

Department of Engineering

Evaluation Procedures and Criteria for Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure

Revised and Approved by Faculty on June 14, 2019

The procedures described in this document are consistent with the policies and procedures mandated in the JMU Faculty Handbook. Faculty members should be familiar with Section III.E. of the Handbook.

I. Department of Engineering Annual Evaluation Protocol

Based on the previous year's Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan (FAAP), faculty members will compile relevant information about their activities in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement, and professional qualifications, and professional service on an annual basis in the Faculty Activities Report (FAR). The Academic Unit Head (AUH) will evaluate the faculty member based on the FAR and other relevant information to assign a performance rating in each area and an overall rating based on the criteria described in this document. The AUH may consult with the AUPAC during the annual evaluation process. The AUH will make the final decisions regarding annual evaluation ratings. For purposes of annual evaluations, faculty will receive a designation in teaching, scholarly achievement, and professional service and an overall rating that reflects one of three levels of performance.

A. Faculty Responsibilities

Faculty members in Department of Engineering should be dedicated, accomplished, and viable educators and scholars. Department of Engineering faculty members should meet the general responsibilities of a full-time JMU faculty member as defined in the Faculty Handbook. Along with these professional responsibilities, Department of Engineering faculty will enjoy the privileges and responsibilities of academic freedom.

Faculty members are responsible to accurately report activities in a timely manner as defined in the timeline for annual evaluation, promotion, and tenure.

B. Criteria

The Department of Engineering will use the Faculty Handbook criteria for re-appointment, promotion, and the award of tenure. These criteria are (a) teaching, (b) scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and (c) professional service. These criteria will also be used as the basis for the annual evaluations of Department of Engineering faculty.

The standards included in teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service are based on (a) *Personal leadership* (b) *Professional commitment and* (c) *Professional collegiality*.

C. Flexibility of Criteria

The evaluation standards described here **should not be interpreted as inflexible and absolute**. The reward system within the Department of Engineering should be sufficiently flexible so that all members of the faculty can align their activities with the mission, goals, and needs of the unit. Annually, these activities shall be reflected in the Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan (FAAR).

II. Procedures for Annual Evaluations

A. Annual Review

- 1) Prior to the beginning of each academic year, the faculty member and the AUH shall determine the relative weights of the three performance areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service. (See JMU Faculty Handbook,).
- 2) Faculty members in the Department of Engineering will submit their FAR to the AUH by June 1 each year. This summary will cover the faculty member's activities and accomplishments in the teaching, scholarly achievement, and professional service areas during the previous 12 months.
- 3) The AUH will rate each performance area and the overall performance of each faculty member using the evaluation rating categories of *excellent*, *satisfactory*, or *unsatisfactory*. The AUH will assign independent ratings for each faculty member.
- 4) Faculty members will be responsible for preparing and submitting annual review documentation of their activities to the AUH for review. The AUH will prepare a letter evaluating the faculty member's performance. Beginning in the fourth year, faculty members on a tenure track contract may request review of annual review documentation by the AUPAC; the AUPAC will prepare a letter evaluating the faculty member's performance as documented in the annual review documentation.

B. Evaluation Ratings for Annual Performance

Satisfactory Performance

This designation reflects competence in professional responsibilities. The faculty member is performing in accordance with the standards of the Department of

Engineering. This category requires documentation from the faculty member that demonstrates performance at this level.

Excellent Performance

This designation signifies that the faculty member meets the criteria at the satisfactory level, but also demonstrates a higher level of performance. Performance at this high level conforms with the excellent levels required for promotion according to the faculty handbook. This category requires documentation from the faculty member that demonstrates performance at this level.

Unsatisfactory Performance

This designation signifies that the faculty member has not performed at a level that is in keeping with the standards of the Department of Engineering. Its occurrence should be interpreted by faculty as substantive concern for success in the faculty role. Designations in this category may jeopardize tenure or promotion and may initiate post-tenure review processes. The procedures for post-tenure review are described in the *JMU Faculty Handbook*.

An overall designation of *Satisfactory* or *Unsatisfactory* will be made of faculty performance for the purpose of determining eligibility for salary increments based on merit. The overall evaluation will take into consideration the evaluations in each area, but will not be simply the sum of evaluations in the three areas. All performance designations will be made in a qualitative, holistic manner, taking into account such factors as level of involvement, amount of time committed, and the value of contributions. The AUH may request additional information or evidence to assist the faculty member in making fair judgments.

C. Standards for Reappointment

The minimum qualification for a faculty member to receive a non-tenure-track reappointment is *Satisfactory* ratings in all three review criteria, although factors similar to consideration for tenure (such as promise of continued long-term performance) will also be evaluated in determining qualification for reappointment. Other factors, such as program need and program financial exigencies, must also be considered in determining reappointment of faculty.

D. Annual Evaluation Letter and Conference

1) The AUH will write a preliminary evaluation letter and give the letter to the faculty member at least one day prior to the faculty member's annual evaluation conference as stipulated in the JMU Faculty Handbook. The AUH and the faculty member will meet to discuss the faculty member's accomplishments during the previous year, the annual evaluation ratings, and the faculty member's goals for the next year. Within seven days of the evaluation conference, the AUH will write the final evaluation letter and give it to

the faculty member. The conference must be scheduled so that the final letter can be delivered to the faculty member by September 15.

2) If the faculty member concurs with the AUH's annual evaluation ratings, the faculty member will sign the final evaluation letter and return it to the AUH within seven days of receipt of the letter. No further action is required by the faculty member. The AUH will forward the final evaluation letter with the faculty member's signature to the Dean of the College of Integrated Science and Engineering (CISE) by October 21.

3) If the faculty member does not concur with the AUH's annual evaluation ratings, but does not wish to appeal the ratings, the faculty member will return the letter unsigned. The AUH will forward the final evaluation letter without the faculty member's signature to the CISE Dean by October 21.

E. Appeals Procedures

If the faculty member does not concur with the AUH's annual evaluation rating, then the faculty member has a maximum of seven days following receipt of the official written evaluation to appeal in writing. The entire appeal process must be completed by October 21.

1) To initiate the appeal, the faculty member must write the appeal letter outlining the area(s) of disagreement and send the letter to the AUH with a copy to the AUPAC.

2) Within seven days of the receipt of the appeal letter, the AUH will meet with the faculty member to discuss the appeal and consult with the AUPAC about the appeal. The AUH will decide either to keep the original evaluation letter or to write a new evaluation letter. The AUH must notify the faculty member of a decision within seven days, and if a revised letter is written, must give the letter to the faculty member during this period.

3) If the faculty member still disagrees with the AUH's final evaluation ratings, within seven days of the receipt of the final reissued or revised evaluation letter, the faculty member may write an appeal letter outlining the area(s) of disagreement and send the letter to the Department of Engineering Annual Evaluation Appeals Committee with a copy to the AUH and the AUPAC. The Department of Engineering Annual Evaluation Appeals Committee will be comprised of three former AUPAC members (or a committee appointed by the CISE Dean, if three former AUPAC members are not available).

4) The Appeals Committee must adhere to the appeals policy outlined in the JMU Faculty Handbook: "In considering an appeal, the crucial questions for the reviewing body are whether all relevant information was objectively reviewed by the AUH, and whether the AUH evaluated similar achievements among similarly situated academic unit members using the same standard of judgment." The AUH will provide the Appeals Committee with the FAR for all faculty members, a list of the ratings for all faculty members, and a copy of all appeal letters and recommendations. The Appeals Committee will report its findings in writing to the faculty member and the AUH within seven days of receiving the appropriate documents.

5) Within seven days of the receipt of the Appeals Committee letter, the AUH and faculty member will meet to discuss the evaluation. The AUH will decide either to keep the most recent evaluation letter or to write a new evaluation letter, and will send the reissued or revised evaluation letter to the faculty member within seven days of the meeting.

6) If the faculty member agrees with the reissued or revised final evaluation letter, the faculty member will sign the letter and return it to the AUH within seven days of receipt of the letter. If the faculty member does not agree with the evaluation letter at this point, the faculty member will inform the AUH of this disagreement in writing and indicate if the faculty member would like the documentation of the appeal sent to the appropriate office in accordance with the faculty handbook along with the unsigned evaluation letter. The AUH will forward the final evaluation letter without the faculty member's signature and, if requested, the appeal documentation, in accordance with the faculty handbook.

Note: The time periods noted in this process are strongly recommended but changes in these time periods can be negotiated among the parties involved to accommodate other commitments.

III. Department of Engineering Protocol for Promotion and Tenure

The Department of Engineering procedures regarding promotion and tenure are based on the procedures described in the *JMU Faculty Handbook*.

A. Evaluation Ratings for Promotion and Tenure

Promotion

The promotion standards used are taken from the *JMU Faculty Handbook*. The *JMU Faculty Handbook* states that “the faculty member shall be evaluated as excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory”. Faculty should review the standards for promotion in the *JMU Faculty Handbook*.

Tenure

The standards for tenure are taken from the *JMU Faculty Handbook*. Faculty should review the standards for tenure in the *JMU Faculty Handbook*.

B. Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Review

The Promotion and Tenure Dossier

It is the faculty member's responsibility to make their own case in an accurate and timely manner and to support their case with the appropriate documentation.

In both promotion and tenure decisions, the AUPAC and the AUH will consider the quality of performance in teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service of a candidate. It is faculty member's responsibility to clearly present and properly cross-reference any activities that fall in multiple categories.

C. Decision Process for Promotion and Tenure Review

The university procedures for promotion and tenure reviews are described in the *JMU Faculty Handbook*

IV. Teaching: Promotion and Tenure Criteria

A. Evaluation Criteria

To receive a *Satisfactory* rating for teaching, a faculty member must demonstrate *many* of the activities listed below:

- 1) Commitment to assigned classes, such as thoroughness of class preparation, careful and objective grading, and timely assessment of and feedback to students;
- 2) Mastery of subject matter;
- 3) Establishment of an identifiable academic relationship with students beyond the information derived in the classroom; availability for out-of-class consultation, patience and understanding in dealing with the problems of individual students;
- 4) Mastery of fair and effective evaluation techniques for student work and self-evaluation;
- 5) Evidence of teamwork in teaching and/or coordinating courses with colleagues;
- 6) Flexibility and adaptability in meeting the current and changing departmental, college, and university needs; knowing and responding to the needs of the academic unit;
- 7) Effective use of teaching evaluations;
- 8) Incorporation of current literature and professional experience into course material;
- 9) Use of interdisciplinary practices, integration in education, and systems theory;
- 10) Ability to communicate abstract or complex ideas;
- 11) Innovation with respect to the use of new teaching methods, teaching aids, evaluation of students;

- 12) Use of effective demonstration, and laboratory and design experiments;
- 13) Appropriate mix of effective learning / teaching strategies;
- 14) Participation in courses for non-departmental students and in team teaching;
- 15) Supervision of theses and student projects.

To receive an *Excellent* rating, the individual must show satisfactory performance in teaching. In addition, the individual must demonstrate some of the achievements listed below:

- 1) Strong positive student response to teaching, such as student-sponsored teaching awards, consistently above average student evaluations or unusually positive alumni comments;
- 2) Peer recognition of teaching ability and commitment to teaching, (e.g., JMU or externally sponsored teaching awards or exceptionally positive reports of peer observation of teaching);
- 3) Evidence of instructional vitality (e.g., developing new courses, methods and materials; innovations in course content or methodology; and use of a variety of teaching methods);
- 4) Leadership in non-traditional learning experiences and activities (e.g., honors research, independent study, class projects, field teaching);
- 5) Quality teaching in a variety of learning contexts (e.g., special lectures, seminars, special studies, discussion groups);
- 6) Breadth in teaching expertise (e.g., the ability to teach a variety of subject areas, at the upper and lower levels);
- 7) Publication of book chapters, textbooks, or teaching materials;
- 8) Presentations and publications on innovations in course content and teaching methodology;
- 9) Professional development through such efforts as participating in workshops, conferences, or similar activities devoted primarily to improving teaching methods and course content, or participating in regional and national pedagogical organizations;
- 10) Leadership in teamwork (e.g., generating a spirit of teaming, building team consensus or capabilities, initiating teams that effectively address Department of Engineering curriculum needs);
- 11) Instructional leadership (e.g., the ability to initiate and execute constructive change in an Department of Engineering, JMU, or external curriculum);

- 12) Mastery of a variety of teaching and learning methodologies to suit a class or academic topic;
- 13) Receive grants or contracts for instructional programs, equipment, or laboratory development;
- 14) Participation in special teaching efforts such as new or experimental courses, and special or continuing education courses;
- 15) Development of new courses and laboratory experiments, revision of curriculum;
- 16) Perform consulting related to teaching or instruction;
- 17) Self-directed study to achieve competence in areas outside the candidate's sub-discipline;
- 18) Demonstrated instructional accomplishments that the AUPAC deems exceptional;
- 19) Leadership in program assessment, evaluation, and accreditation processes.

A faculty member who shows serious deficiencies in either quality or quantity of effort with respect to the evaluation criteria that define Satisfactory shall be rated as *Unsatisfactory*.

B. Evidence

Self-evaluation of Teaching

The Department of Engineering faculty affirms the centrality of academic freedom in course delivery. Consistent with professional norms and as is presently standard practice in the program, each faculty member will prepare a self-evaluation of the faculty member's teaching that includes (but is not limited to) the following information:

- 1) Number of courses developed and type of collaboration;
- 2) Co-instruction in course preps, level, class size, role;
- 3) Number of course preps, level and type of courses taught (e.g., undergraduate/graduate, seniors/freshmen, required/elective), class size, and any other descriptive that may have influenced teaching success;
- 4) Teaching honors and awards;
- 5) Participation in teaching workshops, seminars, or other professional development focused on teaching;

- 6) Innovation in teaching methods and materials;
- 7) Notable successes or overcoming challenges in the classroom; and
- 8) Interpretation/explanation of the most recent student evaluations, and modifications made to address problems or concerns of prior evaluations.

The self-assessment should also include unique challenges, special circumstances, and supplemental activities faced or undertaken by the faculty member. Failure to complete a comprehensive self-evaluation will negatively affect the overall performance evaluation.

Student Evaluation of Teaching

Consistent with professional norms and as is presently standard practice in the Department of Engineering, student evaluations will be administered for all courses taught. Quantitative performance from student evaluations that is below sectional averages is not, in isolation, indicative of "unsatisfactory" performance. Qualitative comments should be used to provide context for understanding quantitative scores. The following information pertaining to student evaluations shall contribute to the performance appraisal outcome:

- 1) Program-wide summary statistics of student evaluation information for all Department of Engineering faculty members;
- 2) Summary statistics, such as averages, for courses with numerous sections;
- 3) Scores of individual survey items (or small clusters of items) that have been identified as particularly relevant to the successful teaching of specific courses. For example, special consideration may be given to items that measure "degree of challenge" and/or "amount of effort required" in addition to the traditional focus on "overall teaching effectiveness"; and
- 4) Written comments of students.

Additional Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (Optional)

- 1) Awards from students and peers can be considered as evidence of teaching effectiveness. It is the desire of the Department of Engineering faculty to state clearly that student evaluations are important and useful but also have limitations and, therefore, should not form the sole basis of evaluating teaching.
- 2) Other evaluation and assessment that support teaching effectiveness.

V. Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications

As faculty members at James Madison University, we not only have the responsibility and privilege of being excellent educators but scholars as well. One major component of scholarly achievement is the creation and dissemination of scholarly products that are shared with and evaluated by other professionals (i.e., work that is externally judged, peer reviewed, invited, or otherwise juried).

A. Evaluation Criteria

A *Satisfactory* rating requires evidence that the faculty member is continuing to contribute within the faculty member's field as evidenced by scholarly products that are shared with and evaluated by other professionals (i.e., work that is externally judged, peer reviewed, invited, or otherwise juried). The activities listed below are examples of evidence that may be used to support a rating of *Satisfactory*. Note that the order in the list does not indicate rank or importance. A faculty member is expected to show many of these activities:

- 1) Publications (refereed or not) resulting from supervising student projects, independent study, and honors projects;
- 2) Active participation in grant proposals for support of research or other scholarly activities;
- 3) Presentations at professional meetings, professional organizations, field conferences, regional meetings, and other scholarly gatherings;
- 4) Development of refereed innovative instructional or education materials;
- 5) Ongoing personal professional development (NSF short courses, attending national meetings, etc.) or an organized program of self-study in a new area of research;
- 6) Acting as a professional consultant;
- 7) Engaging in a coherent plan of ongoing scholarly activity;
- 8) Presentation of faculty seminars and colloquia at JMU and other venues;
- 9) Scholarly activity at other academic institutions and in non-academic settings; and
- 10) Reviewing proposals for sponsored government, academic, or industry programs.

To receive an *Excellent* rating, the individual must show satisfactory performance in scholarly achievement and professional qualifications. In addition, the individual must demonstrate some of the achievements listed below:

- 1) Publication of ongoing research and other scholarly activity in refereed or externally judged professional publications;
- 2) Demonstrated contribution to knowledge to the field through a focused, goal-directed program of research or other scholarly activity;

- 3) Presentation of refereed papers at national or international professional meetings;
- 4) Being awarded grant proposal for external funding and/or directing the resulting project;
- 5) Professional consulting activity which reflects recognition of the individual's expertise and that brings recognition or resources to the department;
- 6) Authoring textbooks or teaching materials which are externally judged as being substantial contributions to the field;
- 7) Publication of book reviews, discussions, and technical reports in one's professional area;
- 8) Invited lectures and/or publication in the proceedings of national or international conference;
- 9) Recipient of government or foundation grants, awards, or contracts;
- 10) Develop/maintain a productive research team outside of regular curricular activities;
- 11) Receive a nomination or award for scholarly achievement or professional achievement awards, or other evidence that demonstrates external recognition of individual professional achievement;
- 12) Engage in systematic professional development that involves substantial development of new knowledge and skills; and
- 13) Make consistently high quality contributions to research of colleagues.

A faculty member who shows serious deficiencies in either quality or quantity of effort with respect to the evaluation criteria that define Satisfactory shall be rated as *Unsatisfactory*.

B. Evidence

Applicants should describe their research activities in such a way that the AUH and AUPAC can fairly evaluate the impact of their scholarly contributions and any special circumstances applicable to their scholarly work during the evaluation period. The AUH and AUPAC may also ask that additional materials be submitted for review and/or submitted for evaluation by professionals more familiar with the specialty area of the work.

We value cross-disciplinary scholarship and understand that such scholarly products vary in levels of investment. Thus, the AUH and AUPAC will be mindful that not all scholarly products can be equally weighted. For example, the type of conference at which a presentation is given, the selectivity of the publication in which the work appears, the impact the work has on the profession, and the time and resources necessary to produce the scholarship are to be considered.

It should also be noted that the Department of Engineering values both single-author and collaborative scholarship, especially collaborative work with students.

The Department of Engineering acknowledges that metrics are dependent of the nature of the specific scholarly activity. Thus, there is flexibility in how the applicant presents the applicant’s scholarly achievements in an application. Moreover, we value both qualitative and quantitative methods for evaluation of the scholarly achievements.

Qualitative Measures	Quantitative Measures
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressing the <i>intellectual merit</i> of the scholarly product. • Addressing the <i>role and contribution</i> of the applicant to the scholarly product. <p>Addressing the <i>broader impacts</i> of the scholarly activity. Broader impacts include the dissemination venue, targeted audience, diversity of contributors, involvement of various types of contributors, impacts to students, impacts to department, impacts to profession.</p> <p>Providing copies of <i>external reviews</i> (for a paper, for proposals, etc.).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Reference letters</i> from experts in the field. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of publications, presentations and grants • Value of grants • Number of <i>citations</i> for the scholarly work. • <i>Impact factor</i> of journals where work is published. • <i>Ratings or scores</i> received during review process of the scholarly work (for grants, papers, books, etc.). • <i>Annual performance ratings</i> provided by AUH each year.

Table I. Although not all-inclusive, this table provides some examples of these qualitative and quantitative measures that can be used for scholarly activity evaluation.

VI. Professional Service: Promotion and Tenure Criteria

Professional service is an important and valued aspect of effective faculty performance. It is expected that Department of Engineering faculty members engage in service activities throughout their career.

A. Evaluation Criteria

The possibilities for faculty service are broad. Some faculty members may concentrate their service in narrowly defined areas while others may render professional service broadly across several domains. It is expected that a significant component of professional service will be devoted to the advancement of the *Department of Engineering, the College of Integrated Science and Engineering (CISE) and/or James Madison University* through a wide variety of tasks.

Activities that qualify as professional service are as follows:

- 1) *Service that advances the mission of the Department of Engineering, CISE and/or the University.* The needs and goals of the Department of Engineering, CISE and the

University are continuously evolving; therefore, valued service contributions will align with these needs and goals. Some examples of valued service activities may include, but are not limited to:

- a) Fulfilling assigned responsibilities and/or identifying and acting to fulfill a need within the Department of Engineering, CISE and/or the University;
- b) Participating as a valued member of a Department of Engineering, CISE and/or University committee, including representation in the Faculty Senate;
- c) Participating in events that increase awareness, notoriety, and standing of the Department of Engineering, CISE and/or the University;
- d) Participating in the design, development, and/or advance of Department of Engineering and/or CISE resources, such as classroom and/or laboratory design, laboratory equipment procurement, etc.;
- e) Serving as a freshmen and sophomore undergraduate advisor or graduate student advisor (committee member, thesis advisor, research supervisor, etc.);
- f) Serving as an advisor to a student group;
- g) Initiating and/or carrying out a program that leads to a significant constructive development or change within the Department of Engineering; and
- h) Additional professional service that the AUPAC deems a valued contribution to the Department of Engineering or the University.
- i) Mentoring/Assisting new faculty members.

2) *Service that advances the engineering professional and scholarly community.* Some examples of such service activities may include, but are not limited to:

- a) Serving as a referee or reviewer of scholarly articles or textbooks;
- b) Reviewing proposals for sponsored government, academic, or industry programs;
- c) Service for a national or international professional organization;
- d) Serving as an editorial member for a professional journal;
- e) Serving as chair or organizing committee member for a professional conference; and

f) Other professional service that the AUPAC deems a valued contribution to the professional and/or scholarly community.

3) *Service that benefits society in areas related to one's professional expertise.* All professional service directed at solving a problem of concern or directed at the betterment of society in the area of one's professional competence will be considered by the AUPAC for the significance of the contribution.

4) *Service that contributes to a positive departmental citizenship and departmental culture within the Department of Engineering.* Activities that promote a positive, productive, and collegial working relationship amongst members of the Department of Engineering community.

B. Evidence

The faculty member will be expected to provide evidence and rationale for the faculty member's service contributions. The AUH and AUPAC will evaluate the faculty member's professional conduct, service contributions, effort and accomplishments in the program, and the alignment of service efforts with the mission and goals of the Department of Engineering and the University. Evaluations will consider:

- The number of service activities in which the faculty member was engaged;
- The scope, quality of work, and outcome of the service activities;
- The impact of the service activities; and
- The alignment of the service activities with the mission and goals of the Department of Engineering and James Madison University.

Satisfactory Service

A necessary, but not sufficient, condition for a rating of satisfactory in the area of service is participation in activities that are basic to the responsibilities of a faculty member. These are defined activities in which faculty members are expected to participate without having been specifically assigned or designated to do so. To receive a rating of *Satisfactory* in Professional Service, the faculty must:

- 1) Attend Department of Engineering and University meetings;
- 2) Attend student-focused activities (e.g., graduation, club meeting, other programs);
- 3) Actively participate as a member of Department of Engineering committees as assigned;
- 4) Actively participate in a University committee (if assigned); and

- 5) Actively participate in at least one professional organization.
- 6) Positively contribute to departmental mission, vision, and culture.
- 7) Advising students regarding career and academic options.

Excellent Service

There are many equally acceptable paths to the achievement of evaluation rating of excellent in the area of service. Exceptional service is exhibited by professionally, effectively, and reliably assuming a significant number of tasks over a sustained time period that support the mission and goals of the Department of Engineering, CISE and/or James Madison University. Similarly, a sustained and significant contribution to the engineering and/or engineering scholarship profession or the community and/or society within one's discipline is considered exceptional service.

To receive a rating of *Excellent* in the area of Professional Service, faculty must meet the criteria for "Satisfactory Service" and provide materials showing evidence of substantial activity and/or quality leadership in activities as described in Section VI-C. Some examples of activities supporting a rating of *Excellent* may include, but are not limited to:

- 1) Active and productive participation in additional Department of Engineering, CISE and/or University committees;
- 2) Chairing a productive committee, as supported by results or outcomes from such committee service;
- 3) Service activities that have a substantial impact on the lives of faculty and/or students;
- 4) Serving as a freshmen and sophomore undergraduate advisor or graduate student advisor (committee member, thesis advisor, research supervisor, etc.);
- 5) Making valuable contributions to the community and/or society making appropriate use of one's professional expertise;
- 6) Providing effective service to professional organizations;
- 7) Making exceptional contributions to the professional development of other faculty;
- 8) Being nominated for or receiving an award for professional service; and
- 9) Actively serving as a faculty advisor to a student society or club.

A faculty member who shows serious deficiencies in either quality or quantity of effort with respect to the evaluation criteria that define Satisfactory shall be rated as *Unsatisfactory*.

VII. Amendment Process

The AUPAC will have the responsibility to regularly review the document and recommend any needed changes to the Department of Engineering faculty. Changes require endorsement by 2/3's of the Department of Engineering faculty. Approved changes will be submitted to the AUH, Dean and Provost for approval. Upon those approvals, the changes will be incorporated into this document.