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Setting performance expectations for faculty members is a complex matter that is interwoven with Policies of the University of Tennessee, UTC Policies and Practices, the UTC Faculty Handbook, Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, the EDO Process, and established ABET accreditation Criteria. The purpose of this document is to consolidate faculty performance expectations and evaluation criteria from all of the above into a single document that will serve as a College of Engineering and Computer Science guideline for setting expectations and evaluating faculty performance. It should be noted that the Complete College Tennessee Act funds the University, College, and Departments according to academic outcomes – in no case shall units or faculty artificially place constraints that cause the University hardship. This document is not meant to supplant general guidelines for evaluation are provided in the Faculty Handbook section on “Best Practices for Evaluation Teaching, Research, and Service.”

Faculty Workload

Faculty members paid full time from the appropriations item “Faculty Salaries” shall be expected to carry a workload equivalent to twelve semester credit hours of instruction in organized classes each semester in accordance with the UTC Faculty Handbook. There is an expectation that faculty are full time professionals, expected to do much more than simply show up to teach classes. Accepted ABET accreditation criteria use an engineering instructional workload of 9 nominal semester hours maximum to allow time for the faculty to participate in advising/mentoring, research, and service assignments. The teaching loads of some faculty may be reduced further due to administrative duties, research and other projects.

A. Faculty members paid partially from a source of funds other than the “Faculty Salaries” line item are expected to carry workloads in proportion to the percentage of salary paid from the appropriations line item “Faculty Salaries”.

B. Teaching Expectations

1. Graduate Instruction. Extra consideration of effort may be proposed in agreement with the Department Head and Dean. It is suggested that one semester credit hour of graduate instruction at the Master’s level (5000) be considered the equivalent of one and one-half semester credit hours of undergraduate instruction and one semester credit hour of graduate instruction at the Doctoral level (6000) be considered equivalent to two semester credit hours of undergraduate instruction.

2. Specialized Instruction. Extra consideration of effort may be proposed in agreement with the Department Head and Dean.
Laboratories – It is suggested that one and one-half contact hours of instruction of regularly scheduled laboratory courses per week be considered the equivalent of one semester credit hour of undergraduate instruction.

Design and Capstone Projects – It is suggested that courses that are listed in the catalog as a combination of lecture and project hours will earn of one hour for each lecture hour and one and one-half contact hour of project work will be considered the equivalent of one semester of credit hour of undergraduate instruction.

3. Other Instructional Activities. Individual Instruction, Supervision of Thesis/Dissertation, and Team Teaching, when assigned by the unit head, should also be considered in the load of faculty, as approved.

4. A reduced workload may be granted, with concurrence of the Dean, if assigned classes do not materialize because of insufficient enrollment and when additional courses or other academic duties cannot be assigned to the faculty member. When granted this exception, faculty will be available for special assignments for the good of the College.

5. Administrative Assignments. Workload credit may be granted for a faculty member who is head of a department or head of a comparable administrative unit. Credit for administrative load is the purview of the Dean and higher administration to decide. Department Heads, however, are expected to take a fair share of teaching load.

6. New Faculty. At the recommendation of the head of the department and upon approval of the Dean, newly-appointed faculty members during the first year of employment may receive a reduced teaching load for developing research, with the written approval of the Dean.

7. New Course Development. Workload credit may be granted to a faculty member involved in the creation of a new course or laboratory, or for the development of a new format, or new materials for an existing course or laboratory, or for teaching a course or laboratory for the first time.

8. Other Credits. With prior approval of the Dean and Department Head, limited faculty workload credit may be granted for:
   - Academic advising of an exceptional number of students or serving as an advisor to student groups.
   - Preparing major documents in the fulfillment of programmatic needs or accreditation requirements.
   - Professionally-related board or other service performed without additional compensation.
   - Other duties performed in the best interests of the academy.
9. On-line instruction credit may be awarded on the basis of the course credit hours, with the approval of the Department Head and Dean. If both in-house and on-line sections of the course are taught concurrently, additional credit may be awarded if agreed to by the Department Head and Dean.

C. Credit for research, both sponsored and un-sponsored, will be awarded by agreement between the faculty member and Head during the EDO Objectives conference. In general, a guide would be that relief from one course might be granted on tangible evidence of scholarly research productivity. The Dean will expect large or multiple grants having having proportional academic year salary savings or contractual commitment to the College/Department for more. In general, release from all courses should not be expected by regular faculty. All foreseen issues should be documented in setting Objectives for the individual EDO and must also be approved by the Dean.

Criteria for EDO Evaluations

Evaluation of the performance of faculty members is accomplished by the EDO process. Evaluations are required in three areas: (1) teaching, student advising, development of new courses, preparation of instructional material and other activities designed to enhance educational and instructional activities, (2) research, scholarship, creative activities, grant development and administration, scholarly publications and presentations, and other activities related to the development and dissemination of new knowledge, and (3) professional service to the university, profession, and community.

Adjunct Faculty, Lecturers, and Instructors are normally expected to engage primarily in teaching and advising unless specifically contracted or directed to do research and/or service – those that are directed to work in the same categories as regular faculty should be judged by the same standards. Research faculty members are expected to engage primarily in research. All other faculty members are expected to engage in professional activities in all three areas of performance. The UTC Faculty Handbook holds teaching to be paramount among the three areas of performance. It is recognized that individual faculty have particular strengths, interests, and resources that contribute to the over-all balance of the College. Therefore the weighting to be given to each area in reaching an overall annual EDO rating will be negotiated between each faculty member and the department head during the goals-setting phase of the annual EDO process. Individual goals should be aligned with the strategic goals and initiatives established for the College. In aggregate, the goals set by the faculty members and the department head must meet the overall goals set for the Department. The Department Head is charged with fairly and equitably identifying qualitative and quantitative differences in performance, based on the rank of the individual and the general guidelines that follow. The Department Head shall insure that goals and objectives set for all faculty members are consistent with promotion and tenure guidelines. The role of the Dean is to insure fairness by encouraging comparable application of the following guidelines across the academic units of the College. The following criteria are not exhaustive. Additional and sometimes unplanned significant contributions to the College may be made and will be credited to the faculty member’s performance when these occur.
Criteria for rating faculty performance must be fairly applied. Individual faculty may equal or exceed criteria within a category while not achieving others. Failure to achieve all in a category may not, in itself, disqualify the faculty member from satisfying the requirements for that category. Other achievements may compensate. These are guidelines, presented to inform decisions in the EDO process and insure that the process is objectively applied. The ultimate performance rating is an assessment of the faculty member’s over-all job performance, especially as related to the needs of the Department and College.

The EDO Procedures should follow the EDO Calendar in the Faculty Handbook including a Departmental Objective Conference (department head and faculty) prior to the faculty member submitting written objectives wherever possible.

Meets Expectations

Teaching and Advising

Faculty members must responsibly plan, teach, and manage courses, assigned by the unit head. They must demonstrate commitment to positive teaching outcomes expressed by the University. This requires that they select textbooks in a timely manner and prepare, publish, and follow syllabi for all assigned courses following UTC guidelines. They must provide quality instruction in all assigned courses as evidenced by good student evaluations. They must responsibly meet their assigned courses. They must arrange for coverage of classes they must miss. They must turn in grades on time.

As graduation rate has become an issue, faculty will maintain strong academic rigor, while being supportive in helping the student to succeed in courses. Faculty have a professional responsibility to constructively work with students and guide them toward graduation.

Attendance is expected for Departmental and College meetings relevant to courses and curriculum. Accreditation outcomes requiring action by a faculty must be met in a timely manner. Documentation showing how the loop is closed in continuous improvement per ABET is every faculty members responsibility.

Assignments and tests should be promptly and fairly graded in accordance with syllabi criteria. They should keep up with and utilize appropriate technology and other instructional resources for their courses. Each faculty member should carry a fair share of the departmental teaching and advising load. Maintenance of graduate standing is expected to allow the faculty member to a fair share that teaching and advising responsibility.

Office hours should be posted and maintained. These should at least equal the number of credit hours taught for the semester and be distributed at various times during the week. Advising of all assigned students should be carried out carefully and responsibly with
attention paid to prerequisites and proper sequencing to allow the student to complete graduation requirements as quickly as possible. Misadvising will be noted on the EDO.

Course folders should be maintained as required for accreditation. Faculty should provide needed documentation and participate in periodic course assessments conducted by their departments for accreditation purposes. Documentation should provide evidence that their courses achieve satisfactory outcomes for assigned accreditation objectives.

Faculty should attend a minimum of one commencement each academic year.

**Research and Scholarly Activities**

Faculty members are expected to stay current in their discipline, and engage in research and scholarly activities. There are many activities and accomplishments which will demonstrate accomplishments in research and scholarly activities. The following discussion provides examples of such activities. It is intended that faculty must accomplish at least some of those listed here.

Refereed technical publications and funded research proposals are significant evidence of research and scholarly activity. The preparation of research proposals and technical papers, are also evidence of some activity. It is the minimum expectation of the Dean that at least one external proposal and one technical paper be submitted per year. Other lessor contributions include patents, copyrights, invited publications or posters, technical or engineering education conference papers with peer review, presentations before professional organizations or societies, and engineering education conferences.

Formal proposals to major outside agencies for funded research projects, such as the research initiation programs offered by the National Science Foundation are encouraged. However, the use of UC Foundation Grants, Faculty Research Grants, Summer Fellowships and Faculty Development Grants are recognized as contributing to the pursuit of external funded research. Other activities which may contribute to the pursuit of successful external funding include review of technical proposals and publications. Significant industrial research activities may be included in this category.

Serving as committee members for Senior Honors Projects, Graduate Projects, or Graduate Thesis are also examples of minimal research and scholarly activity.

The topics for research and scholarly activity are not automatically restricted exclusively to technical subjects, with the approval of the Department Head in the EDO planning. Investigation and reporting on the education process as required by ABET and as appropriate to the philosophy of continual improvement may also an appropriate area for this category. Experimentation and associated reporting on the education process may be appropriate to this category.
**Professional Service**

Faculty are expected to maintain active membership in appropriate professional organizations, and to maintain licensure as a Professional Engineer or other professional certification as appropriate to the discipline.

Faculty participation on departmental/college committees, as assigned, is expected. Further, faculty members are expected to advance the goals of the College by participation in at least one committee, as assigned.

Faculty members are expected to contribute to the University. Membership on one University committee is desirable for tenured faculty.

Involvement in professional service activities locally, in the state or nation is highly encouraged. Such activity enhances the image and stature of the department, College and University will contribute to this category.

**Exceeds Expectations**

University policy generally limits the total number of faculty in this category. A faculty member may also have a very good year relative to a Department, and the unit not meet expectations. The Department Head proposes this level, and the Dean then weighs both unit performance and individual performance in context of the entire College, in determining who is, in turn, recommended to the Provost.

**Teaching and Advising**

Satisfying the ‘Meets Expectations’ requirements plus significant additional activities which might include, but is not limited to, the following:

Activities beyond normal teaching duties, such as developing/teaching a new course that meets a strategic need, developing improved materials/methods for existing course(s), directing an important student research projects, and writing/revising text or laboratory manuals for publication;

The achievement of superior student evaluations or receiving a teaching/advising award;

Activities well beyond normal duties in advising and mentoring that demonstrably help students and the mission of the unit or College;

Activities beyond normal record keeping for assessment such as providing leadership for accreditation and program review activities.
Getting teaching/advising/mentoring funding for the academic mission of the Department/College.

**Research and Scholarly Activities**

The difference between ‘Exceeds Expectations’ and ‘Meets Expectations’ is in the quantity, quality, and positive impact in the body of work in this category. The emphasis in ‘Meets Expectations’ is on activity in the category, and in ‘Exceeds Expectations’ it is on achievement.

Examples of the success expected for ‘Exceeds Expectations’ include publishing paper(s) in refereed journals, contributing a book chapter, authoring/editing a published book, or presentation of an award winning paper at a professional meeting. Published means a citation record exists as of the time frame of evaluation.

Winning an external grant or contract through solicited or unsolicited proposals will also meet the ‘Exceeds Expectations’ level of performance. Weight will be given to awards sufficient to support faculty and graduate student salaries for conducting research projects proportional to the funds expended in a given year. Merit will be judged on the basis of positive impact to the unit or College, not simply on funding amount.

Direction of student work in Senior Honors Projects, Graduate Special Topics, and Graduate Thesis/Dissertation are also examples of research and scholarly activity completed during the evaluation period. These activities will be enhanced as examples in this category if the research is published and/or presented at a professional meeting.

Awards for research and scholarly activities such as receiving recognition as Fellow of a professional society or recognition as a Member of a National Academy will evidence ‘Exceeds Expectations’.

**Professional Services**

Satisfying the ‘Meets Expectations’ requirements plus additional activities such as the following:

Action beyond technical/professional society membership, such as organize/chair a session at a professional meeting, serve as an officer in the society or organize/instruct a short course or professional development activity;

Where exceptional and significant activity is recognized in action beyond Department/College committee membership, such as chairing a major departmental or College committee, active membership in more than one major department/College committee, faculty advisor for an active student organization, significant participation/coordination of student recruiting activities, or special departmental/College assignments;
Action beyond University committee membership, such as chairing a major or active University committee, membership in more than one University committee, or special University assignments;

Judging the regional Science and Engineering Fair, active service on local, state or national boards or committees or unpaid technical assistance provided to outside organizations that add to the positive reputation of the faculty member and unit.

**Overall Rating of ‘Exceeds Expectations’**

To be considered for an overall rating of Exceeds Expectations, in general, a faculty member above the rank of Lecturer/Instructor must exceed expectations overall. In order of importance of categories – teaching and research strength must be shown.

**Tenure and Promotion**

Tenure and promotion are governed by the faculty handbook. In addition, faculty candidates for tenure must demonstrate levels of performance that meet or exceed expectations according to the EDO or equivalent as defined here for the entire term in rank. Much like peer review of scholarly work, it is expected that units provide external evidence, such as recommendation of qualified experts appropriate to the academic discipline, to a candidates dossier prior to the appropriate Rank and Tenure meeting. It is also expected that units will show why an expert is appropriate and that an equal opportunity was provided to the process by the candidate.

Promotion to Associate Professor is well documented in the Faculty Handbook. Promotion to Professor is less well documented. It is an expectation of candidates to Professor that they exceed expectations regularly, and that they demonstrate leadership in the academic or research field at a Professor (expert) level.

**Procedures**

This document is a modification 2006-2007 Academic Year, which was not approved by the Provost (too prescriptive). Upon approval by a majority of the applicable Rank and Tenure Committees, the Dean and the Provost, the document will take effect for the next EDO cycle. This document may be reviewed for change annually by the Rank and Tenure Committee(s). It may be amended at any time by a vote of the Rank and Tenure Committee and further approval administratively. However, any modification made after September 30 will not be effective until the following year.

**Approvals**

This document is in no way all inclusive. There are activities and guidelines based on precedent and tradition of the EDO, Promotion and Tenure processes which might not be
included, but are reserved to the faculty, and administration, in the negotiation of these EDO, Promotion and Tenure processes.

Further, this document is not a contract agreement, but a memorandum of understanding, and is only effective upon the faculty, and administration, within the normal EDO, Promotion and Tenure processes as defined in the Faculty Handbook.

Approval of this document only certifies that it is the current understanding of guidelines for the EDO, Promotion and Tenure Processes.

By the Engineering Rank and Tenure Committee by vote of ____ in favor, ____ opposed with ____ abstaining as certified by _______________Date: __________
Phillip Kazemersky, PhD
Chair of Committee

By the Computer Science Rank and Tenure Committee by vote of ___ in favor, ___ opposed with ______ abstaining as certified by _______________Date: __________
Claire McCullough, PhD
Chair of Committee

By the Computational Engineering Rank and Tenure Committee by vote of ___ in favor, ___ opposed with ______ abstaining as certified by _______________Date: __________
Roger Briley, PhD
Chair of Committee

By the Dean of the College _________________________ Date: ______________
William H. Sutton, Ph.D.
Dean

By the Provost of the University _______________ Date: ______________
Mary Tanner, PhD
Interim Provost and Vice Chancellor