

**DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING SCIENCES
BYLAWS GOVERNING CRITERIA USED FOR EVALUATION OF
FACULTY**

**AMENDMENTS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE EES
FACULTY ON JULY 12, 2013**

**JANUARY 19, 2009
REVISED APRIL 12, 2013**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT GUIDELINES

ARTICLE 1 TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA

- 1.1 Criteria for Tenure and Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty*
- 1.2 Promotion Criteria for Non-tenure Track Faculty*
- 1.3 Metrics to be Used for Evaluation of Tenure Track Faculty*
- 1.4 Mentoring During Tenure Probationary Period*
- 1.5 Mid-tenure Review*

ARTICLE 2 MERIT RAISE CRITERIA FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

- 2.1 Purpose of Merit Based Pay Raises*
- 2.2 Criteria for Award of Merit Pay Raises*

ARTICLE 3 MARKET EQUITY RAISE CRITERIA FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

ARTICLE 4 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

- 4.1 University Criteria*
- 4.2 Departmental Clarification of University Criteria*

ARTICLE 5 PROMOTION CRITERIA FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

- 5.1 Engineer Series*
- 5.2. Research Scientist Series*
- 5.3. Lecturer Series*
- 5.4 Metrics To Be Used for Evaluation of Non-Tenure Track Faculty*

ARTICLE 6 MERIT RAISE CRITERIA FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

- 6.1 Purpose of Merit Based Pay Raises*
- 6.2 Criteria for Award of Merit Pay Raises*

**ARTICLE 7 MARKET EQUITY RAISE CRITERIA FOR NON-TENURE
TRACK FACULTY**

**ARTICLE 8 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR NON-
TENURE TRACK FACULTY**

8.1 University Criteria

8.2 Departmental Clarification of University Criteria

ARTICLE 9 AMENDMENT OF THE BYLAWS

9.1 Voting Faculty

9.2 Amendment Process

APPENDIX A. EES DEPARTMENT'S MERIT PAY CRITERIA

***APPENDIX B. (EXCERPT FROM THE FACULTY SENATE REPORT ON
FACULTY COMPENSATION, APRIL 15, 2004)***

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT GUIDELINES

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) Guidance Re Development of Criteria for Annual Performance Evaluation is described in this section.

Each faculty member's performance of assigned duties shall be evaluated according to rating categories defined by the Director of the School of Sustainable Infrastructure and Environment, the Department Head and the faculty of the department. This definition shall identify for each assignment area some representative examples of the achievements or performance characteristics that would earn each performance evaluation rating, consistent with a faculty member's assigned duties.

a) These departmental clarifications shall

1. Take into consideration the department's mission and the reasonable expectation for different tasks

2. Be adaptable to various assigned duties, so that department faculty have an equitable opportunity to earn merit increases, regardless of their assignments; and

3. Be detailed enough that a reasonable faculty member should not be uncertain or confused about what performance or accomplishment is sufficient in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service to earn each performance evaluation rating. The clarifications shall identify for each assignment area some representative examples of the achievements or performance characteristics that would earn each performance evaluation rating.

b) With respect to research/scholarship/creative activity, each department shall develop discipline-specific clarifications that are consistent with the University's publicly articulated mission. These discipline-specific clarifications must also address how the department values various research/scholarship/creative activities and the outlets in which candidates might be reasonably expected to publish, exhibit, or perform.

c) The departmental clarifications for the annual evaluation rating categories shall assume that 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.

ARTICLE 1 TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA

The Dept. of Environmental Engineering Sciences criteria statement is as follows:

As a unit in the School of Sustainable Infrastructure and Environment, and a major unit of the College of Engineering of the University of Florida, the Dept. of Environmental Engineering Sciences 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 focuses on performance in teaching, research / scholarship, 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. Professional service at the national and international level is expected. Teacher evaluations, success in securing funded research, publications in scholarly journals, honors and awards, national recognition, and Ph.D. production. The potential for long-term sustained excellence is important. Undergraduate classroom teaching is a required and an important component. 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 an impressive record of service to the profession at both national and international levels. The quality as well as the quantity of technical contributions will be judged. Engagement of undergraduates in research is also an expectation. Further examples of information that is to be considered for evaluation are given in Article 1.4.

1.2 Promotion Criteria for Non-tenure Track Faculty

a. 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 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 either Article 1.3 or Article 1.4, depending on the rank of the faculty member.

b. 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 either Article 1.3 or Article 1.4, depending on the rank of the faculty member.

c. 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 either Article 1.3 or Article 1.4, depending on the rank of the faculty member.

1.3 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 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

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
 - e. Development of distance learning courses
- 3. Innovation
 - a. New course development
 - b. Undergraduate and graduate textbook publication
 - c. Other teaching related publications
- 4. Funding
 - a. Teaching related grants
 - i. Source and type
 - ii. Type of review

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 or Chair of professional committees
- 6. Coordination of teaching or research programs

1.4 1.4 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 for promotion to Professor:

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; documentation should be as long it is clear regarding how the nominee distinctly contributed.

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
 - 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 research or education 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
 - e. Development of distance learning courses
3. Innovation
 - a. New course development
 - b. Undergraduate and graduate textbook publication
 - c. Other teaching related publications
4. Funding
 - a. Teaching related grants
 - i. Source and type
 - ii. Type of review

Service:

1. Teaching service
 - i. Professional education
 - ii. Educational research
 - iii. Non-traditional teaching
2. Research service
 - i. Review of professional scholarly journals
 - ii. Editor of professional scholarly journals
 - iii. Editorial board member
 - iv. National committee member for professional organization
 - v. Conference or symposium chair or co-chair
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 or Chair of professional committees
6. Coordination of teaching or research programs

1.5 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.

1.6 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 towards 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 Head and the School Director 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 Environmental Engineering Sciences 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 scholarship, 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 Director in consultation with the Department Head following an extended discussion with the faculty member.

a) Tenure Track Faculty

A copy of the Merit Pay Criteria approved by the EES faculty on 3/25/05 is attached as Appendix A.

ARTICLE 3 MARKET EQUITY RAISE CRITERIA FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

An individual faculty member may make a request to the School Director to have his/her salary reviewed for consideration of a market equity increase. The Director will assign the review to the appropriate departmental committee which will include the Department Head. 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 Director. The Director in consultation with the Department Head 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 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 Director 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 Environmental Engineering Sciences shall be evaluated annually according to the criteria listed in Article 1.3 and rated as either Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory in Teaching, Research/Scholarship 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.

Examples of Satisfactory Performance in each of the three primary categories are given below:

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 the Department Head

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

Scholarship:

Satisfactory

1. Publications in high quality, peer reviewed, journals or prestigious 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 as supervisory committee chair of graduate students appropriate to the rank of the faculty member

Unsatisfactory

1. Publications in poor quality journals or conference proceedings or in high quality venues but 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 fewer graduate students than would be appropriate to the rank of the faculty member.

Service:

Satisfactory

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

Unsatisfactory

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 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, appropriate to a faculty member's assignment, which 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
 - 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

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 Environmental Engineering Sciences 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 Director 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.

ARTICLE 7 MARKET EQUITY RAISE CRITERIA FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

An individual faculty member may make a request to the School Director to have his/her salary reviewed for consideration of a market equity increase. The Director will assign the review to the appropriate departmental committee which will include the Department Head. 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 Director. The Director in consultation with the Department Head 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 Director 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 Environmental Engineering Sciences shall be evaluated annually according to the criteria listed in Article 5.3 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 inclusive, 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 the Department Head

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 high quality, peer reviewed journals or prestigious 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. Serving as supervisory committee chair of graduate students appropriate to the rank of the faculty member

Unsatisfactory

- 1. Publications in poor quality journals or conference proceedings or in high quality venues but 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 fewer graduate students than would be appropriate to the rank of the faculty member.

Service:

Satisfactory

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

Unsatisfactory

1. No service to the profession or the university

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 Environmental Engineering Sciences shall consist of all tenure track faculty who are employed by the Dept. Emeritus faculty and faculty holding visiting, adjunct, or courtesy appointments shall not have voting privileges. Faculty in the Engineer, Research Scientist and Lecturer tracks shall not have voting privileges. The Department Head 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 Head and the Dept. Representative to the College T&P Committee or their representatives shall count the ballots promptly upon expiration of the return deadline and the amended Bylaws shall take effect one year from the date of certification of approval by a two-thirds majority of the voting faculty.

APPENDIX A. EES DEPARTMENT'S MERIT PAY CRITERIA

**University of Florida
College of Engineering
Department of Environmental Engineering Sciences
Merit Pay Criteria
Approved by EES Faculty
3/25/05
Amended 1/16/09**

Introduction

The 6/11/04 report of the Ad-hoc Merit Pay Committee is the basis for the College of Engineering's (COE) guidance with regard to merit pay. The purpose of this document is to provide additional guidance as to merit pay for faculty in the Department of Environmental Engineering Sciences. It should be viewed as an addendum to the COE guidelines. The format of this addendum follows the outline for the COE report.

Purpose of Merit Based Pay Raises

COE Criteria

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

1. Advance college mission
2. Improve the quality of college 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 college reputation in national surveys

EES Criteria

Same as the COE criteria.

Criteria for Award of Merit Pay Raises

COE Criteria

Merit-based pay raises should be based on the quality and quantity of faculty activities in the areas of research, teaching, and service. In consideration of the purposes for merit-based pay outlined above, the importance of research to our mission as a major public research university, and the need to incorporate research advances into coursework and teaching, the *primary emphasis* for merit evaluations should be placed on research. 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. In particular, merit raise judgments should be independent of the current faculty assignment during the period under consideration since these assignments may not reflect the priorities and activities which the college wishes to emphasize and reward.

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: tenure and promotion folders including external letters, and recent memoranda of understanding written by the chair following an extended discussion with the faculty member.

Additional EES Criteria

- Undergraduate and graduate teaching effectiveness is an important component of the evaluation.
- The primary evaluation period should be since the last merit raise was awarded.
- Merit raise evaluations should incorporate faculty assignments since the last merit raise was awarded.

Metrics

COE Metrics

The following metrics should be considered by the departments as evidence of meritorious performance. The relative importance of the metrics will vary among the departments.

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
 - 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

Service:

- 1. Editorships and editorial board memberships*
 - a. Journal quality
 - b. Journal acceptance rate
- 2. Conference program committee chairmanships and memberships*
- 3. Service to Professional Society – i.e. high ranking officer
- 4. External service recognition, commendations, awards
- 5. Exceptional internal service activities with the potential for significant institutional impact**

* Only highly prestigious, i.e. scrutinized and visible, editorships and conference chairmanships should be counted under this category.

** Examples of internal service activities meeting this standard include service on groups working to establish new academic units or major programs, and leadership of large interdisciplinary initiatives involving faculty from several departments and colleges.

Additional EES Metrics

1. Publications should include books, texts, and monographs that have been subjected to peer review.
2. Exemplary service to the department should be recognized.

Implementation

COE

Faculty Input

It is the collective responsibility of the faculty in each department to consider the question of “What makes a professor in this discipline renowned, both externally and internally?”, and formulate qualitative and/or quantitative guidelines by which the Chair will evaluate the activity reports provided by the faculty. These guidelines should assign relative importance, emphasis, and/or weighting to be given to the various metrics listed above. To properly calibrate the various metrics, department faculty are encouraged to define “target levels” corresponding to acceptable vs. meritorious performance.

The exact form of these guidelines may vary from department to department. For example, the guidelines could take the form of a highly quantitative “formula” which weights and sums the various contributions and arrives at a composite numerical “score” for each faculty member, similar to that proposed in the April 15, 2004 Report of the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Compensation (See Appendix B). Other departments may wish to rank the metrics in order of importance and group faculty members into “bins” or “levels” such as *Excellent*, *Good*, *Fair*, *Poor* for each category of activity. Other departments may rank the relative importance of the various metrics, and provide this ranking and weighting to the Chair to use when making a subjective judgment about the overall quality, quantity, and impact of the faculty member’s activities. Finally, the guidelines and weighting of metrics should be reviewed and updated periodically by department faculty to ensure continued relevance and congruence with the department’s goals and objectives.

EES

Faculty Input

Faculty shall be evaluated using criteria such as *Excellent*, *Good*, and *Fair* for each category of activity.

Final Evaluation

COE

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.

EES

Same as COE.

EES

The Department Chair shall provide information on faculty performance to the Chair's Advisory Committee and solicit their input and advice on the distribution of merit raises.

Distribution of Merit Pay

COE

1. It is recommended that monies available for merit raises not be distributed "across-the-board" to departmental faculty.
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.

EES

Same as COE.

Appendix B. (Excerpt from the Faculty Senate Report on Faculty Compensation, April 15, 2004)

6. Merit Based Compensation

The simplest and most transparent raise procedure would be to allocate all raise funds across the board, either as a constant percentage or as a constant dollar amount. We do not recommend doing this. The academic mission of the University of Florida is teaching, research, and service. Further, a stated goal of this university is to rise to the top tier of U.S. universities. To meet this goal the university must reward the faculty who excel in their mission. Therefore, faculty compensation should be merit based, and moreover, the criteria with which that merit is measured should be fair, explicit, and understood by all. Transparency does not require that the criteria be simplistic. Faculty are able to deal with complexity, as long as the rules are available and the procedures for applying them are not hidden. Moreover, part of the complexity of the university is that no rule will be suitable for all colleges and departments. Faculty in all colleges and departments, however, should have confidence that they know what the rules are, how they are implemented, and how and why exceptions are made.

Toward this goal, we recommend that there be two related methods through which faculty are involved, in an advisory capacity as defined in the Senate document on shared governance, in setting compensation. The first is in the process of allocating annual raises. The second is through less-frequent periodic review of the pattern of department compensation.

The annual process should be merit-based. We are not recommending that any department be allowed the right to grant themselves across-the-board raises year after year. After cost-of-living adjustments, raises must reward merit, based on criteria developed by faculty in consultation with administrators. To illustrate how this would work, we have developed an illustrative merit-based compensation plan employing quantifiable metrics. We are not suggesting that any plan be applied rigidly by all departments. We are instead recommending that each department have a set of criteria—mathematical or not; but explicit, detailed, written, and available to all faculty.

These metrics are based on individual faculty contributions to teaching, research, and service. The relative contribution to the academic mission is different for each faculty, department and college. Therefore, the *Merit Raise* plan is weighted by the assigned responsibilities of each faculty in meeting his or her expected relative contribution to the academic mission. In addition, direct financial contributions to the university by Clinical and Extension faculty, and faculty heavily involved in research are compensated through the *Merit Bonus* plan.

Within each part of the academic mission we have incorporated quantifiable metrics. For teaching, these metrics include course evaluations, peer reviews and the contribution due to teaching large classes. For research, these metrics include

publications and scholarly works, graduate students supervised, awards, external research support and PhD students graduated. For service, these metrics include committees, editorial responsibilities and election to a society office.

It is expected that contributions and their impact will vary dramatically among departments and colleges. Therefore, these and other faculty contributions are multiplied by an impact factor. The impact factor differentiates the importance of the specific contribution with regard to other similar contributions (publication of a manuscript in a prestigious journal has a greater impact factor than a conference abstract, and a Nobel Prize has a greater impact factor than a best paper award) as well as the importance of that contribution criteria to the academic mission of the department (e.g., a department may decide to use peer evaluations rather than course evaluations assigning an impact factor of zero to course evaluations. In view of these complexities, impact factors will be determined on a departmental and college basis by faculty committees.

If faculty respond to these incentives and if departments implement them effectively, then department rankings should rise consistent with the stated UF goal. Therefore, the *Merit Raise* plan also includes department rankings. The quantitative relationship for this plan is presented below. The more effectively a department advances the university's goal of becoming a top ten public institution, the more its members are to be rewarded by the university.

In many colleges, another component of faculty compensation should be the direct financial resources the faculty bring to the university in excess of their expected contribution to the academic mission. This component should be in the form of an annual bonus as shown in the *Merit Bonus* plan, below.

The *Merit Raise* and *Merit Bonus* plans are intended to provide guidelines for deans and departmental chairs in their allocation of available finances. Implementation under UF's Shared Governance will require creation of a Faculty Senate Compensation Committee, under the auspices of the Academic Freedom, Faculty Quality and Faculty Welfare Policy Council. Deans and chairs will provide raise and bonus data compared against *Merit Raise* and *Merit Bonus* plans for their college and departments to the committee and explain any significant deviations from the plan and/or request modification of the plan for their colleges. The final authority for giving raises rests with the administration. But we urge that the faculty have a strong advisory role, including the right to explanations when their recommendations based on explicit criteria are not followed.

Finally, it is incumbent on the President and the University to make merit based compensation a priority budget item. When cost of living raises are limited by state budgets, other resources must be brought to bear to implement this plan fully and reward our most meritorious faculty.

Merit Raise, Contributions from teaching (T), research (R) and service (S):

$$\text{Merit Raise} = [\text{fr}((\sum \text{IF}_{\text{CE}} \cdot \text{CE} / \text{X}_{\text{CE}}) + (\sum \text{IF}_{\text{PR}} \cdot \text{PR} / \text{X}_{\text{PR}}) + (\sum \text{IF}_{\text{CS}} \cdot \text{CS} / \text{X}_{\text{CS}}) + \text{other...}) + \text{fr}((\sum \text{IF}_{\text{P}} \cdot \text{N}_{\text{P}} / \text{X}_{\text{P}}) + (\sum \text{IF}_{\text{G}} \cdot \text{N}_{\text{G}} / \text{X}_{\text{G}}) + (\sum \text{IF}_{\text{A}} \cdot \text{N}_{\text{A}}) + (\sum \text{IF}_{\text{S}} \cdot \text{N}_{\text{S}}) + (\sum \text{IF}_{\text{D}} \cdot \text{N}_{\text{D}}) + \text{other...}) + \text{fs}((\sum \text{IF}_{\text{C}} \cdot \text{N}_{\text{C}}) + (\sum \text{IF}_{\text{E}} \cdot \text{N}_{\text{E}}) + (\sum \text{IF}_{\text{O}} \cdot \text{N}_{\text{O}}) + \text{other...})] \cdot [(100-\text{DR})/(100-\text{CR})]$$

f_i = Weighting factor from Faculty Assignment Report

\hat{O} = Sum of all contributions in this category

IF_i = Impact factors (0 – 1)

N_i = Number

X_i = Departmental mean

CE = Course evaluations

PR = Peer reviews

CS = Class size

P = Publications, patents, or other scholarly works

G = Graduate students supervised

A = Awards

\$ = External contract/grant research support generated

D = PhD students graduated

C = Committees (departmental, college, university)

E = Editorial board

O = Society officer

DR = Department ranking (1 high, 100 low)

CR = College ranking (1 high, 100 low)

Merit Bonus, Direct external financial compensation:

$$\text{Annual Bonus} = \text{IF} \cdot \text{M}$$

IF = Impact factor (0.1 – 1.0). Some departments may wish to modify the calculation of IF to take account of the cost to the university of supporting the revenue-creating activities. Additionally, as we are now in the age of collaborative and team-generated research, impact factors can be used to apportion credit for such activities. Moreover, impact factors can be adjusted to account for:

M = Monthly salary generated by external contract/grant research support or clinical work above and beyond academic and fiscal requirements (summer salary for 9 month faculty or annual salary for clinical and extension faculty).

To reiterate, we note that this procedure is illustrative. Many departments will prefer a less mathematical statement of their criteria. Moreover, we recognize that even a formula as full as that given above cannot capture the complexity of faculty contributions. In particular, a major responsibility of departmental compensation committees is to assess the *quality* of faculty contributions. Consequently such explicit formulations are starting points. Faculty committees generating raise recommendations to administrators should first apply the explicit criteria, which should be fully documented and available to all faculty, and then justify their deviations from them.

The second component of faculty involvement should be periodic review of the pattern of compensation in each department, using faculty portfolios and compensation data. Every three to five years, varying with department, a faculty committee should

assess the existing pattern of compensation, comparing it to each faculty member's contributions to advancing the department's goals. Raise recommendations in that and subsequent years should take account of each person's status relative to the desired pattern.

The first of the periodic reviews should begin as soon as possible. In it each department committee should establish appropriate national comparisons with peer departments to determine the extent to which individual faculty members are undercompensated, taking into account productivity and merit. Part of any new resources should be used to address the most egregious cases where salary clearly fails to reflect the productivity of the faculty member. These people are productive and visible but underpaid, and consequently most at risk of leaving the University. Deans should assess the accuracy of the departments' reviews and be charged with providing the resources to deal with the most urgent cases.

Both the annual raise recommendations and the periodic assessments of the overall patterns of compensation should be reviewed by the Faculty Senate Compensation Committee, which should report annually to the Senate. The annual report should assess implementation of the process by departments and colleges, the allocation of raises, the overall patterns of compensation, and the University's progress in moving toward a level and structure of compensation that is commensurate with its goal of becoming a top ten public institution.