

BYLAWS OF MATERIALS SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

This formatted, compiled and revised version is accurate as of 28th of September 2023
Voted and Approved by the Faculty on 21st of November 2023

Article I. Definition of Faculty

The word "Department" shall be used to designate the Department of Materials Science and Engineering. The word "Faculty" shall be used to designate the collection of members in the Department who hold faculty status according to the University of Florida (UF) Constitution/Bylaws and whose primary appointment is in the Department. The "Department Faculty" includes tenured and tenure track-faculty holding the positions as Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor and Distinguished Professor and non-tenure track faculty holding positions of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Master Lecturer, Assistant Engineer, Associate Engineer, Engineer, Assistant Research Scientist, Associate Research Scientist, and Research Scientist, Assistant Research Professor, Associate Research Professor, Research Professor, Professor-of-Practice, and Emeritus Faculty.

Section 1. Faculty members – Definition of those with voting rights.

- A. All faculty members in the department have voting rights within the department (except for Emeritus faculty as noted in Article I, Section 1.C). On some issues, voting rights may be limited to faculty with certain titles and/or tenure status, according to University Constitution/Bylaw, and/or the faculty collective bargaining agreement.
- B. Joint faculty members of the Department who are either tenured or hold a tenure track position in another department may be made voting faculty members by a 2/3 majority vote of the voting faculty members. These members shall be designated voting faculty members in these bylaws.
- C. Emeritus faculty members do not automatically have voting rights. Emeritus faculty members may be made voting emeritus faculty members by a 2/3 majority vote of the eligible voting faculty members. These members shall be designated voting Emeritus faculty members in these bylaws. The voting rights of voting Emeritus faculty members elapse at the end of each academic year but are renewable by majority vote of the eligible voting faculty members.
- D. Any voting faculty members may request temporary status as non-voting faculty members by submitting a written request to the Chair; voting status shall be restored on written request to the Chair.
- E. Affiliate faculty status does not automatically grant the voting rights in the Department.

Section 2. Maintenance of Records.

- A. The Department Chair shall maintain an up-to-date roster of eligible voting faculty members, joint-appointed faculty, and emeritus faculty members that have voting rights.
- B. The Department Chair shall initiate votes on the granting and renewal of voting rights of emeritus, adjunct, and affiliate faculty members.

Article II. Faculty meetings

Section 1: Attendance

- A. Attendance is open to voting and non-voting faculty members and Department members other than restricted by these bylaws.
- B. Attendance of individuals outside of the Faculty is by invitation from the Department chair or a majority of the Faculty for individual meetings.
- C. Attendance of other individuals is by invitation from the Department chair or a majority of the Faculty for individual meetings.
- D. Faculty meetings serving a specific service as defined by the UF Constitution, such as, but not limited to, tenure and promotion, can only be attended by persons specified in the UF Constitution.

Section 2. Procedures

- A. Faculty meetings

-
- a. Faculty meeting shall normally be held at least once during each calendar month of the academic year.
 - b. Special faculty meetings can be called by the Department Chair or a minimum of five voting faculty members with a minimum of three business days prior notice to the faculty.
 - c. While faculty meetings are usually open, there are times when faculty meetings may be closed to certain members of the faculty that may not be eligible to vote on certain materials (e.g. discuss of tenure and/or promotion cases).
- B. Faculty meeting rules
- a. A Faculty meeting may be held if a quorum for the meeting is present.
 - i. A quorum for the meeting is present when at least one-half of the eligible voting faculty members are present.
 - b. In the conduct of its business, Faculty meetings shall be guided by the customary rules of parliamentary procedure, insofar as these are not modified by the provisions of the Constitution of the University of Florida or the Bylaws of the Senate or the Bylaws of the Department.
 - c. In cases of dispute, recourse shall be to the currently available edition of Robert's Rules of Order available.
 - i. Hardcopy of Robert's Rules of Order shall be maintained and made available by the Department Chair.
 - ii. The most current electronic version, as provided at the UF Library website, can be substituted in the absence of a hard copy.
 - iii. Disputes on interpretation of bylaws and rules can be directed by the Bylaws committee for a ruling by the UF Office of General Counsel as a last recourse.

Section 3. Voting

Votes on departmental policy, procedure, and recommendations for hire will be handled according to the following policies and procedures.

- A. Majority
 - a. A simple majority is defined as greater than one-half of the eligible voting members of the Faculty.
 - b. A two-thirds majority is defined as equal to or greater than two-thirds of the designated eligible voting faculty members.
- B. Promotion and tenure
 - a. Voting will be conducted according to the University of Florida Constitution.
- C. Recommendations for employment as a member of the Faculty
 - a. Recommendation for employment as a member of the Faculty shall be discussed at a meeting of the faculty prior to voting.
 - b. Recommendations for appointments to the faculty as tenured and tenure-track appointments shall require a 2/3 majority of the eligible voting tenured/tenure track faculty members.
 - c. Recommendations for appointments to the Faculty other than tenured and tenure-track shall require a 2/3 majority of the eligible voting faculty members.
- D. Amendments and changes to these bylaws
 - a. Amendments and changes to these bylaws may be recommended by faculty members to the Bylaws committee for consideration.
 - b. A meeting of the faculty will be held to discuss the amendments or changes to these Bylaws in the Department at least two weeks prior to a vote on the proposed changes.
 - c. All amendments and changes to these bylaws shall be communicated to the faculty in writing at least two weeks prior to a vote on the proposed changes.
 - d. All changes to these bylaws shall require approval by 2/3 of the eligible voting faculty members.
- E. All other matters
 - a. All other matters must be approved by a simple majority of the eligible voting faculty members.
- F. Roster of the Faculty
 - a. A list of members of the Faculty including their rank in the Department shall be maintained by the Department Chair.

-
- b. A list of the members of the Faculty including their voting status shall be published on or before the First Day of Classes of each academic semester.
 - c. The Department Chair shall present for a vote by the faculty, each academic year, a list of all faculty members seeking renewal of their status under Article I.

Section 4. Voting procedures

Votes on departmental policy, procedure, and recommendations for Faculty employment will be decided under the following conditions:

- A. Voting in faculty meetings
 - a. Show of hands of eligible voting faculty members can be used for balloting on all matters other than hiring, tenure, or promotion, which require an electronic vote.
 - b. Electronic voting can be used in the absence of quorum of eligible voting faculty members at the meeting.
- B. Electronic Voting
 - a. Electronic votes will be handled in a manner entailing a formal written posting of the motion and electronic submission of individual votes by the eligible voting faculty members.
 - b. All votes shall be cast within 72 hours of the posting.
 - c. Tallies cannot be made before the expiration of this voting period.

Article III. Tenure and promotion criteria for tenure track faculty

The Department of Materials Science and Engineering criteria statement is as follows: As a major unit of the College of Engineering of the University of Florida, the Department of Materials Science and Engineering pursues the same mission as the University and the College, and promotes excellence in teaching, research, and service.

Section 1. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty

Evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure focuses on performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

- A. To be recommended for tenure or promotion to Associate Professor, a member of the Faculty 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 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. Metrics for use in the evaluation of tenure track Faculty are given in Article III 0. In addition to the metrics listed, external letters of evaluation shall be considered for promotion.
- 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, research, and service to the profession at both national and international levels. The quality as well as the quantity of technical and educational contributions will be judged. Metrics for use in the evaluation of tenure track Faculty are given in Article III 0. In addition to the metrics listed, external letters of evaluation shall be considered for promotion.
- C. The departmental process for Tenure and Promotion will follow the updated procedures and timeline provided annually by the College of Engineering.

Section 2. Metrics for Use in the Evaluation of Tenure Track Faculty

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

- A. Research:
 - a. Peer Reviewed Publications
 - i. Journal Papers

-
1. Quality of Journal
 2. Quality of Paper
 3. Contribution to paper
 4. Number of Papers
 - ii. Papers in conference proceedings and other refereed volumes
 1. Conference Quality
 2. Quality of Paper
 3. Contribution to paper
 4. Number of Papers
 - b. Not peer reviewed Publications – Number and Quality
 - i. Advanced level books, texts, and monographs
 - ii. Patents and copyrights
 - iii. Conference papers
 - iv. Other scholarly works
 - c. Originality and relevance of research
 - i. Citation indices generated by ISI and Google Scholar without self-citations
 - ii. Paper Awards
 - d. Recognition and stature in profession
 - i. Awards, Fellowships, etc.
 - ii. Invited talks, Keynote talks
 - iii. Other honors
 - e. Research funding
 - i. Source and type of review
 - ii. Educational research
 - iii. Amount
 - iv. Overhead Generated
 - f. Graduate student supervision
 - i. Number and quality of Ph.D supervised/graduated
 - ii. Number and quality of Engineer supervised/graduated
 - iii. Number and quality of M.S. supervised/graduated
 - iv. Student placement
- B. Teaching:
- a. Evaluations
 - i. Student
 - ii. Peer
 - iii. Awards
 - b. Level of Effort
 - i. Class size
 - ii. Updating of course content
 - iii. Laboratory/facilities development
 - iv. Introduction of new approaches and new initiatives
 - c. Effectiveness
 - i. Letters from Students
 - ii. Exit and Alumni Survey Data
 - iii. Peer Input
 - d. Innovation
 - i. New course development
 - ii. Undergraduate and beginning graduate textbook publication
 - iii. Other teaching related materials, tools or content
 - e. Extramural Funding
 - i. Source and type
 - ii. Type of review
 - iii. Overhead Generated
- C. Service:
- a. Teaching
 - i. Professional education
-

-
- ii. Non-traditional teaching
 - iii. Outreach activities
 - b. Editorial Activities
 - i. Journals
 - ii. Conference Proceedings
 - iii. Manuals
 - iv. Codes
 - v. Non-traditional media
 - c. External service recognition, commendations, awards
 - i. Meeting Organizer
 - ii. Symposium organizer/chair
 - iii. Session chair
 - iv. Reviewer
 - d. Exceptional internal service activities with the potential for significant institutional impact, for example research organization / leadership
 - e. Professional Service
 - i. Mentoring
 - ii. Advisor to student society
 - iii. Member, Chair, or Officer of professional committees or societies
 - iv. Other service activities
 - f. Coordination of teaching or research programs

Section 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 member of the Faculty'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 concerning their performance.

Mid-tenure Review

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

Sustained Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

The department Tenure and Promotion Committee will participate in the sustained performance evaluations of tenured faculty.

Article IV. Merit raise criteria for tenure track faculty

Section 1. Purpose of Merit Based Pay Raises

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

- A. Advance departmental mission
- B. Improve the quality of department programs
- C. Recognize and reward meritorious performance and sustained excellence of faculty
- D. Promote retention of the most valuable and productive faculty
- E. Improve faculty morale
- F. Provide incentives for future faculty efforts

 G. Improve department reputation in national surveys
Section 2. Criteria for Award of Merit Pay Raises

The Faculty has approved a merit raise formula that is used to rank the productivity of each member of the Faculty for any given year. The pool of money available for merit raises is then given out in 'shares'. The number of shares each member of the Faculty receives is determined through the following formula, where each member of the Faculty generates a merit raise factor based on the year's work. Depending on the availability of funds and deviation of the merit raise factor, each member of the Faculty will qualify for 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, or 2.0 shares of the merit raise pool depending on which quartile of productivity they achieve. This value of a share of raise is determined by taking the total number of shares to be distributed from this process. This accounts for 70% of the total number of shares. The final 30% of the shares are allocated to the chair for distribution to the faculty based on her/his discretion. The total dollar value of the raise pool is then divided by the total number of shares to be distributed to arrive at the share value. The chair then allocates this share value to each member of the Faculty and distributes the 30% of the discretionary shares.

$$A. \text{ Merit Raise Factor} = \sum_i \left(\frac{N_i}{X_i} \right) IF_i$$

$$= \left(\frac{N_P}{X_P} \right) (1) + \left(\frac{N_G}{X_G} \right) (1) + \left(\frac{N_S}{X_S} \right) (1) + \left(\frac{N_D}{X_D} \right) (0.5) + \left(\frac{N_A}{X_A} \right) (0.5) + \left(\frac{N_C}{X_C} \right) (0.5) + \left(\frac{N_E}{X_E} \right) (0.5) + \left(\frac{N_S}{X_S} \right) (0.5)$$

B. Definition of terms:

IF_i = Impact factor per category (weights between 0 and 1)

N_i = Number contributed by the individual faculty in the i^{th} category.

X_i = Departmental mean in the i^{th} category.

Categories:

P = Weighted Publication Value (Journal Articles = 1, Book, Editor or Chapter = 3, Book, Author = 10)

G = Graduate students supervised

A = Awards

\$ = External contract/grant research support generated

D = PhD students graduated

C = National Committees

E = Editorial board

S = Organize symposia, present invited, plenary or keynote talks

Article V. Market equity raise criteria

An individual member of the Faculty 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 departmental Compensation Committee. The committee will compare the member of the Faculty's salary with the University of Florida designated salary survey, e.g., Oklahoma State University Salary Survey, and consider such factors as the member of the Faculty's value and productivity to the department in developing a recommendation. The committee's recommendation will be sent to the chair. The Chair will evaluate the committee's recommendation and make a decision regarding the recommendation.

Article VI. Annual performance evaluation criteria

Performance evaluations are intended to communicate to a member of the Faculty a qualitative assessment of that member of the Faculty's performance of assigned duties by providing written constructive feedback that will assist in improving the member of the Faculty'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 member of the Faculty's annual evaluation shall also consider, where appropriate and available, information from the following sources: immediate supervisor, peers, students, member of the Faculty/self, other university officials who have responsibility for supervision of the member of the Faculty, and individuals to whom the member of the Faculty 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 member of the Faculty shall be shown to the member of the Faculty, who may attach a written response.

Section 1. University Level Criteria

The annual performance evaluation shall be based upon assigned duties, and shall carefully consider the nature of the assignments and quality of the performance in terms as established by the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Section 2. Departmental Clarification of University Criteria

Faculty in the Department of Materials Science and Engineering shall be evaluated annually according to the criteria listed in 0 of Article III, 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 member of the Faculty'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. These metrics, in addition to those listed in 0 of Article III, shall be considered for the annual performance evaluation.

A. Research:

a. Satisfactory

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

b. Unsatisfactory

- i. Publications in poor quality journals or conference proceedings or in high quality venues but at a rate well below departmental averages
- ii. Little or no participation in conferences through contributed or invited presentations by faculty and/or their students.
- iii. Little or no research funding or poor proposal generation rate
- d. Supervision of few or no Ph.D. students.

B. Teaching:

a. Satisfactory

i. Evaluations

1. Student evaluations near or above departmental averages and/or
2. Other positive feedback from students, e.g. during exit interviews and/or
3. Awards for excellence in teaching and/or
4. Satisfactory peer evaluation from observation and analysis arranged by dept. chair

ii. Level of Effort

1. Course content kept up to date.
2. Introduction of new approaches and new initiatives in existing courses or development of new courses.
3. Timely fulfillment of ABET assessment requirements.

b. Unsatisfactory

i. Evaluations

1. Student evaluations well below departmental averages and/or
2. Other negative feedback from students, e.g. during exit interviews

ii. Level of Effort

1. Course content not kept up to date

-
2. Lack of introduction of new approaches and new initiatives in existing courses and no development of new courses
 3. Late or incomplete reporting of assigned ABET assessments
- C. Service:
- a. Satisfactory
 - i. Service to profession through participation as member or chair of professional or technical committee.
 - ii. Editor or Associate Editor of Archival Journal.
 - iii. Service to department, college, or university through participation in faculty meetings and departmental, college or university committees.
 - b. Unsatisfactory
 - i. No service to the profession.
 - ii. Poor performance of duties as member of department, college, or university committees.

Article VII. Promotion criteria for non-tenure track faculty

Section 1: Engineer Series

The following are the Herbert Wertheim College of Engineering, Department of Materials Science and Engineering criteria and guidelines for promotion within the Engineer Series. These criteria and guidelines have been established to assist in the evaluation of promotion packages.

1. Criteria

1.1. General Considerations

Evaluation of faculty members in the Engineer Series for promotion and salary increases is generally limited to performance in two categories: (1) research and service or (2) teaching and service.

The Engineer Series is intended for faculty who have a significant effort in service. The percentage assignment of their duties must be taken into consideration.

Service focuses on activities that support the broad missions of the Herbert Wertheim College of Engineering and the University of Florida.

Teaching may include traditional classroom and laboratory teaching, but also areas such as professional education, and non-traditional teaching (short courses, professional development etc.).

Research may include traditional disciplinary research activities, but also the scholarship of teaching and learning, industry supported activities, and applied research.

The quality of performance in (1) research and service or (2) teaching and service must be consistent with that of the Professorial Series for the equivalent rank, taking into account the more distinct nature of the teaching and research activities.

1.2. Promotion to Associate Engineer

To be recommended for promotion to Associate Engineer, a faculty member shall demonstrate sustained excellent performance with clear impact on and recognition from their unit in their assigned categories.

1.3. Promotion to Engineer

To be recommended for promotion to Engineer, a faculty member shall demonstrate a sustained and distinguished record with clear impact on and recognition from the Herbert Wertheim College of Engineering in their assigned categories.

2. Guidelines

Promotion of the Engineer Series follows the dates and guidelines for general faculty Promotion and Tenure.

The submission shall follow the standard packet guidelines for format.

Candidates will be evaluated on their contribution to (1) Research and Service or (2) Teaching and Service with emphasis depending on their assigned duties.

Publications generally appear as conference proceedings, codes, educational manuals, or other non-traditional avenues, consistent with the individual's focus on (1) research and service or (2) teaching and service.

Candidates who have teaching in their assignment should include evidence of teaching effectiveness in addition to student evaluations. This evidence may include peer evaluations, a teaching portfolio, evaluation of student learning by instructors of follow-on classes, student comments on exit interviews, or other documentation. These forms of evidence will carry equal weight to student evaluations.

Based on the duties of the faculty in the Engineer Series, reference letters may come from industry, government agencies, internal or external senior faculty most capable of an informed, objective evaluation of the candidate. Letters of evaluation should normally be written by faculty of higher rank than the candidate is seeking. If the evaluator is from industry or a governmental agency, this person should hold standing at least equivalent to that of the candidate.

The College expects five letters of evaluation for promotion, with at least half of the letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate and the remaining letters from evaluators suggested by the chair. The request for additional letters beyond the required five is at the discretion of the chair.

3. Examples

The following are generic examples of backgrounds that might fit for the Engineer Series.

Example 1: A faculty member has the specialty of distance learning. They get grants to implement other people's courses in distance learning environments. They also get grants to develop and provide training on how to develop web courses. In addition, they write grants to fund undergraduate research (They do not actually do most of the research but fund the students to work with other faculty.) They also provide very significant service to the profession. They are involved in many professional committees, and chair some. They present at statewide conferences on teaching and learning.

Example 2: A faculty member runs a special undergraduate program. The program works with cohorts of students and provides special classes to the students. The faculty member is involved in coordinating the program, recruiting students, seeking funding sources and publicizing the program. The faculty member is a member of university committees, publishes results of the program at conferences and seeks small grants to support expansion of the program.

Example 3: A faculty member develops courses for both residential and UF Online sections of courses for a department. They teach a number of sections of courses themselves. The faculty member assists other department faculty in best teaching practices and course design for both residential and UF Online students. The faculty member coordinates teaching assignments and offerings of courses for the UF Online program. The faculty member develops training programs for undergraduate peer mentors or graduate teaching assistants to be used by faculty department.

Section 2: Research Scientist Series

Evaluation of member of the Research Scientist Series for promotion is generally limited to performance in research. If service or teaching activities are part of the 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. Metrics such as those given in 0 Article III consistent with their assignment can be used in their evaluation. A candidate applying for promotion from Assistant Research Scientist to Associate Research Scientist is expected to have demonstrated sustained outstanding record in the primary assigned area(s). A candidate applying for promotion from Associate Research Scientist to Research Scientist is expected to have demonstrated a continuing level of productivity that merits distinction in the primary assignment.

Section 3: Lecturer Series

The following are the Herbert Wertheim College of Engineering, Department of Materials Science and Engineering criteria and guidelines for promotion within the Lecturer Series. These criteria and guidelines have been established to assist in the evaluation of promotion packages.

1. General Considerations.

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

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

2. Criteria for Promotion of Lecturers.

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

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

2.1. Overall Criteria

a. A candidate applying for promotion from **Lecturer to Senior Lecturer** is expected to have demonstrated sustained distinction in the primary assigned area, and at least emerging leadership with respect to assigned areas or duties.

b. A candidate applying for promotion from **Senior Lecturer to Master Lecturer** is expected to demonstrate a continuing level of productivity that merits distinction in the primary assignment, as well as a high level of leadership in the assigned areas or duties.

2.2. Major Sources of Evidence

a. **Teaching.** The candidate will be evaluated on their overall teaching. The evaluation of teaching can be categorized into three areas: teaching quality, innovation in approaches to enhance student learning, and professional development. Individual evidence presented, as part of the comprehensive evidence package for teaching evaluation, should be given equal weight when applicable. Depending on the nature of the candidate's teaching assignment, possible sources of evidence to demonstrate distinction in teaching may include, but are not limited to:

- Evidence of a submitted teaching portfolio that may include self-reflection including teaching approach, educational goals, teaching philosophy, and development / improvement of teaching performance.

-
- Publications related to teaching and professional service
 - Student and chair evaluations of the candidate's teaching and advising performance.
 - Peer evaluation(s) of teaching, including visitations to classes and review of syllabi, examinations and other instructional materials are required for candidates with a teaching assignment. Frequency of peer evaluation(s) should be determined in consultation with the chair based on teaching assignment of faculty member.
 - Receipt of awards for teaching and/or advising
 - Evidence of exemplary development and/or implementation of new courses, use of innovative teaching methods, instructional materials, curriculum design, novel delivery methods, technological innovations, and syllabi.
 - Demonstration of the ability to adapt to the changing demands of the discipline by participating in continuing professional development activities. Including new technical content arising from advances in the discipline, including other appropriate content innovations such as new technologies and current research topics, attending workshops & seminars, developing courses in new discipline areas, and addition of new materials.
 - Evidence of professional mentoring of 1) undergraduate students, 2) novice or developing teachers, 3) graduate students, and/or 4) colleagues.
 - Evidence of other instructional activities such as international teaching activities, undergraduate advising, or student organization advisement.

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

- Presentations/publications about service activities or programs
- Supervisor or peer evaluations or other evaluative evidence indicating exemplary performance in service.
- Evidence of efforts for continued professional development and improvement in service/administrative performance.
- Awards for Service
- Demonstrated service in an editorial capacity for the profession (e.g., journals, textbooks).
- Evidence of program evaluation reports, technical reports, monographs, accreditation reports.
- Evidence of service to support research activities and other service activities that will assist the department, college and university in achieving its goals.
- Evidence of exemplary service or consultation to public/private schools, community colleges, department, college or university committees; community-based organizations, and the profession including outreach activities.
- Evidence of providing exemplary professional development for practicing professionals with appropriate follow-up support beyond delivery of professional development.
- Evidence of exemplary contributions or leadership on committees related to teaching.
- Evidence of exemplary collaboration with UF faculty to translate traditional university-based coursework to apply to job-embedded programs.
- Evidence of leadership roles related to teaching ones discipline.
- Leadership of an institute or Centre, or leadership on college and university committees.
- Leadership roles in professional organizations as evidenced by election or appointment to offices or committees, and leadership in conference organization.
- Leadership roles in shaping educational policy at the local, state, and/or national level.

c. Research. Although Lecturers in the Herbert Wertheim College of Engineering are typically assigned primary duties in the area of teaching and service, they may also have assigned duties in research or professional service.

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

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

3. Letters of Evaluation.

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

Section 4. Progress-to-Promotion (PtP) for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

The purpose of this appraisal shall be to assess the non-tenure track faculty member's progress toward meeting the criteria for promotion and to provide assessments, suggestions, and guidance to assist the faculty member in fulfilling the University's, College's, and Department's criteria. A faculty member who declines to be reviewed under this PtP process must do so in writing by submitting a letter to their chair/director by the date specified by the CBA (currently January 10th) in the year that this assessment would normally take place. The non-tenure track faculty member shall compile a dossier consistent with their assignments, without evaluation letters.

Article VIII. Merit raise criteria for non-tenure track faculty**Section 1. Purpose of Merit Based Pay Raises**

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

- A. Advance departmental mission
- B. Improve the quality of department programs
- C. Recognize and reward meritorious performance and sustained excellence of Faculty
- D. Promote retention of the most valuable and productive faculty
- E. Improve faculty morale
- F. Provide incentives for future faculty efforts
- G. Improve department reputation in national surveys

Section 2. Criteria for Award of Merit Pay Raises

- A. Merit-based pay raises should be based on the quality and quantity of activities of the Faculty with regard to assigned responsibilities. 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 member of the Faculty over the evaluation period, which will serve as the member of the Faculty '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 member of the Faculty.
- B. The same metrics described in 0 Article III should be used by the department to determine meritorious performance. The relative importance of the metrics will vary among the ranks. Members of the 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 members of the Faculty whose assignments encompass more than one area will be evaluated using the relevant metrics.

Article IX. Graduate Faculty Status

The MSE department should be expansive and welcoming of Graduate Faculty. The rationale begins with the inherent multidisciplinary nature of the materials and nuclear science and engineering fields, and the need to communicate and collaborate across disciplines and departments with faculty who are engaged in materials and nuclear science and engineering research. It continues with the furtherance of collaborative research and engagement in pedagogical activity, such as graduate mentorship and teaching.

All individuals who serve on supervisory committees or direct master's theses and doctoral dissertations must be appointed to the Graduate Faculty. MSE|NE Graduate faculty status allows faculty members to serve on graduate supervisory committees as chairs, co-chairs, and committee members within the MSE Department. Those holding Graduate faculty status outside of MSE|NE may serve as an external committee member.

Section 1. Appointment Procedures

University of Florida faculty members who are appointed to full-time faculty positions in tenured or tenure-accruing positions are appointed to the Graduate Faculty as a matter of course within the academic unit that hired them, shortly after the time of their appointment to the university faculty. For all others, a graduate degree program's academic unit nominates faculty members for appointment to the Graduate Faculty following the policy guidelines of the Graduate School. For MSE|NE full-time faculty in non-tenure track positions, the MSE department will nominate these individuals for MSE|NE Graduate Faculty status.

- A. Requirements: Election of appointment to the MSE|NE Graduate Faculty requires a University of Florida Human Resources Courtesy or Affiliate appointment within the MSE department and at least

-
- a two-thirds vote of approval the MSE|NE Graduate Faculty. Additionally, the following requirements must be met:
- a. The candidate should demonstrate strong involvement in graduate student supervision (e.g. serving on committees) shortly upon appointment.
 - b. Demonstration of significant recent activity in the fields of MSE and/or NE. Examples of this include:
 - i. Publication in MSE/NE journals
 - ii. Significant research activity in MSE/NE areas
 - iii. Guest lecturing in courses within the current MSE/NE curriculum.
 - iv. Collaboration with MSE Primary Faculty
 - v. Co-advising a MSE/NE graduate student
 - vi. Advising a non-MSE/NE student whose work is within the realm of MSE/NE, particularly that resulting in MSE/NE conference or journal publications
 - vii. Service on MSE department committee or national committees of MSE/NE organizations
 - c. A Sponsor who is a Primary member of the MSE|NE Faculty: To apply for election to the MSE|NE Graduate Faculty, the candidate must have an official sponsor from a faculty member with primary appointment in the MSE department. This Primary Faculty Sponsor will serve to submit the paperwork to the Department Chair, discuss the application package with the faculty at a department faculty meeting, and serve as the affiliated faculty member's champion during the general faculty vote.
- B. Application: To apply to be a member of the MSE|NE Graduate Faculty, the candidate must submit an application per the graduate school guidelines. The applicant should submit this to their MSE|NE Sponsor for review. The application must include the following:
- a. Outline of Scholarly Activity: Applicants should submit a CV that demonstrates significant activity in the MSE and/or NE fields of engineering. This activity may be evidenced by, for example, publications in MSE|NE journals, research collaborations with MSE colleagues, co- advising of MSE|NE graduate students (either at UF or previous institutions), and/or MSE|NE industry experience. In addition to research activity, involvement in teaching and graduate advisement should be clearly presented within the CV.
 - b. Summary of Motivation and Future Involvement: A brief summary outlining the motivation for seeking this appointment, as well as plans for future involvement in the department if/once this appointment is approved. These plans may include specific information on planned research collaborations with primary MSE|NE faculty, student co-supervision, and/or proposed contributions to lectures within the current MSE|NE curriculum.
 - c. Current Involvement in MSE|NE Graduate Students: Candidates should also include a brief summary of their involvement with MSE|NE Graduate Students to date.
- C. Review Procedure: Following the submission of the application to the MSE|NE Primary Faculty Sponsor, the Sponsor will then forward this to the Department Chair. All Courtesy appointments will be reviewed by the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee and a recommendation will be put to the faculty for or against appointment, who will then vote on the appointment. The MSE faculty sponsor will have the opportunity to present a case for the candidate before a vote is taken. General faculty votes must be > 80% (of those present at the meeting at which the candidate is proposed) in favor of the appointment to be approved. Votes on Affiliate or Courtesy Status and MSE Graduate Faculty Status will be conducted separately. Both votes must pass in order for the appointment to move forward.
- D. Vote Outcome: Upon final approval by the MSE Department Chair, HWCOE, and Graduate School, the candidate will receive official, written notification from the MSE Department Chair.
- a. Within the first month of appointment, the affiliated faculty should contact the Department Chair to provide faculty synopsis, photo, weblink for MSE website, and arrange to give a seminar.
 - b. Should the appointment not be approved, the candidate can reapply after 1 year.
- E. Terms: Appointments are for four years starting in fall semesters*, after which MSE/NE-related activity is reviewed prior to reappointment. Therefore, review for renewal of appointments takes place every two years. The guideline for renewal is outlined in the next section.

Section 2. Appointment Period

Receiving Graduate Faculty Status in the MSE and/or NE Program implies that the recipient has expertise and ongoing activity in science and/or engineering components within the broad material

and/or nuclear fields. Therefore, to verify this requirement, appointments are reevaluated/renewed every four years.

Section 3. Membership

The Department will present an updated list of the active Graduate Faculty in the first faculty meeting of the fall semesters. As needed, new appointments and renewals will be presented for a vote. The updated list will be posted and maintained on the MSE website.

Section 4. Duties and Responsibilities of members with MSE/NE Graduate Faculty Status

The MSE Department strives to generate a collaborative and mutually beneficial relationship for our members with Graduate Faculty Status. Thus, there are benefits and responsibilities associated with joining our department.

- A. General responsibilities:
 - a. Agreement to give a department seminar and/or guest lecture on a primary MSE/NE course (undergraduate or graduate) at an appropriate date (the seminar and/or guest lecture should be based on a relevant topic of interest to MSE/NE students and faculty).
 - b. Maintenance of a current web page for linking with the MSE homepage
 - c. Submission of CV to the MSE Department every four years.
 - d. Informing the MSE Department of all MSE/NE-related topic courses the faculty member is teaching in their home department
 - e. Maintain close communication with the MSE Academic Services Office to ensure that all academic procedures and schedules of the MSE/NE graduate students advised are being followed.
- B. Graduate Committee Membership: Per UF Graduate School guidelines, faculty that have Graduate Faculty Status in any department at UF may serve as a counted member on a Ph.D. or Masters committee and consequently they can no longer serve as an External member and may only be counted as a general member of the committee.
- C. Chair of Graduate Committees: Appointees (of both Courtesy and Affiliate types) with Graduate Status may serve as the Chair of a graduate committee (doctoral or MS), provided at least one other member of the committee is a member of the Primary MSE/NE faculty. The chair of the committee must provide funding/scholarship directly to the MSE/NE student.

Section 5: Review and Reappointment

- A. Affiliate and Courtesy Renewal of Graduate Faculty Status: After the initial application, reappointments will be based on review of the activity summary (outlined below). Appointments will be reviewed by the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee and a recommendation will be put to the faculty for or against renewal, who will then vote on renewal during the first Faculty meeting of the fall semester, or via electronic voting shortly after. If previously granted Graduate Faculty Status then the graduate faculty status will be automatically granted if renewal is approved. The vote on renewal will occur during the first Faculty meeting of the fall semester, or via electronic voting shortly after.
- B. Requirements for renewal: Prior to renewal (i.e., in the spring or summer semesters before the voting in the fall semester is expected to take place), the Affiliate and Courtesy Graduate Faculty must submit a completed Activity Electronic Summary Form to the Department Chair. This summary form will highlight participation in MSE/NE-related activities of the previous four years, which may include:
 - a. Lecturing on courses within the MSE/NE curriculum
 - b. Serving on an MSE/NE student PhD committee as chair, co-chair, or member.
 - c. Supervision of a MSE/NE MSc student
 - d. Supervision of a MSE/NE undergraduate student
 - e. Collaboration with a MSE core faculty member that has resulted in a peer-reviewed publication, conference presentation, or federal grant application
 - f. Presentation of a UF MSE/NE seminar
- C. Sunset and Hiatus. After appropriate reminders, failure to submit a report will result in the revocation of Graduate Faculty Status. The individual will be able to re-apply for an appointment for the following fall (i.e., effectively a one year hiatus).

Section 6: Exceptions and Clarifications

- A. The Department Chair has the authority to extend the following appointments at their discretion:
- a. Courtesy Appointments. This is intended for is any person who provides services to the University of Florida with no monetary or material compensation, on a continuous, occasional, or one-time basis, performing duties that align with teaching, research, or service. The Courtesy modifier should be used for those individuals not currently employed by the University of Florida.
 - b. Affiliate Appointments. This is intended to designate employed University of Florida faculty member's participation in some function within the department on an infrequent or occasional basis.
 - c. Special appointments. This is for special appointments to a graduate student's supervisory committee of qualified personnel who do not have regular Graduate Faculty Status at the University of Florida in order to serve as guest experts on graduate students' supervisory committees. Special appointments can serve only as members on supervisory committees (not as chairs, co-chairs or externals). Special appointments do not count toward the required minimum for a valid supervisory committee (which must be filled by current Graduate Faculty), but over and above that number.
- B. In cases of extenuating and unexpected circumstances, where delay of appointment or renewal until fall semester will negatively affect the graduate student academic progress and compliance with academic regulations (Ph.D. committee composition, etc.), the Department Chair will have the authority to present individual cases to the MSE|NE faculty for voting during a Faculty meeting throughout the academic year.