

# Department of Electrical Engineering Bylaws

Approved: July 25, 2003

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The bylaws of the Department of Electrical Engineering define:

1. the role of faculty in Department affairs,
2. general criteria for the qualitative evaluation of faculty performance,
3. procedures and criteria for promotion and tenure, and
4. procedures and criteria for the annual performance evaluation of tenure-track and tenured faculty.

These bylaws may be amended in accordance with the collective bargaining agreement in place at the time of the amendment.

## 2. FACULTY GOVERNANCE

### 2.1. Membership

All full-time faculty members of Wright State University with primary appointments in the Department of Electrical Engineering are voting members of the Department.

### 2.2. Organization

The Department faculty will use Department meetings to make recommendations and to inform the faculty of items of interest occurring in the Department, the College, and the University. All recommendations of the Department faculty shall be made by simple majority vote. Conduct of the meetings of the Department, and those of its committees, may be informal, but in case of dispute over procedure, Robert's Rules of Order (revised) must be followed.

A meeting of the Department faculty shall be called at least once each term from September to June by the Department chair. Additional meetings shall be called as necessary.

A meeting agenda shall be distributed by the chair to all members of the Department at least two business days before the meeting. Members should suggest items to the chair prior to this time. A quorum for the meeting is defined as a majority of the bargaining unit faculty in the Department. Written minutes of the meeting shall be kept.

### 2.3. Standing Committees

The Department of Electrical Engineering faculty governance structure consists of four standing committees: the Undergraduate Studies Committee, the Graduate Studies Committee, the Faculty Development Committee, and the Laboratory Resources Committee. All committee appointments are effective for at least one but not more than two academic years except as noted below. New committee members will take office in the fall term.

### 2.4. Ad hoc Committees

The Department faculty, any standing committee, or the Department chair may form ad hoc committees to undertake and discharge specific tasks.

## **2.5. General Responsibility**

It is expected that committees will discharge their duties in a timely and professional manner, maintain a record of significant activities, and report their progress and product to the appropriate body or authority. It is expected that committees will occasionally establish guidelines they view as helpful in the efficient execution of their duties. A guideline may constitute a useful precedent and will be made available to successive committees for their convenience. Guidelines are not binding on future committees.

Committees may form subcommittees to focus on certain specific issues within the committee's general areas of responsibility. Findings, reports, minutes of meetings, and correspondence shall be maintained by the committee chair.

## **2.6. Undergraduate Studies Committee**

### **2.6.1. Purpose**

The Committee has the responsibility for evaluating and making recommendations on issues relating to the undergraduate programs associated with the Department. In particular, the Committee shall

- Assist in obtaining and sustaining accreditation of eligible programs in the Department.
- Make recommendations on all changes, additions, or deletions of undergraduate courses offered by the Department of Electrical Engineering.
- Make recommendations on all changes in the requirements for degrees or certificate programs in all undergraduate programs in the Department.
- Review materials used in courses to insure that course content is consistent with the catalog descriptions and prerequisite material is covered in prerequisite courses.
- Review student responses and summative reviews generated for ABET course evaluations and assist in the preparation of materials for ABET reviews.
- Review and make recommendations on undergraduate petitions.
- Review and make recommendations for undergraduate awards and scholarships.

The Undergraduate Studies Committee may delegate some of its curriculum development and maintenance tasks to "Area Committees" concerned with courses clustered in sub-disciplines with membership generally consisting of faculty with expertise in these areas and faculty with teaching responsibilities in these areas.

### **2.6.2. Composition**

The Committee shall be composed of at least four BUFMs, appointed by the Department chair, and the Department chair (non-voting). Prior to the end of the academic year, the members shall elect the chair of the committee to serve the following academic year. Since the evolution of curriculum matters can be a lengthy process and since continuity of leadership is often critical in making real progress, the chair of the undergraduate studies committee is not limited to a two-year term of service. Prior to the end of the academic year, the committee will

forward to the Department chair the name of the member recommended to serve as the Departmental representative to the College Curriculum Committee for the following academic year. Normally, the incoming chair of this committee assumes this duty.

## **2.7. Graduate Studies Committee**

### **2.7.1. Purpose**

The Committee has the responsibility of evaluating and making recommendations on all issues relating to the graduate programs of the Department. In particular, the Committee shall

- Make recommendations on all changes, additions, or deletions of graduate courses offered by the Department of Electrical Engineering.
- Make recommendations on all changes in the requirements for degrees or certificates in all graduate programs in the Department.
- Make recommendations on all variations and exceptions to the degree requirements. This includes the evaluation of transfer courses and substitutions in the degree program.
- Review and make recommendations on graduate petitions.
- Review and make recommendations on admission to graduate programs.

### **2.7.2. Composition**

The Committee shall be composed of at least four BUFMs, appointed by the Department chair, and the Department chair (non-voting). The Department chair shall appoint the chair of the committee who will also act as the Graduate Studies Director for the Department. The graduate studies director appointment is not limited to two years. Prior to the end of the academic year, the committee will forward to the Department chair the name of the member recommended to serve as the Departmental representative to the College Graduate Studies Committee.

## **2.8. Faculty Development Committee**

### **2.8.1. Purpose**

To assist in establishing and maintaining a faculty of excellence, that is, a faculty exhibiting superior performance in teaching, research, and service. The specific responsibilities of the Committee are as follows:

- To provide an annual evaluation of all untenured BUFMs summarizing their progress toward tenure as discussed in Section 3.1.3.1.
- To provide an annual evaluation for all tenured Assistant and Associate Professors summarizing their progress toward promotion unless the individual requests that the evaluation be conducted once every three years.
- To provide for peer evaluation of teaching for faculty members. Details concerning the process of peer evaluation are described in Section 3. A report on the peer evaluations will be reviewed by the Faculty Development Committee and submitted to the Department chair (copy to evaluatee) as resource material for preparing annual evaluations.
- To provide assistance, exhortation, or intervention for bargaining-unit faculty who exhibit performance or behavior patterns below department standards.
- To review and make recommendations on tenure and promotion cases.
- To review and make recommendations for requests for Professional Development or other leave.

- To arrange for colloquia and special lectures to support faculty areas of interest.
- To appoint a mentor for each untenured BUFM.

### **2.8.2. Composition**

The Committee shall be composed of all tenured BUFMs in the Department and the Department Chair (non-voting). If there is an insufficient number of members of the Committee, as required by the collective bargaining agreement, the committee will consult with the candidates and select tenured BUFMs from other Departments to bring the membership to the minimum required. Prior to the end of the academic year, the members shall elect the chair of the Committee to serve the following academic year. Voting members of the Committee shall not participate in the evaluation of members nor vote on recommendations for promotion to ranks higher than their own.

### **2.8.3. Activities**

The Faculty Development Committee shall meet as needed to undertake such tasks as it may set for itself in achieving the goals expressed above.

## **2.9. Laboratory Resources Committee**

### **2.9.1. Purpose**

The Committee has the responsibility of evaluating and making recommendations on certain issues relating to the staffing, housing, and equipping the various laboratories of the Department. In particular, the Committee shall

- Make recommendations on the selection of Departmentally-funded GTAs and GRAs.
- Review and make recommendations on the utilization and expansion of laboratory equipment and space.

### **2.9.2. Composition**

The Committee shall be composed of at least four BUFMs, appointed by the Department chair, and the Department chair (non-voting). Normally, the committee shall consist of faculty members who are actively involved in the development and maintenance of the department laboratories.

## **3. QUALITATIVE EVALUATION CRITERIA**

The following general criteria apply for the evaluation of BUFMs for annual reviews and for promotion and tenure. More specific requirements for annual evaluation, and for promotion or tenure to Associate Professor and to Professor are discussed in following sections. The qualitative measures are defined in this section. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide evidence of excellence as a scholar, as a teacher, and as an effective service provider to the institution and to the academic and professional communities. Letters of reference may be used as evidence of strength or contributions. The criteria are grouped into three categories: Research, Teaching, and Service.

### **3.1. Research**

The most important components of a faculty member's research performance are the publication record, the record of external funding, and the evaluation letters received from external referees. While it is understood that faculty typically focus their research

within their own engineering discipline, it is acknowledged that engineering education is a viable field for research endeavors.

### **3.1.1. Scholarship**

A scholarship record consists of monographs, textbooks, archival journal papers, patents, conference papers, technical reports, and other published works.

#### **3.1.1.1. Monographs, Textbooks, and Journal Papers**

Monographs and textbooks are considered of high scholarly value only if they are respected, peer-reviewed technical contributions in the appropriate field.

Journal papers are considered to be high quality only if they appear in archival, internationally-recognized, technical journals that include a formal, rigorous review process and adhere to an acceptance criteria comparable to that of IEEE transactions and journals.

#### **3.1.1.2. Other Forms of Publications**

A complete publication record includes more than books and journal papers. Patents, papers appearing in journals not meeting the criterion described in Section 3.1.1.1, conference papers (both refereed and otherwise), books other than those qualifying above, book chapters, magazine articles, and web-published works are all worthy products of faculty scholarship. While these individual works are generally of lesser scholarly value than the book or archival journal paper, they may, in aggregate, represent significant scholarship value.

In particular, papers appearing in highly-selective, conference proceedings with selections based on peer review of the full paper, that have standards commensurate with those of the various IEEE societies' premier conferences are deemed as high-quality and have scholarly value as discussed below. In order to have significant impact, it is imperative that the conferences involved be widely recognized as refereed, selective, and of the highest quality. The quality and visibility of the conference as a focal point for research in the area must be clearly evidenced by the candidate.

#### **3.1.1.3. Quantitative Composition and Relative Values of Scholarly Works**

It is required that at least one-half of the candidate's required journal publications appear in high-quality journals. The value of one awarded U.S. patent is equivalent to that of one journal paper. The value of one high-quality conference paper is equivalent to that of one-fifth of one journal paper with the limitation that at most two conference papers may be so regarded per year of professional service after receiving the terminal degree. Scholarship of other forms, as listed in this section, can be considered as performance equivalents when equivalent scholarship accomplishment is clearly evidenced. Additional limitations affecting acceptable proportionalities in the scholarship record are noted in the sections addressing specific expectations for promotion and tenure.

#### **3.1.1.4. Authorship Considerations**

A majority of the required publications, especially the archival publications, should have the faculty member as a primary contributor. Collaborative efforts are encouraged where appropriate when resources can be obtained through teamwork that would not be available to the single investigator. Nevertheless, a publication record in which a disproportionate share of the papers are primarily authored by collaborators is not appropriate in that it fails to document the establishment of an independent research program.

#### **3.1.1.5. Citation Records**

While it is difficult to measure the long-term impact of one's scholarship, the record of citations of work authored or coauthored by faculty members, as found in the Science Citation Index is an indication of the significance of published works.

#### **3.1.1.6. Consistency in the Publication Record**

The faculty member should be able to show that the publication record has been built and sustained over his or her time at Wright State University. It is natural that a transient period may occur as faculty establish their own research program, or develop new avenues of investigation. However, once a reasonable period of adjustment expires, the research program of the faculty member should begin to grow and produce in a fairly steady manner. To receive a favorable evaluation, evidence of consistency must be present in the faculty member's record.

### **3.1.2. Funding**

Faculty members are expected to contribute to the Departmental research mission not only through scholarly publication, but also by obtaining resources to support research activities. The primary objective of seeking funding is to aid in the production of high quality scholarship and to allow a faculty member to build the infrastructure to sustain such activities.

#### **3.1.2.1. External Awards**

The cornerstone of an active academic research program and a priority in the Departmental research mission is the sustained support of graduate students and building research infrastructure. It is understood that funding from external awards is commonly used to support research activities, facilities, and personnel in addition to graduate students. While these expenditures may all be instrumental in establishing and maintaining a research program, it is the sustained support of graduate students and total research funding that will be used as primary measures of the research value of external funding awards.

Along with refereed publications, the success of reviewed proposals by private, government, and industrial sources provides an additional external measure of the quality and contribution of faculty research. Faculty members are expected to demonstrate success in obtaining competitive funding in the role of principal or co-principal investigators.

### **3.1.2.2. Internal and Targeted Funding**

Opportunities for “internal” funding opportunities, i.e., those that limit the competition for the awards, frequently exist within Wright State University and from targeted programs such as those sponsored by DAGSI and the Ohio Board of Regents. Often, a primary objective of these programs is to enhance the recipient’s ability to competitively obtain additional external funding from other agencies. Success of these programs should be directly reflected in the publications generated and external funding obtained as a result of the internal support. Consequently, internal funding has little bearing in an evaluation for promotion or tenure.

## **3.2. Teaching**

Faculty members are expected to demonstrate excellence: in the classroom and in the laboratory; as a major advisor for Ph.D. dissertations, M.S. theses, and M.S. research projects; as a supervisor for senior design, honors, independent study, and summer projects; as a mentor of students; and in curriculum and program development. Since both the practice of engineering and methods of teaching are constantly changing, faculty members are expected to implement innovations in curriculum content, delivery, and learning environment. The Great emphasis is placed on meaningful laboratory experiences. Faculty members are expected to create and maintain valuable and technologically relevant learning experiences in the laboratory as well as in the classroom.

Evidence of excellence in the classroom can be inferred from a variety of sources. These include: evaluations of classroom instruction by students, alumni, and peers; the publication of textbooks, courseware, web-based learning modules, or laboratory modules; substantive course development or revision; and documented teaching innovations, curriculum development, external support for curriculum development, teaching awards, and publications addressing engineering education or courseware.

Evidence of excellence in laboratory instruction includes evaluations of the laboratory experience by students, alumni, peers, and GTA’s, published or distributed courseware, substantive lab creation or enhancement, equipment innovations reflecting current technology, external support for laboratory development or equipment, and publications addressing engineering education or courseware.

Faculty members are expected to effectively and creatively use available classroom and laboratory resources and administer their classes and laboratories in a manner that is punctual, prepared, professional, and personable. In addition, faculty members should be available, outside of class, for a reasonable period of time each week, to meet with students from class, from student organizations, or who are seeking advice on other academic matters.

Faculty members are expected to treat students with courtesy and respect and in a manner that affirms their professional development. Each faculty member is expected to teach a variety of material at both undergraduate and graduate levels subject to Department scheduling constraints.

Peer evaluation of teaching and student evaluation of teaching are employed as processes for measuring teaching effectiveness. In the implementation of these processes, it is important that the evaluation results are interpreted with respect to faculty

rank & experience, class type, class level, and other factors that may influence the data but are not necessarily relevant to measuring effectiveness.

### **3.2.1. Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

Teaching represents a multifaceted activity, which can be evaluated in many different ways. An important way of evaluating teaching is the evaluation through peers. Such a peer evaluation shall be an integral part of the evaluation provided by the department faculty development committee to untenured faculty members on an annual basis and to other faculty members as specified below. Evaluations should cover courses at different levels and of different kinds to gain a composite view of teaching effectiveness.

The peer evaluation procedure separately addresses the evaluation of content and the evaluation of delivery. Content is defined as the total production of faculty not directly associated with student contact, e.g., syllabus, books, lab manuals, web resources, notes, handouts, exams, presentations, demonstrations, homework, etc. Delivery encompasses activities directly associated with student contact, e.g., classroom and laboratory environment, lecture style, project team leadership, accessibility, punctuality, congeniality, grading, promptness, GTA management, etc. Requirements for and administration of peer teaching evaluations are discussed below.

#### **3.2.1.1. Evaluation Administration**

The department bargaining unit faculty shall annually elect one tenured BUFM as the coordinator for peer teaching evaluation. Peer teaching evaluation shall be performed by an ad-hoc committee of at least three tenured BUFMs appointed by the department chair with input from the teaching evaluation coordinator. One committee member shall be appointed as the chair, who shall draft the necessary reports for review of the whole committee.

Untenured faculty are evaluated with regard to content for at least one course annually. Untenured faculty are evaluated with regard to delivery for at least one course annually.

Tenured associate professors are evaluated with regard to content for at least one course annually. Tenured associate professors are evaluated with regard to delivery for at least one course annually.

Tenured full professors are evaluated with regard to content for at least one course annually. Tenured full professors are evaluated with regard to delivery at the request of the individual faculty member.

Individual faculty members can request additional content or delivery evaluations whenever desired. Additional evaluations may also be suggested by the faculty development committee or by the chair when warranted.

#### **3.2.1.2. Evaluation of Content**

For the evaluation of content, the teaching evaluation committee may recommend the formation of a committee consisting of tenured BUFMs teaching in similar course areas as the assessee. The committee will



review the syllabus, books, lab manuals, web resources, notes, handouts, exams, presentations, demonstrations, homework, etc. The committee will write a report evaluating the faculty member's teaching content, based on its review.

### **3.2.1.3. Evaluation of Delivery**

For the assessment of delivery, the evaluation committee chair shall obtain from the faculty member to be evaluated a list of all class meetings for the current quarter indicating those classes not conducive to a classroom evaluation. Each committee member will choose one visit date, not coinciding with another member's visit date. Peer visits are to be unannounced and extend through the whole class period.

When all visits are completed, the committee shall meet and discuss observations. The committee chair shall then set up a meeting with the faculty member who was evaluated and convey the assessment of the committee. After receiving the written report from the committee chair, the assessee may ask for clarifications or submit a rebuttal within two weeks, which must be attached to the teaching evaluation report.

### **3.2.1.4. Peer Evaluation Reports**

All reports from the evaluation of content and the evaluation of delivery will be conveyed to the evaluatee, the FDC, and the Department Chair.

## **3.2.2. Student Evaluation of Instruction**

Bargaining-unit faculty are required to participate in the student evaluation of instruction process as prescribed by the CBA. The results of these evaluations, in whatever form available, will be used as one of the measures of teaching effectiveness.

## **3.2.3. Consistency in Teaching**

Consistency is a key aspect of the candidate's evaluation with respect to teaching. Generally poor teaching evaluations punctuated by the occasional good or excellent responses are not considered sufficient for promotion and tenure.

## **3.2.4. Symptoms of Unsatisfactory Teaching**

While it may be difficult to define acceptable teaching, the symptoms of unsatisfactory teaching tend to be more obvious. These include (but are not limited to):

- Missed classes (without informing the Department or without adequate explanation)
- Missed advising appointments
- Persistent, legitimate student complaints
- Erratic classroom behavior
- Failure to keep appropriate office hours or otherwise be available to students and advisees
- Failure to respond appropriately to reasonable student questions or complaints
- Irresponsible or unprofessional conduct with students

- Failure to provide the chair the documentation required for evaluation of teaching
- Refusal to teach assigned courses

### **3.3. Service**

Faculty members are expected to contribute to efforts that advance the Department, the academic community and its professional activities. The very nature of service, which often involves behind-the-scenes contributions, makes it difficult to measure. At the same time, much of the growth and progress of the Department is directly related to the service offered by faculty. The value of service is difficult to overstate. In order to facilitate evaluation of the significance of a service activity, the faculty member should describe the nature, time-investment, and impact of their contribution to that endeavor or committee.

Examples of valued service at the Department and College level include active participation in recruiting and retaining students, serving as a reviewer for the purpose of peer evaluation of teaching, technical and developmental interaction with government and industry, and advising students participating in defense or industry-sponsored design projects. This is in addition to actively and responsibly participating in Department, College, and University committees. When serving in these latter roles, faculty members should consistently attend assigned committee and other Departmental meetings and complete the work necessary for the committees to fulfill their responsibilities.

Examples of service to the professional and scholarly communities include holding leadership roles in professional societies and organizations, holding editorships of journals and other widely-disseminated technical publications, serving on conference organization and technical committees, organizing and chairing tracts or sessions at conferences, reviewing papers, books, and proposals and participating in review panels.

## **4. PROMOTION AND TENURE**

### **4.1. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**

In this section we outline specific quantitative requirements for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure and for awarding tenure to an untenured Associate Professor. Levels of performance are described in terms of “strong,” “expected,” “competent,” and “unacceptable” using the evaluation criteria and qualitative measures for the components in the areas of research, teaching, and service described in Section 3 above. An “unacceptable” rating is assigned to any of the components below when the candidate’s record fails to meet the criteria for “competent.”

To be promoted to associate professor and/or tenured, a candidate must demonstrate a level of performance that is “competent” in service, that averages to a composite level of no less than “expected” in teaching, and that averages to a composite level of no less than “expected” in research.

An “expected” rating for teaching can be obtained with any of the following combinations:

<b>INSTRUCTION</b>	<b>GRADUATE ADVISING</b>
Expected	Expected
Strong	Competent
Competent	Strong

An “expected” rating for research can be obtained with any of the following combinations:

<b>SCHOLARSHIP</b>	<b>FUNDING</b>
Expected	Expected
Strong	Competent
Competent	Strong

#### **4.1.1. Time of Consideration**

It is normally expected that an Assistant Professor will be considered for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure during the sixth year at Wright State University, or the final probationary year. Consideration for the award of tenure to an untenured Associate Professor will generally occur during his or her third year at Wright State University. The criteria below refer to the candidate’s record with emphasis on the immediately preceding five years, which may include time prior to the candidate’s joining the faculty at Wright State University.

#### **4.1.2. Early Consideration**

A candidate may be considered for promotion to Associate Professor or for tenure prior to the normal time when a candidate’s performance is uniformly rated “strong” in research and teaching or when a candidate has experience as a tenure track faculty member at other institutions. In this case, the candidate’s performance must be of the level and duration at Wright State University for the Faculty Development Committee to be confident of its recommendation.

#### **4.1.3. Research**

Faculty research is evaluated in terms of scholarship and funding. In the evaluation of a faculty member’s contribution, these two components are assigned equivalent weights. The composite evaluation for research is the average of the two components. An “unacceptable” rating is assigned to any candidate who fails to meet the “competent” criteria in either component.

#### **4.1.3.1. Scholarship**

A strong scholarship record includes twelve or more journal papers in addition to publications of other form (see Section 3). An expected scholarship record includes at least nine journal papers in addition to publications of other form. A record that is just competent includes at least seven journal papers and evidence of activity in generating publications of other form.

#### **4.1.3.2. Funding**

A strong funding record includes total funding of at least \$300,000.00, and 16 quarters of graduate student support. An expected funding record includes at least \$150,000.00 in total funding, and 8 quarters of graduate student support. A record that is just competent includes at least \$100,000.00 in total funding, and 6 quarters of graduate student support.

#### **4.1.4. Teaching**

Faculty teaching is evaluated in terms of instruction and graduate advising. In the evaluation of a faculty member's contribution, the components are assigned equivalent weight. An "unacceptable" rating is assigned to any candidate that fails to meet the "competent" criteria in either component.

##### **4.1.4.1. Instruction**

A strong evaluation in instruction requires: consistently excellent student and peer evaluations along with evidence of teaching awards or other evidence of exemplary teaching performance; and demonstrated participation in curriculum development, laboratory development, instructional innovation, course oversight, and student advising beyond that expected of a typical faculty member. An expected evaluation in instruction requires: consistently-favorable student and peer evaluations; and demonstrated participation in curriculum development, laboratory development, instructional innovation, course oversight, and student advising. Performance is competent if the faculty member's most recent student and peer evaluations are favorable with performance improving with experience; and if the faculty member demonstrates competence with classroom and laboratory instruction, is well prepared for their teaching assignment, communicates the material effectively, administers classrooms and laboratories punctually and consistently, and is available to students. Competent performance requires student and peer evaluation measures that are absent a clear pattern of the symptoms of unsatisfactory teaching outlined in Section 3.1.3.2.

##### **4.1.4.2. Graduate Advising**

A strong record includes the successful advising to completion of nine graduate student units, where a unit is measured in terms of M.S. and Ph.D. students with one M.S. student representing one unit and one Ph.D. student representing three units. An expected record includes the successful advising to completion of six graduate student units. A competent record includes the successful advising to completion of at least three graduate student units.

#### 4.1.5. Service

A competent rating requires that the candidate compile a record of regularly and effectively serving the needs of the Department, College, or University through participation in Department, College, and University committees as assigned or as opportunities arise. In addition, a competent record includes evidence of willingness to serve the professional community by reviewing manuscripts, or reviewing grant proposals, or serving on conference committees or performing other service.

#### 4.2. Criteria for Promotion to Professor

The career accomplishments of the candidate for promotion to professor should show clear evidence of nationally or internationally recognized contributions to the discipline. Moreover, evidence of continuing and consistent scholarship is required to ensure that the candidate's contributions represent the current state of the discipline and an appropriate level of scholarly activity.

Levels of performance are described in terms of "superior," "strong," and "expected." A candidate whose record is "expected" in teaching or service must demonstrate "superior" performance in a second area and no less than "strong" in the third area to receive a favorable recommendation for promotion. A less than "expected" rating in any area is sufficient for an unfavorable recommendation for promotion.

To be promoted to professor a candidate must demonstrate a level of performance that averages no less than "strong" in research, that averages no less than "strong" across teaching and service, and does not fall below "expected" in any component.

A "strong" rating for research can be obtained with any of the following combinations:

SCHOLARSHIP	FUNDING
Strong	Strong
Superior	Expected
Expected	Superior

A "strong" rating for teaching and service combined can be obtained with any of the following combinations:

INSTRUCTION	GRADUATE ADVISING	SERVICE
Strong	Strong	Strong
Superior	Expected	Strong
Superior	Strong	Expected
Strong	Superior	Expected
Strong	Expected	Superior
Expected	Superior	Strong
Expected	Strong	Superior

#### **4.2.1. Time of Consideration**

To provide sufficient time to establish a continuous record of research at the level expected for promotion to Professor, a candidate normally will have completed at least five years at the rank of Associate Professor. In exceptional cases, a candidate may be considered for promotion to Professor prior to the completion of five years at the rank of Associate Professor. A candidate may be considered exceptional when the record for research, teaching, and service is uniformly rated “superior” and when this level of performance has been of sufficient duration for the Faculty Development Committee to be confident of its recommendation.

#### **4.2.2. Research**

Faculty research is evaluated in terms of scholarship and funding. In the evaluation of a faculty member’s contribution, these two components are assigned equivalent weights. The composite evaluation for research is the average of the scholarship and funding components. An “unacceptable” rating is assigned to any candidate record that fails to meet the “expected” criteria in either scholarship or funding.

##### **4.2.2.1. Scholarship**

A superior scholarship record includes 24 or more journal papers (12 or more occurring since the last promotion) in addition to publications of other form (see Section 3). A strong scholarship record includes at least 21 journal papers (10 or more occurring since the last promotion) in addition to publications of other form. A record that is just expected includes at least 18 journal papers (9 or more occurring since the last promotion) in addition to publications of other form. While scholarship of several forms may, in aggregate, satisfy the expectations described here (see section 3.1.1.3), at least three-fourths of the requirement must be satisfied by archival journal papers.

##### **4.2.2.2. Funding**

A superior funding record includes total funding of at least \$1,000,000.00 (with at least \$500,000.00 occurring since the last promotion), and 40 quarters of graduate student support (with at least 20 occurring since the last promotion). A strong record includes funding of at least \$750,000.00 (with at least \$325,000.00 occurring since the last promotion), and 30 quarters of graduate student support (with at least 15 occurring since the last promotion). A record that is just expected includes funding of at least \$500,000.00 (with at least \$250,000.00 occurring since the last promotion), and 20 quarters of graduate student support (with at least 10 occurring since last promotion).

#### **4.2.3. Teaching**

Faculty teaching is evaluated in terms of instruction and graduate advising. In the evaluation of a faculty member’s contribution, the instruction and graduate advising components are assigned the same weight. An “unacceptable” rating is assigned to any candidate record that fails to meet the “expected” criteria in either instruction or graduate advising.

#### **4.2.3.1. Instruction**

A superior evaluation in instruction requires: consistently excellent student and peer evaluations along with teaching awards or other evidence of exemplary teaching performance; and demonstrated consistent leadership and participation in curriculum development, laboratory development, instructional innovation, course oversight, and student advising beyond that expected of a typical faculty member. A strong evaluation in instruction requires: consistently-favorable student and peer evaluations desirably with performance improving with experience; and demonstrated consistent participation in curriculum development, laboratory development, instructional innovation, course oversight, and student advising. Performance is expected if the faculty member's most recent student and peer evaluations are favorable with performance improving with experience; and if the faculty member exhibits commitment to curriculum development, laboratory development, instructional innovation, course oversight, and student advising; demonstrates competence with classroom and laboratory instruction, is well prepared for their teaching assignment, communicates the material effectively, administers classrooms and laboratories punctually and consistently, and is available to students. Expected performance requires student and peer evaluation measures that are absent a clear pattern of the symptoms of unsatisfactory teaching outlined in Section 3.1.3.2.

#### **4.2.3.2. Graduate Advising**

A superior record includes the successful advising to completion of 18 graduate student units including at least 2 Ph.D. students, where a unit is measured in terms of M.S. and Ph.D. students with one M.S. student representing one unit and one Ph.D. student representing three units. A strong record includes the successful advising to completion of 9 graduate student units including at least 1 Ph.D. student. An expected record includes the successful advising of at least 6 graduate student units including at least 1 Ph.D. student.

#### **4.2.4. Service**

The service contribution of a faculty member is generally measured with regard to activities described in Section 3.1.4.

A superior rating in service requires substantial service to professional and scholarly communities outside the University and demonstrated leadership and commitment in service to the Department, College, or University. Substantial service implies leadership or accomplishments that confirm that the individual is nationally or internationally acknowledged for his or her service accomplishments. A superior rating indicates the candidate's contribution to be well beyond that expected of a typical faculty member.

A strong rating in service requires that the candidate compile a record of regularly and effectively serving the needs of the Department and also the College or University through participation in recruiting and retaining students, through professional interaction with local government and industry, and through leadership of and regular participation in Department and either College or University committees. Evidence of significant service leadership at Wright State

or in professional societies is required. In addition, a strong rating requires that the candidate show evidence of involvement on the national level by reviewing manuscripts, reviewing grant proposals, serving on conference committees or performing other service to the professional community.

An expected record must demonstrate that the candidate consistently serves the needs of the Department and also the College or University through participation in recruiting and retaining students and through regularly and effectively serving on Department, College, or University committees. In addition, an expected record includes evidence of serving the professional community by reviewing manuscripts, reviewing grant proposals, serving on conference committees or performing other service to the professional community.

#### **4.3. Criteria for Award of Tenure to an Untenured Professor**

Consideration for the award of tenure to an untenured Professor will occur during his or her second year at Wright State University. To ensure that the candidate's contributions represent the current state of the discipline and to provide confidence that an appropriate level of scholarly activity will be sustained in the future, the candidate's record must roughly satisfy the criteria for promotion to Professor listed above.

#### **4.4. Criteria for Initial Appointment with Tenure**

Occasionally an award of tenure is made with an initial appointment to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. When this is considered, it is expected that the candidate currently has tenure at an academic institution whose stature and expectations are comparable with those of Wright State University. The career accomplishments of the candidate should provide clear and compelling evidence of a nationally recognized contributor to the discipline. To ensure that the candidate's contributions represent the current state of the discipline and to provide confidence that an appropriate level of scholarly activity has been attained, the specific criteria, discussed above, for promotion to the rank being considered must be satisfied.

### **5. ANNUAL EVALUATION**

The annual performance evaluation of BUFMs by the department chair assesses contributions in the categories of research, teaching, and service in terms of 4 = "extraordinary," 3 = "outstanding," 2 = "meritorious," 1 = "adequate," and 0 = "unsatisfactory." The numerical scores summarizing these evaluations are assigned based on the qualitative measures discussed in Section 3 and the quantitative measures discussed below. In order to aid the equity and understanding of this process, the Department chair will compile and distribute to faculty a summary of the prior year's evaluation statistics on an annual basis.

Each category is evaluated in terms of an integer from 0 to 4, with 4 representing "extraordinary," following the procedures described below. The overall BUFm performance evaluation is computed as a convex sum ( $rT * wT + rR * wR + rS * wS$ ), where the numerical ratings for teaching, research, and service are denoted by  $rT$ ,  $rR$ , and  $rS$ , respectively and where the weight factors: ( $wT$ ,  $wR$ ,  $wS$ ) are constrained according to BUFm academic rank (shown below). The weights must add to 1 and are chosen to maximize the sum within these constraints. The resulting weighted sum is the overall numerical rating for an individual.



## Weight Factor Ranges by BUFM Academic Rank

Weight Category	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
Teaching: wT	0.4 – 0.5	0.3 – 0.6	0.3 – 0.6
Research: wR	0.4 – 0.5	0.2 – 0.6	0.2 – 0.6
Service: wS	0.0 – 0.1	0.1 – 0.3	0.1 – 0.3

The Department chair may assign weightings different from those defined above in any of the following situations:

- To accommodate the faculty member's unique work assignment
- To impose discipline pursuant to the CBA.
- To correct a pattern of substandard performance extending for more than one year.>

### 5.1. Specific Evaluation Assignments

In the following subsections, criteria for the annual evaluation of research, teaching, and service are discussed. An evaluation of "unsatisfactory" in any area indicates that the faculty member has not demonstrated adequate production in that area. Substantial and immediate improvement is imperative.

Objective interpolation and extrapolation will be used to evaluate cases not falling directly into the categories described below. Further, since academic and scholarly products are often accomplished over the course of multiple years, performance in recent years, as well as performance in the current evaluation year will be considered so as to mitigate misrepresentations caused by temporal quantization.

### 5.2. Research

Measures for productivity in research include: Awards for research or scholarship; publication of journal papers, books, or other forms of research; acceptance of journal papers, books, or other forms of scholarship; submission of journal papers, books, or other forms of scholarship; quarters of graduate student support; total funding expenditures; new proposals awarded; new proposals submitted; and award or submission of patents.

Notice that, while research performance is divided into scholarship and funding, the composite sum of these activities are used to measure research performance, with compensatory allowances permitted between the categories.

#### 5.2.1. Performance at the Extraordinary (= 4) level

**Scholarship:** Two or more journal papers or books published, with several journal papers or books accepted or submitted, and some production of other forms of scholarship.

**Funding:** Eight quarters of graduate student support, \$75k or more research expenditures, with evidence of continuing external funding awards or submissions.

### **5.2.2. Performance at the Outstanding (= 3) level**

Scholarship: One or more journal papers or books published, with at least one journal paper or book accepted or submitted, and some production of other forms of scholarship.

Funding: Four quarters of graduate student support, \$50k or more research expenditures, with evidence of continuing external funding awards or submissions.

### **5.2.3. Performance at the Meritorious (= 2) level**

Scholarship: Production of at least three forms of scholarship published, accepted, or submitted.

Funding: Three quarters of graduate student support, \$25k or more research expenditures, with evidence of continuing external funding awards or submissions.

### **5.2.4. Performance at the Adequate (= 1) level**

Scholarship: Production of at least one form of scholarship published, accepted, or submitted.

Funding: Evidence of continuing external funding awards or submissions. If the faculty member has had no external research support during the year, there must be documentation about submission of a research proposal to an external agency.

### **5.2.5. Performance at the Unsatisfactory (=0) level**

Performance measures are less than adequate.

## **5.3. Teaching**

Factors used in rating teaching performance include effectiveness of in-class teaching; teaching of workshops and continuing education courses; student advising; serving as major advisor for Ph.D. dissertations and M.S. theses; serving on thesis and dissertation committees; supervising senior design, honors and independent study projects; supervising postdoctoral fellows; developing new courses and laboratories, integrating new technologies in courses and attracting funds for laboratory equipment to support teaching.

### **5.3.1. Performance at the Extraordinary (= 4) level**

The faculty member must demonstrate teaching activities that exceed expectations for outstanding and make major contributions to department and college which are recognized outside the university.

### **5.3.2. Performance at the Outstanding (= 3) level**

Assuming the faculty member has met the requirements for meritorious performance, at least two measures such as those listed below can be used as evidence for outstanding teaching:

- co-authoring at least one journal article with students;
- attracting funds for laboratory equipment to support teaching;
- serving as a major advisor for a completed master's thesis or doctoral dissertation.

### **5.3.3. Performance at the Meritorious (= 2) level**

Assuming the faculty member has met the requirements for adequate performance, at least two measures such as those listed below can be used as evidence of meritorious teaching:

- preparing a course that the faculty member is teaching for the first time;
- making major modifications to a course;
- serving on master's thesis and dissertation committees of students graduating during that year;
- effectively supervising independent study projects and honors thesis students;
- effectively integrating new technologies into classroom instruction.

### **5.3.4. Performance at the Adequate (= 1) level**

The faculty member in this category performs satisfactorily based on student evaluations and review of the relevant teaching materials. Adequate performance in teaching is represented by only few negative comments by students and, if available, an overall positive assessment by peers. Performance at an adequate level of teaching is typically demonstrated through:

- meeting with the class at scheduled times unless there are extenuating circumstances;
- being available during posted office hours unless there is an unavoidable conflict;
- being prepared for the classroom;
- keeping course content current.

### **5.3.5. Performance at the Unsatisfactory (= 0) level**

The faculty member does not meet the requirements of an adequate level of in-class teaching performance. Unsatisfactory performance often leads to a significant number of student complaints. Examples of in-class teaching problems include:

- the faculty member does not seem prepared for classroom activities;
- the faculty member does not return examinations and assignments in a timely manner, does not manage the classroom well or is not available to students;
- on a regular basis, the faculty member shows up late for class, dismisses class early or does not show up for class at all;
- on a regular basis, the faculty member is not available during office hours.

## **5.4. Service**

Measures for productivity in service include awards for service along with the following.

At the professional level: memberships on boards of directors, editorships, conference chairs, technical program committee memberships and paper and proposal reviews.

At the University, College, or Community levels: faculty governance positions, committee chairs and memberships, and memberships in community educational or student organizations, development activities.

At the Department level: directing academic programs, leading research teams, developing new academic or research programs, developing and participating in recruiting & retention programs, committee chairs and memberships, and advising student groups and students.

Occasionally, faculty members devote themselves to causes that further the goals of the department in ways not immediately obvious in the activity report record. Examples of these instances include championing a particular committee action or accepting personal responsibility for the execution of some committee charge. In these cases, the chair is given latitude to appreciate the evaluation of the service component accordingly.

Notice that, while service is divided into three levels: professional; University, College, or community; and Department. The composite sum of these activities are used to measure service performance, with compensatory allowances permitted between the categories.

#### **5.4.1. Performance at the Extraordinary (= 4) level**

Professional level: at least one board membership or editorship or program committee membership along with reviewer activity.

University, College, or Community level: at least two chairmanships.

Department level: at least one directorship or team leader or significant chairmanship (not sub-committee), and strong participation in recruiting and retention efforts.

#### **5.4.2. Performance at the Outstanding (= 3) level**

Professional level: at least one board membership or editorship or program committee membership along with reviewer activity.

University, College, or Community level: at least one chairmanship or two memberships.

Department level: at least one directorship or team leader or significant chairmanship (not sub-committee), or at least three significant memberships (not sub-committee), and strong participation in recruiting and retention efforts.

#### **5.4.3. Performance at the Meritorious (= 2) level**

Professional level: reviewer activity.

University, College, or Community level: at least one membership.

Department level: at least two significant memberships, and participation in recruiting and retention efforts.

**5.4.4. Performance at the Adequate (= 1) level**

Professional level: reviewer activity. or University, College, or Community level: at least one chairmanship or membership.

Department level: at least two significant memberships, and participation in recruiting and retention efforts.

**5.4.5. Performance at the Unsatisfactory (=0) level**

Performance measures are less than adequate.