

BYLAWS GOVERNING CRITERIA USED FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF MECHANICAL AND AEROSPACE ENGINEERING

ARTICLE 1. TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA FOR TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

The Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering (MAE) is a major unit of the College of Engineering of the University of Florida and as such, holds the same interests in pursuing excellence in teaching, research, and service.

1.1 Criteria for Tenure and Promotion of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

- a) A tenure track faculty member seeking tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor status **is expected to earn recognition from peers as an accomplished expert in his/her chosen field through a body of creative work and scholarly contribution and has an accomplished record as an educator.** These criteria are consistent with University of Florida regulations requiring a faculty member to achieve distinction in two of the three scholarly categories: teaching, research, and service. Since the principal responsibilities of faculty members in the MAE Department are teaching and research, performance in these areas is primarily emphasized. However, if the faculty member's service assignment is substantial and contributions are extraordinary in significance, impact, and visibility, their service contributions may be considered. Metrics are helpful in gauging scholarly contributions and examples of those that will be considered are listed in Article 1.2. A holistic approach is used by the MAE Department in evaluating tenure and promotion applications which includes both qualitative and quantitative evaluation.
- b) A faculty member seeking promotion to Professor **must have established a distinguished record in his/her chosen field with evidence of national and international recognition, an accomplished record as an educator, and demonstrated service to the profession at both national and international levels.** Metrics are helpful in gauging scholarly contributions and examples of those that will be considered are listed in Article 1.2. A holistic approach is used by the MAE Department in evaluating applications for promotion to Professor, which includes both qualitative and quantitative evaluation.

1.2 Metrics that may be used for Tenure and/or Promotion Evaluation

Research:

1. Publications

a. Peer reviewed

i. Journal papers

1. Journal quality and impact

ii. Papers in conference proceedings and other refereed volumes

1. Acceptance rate

2. Quality
 3. Number of reviewers per paper
 - iii. Authorship
 - 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. Respected citation indices
 - b. External letters
 - c. Internal letters
 - d. Collaborative research
 - e. Other relevant measures of impact
3. Recognition and stature in profession
 - a. Awards, Fellowships, etc.
 - b. Invited talks, Keynote talks, International talks
 - c. Professional short courses
 - d. Other honors
4. Research funding
 - a. Source and type
 - i. Grants and contracts
 - ii. Research and infrastructure
 - iii. Type of peer review
 - iv. Interdisciplinary and disciplinary
 - v. Federal, state, industrial, and non-profit
 - b. Amount
 - c. Student or Post-Doc support
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
 - e. Chair and Co-Chair
 - f. Graduate committees
 - g. Graduate student fellowships
6. Supervision of others
 - a. Post-Docs
 - b. Visiting Scholars
 - c. Student Exchange
7. Laboratory certification or accreditation

Teaching:

1. Evaluations
 - a. Student
 - b. Peer

- c. Awards
- 2. Level of Effort
 - a. Class size
 - b. Core and elective courses
 - c. Updating of course content
 - d. Laboratory/facilities development
 - e. Introduction of new approaches and new initiatives
- 3. Innovation
 - a. New course development
 - b. Undergraduate and beginning graduate textbook publication
 - c. Other teaching related publications
- 4. Funding
 - a. Teaching related grants
 - i. Source and type
 - ii. Type of review
- 5. Undergraduate student research supervision
 - a. High honors committee
 - b. Undergraduate research
 - c. Independent study

Service:

- 1. Teaching
 - a. Professional education
 - b. Educational research
 - c. Non-traditional teaching
- 2. Publications (reviewer, editor, editorial board)
 - a. Journals
 - b. Conference proceedings
 - c. Manuals
 - d. Codes
 - e. Non-traditional media
- 3. External service recognition, commendations, awards
- 4. Exceptional internal service activities with the potential for significant institutional impact.
- 5. Professional Service
 - a. Advisor to student society
 - b. Member or Chair of professional committees
 - c. Conference organization and planning
 - d. Support of student competitions
 - e. Proposal review
 - f. Technical committees
 - g. Governmental service
 - h. Professional license
- 6. Coordination of teaching or research programs
- 7. University, college, and departmental committees
- 8. Faculty governance
- 9. Public and community service

1.3 Mid-tenure Review

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

ARTICLE 2. MERIT RAISE CRITERIA FOR TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

2.1 Purpose of Merit Based Pay Raises

Merit pay raises in the MAE department should be used to reward and encourage faculty productivity in areas which enhance the visibility and external reputation of the Department as well as major contributions to the functioning of the Department.

2.2 Criteria for Merit Pay Raises

The Chair should consider the above criteria, both quantitatively and qualitatively, in ranking faculty for consideration of merit-based pay raises. Research productivity enumerated above; as measured by publications in peer reviewed journals, grant and contract funding, and numbers of doctoral students supervised and graduated, provides important indications of visibility and reputation. However, direct indications of faculty visibility and recognition, such as impact measures, awards and honors, and media coverage are also important to consider, especially for more senior faculty members. Excellence in teaching as evidenced by exceptionally visible and innovative teaching activities, and truly outstanding performance in major service activities should also be considered in merit decisions. These criteria should be applied differently to faculty members at different stages of their careers, with outside recognition becoming progressively more important with seniority. Merit-based raises should generally reflect a continuous trend of productivity and excellence over a period of several years, but can also reflect achievements during a single academic year. To be considered for merit pay raises, a faculty member should excel in the targeted areas.

ARTICLE 3. PROMOTION CRITERIA FOR NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

3.1 Engineer Series

Evaluation of faculty members in the Engineer Series for promotion is generally focused primarily on job performance. 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 3.4.

3.2. 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 3.4.

3.3. 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 3.4.

3.4 Metrics that may be used for Evaluation of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Examples in each of the three primary categories are listed below. These are not intended to be all inclusive, and all items will not apply to all individuals.

Research:

1. Publications

a. Peer reviewed

i. Journal papers

1. Journal quality and impact

- ii. Papers in conference proceedings and other refereed volumes
 - 1. Acceptance rate
 - 2. Quality
 - 3. Number of reviewers per paper
 - iii. Authorship
 - 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. Respected citation indices
 - b. External letters
 - c. Internal letters
 - d. Collaborative research
 - e. Other relevant measures of impact
- 3. Recognition and stature in profession
 - a. Awards, Fellowships, etc.
 - b. Invited talks, Keynote talks, International talks
 - c. Professional short courses
 - d. Other honors
- 4. Research funding
 - a. Source and type
 - i. Grants and contracts
 - ii. Research and infrastructure
 - iii. Type of peer review
 - iv. Interdisciplinary and disciplinary
 - v. Federal, state, industrial, and non-profit
 - b. Amount
 - c. Student or Post-Doc support
- 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
 - e. Chair and Co-Chair
 - f. Graduate committees
 - g. Graduate student fellowships
- 6. Supervision of Others
 - a. Post-Docs
 - b. Visiting Scholars
 - c. Student Exchange
- 7. Laboratory certification or accreditation

Teaching:

1. Evaluations
 - a. Student
 - b. Peer
 - c. Awards
2. Level of Effort
 - a. Class size
 - b. Core and elective courses
 - c. Updating of course content
 - d. Laboratory/facilities development
 - e. Introduction of new approaches and new initiatives
3. Innovation
 - a. New course development
 - b. Undergraduate and beginning graduate textbook publication
 - c. Other teaching related publications
4. Funding
 - a. Teaching related grants
 - i. Source and type
 - ii. Type of review
5. Undergraduate student research supervision
 - a. High honors committee
 - b. Undergraduate research
 - c. Independent study

Service:

1. Teaching
 - a. Professional education
 - b. Educational research
 - c. Non-traditional teaching
2. Publications (reviewer, editor, editorial board)
 - a. Journals
 - b. Conference Proceedings
 - c. Manuals
 - d. Codes
 - e. Non-traditional media
3. External service recognition, commendations, awards
4. Exceptional internal service activities with the potential for significant institutional impact.
5. Professional Service
 - a. Advisor to student society
 - b. Member or Chair of professional committees
 - c. Conference organization and planning
 - d. Support of student competitions
 - e. Proposal review
 - f. Technical committees
 - g. Governmental service
 - h. Professional license

6. Coordination of teaching or research programs
7. University, college, and departmental committees
8. Faculty governance
9. Public and community service

ARTICLE 4. MERIT RAISE CRITERIA FOR NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

4.1 Purpose of Merit Based Pay Raises

Merit pay raises in the MAE department should be used to reward and encourage faculty productivity in areas which enhance the visibility and external reputation of the Department as well as major contributions to the functioning of the Department.

4.2 Criteria for Merit Pay Raises

The Chair should consider the above criteria, both quantitatively and qualitatively, in ranking faculty for consideration of merit-based pay raises. Research productivity enumerated above; as measured by publications in peer reviewed journals, grant and contract funding, and numbers of doctoral students supervised and graduated, provides important indications of visibility and reputation. However, direct indications of faculty visibility and recognition, such as impact measures, awards and honors, and media coverage are also important to consider, especially for more senior faculty members. Excellence in teaching as evidenced by exceptionally visible and innovative teaching activities, and truly outstanding performance in major service activities should also be considered in merit decisions. These criteria should be applied differently to faculty members at different stages of their careers, with outside recognition becoming progressively more important with seniority. Merit-based raises should generally reflect a continuous trend of productivity and excellence over a period of several years, but can also reflect achievements during a single academic year. To be considered for merit pay raises, a faculty member should excel in the targeted areas.

ARTICLE 5. MARKET EQUITY CRITERIA

All faculty members of MAE are entitled to have their individual national market salary established. In order to determine market salary, the OSU/ARL Annual Survey will be used as a starting point to establish a baseline salary. The national market salary will be established by analyzing the individual faculty member's performance against the performance of his/her peers of equal academic rank at other AAU Universities. Consideration will also be given to number of years in rank. The metrics listed in Articles 1.2 and 3.4 may be used for this analysis. The outcome of the analysis will be used to determine the degree to which the faculty member performs at, above, or below the average of his/her peers, and that determination will be used to establish the faculty member's market salary.

ARTICLE 6. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

6.1 University Level Criteria

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

- a. Teaching effectiveness, including effectiveness in presenting knowledge, information, and ideas by means or methods such as lecture, discussion, assignment and recitation, demonstration, laboratory exercise, practical experience, student evaluations, assessment of and engagement with student work, and direct consultation with students.
 - 1) The evaluation shall include consideration of effectiveness in presenting knowledge and skills, and effectiveness in stimulating students' critical thinking and/or creative abilities, the development or revision of curriculum and course structure, and adherence to accepted standards of professional behavior in meeting responsibilities to students.
 - 2) The evaluation shall include consideration of other assigned university teaching duties, such as advising, counseling, supervision of interns, or duties of the position held by the faculty member.
 - 3) The evaluator shall take into account any relevant materials submitted by the faculty member such as class notes, syllabi, student exams and assignments, a faculty member's teaching portfolio, results of peer evaluations of teaching, and any other materials relevant to the faculty member's instructional assignment.
 - 4) The chair shall consider all information available in forming an assessment of teaching effectiveness.
- b. Contribution to the discovery of new knowledge, development of new educational techniques, and other forms of research/scholarship/creative activity.
 - 1) Evidence of research/scholarship/creative activity, either print or electronic, shall include, but not be limited to, published books, chapters in books; articles and papers in professional journals; musical compositions, paintings, sculpture; works of performing art; papers presented at meetings of professional societies; reviews, and research

and creative activity that has not yet resulted in publication, display or performance.

- 2) The evaluation shall include consideration of the quality and quantity of the faculty member's research/scholarship and other creative programs and contributions during the evaluation period, and recognition by the academic or professional community of what has been accomplished.
- c. Service within the university and public service that extends professional or discipline-related contributions to the community; the State, including public schools; and the national and international community. Such service includes contributions to scholarly and professional conferences and organizations and unpaid positions on governmental boards, agencies, and commissions that are beneficial to such groups and individuals.
- d. Participation in the governance processes of the institution through significant service on committees, councils, and senates, and the faculty member's contributions to the governance of the institution through participation in regular departmental or college meetings.
- e. Service as the UFF/UF President, service on the UFF bargaining team, or service as an official UFF grievance representative shall be considered significant service for the purposes of this subsection.
- f. Other assigned university duties, such as advising, counseling, supervision of interns, and academic administration, or as described in a Position Description, if any, of the position held by the faculty member.

6.2 Departmental Clarification of University Criteria

Faculty in the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering shall be evaluated annually and shall be rated as either Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory. In addition, further refinement of the yearly evaluation beyond Satisfactory (e.g. Excellent, Good, etc.) is encouraged. Their overall rating of Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory will be based upon consideration of their assignment in each of the three primary categories, research, teaching, and service. 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. Metrics listed in Articles 1.2 and 3.4 may be used for evaluation.

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
- b. Other positive feedback from students, e.g. during exit interviews
- c. Awards for excellence in teaching

d. Satisfactory peer evaluation from observation and analysis as arranged by Dept. Chair or committee

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

b. Other negative feedback from students, e.g. during exit interviews

c. Administrative notification of unsatisfactory teaching

d. Unsatisfactory peer evaluation from observation and analysis as arranged by Dept. Chair or committee

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 graduate 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 effort toward research support

4. Supervision of few or no Ph.D. students

Service:

Satisfactory

1. Service to profession through participation as member or chair of professional or technical committee
2. Serve as external reviewer
3. Editor or Associate Editor of Archival Journal
4. Service to department, college or university through participation in college or university committees, and faculty assignments.
5. Excellence in advising

Unsatisfactory

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

ARTICLE 7. AMENDMENT OF THE BYLAWS

7.1 Voting Faculty

For purposes of adopting or amending this set of bylaws, the Voting Faculty of the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering shall consist of all tenure-track and tenured faculty who are employed by the Department. Faculty in the Engineer, Research Scientist and Lecturer tracks shall have voting privileges on all articles except Articles 1 and 2. Emeritus faculty and faculty holding visiting, adjunct, affiliate, 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.

7.2 Amendment Process

These bylaws may be amended by the following procedure:

- a) Amendments to any article or proposed new article can be submitted by any voting faculty as long as they can vote on the existing article or are impacted by the proposed new article.
- b) 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.
- c) 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.

d) The deadline for return of the ballots shall be no later than thirty (30) days from the date of ballot distribution.

e) The Department Chair and the Department Representative to the College T&P Committee or their representatives shall count the ballots promptly upon expiration of the return deadline. The amended Bylaws shall take effect one year from the date of certification of approval by a two-thirds majority of the voting faculty.