

DEPARTMENT OF MECHATRONICS ENGINEERING

FACULTY PROMOTION AND TENURE

Approved 2018

BACKGROUND

The promotion and tenure policies of the University System of Georgia are contained in the Policy Manual of the Board of Regents. Policies of Kennesaw State University contain additional elements that reflect the history, structure, and identity of the university and are found in the Kennesaw State University Faculty Handbook. Policies of the Department of Mechatronics Engineering at KSU contain additional elements that reflect the vision, mission and identity of the program. The process for promotion or tenure at Kennesaw State University culminates in the president's recommendation to the Board of Regents, which is the final authority on promotion and/or tenure decisions.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to set forth the Department of Mechatronics Engineering's standards and procedures for awarding promotion and/or tenure to the department's faculty members. It is based upon the policies and procedures of the University System of Georgia and the policies and procedures of the Kennesaw State University. It is intended as supplemental to such policies and procedures and does not supplant such policies, procedures or criteria therein listed. The document has been approved by the Mechatronics Engineering Peer Committee (Tenure and Promotion Committee), Department Faculty Council, and submitted to the department chair and the dean for implementation.

Several working assumptions were identified during the course of the document's preparation. A set of promotion and tenure standards and procedures for the Department of Mechatronics Engineering at KSU shall:

1. be compatible with standards and procedures operating at the University level;
2. clearly identify those qualities which are of value to the Department of Mechatronics Engineering, but which may be distinct from those of other academic units within the University;
3. focus on standards which can be implemented in a spirit of consistency and fairness;
4. reflect the collective understanding and will of the Mechatronics Engineering faculty regarding their responsibilities as members of that faculty;
5. establish standards which ensure maintenance of the highest degree of excellence within the Department of Mechatronics Engineering;
6. provide a meaningful role for peer review, thereby further safeguarding the collective interest of the Department of Mechatronics Engineering faculty;

7. provide meaningful guidance and assistance to the dean, the department chair and the faculty as a whole in matters of faculty evaluation in the process of promotion and tenure;
8. be stated in a clear and unambiguous manner, thereby minimizing the dangers of confusion and misinterpretation.

FACULTY PERFORMANCE

Faculty performance in the Department of Mechatronics Engineering is evaluated following the general guidelines established in the College and University guidelines. The key points of these general guidelines are:

- The Faculty Performance Agreement;
- The Annual Review Document;
- Definitions of scholarly activity and scholarship;
- For tenure and/or promotion of tenured/tenure track faculty, external letters are required.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

TEACHING CREDENTIALS

The Department of Mechatronics Engineering recognizes the minimum qualifications for employment stipulated by the University System of Georgia (803.01.02). The Department of Mechatronics Engineering also recognizes the credentials for promotion and tenure as stipulated in the KSU Faculty Handbook (3.5 General Expectations for Tenure, Promotion and Post-tenure Review). In keeping with the current university requirements for hire, the Department of Mechatronics Engineering asserts the necessity of an earned Doctorate Degree or terminal degree in the field of expertise as a requirement for hire in Professorial ranks. The Department of Mechatronics Engineering is committed to the advancement of traditional scholarship, professional practice and creative activity. To be considered for promotion or tenure in Professorial ranks in the Department of Mechatronics Engineering, a faculty member must meet the following minimum requirement

- Ph.D. or Doctorate – An earned doctoral degree appropriate to the discipline and from an accredited/recognized institution.

For promotion of non-tenure track Lecturers to Senior Lecturer, a faculty member must meet the following minimum requirements

- M.S. – An earned master's degree appropriate to the discipline and from an accredited/recognized institution, AND
- Professional licensure – U.S. license appropriate to the departmental disciplines. Faculty applicants holding licenses from foreign countries must first obtain reciprocity to satisfy this requirement.

TIME IN RANK

The Department of Mechatronics Engineering recognizes the provision in the KSU Faculty Handbook for the granting of credit toward promotion and tenure, but prefers that new hires pursue, at the outset, a five-year probationary period. The Department of Mechatronics Engineering acknowledges that the existing university's guidelines also provide for the possibility of any faculty to request early review within the promotion and tenure process. The Department of Mechatronics Engineering recommends the latter course of action versus the seeking of credit by those new hires believing their background justifies compressing the traditional five year probationary period.

CATEGORIES FOR EVALUATION FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

The Department of Mechatronics Engineering recognizes the criteria for promotion and tenure as outlined in the KSU Faculty Handbook (3.5 General Expectations for Tenure, Promotion and Post-tenure Review). Evidence for consideration of promotion and tenure should be referenced according to the three categories of evaluation identified under KSU Faculty Handbook (3.3 Basic Categories of Faculty Performance) Evaluation of Faculty- Faculty Ratings Form. Those categories are as follows:

1. Teaching, Mentoring, and Supervising
2. Research and Creative Activity
3. Professional Service

CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

Faculty candidates for tenure and for promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate evidence of “noteworthy” achievement in the faculty performance categories of 1) Teaching, Mentoring, and Advising, and 2) Research and Creative Activity. A minimum level of “satisfactory” must be evidenced in the faculty performance category of 3) Professional Service.

Candidates for Professor must also achieve a minimum of “noteworthy” in 1) Teaching, Mentoring, and Advising and 2) Research and Creative Activity, with a minimum of “satisfactory” in 3) Professional Service. Additionally, the candidate must show evidence of mastering Associate Professor criteria, establishing himself or herself as a highly effective and highly accomplished teacher and scholar. This should include assuming significant leadership roles in institutional and/or professional groups.

Promotion to Senior Lecturer requires a minimum of “noteworthy” in 1) Teaching, Mentoring, and Advising, and a minimum of “satisfactory” in 2) Research and Creative Activity and 3) Professional Service, assuming these categories are included in the faculty's workload model.

Definitions the Southern Polytechnic College of Engineering and Engineering Technology uses five terms to define levels of achievement in the annual evaluation, promotion and tenure, pre-tenure, post-tenure, and promotion processes. The five levels are “exemplary”, “noteworthy”, “satisfactory”, “unsatisfactory”, and “unacceptable” and are defined by the Annual Faculty Evaluation Guidelines appended to this document.

Teaching, Mentoring and Supervising

The Department of Mechatronics Engineering asserts that, as criteria for promotion and tenure, a faculty member must demonstrate teaching effectiveness. An effective educator shall:

1. demonstrate proficiency in, and continued pursuit of, the subject matter to which their teaching responsibilities have been assigned.
2. demonstrate the ability to achieve the objectives of the courses being taught.
3. demonstrate an ability to recognize a student's talents and abilities and to foster them
4. demonstrate leadership.

Listed below (with no attempt to suggest any rank order) are some types of evidence to support performance of a faculty member as teacher and educator.

1. Course and Curriculum Development

- A. Development of new courses and laboratory experiences, or new approaches to teaching.
- B. Extensive work in curriculum revision or teaching methods for the college or department.

2. Teaching Skills and Methods

- A. Summaries of student evaluations for all courses taught during the previous four years or since initial hire.
- B. Summaries of feedback from students, peer reviews, administration reviews, alumni, and other meaningful sources.
- C. Evidence that feedback has been continuously and effectively used to improve teaching performance, where appropriate.
- D. Participation in programs, conferences, or workshops designed to improve teaching skills.
- E. Awards or other forms of recognition for outstanding teaching.

3. Education Activities

- A. Supervision of independent Study courses, Thesis projects, Honors Thesis, Graduate Thesis, Dissertations, Field Trips, and Internships.
- B. Supervision of students working in instructional activities, such as lectures, laboratories, recitations, self-paced instruction or tutoring.
- C. Visiting Critic, Guest Lecturer, Guest Evaluator at other Schools, Departments of Engineering.

D. Specialized teaching for honors students or for other types of special programs.

Research and Creative Activity

An effective educator shall set an example in scholarship appropriate to the discipline. In keeping with the Department of Mechatronics Engineering's commitment to the advancement of traditional scholarship, professional practice and creative activity, accomplishments in the area of academic achievement are expected to be of high quality and of scholarly, artistic and/or professional significance.

Research and Creative Activity is broadly defined to encompass a wide array of activities that contribute to the advancement of knowledge, understanding, application, problem solving, and pedagogy. It includes the scholarship of discovery, integration, interpretation, application, as well as the scholarship of pedagogy and learning both within and across disciplines, and professional practice. Activity in these areas becomes Research and Creative Activity when the work is formally shared with others and thus is subject to review of its quality, value and significance. To provide objective evaluation of creative and professional activities, the program may enlist the use of external peer reviews.

Research and Creative Activity will be considered for tenure and promotion evaluation if it is relevant to the faculty's research, teaching, and/or professional work and if it serves to advance their field or cognate disciplines. In cases where scholarship is a joint effort with others, there must be clear evidence that the individual under consideration has taken a leading role in conducting the work.

Listed below (with no attempt to suggest any rank) are some types of evidence to support Research and Creative Activity in the areas of scholarship and professional practice:

Scholarship

1. Research. It is assumed that output in this area will make original contributions to the body of knowledge about Mechatronics Engineering, Mechatronics Engineering practice, or Mechatronics Engineering education (this category could include teaching innovations when they are undertaken with a research perspective and are applicable to the field in general). Efforts in this form of scholarship are expected to be in areas consistent with a faculty member's academic preparation and teaching assignments. In many respects, this type of scholarship comes closest to the type of scholarship normally produced in a university. However, reviewers must be aware of the caveat regarding funding indicated below when judging a Mechatronics Engineering faculty member's contribution in this area.

2. Grants and Sponsored Programs. Consideration should be given to the development of research proposals reviewed by external bodies, the securing of funding, the ability to engage and support graduate students, the execution of the project, and the critical evaluation of the finished project. It should be recognized that, funding for the emerging discipline of mechatronics tends to lap into other areas: architecture, computer technology, mechanical or electrical engineering, etc. Few funding programs exist that sponsor strictly Mechatronics Engineering research. Consideration should be also given to the prestige of the funding agency, the impact or the potential of the impact of the work, and the value of the grant.

3. **Unfunded Research.** Because of the circumstances indicated above, some valuable research might have to be accomplished without funding. In these cases, consideration should be given to the dissemination of this research through publications, presentations, and lectures (see below). External reviewers may also be asked to give assessments of the quality and importance of this work, its relevance to the field, and its potential to garner future funding or dissemination opportunities. In the case of work in its beginning stages, it is expected that the candidate would include a development plan that indicates possible funding sources and venues for dissemination.

4. **Publication of Research Work.** Consideration should be given to the status of the publication (refereed/non-refereed; national distribution; and professional, scholastic, trade, or popular journal) and the scope of the work (book, chapter in a book, article, or abstract).

5. **Reviews and Citations.** Consideration should be given to the quality of the work as reviewed in journals and to the frequency with which the candidate's research work is cited or serves as a platform for another researcher.

6. **Papers Presented.** One of the avenues for dissemination of research work is the presentation of papers at professional conferences. Consideration should be given to the level of the conference (international, national, or regional), whether the papers are refereed or not, and the amount of involvement in the conference (paper given, moderator, panelist). The paper's inclusion in the published proceedings of the conference should also be considered.

7. **Invited Lectures.** Consideration should be given to the status of the sponsor and the audience (university, association, professional organization, and researchers), the scope of the presentation (a series of lectures, a single lecture, or a keynote address), the area of scholarship represented, and critical reviews.

8. **Proposal Reviewers and Editorial Boards.** The candidate's status might result in invitations to serve on professional or academic panels that review proposals for funding, to referee papers for inclusion in professional or academic conferences, or to sit on editorial boards of professional or academic journals. Consideration should be given to the scope of the work; the prestige of the panel, conference or journal; and the reputation of fellow reviewer's or editorial board members.

9. **Awards.** Consideration should be given to the type of award given (international, national, regional, or local), whether the award is for a particular piece of research or a body of work, and the prestige of the awarding agency.

10. The faculty candidate must demonstrate the relevancy of scholarship to his or her teaching responsibilities.

Professional Practice

1. Professional Consultation and Practice. It is assumed that work in this area would demonstrate a contribution to the profession, represent a creative or intellectual stretch beyond normal practice, or be recognized by awards or publication. It is also recognized that contributions in this form of scholarship are difficult and usually slow to develop. Success often depends on several participants beyond the control of the faculty member, and appropriate recognition of contributions is usually accorded to a very small percentage of endeavors. Yet, efforts in this type of scholarship are very important to a professional program. Evidence of work should be documented through. Efforts in this form of scholarship are expected to be in areas consistent with a faculty member's academic preparation and teaching assignments.
2. Professional Engineering License (or closely related as determined by the department promotion and tenure peer committee). Successful completion of licensure examination is in itself an accomplishment and represents a level of capability to be legally trusted to perform engineering design. It also signifies a desire to engage in professional activity in Mechatronics Engineering.
3. Professional Commissions. While securing commissions to do engineering work does not usually represent normal peer evaluation; it sometimes is the result of a process that involves competition for the project. Consideration should be given to the selection process, the prominence of the project, and the reputation of the client.
4. Design Awards. Consideration should be given to the status of the awards program itself (national, regional, state, or local), the sponsor of the awards program (Professional societies, trade organizations, or material suppliers), the reputation of the awards program, and the prestige of the jury. Where it is possible to ascertain, the number of entries juried and the level of award should also be considered. Also to be considered are awards for a body of work and not just a single design.
5. Publication of Professional Work in Journals. Consideration should be given to the status of the publication (book, professional journal, trade magazine, popular journal, newspaper), its distribution (international, national, regional, local), and the type of coverage (featured article, article, mentioned as part of larger topic). For publication of teaching activities, consideration should be given to the status of the publication (book, professional journal - refereed or not -, trade magazine, popular journal), its distribution (international, national, regional, local), the type of coverage (featured article, article, mentioned as part of larger topic), and critical reception.
6. Competitions. Design competitions are one way of securing professional work. It is also a means by which a designer can explore ideas without securing a client. Consideration should be given to the level of competition (international, national, regional, or local), the number of entrants, the scope of the work, and the prestige of the sponsor and the jurors (thus the significance of the competition).
7. Exhibitions. Consideration should be given to the status of the exhibition, whether the entries were juried or not, the prestige of the exhibition's location, whether a one person show or one-piece in a larger exhibition, and documented critical reviews.

8. Invited Lectures. As a result of professional work, one might be invited to present in a lecture format either a single piece of work or a body of work. The importance here is the dissemination of information and the recognition of the importance of and interest in one's professional work. Consideration should be given to the significance of the audience and sponsor (a university, a professional society, a trade organization, or a civic group), to whether the sponsor is a national, regional, or local group, and to the scope of the presentation (a lecture, participation on a panel, a tour of the building).

9. Consulting. In the capacity of a professional, one might be asked to assist another organization in a consulting role. Consideration should be given to the nature and scope of the consulting (policy making, technical assistance, or application of expertise), the employing agency (a government group or agency, a private organization, or a firm), the impact of the consultation. Documentation (reviews, published articles or books giving credit to the faculty member, or evidence of the impact of the consulting) of the dissemination of this consultation should be considered.

10. The faculty candidate must demonstrate the relevancy of the Professional Practice to his or her teaching responsibilities.

Professional Service

An effective educator shall set an example in service appropriate to the discipline. KSU identifies areas of faculty service as follows:

1. Service to KSU and Program - service to KSU and the department comes in the form of committee activity and the necessary charges of any faculty in the daily and yearly academic functions of the program. Activities to assist and support students, Department, College, or University will be recognized as a valuable faculty service. Some types of faculty service are as follows: supporting student projects and organizations; promoting department outreach; and assisting special service needs of the College and University.

2. Service to the Profession - service to the profession comes in the form of the lending of expertise to professional organizations. It falls to the faculty to identify which subcategory the professional service applies. What professional community receives the service? Is the professional service to an academic organization (ABET, ASEE for example), to a professional organization (IEEE, ASME, ISA, AIAA for example)?

3. Service to the Community- service to the community comes in two forms;

A. The application of expertise pro bono to the community- serving a community organization in the capacity as an expert.

B. The application of one's personal time to a community organization- serving as a volunteer for a community organization or charity in a capacity that does not contribute your expertise.

The committee asserts that pro bono work (3.A) and the application of one's personal time (3.B) both are of value in establishing the faculty member as a role model of community involvement and activism for its students. Nevertheless, the committee also recognizes that the application of one's expertise pro bono to the community (3.A.) serves the greater goals of the program and KSU and therefore

carries more weight in the evaluation process for promotion and tenure.

TEACHING OUTSIDE THE AREA FOR WHICH A FACULTY IS HIRED

The normal practice of the Department of Mechatronics Engineering will be to assign faculty in their declared and demonstrated area of expertise. It may be necessary, however, due to unforeseen circumstances, to deviate from the norm to meet departmental needs in another area. Assignment is an administrative responsibility with due consideration to faculty desires and abilities. Faculty hired to teach in a certain area are expected, as a norm, to teach there. Permanent reassignments are subject to negotiation.

Appendix:

Southern Polytechnic College of Engineering & Engineering Technology Faculty Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

College of Engineering and Engineering Technology
FACULTY PROMOTION AND TENURE

BACKGROUND

The promotion and tenure policies of the University System of Georgia are contained in the Policy Manual of the Board of Regents. Policies of Kennesaw State University contain additional elements that reflect the history, structure, and identity of the university and are found in the Kennesaw State University Faculty Handbook. Policies of the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology at KSU contain additional elements that reflect the vision, mission and identity of the ~~program~~ **college**. The process for promotion or tenure at Kennesaw State University culminates in the president's recommendation to the Board of Regents, which is the final authority on promotion and/or tenure decisions.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to set forth the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology's standards for awarding promotion and/or tenure to the college's faculty members. It is based upon the policies and procedures of the University System of Georgia and the policies and procedures of the Kennesaw State University. It is intended as supplemental to such policies and procedures and does not supplant such policies, procedures or criteria therein listed.

Several working assumptions were identified during the course of the document's preparation. A set of promotion and tenure standards and procedures for the college shall:

1. be compatible with standards and procedures operating at the University level;
2. clearly identify those qualities which are of value to the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology, but which may be distinct from those of other academic units within the University;
3. focus on standards which can be implemented in a spirit of consistency and fairness;
4. reflect the collective understanding of the college faculty regarding their responsibilities as members of that faculty;
5. establish standards which ensure maintenance of the highest degree of excellence within the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology;
6. provide meaningful guidance and assistance to the dean, the department chair and the faculty as a whole in matters of faculty evaluation in the process of promotion and tenure;
7. be stated in a clear and unambiguous manner, thereby minimizing the dangers of confusion and misinterpretation.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE:

TIME IN RANK

The College of Engineering and Engineering Technology recognizes the provision in the KSU Faculty Handbook for the granting of credit toward promotion and tenure, but prefers that new hires pursue, at the outset, a five-year probationary period. The college acknowledges that the existing university's guidelines also provide for the possibility of any faculty to request early review within the promotion and tenure process. The college recommends the latter course of action versus the seeking of credit by those new hires believing their background justifies compressing the traditional five year probationary period.

CATEGORIES FOR EVALUATION FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

The College of Engineering and Engineering Technology recognizes the criteria for promotion and tenure as outlined in the KSU Faculty Handbook (3.5 General Expectations for Tenure, Promotion and Post-tenure Review). Evidence for consideration of promotion and tenure should be referenced according to the three categories of evaluation identified under KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.3, Basic Categories of Faculty Performance. The categories are as follows:

1. Teaching (a.k.a. Teaching, Advising & Mentoring)
2. Research and Creative Activity
3. Professional Service (a.k.a. Service)

CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

For the period of time evaluated, faculty candidates for tenure and for promotion must demonstrate evidence of “noteworthy” achievement in the faculty performance categories of 1) Teaching and, 2) Research and Creative Activity. A minimum level of “satisfactory” must be evidenced in the faculty performance category of 3) Professional Service.

Faculty candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor hired prior to Fall 2016 must demonstrate evidence of “noteworthy” achievement in the faculty performance categories of 1) Teaching and 2) ***at least one of the following performance categories***, Research and Creative Activity OR Professional Service. A minimum of “satisfactory” must be evidenced in all three categories.

The Southern Polytechnic College of Engineering and Engineering Technology uses five terms to define levels of achievement in the annual evaluation, promotion and tenure, pre-tenure, and post-tenure processes. The five levels are “exemplary”, “noteworthy”, “satisfactory”, “unsatisfactory”, and “unacceptable” and are defined by the Annual Faculty Evaluation Guidelines which follow.

**SOUTHERN POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE OF
ENGINEERING & ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY**

ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION GUIDELINES

TEACHING, ADVISING & MENTORING

The following five-point rating scale is provided for guidance in the evaluation of effective teaching performance.

Unacceptable

0. This faculty member neglects his/her duties with such actions as frequently not meeting classes, failing to prepare adequately for classes, refusing to accept teaching assignments when requested by the department chair or does not accept the faculty role of advisor and mentor. He/she receives poor teaching evaluations and does not assess whether his/her students have met the course outcomes. A substantial number of expectations in this area as outlined on their Faculty Performance Agreement are unmet and/or they did not satisfy the conditions of reassigned time.

Unsatisfactory

1. This faculty member meets his/her classes, but conducts them without enthusiasm or imagination. He/she might not keep regular office hours nor otherwise make himself/herself available to students. He/she might be continuing to use the same material from year to year, thereby not keeping up with developments in the discipline. This faculty member does not use the results of the outcomes assessment process to improve their courses. This faculty member might not cooperate in the planning of courses with multiple sections. Because of such performance, he/she will not be respected by colleagues and receives mediocre teaching evaluations. This faculty member might not accept the role as faculty advisor/mentor. A substantial number of expectations in this area as outlined on their Faculty Performance Agreement are unmet and/or they did not satisfy the conditions of reassigned time.

Satisfactory

2. This faculty member adequately fulfills duties in teaching and advising as required. He/she conducts classes, is available to students, is current in the discipline, uses a variety of teaching methods appropriate to the discipline being taught, and cooperates in departmental or college-wide teaching endeavors. This instructor is considered by his/her colleagues as a dependable member of the faculty and receives satisfactory teaching evaluations with Digital Measures scores usually higher than 2.5. If they have received reassigned time to do work in this area, they have met or exceeded the requirements of the agreement.

Noteworthy

3. This faculty member is imaginative and enthusiastic about teaching and advising, plans carefully, and carries through. His/her students find this instructor to be a stimulating classroom lecturer or leader of discussions. This teacher is very widely read in the discipline, explores new methods of teaching appropriate to the discipline being taught, continuously introduces into his/her courses the results of his/her own investigation. Both students and colleagues will recognize him as a very good teacher and receives Digital Measures scores normally 3.0 or higher. Continually tries to improve both the style and substance of the advising role by evaluating the effectiveness of his/her advising practices and willingly participating in advisor-training programs offered by the College for this purpose. If they have received reassigned time to do work in this area, they have met or exceeded the requirements of the agreement.

Exemplary

4. This faculty member is considered one of the best in the teaching and advising roles. He/she is highly imaginative, completely dependable, and in command of his/her discipline. This teacher generally receives excellent evaluations from both students and faculty. Digital Measures scores are in the 3.5+ range. Though he/she is demanding, this instructor is compassionate in his/her relationships with students and exerts every effort to be personally supportive. This professor may supervise students in research or independent study courses. He/she is recognized by faculty as a very good advisor. Students may request this faculty member as his/her advisor. If they have received reassigned time to do work in this area, they have exceeded the requirements of the agreement.

ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION GUIDELINES (cont.)

RESEARCH & CREATIVE ACTIVITY

The following five-point rating scale is provided for guidance in the evaluation of creative scholarly activity.

Unacceptable

0. This faculty member shows no interest in his/her discipline and does not read relevant material to keep current other than that required for class preparation. A substantial number of expectations in this area as outlined on their Faculty Performance Agreement are unmet and/or they did not satisfy the conditions of reassigned time.

Unsatisfactory

1. This faculty member reads in his/her discipline beyond textbooks and what is required for class preparation and attends professional events such as lectures, symposia, etc. A substantial number of expectations in this area as outlined on their Faculty Performance Agreement are unmet and/or they did not satisfy the conditions of reassigned time.

Satisfactory

2. This faculty member has demonstrated this year that he/she is successfully executing a plan for creative scholarly activity which includes professional development as detailed on their Faculty Performance Agreement. He/she published or has made significant progress towards the completion of a peer-reviewed publication or comparable intellectual contribution in their discipline *or engineering education*. For a consulting activity to be considered a comparable intellectual contribution, it must be scholarly and professional in nature. They hold membership in a discipline related professional organization and/or maintain/pursue professional licensure in their discipline. If they have received reassigned time to do work in this area, they have met or exceeded the requirements of the agreement.

Noteworthy

3. In any given year the hallmark of this faculty member's performance is organization and consistency in setting and achieving goals for creative scholarly activity and professional development as detailed on their Faculty Performance Agreement. He/she published or has made significant progress towards the completion of multiple peer-reviewed publications, an external proposal, or comparable intellectual contributions in their engineering discipline (i.e., not engineering education). For a consulting activity to be considered a comparable intellectual contribution, it must be scholarly and professional in nature. They hold membership in a discipline related professional organization and attend at least one professional meeting on a regular basis. They may have attended one or more state or regional workshops and/or maintain professional licensure in their discipline. If they have received reassigned time to do work in this

area, they have met or exceeded the requirements of-the agreement.

Exemplary

4. This year this person has exceeded the standards set forth in 3 above. This faculty member's publications and creative scholarly activity make him/her respected beyond the campus in his/her field. He/she has published in quality journals, presented at a national conference and/or submitted a grant proposal to a national funding agency. His/her scholarly or creative work has been judged as being excellent by his/her professional colleagues, i.e. awarded a fellowship, awarded a research grant, etc. Also, this person continues to demonstrate a higher level of independent functioning via a well-defined creative scholarly activity thrust or recognition in a specialized creative scholarly activity area. They maintain membership in one or more discipline related professional organizations and hold an office/position in at least one. They have attended two or more state, regional or national seminars or workshops and/or maintain professional licensure in their discipline. If they have received reassigned time to do work in this area, they have exceeded the requirements of the agreement.

ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION GUIDELINES (cont.)

SERVICE

The following five-point rating scale is provided for guidance in the evaluation of professional service activities.

Unacceptable

0. This faculty member performs University and professional service activities reluctantly and with minimum effort, participates in no professional programs, holds no offices in professional organizations, and performs no consulting work or similar activities. A substantial number of expectations in this area as outlined on their Faculty Performance Agreement are unmet and/or they did not satisfy the conditions of reassigned time.

Unsatisfactory

1. This faculty member serves on committees to which he/she is appointed, but makes no special effort to assist students, or the Department, College, or University. He/she frequently fails to cooperate with colleagues serving on committees. The faculty member maintains memberships in one or more professional organizations, but is seldom involved in organizational meetings, seminars, consulting work, or similar activities. A substantial number of expectations in this area as outlined on their Faculty Performance Agreement are unmet and/or they did not satisfy the conditions of reassigned time.

Satisfactory

2. This faculty member fulfills all student support activities and committee assignments effectively. He/she assists willingly in the special service needs of the Department, College, and University; serves on committees effectively; and earns the appreciation of colleagues. This person occasionally presents a continuing education training program for persons in his/her discipline and occasionally presents a civic or community training program or gives a civic or community talk related to their discipline. The faculty member occasionally serves as a paper reviewer, chair, or discussant, and occasionally performs unpaid consulting work or similar activities. If they have received reassigned time to do work in this area, they have met or exceeded the requirements of the agreement.

Noteworthy

3. This faculty member is considered very effective at student support, committee work, outreach and continuing education programs. He/she is occasionally selected to serve on or to chair important committees. Through such activities, this person earns university-wide respect and recognition for their program. The faculty member is well known throughout regional/national organizations within his/her discipline. The faculty member demonstrates this level of achievement by involvement in one or more of the following activities: attends professional

meetings of regional and/or national organizations and is frequently called upon to serve as a paper reviewer, chair, or discussant, and may serve as an officer; frequently performs unpaid consulting or training services for business groups within his/her discipline on and off campus; or similar activities. This faculty member may serve as faculty advisor to a student group. He/she volunteers at some community events, i.e. judge for local science fair, speaker at career day, etc. If they have received reassigned time to do work in this area, they have met or exceeded the requirements of the agreement.

Exemplary

4. This faculty member is highly respected throughout the campus for his/her student, committee and community work. This faculty member has distinguished himself/herself for work with students, committees, and continuing education, having received service-oriented awards or served with distinction on prestigious campus-wide committees. The faculty member may be the faculty advisor of a student competition team or organizer of a student competition. He/she may have been nominated or received a service-oriented award or served with distinction on a prestigious campus-wide committees. The faculty member has distinguished himself/herself in at least one professional organization supporting his/her discipline. The faculty member demonstrates this level of achievement in one or more of the following activities; holds regional or national office, appears on national professional programs, hosts a national or international conference, serves on editorial boards and may occasionally serves as editor of proceedings or journals or similar activities. He/she may be called upon for important unpaid consulting or training assignments by business or industry groups. If they have received reassigned time to do work in this area, they have exceeded the requirements of the agreement.

As approved by College T&P committee, CFC and Dean
10-3-2016