1. SEAS POLICY

The School of Engineering and Applied Science has a long standard practice of conducting an annual review of all tenured and tenure track faculty members. This process also constitutes the post-tenure review. The purpose is to ensure fair evaluation and constructive critique of their contributions to the University and disciplines through their teaching, research, and service efforts.

2. REVIEW CRITERIA AND ASSESSMENT

All faculty members are evaluated annually on the basis of teaching, research, and service performances, and when necessary the Chair and Dean may incorporate concerns about professional conduct. Good performance is the basis for merit pay adjustments and promotion. Poor performance or improper conduct may be the basis for sanctions ranging from salary adjustments to, in the extreme, termination of service.

The following criteria are not exclusive of other noteworthy accomplishments nor are the lists in order of importance.

A. TEACHING

It is the responsibility of the Chair to evaluate the quality of faculty teaching performance, using such sources as:

- Student course evaluation questionnaires.
- Student interviews and peer evaluations.
- Textbooks, computer software, or other educational media developed by the faculty member.
- Senior theses and projects.
- Evaluations of teaching in non-credit courses, workshops, colloquia, and interdisciplinary courses.
- Courses and laboratory development.

B. RESEARCH

---

1 The procedure for promotion and tenure are detailed in separate document: SEAS Policy and Procedures Memorandum #9.
2 Grounds for terminations are specified in the Faculty Handbook.
It is the responsibility of the Chair to evaluate the quality of the research activities of each faculty member. The evaluation should take into consideration both the mission of the Department and the nature of the scholarly and creative activity within the discipline. A mere listing of activities does not constitute evaluation. Among the activities to be evaluated are:

- Refereed journal publications, scholarly books, research monographs, and proceedings. The Chair should take into consideration and comment upon the reputation of journals or conference proceedings in which the faculty member has published and the nature of the reviews received for published books.

- Supervision of graduate students’ research in Masters of Science and PhD programs. The quality of the advising and number of students advised should be taken into account.

- Supervision of Masters Degrees of Engineering or Applied Science. Credit should be given for the mentoring required for students doing independent projects.

- Supervision of undergraduate research projects.

- Patents and other intellectual properties. Recognition should be given for the development of new products, processes, or significant software.

- Presentations at professional meetings, invited lectures or seminars.

- Grants and contracts—The effectiveness with which faculty members have sought and secured support for research, worked with graduate assistants and colleagues, and the leadership which faculty members have demonstrated as principal or co-principal investigator should be assessed.

- Development and supervision of major research programs.

- Instructional research – Well-designed and assessed pedagogic research, and the recognition it has received in publications or by adoption at other institutions should be recognized.

C. SERVICE
It is the responsibility of the Chair to evaluate such professional activities as:

- Services to the Department, School, and University, which include advising and counseling, service on committees and task forces, special service assignments, or sponsorship of student activities.

- Services to the discipline which include holding of office or organizing conferences in a scholarly or professional society, editing proceedings, acting as a reviewer of manuscripts and proposals, or presenting non-research papers. The stature of the society itself and its relevance to the mission of the University should be taken into account.

- Services to state, national, and international organizations through appointment to boards or task forces.

- Services to the community through the application of professional skills for the public welfare in a manner that is consistent with the mission of the University. Relevant activities include University outreach programs, public lectures, and consulting.

D. PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

On occasion, the Chair or Dean may be required to evaluate the conduct of a faculty member who may have behaved in an unethical manner, willfully neglected duties, or engaged in serious misconduct. Cases of this type do not include those involving legal or regulatory violations which are handled by outside authorities. While proper conduct is expected and not weighed in normal situations, cases of improper behavior will be evaluated in the review process and may, in the extreme, lead to suspension or termination (see paragraphs 3H, 3I, and 3J below).

3. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCESS

This review process includes the following steps:

A. The initial step for evaluation of a faculty member’s performance is the preparation by the individual for an annual report for the Department Chair. The format follows a standard outline provided by the Dean’s Office and details the teaching, research, service, and consulting activities together with whatever other information the individual wishes to have taken into consideration by the Chair and Dean in the evaluation. A copy is submitted to the Dean by the Chair.

---

3 All steps in this process are to be consistent with the faculty rights outlined in the University of Virginia Faculty Handbook.
B. The Chair then makes an evaluation of the individual’s performance based on the annual report, student evaluations of teaching, an up-to-date curriculum vitae, peer evaluations, and such other information the Chair wishes to include. The evaluation consists of an assessment of the performance of the faculty member including progress toward meeting individual goals resulting from previous evaluations. It may also include a review of improper conduct concerns.

C. After completing the evaluation of the member’s activities, the Chair discusses it with the faculty member in an annual private conference. At this time, the faculty member and Chair agree on a set of goals for the coming year. If appropriate, the Chair should make suggestions for improvement or make clear any unacceptable performances. Where such deficiencies are noted, the Chair should work with the faculty member to address them. Particular care should be taken in the counseling of faculty members who are working towards promotion and tenure.

D. Faculty members who, after substantive discussion with the Chair, are dissatisfied with their annual review by the Chair may present their points of view in writing to the Dean with a copy to the Chair.

E. After the conference with the faculty member, the Chair will submit to the Dean a written assessment of the contributions of the faculty member to the Department, School, and University. As part of this evaluation, the Chair should clearly address whether or not the faculty member is meeting the expectations required of someone in his or her position.

F. Copies of the faculty member’s annual report, the Chair’s evaluation, the faculty member’s written comments, and the Dean’s recommendation, where appropriate, are retained for the record in the faculty member’s personnel file maintained by the Dean’s Office.

The above steps constitute the normal process for annual review and recognition of meritorious performance.

G. If a pattern of serious deficiencies in performance or conduct of a faculty member is noted, then the Chair shall detail the concerns in a written statement to the Dean and faculty member. The faculty member and Chair will develop a detailed plan to correct the deficiencies, which includes a timetable of assessment. This plan will be signed by the faculty member, the Chair, and the Dean.
H. In cases that are difficult to evaluate or reconcile, the Dean may choose to appoint a peer review committee to conduct an in-depth review of the faculty member’s performance and recommend appropriate action. The committee should include representation from a department other than the one to which the affected faculty member is assigned. It may also include representation from another school or university.

I. If serious deficiencies have been documented in previous evaluations and have not been corrected, then the Chair and the Dean may initiate sanctions in the form of reduced or zero salary raise, suspension, or termination of employment. The initiation of sanctions begins with the Dean advising the faculty member of the intended action and asking the individual for a show cause statement of why such action should not be taken. Upon receipt of this response, the Dean shall make a decision to proceed or to adjust the sanction. If the Dean decides that a sanction is warranted, then he/she will notify the Provost and prepare a full documented recommendation. The faculty member and Chair will receive copies of the Dean’s recommendation.

J. The faculty member will have the right to appeal a sanction by following the procedure described in the Faculty Handbook.