

BYLAWS GOVERNING CRITERIA USED FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY

ARTICLE 1 TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

The Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering's criteria statement is as follows: As a major unit of the College of Engineering of the University of Florida, the Department of Industrial and Systems 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 Assoc. Professor or for tenure, a faculty member is expected to have an outstanding record in two of these areas. Since the principal responsibilities of each department are teaching and research, performance in these areas is emphasized unless the candidate's service contributions are extraordinary in significance, impact and visibility. 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. The quality as well as the quantity of technical contributions will be judged. Further examples of information that is to be considered for evaluation are given in Article 1.2.

1.2 Metrics To Be Used for Evaluation of 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- b. Not peer reviewed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 materials, tools or content
- 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
 - iii. Other service activities
6. Coordination of teaching or research programs

1.3 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.

1.4 Mid-tenure Review

During the Spring semester 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

Achievement of the Department's mission is dependent not only upon maintaining and developing an appropriate balance of faculty expertise and fostering a high level of esprit de corps among the faculty, but also upon providing a competitive system of faculty salaries.

Merit pay is an important form of recognition for faculty members who have rendered quality performance in their duties. The purpose of merit pay is to recognize meritorious faculty performance that has furthered the mission of the Department, the College, and the University. It is the intent of the ISE faculty that the merit pay program shall be designed to improve faculty morale and to instill in all faculty members a sense of pride and accomplishment in their work.

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.

The evaluation of performance of tenured and tenure-track faculty shall be based on the quality and quantity of faculty activities in the areas of research, teaching, and service. However, the primary emphasis should be placed on research. The guidelines below shall be used in the evaluation procedure.

- (a) Merit-based raises should reflect a continuous trend of productivity and excellence over a period of several years.
- (b) Merit raise judgments should be independent of the faculty assignment during the period under consideration.
- (c) The evaluation of research will be based on performance with respect to the following metrics.

The metrics are ranked in order of importance, with rank 1 being the most important criteria and rank 5 indicating the least important criteria:

1. Peer reviewed journal papers
Research grants (federal or state funding agency)
Number and quality of Ph.D. students supervised/graduated
Fellowship of a professional Society or Academy
2. Advanced level books, research texts, and monographs
External letters (if available, e.g. as part of a tenure/promotion folder)
Research contract (company)
3. Peer reviewed papers in conference proceedings and other volumes
Research book editorship
Infrastructure (equipment) grant
Awards
Invited talks
Keynote talks
Number of Engineer degree students supervised
4. Non-peer reviewed conference papers
Number of M.S. students with thesis supervised
Citation indices (only at full professor level)
5. Patents and copyrights

(d) The evaluation of teaching will be based on performance with respect to the following metrics.

The metrics are ranked in order of importance, with rank 1 being the most important criteria and rank 4 indicating the least important criteria:

1. University-wide teaching awards
Undergraduate and graduate textbook publication
2. New course development
Teaching-related grants
3. Student evaluations
Departmental teaching awards
4. Level of effort (class size, course updating, lab/facilities development, introduction of new approaches/initiatives)

(e) The evaluation of service to the Department, the College, the University, and the profession will be based on performance with respect to the following metrics.

The metrics are ranked in order of importance, with rank 1 being the most important criteria and rank 4 indicating the least important criteria:

1. Editorships and editorial board memberships
2. Conference program committee chairmanships and memberships
Service to professional society (i.e., high-ranking officer)

3. Organizing sessions/clusters at meetings
External service recognition, commendations, awards
4. Exceptional internal service activities with the potential for significant institutional impact
Refereeing of journal articles
Review of grant proposals

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 one or more established and recognized salary survey(s) focused on academic positions. The Oklahoma State Survey and the CUPA-HR have been identified as resources. The committee will consider such factors as the faculty member's value and productivity to the department as well as the number of years in the current position in developing a recommendation. The committee will make every effort to be consistent in their evaluation of applications, including the use of surveys. The committee's recommendation will be sent to the chair. The Chair will evaluate the committee's recommendation and make a decision regarding the recommendation.

ARTICLE 4 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

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

4.1 University Level Criteria

The annual performance evaluations shall be based upon assigned duties and shall 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, supervision of graduate students, and direct consultation with students. The evaluation shall include consideration of:
 - (1) 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) Other assigned university teaching-related duties.
 - (3) 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) 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 for UFF may require a significant commitment of time and shall be acknowledged in the annual evaluation.
- (f) Other assigned university duties, such as advising, counseling, supervision of interns, and academic administration, or as described in a position description.

4.2 Departmental Clarification of University Criteria

Faculty in the Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering shall be evaluated annually according to the criteria listed in Article 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 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 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 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 of a number of Ph.D. students in keeping with the departmental average

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 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. Regarding letters of evaluation, according to College expectation, five (5) internal or external letters will be called for promotion with three (3) from evaluators identified by the candidate and two (2) suggested by the department chair.

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. Regarding letters of evaluation, according to College expectation, five (5) internal or external letters will be called for promotion with three (3) from evaluators identified by the candidate and two (2) suggested by the department chair. For promotion to research scientist, at least two (2) external letters must be included.

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. Regarding letters of evaluation, according to College expectation, five (5) internal or external letters will be called for promotion to senior lecturer with three (3) from evaluators identified by the candidate and two (2) suggested by the department chair. For promotion to master lecturer, at least two (2) external letters must be included.

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:

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. Undergraduate student supervision
 - a. Honors thesis chair/co-chair or committee member
 - b. Capstone senior design project team advising/supervision
 - c. Undergraduate student research study (EGN4912/4913) or employment
5. Funding
 - a. Teaching related grants
 - i. Source and type
 - ii. Type of review

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

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. Administrative/program coordination service to the department
- 6. Professional Service
 - i. Advisor to student society
 - ii. Member, Chair, or Officer of professional committees or societies
- 7. Coordination of teaching or research programs

The Chair's letter of evaluation [of performance based on the above examples] will be considered as a primary source of evidence to demonstrate lecturer satisfactory performance in their primary assigned area and satisfactory performance in their other areas of assigned duties.

5.5 *Progress-to-Promotion (PtP) Review*

During Spring of the third year* of service in the same non-tenure track faculty role, a faculty member will have the option of participating in a *PtP* review. The purpose of this review shall be to assess the non-tenure track faculty member's progress toward meeting criteria for promotion and to provide thoughtful and constructive guidance to assist the non-tenure track faculty member in fulfilling the University's, College's, and Department's criteria for promotion.

(* - The PtP process has not been conducted prior to 2022. The initial offering is for non-tenure track faculty with a frequency of one time in their third year or greater of

continuous service, similar to the midterm review (Section 1.4) that is conducted one time in the third year for tenure-track faculty.)

Non-tenure track faculty undergoing this review must prepare an appraisal dossier following current college guidelines, but without the external letters of evaluation. Eligible voting faculty members of the department (all tenured, tenure-track and previously promoted non-tenure track faculty) shall have the opportunity to review the dossier and meet with the department chair to discuss whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress towards promotion, according to the criteria described in previous sections, and at a rate appropriate for a faculty member in their third year of service. The department may also use a committee review that includes both tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty (senior in rank) to review the PTP cases. As the department includes all eligible tenured faculty in committee review of mid-tenure cases, the department shall also include all eligible faculty in review of the PTP cases.

The appraisal process shall be confidential. The department chair will prepare a letter based on the observations of the voting faculty and her/his own review and assessment of the candidate's progress to promotion. The Department Chair will provide a copy of the letter to the candidate faculty member. Results of the evaluation shall not be placed in the faculty member's evaluation file, shall not be included in the subsequent promotion packet and shall not be used in any future evaluation of the non-tenure track faculty member for promotion.

ARTICLE 6 MERIT RAISE CRITERIA FOR NON TENURE TRACK FACULTY

6.1 Purpose of Merit Based Pay Raises

Achievement of the Department's mission is dependent not only upon maintaining and developing an appropriate balance of faculty expertise and fostering a high level of esprit de corps among the faculty, but also upon providing a competitive system of faculty salaries.

Merit pay is an important form of recognition for faculty members who have rendered quality performance in their duties. The purpose of merit pay is to recognize meritorious faculty performance that has furthered the mission of the Department, the College, and the University. It is the intent of the ISE faculty that the merit pay program shall be designed to improve faculty morale and to instill in all faculty members a sense of pride and accomplishment in their work.

6.2 Criteria for Award of Merit Pay Raises

Merit-based pay raises should be based on the quality and quantity of faculty activities in the areas of research, teaching, and service. Merit-based raises should

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

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

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 one or more established and recognized salary survey(s) focused on academic positions. The Oklahoma State Survey and the CUPA-HR have been identified as resources. The committee will consider such factors as the faculty member's value and productivity to the department as well as the number of years in the current position in developing a recommendation. The committee will make every effort to be consistent in their evaluation of applications, including the use of surveys. The committee's recommendation will be sent to the chair. The Chair will evaluate the committee's recommendation and make a decision regarding the recommendation.

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

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

service assignment. Any materials to be used in the evaluation process submitted by persons other than the faculty member shall be shown to the faculty member, who may attach a written response.

8.1 University Level Criteria

The annual performance evaluations shall be based upon assigned duties and shall 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, supervision of graduate students, and direct consultation with students. The evaluation shall include consideration of:
 - (1) 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) Other assigned university teaching-related duties.
 - (3) 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) 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 for UFF may require a significant commitment of time and shall be acknowledged in the annual evaluation.
- (f) Other assigned university duties, such as advising, counseling, supervision of interns, and academic administration, or as described in a position description.

8.2 Departmental Clarification of University Criteria

Faculty in the Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering 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 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 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 of a number of Ph.D. students in keeping with the departmental average

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 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 SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION ARTICLE FOR ISE DEPARTMENT BYLAWS

The University CBA (collective bargaining agreement) stipulates that there will be a defined SPE (sustained performance evaluation) process in each department's

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

ARTICLE 10 AMENDMENT OF THE BYLAWS

10.1 Voting Faculty

For purposes of adopting or amending this set of bylaws, the Voting Faculty of the Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering shall consist of all tenure track faculty who are employed by the Department. 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.

10.2 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) Per CBA Article 9.2 (b), provisions in the bylaws relating to tenure, promotion, merit salary increases, market equity salary increases, and performance evaluations must be approved in a vote by a majority of all affected faculty in the relevant unit who are eligible to vote on the matter under consideration. The vote shall take place in a publicly noticed meeting and shall be by show of hands. The totals of yes, no and abstentions shall be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.