Contents

Faculty Annual Evaluation Guidelines (CEGE)

Department of Civil, Environmental and Geomatics Engineering

College of Engineering and Computer Science

Florida Atlantic University

INTRODUCTION

This document outlines the guidelines for the annual faculty evaluation in the Department of Civil, Environmental, and Geomatics Engineering within the College of Engineering and Computer Science at Florida Atlantic University. These guidelines presented herein are consistent with the principles of academic freedom, allowing faculty to pursue endeavors consistent with their expertise, interests, and abilities while fulfilling the mission of the Department, College, and University. The Department also maintains a detailed evaluation rubric based on these guidelines.

GUIDELINES

The Department Chair shall evaluate the annual performance of the Faculty by considering the following criteria:

A. Teaching and student mentoring, as evidenced by:

- ♦ Quantitative data on teaching, including SPOT and peer teaching evaluations.

- ♦ Supervision of graduate and undergraduate students.

- ♦ Publications in peer-reviewed engineering education journals and conferences.

- ♦ Development of new courses or laboratories in the candidate's field of expertise.

- ♦ Publication of textbooks, lab manuals or other instructional material.

- ♦ Teaching recognition.

B. Scholarship and research impact, as evidenced by

- ♦ A record of peer-reviewed publications in the journals and the international conferences in the candidate's field.

- ♦ To Published with their students in the high-impact factor and conferences

- ♦ Submission or approval of patents.

- ♦ Served as PI or co-PI of peer reviewed research grants, subawards or subcontracts from federal or state agencies. Grants from non-profit research organizations/foundations or industry will also be considered.

- ♦ Financial support of graduate students and postdocs through research grants.

- ♦ Submission of competitive research proposals to federal agencies, local governments, nonprofit organizations, and industry.

- ♦ Ph.D. dissertations supervised by the candidate as a major advisor.

- ♦ Supervision of master's theses to completion.

- ♦ Financial support and supervision of graduate students and post-doctoral fellows.

C. Service, as evidenced by

- ♦ Participation on review panels at national funding agencies, e.g., NSF, NIH, etc.

- ♦ Serving on journal editorial boards, technical committees of national professional organizations.

- ♦ Reviewing for journals and/or conference proceedings.

- ♦ Serving on conference program committees and/or chairing conference technical sessions.

- ♦ Participation in Department, College, or University committees.

- ♦ Participation in community engagement.

- ♦ Participation in the local communities of the candidate's profession.

- ♦ Outreach efforts, for example in the form of workshops and presentations for K-12 and higher-education students.

The department Chair shall evaluate each category (A, B, and C) using the following rating scales:

- ♦ **Exceptional (5/5)**: Demonstrates an exceptional level of accomplishment in the specific category of the annual workload assignment, significantly surpassing the expected performance of faculty in the department.

- ♦ **Outstanding (4/5)**: Demonstrates an outstanding level of accomplishment in the specific category of the annual workload assignment, surpassing the expected performance of faculty in the department.

- ♦ **Good (3/5)**: Demonstrates a good level of accomplishment in in the specific category of the annual workload assignment, meeting the expected performance of faculty in the department.

- ♦ **Needs improvement (2/5)**: Performance falls below the expected level of accomplishment in the specific category of the annual workload assignment but shows potential for improvement.

- ♦ **Unsatisfactory (1/5)**: Performance fails consistently to meet the expectation based on the above criteria in the specific category of the annual workload assignment. This reflects

disregard or failure to follow previously documented and/or otherwise given advice or other efforts to provide correction; or documented incompetence or misconduct, as defined in applicable University regulations and policies, or applicable CBA provisions.

The department chair shall assign an overall performance rating to each faculty member, determined by a weighted average of the scores from the three categories above, with the weights reflecting the annual workload assignments in Teaching, Research, and Service.

Faculty Annual Evaluation Guidelines (EECS)

Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science

College of Engineering and Computer Science

Florida Atlantic University

INTRODUCTION

This document outlines the guidelines for the annual faculty evaluation in the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science within the College of Engineering and Computer Science at Florida Atlantic University. These guidelines presented herein are consistent with the principles of academic freedom, allowing faculty to pursue endeavors consistent with their expertise, interests, and abilities while fulfilling the mission of the Department, College, and University. The Department also maintains a detailed evaluation rubric based on these guidelines.

GUIDELINES

The Department Chair shall evaluate the annual performance of the Faculty by considering the following criteria:

A. Teaching and student mentoring, as evidenced by

♦ Quantitative data on teaching, including SPOT and peer teaching evaluations.

♦ Supervision of graduate and undergraduate students.

♦ Publications in peer-reviewed engineering education journals and conferences.

♦ Development of new courses or laboratories in the candidate's field of expertise.

♦ Publication of textbooks, lab manuals or other instructional material.

♦ Teaching recognition.

B. Scholarship and research impact, as evidenced by

♦ A record of peer-reviewed publications in the journals and the international conferences in the candidate's field.

♦ Submission or approval of patents.

♦ Served as PI or co-PI of peer reviewed research grants, subawards or subcontracts from federal or state agencies. Grants from non-profit research organizations/foundations or industry will also be considered.

♦ Financial support of graduate students and postdocs through research grants.

- ♦ Submission of competitive research proposals to federal agencies, local governments, nonprofit organizations, and industry.

- ♦ Ph.D. dissertations supervised by the candidate as an advisor.

- ♦ Supervision of master's theses to completion.

- ♦ Financial support and supervision of post-doctoral fellows.

C. Service, as evidenced by

- ♦ Participation on review panels at national funding agencies, e.g., NSF, NIH, etc.

- ♦ Serving on journal editorial boards, technical committees of national professional organizations.

- ♦ Reviewing for journals and/or conference proceedings.

- ♦ Serving on conference program committees and/or chairing conference technical sessions.

- ♦ Participation in Department, College, or University committees.

- ♦ Participation in community engagement.

- ♦ Participation in the local communities of the candidate's profession.

- ♦ Outreach efforts, for example in the form of workshops and presentations for K-12 and higher-education students.

The department Chair shall evaluate each category (A, B, and C) using the following rating scales:

- ♦ **Exceptional (5/5)**: Demonstrates an exceptional level of accomplishment in the specific category of the annual workload assignment, significantly surpassing the expected performance of faculty in the department.

- ♦ **Outstanding (4/5)**: Demonstrates an outstanding level of accomplishment in the specific category of the annual workload assignment, surpassing the expected performance of faculty in the department.

- ♦ **Good (3/5)**: Demonstrates a good level of accomplishment in in the specific category of the annual workload assignment, meeting the expected performance of faculty in the department.

- ♦ **Needs improvement (2/5)**: Performance falls below the expected level of accomplishment in the specific category of the annual workload assignment but shows potential for improvement.

- ♦ **Unsatisfactory (1/5)**: Performance fails consistently to meet the expectation based on the above criteria in the specific category of the annual workload assignment. This reflects disregard or failure to follow previously documented and/or otherwise given advice or other efforts to provide correction; or documented incompetence or misconduct, as defined in applicable University regulations and policies, or applicable CBA provisions.

The department chair shall assign an overall performance rating to each faculty member, determined by a weighted average of the scores from the three categories above, with the weights reflecting the annual workload assignments in Teaching, Research, and Service.

Faculty Annual Evaluation Guidelines (OME)

Department of Ocean and Mechanical Engineering

College of Engineering and Computer Science

Florida Atlantic University

INTRODUCTION

This document outlines the guidelines for the annual faculty evaluation in the Department of Ocean and Mechanical Engineering within the College of Engineering and Computer Science at Florida Atlantic University. These guidelines presented herein are consistent with the principles of academic freedom, allowing faculty to pursue endeavors consistent with their expertise, interests, and abilities while fulfilling the mission of the Department, College, and University. The Department also maintains a detailed evaluation rubric based on these guidelines.

GUIDELINES

The Department Chair shall evaluate the annual performance of the Faculty by considering the following criteria:

A. Teaching and student mentoring, as evidenced by

- ♦ Quantitative data on teaching, including SPOT and peer teaching evaluations.

- ♦ Supervision of graduate and undergraduate students.

- ♦ Publications in peer-reviewed engineering education journals and conferences.

- ♦ Development of new courses or laboratories in the candidate's field of expertise.

- ♦ Publication of textbooks, lab manuals or other instructional material.

- ♦ Teaching recognition.

B. Scholarship and research impact, as evidenced by

- ♦ A record of peer-reviewed publications in the journals and the international conferences in the candidate's field.

- ♦ Submission or approval of patents.

- ♦ Served as PI or co-PI of peer reviewed research grants, subawards or subcontracts from federal or state agencies. Grants from non-profit research organizations/foundations or industry will also be considered.

- ♦ Financial support of graduate students and postdocs through research grants.

♦ Submission of competitive research proposals to federal agencies, local governments, nonprofit organizations, and industry.

♦ Ph.D. dissertations supervised by the candidate as an advisor.

♦ Supervision of master's theses to completion.

♦ Financial support and supervision of post-doctoral fellows.

C. Service, as evidenced by

♦ Participation on review panels at national funding agencies, e.g., NSF, NIH, etc.

♦ Serving on journal editorial boards, technical committees of national professional organizations.

♦ Reviewing for journals and/or conference proceedings.

♦ Serving on conference program committees and/or chairing conference technical sessions.

♦ Participation in Department, College, or University committees.

♦ Participation in community engagement.

♦ Participation in the local communities of the candidate's profession.

♦ Outreach efforts, for example in the form of workshops and presentations for K-12 and higher-education students.

The department Chair shall evaluate each category (A, B, and C) using the following rating scales:

♦ **Exceptional (5/5)**: Demonstrates an exceptional level of accomplishment in the specific category of the annual workload assignment, significantly surpassing the expected performance of faculty in the department.

♦ **Outstanding (4/5)**: Demonstrates an outstanding level of accomplishment in the specific category of the annual workload assignment, surpassing the expected performance of faculty in the department.

♦ **Good (3/5)**: Demonstrates a good level of accomplishment in in the specific category of the annual workload assignment, meeting the expected performance of faculty in the department.

♦ **Needs improvement (2/5)**: Performance falls below the expected level of accomplishment in the specific category of the annual workload assignment but shows potential for improvement.

♦ **Unsatisfactory (1/5)**: Performance fails consistently to meet the expectation based on the above criteria in the specific category of the annual workload assignment. This reflects disregard or failure to follow previously documented and/or otherwise given advice or other efforts to provide correction; or documented incompetence or misconduct, as defined in applicable University regulations and policies, or applicable CBA provisions.

The department chair shall assign an overall performance rating to each faculty member, determined by a weighted average of the scores from the three categories above, with the weights reflecting the annual workload assignments in Teaching, Research, and Service.