - b. External letters
- 3. Recognition and stature in profession
 - a. Awards, Fellowships, etc.
 - b. Invited talks, Keynote talks
 - c. Other honors
- 4. Research funding
 - a. Source and type
 - i. Grant vs. contract
 - ii. Research vs. infrastructure
 - iii. Type of peer review
 - iv. Interdisciplinary vs. disciplinary
 - b. Amount
- 5. Graduate student supervision
 - a. Number and quality of Ph.D supervised/graduated
 - b. Number and quality of Engineer supervised/graduated
 - c. Number and quality of M.S. supervised/graduated
 - d. Student placement

Teaching:

- 1. Evaluations
 - a. Student
 - b. Peer
 - c. Awards
- 2. Level of Effort
 - a. Class size
 - b. Updating of course content
 - c. Laboratory/facilities development
 - d. Introduction of new approaches and new initiatives
- 3. Innovation
 - a. New course development
 - b. Undergraduate and beginning graduate textbook publication
 - c. Other teaching related publications
- 4. Funding
 - a. Teaching related grants
 - i. Source and type
 - ii. Type of review

5. Student Advising
 - a. Competition teams
 - b. Advisor for student societies
 - c. Other student-oriented extra-curricular activities

Service:

1. Teaching
 - i. Professional education
 - ii. Educational research
 - iii. Non-traditional teaching
2. Publications
 - i. Journals
 - ii. Conference Proceedings
 - iii. Manuals
 - iv. Codes
 - iii. Non-traditional media
3. External service recognition, commendations, awards
4. Exceptional internal service activities with the potential for significant institutional impact.
5. Professional Service
 - i. Advisor to student society
 - ii. Member, Chair, or Officer of professional committees or societies
6. Coordination of teaching or research programs

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 Civil and Coastal 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 and Metrics 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.

6.3 Implementation

Consistent with the Department merit pay criteria adopted December 13, 2005 and the College of Engineering criteria that appear in the June 11, 2004 Report of the Ad Hoc Merit Pay Committee, no priority is implied with the numbers listing activities under Article 5.4. The Department Chair shall provide as much guidance as possible regarding the priority on activities listed under Article 5.4 in merit pay considerations. Guidelines and weighting of metrics should be reviewed periodically by faculty to ensure continued relevance and congruence with the department's goals and objectives.

Final Evaluation: A merit based pay raise system requires comparative evaluation of departmental faculty. The final evaluation is the responsibility of the Department Chair, who should give due consideration to the guidelines established by the department faculty and may choose to solicit help (i.e., peer evaluation) from the faculty.

Distribution of Merit Pay: After cost-of-living adjustments to all those with satisfactory service reviews, raises must reward merit. The following provides recommendations for the distribution of merit pay.

1. It is recommended that monies available for merit raises not be distributed "across-the-board" to departmental faculty, as this defeats the purpose of such raises.
2. In making merit pay decisions, the Chair should follow the guidelines established by the department faculty, but may also consider the productivity/merit of faculty members relative to their current level of pay, as well as relative to national norms.
3. Eligibility for, and decisions on merit pay raises should not be influenced by other pay increases due to bonus programs, promotions, or other special programs.
4. In the interests of transparency, it is recommended that the chair inform the faculty regarding the distribution of merit pay. This could be accomplished in the form of a histogram showing the numbers of faculty

receiving raises in various ranges of dollar amounts, while still protecting the privacy of individuals.

ARTICLE 7 MARKET EQUITY RAISE CRITERIA

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

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 Civil and Coastal Engineering shall be evaluated annually according to the criteria listed in Article 5.4 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. Typically, the period over which a faculty member's performance is evaluated is the preceding year. However, the department may allow for an evaluation period for research/scholarship/creative activity of up to 3 years.

Examples of Satisfactory Performance in each of the three primary categories are given below. These are not intended to be exhaustive, they are merely examples.

Teaching:

Satisfactory

1. Evaluations

- a. Student evaluations near or above departmental averages and/or
- b. Other positive feedback from students, e.g. during exit interviews and/or
- c. Awards for excellence in teaching and/or
- 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

1. Evaluations

- a. Student evaluations well below departmental averages and/or
- 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

Research:

Satisfactory

1. Publications in quality, peer reviewed journals or conference proceedings at a rate in keeping with departmental averages
2. Participation in conferences through contributed or invited presentations by faculty and/or their students
3. Research funding at a level appropriate to the discipline and sufficiently adequate to fund a vibrant research program including support of graduate students
4. Supervision of a number of Ph.D. students in keeping with the departmental average

Unsatisfactory

1. Publications in poor quality journals or conference proceedings or at a rate well below departmental averages
2. Little or no participation in conferences through contributed or invited presentations by faculty and/or their students
3. Little or no research funding or poor proposal generation rate
4. Supervision of few or no Ph.D. students

Service:

Satisfactory

Service to profession through participation as member or chair of professional or technical committee

Editor or Associate Editor of archival Journal

Service to department, college or university through participation in faculty meetings and departmental, college or university committees

Unsatisfactory

No service to the profession

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 Civil and Coastal 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 thirty (30) 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. The amended Bylaws shall take effect one year from the date of certification of approval by a two-thirds majority of the voting faculty.