Bylaws

The Department of Computer and Information Science and Engineering

Effective date: May 16, 2016

1. Preamble

The purpose of this document is to set forth the organization and procedures for the Department of Computer and Information Science and Engineering of the University of Florida. We consider the purpose of the Department of Computer and Information Science and Engineering to be the generation, accumulation, organization, application, and dissemination of knowledge in Computer and Information Science and Engineering. In order for the Department and its Faculty to fulfill this mission, it is necessary for it to have operating procedures, herein referred to as Bylaws. These Bylaws are governed by and are subordinate to the University of Florida Constitution, the College of Engineering Constitution, the Florida Administrative Code, the University of Florida Board of Trustees, and the University of Florida - United Faculty of Florida Collective Bargaining Agreement.

The Department of Computer and Information Science and Engineering is committed to the principles of shared governance, diversity, and equal opportunity.

2. Department Organization

The programs of the Department of Computer and Information Science and Engineering shall be conducted by the department Faculty through a Chair, who shall have general responsibility for the activities of the department. The Chair is assisted by the Administrative Officers of the Department, including the Associate Chair, Graduate Coordinator, and Undergraduate Coordinator.

2.1 Definition of Faculty

The Faculty of the Department of Computer and Information Science and Engineering shall consist of tenured faculty whose tenure home is the Department and all other faculty (as defined by Senate Bylaw 21, April 15, 2004, February 17, 2005) whose primary appointment is in the Department. The Tenure Eligible Faculty shall consist of the subset of the Faculty who are in the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, professor or above.

3. Steering Committee

The Department Steering Committee is the elected representative body of the Faculty. The Steering Committee advises the Chair on departmental matters. Special Faculty meetings may be called by a three fifths majority of the Steering Committee.

The Steering Committee is not a policy-making or legislative body. Policy questions subject to a vote shall be remanded to the Department as a whole.

3.1 Duties of the Steering Committee

The Steering Committee advises the Chair on all matters of concern to the Department, including:

1. issues related to departmental programs; faculty assignments and schedules;
2. the work of, and relations between, the various committees in the Department;
3. relations with other departments and programs;
4. issues concerning the staff;
5. concerns of individual faculty members;
6. strategic planning and commitments, including issues related to faculty hiring; and
7. finances and budget, and towards this end shall receive a report from the Chair on income and expenditures and the state of Departmental finances each semester.

In addition, the steering committee is responsible for

8. mediation when an individual faculty member wishes to appeal a judgment of the Chair;
9. *performing a biannual assessment of the Chair. This biannual assessment is not intended and shall not be used as a record containing information reflecting academic evaluations of employee performance. Its sole purpose is to provide feedback to the chair and communicate this feedback to the faculty.*(see http://www.flsenate.gov/Laws/Statutes/2012/Chapter1012/ 1012.91)
10. representing the Department in communication with the College and University administration regarding appointments of an Interim/Acting Chair.

The Steering Committee may delegate its advisory authority on specific matters to Administrative Officers, Committees or Committee Chairs, or Department as a whole, as appropriate, or as defined by these Bylaws.

Generally the Chair will query the Steering Committee for advice on major policy decisions, however, the Steering Committee has the right to provide advice to the Chair on its own initiative.

3.2 Speaker of the Steering Committee

The Steering Committee shall select a Speaker, who coordinates and communicates the activities of the steering committee to the Faculty and the Department; chairs meetings of the Steering Committee when it is not serving as an advisory committee to the Department Chair; and chairs meetings of the Faculty when the meeting was not called by the Department Chair.

3.3 Election of the Steering Committee

The Steering Committee shall consist of five elected members. Members are elected for a term of two years. At least one member should hold the rank of Professor; and at least one member should hold the rank of Associate Professor.

Elections for members of the Steering Committee shall be held in April. All members of the Faculty are eligible to be elected. The continuing members of the Steering Committee shall supervise elections. The initial announcement calling for nominations shall review the nomination procedure and specify the timing and the method by which the vote will be held, and how the winners will be determined. There shall be a one-week nominating period. Nominations can be made by a single eligible faculty member with consent of the nominee. The election shall take place by secret ballot or by electronic voting no less than one week after nominations are closed. Each individual may vote for no more than the number of candidates to be elected. If there is no continuing Full Professor, then the Full Professor with the most votes shall be elected. If there is no continuing Associate Professor, then the Associate Professor with the most votes shall be elected. The person or persons with the most votes of the remaining candidates shall be elected. The newly elected members shall assume their responsibilities at the beginning of the fiscal year and serve for two years. Special elections shall be held to fill vacancies.

The initial election of Steering Committee members will be held as soon as possible after the adoption of these Bylaws by the Department. Three members will have a two year term and two will have a one year term, chosen by lot.

4. The Chair

The administrative responsibility of the Department rests with the Chair, who shall have general responsibility for the activities of the Department. He or she carries out the procedures outlined by the College and University and acts in consultation with the Steering Committee.

4.1 Duties of the Chair

The Chair is the chief administrative officer and the chief financial officer of the Department. As such, the Chair shall:
1. Lead the Faculty, by
   a. appointing the Administrative Officers of the Department (Sections 5-7);
   b. selecting the members of non-elected Department Committees (Section 8) and Faculty Governance Positions (Section 9);
   a. making faculty assignments in accordance with the CISE Effort Assignment Guidelines;
   b. nominating faculty for awards;

c. evaluating faculty on an annual basis and recommending faculty for merit increases in accordance with the CISE Merit Pay Process For Tenure Track Faculty;

d. considering faculty leave requests;

e. overseeing the tenure and promotion process [see Section 11.2];

f. recruiting and hiring new faculty members;

g. appointing joint, adjunct, and visiting faculty members;

h. reviewing all joint, affiliate and courtesy appointments annually; and

i. coordinating the efforts of the faculty in their exercise of control over the academic affairs and curricula of the department [see Note 1].

2. Lead the staff by
    a. supervising the day-to-day activities of the Department and its staff; and
    b. hiring and evaluating staff.

3. Govern the Department by
    a. calling, preparing the agenda for, and presiding over faculty meetings;
    b. ensuring that all provisions of these Bylaws are followed;
    c. removing chairs of standing or appointed committees when the required duties of those committees are not being carried out; and
    d. creating ad-hoc committees.

4. Supervise Departmental resources, by:
    a. supervising all receipts and expenditures of departmental funds;
    b. preparing the annual academic program review and budget proposal for the Dean [see Note 2]; and
    c. allocating space.

5. Represent the Department [see Note 3], by
    a. representing the Department to university officers and bodies and *vice versa*;
    b. acting as a general spokesperson;
    c. advocate the interests of the Department and its faculty; and
    d. acting as the primary liaison for the Industrial Advisory Board.

Note 1: See Article VI.2.(A).1 of the Constitution of the University of Florida (January 14, 2013)

Note 2: At a faculty meeting in the Fall semester (normally the first one), the Chair shall present a report on the previous academic year's finances as well as the proposed budget for the new academic year. Current budget documents shall be available to any member of the Department upon request.

Note 3: The Chair may designate an Acting Chair to represent the Department on a short term basis, as needed.

The selection of the Chair shall follow the procedures set forth in the College of Engineering Constitution. When the Department is asked by the Dean to provide members of a search committee, these members shall be elected by the Faculty.

5. Associate Chair

The Associate Chair is appointed by the Chair and assists the Chair in the operation of the Department.

Duties
Specific duties are determined by the Chair. Typically, the Associate Chair may
1. supervise academic advisor(s) and system administrator(s);
2. assist with the management of academic programs by
   a. serving as Acting Undergraduate or Graduate Coordinator as necessary;
   b. addressing requests from the College of an academic nature;
   c. assisting the Chair in overseeing accreditation activities;
   d. overseeing the TA assignment process and working with the TA Assignment Coordinator;
   e. overseeing course instructor and TA evaluation protocols;
   f. working with academic advisors to formulate course offerings and schedules;
   g. providing logistic coordination with UF EDGE and providing projections of EDGE courses to be taught;
   h. working with faculty and the Chair in planning teaching assignments;
   i. identifying and recruiting adjunct faculty and PhD students in cooperation with relevant faculty as necessary to teach courses; and
   j. coordinating DAS course offerings with the Digital Worlds Institute head and the Chair.
3. serve as department ombudsman for students, faculty, staff, and others;
4. serve as an ex-officio member of various standing committees, including Undergraduate Petitions and Systems Facilities;
5. oversee management of bi-annual Career Development Workshop (CDW);
6. certify annual space allocation reports;
7. assist the Chair in interacting with various outside entities (government agencies, other universities, companies, etc.);
8. assist the Chair in conducting Industrial Advisory Board meetings;
9. assist the Chair with formulation of draft committee assignments; and
10. serve as Acting Chair upon request of the Chair in his/her absence.

6. Graduate Coordinator

The Graduate Coordinator is appointed by the Chair and works with the advisors, Associate Chair, Chair, and Graduate Program Affairs and Petitions Committee to manage and strengthen the graduate programs.

Duties

Specific duties are determined by the Chair. Typically, the Graduate Coordinator may
1. chair the Graduate Admissions Committee;
2. chair the Graduate Program Affairs;
3. coordinate recruitment of graduate students, issue admission letters, and make nominations, when required, for fellowships and awards on behalf of the Department;
4. track academic progress of students on an annual basis in consultation with the Graduate Program Affairs Committee; and
5. serve as a liaison for the graduate students in petition processes and grievance procedures.

7. Undergraduate Coordinator

The Undergraduate Coordinator is appointed by the Chair and works with the advisors, Associate Chair, Chair, and Curriculum Committee to manage and strengthen the undergraduate programs.

Duties

Specific duties are determined by the Chair. Typically, the Undergraduate Coordinator may
1. assist the undergraduate advisers and College advising staff in dealing with undergrad advising problems and issues;
2. together with the advisors, strengthen existing activities and develop new initiatives to increase undergrad recruiting, retention, and diversity;
3. serve as liaison between CLAS and the Curriculum Committee;
4. attend monthly CoE and CLAS Undergraduate Coordinators meetings;
5. serve as Chair of the Undergraduate Petitions Committee;
6. serve as an *ex officio* member of the Curriculum Committee;
7. oversee the teaching of CISE's contribution to EGN 1002 ("Intro to Engineering");
8. assist the Associate Chair in connection with yearly evaluations of undergraduate advising staff and related matters; and
9. serve as Commencement Representative in the role of Undergraduate Coordinator.

8. Standing Committees

Unless otherwise indicated, members and chairs of the Department's standing committees are appointed by the Department Chair, with the advice of the Steering Committee.

1. *ABET, SACS, ALC Coordination*
    a. This committee is responsible for coordinating activities required by the agencies that accredit the Department's degree programs and the University.
    b. The committee also holds primary responsibility for preparing documentation for accreditation visits.
2. *Curriculum Committee*
    a. The Undergraduate Coordinator is an *ex-officio* member of this committee. Other members are appointed by the chair.
    b. The Curriculum Committee is responsible for evaluation and development of undergraduate academic curricula and presenting these to faculty for approval.
    c. This committee is responsible for initial investigation and approval of new course proposals, which are then approved by the Department Faculty before being forwarded to the College of Engineering Curriculum Committee for approval.
    d. The Chair of the Curriculum Committee is nominated, and if elected, serves as the College of Engineering Curriculum Committee Representative.
    e. A member of this committee serves as the Department liaison with the State Course Numbering organization
3. *Graduate Program Affairs & Petitions Committee*
    a. This committee is responsible for enforcing academic policies for all CISE graduate degree programs including the course and credit requirement, various exam regulations, academic performance requirement, TA eligibility, timeline toward graduation, etc.
    b. This committee is responsible for formulating curricula and recommended policies regarding all aspects of the graduate program and submitting them to the faculty for approval.
    c. At the close of each semester, the committee reviews the progress of all students in the graduate program.
    d. This committee is charged with making department level response to graduate petitions for waivers of academic requirements.
    e. The Graduate Coordinator serves as the committee chair.
    f. A graduate advisor is an *ex officio* member of the committee.
4. *Graduate Admissions*
    a. This committee is responsible for admissions to the graduate program
    b. The Graduate Coordinator is the Chair of this committee.
5. *TA Assignment Coordinator.*
    The TA Assignment Coordinator works with guidance from the Chair and Associate Chair to assign eligible graduate students to courses.
6. *Undergraduate Petitions Committee*
    a. The undergraduate petitions committee is charged with making department level responses to undergraduate petitions for waivers of academic requirements.

     b. The Undergraduate Coordinator is the chair.

     c. The Associate Chair serves as an *ex-officio* member.

7. *PhD Exam Committee*

     a. This committee coordinates the administration of the comprehensive PhD exams.

     b. The committee may bring policy recommendations regarding the PhD examinations to the Department faculty for approval

     c. The committee consists of a chair and a representative from each area offering a PhD examination.

8. *Systems Facilities Committee*

     a. The Systems Facilities Committee advises the Chair on Department system infrastructure policies, purchases, and strategic planning in consultation with the IT Staff, Faculty, and others.

     b. The Associate Chair and Senior Systems Administrator are ex-officio members

9. *Colloquium Committee*

     a. The Colloquium Committee is responsible for developing a successful seminar program with input from the Faculty.

     b. Policies of the Colloquium Committee are described in detail in the Colloquium Committee Processes and Policies Manual (http://www.cise.ufl.edu/administration/manuals/pdf/manual_00.pdf)

10. *Faculty Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee*

     a. Provides a recommendation to the Chair for Faculty Tenure & Promotion cases, midterm reviews, and advanced reviews.

     b. Membership in this committee is restricted to faculty at the rank of Professor or above

     c. The Chair of this committee normally serves as the department representative on the College of Engineering Personnel Board

11. *Industrial Advisory Board Committee*

     The Industrial Advisory Board Committee serves as the faculty liaison with the Department's Industrial Advisory Board.

12. *Certificate Programs Coordination*

     a. Oversee Undergraduate and Graduate Certificate Programs.

     b. Assist with and coordinate recruiting efforts, policy revisions, and student support activities.

13. *Scholarship and Awards Committee (for other than new admissions)*

     a. This committee identifies undergraduate and graduate students for scholarships and awards

     b. Undergraduate and graduate advisors are *ex officio* members

14. *Faculty Awards and Recognition Committee*

9. Faculty Governance Positions

Additional governance positions are appointed by the Chair (except where elected as noted below). These include Departmental representatives on various College Committees as well as other tasks. For example

1. ACM Advisor
2. Association of Graduate Students in CISE (ASCIE) Advisor
3. College of Engineering Personnel Board Representative
    a. This is an elected position normally held by the Chair of the Department Faculty Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee
4. College of Engineering Curriculum Committee Representative
    a. This is an elected position normally held by the Chair of the Department Curriculum Committee
    b. The College of Engineering Curriculum Committee representative is responsible for ensuring that no new courses proposed by other departments that overlap or duplicate with CISE courses are approved without the collegial discussion of the situation by both departments.
5. College of Engineering Minority Affairs Committee Representative
6. College of Engineering Honors and Awards Elected Representative
7. College of Engineering EDGE Process Faculty Advisory Committee
8. College of Engineering EDGE Class Scheduling Committee
    a. This position is normally held by the Associate Chair
9. College of Engineering Commencement Marshal
10. College of Engineering Library Services Advisory Committee Representative
11. College of Engineering Safety Committee Representative

10. Industrial Advisory Board

The Mission of the Industry Advisory Board is to create and foster a partnership between the CISE leadership and the Industry that is the consumer of its graduates and its research.   The Industrial Advisory Board is governed by its Charter (http://www.cise.ufl.edu/iab).

11. Procedures

The following procedures shall be followed subject to the regulations of the College and the University.

11.1 Academic Programs

Undergraduate degree requirements are recommended by the Curriculum Committee and must be approved by the Tenure Eligible Faculty. Graduate degree requirements are recommended by the Graduate Committee and must be approved by the Tenure Eligible Faculty. New course proposals are vetted by the Curriculum Committee and approved by the Faculty.

11.2 Graduate Faculty Status

Graduate Faculty status in the Department may be granted in accordance with the policies and procedures of the Graduate School and grants the privilege of serving as Chair or Co-Chair of the Supervisory Committee of students enrolled in a CISE M.S. or Ph.D. Program.   Graduate Faculty status may be granted to eligible faculty members who are not members of the Department Faculty; For those who are not members of the Department Faculty, this status shall expire after three years without service as Chair or Co-Chair of a supervisory committee for a CISE student. Eligible voters in CISE Graduate Faculty elections are CISE Faculty members who hold Graduate Faculty status.

11.3 Promotion and Tenure

The promotion and tenure process shall be carried out in accordance with the College of Engineering and University constitutions based on approved criteria and procedures described in the document "BYLAWS GOVERNING CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES USED FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY" (March 9, 2009).
(http://www.cise.ufl.edu/administration/docs/bylaws.pdf).   Within the Department, the Faculty Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee is responsible for evaluating candidates for promotion and tenure and making a recommendation to the appropriate subset of the Department Faculty. The Department Chair is responsible for overseeing the entire process including identifying candidates for tenure and promotion, requesting external and internal letters, bringing the candidacy to the faculty for evaluation and writing a letter to the Dean supporting or not supporting the candidate. Individual faculty members have the right to self-declare their candidacy at any time.

11.4 Faculty Meetings

Faculty meetings may be called by the Chair, the Steering Committee, or by petition of at least five faculty members of the Department.

The Chair shall preside over all faculty meetings called by the Chair or Acting Chair; all other faculty meetings shall be chaired by the Speaker of the Steering Committee or his or her designee.

One third or more of the number of members of the Department not on leave constitute a quorum.

Votes on motions may be cast at Faculty meetings or by paper/email or electronic ballot. Unless otherwise specified in these bylaws or other governing documents, the default is to cast ballots in meetings. A vote on any issue will be held by paper/email or electronic ballot if requested before the vote by a faculty member present at the meeting. The motion should be presented to the faculty as soon as practical after the meeting is adjourned. Voting will close at 5pm on the earliest day which satisfies the constraint that the election is open for two full business days.

Meetings shall be conducted in accordance with practices described in the most recent edition of *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised.*

12. Amendments

This document may be amended by a vote at a faculty meeting or by a mail ballot or electronic voting following a faculty meeting that included a discussion of the proposed changes. The precise wording of the amendment shall be circulated one week in advance of the vote. All members of the Department Faculty (including those on leave) are eligible to vote. The amendment will be approved if over fifty percent of those eligible vote in favor of the amendment.

BYLAWS GOVERNING CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES USED FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY

COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING DEPT.

BYLAWS GOVERNING CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES USED FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY

COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING DEPT.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction. Overall Evaluation Principles

Faculty will be evaluated in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The department faculty are viewed as a diverse set of creative individuals who may excel in different areas. It is not possible to completely specify all possible appropriate and meritorious activities, accomplishments, awards, etc that a faculty member may engage in. Therefore, an exhaustive list of criteria with associated quantitative weights is not given here. However, the core activities of faculty: publishing in high quality outlets, participation in and organization of national and international research and educational forums, service to the university and the profession, garnering funding for research and educational activities, and quality teaching and pedagogical activities are clearly the main foci of faculty evaluations. Any documented effort at these activities will be taken into consideration.

The evaluation criteria and procedures discussed in this document are for: annual performance, tenure and promotion, merit pay raise and finally market equity raise. There are redundancies in the criteria and procedures and the structure of this document reflects that. All annual performance evaluation criteria are relevant in the consideration of merit pay and tenure and promotion so the former are described first. However, receiving a given rating in an annual evaluation at the departmental level does not necessarily imply that one will receive the same rating in that area for merit or promotion and tenure.

Article 1. Annual Performance Evaluation of Tenure Track Faculty

Performance evaluations by the chair of the unit 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.

1.1 University Level Criteria and Procedures

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 or course structure or pedagogical methods, 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.

1.2 **Departmental clarification of university level criteria and procedures**

Faculty in the Dept. of CISE shall be evaluated annually according to the criteria listed in Article 1.2 and rated as either Excellent, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory in Teaching, Research and Service based on their performance in each of those areas. If there is any conflict between the College and Departmental level criteria, the departmental criteria in Article 1.2 shall be used. Faculty member's overall rating of Excellent, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory will be based upon consideration of their assignment and their rating in each of the three primary categories. Therefore, the percentage assignment to each area should be known by each faculty member at the beginning of the evaluation period. There may be adjustments to assignments during the evaluation period based on unforeseen changes. For example, a opportunity to participate on a large multi-investigator grant could present itself to a faculty member who thereby ends up with much more research activity than was planned for. In such an example, the research percentage for that faculty member may be increased.

The evaluation period for a faculty member's performance will be the previous year. The performance evaluation will depend on standardized activity reports submitted by the faculty member to the Chair of the CISE dept. Evaluations may be reviewed by the CISE steering committee but if any evaluations reviewed by the committee, then all evaluations must be reviewed by the committee to provide the appropriate context.

Examples of Satisfactory Performance in each of the three primary categories are given below. These are not intended to be exhaustive, they are merely examples. Moreover, since evaluations will take assignment into consideration, what is considered excellent for one faculty member may not be for another. For example, if the primary assignment of a faculty member is in teaching then Excellence in teaching requires examples such as those listed under Excellent below. However, if the primary assignment of a faculty member is research, then an Excellent rating in teaching may be given using criteria under the Satisfactory listing below. Thus, the evaluation is conditioned on the assignment.

Teaching:

Excellent

In addition to meeting the criteria for Satisfactory performance, the following additional criteria shall be considered in the assignment of an Excellent rating.

1. Obtaining funding for teaching infrastructure such as new teaching laboratories, equipment, or software; or funding for teaching assistants, fellowships, and scholarships.
2. Publishing in educational journals.
3. Development of meaningful new courses.
4. Publishing textbooks that are in use at a significant number of institutions.

> However, if a faculty member is teaching three or more courses, then less weight will be given to the above criteria and more emphasis will be put on things such as excellent teaching evaluations, exit interviews, and peer evaluations as well as significant excellence in teaching awards.

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

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:

Excellent

1. Publications in high quality, peer reviewed journals or prestigious conference proceedings at a high rate for the discipline.
2. High level of participation in conferences through contributed or invited presentations by faculty and/or their students.
3. Research funding at a high level for the specific discipline, to fund the support of many graduate students and a vibrant research program which may also include salary buy-out.
4. Supervision and graduation of a high number of Ph.D. students for the specific discipline, with strong dissertations that produce scholarly publications in reputable journals and conferences.

Satisfactory

1. Publications in high quality, peer reviewed journals or prestigious conference proceedings at a rate in keeping with the specific discipline.
2. Participation in conferences through contributed or invited presentations by faculty and/or their students
3. Research funding at a level appropriate to the specific discipline and sufficiently adequate to fund a vibrant research program including support of graduate students
4. Supervision and graduation of an adequate number of Ph.D. students appropriate to the specific discipline, with strong dissertations that produce scholarly publications in reputable journals and conferences

Unsatisfactory

1. Publications in poor quality journals or conference proceedings or in high quality venues but at a rate well below departmental averages
2. Little or no participation in conferences through contributed or invited presentations by faculty and/or their students
3. Little or no research funding or poor proposal generation rate
4. Supervision of fewer Ph.D students than appropriate for the specific discipline or no Ph.D. students

Service:

Excellent

Editor-in-Chief of highly reputable journal

General or program chair of highly reputable conference Special session organizer for highly reputable conference Significant advisory activities for government agencies University-level leadership in shared governance

Satisfactory

Service to profession through participation as

member or chair of professional or technical committee program committee member

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 2. Tenure and Promotion For Tenure Track Faculty

The Dept. of Computer and Information Science and Engineering criteria statement is as follows: As a major unit of the College of Engineering of the University of Florida, the Dept. of Computer and Information Science and Engineering pursues the same mission as the university and the college, and promotes excellence in teaching, research, and service. It therefore abides by the University and College rules and procedures for tenure and promotion. Additional clarifications specific to the department are given below.

2.1 Departmental Criteria and Procedures 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. Performance evaluations are useful in the evaluation although separate packets will be required for consideration for promotion and tenure.

a) To be recommended for promotion to Assoc. Professor or for tenure, a faculty member is expected to have an Excellent ranking 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 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, conditioned on his/her assignments, 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 to be considered for evaluation are given in Article 2.2.

2.2 Metrics To Be Used for Evaluation of Tenure Track Faculty

Annual evaluations shall be taken into consideration in the time period that starts at the latest date from the following set of dates: the date of the last promotion of the faculty member, the faculty member's first date of employment, 6 years prior to the date of the request for promotion and/or tenure. However, an independent document describing the faculty member's qualifications for promotion and/or tenure must be produced using guidelines defined by the CISE Department and College of Engineering 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
5. Graduate student supervision
    a. Number and quality of Ph.D supervised/graduated
    b. Number and quality of Engineer supervised/graduated
    c. Number and quality of M.S. supervised/graduated

d. Student placement

Teaching:

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

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
   - iv. Government or non-profit institute reports
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
7. Government advisory boards

2.3 **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.

2.4 **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. In particular, it is important that the faculty mentor participate in this review. 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 3. Merit Raise Criteria For Tenure Track Faculty

3.1 **Purpose of Merit Based Pay Raises**

Pay raises based on merit may be used to promote and further various goals of the Dept. of Computer and Information Science and Engineering including:

1. Advance departmental mission
2. Improve the quality of department programs
3. Recognize and reward meritorious performance and sustained excellence of faculty
4. Promote retention of the most valuable and productive faculty
5. Improve faculty morale
6. Provide incentives for future faculty efforts
7. Improve department reputation in national surveys

3.2 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 the standardized activity reports submitted by the faculty member over the evaluation period for their annual evaluations, 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.

3.3 Procedure for Award of Merit Pay Raises

A specific procedure for awarding merit pay raises that is consistent with these general guidelines will be voted on by the tenure track faculty and maintained on the departmental website. The process may be modified if a proposal to do so is presented to the entire tenure track faculty, a discussion and subsequent vote take place, and a majority of the faculty voting vote to form a committee to modify the process. The resulting modification will then presented to, discussed by, and voted on by the tenure track faculty. For examples of procedures, see the College of Engineering REPORT OF THE AD-HOC MERIT PAY COMMITTEE June 11, 2004. The process in place at the time this document was produced is given below.

CISE Department Merit Pay Process (Apr 27, 2007, version)
This version was approved by a secret faculty vote conducted May 4 through May 11. 17 in favor, 9 against, and 3 abstain.

(1) Near the end of each Spring semester, each faculty member prepares an activity report, and submits it to the CISE Chair.

(2) As part of his or her evaluation, the Chair also makes a preliminary placement of the faculty member into one of typically five "bins", based on the contents of the activity report. This placement is made according to the Merit Pay Criteria already established by the department. Because merit pay increases are not available every year, the placement may consider up to 3 past years of performance.

(3) The Chair communicates these bin placements to each faculty member (each faculty member receiving only his or her own bin placement). Along with this placement, the Chair writes an overall summary of the placement process for the whole department, describing the typical performance levels of the faculty members in each bin, and how many faculty were placed in each bin. The summary includes a qualitative and quantitative summary of the performance levels of faculty in each bin. This overall summary is given to each faculty member.

(4) If a faculty member feels that his or her placement in a bin does not reflect their performance, then he or she requests a meeting with the Chair in order to reconcile it. This request, and the meeting, must take place within one week after step (3) completes, with reasonable allowances made in case of travel.

(5) If the meeting does not lead to a result acceptable to the faculty member, the faculty member requests the CISE Steering Committee to review the result. The request is made in writing, giving the reasons why an appeal is being made. This request for a review must be made within one week after the meeting in step (4). If the faculty member is also a member of the Steering Committee, then he or she does not take part in the Steering Committee's review of his or her case.

(6) The CISE Steering Committee reviews all appealed merit placements, at the same time. In order to make an accurate recommendation, the committee may ask the Chair to clarify his or her overall summary (see (3) above). The committee may also ask the Chair for a briefing. The Steering Committee meets with the faculty member, and makes a recommendation to the Chair for each appealed result, within two weeks after step (5) completes (that is, no later than four weeks after the initial evaluation by the Chair).

(7) The Chair makes any adjustments to the merit pay bin placement, based on the Steering Committee's recommendation. If the CISE Steering Committee's recommendation differs from the Chair's final placement, the Chair provides a written explanation of the discrepancy to the Committee, and to the faculty member.

(8) The Chair submits his or her recommendation for merit pay salary increases to the Dean, according to the merit bin placement of each faculty member. Modest differences of merit pay increases may exist within each bin, but the salary increase of faculty placed in a higher bin will not be less than the salary increase of faculty placed in a lower bin.

> Footnote: The CISE Steering Committee consists of at least four faculty members. This document does not specify how the CISE Steering Committee is selected; as of Spring 2007, its members are appointed by the Chair.

Article 4   Annual Performance Evaluation For Non Tenure Track Faculty

Performance evaluations by the chair of the unit 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 and Procedures

The University Level Criteria and Procedures are the same as for the tenure track faculty.

4.2 Departmental clarification of university level criteria and procedures

Faculty in the Dept. of CISE shall be evaluated annually according to the criteria listed in Article 4.2 and rated as either Excellent, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory in Teaching, Research and Service based on their performance in each of those areas. If there is any conflict between the College and Departmental level criteria, the departmental criteria in Article 4.2 shall be used. Faculty member's overall rating of Excellent, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory will be based upon consideration of their assignment and their rating in each of the three primary categories. Therefore, the percentage assignment to each area should be known by each faculty member at the beginning of the evaluation period. There may be adjustments to assignments during the evaluation period based on unforeseen changes. For example, a opportunity to participate on a large multi-investigator grant could present itself to a faculty member who thereby ends up with much more research activity than was planned for. In such an example, the research percentage for that faculty member may be increased.

The evaluation period for a faculty member's performance will be the previous year. The performance evaluation will depend on standardized activity reports submitted by the faculty member to the Chair of the CISE dept. Evaluations may be reviewed by the CISE steering committee but if any evaluations reviewed by the committee, then all evaluations must be reviewed by the committee to provide the appropriate context.

Examples of Satisfactory Performance in each of the three primary categories are given below. These are not intended to be exhaustive, they are merely examples. Moreover, since evaluations will take assignment into consideration, what is considered excellent for one faculty member may not be for another. For example, if the primary assignment of a faculty member is in teaching then Excellence in teaching requires examples such as those listed under Excellent below. However, if the primary assignment of a faculty member is research, then an Excellent rating in teaching may be given using criteria under the Satisfactory listing below. Thus, the evaluation is conditioned on the assignment.

Teaching:

Excellent

1. Evaluations
   a. Student evaluations significantly 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. Excellent peer evaluation from observation and analysis arranged by dept. chair

2. Level of Effort
   a. Course content kept up to date
   b. Introduction of significant new approaches and new initiatives in existing courses or development of meaningful new courses
   c. Number of senior and other student projects advised well above the departmental average
   d. Timely fulfillment of ABET assessment requirements

3. Obtaining funding for teaching infrastructure such as new teaching laboratories, equipment, or software; or funding for teaching assistants, fellowships, and scholarships.

4. Publishing in educational journals.

5. Publishing textbooks that are in use at a significant number of institutions.

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. 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. Advising near the departmental average of senior and other student projects

    d. Timely fulfillment of ABET assessment requirements

    e. Level of administrative overhead as reflected by class size and degree of TA support

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. Number of senior and other student projects advised well below the departmental average
    d. Late or incomplete reporting of assigned ABET assessments

Research:

Excellent

1. Publications in high quality, peer reviewed journals or prestigious conference proceedings at a high rate for the discipline.
2. High level of participation in conferences through contributed or invited presentations by faculty and/or their students.
3. Research funding at a high level for the specific discipline, to fund the support of many graduate students and a vibrant research program which may also include salary buy-out.
4. Supervision and graduation of a high number of Ph.D. students for the specific discipline, with strong dissertations that produce scholarly publications in reputable journals and conferences.

Satisfactory

1. Publications in high quality, peer reviewed journals or prestigious conference proceedings at a rate in keeping with the specific discipline.
2. Participation in conferences through contributed or invited presentations by faculty and/or their students
3. Research funding at a level appropriate to the specific discipline and sufficiently adequate to fund a vibrant research program including support of graduate students
4. Supervision and graduation of an adequate number of Ph.D. students appropriate to the specific discipline, with strong dissertations that produce scholarly publications in reputable journals and conferences

Unsatisfactory

1. Publications in poor quality journals or conference proceedings or in high quality venues but at a rate well below departmental averages

2. Little or no participation in conferences through contributed or invited presentations by faculty and/or their students

3. Little or no research funding or poor proposal generation rate

4. Supervision of fewer Ph.D students than appropriate for the specific discipline or no Ph.D. students

Service:

Excellent

Editor-in-Chief of highly reputable journal

General or program chair of highly reputable conference Special session organizer for highly reputable conference Significant advisory activities for government agencies University-level leadership in shared governance

Satisfactory

Service to profession through participation as member or chair of professional or technical committee program committee member
Associate Editor of Archival Journal

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

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 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 very applied and related to professional activities. Areas like professional education, educational research, applied research, and non-traditional teaching (short courses, professional development, etc.) are also to be considered. The percentage assignment of their duties must be taken into consideration. Further description of metrics that can be considered for evaluation is given in Article 5.4.

5.2. **Research Scientist Series**

Evaluation of faculty members in the Research Scientist Series for promotion is generally limited to performance in research. If service or teaching activities are part of the faculty member's assignment, they must also be included in the evaluation. Performance in research is the driver for promotion and salary decisions, however, and faculty are expected to excel in research. The quality of their research performance must be consistent with that of the Professorial Series for the equivalent rank. Further description of metrics that can be considered for evaluation is given in Article 5.4.

5.3. **Lecturer Series**

Evaluation for promotion in the Lecturer series is primarily for faculty involved in teaching, thus promotion in the lecturer track requires demonstrating excellence in teaching. Performance in service or research may also be considered depending on the faculty assignment. Teaching is evaluated in three areas: teaching quality, innovation in approaches to enhance student learning and professional development. Service is evaluated on quality and benefit to the goals of the department, college and university. Further description of metrics that can be considered for evaluation is given in Article 5.4.

5.4 **Metrics To Be Used for Evaluation of Non Tenure Track Faculty**

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

Research:

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

5. Graduate student supervision (if eligible for graduate faculty)
   a. Number and quality of Ph.D supervised/graduated
   b. Number and quality of Engineer supervised/graduated
   c. Number and quality of M.S. supervised/graduated
   d. Student placement

Teaching:

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

Service:

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

Article 6 Merit Raise Criteria For Non Tenure Track Faculty

6.1 Purpose of Merit Based Pay Raises

Pay raises based on merit may be used to promote and further various goals of the Dept. of Computer and Information Science and Engineering including:

1. Advance departmental mission
2. Improve the quality of department programs
3. Recognize and reward meritorious performance and sustained excellence of faculty
4. Promote retention of the most valuable and productive faculty
5. Improve faculty morale
6. Provide incentives for future faculty efforts
7. Improve department reputation in national surveys.

6.2 Criteria for Award of Merit Pay Raises

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

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

6.3 Procedure for Award of Merit Pay Raises

A specific procedure for awarding merit pay raises that is consistent with these general guidelines will be voted on by the non tenure track faculty and maintained on the departmental website. The process may be modified if a proposal to do so is presented to the non tenure track faculty, a discussion and subsequent vote take place, and a majority of the faculty voting vote to form a committee to modify the process. The resulting modification will then presented to, discussed by, and voted

on by the tenure track and non tenure track faculty. As an example, the procedure in place at the time this document was produced is:

Procedure for Non-Tenure Track Merit Pay Distribution
Process 3/20/07 algorithm

1. A merit pay pool is established by multiplying all non-tenure track salaries by the percentage merit pay allocation.

2. Each NTT faculty member is then placed into one of four "bins," on the basis of a performance rating by the department chair, averaged over the preceding 3 years, using the published criteria for award of merit raises:

   a. bin 1 = needs improvement
   b. bin 2 = satisfactory performance
   c. bin 3 = excellent performance
   d. bin 4 = truly extraordinary performance

   (We would anticipate that "bin 4" would seldom be used, but that it could be used to recognize exceptional achievement

3. A weighting factor (w_i) of 1, 2, 3, and 5 is preassigned to bins 1-4 respectively.

4. The calculation of per faculty merit raise for each bin is then calculated using the

   formula: merit raise = (total pool \$ * w_i)/ $\sum$(w_i* number in each bin)

   Example.   Assume that the NTT merit pool = \$2400.
   Assume there are 8 NTT faculty.
   Assume 4 each are assigned to bins 2 and 3.
   Then, merit pay raise for each faculty member in bin 3 would be:

   \$360 = (\$2400*3)/((4*3)+(4*2)) = \$7200/20

   This approach will favor those faculty with lower salaries, similar to the tenure-track system that awards fixed dollar amounts.

Article 7 Market Equity Raise Criteria

An individual faculty member may make a request to the department chair to have his/her salary reviewed for consideration of a market equity increase. The chair will assign the review to the appropriate departmental committee. The committee will compare the faculty member's salary with the Oklahoma State University Salary

Survey and consider such factors as the faculty member's value and productivity to the department in developing a recommendation. The committee's recommendation will be sent to the chair. The Chair will evaluate the committee's recommendation and make a decision regarding the recommendation.

Article 9 Amendment of the Bylaws

9.1 Voting Faculty

For purposes of adopting or amending this set of bylaws, the Voting Faculty of the Dept. of Computer and Information Science and Engineering shall consist of all tenure track faculty who are employed by the Dept. In addition, faculty in the Engineer, Research Scientist and Lecturer tracks shall have voting privileges on Articles 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 only. Emeritus faculty and faculty holding visiting, adjunct, or courtesy appointments shall not have voting privileges on any of the articles. The Chair or representative shall prepare and maintain a roster of the eligible Voting Faculty and update the list as necessary to reflect additions and deletions as they occur.

9.2 Amendment Process

These bylaws may be amended by the following procedure:

a) The proposed amendment(s) shall be submitted in writing to the faculty at least two (2) weeks before a regular or special Faculty meeting. Bylaws amendments may only be considered at meetings scheduled during the academic year.

b) Upon an affirmative vote by a majority of voting members present at said meeting, the Departmental Representative to the Tenure and Promotion Committee shall conduct, at the earliest opportunity, a mail (or electronic) ballot of the Voting Faculty of the department regarding the proposed amendment(s) to the Bylaws. The faculty in attendance may, by majority vote, revise the proposed amendment(s) prior to proffering them for a ballot.

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

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