

Department of Engineering
Faculty Evaluation Metrics for Annual Activity

Adopted by Consensus 10 Nov 2017

Note: Overall rating must *exceed* 2.0 for consideration for merit raise. Overall rating will be computed from a weighted average based on research / teaching / service. Any item failing to meet the “Standard” rating level will be considered “Unsatisfactory” (rating of 1). For faculty in probationary period (*i.e.*, prior to application for promotion to associate professor and/or tenure), ratings of “high” will correspond to satisfactory progress toward tenure, as the “high” rating requirements will correspond to the requirements for promotion and tenure for the School of Engineering and Computing Sciences, as published in the Faculty Handbook of the College of Science and Engineering.

Unless otherwise noted, evaluations will be based on a three-year running average, using the year for which the faculty member is being evaluated plus the previous two years. So, for example, a requirement might read “Two publications in the last three years” or “\$X of research funding over the past three years.” In some cases, there will be requirements for *annual* achievements, and these will be noted. Administrative releases will be counted the same as teaching load (*i.e.*, a person with a one-course-per-semester release and 2:2 teaching load will be evaluated the same as a person with a 3:3 teaching load).

Research

Note: It is recognized that the Department of Engineering does not as yet have a graduate program. This is taken into account in the research productivity targets outlined below.

Note: Journal publications will be counted in the year of their citations (so *e.g.* if in citing the article, an author uses 2017 in the citation, that article will count in 2017) ; this will avoid “double counting” of journal publications. Ratings may be fractions of the stated number, depending on the level of the conference where presentations are made, the level of the journal in which the publications appear, or the source of the external funding. The level of publication will be based on the reputation of the journal (*e.g.*, *Transactions of the ASME*, *IEEE*, *AIAA Journal*, *etc.*) or the impact factor for lesser-known journals.

Note: The proposals that will be counted in the evaluation criteria listed below are those to external agencies that are competitive in nature. Awarded internal proposals (such as TAMU-CC research development proposals) will be considered and will count towards the amounts listed. Grant proposals may include equipment proposals if funding comes from a state or national agency.

Note: For tenure-track professors in probationary period, per the School of ENCS appendix in the COSE Faculty Handbook, the requirement for promotion to associate professor and tenure is a total of three journal publications at the end of the first five years. Thus, someone being evaluated after the completion of the fifth year of service should have, at a minimum, three journal publications.

3:3 teaching load

Standard (rating of 2): For three-year period, at least two presentations (oral or paper) of research results at regional or national conferences *or* two sponsorships of student teams at competitions *or* for student research paper presentations, and at least two submitted grant proposals

High (rating of 3): For three-year period, accomplishment of Standard level plus one published journal paper; *and* three or more research proposals submitted *or* research funding averaging \$25,000 per year for one or more years awarded

Excellent (rating of 4): For three year period, accomplishment of Standard level plus two or more published journal papers; and research funding averaging \$50,000 per year for one or more years awarded

2:2 teaching load

Standard (rating of 2): For three-year period, at least one research publication and at least two research paper presentations at regional or national conferences *or* sponsorships of student teams at competitions or for student research paper presentations, and at least two submitted grant proposals

High (rating of 3): For three-year period, accomplishment of Standard level plus two published journal papers; and research funding averaging \$50,000 per year for two or more years awarded

Excellent (rating of 4): For three-year period, accomplishment of Standard level plus three published journal papers; and research funding averaging \$100,000 per year for two or more years awarded; **OR** accomplishment of Standard level plus one or more journal papers and research funding averaging \$200,000 per year for two or more years awarded

1:2 or 1:1 teaching load

Standard (rating of 2): For three-year period, at least two published journal papers; and four paper presentations at regional or national conferences *or* two papers and sponsorships of student teams at competitions or for student research paper presentations; and at least three submitted grant proposals

High (rating of 3): For three-year period, accomplishment of Standard level plus two published journal papers; and research funding averaging \$75,000 per year for one or more years awarded

Excellent (rating of 4): For three-year period, accomplishment of Standard level plus three published journal papers; and research funding averaging \$150,000 per year for two or more years awarded; **OR** accomplishment of Standard level plus two or more journal papers and research funding averaging \$300,000 per year for two or more years awarded

Teaching

The ratings will take into account the teaching load for each instructor (see below) and the “teaching portfolio” as expressed through Digital Measures (new course developments, innovations in teaching, *etc.*). Significant improvement in courses or development of course materials, development of new courses, development of new teaching technologies, advising of student capstone teams, *etc.*, may merit an increase to the next level, depending on the degree of effort involved.

Standard (rating of 2): For three-year period, student evaluation scores for two of three years no more than one-half standard deviation below the average student evaluation score for the department *or* two acceptable peer observation of teaching scores (scores may be mitigated by large class sizes, first-time teaching of courses, material reported in the “teaching portfolio,” *etc.*)

High (rating of 3): A student evaluation score of more than one-half standard deviation above the average student evaluation score for the department or university / external recognition of teaching for the year for which evaluation is being conducted; *or* an improvement of at least one-half standard deviation over the previous year's evaluation; *or* a significant improvement in the peer observation of teaching; *or* university recognition for teaching (scores may be mitigated by large class sizes, first-time teaching of courses, material reported in the "teaching portfolio," *etc.*).

Excellent (rating of 4): A student evaluation score at least 1.5 times the standard deviation above the average student evaluation score for the department or university / external recognition of teaching for the year for which evaluation is being conducted; *or* an improvement of at least one standard deviation over the previous year's evaluation; *or* a significant improvement in the peer observation of teaching; *or* university or external recognition for teaching (scores may be mitigated by large class sizes, first-time teaching of courses, material reported in the "teaching portfolio," *etc.*).

Service

Since service is generally a relatively small fraction of the total workload assignment for each faculty member, the standards will be the same for all teaching loads (those with lighter teaching loads generally having a larger research expectation, so essentially all faculty have more or less the same expectations for service). Ratings may be fractions of the standing number, depending on the level of service (*e.g.* serving on an elected University committee will merit a somewhat higher rating than serving on an elected College of Science and Engineering committee, *etc.*). Administrative assignments will also be considered.

Standard (rating of 2): Any *two* of the following: Participation in at least two "stand-alone" (*i.e.*, one-day or single-event) outreach activities or service on a departmental committee *or* service on a college-level committee or on a national / international conference organization committee *or* serving as an advisor to a student organization *or* reviewer for at least three journal articles

High (rating of 3): Service on an elected college or university committee or Faculty Senate or on a national / international (standing) technical committee or as a regional officer of a national or international organization

Excellent (rating of 4): Chairing an elected college or university committee or Faculty Senate or chairing a national / international (standing) technical committee or chairing a national / international conference or as a national officer or fellow of a national or international organization