

# **CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL DIAGNOSTICS & BIOREMEDIATION BYLAWS AND STANDING RULES**

## **1. Name of Center**

The Center for Environmental Diagnostics and Bioremediation, hereafter referred to as the CEDB, is a unit of the Hal Marcus College of Science and Engineering (HMCSE) at The University of West Florida. Faculty members in CEDB perform tenure and promotion review within relevant academic departments at the University of West Florida specific to the faculty member's specific research expertise.

## **2. Mission**

CEDB was established in 1990 and works in collaboration with affiliated academic departments and diverse external organizations to enrich the research, teaching, and service functions of the University of West Florida. The CEDB engages in basic and applied research pertinent to the assessment and improvement of environmental health; provides research and training opportunities for graduate and undergraduate students; teaches required and elective courses in the academic department in which they are seeking tenure and in support of academic programs in the HMCSE; and contributes to public service.

## **3. Structure of the Center**

### *Section 1. Members of the Center*

CEDB shall be composed of a director, faculty members, post-doctoral associates, visiting researchers/professors, and support staff. A tenured member of the Faculty may, after retirement, petition the active Faculty for election to emeritus status. Emeritus faculty are not members of the Department or Faculty, as defined above.

### *Section 2. Eligibility in Governance*

Faculty holding the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor or title of research assistant, research associate, and research professor are eligible to participate in CEDB governance activities, and to vote on non-personnel matters. The eligibility to vote on faculty personnel matters is restricted to full-time tenured/tenure earning faculty in a manner consistent with University guidelines. The faculty may, by majority vote, extend voting rights to other individuals associated with CEDB.

### *Section 3. Role of the Director*

The Director will perform all responsibilities in the best interests of CEDB by taking into account the wisdom and advice of faculty colleagues. The Director reports to the Dean of the Hal Marcus College of Science and Engineering and has a position on the HMCSE

Dean's Council. The Director is responsible for management of departmental financial resources, assignment of duties to faculty and staff, annual evaluation of faculty and staff, initial adjudication of grievances filed by faculty, coordination of CEDB committees, and scheduling of Center meetings, as well as other duties as needed.

#### **4. Center Meetings**

There should be at least two CEDB faculty and staff meetings during each semester. A majority of eligible faculty must be present to carry out official Center business. Parliamentary procedures, order of business, and voting procedures, etc. will be carried out according to Robert's Rules. At least one week's notice shall be given, excepting emergency situations, for scheduling, or cancelling a faculty and staff meeting. Faculty may place items on the agenda by contacting the Director prior to the meeting. Minutes will be taken by the office manager and distributed to the faculty no later than one week following a meeting.

#### **5. Committee Structure**

##### *Section 1. Ad Hoc Committees/Working Groups*

Ad Hoc committees/working groups are formed by the Director as needed to carry out specific duties (examples: personnel committee; space and equipment working groups). Ad Hoc committees/working groups are disbanded following completion of assigned duties.

#### **6. Academic Policies**

*Section 1. CEDB Faculty shall follow the academic policies of the individual academic departments in which they are seeking or have been awarded tenure.*

#### **7. Personnel Policies/Procedures**

##### *Section 1. Recruitment/Selection of New Faculty*

Advertising, recruiting, and selection of new faculty follow the established university procedures.

##### *Section 2. Annual Work Assignments*

The Director, in consultation with the faculty member and the chair of the Academic Department in which they have other assignments or are seeking or have been awarded tenure, will establish the faculty member's assignments in teaching, research, and service for the upcoming academic year in accordance with the joint appointment statement of expectations. These assignments are based upon the needs of the Department and the

professional development of the faculty member. The Director prepares and signs the letter of assignment which is co-signed by the Academic Department Chair, and refers to the Dean for further processing.

*Section 3. Faculty Mentoring*

Mentoring of untenured, tenure-track faculty, and research faculty is a critical part of moving the faculty member toward a successful tenure decision and/or career development. Faculty will follow the mentoring program of the CEDB or department in which they are seeking tenure. The CEDB Director will closely monitor the progress of the mentoring program. The five-year development period for tenure seeking faculty passes quickly, so it is recommended that meetings be held at the end of each semester to assess progress in teaching, research and service. Mentored faculty are expected to provide a statement on their accomplishments in the three areas during the previous semester, as well as a summary of their accomplishments for the period during which they have been in the tenure track at UWF. The CEDB Director and academic chair as appropriate will confer with the candidate's mentoring committee in preparing the annual Progress Toward Tenure letter that must accompany the Annual Evaluation of non-tenured, tenure-earning faculty each spring.

*Section 4. Annual Evaluation Procedures (see Appendix II for criteria)*

Annual evaluations are made by the Director in consultation with the Academic Department Chair as appropriate in which CEDB faculty are seeking or have been awarded tenure. The evaluation is based on the annual assignment letter written by the Director, and acknowledged by the faculty member. The assignment letter addresses teaching, research, and service.

The faculty member will document accomplishments for the year under consideration based on the annual evaluation criteria. The Director, appropriate academic department Chair, and faculty member review and discuss the submitted material and the results of the evaluation form. The academic department chair specifically provides an evaluation of teaching. The Director then writes a letter of evaluation with a rating of one of four rankings: unsatisfactory, does not meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations in each of the areas of teaching, scholarly activities, and service. An overall evaluation is also provided based on the results from the evaluation form. The letter of evaluation, signed by the faculty member, is forwarded to the Dean for further evaluation.

*Section 5. Tenure (see Appendix I for criteria)*

Excellence in scholarship, significant demonstration of teaching effectiveness, and tangible evidence of service to the university, community and profession justify the decision to be considered for tenure.

During the tenure earning years the faculty member, in pursuing activities listed on the *Criteria for Annual Evaluation*, should seek critiques and guidance from the assigned mentors, as well as other colleagues within the university.

Mid-Tenure review will take place at the end of the third year. The faculty member will put together a dossier consisting of a list of contributions to research, teaching, and service, current CV, summary of scholarly productivity and accomplishments, teaching evaluations, and service contributions. Documentation to support accomplishments is encouraged. Letters of evaluation from outside the department are not necessary for the mid-tenure review process. The candidate will supply the CEDB Director with the dossier who will then forward it to the Chair of the Academic Department if appropriate. The dossier will then be evaluated according to the by-laws of CEDB and the academic department in which they are seeking tenure.

*Section 6.* Promotion (see Appendix I for criteria)

Excellence in scholarship, significant demonstration of teaching effectiveness, and tangible evidence of service to the university, community and profession justify the yearly reappointment of an assistant professor.

To be promoted to Associate Professor, the candidate must show continued meeting or exceeding Center expectations for performances in research and significant contributions to teaching excellence. Leadership in service to the department, college, university, and profession should be shown.

Substantial and tangible contributions in scholarship, as recognized by peers external to the university, in the area of expertise justify promotion to the rank of Professor. The professor must show continued performances of excellent teaching, and carry out major responsibilities in service within and/or beyond the university.

CEDB faculty candidates for promotion shall be evaluated according to the by-laws of CEDB and the academic department (if appropriate) in which they are seeking promotion.

*Section 7.* CEDB staff members hired as Research Associates

The University extends the annual evaluation criteria defined in Department/Unit bylaws for staff member's performance for consideration of promotion to Senior Research Associate. A staff member's eligibility for promotion to Senior Research Associate shall reflect the annual evaluation ratings (inclusive of both the Dean and Center Director ratings) received by the staff member and are based on the annual assignment letter. It is expected that these staff members' duties will fall primarily in research and scholarly activities, but may also include service and student mentoring. During the pre-promotion window, a staff member receiving consistent "Meets Expectations" annual evaluation

ratings in research and scholarly activities and other assigned duties shall constitute the standard for successful promotion to the rank of Senior Research Associate.

*Section 8. Post Tenure Review*

The University of West Florida adheres to the Florida Board of Governors' Regulation 10.003 as well as article 11 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, in all matters relating to post-tenure review.

All tenured full-time faculty in CEDB are evaluated for sustained performance every five years. For faculty hired with tenure, the hire date shall constitute the date of the last promotion. Evaluation is based on criteria set for tenure status in CEDB. Faculty receiving an "Unsatisfactory" Post Tenure Review will receive a notification of non-renewal of their contract. As defined by the State of Florida Board of Governors, a ranking of Unsatisfactory indicates failure to meet expectations that reflect disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in applicable university regulations and policies. Faculty who receive a rating of "Does not meet expectations" must construct a performance enhancement plan in consultation with the center Director and HMCSE Dean outlining measures to correct deficiencies. The plan must be approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The plan must include a deadline for the faculty member to achieve the requirements of the performance improvement plan. The deadline may not extend more than 12 months past the date the faculty member receives the improvement plan. Each faculty member who fails to meet the requirements of a performance improvement plan by the established deadline shall receive a notice of termination from the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

*Section 9. Summer Supplemental Contract Opportunities*

All full-time faculty are given the opportunity to teach during the summer term contingent upon large enough class enrollment, and programmatic needs in the relevant academic department.

*Section 10. Office Hours*

All faculty teaching a face-to-face lecture section are required to meet a posted schedule of office hours in accordance with the by-laws of the academic department in which they are teaching.

*Section 11: Allocation of Paid Overload Appointments*

Paid overload appointments will be granted by the Dean as needed to fulfill the teaching obligations of the department in which CEDB faculty are teaching.

*Section 12:* Faculty Development

CEDB is committed to assisting faculty development. To facilitate planning, faculty requesting sabbaticals will notify the CEDB Director. Faculty requesting release time for curriculum and/or research development should present the plan to the Director for review. Release time can only be granted by the Provost or Dean.

**8. Center Resources**

*Section 1.* Budgeting

The CEDB Director maintains control of center budgets. In addition to salaries and stipends, in consultation with CEDB faculty, Center resources may be used to support professional development, research program development, or Center infrastructure.

*Section 2.* Equipment

CEDB facility and equipment resources are available to all CEDB faculty and staff researchers in support of the mission of CEDB.

**9. Amendments to Bylaws**

Any amendment to the CEDB Bylaws and Standing Rules must come through petition of a faculty member and subsequent discussion and approval by the center as a whole.

**10. Revision History**

April 2018

February 2024

**APPENDIX I**  
**CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL DIAGNOSTICS & BIOREDIATION**  
**PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA**

The CEDB supports the University assertion that a candidate for tenure and promotion must demonstrate expertise in the areas of research, teaching, and service. Requirements must align with University of West Florida guidelines. CEDB faculty seeking promotion and tenure must adhere to the CEDB by-laws and the academic department in which they are seeking or have been granted tenure as appropriate. In this regard, requirements for tenure and promotion may be different for two faculty members within CEDB. It is also expected, however, that the CEDB Director and academic department chair work together to establish changes in departmental requirements owing to the greater scholarly activity performance expectation of CEDB faculty and reduced teaching load requirements. The criteria that must be met for research, teaching, and service contributions will reflect the relative distribution of assigned duties stated on the candidate's contracts over the period of evaluation. The candidate must provide a summary of how the relative distribution of duties was estimated, and copies of all contract assignments for the period of evaluation must be available in the tenure/promotion packet. The CEDB Director and department Chair must approve the summary allocation of duties (research, teaching, service) in writing in the form of the letters of assignment. The standard CEDB 9-month contract is 6 contact hours of teaching (0.25 FTE).

**A. TEACHING**

The faculty member must demonstrate competence in teaching while contributing to the instructional needs of departmental programs. The faculty member will develop and instruct lecture/laboratory course(s) in area(s) of expertise and assist at all levels of instruction in a collegial atmosphere.

Specific requirements for teaching are referenced in the by-laws of the academic department in which the CEDB faculty candidate is teaching.

**B. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES**

Candidates for tenure and promotion must carry out the following activities:

- Conduct original research and contribute to the discovery, application, integration, and teaching of knowledge
- Secure extramural competitively awarded grants
- Involve undergraduate and graduate students in the research activities, including chairing master's thesis committees
- Communicate results at professional meetings
- Publish results in peer-reviewed journals, books or monographs

- Contribute to the University goals on issues of regional, statewide, national, and international concerns.

The candidate for tenure must establish an area of research specialty in the discipline. The research laboratory must be functional and active, involving undergraduate and/or graduate student participation. The candidate's scholarly activity must be recognized by peers external to the University. It is expected that a CEDB candidate seeking tenure and promotion to associate professor publish a minimum of eight peer-reviewed manuscripts focused on scholarly activities conducted since starting as a tenure-seeking faculty member at University of West Florida. At least four of those articles must have the candidate as 1<sup>st</sup> or corresponding author. The remaining publications may be a peer-reviewed or edited research or education-based journal article(s), book chapter(s), or technical report(s), where the candidate is a co-author.

The candidate for promotion to associate professor must establish significant and tangible scholarship in the area of expertise. The candidate's scholarly activity must be recognized by peers external to the University. The candidate must publish at least eight peer-reviewed publications, four of which must be peer-reviewed research articles with the candidate as 1<sup>st</sup> or corresponding author. The remaining publications may be peer-reviewed or edited research or education-based journal article(s), book chapter(s), or technical report(s), where the candidate is a co-author.

Substantial and highly tangible contributions in scholarship, as recognized by peers external to the university, in the area of expertise justify promotion to the rank of professor. Candidates for promotion to Professor must publish at least ten peer-reviewed publications since their last promotion, four of which must be peer-reviewed research articles with the candidate as 1<sup>st</sup> or corresponding author. The remaining publications may be peer-reviewed or edited research or education-based journal article(s), book chapter(s), or technical report(s), where the candidate is a co-author.

#### **C. SERVICE**

The candidate for tenure must show tangible evidence of service to the University, community and profession. Leadership in service to the department, college, and University must be shown by the candidate for promotion to associate professor. The candidate for professor must demonstrate the ability to shoulder major responsibilities in service within and/or beyond the University including leadership roles.

#### **D. EXTRAMURAL SUPPORT: GRANTS AND CONTRACTS**

The candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor must be awarded at least one externally funded competitive research grant, contract, or other source of support from an organization outside of The University of West Florida.



The candidate for promotion to professor must be awarded at least two externally funded research grants, contracts, or other sources of support from an organization outside of The University of West Florida, while in rank as associate professor.

-----

**APPENDIX II**  
**CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL DIAGNOSTICS & BIOREMEDIATION**  
**ANNUAL EVALUATIONS**

Faculty members are required to submit a statement and documentation of accomplishments on a yearly basis at the end of spring semester for annual review and evaluation by the CEDB Director in conjunction with the Chair of the academic department in which they are teaching and or seeking or have been awarded tenure. The evaluation is then sent to the Dean of the Hal Marcus College of Science and Engineering. Faculty members are evaluated and receive rankings (unsatisfactory, does not meet expectations, meets expectations, exceeds expectations) in three areas: research, teaching, and service. They also receive an overall combined ranking.

Specific guidelines for annual evaluations will be provided by the by-laws of CEDB and the academic department in which the CEDB faculty member are teaching and or seeking or has been awarded tenure. Adjustments to those expectations will be agreed upon by the CEDB director and academic chair, especially regarding increased scholarly activities expectations and reduced teaching load requirements.

The overall combined ranking is made by the Director of CEDB based on all activities in research, teaching, and service. The assessment includes considering the degree of accomplishment in each area as it relates to the others to weight each area in arriving at the overall ranking. The Director will assess the faculty member based on their performance according to the annual letter of assignment and will include the faculty member's contributions to the department above and beyond those guidelines as observed by the Director.

**Criteria for Annual Evaluation for Teaching:**

To be agreed upon by the CEDB Director and Academic Department Chair.

**Criteria for Annual Evaluation for Service:**

As determined by CEDB by-laws.

**Criteria for Annual Evaluation for Research & Scholarly Activities:**

As determined by CEDB by-laws.

**Research & Scholarly Activity (areas of effort) Categories**

**1. Publications (Refereed)**

Journals: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)

Technical reports: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)

Proceedings full paper: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)

Books as author: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)

Books as editor: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)

Chapters in books: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)

**2. Publications (Non-refereed)**

- Technical reports: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
- Proceedings full paper: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
- Books as author: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
- Books as editor: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
- Chapters in books: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
- 3. Meeting/Conference: international, national, regional, local
  - Presentations
  - Invited speaker
- 4. External grants/contracts (Reviewed)
  - Federal: submitted, new awards, continuing
  - State: submitted, new awards, continuing
  - Local: submitted, new awards, continuing
  - Private: submitted, new awards, continuing
- 5. External grants/contracts (Non-reviewed)
  - Federal: submitted, new awards, continuing
  - State: submitted, new awards, continuing
  - Local: submitted, new awards, continuing
  - Private: submitted, new awards, continuing
- 6. Internal grants/contracts: submitted, new awards, continuing
- 7. Student Research
  - Graduate student: chair of MS thesis committee, MS thesis committee member, activities in support of faculty research
  - Undergraduate student: thesis, activities in support of faculty research
- 8. Other Activities
  - Abstracts: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
  - Patents on products related to field of study: filed, awarded
  - Workshops attended related to field of study
- 9. Awards related to field of study

For the purpose of Annual Evaluations, manuscripts and research proposals that have been submitted will be considered. However, to meet expectations for promotion and tenure, manuscripts must have been accepted for publication and research proposals must have been funded.

### **Research: CEDB Standard**

Individuals in tenured/tenure earning positions in CEDB are expected to participate in research and scholarly activities. The following standard is based on a 1:1 fall:spring teaching load, the standard assignment for CEDB faculty members. Individuals are expected to perform at least 9 activities in at least 3 categories. The activities listed are not exhaustive and actual ranking is the discretion of the director based on the quality and scope of the activities. For annual evaluations, faculty members are responsible for justifying their proposed ranking including addition of activities not listed above.

### **Research: Evaluation Ranking & Indicators**

#### **Unsatisfactory**

This performance level demonstrates serious problems in developing scholarship and creative projects as reflected by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative production is well below the Center standard.

Indicators:

- \* Scholarly agenda or creative plan has not been identified (e.g., central focus of career interest has not materialized)
- \* Minimal pursuit of scholarly and creative projects
- \* Avoidance of professional organization involvement that could help disseminate or display faculty work
- \* Failure to pursue expected professional enhancement activities (e.g., licensure, continuing education, technology training)
- \* Avoidance of grant exploration or pursuit
- \* Ethical regulations violated regarding scholarly or artistic production
- \* Poor time management strategies handicap work output

#### **Does not meet expectations**

This performance level demonstrates only minor tangible progress toward executing a scholarly and creative agenda as shown by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative projects are moderately below the departmental standard.

Indicators:

- \* General focus of interest identified
- \* Evidence of some completion of beginning stages of scholarly or artistic process (e.g., data collection, manuscript outline, artistic plan)
- \* Exploration of possible scholarly collaboration or resource network to help with specific plan
- \* Professional organizations identified that will support scholarly and creative goals
- \* Appropriate professional educational opportunities (e.g., licensure, technology training, special educational opportunities) identified
- \* Sources of external support for scholarship or creative activities agenda identified and explored
- \* Judgment about ethical standards for scholarly and artistic production may be problematic at times
- \* Questionable time management strategies limit production

### **Meets Expectations**

This performance level demonstrates tangible progress in scholarship or creative activity agenda as shown by the indicators below, and work falls within the departmental standards.

Indicators:

- \* Specific scholarly agenda or creative plan well suited to regional comprehensive university identified, including appropriate timelines and preferred dissemination or display venues
- \* Completed projects suggest the potential for significant, high-quality scholarship over the candidate's career.
- \* Meets department production targets for both quantity and quality of scholarship and or contributes to departmental production goals
- \* Appropriate professional educational opportunities pursued
- \* Involvement with professional organizations that will support scholarly or creative goals
- \* Grants developed and submitted to capture support
- \* Adheres to relevant ethics conventions for scholarly and creative projects
- \* Reasonably effective time management strategies contribute to success

### **Exceeds Expectations**

This performance level demonstrates unusually high degree of skill in design and execution of scholarly and creativity projects as shown by the indicators below that build upon the indicators for excellence. In general, scholarly and creativity projects exceed the standards of excellence of the department.

Indicators:

- \* Both quantity and quality measures clearly exceed department expectations
- \* National or international audience
- \* National or international recognition earned for quality
- \* Awards received for scholarly or creative projects
- \* Achievements in continuing professional training show unusual merit
- \* Strong record of grant pursuit, grant awards, successful completion, and dissemination of results
- \* Campus and/or disciplinary leadership in promoting scholarly and creative projects

### **Service: CEDB Standard**

#### **Activity (areas of effort) Categories**

#### 1. Institution (department, college, university)

Committee/council/task force as member

Committee/council/task force as chair

Institution sponsored activities: open house, orientations, recruitment.

Sponsorships for student organizations

#### 2. Profession

Associations/Societies: officer, committees, invited seminars

Journals: editorships, reviewer

Agencies: board memberships, reviewer

Meeting/conference: hosting, chairing sessions

Publishing houses: textbook reviews

3. Community
  - Invited seminars
  - Juror/Judge
  - Sponsor/participant outreach activities
4. Awards related to service

### **Service: Departmental Standard**

Individuals in CEDB are expected to participate in service-related areas including activities from at least two of the first three categories listed above with at least four activities total. Two activities may be single events (such as review of a manuscript); two activities must be recurring events (such as serving on a standing committee), one of the two recurring events must be from category 1 institutional activities.

### **Service: Evaluation Ranking & Indicators**

#### **Unsatisfactory**

This performance level demonstrates serious problems in fulfilling appropriate service role for faculty as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is absent.

Indicators:

- \* Service activity nonexistent or very poor in quality, producing a potentially adverse impact on the goals of the relevant organization
- \* Significance of the obligation of service in the faculty role in a regional comprehensive university not apparent (e.g., faculty seems resistant or oblivious to service needs)
- \* Community service, if any, does not in any way provide synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions

#### **Does not meet Expectations**

This performance level demonstrates only minor tangible progress in service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is moderately below the departmental standard.

Indicators:

- \* Appropriate arenas for service identified and explored
- \* Minimal contributions made in service role (e.g., "sits" on committees as compared to active participation)
- \* Recognition of service obligation in faculty role shapes consideration
- \* Over-commitment to service spreads faculty time too thinly to facilitate effectiveness
- \* Community service, if applicable, provides limited, tangential synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and service functions

#### **Meets Expectations**

This performance level demonstrates major tangible progress in relevant service contributions as shown by the indicators below.

- \* Emerging service agenda reflects reasonable expectation for rank. Scope and effort level meet department standards
- \* Selection of service activity expresses understanding of faculty service role in regional comprehensive university

- \* Usually participates actively and constructively in service activity
- \* Usually effective in service as citizen of department
- \* Community service, if applicable, provides reasonable synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions

### **Exceeds Expectations**

This performance level demonstrates high degree of skill in service contributions as shown by the indicators below that build upon indicators for excellence. In general, service contributions exceed the standards of excellence of the department.

Indicators:

- \* Leadership demonstrated in targeted arenas of service (e.g., holds elected office; collaborates skillfully and innovatively)
- \* Problems solved proactively through vigorous contributions
- \* Wide external recognition (local, national or international audiences) or awards achieved for quality of service contributions
- \* Community service, if applicable, provided significant and measurable impact; service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions