The Department of General Engineering RST Plan for Activities during 2015

1. General Departmental Policies and Procedures
   1.1 Departmental Review Bodies
      1.1.1 Department Salary and Promotion Committee (DSPC)
         1.1.1.1 Composition of the DSPC

The DSPC shall include three tenured faculty members from the General Engineering Department. If the Department were to have fewer than three eligible tenured faculty members, the procedures in Section 6.3.4.4 of the Faculty Handbook would be followed. The Department Chair may not serve as a member of the DSPC.

         1.1.1.2 Procedure for Election of the DSPC

All eligible General Engineering faculty members (tenured and probationary) shall serve on DSPC. Any nominated faculty members outside of the General Engineering Department must be approved unanimously by the General Engineering faculty.

         1.1.1.3 Definition of Peer Group for Promotion and Salary Review

All faculty members of the General Engineering Department shall participate in the yearly peer evaluation process.

         1.1.1.4 Procedure for Conducting Peer Group Evaluation and Voting

All faculty members will review the materials provided by the other faculty members (including Form 4: List of Activities for Previous Year) and provide recommendations to the DSPC. This input will be used by the DSPC to complete the official peer evaluations, recording them on Form 5 (Salary Review) and, when appropriate, Form 6 (Request for Promotion to Full Professor).

Voting for salary and promotion will be conducted by a show of hands. Faculty members will leave the room when votes regarding their salaries are taken. The number of those in favor and those against shall be recorded in the minutes. If at least one member requests a roll call vote, then each person’s vote is recorded in the minutes (see Section 6.3.4.3 of the Faculty Handbook).
1.1.2 Renewal and Tenure Review Body (RTRB)

1.1.2.1 Composition of the RTRB/RTRBs and Voting Procedure

All tenured faculty members of General Engineering Department shall be the members of RTRB. If the department were to have fewer than three eligible tenured faculty members, procedures to augment the RTRB would be followed; see Section 6.3.4.5 of the Faculty Handbook.

The General Engineering tenured faculty for RTRB 2015 will include Abulkhair Masoom, Hong Teng and any additional GE faculty members who will be tenured as of September of 2015.

The RTRB Chair will be elected by the members of the RTRB. The Department Chair may not be the Chair of the RTRB.

The voting procedure for RTRB shall be conducted by a show of hands. The number of those in favor and those against shall be recorded in the minutes. If at least one member requests a roll call vote, then each person’s vote is recorded in the minutes (see Section 6.3.4.3 of the Faculty Handbook).

1.1.2.2 Composition of an Interdisciplinary RTRB and Voting Procedure (if applicable)

Not applicable.

1.2 Procedure for Approving the Departmental RST Plan/Sub-Plans by the Departmental Faculty

The RST Plan is reviewed at a meeting of all General Engineering faculty members. A simple majority of those voting shall be required for approval of the Departmental RST Plan. Voting shall be conducted by a show of hands.

1.3 Procedures for Evaluation of Departmental Faculty

1.3.1 Peer Evaluations

All General Engineering faculty members shall participate in peer evaluations every year. The peer evaluations for each faculty member consist of the following: teaching effectiveness; professional development, and university and community service.

Peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be independent of student evaluations. Each faculty member is peer-evaluated with input from all department faculty members, with regard to course preparation and instruction, classroom presentation, student interaction, course content
and innovation, and grading of each assigned course. Efforts to remain current in educational related issues are also considered.

1.3.2 Student Evaluations

Student evaluations must be conducted each semester for probationary faculty during their first three years of service in all classes they teach. Other probationary faculty must be evaluated by students in all classes they teach in one semester at least once a year. All other faculty must be evaluated by students in all classes they teach in one semester at least once every three years. Faculty seeking promotion must be evaluated for all courses they teach in both semesters (fall and spring) of the preceding academic year (or the two most recent semesters if the faculty member has significant and/or extended release time for non-teaching assignments).

Faculty members have the right to make written responses to any evaluations and to have those responses placed in their files.

1.3.3 Additional Types of Evaluation (if applicable)

Not applicable.

1.4 Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty with Non-Teaching Assignments

Faculty members with non-teaching assignments shall be evaluated according to their respective percentages for teaching and non-teaching. For example, if a faculty member has 50% non-teaching duties, then 50% of the evaluation would be based on the non-teaching duties and the other 50% of the evaluation would be split according the weights established in Section 2.1.

The areas of teaching effectiveness, professional, scholarly, and creative activities; and university and community service shall be evaluated as in Section 1.3. The non-teaching assignment shall be evaluated based on performance of the duties of the assignment. In addition, organization and communication skills should be considered. If appropriate (such as for department chair and program coordinator), items such as leadership, professional effort, and management skills should be considered. See Section 6.3.5.4 (3) of the Faculty Handbook for a more comprehensive list of items generally considered part of the evaluation for faculty with non-teaching assessments.
2. Renewal of Probationary Faculty

2.1 Departmental Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Professional/Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service

2.1.1 Teaching Effectiveness

The weight of teaching effectiveness is 70% of the overall evaluation. Within teaching effectiveness, the peer evaluation and student evaluation weigh 60% and 40% respectively.

Based on peer and student evaluations the teaching effectiveness of a faculty member is ranked as: does not meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations.

2.1.2 Professional, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

The weight of professional development is 15% of the overall evaluation.

Evaluation of professional development will be based on the following activities:

a) course development
b) course improvement
c) presentations to professional groups
d) publications
e) membership/involvement in professional organizations
f) attendance at seminars and professional meetings
g) proposals and written reports
h) professional consulting
i) organization of professional meetings
j) professional registration
k) continuing education

The professional development of a faculty member is ranked as: does not meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations. A faculty member need not be involved in all of the above activities to be ranked as exceeding expectations.

2.1.3 Service to the University and to the Community

The weight of university and community service is 15% of the overall evaluation. University and community service of a faculty member is ranked as: does not meet expectations, meets expectations or exceeds expectations.
University and community service shall be evaluated on the basis of involvement in the following.

a) membership on university committees
b) membership on college committees
c) student society advising
d) attendance at student activities
e) advising of current students
f) recruitment and advising of prospective students
g) course coordination
h) course maintenance
i) participation in Pioneer Preview
j) participation in community projects

A faculty member need not be involved in all the above activities to be ranked as exceeding expectations.

2.2 Ancillary Materials Required by the Department for Inclusion in the RST File (if applicable)

Not applicable.

3. Granting of Tenure

3.1 Departmental Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Professional/Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service

3.1.1 Teaching Effectiveness

The weight of teaching effectiveness is 70%. Within teaching effectiveness the peer evaluation accounts for 60% and the student evaluation accounts for 40%.

The peer evaluation shall take into account the number and variety of courses taught, realization of student learning outcomes, and student advising.
3.1.2 Professional, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

The weight of professional development is 15%. When professional, scholarly and creative activity are evaluated, the fact that the General Engineering faculty carry significant teaching loads without any release time for professional development shall be taken into account.

Evaluation of professional development will be based on the following activities:
a) course development
b) course improvement
c) presentations to professional groups
d) publications
e) membership/involvement in professional organizations
f) attendance at seminars and professional meetings
g) proposals and written reports
h) professional consulting
i) organization of professional meetings
j) professional registration
k) continuing education

3.1.3 Service to the University and to the Community

The weight of university and community service is 15%.

University and community service shall be evaluated on the basis of involvement in the following.

a) membership on university committees
b) membership on college committees
c) student society advising
d) attendance at student activities
e) advising of current students
f) recruitment and advising of prospective students
g) course coordination
h) course maintenance
i) participation in Pioneer Preview
j) participation in community projects
3.2 Ancillary Materials Required by the Department for Inclusion in the RST File (if applicable)

Not applicable.

4. Promotion to Full Professor

4.1 Departmental Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Professional/Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service

4.1.1 Teaching Effectiveness

- The weight given to teaching effectiveness is 70%. The weighted criteria for evaluating teaching effectiveness are: 40% based student evaluation and 60% based on peer evaluation. The peer evaluation must be independent of student evaluation.
- With respect to peer and student evaluation the faculty member considered for promotion is ranked exceeding, meeting or not meeting expectations. The ranking is based on, but not limited to, preparation, difficulty, content, instruction, knowledge, innovation and grading of each assigned course. Efforts to remain current in education related issues will also be considered.

4.1.2 Professional, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

- The weight given to professional, scholarly and creative activity is 15%.
- Evaluation of professional, scholarly and creative activity will include the following criteria:
  o Course Improvement
  o Course Development
  o Presentations to Professional Groups
  o Publication: papers, book, chapters, article
  o Membership/Involvement in Professional Organizations
  o Attendance at Seminars and Professional Meetings
  o Proposals and Written Reports
  o Professional Consulting
  o Organization of Professional Meetings
  o Professional Registration
  o Continuing Education

The faculty member considered for promotion need not be involved in all of these activities to be rated as exceeding expectations in the area of professional, scholarly and creative activity.
4.1.3 Service to the University and to the Community

- The weight given to the university and community service is 15%.
- Evaluation of the university and community service is based on the following criteria:
  - Membership on University Committees
  - Membership on College Committees
  - Student Society Advising
  - Attendance at Student Activities
  - Advising of Current Students
  - Recruitment and Advising of Prospective Students
  - Course Coordination
  - Course Maintenance
  - Participation in Pioneer Preview
  - Participation in Community Projects

The faculty member considered for promotion need not be involved in all of these activities to be rated as exceeding expectations in the area of the university and community service.

4.2 Ancillary Materials Required by the Department for Inclusion in the RST File (if applicable)

Not applicable.

5. Salary and Inequity

5.1 Departmental Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Professional/Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service

5.1.1 Teaching Effectiveness

The weight for teaching effectiveness shall be 70%

- Teaching includes an array of activities that provide students opportunities for learning in and beyond the classroom (e.g., syllabi, samples of tests or assignments, use of new technology, academic and career advising, supervision of independent work, student organizations, internships, student-faculty projects, field trips, and laboratory work, availability to students and colleagues, and individual tutoring).

5.1.2 Professional, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

The weight professional, scholarly, and creative activity shall be 15%
Examples of such scholarly and professional activities include published research, presentation of research (including research co-authored by students), participation in professional meetings and conferences, unpublished materials, holding office in professional organizations, service as a consultant, clinician or professional teacher (outside of usual UW-P responsibilities), continued formal and informal study, etc.

5.1.3 Service to the University and to the Community

The weight for the University and community activity shall be 15%

- University service will be rated in accordance with the responsibilities assumed outside of teaching and research (e.g., system, university, college, and department faculty committees).

- Community service will be rated according to the faculty member's active participation in his/her field which benefits the non-university community.

5.1.4 Departmental Guidelines for Determining Merit or High Merit

- Four criteria will be considered, including three peer ratings (teaching effectiveness, scholarly/professional development, and service) and student evaluations of teaching effectiveness.

- Faculty members who receive more than one rating of “does not meet expectations” shall not be recommended for merit.

- Faculty members who receive no “does not meet expectations” shall be recommended for merit.

- Faculty members who receive ratings of “meets expectations” and “exceeds expectations” and demonstrate exceptional performance in at least one of the four areas shall be recommended for high merit.

5.2 Ancillary Materials Required by the Department for Inclusion in the RST File (if applicable)

Not Applicable.
6. Post-tenure Review (PTR)

6.1 Departmental Criteria for Evaluation

Tenured faculty will be reviewed at five year intervals beginning with the fifth anniversary of tenure. Any faculty member wishing a PTR sooner may petition the department chair, who will then act on that request.

On the year of PTR, the faculty member must submit Form 7 of the URSTPC Policies to the department chair. This form summarizes the faculty member’s major activities and DSPC evaluations since tenure or the previous PTR and outlines a personal plan for continued growth and development until the next PTR. (See the guidelines in chapter 6 of the Faculty Handbook.) The department chair will forward Form 7 to the DSPC for review.

Based on the information contained in Form 7, the DSPC will prepare a written preliminary evaluation. The faculty member will meet with the department chair to review this evaluation. At this meeting, the department chair will address the developmental needs of the faculty member to make progress toward achieving the plan’s goals and will recommend ways of helping the faculty member to meet those goals. The faculty member will have an opportunity to meet with the DSPC to discuss the preliminary PTR evaluation. The DSPC will then finalize the PTR evaluation, and the department chair will forward it to the dean, with a copy given to the faculty member.

The schedule for Post tenure reviews:
2015-16 None
2019-20 Abulkhair Masoom
2020-21 Hong Teng

6.2 Departmental Policy on Professional Development Tied to Post-tenure Review

If the faculty member’s review reveals a need for significant improvement in performance, the department chair will report such to the academic dean. The dean and the chair, in consultation with the faculty member, will suggest a plan to aid the faculty in improving performance and will assist the faculty member in finding resources to fund the plan.