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These evaluation guidelines have been developed to assist the Chair of the Construction Management Department (CM) in applying the University Criteria set forth in Article 18.4 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA 18.4 - University Criteria for Annual Performance Evaluations) during the performance evaluation process, and to provide guidance to CM faculty members in achieving standards of performance corresponding to the evaluation ratings. Each faculty member shall be evaluated in each area of assigned duties consistent with the following rating categories: Meets Expectations, Exceeds Expectations, Far Exceeds Expectations, Below Expectations, and Unsatisfactory.

Each faculty member is required to submit a Faculty Annual Self Evaluation Portfolio (Annual Evaluation), in keeping with CBA 18.2(a). The Annual Evaluation shall be used by faculty to provide documentation and evidence to support the annual rating in the areas of teaching, research, service, and advising (for instructors only). Failure to submit a self-evaluation, or submission of an incomplete self-evaluation may result in a rating of Below Expectations or Unsatisfactory for those areas of the assignment where evidence of faculty activity is either incomplete or not presented at all.

Each faculty member is also expected to perform all activities of their assignment in accordance with section CBA 10.3 - Academic Responsibility of Faculty Members. Failure to maintain the professional decorum established in CBA 10.3 may result in a rating of Below Expectations or Unsatisfactory in one or more areas of the evaluation which relate to the offending behavior, as determined by the Chair of the Construction Management Department.

The guidelines are given for an FTE distribution of 0.75 for teaching and 0.25 for research and service for tenure track faculty and 0.25 for teaching and 0.75 for advising and service for instructors/advisors. If the FTE distribution of an individual faculty member is different, each category will be adjusted accordingly and the faculty member will be provided the opportunity to discuss this adjustment with the Department Chair at the beginning of the term for which their FTE distribution differs. The faculty member shall include any documentation or information that the faculty member thinks should be taken into account in the completion of his/her performance evaluation, including course load, class size and format, and special circumstances such as a leave of absence.

**Teaching**

Each CM faculty member is typically assigned 18 contact hours (may be less depending on course buyouts from funded research projects or reassignments by Chair) for the academic year and each is expected to work collegially and actively for the overall good of our academic programs. Student evaluations (ISQ’s) are used in the context of the evidence presented and not as stand- alone indicators of teaching quality, i.e., very high student ratings do not automatically lead to a rating of “exemplary.” In addition to instructing, all faculty are expected to produce ABET/ACCE course assessment documentation, as part of their teaching duties.

**Meets Expectations:** Produce evidence that demonstrates a commitment to proficiency in teaching by providing lectures and laboratory teaching in an effective manner.

**Exceeds Expectations**: Demonstrate a satisfactory level of performance, as described above, with evidence provided to indicate some additional level of development of new course(s) or course content or innovation leading to enhanced and engaged student learning. Examples may include guest speaker, industry involvement, real-world examples, site visits, etc.

**Far Exceeds Expectations:** Produce evidence that demonstrates excellence in teaching. Appropriate evidence consists of course materials and documents that demonstrate student success and engagement and innovative teaching methods including, but not limited to experiential learning, projects with industry or the community, and scholarly research through teaching, as evidenced by significant student work.

**Below Expectations**: Failure to provide evidence that demonstrates a commitment to proficiency and improvement in teaching and/or failure to conduct assessment of course outcomes in all assigned courses and/or produce assessment documents for ABET/ACCE and other purposes in a timely manner.

**Unsatisfactory:** Consistent failure to provide evidence that demonstrates a commitment to proficiency in teaching such as failure to revise courses when necessary, missed classes (without justification), persistent and justified student complaints, erratic classroom behavior, failure to keep minimal office hours; and/or consistent failure to incorporate assessment of course outcomes and/or produce assessment reports in a timely manner and/or no evidence of any progress in improving the quality of instruction; and/or exhibiting unprofessional behavior (i.e., behavior that does not meet the standard set forth in Article 10.3 of the CBA, Academic Responsibility of Faculty Members, where it applies to teaching).

**Research**

Each tenure-track or tenured CM faculty member is expected to conduct a program of research in his or her research areas. Funded research activity is encouraged but not required for successful demonstration of scholarship. Faculty members are expected to perform all research activities and subsequent publication in an ethical manner. Demonstration of the caliber of publication venues is required in the annual report. The director may take into account factors including, but not limited to the impact factor of the journal, reputation of conferences, and overall quality of the publication when assigning ratings to the tenured-track or tenured faculty member’s overall scholarly effort. Emphasis will be placed on the quality of the research effort and dissemination of valuable findings.

**Meets Expectations:** Develop an active research program that is on track to produce an average of one peer-reviewed paper per year in a quality journal. Evidence may include paper presentations and conferences (assuming these presentations will be followed-up by a journal article), significant proposal activity, development of a state or government technical document, paper submissions, paper under review, working paper, or evidence of significant progress in existing research (both funded and unfunded).

**Exceeds Expectations:** Demonstrate satisfactory performance plus additional contribution to the archival literature, including book chapters, papers at prestigious conferences, etc. Demonstrate a commitment to involving students in the process of research, supervising undergraduate independent study or advising graduate student research and production of journal papers with students as coauthors.

**Far Exceeds Expectations:** In addition to the conditions in the “exceeds expectations” category, develop and maintain an effectiveresearchprogram that provides numerous opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students to be involved in research, and securing outside funding in the form of industry partnerships, government sponsored grants or other forms of funded scholarly activity. Appropriate evidence of an exemplary rating may include multiple (i.e. two or more) peer-reviewed journal publications, one peer-reviewed journal publication and participation in several conferences, a high rate of proposal activity, or significant progress on several research topics.

**Below Expectations:** Development of a research program that is not on track to produce an average of one peer-reviewed journal article per year (for example – on pace to produce a peer-reviewed journal article every two or three years). A below expectations rating implies limited involvement in the research community including a combination of limited visibility, limited proposal activity, limited paper submission, and limited to no progress in producing any research results (both funded or unfunded).

**Unsatisfactory:** Failure to demonstrate any scholarly activities, as evidenced by no proposal activities, no progress in research activities, no publication attempt/effort, and/or no evidence of any attempt to initiate and/or sustain a research program.

**Service**

Each CM faculty member is expected to be actively involved in institutional governance and the construction profession. Faculty members are encouraged, but not required to engage in institutional governance from the departmental level up to the university level. All faculty members are expected to participate in the department governance. Activity in professional and community organizations is also encouraged.

**Meets Expectations:** Provide evidence of participation in governance of the CM through attendance of faculty meetings, program meetings and active participation in regular and ad hoc department committees.

**Exceeds Expectations:** Provide evidence of active involvement with governance within and beyond the CM through service on committees and/or documented service in professional organizations, engineering community and educational efforts in the region.

**Far Exceeds Expectations:** Demonstrated excellence in service to and/or leadership of (i) department, (ii) university (iii) profession and/or community in his/her field of expertise. Provide evidence of participation in CM, CCEC and/or University committees. Documented participation and/or leadership within professional organizations and/or community service organizations can also be used to demonstrate exemplary activity.

**Below Expectations**: Failure to demonstrate a consistent record of contribution (i) in the governance of the department, college and the university, such as poor attendance to faculty meetings, program meetings, inactive participation in regular and ad hoc committees and/or (ii) to the profession such as inactive service in professional societies.

**Unsatisfactory**: Failure to demonstrate a consistent record of contribution (i) in the governance of the department, college and the university, such as very poor or no attendance to faculty meetings, program meetings, inactive participation in regular and ad hoc committees and/or (ii) to the profession such as no service in professional societies.