

Performance implied by the FAIR evaluation process for the calendar year 2009. It is assumed that the criteria will change as performance standards increase and as new faculty are added.

Teaching

Below are criteria (a-l) that could be considered for merit scores of 4 or 3, and the level of expected achievement is listed further below. Note that these criteria are in no specific order or rank.

- (a) Received a teaching award.
- (b) Developed new teaching method(s), or lab modules, or industrial involvement, or novel use of computer technology (such as new software, virtual labs, multimedia, etc) that have a significant effect on student learning and performance. (c) Excellent student evaluations from student surveys and feedback to chair.
- (d) Published education-related articles in refereed journals and/or presented education-related papers in national meetings on education.
- (e) Obtained funding for educational projects.
- (f) Developed and taught WI course(s) with above average teaching evaluations.
- (g) Creation and teaching of specific courses and laboratories or training workshops with economic development or entrepreneurial content with evidence of effectiveness.
- (h) Inclusion of economic development and/or entrepreneurial content into existing courses and laboratories with evidence of effectiveness.
- (i) Leadership in curriculum revisions, curriculum learning objectives, and learning assessments.
- (j) Evidence of active learning or other instructional innovations techniques improving student learning
- (k) Evidence of laboratory or other hands on learning activities enhancing student learning.
- (l) Teaching 3 or more courses (of 3 cr. hrs or more) each semester with above average student evaluations.

Score 4: Meets criteria for score 2 and Substantial recognition in the area of teaching such as a national or university teaching award and/or outstanding performance in a substantial combination of the areas listed in (a) thru (l) above.

Score 3: Meets criteria for Score 2 plus above average teacher evaluations and some recognition of teaching performance as described in (a) thru (l) above

Score 2: Average teaching evaluations and normal activity associated with teaching such as revising a course, introduction of a lab or teaching a writing intensive course. Evaluates required class learning objectives on time. Turns in required class assessments on time.

Score 1: Below average teacher evaluations.

Evidence of problems in teaching.

Not developing required class learning objectives on time.

Not turning in required class assessments on time.

Research

Performance implied by the FAIR evaluation process for the calendar year 2009. It is assumed that the criteria will change as performance standards increase and as new faculty are added. In addition to criteria listed, evidence of independent work and mentoring of junior faculty will be considered. It is assumed that the criteria will change as performance standards increase and as new faculty are added.

Faculty involvement in economic development and entrepreneurial activities, which are relevant to research is also important and will be included in the evaluation. These contributions could include:

- patents, SBIR and STTR contacts, partnerships and projects with industry and business, significant activity in a consortium, and faculty and student start-up companies.
- Royalty money brought into the university as a result of licensing/patenting activities.

In general these activities will not “replace” the expected research accomplishments, but will “add” to increase a score.

Professor

Score 4: Near \$225,000 expenditures of funds per year. Significant new awards for the year indicating that expenditure levels will continue. Graduate student support.

Three to four refereed journal publications per year. Citations should be used to indicate quality and significance.

Advising and supporting two to three PhD students and three to four MS students or a total of 5-7 graduate students. Evidence of a production rate of more than 0.5 PhDs/year and more than 1.3 MS/year.

A component of these expenditures could be “course buy out” to justify lighter teaching loads associated with research activity.

Score 3: Near \$150,000 expenditures. Advising and supporting 3 to 5 graduate students including 1 or 2 PhD students with a commensurate production rate exceeding 0.5 PhDs/year and 1.3 MS/year. Three to four refereed journal publications per year. Citations will be considered. New grants during year that indicate that expenditure levels will continue.

Score 2: Near \$85,000 expenditures. Some graduate student support with approximate production rate of 0.5 PhDs/year and 1.3 MS/year. Two to three refereed publications. Research grants received in prior year and proposals indicating continued research funding.

Score 1: Below \$30,000 in expenditures. No new awards or proposals. Publication rate zero to 1.

Performed below expectation in research expenditures, refereed journal publications and presentations, graduate student support and number of graduate students supervised.

Score 0: Essentially no research activity.

Research

Performance implied by the FAIR evaluation process for the calendar year 2009. It is assumed that the criteria will change as performance standards increase and as new faculty are added. In addition to criteria listed, evidence of independent work and mentoring of junior faculty will be considered. It is assumed that the criteria will change as performance standards increase and as new faculty are added.

Faculty involvement in economic development and entrepreneurial activities, which are relevant to research is also important and will be included in the evaluation. These contributors include patents, SBIR and STTR contracts, partnerships and projects with industry and business, and faculty and student start-up companies.

In general these activities will not “replace” the expected research accomplishments, but will “add” to increase a score.

Associate Professor

Score 4: Near \$150,000 in expenditures. New grants awarded and new proposals in the year under review that indicate funding will continue. Graduate student supervision and support, especially PhD. At least 2 refereed journal publications. Citations will indicate quality and significance

A component of these expenditures could be “course buy out” to justify lighter teaching loads associated with research activity.

Score 3: Near \$100,000 in expenditures. New grants awarded and proposals submitted indicate funding will continue. Graduate student support. At least 2 refereed journal publications. Citations will be considered.

Score 2: Near \$70,000 in expenditures. New grants awarded and/or serious attempt to acquire external funding by submitting full proposals to industry or federal sponsoring agencies. At least 1 refereed publication. Some graduate student support.

Score 1: Very little expenditures. No publications.

Score 0: Essentially no research activity.

Assistant Professor

Faculty involvement in economic development and entrepreneurial activities, which are relevant to research is also important and will be included in the evaluation. These contributors include patents, SBIR and STTR contracts, partnerships and projects with industry and business, and faculty and student start-up companies.

In general these activities will not “replace” the expected research accomplishments, but will “add” to increase a score.

- Score 4:** Expenditure level near \$140,000. At least 2 refereed journal publications. Provide graduate student support. New grants and proposals indicating that funding level will continue and grow.
- Score 3:** Expenditure level near \$100,000. At least 2 refereed journal publications. Provide graduate student support. New grants and proposals indicating that funding level will continue.
- Score 2:** (before 3 years) Expenditures and proposal submissions to external sources adequate to begin a research program. At least one refereed publication.
(after 3 years) Expenditures that indicate the establishment of a funded research program. Several new proposals submitted. At least 2 refereed journal publications.
- Score 1:** Very little expenditures. No publications. Minimal attempts to secure research funding.
- Score 0:** Essentially no research activity.

Service

Performance implied by the FAIR evaluation process for the calendar year 2009. It is assumed that the criteria will change as performance standards increase and as new faculty are added.

- Score 4:** Significant involvement in some of the following activities:
- Evidence of significant involvement at the national level (or international level) in conferences, professional societies, consortiums, editorial board(s), grant review panels, editorship of technical journals or other significant publications.
 - Outstanding services to Department, College, and University and substantial leadership at national and international level.
 - Leadership in ABET or other accrediting activities.
 - Extraordinary effort in the revision of a curriculum.
 - Significant involvement or leadership in economic development and entrepreneurial activities at the local, state or national level, such as in developing new economic policy, public awareness of economic issues, etc.

Score 3: Involvement in some the following activities:

Leadership positions in active Department, College, and University committees and in Services at the national level.

Evidence of national leadership and/or significant local effort.

Leadership in the growth and performance of a major student organization(s) resulting in national recognition.

Evidence of involvement in economic or entrepreneurial activities at the local or state level.

Score 2: Normal committee assignments one would expect from a faculty member.

Performed well on Department, College, and University committees.

Score 1: Little indication of any type of service.

Did not contribute significant service to Department, College, and University.

Score 0: Essentially no service activity.