MSU College of Engineering Guidelines
For Faculty Annual Reviews

Each College of Engineering faculty member participates in an annual performance review with his or her department head. The review process should be supportive and collegial, and should help faculty build on strengths and identify weaker areas of performance. Thorough, consistent, and fair annual reviews are important in the tenure and promotion process and important in fairly distributing merit raises when they are available.

The “MSU College of Engineering Guidelines for Faculty Annual Reviews” provides information for all faculty and department heads to guide the review process. These guidelines are not meant to be all-inclusive. New faculty in particular should clarify the annual review process with their department head to understand how these guidelines are applied.

Each faculty member should have an understanding with his or her department head about the appropriate emphasis among teaching, research, and service, and the faculty member’s review should be commensurate with the faculty member’s appointment and assignment. The faculty member’s specific assignment can change from year to year, and the annual review reflects performance on the specific assignment for that year.

The department head assigns ratings for each faculty member, and these ratings are used to determine the distribution, within the department, of any portion of a salary raise devoted to merit. The ratings are assigned for teaching, research, and service; in addition, the faculty member receives an overall rating. The possible ratings are:

- EP: Extraordinary Performance
- EE: Exceeded Expectations
- ME: Met Expectations
- BE: Below Expectations
- UP: Unsatisfactory Performance

According to the Faculty Handbook, any faculty member who receives two overall Unsatisfactory Performance (UP) ratings in a row automatically has a post-tenure review.

The ratings are not necessarily comparable across departments; for example, an EP rating in one department may be assigned for different reasons than an EP rating in another. However, the department heads should keep in mind the importance of some level of consistency (across departments) in the rating process in order to aid the college-level promotion and tenure committee in making fair decisions and to promote faculty satisfaction with the equity of the review process.

The underlying assumption is that all faculty members should be capable of “meeting expectations”; thus, ME should not necessarily be the average rating for a department.
Departments use the web-based Faculty Activity Survey (the Delaware Data collection tool) for annual reviews, and all faculty should familiarize themselves with the questions on that survey. Below are examples of activities and documentation that might be considered during the annual review process in each of the areas of teaching, research, and service. In all three areas, the lists provided should be used as guidance for both the faculty member and the department head. An individual faculty member’s activities may not include all of those listed; on the other hand, other activities might also provide evidence of performance in the three areas.

NOTE: Depending on an individual faculty member’s assignment, outside consulting might be considered in the annual review process in any of the three categories below. Consulting should not interfere with performance of regular expected duties.

Teaching

Below is a list of activities that might be considered when determining a faculty member’s teaching contributions for the year and the faculty member’s rating.

**Instruction**

- Student evaluations of the faculty member and the faculty member’s courses. While student evaluations do not portray a complete picture and should not be used exclusively, good evaluations and good pedagogy are generally correlated. Some evidence of teaching quality that might be shown in student evaluations include communicating high expectations for students, providing frequent opportunities for assessment of student learning and timely feedback, providing clear learning objectives, and presenting information in a way that students can understand.

- A self assessment written by the faculty member. This assessment might include information about the following
  - A description of what the faculty member has done to improve the courses and labs that he or she has taught during the past year (could include, for example, how the faculty’s research and creative activity were incorporated into the course).
  - Evidence of the quality of the courses taught. This evidence could include evidence relating to course design, course materials, and/or course delivery from senior exit surveys, focus groups, or peer evaluations. Evidence of quality could include the clarity and completeness of course materials and appropriate uses of technology.
  - A description of what the faculty member has done to improve the curriculum as a whole during the past year (for example, ABET participation)

- Teaching related publications and presentations.
- Teaching related grants.
Activities that relate to improving one’s own or others teaching ability, including collaborating with colleagues to improve teaching and learning and attending faculty development opportunities related to teaching.

Other teaching related activities or evidence (for example, overseeing independent study projects, awards, honors).

Advising

- Number of undergraduates and graduates advised.
- The ability to advise undergraduates effectively. Evidence regarding quality of advising could be obtained from departmental surveys of students or letters from students. Effective advising generally includes being available regularly, informing students of university policies and procedures, assisting students in locating available resources, guiding students in the selection of classes to meet academic requirements, communicating basic career guidance, and writing letters of recommendation for scholarships and job placement.
- The ability to advise, recruit, and retain graduate students effectively. (See above)
- Activities that relate to improving one’s own or others advising ability.
- Other advising related activities or evidence.

Research

Below is a list of evidence that might be considered when determining a faculty member’s research contributions for the year and the annual rating. The College of Engineering values collaborative and multi-disciplinary research efforts, and faculty are encouraged to seek out such opportunities.

- **Publications** (should include scholarly work related to teaching)
  - Papers submitted to refereed journals, non-refereed journals, and conferences
  - Books or book chapters submitted
  - Papers accepted by refereed journals, non-refereed journals, and conferences
  - Books or book chapters accepted
  - Technical reports

- **Graduate students supervised in research activities**
  - Committees chaired (M.S. and PhD)
  - Other committee involvement

- **Undergraduate students engaged in and supervised in research activities**

- **Grants and contracts** (should include grants related to the scholarship of teaching)
  - Internal and external grant or contract proposals submitted
  - Internal and external grant or contract proposals awarded
  - Total dollar value of funded internal and external grants or contracts

- **Patents**
  - Patent applications filed
  - Patents issued

Professional Development
Awards

Presentations or Exhibitions
- Invited presentations
- Formal presentations at professional conferences
- Exhibitions

Other research activity (work in progress, new initiatives, editing a journal)

Service

Below is a list of activities that might be considered when determining a faculty member’s service contributions for the year and the annual rating.

- Service to the department (for example, departmental committees, accreditation activities, participation with student organizations, and other general activities that benefit the department)
- Service to the College of Engineering (for example, college committees and task forces; participation in student organizations; participation in college initiatives, such as recruitment, retention, and diversity)
- Service to the university (for example, MSU committees, Faculty Council, guest lectures, university outreach)
- Service to the profession (for example, serving as a professional society officer, organizing a conference, reviewing papers or proposals)
- Service to the public (this could occur at the community, state and/or national levels). Public service would generally be related to the profession, but could be broader.

General Professional Behavior

In all activities, faculty should exhibit the following professional behaviors:

- Exhibit a professional demeanor in his or her role.
- Develop a plan of professional growth and show progress toward goals in all areas of his or her assignment.
- Respect colleagues (including staff) and students as individuals.
- Practice active listening.
- Interact positively within the university, with the public, with students, and with other constituents.
- Maintain academic integrity and currency in the field of study.
- Respect and promote diversity.
- Use modern technology consistent with his/her academic discipline and the needs of students.