Faculty Evaluation Criteria
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

These criteria describe expectations to be applied in all faculty evaluations including tenure, promotion, post-tenure review, first-year review and annual evaluation. Faculty are evaluated on both quantity and quality of work in three areas of performance: teaching, research, and service. Each faculty member’s evaluation should be based on their annual workload agreements negotiated with the Department Chair prior to the start of the academic year.

1. Teaching

1.1 Basic Criteria for Annual Review

1.1.1 Quantity of Teaching. The number of courses taught is based on the percentage in the annual workload agreement according to university and college workload policies. A regular 3-hour undergraduate lecture class is 10% of annual teaching load. Other types of courses and teaching assignments have equivalent percentages which are listed in the university and college workload policies. If a faculty’s course does not make, it is the faculty’s responsibility to either take on additional teaching activities, or to request that the Department Chair change the percent time devoted to teaching. If faculty are assigned more teaching than is required by their percentage workload, this should be considered when determining their rating.

1.1.2 Responsibilities Outside Regular Classes. Faculty are expected to engage in each of the following mandatory duties as part of their teaching assignment.

a. Faculty should supervise at least one group of senior design students each year. If no senior design teams were supervised in the current semester, faculty should assist in evaluating final project presentations and demonstrations.

b. Faculty should demonstrate course improvements or curriculum development each year. This could be documented through new syllabi, new projects or assignments, or improvements in assessment results for students completing the courses.

c. Tenure-track faculty should document work with graduate students each year, toward the goal of supervising thesis students as committee chair. Tenured faculty should document work
with graduate students each year toward the goal of supervising thesis students as committee chair or member; supervision as thesis committee chair is more valuable.

1.1.3 Quality of Teaching. Faculty are expected to demonstrate effective teaching and a commitment to serving students.

a. Faculty should be available to students during office hours and by appointment and by e-mail.

b. Faculty should not miss class without approval from the Department Chair or delegate, and an approved plan to address the absence.

c. Faculty should cover appropriate and relevant content at an appropriate level, and must at a minimum cover the department approved baseline syllabus (if applicable).

d. Faculty should have peer evaluations with a rating of “meet expectations” or higher at least every three years for tenured faculty and senior lecturers, and at least annually for tenure-track faculty and other lecturers. If an evaluation is not satisfactory, the faculty must request additional peer evaluations to demonstrate improvement.

e. Faculty who meet expectations typically earn student evaluations (averaged over all courses in the review period) of 80%-90% (overall rating), with no course evaluated at less than 65%.

1.1.4 Additional Measures. Faculty may also show teaching effort through activities such as covering for absent faculty, attending teaching workshops or training, or holding out-of-class mentoring sessions for students. Faculty may show teaching excellence through student achievements, teaching awards, and other recognitions, and these may be considered by the review level in deciding whether to give a rating of “exceeds expectations” However, these activities cannot substitute for the basic responsibilities outlined above.

1.2 Additional Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

Faculty seeking tenure or promotion should have graduated one or more thesis students as Committee Chair over the period of review.

1.3 Additional Criteria for Post Tenure Review
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Tenured faculty should show that they have supervised graduate students either as committee chair or committee member.

2. Research

2.1 Basic Criteria for Annual Evaluation

The following are the minimum requirements to “Meet Expectations” in an annual review.

Faculty who had 10% of their time devoted to research must demonstrate engagement in research through one or more of the following outcomes:

• research publications and/or research conference presentations, or
• submission of an external proposal, or having an active grant or contract in which the faculty is recognized as key personnel by the funding agency, or
• student research resulting in a thesis or publication.

Faculty who had 20% of their time devoted to research

• must have published research in a refereed journal or conference proceeding, and
• must have submitted an external proposal as PI or co-PI, or have an active grant or contract, and
• must demonstrate that they have engaged students in their research. Examples of how engagement can be demonstrated are poster presentations by students, co-authorship of publications, and hiring of students as research assistants.

Faculty who had 30% of their time devoted to research

• must meet all the requirements for 20% time devoted to research, and
• must have produced two or more items in at least one of the following categories: (a) refereed journal articles or conference proceedings, (b) grant proposals, or (c) student research resulting in a completed thesis.

Faculty who had 40% of their time devoted to research

• must meet all the requirements for 30% time devoted to research, and
• must have an active external grant or contract, as PI or co-PI, which supports students as research assistants.

Faculty with more than 40% of their time devoted to research

• must meet all the requirements for 40% time devoted to research, and
• must show both quantitatively and qualitatively more productivity than is required for 40% in at least one of the following categories: (a) refereed journal articles or conference proceedings, (b) grant proposals, or (c) student research resulting in a completed thesis.

Note: Other forms of publication such as books, book chapters, and patents can count in place of journals and conference papers if it is shown that they went through a peer review or equivalent process.

2.2 Additional Criteria for Tenure or Promotion

The following criteria must be satisfied to meet expectations. The entire review period is considered; each criterion does not need to have been met every academic year.

• Faculty must have published two or more refereed journal articles during the review period. This requirement cannot be substituted with other forms of publication.
• Faculty must have involved students in research leading to student co-authorship of refereed journal or conference papers.
• Faculty must demonstrate that they can lead research efforts. At least some of the publications during the review period should have the faculty or the faculty’s research students as first authors. At least some of the proposals should be as PI, or lead at UTRGV in the case of multi-university proposals.

• Faculty must demonstrate that they can conduct independent research at UTRGV. At least some of the publications during the review period should describe work done primarily at UTRGV.

• Faculty must demonstrate that the quality of their research has been recognized in the professional community. This can be demonstrated through citations, journal impact factors, best paper awards, renewed or repeated external funding, external review letters, and similar measures.

2.3 Additional Criteria for Post-Tenure Review

In order to meet expectations in research, the total productivity over the review period should be at least five times that required for a single year. The work should not be concentrated in only one or two of the review years.

3. Service

3.1 Basic Criteria for Annual Evaluation

A wide variety of activities may benefit students, the department, the college, the university, the community, or the engineering profession. Different faculty may choose to engage in different types of service; however, some specific duties are required as listed below. The accomplishments presented at the end of the year should be consistent with the percent effort assigned. 20% is equivalent to an average of eight hours per week spent on service activities during regular semesters.

3.1.1 Mandatory Service Responsibilities. The following specific activities are essential for the success of the department and may not be substituted with other accomplishments to meet expectations:
a. All faculty must turn in completed rubrics for their senior design groups.

b. If assigned by the assessment coordinator, faculty must administer assessment tests or surveys and turn in the collected materials.

c. If assigned by the assessment coordinator, faculty must participate in analyzing assessment data and making recommendations for program improvement.

d. Faculty must demonstrate that they contributed to undergraduate and/or graduate student recruitment activities, which could include but are not limited to school visits, recruitment events, lab tours, development of presentation materials, mentoring potential applicants, judging in competition events, and recruiting graduate students.

e. Faculty must make themselves available for advisement for any student in the categories assigned to them by the undergraduate coordinator.

f. If a faculty was assigned release time for a specific task or activity, the faculty must demonstrate results related to that assignment.

3.1.2 Examples of Service Activities. The following list is not exclusive.

a. Student Service: Advisor for a student organization, work with competition teams, writing references and recommendations for students, helping students with extracurricular projects, helping students with career placement, and providing training and reviews for licensing exams.

b. Department, College, and University Service: Recruitment events, representing the department or college at public events, committee membership, chair of a committee, serving as coordinator for a project, assessment activities, working on accreditation self-study, working on program review, serving as judge or coordinator for poster presentations, developing websites and promotional materials, writing and grading comprehensive exams, maintaining laboratories and equipment.

c. Community Service: Presentations to community groups, serving on advisory boards, giving tours to visiting groups, HESTEC (Hispanic Engineering, Science, and Technology Week) community day, non-refereed articles for the general public, working with alumni, volunteer consulting.
d. Professional Service: Reviewer/referee for a journal or conference; service on technical program committees, organizing committees, standards committees; or editorial boards; editor or associate editor; external tenure or promotion reviewer for another university; thesis/dissertation committees at other universities; officer of a professional organization; non-refereed or self-published papers, presentations, tutorials; reviewer or panelist for grants; writing recommendations for faculty and colleagues.

3.2 Additional Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

Faculty applying for tenure or promotion should have service activities across multiple categories in Section 3.1.2.

3.3 Additional Criteria for Post-Tenure Review

In order to meet expectations in service, the total productivity over the review period should be at least five times that expected for a single year. The work should not be concentrated in only one or two of the review years. They should also have service activities across multiple categories in Section 3.1.2.

4. Other Requirements

4.1 Faculty Dossiers

Faculty dossiers, in addition to university requirements, should include:

(a) the faculty’s annual workload agreements for the last five years, and modifications to the agreements if applicable.
(b) a summary of research accomplishments for the last five years, and
(c) an explanation of how the current year’s research activities contribute to the faculty’s long-term goals.
4.2 Area and Overall Ratings

A rating of “exceeds expectations”, “meets expectations”, “does not meet expectations”, or “unacceptable” should be given in each area (teaching, research if applicable, and service), along with an overall rating.

In determining the overall rating, consideration should be given to the percentage effort in each area. However:

a. An overall rating of “exceeds expectations” cannot be given if any of the three areas (teaching, research if applicable, service) are rated “does not meet expectations” or “unacceptable”.

b. An overall rating of “meets expectations” cannot be given if any of the three areas (teaching, research if applicable, service) are rated “unacceptable”.

4.3 Additional Requirements for Tenure or Promotion

Simply meeting expectations does not guarantee tenure or promotion. Faculty seeking tenure or promotion should exceed expectations in one or more areas of performance.

4.4 Additional Requirements for Early Tenure or Promotion

Time in service and demonstrated consistency over a period of years are important parts of tenure and promotion. Early applications will be held to higher standards, and are discouraged unless the candidate has received an invitation to apply from the Dean or Department Chair.

4.5 Department Committee
1. To allow for rotation of membership, a new election should be held each year to select the committee (or committees) which evaluate faculty.

2. The committee evaluation should provide useful feedback to the faculty member, including a summary of strengths and weaknesses, a justification for ratings based on the criteria, and recommendations for improvement.

3. The strengths and weaknesses of each case should be discussed transparently in a meeting of the entire committee, and ratings should be determined without secret voting.