

CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

School of Engineering
Lebanese American University

Contents

Preamble.....	2
Procedure	2
Teaching Dimension	3
Research Dimension.....	4
Service Dimension.....	7
Appendix A: Evaluation tools related to the teaching dimension	8
Appendix B: Evaluation tools related to the service dimension	21
Appendix C: Faculty Annual Report & Evaluation	23

PREAMBLE

The criteria for promotion and tenure will shape the future of the school and therefore should be consistent with the mission of the school and should realize its vision. These criteria should also serve as a compass for success in the academic careers of the faculty. The evaluation for promotion and tenure is based upon three performance dimensions: (1) teaching, (2) research, and (3) service. This triad encompasses the primary activities of the faculty and will provide for quality teaching for students, development and growth for the faculty, and self-governance and community extension for the school.

PROCEDURE

The school dean appoints a peer committee to evaluate applicants for promotion and tenure. After careful review of the application file according to the criteria for promotion and tenure presented in this document, the committee submits its final recommendation to the dean.

There should be two different peer committees: one composed of faculty members with rank of associate professor or higher for the promotion to the rank of associate professor and the other composed of professors for the promotion to the rank of professor. Each committee should include at least one faculty from each department and can include faculty members from outside the school. Composition of the committee should cover the discipline of every applicant. The committee should exclude faculty with administrative assignments. The composition of the committee could deviate from the above due to restrictions in faculty availability. In any case, guidelines for peer committee membership should be consistent with the university-wide procedure and practice.

The committee should take the input of external reviewers in making their final recommendation. The external reviewers are selected by the committee and should include at least two reviewers out of a list of at least four names provided by the applicant. The external reviewers should have a higher academic rank than the applicant. The committee should provide the external reviewer with the following: (1) standard cover letter, (2) CV of applicant and (3) all material in the application file related to the research dimension. In any case, guidelines for external reviews should be consistent with the university-wide procedure and practice.

The application file which is the basis of evaluation should include the following: (1) standard cover letter, (2) annual faculty evaluations for all years covering the evaluation period, and (3) material that demonstrate quality of performance in teaching, research, and service.

The criteria for promotion and tenure are based on a point scoring system that combines the three dimensions into one overall score = $0.4 \times T + 0.3 \times R + 0.3 \times S$ where T stands for the total score on teaching, R is the total score on research and S is the total score on services. A minimum overall score of 60% is required for promotion to associate professor and 70% for promotion to full professor.

TEACHING DIMENSION

The school recognizes that LAU is primarily a teaching institution. Faculty seeking promotion and tenure in the school, therefore, are evaluated on a set of required teaching components that are essential to the operation in addition to other desired components that contribute to the teaching-learning process. The required components are listed in the table below with a checkmark (✓) and relate to instruction and student advising. The additional components relate to curricular development & assessment, scholarly activities, and official recognition. Surveys and rubrics that are used in the evaluation of teaching are provided in Appendix A.

Criteria	Score	Weight	Score should be based on the following
1. Instruction			
Quality of Instruction	T1.1	0.30	(✓) Yearly course evaluation over the entire evaluation period
	T1.2	0.20	(✓) Surveys sent to Alumni addressing the quality of instruction
Innovation in instruction methods, approaches, and techniques including active learning	T1.3	0.30	(✓) Chair evaluation using rubric for evaluation of course delivery
	T1.4	0.05	Rubric for teaching innovation and active learning (student version)
	T1.5	0.05	Rubric for teaching innovation and active learning(chair version); supporting documents including samples of student work demonstrating impact of teaching methods on student learning; and teaching statement produced by faculty detailing approach used and how it impacted student learning in the course
Independent Student Supervision	T1.6	0.10	(✓) Surveys sent to students addressing quality of supervision on final year projects
2. Curricular Development and Assessment			
Curricular Development and Assessment	T2.1	0.20	Rubric for curricular development and assessment; and Supporting documents such as: course assessment form, PO workbooks, PO assessment exams, development of new assessment tools, new minors, etc.
3. Quality of Student Advising			
	T3.1	0.10	(✓) Survey sent to advisees addressing the quality of advising
4. Scholarly Activities			
External funding	T4.1	0.10	Dollar Amount for laboratory equipment/software or course development. Score evaluation should be consistent with related item in the research dimension
	T4.2		
Dissemination of good practice	T4.3	0.20	Published journal and conference papers in teaching and assessment methods; and published textbooks. Score should be consistent with related item in the research dimension.
	T4.4		
5. Official Recognition			
Recognition of teaching efforts	T5.1	0.10	Teaching awards.

Notes:

1. When the response rate is low, the corresponding weight is carried over to the score provide by the chair (T1.3)
2. The required criteria are designated by the checkmark (✓) and their weights add up to 1.0

The total score on teaching is T = the weighted sum of all the scores in the above table. The requirements for promotion in the teaching dimension are:

Promotion to the rank of	Associate Professor	Full Professor
Minimum value of T	60%	60%
Minimum value of weighted sum of scores that have a checkmark (✓)	60%	60%

RESEARCH DIMENSION

The school recognizes research as an essential dimension in the educational process and as a main contributor to faculty development. Faculty seeking promotion and tenure in the school, therefore, are evaluated on a set of required research components that are essential to the operation in addition to other desired components that enhance research programs. The required components are listed in the table below with a checkmark (✓) and relate to journal publications. The additional components relate to grants, other scholarly activities, and official recognition. The school values the quality as well as the throughput of scholarly activities.

Criteria	Score	Weight	Score should be based on the following
1. Disciplinary Journal Publications			
Significance and impact of the publication; and primary authorship	R1.1	0.50	(✓) Papers published in journals that are listed in the Journal Citation Record (JCR) with a nonzero journal impact factor (JIF). This includes regular, technical note, short/brief paper, letter and book review. Papers that are published in journals that are not listed in JCR will not be counted.
2. Grants			
Funded projects and primary investigator	R2.1	0.15	Number of funded projects and number of investigators
Amount of funding	R2.2	0.15	Dollar amount allocated to LAU
3. Other Scholarly Activities			
Publications excluding journals	R3.1	0.20	Papers published in international refereed conference proceedings; Peer-reviewed book chapters and with internationally recognized publishers or international societies; Patents; and Peer-reviewed edited books with internationally recognized publishers or international societies. Only regular conference papers are considered –posters, short papers, abstracts are not counted.
4. Official Recognition			
Recognition of research and scholarly activities	R4.1	0.10	Includes award for best journal paper and award for best conference paper

Notes:

- The required criteria are designated by the checkmark (✓)

The total score on research is R = the weighted sum of all the scores in the above table. The requirements for promotion in the research dimension are:

Promotion to the rank of	Associate Professor	Full Professor ¹
Minimum value of R	40%	60%
Minimum value of R1.1	25%	35%
Minimum number of disciplinary journal papers	4	6
Primary authorship on disciplinary journal papers	first author on at least one paper	single author on at least one paper

- The minimum requirements for full professor should be accumulated while at the rank of Associate Professor.

The school recognizes journals that are only listed in the Journal Citation Reports.

Journal Citation Reports® (JCR), a product of Thomson Reuters, offers a systematic, objective means to critically evaluate the world's leading journals, with quantifiable, statistical information based on citation data. The evaluation used by JCR includes: retrievability of source articles; application of the peer review process; editorial content; international diversity of its authorship; and citation data.

The school recognizes the quality of journal publications through the Impact Factor (IF) and the Eigenfactor (EF) of the journal where the article is published.

The impact factor is a measure of the frequency with which the "average article" in a journal has been cited in a given period of time. Whereas the Eigenfactor Score is a popular new metric designed to reflect the prestige and citation influence of journals by considering scholarly literature as a network of journal-to-journal relationships.

The score on a journal publication depend on the category, impact, and authorship of the paper as given below:

R1.1 = sum over all papers of the product: $(C \times I \times A)$

"C" is the category factor and is according to the following table:

1	regular paper
0.5	technical note, short or brief paper, letter, book review, correspondence/discussion paper

The different categories of journal papers should be as defined by the journal.

"I" is the impact of the paper and is calculated according to the following equation:

$$I = 0.2 + 0.8 \max \left[\frac{IF}{\text{Max}(IF)}, \frac{EF}{\text{Max}(EF)} \right]$$

where IF is the Impact Factor and EF is the Eigenfactor of the journal where the article is published, and Max(IF) or Max(EF) are the IF or EF of a journal covering the major area(s) of the article under consideration with the highest IF or EF. The actual values used for Max(IF) and Max(EF) are determined by the peer committee. The impact of the paper should be computed based on the date of publication.

"A" is the authorship factor and is given according to the following table with N = Number of authors excluding all LAU students:

N	1 st Author	2 nd Author	3 rd Author	4 th Author	5 th Author
1	1.0				
2	0.55	0.45			
3	0.50	0.35	0.15		
4	0.50	0.30	0.10	0.10	
5 or more	0.45	0.25	$0.3/(N-2)$	$0.3/(N-2)$	$0.3/(N-2)$

The values on authorship factor listed in the table above are to be considered as general guidelines with the actual values determined by the peer committee.

In order to encourage interdisciplinary research, papers collaborated and published with authors outside the engineering fields are awarded an additional 0.10 to the value obtained from the table above.

The school recognizes the importance of securing funded projects in fostering research programs. The scores on funded projects depend on the number of investigators and on the amount of funding that is allocated to LAU.

R2.1 = sum over all funded projects of: P

“ P ” depends on the number of investigators and is given according to the following table with N = Number of PI and Co-PI where PI stands for principle investigator.

N	P	
	PI	Co-PI
1	1	
2 or more	$1.2/N$	$\frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{N-1.2}{N-1} \right)$

R2.2 = sum over all funded projects of: D

“ D ” depends on the amount of funding according to the following table:

Dollars amount	1-5K	5-10K	10-50K	50-100K	100-500K	$\geq 500K$
D	0.7	1	1.3	2	2.3	3

The scores on publications other than journal papers depend on the category and number of authors.

R3.1 = sum over all non-journal papers of the product: $(C \times A)$

“ C ” is the category factor and is according to the following table and “ A ” is the authorship factor as defined previously for journal papers.

0.5	Paper published in international refereed conference proceedings, supported by the department, a peer-reviewed book chapters and with internationally recognized publishers or international societies, or a patent
5	Peer-reviewed edited books with internationally recognized publishers or international societies.

Awards received based on publications are recognized according to the following:

R4.1 = sum over all of awards of:

$I \times A$	Award for a journal Paper
$0.2 \times A$	Award for a conference Paper

where “ I ” and “ A ” are as defined previously for journal papers.

SERVICE DIMENSION

The school recognizes an obligation to provide the university, the community, and the profession service through the expertise of its faculty. Faculty seeking promotion and tenure in the school, therefore, are expected to demonstrate a record of sustained, effective service within the following settings: department, school, university, community and profession. The service dimension is divided into internal and external activities as listed in the table below with a checkmark (✓) to designate required activities. The rubric that is used to evaluate this dimension is provided in Appendix B.

Criteria	Score	Weight		Score should be based on the following
1. Internal Service				
Serving on Committees	S1.1	1.0	(✓)	Rubric for service activities
Personal Initiative	S1.2	0.20		Rubric for service activities
Service to student activities	S1.3	0.20		Rubric for service activities
2. External Service				
Service to the profession	S2.1	0.20		Rubric for service activities
Outreach to K-12 Public and Private schools	S2.2	0.20		Rubric for service activities
Service to the community and public	S2.3	0.20		Rubric for service activities
Visibility in local and regional media	S2.4	0.20		Rubric for service activities

Notes:

1. The required criteria are designated by the checkmark (✓)

The total score on service is S = the weighted sum of all the scores in the above table. The requirements for promotion in the service dimension are:

Promotion to the rank of	Associate Professor	Full Professor
Minimum value of S	40%	40%
Minimum value of S1.1	40%	40%

APPENDIX A: EVALUATION TOOLS RELATED TO THE TEACHING DIMENSION

T1.1: Course evaluation by students	9
T1.2: Survey on quality of teaching sent to Alumni	10
T1.3: Rubrics for evaluation of course delivery	11
T1.4: Rubrics for evaluation of teaching innovation & active learning (filled by students)	12
T1.5: Rubrics for evaluation of teaching innovation & active learning (filled by chair)	13
T1.6: Survey for supervision of Final Year Projects	14
T2.1: Rubrics for evaluation of curricular development and assessment.....	15
T3.1: Survey for Quality of Student Advising	16
T4.1: External Funding (Number and PI).....	16
T4.2: External Funding (Dollar Amount)	16
T4.3: Dissemination of Good Practice (Education Journal Papers).....	17
T4.4: Dissemination of Good Practice (other education publications).....	17
T5.1 Official Recognition	18
Course delivery report	19

T1.1: COURSE EVALUATION BY STUDENTS

T1.1 is the average of “Course Scores” for all courses taught during the evaluation period and converted to a scale of 100%.

The “Course Score” is obtained per course and is the maximum of the following three scores obtained on the web survey administered by the university at the end of each semester:

- (1) Average of scores on questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9
- (2) Score on question 20
- (3) Score on question 21

Scale =

Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	N/A
------	--------------	------	-----------	-----------	-----

A. Instructor’s Organization 1. Set out and met clear Objectives for the course 2. Knowledgeable about course material 3. Presented well prepared and relevant lectures
B. Instructor’s Interaction with Students 4. Demonstrated concern about whether students were learning 5. Inspired and motivated student interest in the course content 6. Was available for consultation outside class 7. Encouraged questions inside and outside class
C. Course Organization and Content 8. Course topics were available and worth learning 9. Course material organized and presented in a clear fashion 10. Your previous education prepared you well for this course
D. Course Aids 11. Textbook was useful 12. Software/Computer increased your understanding of course material 13. Use the blackboard and visual aids well
E. Course Assignments and exams 14. Assignments were relevant to course material 15. Exam questions were fair 16. Course was graded fairly
F. Laboratory Sessions 17. Instructor gave well-prepared and relevant sessions 18. Lab work strengthened your understanding of the course material 19. Lab equipment were adequate
G. Overall Ratings 20. The Overall quality of the course 21. The instructor’s overall teaching

T1.2: SURVEY ON QUALITY OF TEACHING SENT TO ALUMNI

T1.2 is calculated based on the following survey and converted to a scale of 100%

Scale =

N/A	Poor	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Excellent
-----	------	---------------	---------	---------------	-----------

Faculty name: _____

How many courses did you take with this faculty member?

- 1
- 2-3
- 3-4
- 4-5
- >6

Please evaluate teaching of this faculty member with respect to the following aspects:

1. Instructor's ability to deliver the knowledge necessary to succeed
2. Instructor's influence on your interpersonal skills necessary to succeed
3. Contribution of your instructor's classes to strengthening your technical skills
4. Instructor's availability to help outside the classroom
5. Personality of your instructor in motivating you to learn
6. Overall educational experience gained with this instructor fulfills your expectations

T1.3: RUBRICS FOR EVALUATION OF COURSE DELIVERY

T1.3 is the sum of the weighted scores obtained on the following two rubrics

Evidence: Course-file, Faculty Input

Indicator	Unsatisfactory	Expected	More than expected	Weight	Score
Points*	(1/3) x 100	(2/3) x 100	(3/3) x 100		
Course delivery	Course delivery NOT according to syllabus or not consistent with the course learning outcomes	Course delivery according to syllabus with sufficient assigned and graded student work	Course delivery according to syllabus with assigned and graded student work highly relevant to course learning outcomes	1	

* Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to delivery that is below what is “Unsatisfactory” OR to course-files that do not adhere to the format and contents listed in Table 1.

Indicator	Expected	More than expected	Far exceeds expectations	Weight	Score
Points*	(1/3) x 100	(2/3) x 100	(3/3) x 100		
Course Improvement	Some adjustments with feedback on success	Implementation of course improvement plan according to Table 2	Demonstration of success in implementing course improvement plan according to Table 2	0.2	

*Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any improvement plan that is below what is “Expected”

T1.4: RUBRICS FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING INNOVATION & ACTIVE LEARNING (FILLED BY STUDENTS)

T1.4 is calculated based on the following rubrics

Students are engaged in active learning when teaching methods expand beyond a regular classroom environment and when the course emphasis shifts from what the teacher is doing to what the student is learning. Teaching innovation methods are used when the instructor encourages students to transform and reflect on most of the content to make their own meaning out of it through projects, special assignments, or group work. Instructors who use teaching innovation and active learning in their courses are encouraged to document their models of instruction and highlight the sections of the course where their innovative techniques were used.

Please rate your experience in the course which used innovation in teaching and active learning.

Indicator	Expected	More Than Expected	Far Exceeds Expectations	Score
Points*	(1/3)x100	(2/3)x100	(3/3)x100	
Learning Experience	Useful to understand the theory taught in class	Highly useful to understand the theory taught in class	Extremely useful to understand the theory taught in class	
Amount of teaching time spent by instructor	Spent some time out of the scheduled office hours to work with you	Spent considerable time out of the scheduled office hours to work with you	Was available at all times to help you	
T1.4 =				

*Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any indicator that is below what is expected

T1.5: RUBRICS FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING INNOVATION & ACTIVE LEARNING (FILLED BY CHAIR)

T1.5 is calculated based on the following rubrics

Evidence: Teaching Statement written by faculty

Students are engaged in active learning when teaching methods expand beyond a regular classroom environment and when the course emphasis shifts from what the teacher is doing to what the student is learning. Teaching innovation methods are used when the instructor encourages students to transform and reflect on most of the content to make their own meaning out of it through projects, special assignments, or group work. Instructors who use teaching innovation and active learning in their courses are encouraged to document their models of instruction and highlight the sections of the course where their innovative techniques were used.

Please rate the use of instructional technology and active learning in this course:

Indicator	Expected	More Than Expected	Far Exceeds Expectations	Score
Points*	(1/3)x100	(2/3)x100	(3/3)x100	
Use of innovative teaching or active learning methods	Instructional technology is used in part of the course	Instructional technology is one of the major components of the course	Instructional technology is the central component of the course	
Use of methods for assessing students learning	Assesses learning experience through graded work without taking any corrective measures during the course	Assesses learning experience through graded work and takes corrective measures accordingly	Closes the loop by assessing learning experience, taking corrective measures and reassessing to show improvement	
Samples of students work	Samples adequately show quality of work	Samples clearly show quality of work	Samples undoubtedly show quality of work	
T1.5 =				

*Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any indicator that is below what is expected

T1.6: SURVEY FOR SUPERVISION OF FINAL YEAR PROJECTS

T1.6 is based on the following survey and converted to a scale of 100%

Scale =

N/A	Poor	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Excellent
-----	------	---------------	---------	---------------	-----------

Write the name(s) of your FYP advisor(s):

Please evaluate the quality of the following aspects of your FYP experience for every advisor individually:

1. Advisor was regularly available for consultation
2. Advisor's guidance was helpful
3. Project scope and deliverables were clearly explained by your advisor
4. Continuous feedback on your performance was provided by your advisor
5. Have you attended regularly all your FYP scheduled meetings with your advisor?
6. Overall rating of your FYP advisor

T2.1: RUBRICS FOR EVALUATION OF CURRICULAR DEVELOPMENT AND ASSESSMENT

T2.1 is calculated based on the following rubrics

Indicator	Expected	More Than Expected	Far Exceeds Expectations	Score
Points*	(1/3)x100	(2/3)x100	(3/3)x100	
Course learning Outcome assessment	Assesses course learning outcomes in some courses	Adequately assesses course learning outcomes	Assesses all course learning outcomes at all times and provides feedback. Closes the assessment loop and uses it for student learning improvement.	
Program outcome Assessment	Assesses program outcomes according to the assessment plan	Performs adequate assessment of program outcomes	Performs thorough assessment and provides feedback	
Curricular improvement	Some involvement in curricular improvement	Recognizes and suggests curricular improvement	Actively engaged in curricular improvement	
Curricula Development	Some involvement in curricula development	Recognizes and suggests curricula development	Actively engaged in curricula development	
T2.1 =				

*Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any indicator that is below what is expected

T3.1: SURVEY FOR QUALITY OF STUDENT ADVISING

T3.1 is based on the following survey and converted to a scale of 100%

Scale =

N/A	Poor	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Excellent
-----	------	---------------	---------	---------------	-----------

Write the name of your academic advisor: _____

Please evaluate the quality of the following aspects relating to your academic advisor

1. Advisor’s availability to meet with you at least once a year
2. Advisor’s willingness to address your academic issues
3. Advisor’s knowledge of academic policies and curriculum requirements
4. Advisor’s input when discussing your course load
5. Advisor’s responsiveness to your concerns (such as workload, study habits, curricular issues)
6. Career advising
7. Overall satisfaction with your academic advisor

T4.1: EXTERNAL FUNDING (NUMBER AND PI)

T4.1 = sum over all funded projects of: *P*

“*P*” depends on the number of investigators and is given according to the following table with *N* = Number of PI and Co-PI where PI stands for principle investigator.

<i>N</i>	<i>P</i>	
	PI	Co-PI
1	1	
2 or more	$1.2/N$	$\frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{N-1.2}{N-1} \right)$

T4.2: EXTERNAL FUNDING (DOLLAR AMOUNT)

T4.2 = sum over all funded projects of: *D*

“*D*” depends on the amount of funding according to the following table:

Dollars amount	1-5K	5-10K	10-50K	50-100K	100-500K	≥ 500K
<i>D</i>	0.7	1	1.3	2	2.3	3

T4.3: DISSEMINATION OF GOOD PRACTICE (EDUCATION JOURNAL PAPERS)

The score on a journal publication depend on the category, impact, and authorship of the paper as given below:

T4.3 = sum over all papers of the product: $(C \times I \times A)$

“C” is the category factor and is according to the following table:

1	regular paper
0.5	technical note, short or brief paper, letter, book review, correspondence/discussion paper

“I” is the impact of the paper and is calculated according to the following equation:

$$I = 0.2 + 0.8 \max \left[\frac{IF}{\text{Max}(IF)}, \frac{EF}{\text{Max}(EF)} \right]$$

where IF is the Impact Factor and EF is the Eigenfactor of the journal where the article is published. Journal(s) with highest IF and highest EF with a scope capable of covering the article under consideration should be approved by the department. Lists of journal names with Max(IF) or Max(EF) for different areas/disciplines shall be posted on the school website under faculty login. The impact of the paper should be computed based on the date of publication.

“A” is the authorship factor and is given according to the following table with N = Number of authors excluding all LAU students:

N	1 st Author	2 nd Author	3 rd Author	4 th Author	5 th Author
1	1.0				
2	0.55	0.45			
3	0.50	0.35	0.15		
4	0.50	0.30	0.10	0.10	
5 or more	0.45	0.25	$0.3/(N-2)$	$0.3/(N-2)$	$0.3/(N-2)$

T4.4: DISSEMINATION OF GOOD PRACTICE (OTHER EDUCATION PUBLICATIONS)

The scores on publications other than journal papers depend on the category and number of authors.

T4.4 = sum over all non-journal papers of the product: $(C \times A)$

“C” is the category factor and is according to the following table and “A” is the authorship factor as defined previously for journal papers.

0.5	Paper published in international refereed conference proceedings, supported by the department, a peer-reviewed book chapters and with internationally recognized publishers or international societies.
5	Peer-reviewed edited textbooks with internationally recognized publishers or international societies.

T5.1 OFFICIAL RECOGNITION

The score is determined by the peers committee

For each award provide the following information:

Award title: _____

Awarding agency: _____

Date of award: _____

Other information: _____

COURSE DELIVERY REPORT

The evaluation of course delivery is based on the input from the instructor and the content of the course-file. It is the responsibility of the instructor to prepare and submit a course-file according to the requirements provided in this document and provide any supplementary input regarding the delivery of the course. It is the responsibility of the chair to evaluate course delivery according to the Rubrics provided in this document taking into consideration the input of the instructor.

Date of Evaluation: _____ Name of Department: _____

Name of Faculty: _____ Name of Department Chair: _____

Course number & title: _____

Semester & year course was offered: _____

Table -1- Course-file format and contents (Required)

Course-file format:

Instructors are encouraged to submit electronic files. For box files items in should be separated by numbered dividers and for electronic files should be placed in separate numbered folders.

Course-file contents:

All the following items are required. Any items missing will render the file incomplete.

- (1) Current course syllabus as distributed to students
- (2) Spreadsheet of course grades and all other grades used to compute the course grades
- (3) Statements of all assigned work plus solution
- (4) Statements of all tests and final exam plus solution
- (5) Samples* of graded student work on homework, lab reports, papers, projects, ...
- (6) Samples* of graded student work on all tests and final exam

*Samples of graded student work should include examples of excellent, average, and poor work

Table -2- Course improvement plan* (optional)

- (1) Purpose of course improvement
- (2) Actions that will be taken to improve course
- (3) Measures of success in improving the course
- (4) Demonstration of success in improving the course

*The plan should be recognized by the chair in order to be counted

Faculty input and feedback:

--

Department chair evaluation and feedback for improvement (if any):

--

Signature of chair:

Closing comments by faculty:

--

Signature of faculty:

APPENDIX B: EVALUATION TOOLS RELATED TO THE SERVICE DIMENSION

S1.1 – S2.4: Rubrics for Service Activities 22

S1.1 – S2.4: RUBRICS FOR SERVICE ACTIVITIES

S1.1– S2.4 are evaluated based on the following rubric

Evidence:

- Service activities as provided in the “Faculty Annual Report & Evaluation” under the Service Dimension (Tables 1, 2, & 3)
- Faculty input

Indicator	Unsatisfactory	Less than expected	Expected	More than expected	Far exceeds expectations	Score
Points*	0	(0.2) x 100	(0.4) x 100	(0.7) x 100	(1.0) x 100	
Serving on Committees (Table 1)	Frequent absences from regular meetings of a committee	Partial participation or contribution to the work of a committee	Regular participation and contribution to the routine work of a committee that meets about 10 times a year	Supportive role that advances the work of a committee that has a substantial workload	Leadership role in a committee that has a substantial workload that results in a new or revised document that has an impact on the operation of department, school or university	S1.1

Indicator	Expected	More than expected	Far exceeds expectations	Score
Points*	(1/3) x 100	(2/3) x 100	(3/3) x 100	
Personal Initiative (Table 2)	Proposing new resources and activities to improve the department or school	Exploring new resources and activities to improve the department or school	Starting new educational or research activities, facilities or centers; implementing novel means that improve the department or school	S1.2
Service to student activities (Tables 1,2)	Involvement in student activities that improve the quality of campus life and student experience	Continuous commitment to student activities that enhance student experience	Development and planning new and innovative activities to enhance student engagement	S1.3
Service to the profession (Tables 1,2)	Involvement in professional activities	Regular participation in professional activities	Substantial service to the engineering profession	S2.1
Outreach to K-12 Public and Private schools (Tables 1,2)	Participation in visits to K-12 schools	Continuous commitment to activities targeted to K-12 schools to promote the school and profession	Development and planning new and innovative outreach activities to K-12 schools	S2.2
Service to the community and public (Tables 1,2)	Involvement in activities that serve: public and private organizations, governmental agencies, or industry	Continuous commitment to activities that serve the community	Development and participation in new outreach activities that benefit the community and society	S2.3
Visibility in local and regional media (Tables 3)	Casual appearances in the media	Regular participation in media to promote engineering and the school	Development and planning new and innovative exposure opportunities to market the department or school	S2.4

*Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any service activity that is below what is “Expected”

APPENDIX C: FACULTY ANNUAL REPORT & EVALUATION

A comprehensive annual evaluation of faculty is essential for advancement towards promotion and continuous improvement. This annual evaluation is a formal documentation that should be used by the peer committee for evaluating applicants in the dimensions of: (1) Teaching, (2) Research and (3) Service. This form is to be completed by the faculty and evaluated by chair with feedback from both.

Date of Evaluation: _____ Name of Department: _____

Name of Faculty: _____ Name of Department Chair: _____

Evaluation Period: _____

FACULTY ANNUAL REPORT: TEACHING DIMENSION

For each course taught provide the following information:

Semester: _____

Course number: _____

Course title: _____

Section number: _____

CRN number = _____

Number of students = _____

Course evaluation score = _____

FACULTY ANNUAL REPORT: RESEARCH DIMENSION

JOURNAL PAPERS

For each accepted journal paper provide the following information:

Title of the article: _____

Date of acceptance: _____

Category of article¹: _____

Names of authors²: _____

Name of Journal: _____

Journal Impact factor (IF) = _____

Journal Eigenfactor (EF) = _____

Name of Journal with max(IF)³: _____

Max(IF) = _____

Name of Journal with max(EF)³: _____

Max(EF) = _____

Notes:

1. Categories include: regular paper, technical note, short/brief paper, letter, book review, correspondence/discussion paper
2. List of authors as they appear on the article noting any LAU students and any interdisciplinary research collaboration
3. Journal(s) with highest IF and highest EF with a scope capable of covering the article under consideration should be approved by the department. Lists of journal names with Max(IF) or Max(EF) for different areas/disciplines shall be posted on the school website under faculty login.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

For each accepted article provide the following information:

Title of the article: _____

Date of acceptance: _____

Category of article¹: _____

Venue of article: _____

Notes:

1. Categories include: international refereed conference proceedings, a peer-reviewed book chapters and with internationally recognized publishers or international societies a patent, a Peer-reviewed edited books with internationally recognized publishers or international societies. Only regular conference papers are considered – that is, posters, short papers, abstracts are not considered.

FUNDED PROJECTS

For each funded project provide the following information:

Project title: _____

Date of acceptance: _____

Funding agency: _____

Names of all collaborators¹: _____

Notes:

1. List all collaborators and specify their capacity: PI, Co-PI, others

OFFICIAL RECOGNITION

For each journal or conference paper receiving best paper award, provide information consistent with the list of journal or conference papers.

FACULTY ANNUAL REPORT: SERVICE DIMENSION

Table -1- Faculty Record for Teamwork

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
#	Name of committee and Type of service	Duration of Service	Faculty Role	Meeting Frequency and attendance	Description of work accomplished by team	Faculty contribution to teamwork
1						
2						

Provide the following information according to the column numbers:

- (1) Name of committee and the type of service it provides: Institutional (university/school/department/senate) service, community/public service, professional service, or other (Specify)
- (2) Term of service: Fall-201x, Spring-201x, Summer-201x, or actual dates (Specify)
- (3) Chair, secretary, member, or other (specify)
- (4) Total number of meetings scheduled for full duration and total number of meetings attended by faculty
- (5) Brief description of major accomplishment of the team
- (6) Brief description of contribution of faculty to the accomplishments of the team

Table -2- Faculty Record for Individual Work

	(1)	(2)	(3)
#	Type of Service	Duration of Service	Description of work accomplished
1			
2			

Provide the following information according to the column numbers:

- (1) Institutional (university/school/department) service, community/public service, professional service, or other (Specify)
- (2) Dates over which service was rendered
- (3) Brief description of work accomplished

Table -3- Faculty Record of Visibility

	(1)	(2)	(3)
#	Type of Media	Date	Description of media coverage
1			
2			

Provide the following information according to the column numbers:

- (1) Television, Radio, Newspaper, Magazine, other (Specify)
- (2) Date(s) on which event occurred
- (3) Brief description of context and content of the coverage

FACULTY ANNUAL REPORT: FACULTY AND CHAIR FEEDBACK

Faculty Reflections and Feedback on Teaching/Research/Service:

--

Department Chair Evaluation and Feedback for improvement (if any):

--

Signature of chair:

--

Closing comments by faculty:

--

Signature of faculty:

--