

## **Aerospace Engineering Department Evaluation Criteria for Promotion and Tenure**

The University of Kansas Aerospace Engineering Department holds the principles of Academic Freedom and Due Process as paramount in the evaluation of all of its appointed Faculty Members. This document provides Aerospace Engineering Department evaluation criteria for Promotion and Tenure (P&T). This document is intended to be in accordance with Article VIr of the Engineering Senate Rules and Regulations, and Article VI of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations. This document has been developed specifically by the Department of Aerospace Engineering to address supplementary information beyond the common evaluation criteria defined in Article VIr of the Engineering Senate Rules and Regulations, and does not replace or otherwise weaken School of Engineering criteria defined therein. The three areas of evaluation are: teaching; research and scholarship; and, service and administration. The departmental P&T criteria are addressed in two sections:

- 1.) Evaluation criteria for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor rank with granting of continuous tenure
- 2.) Evaluation criteria for promotion from Associate to Full Professor rank

Finally, composite evaluations and recommendations in Aerospace Engineering Department are addressed in Section 3.

---

### **Section 1: Evaluation criteria for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor rank with tenure**

**Teaching:** is evaluated on the basis of the combination of student teaching evaluations, peer teaching evaluations, participation in undergraduate and graduate advising, and candidate efforts to improve teaching. New assistant professors in Aerospace Engineering are typically given an initially lower than average teaching load of one course per semester, to assist them in building their research program. After one or two years, research active faculty members in Aerospace Engineering are typically expected to teach 3-4 courses per year. Teaching overloads are considered to be 15 or more course credit hours of 5 or more students per academic year.

Peer evaluations and efforts for improvement are generally qualitative. Peer evaluators are typically assigned by the department P&T chair. While the student evaluations may include qualitative comments, they also provide quantitative ratings (0-5, from worst to best) categorized as follows:

Scale: Excellent	4.20-5.00
Very Good	3.51-4.19
Good	3.01-3.50
Marginal	2.50-3.00
Poor	0.00-2.49

The Department performs averages over all categories on the department CBI assessment device. Because end of term student evaluations target only a subset of assessment categories and notably lack domain expertise, peer evaluations are

generally of higher weight, though trends (consistently increasing or decreasing values) in student evaluations are also important, particularly for instructor availability, organization, communication and respect for students. Independent indications of teaching proficiency may also include engagement in instructional activities that lead directly to products of experiential learning, to include undergraduate and/or graduate students capturing regional, national or international awards in areas relevant to the topic of instruction.

It is expected that directing graduate students in research activities will be a major component of graduate advising. This involves serving as a major advisor and chair of masters and/or doctoral level thesis committees. Participation as a member of graduate thesis committees of other faculty is also expected.

Similarly, due to the applied nature of engineering, directing undergraduate and graduate students in individual studies and experiential learning activities is encouraged. The evaluation of such activities includes recognition for the resources the faculty member is able to bring to bear to enable the activity, as well as outcomes of the activity, to include publication, product development or success in regional, national or international competitions.

Faculty members are encouraged to participate in symposia, workshops, and similar opportunities to gain skills and ideas for improving their teaching. Educational or pedagogical research is considered for teaching with regard to professional development, but is primarily evaluated under research. Overall “good” levels of teaching (e.g., student evaluations above 3.00, and positive peer evaluation) are expected.

**Research and Scholarship:** It is required that research and scholarship will be a substantial component of the total professional activity. This must include communication of research findings or scholarly ideas, supporting and advising students and improving and establishing a funded research program. Candidates are expected to produce high-impact scholarly work with a consistent publication record in reputable, refereed archival journals, refereed conference papers, books and book chapters, and patents. The impact of the scholarly work will be gauged by the P&T Committee and will be based on aspects such as: (a) the assessment of the research provided by external reviewers, (b) citation factors of the scholarly work using appropriate citation tools, (c) the quality of the publications, (d) the external funding support for the research and (e) the impact of professional practice that extends and develops research productivity. Candidates must demonstrate ability to support and maintain their research program, as demonstrated by a major role (PI or Co-PI) in attracting and acquiring funded external grants and supporting graduate students. Candidates must demonstrate successful supervision of graduate students.

**Service and Administration:** The Aerospace Engineering Department prefers to limit the amount of service involvement at the school and university level for untenured faculty members in order to provide more opportunities for development of curricula and

establishment of a robust research program. Regular service at the department level and some service at the national level such as professional organization service, conference session chair, peer review of manuscripts, and research proposal review are expected. Service is a necessary component of the candidate's application for promotion with tenure, but it does not weigh in the P&T decisions as significantly as does the candidate's record of teaching, research and scholarship.

---

## **Section 2: Evaluation criteria for promotion from Associate to Full Professor rank**

**Teaching:** The criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure must also be met in the time period since that promotion. In addition, faculty are expected to have a consistent record of good quality teaching and regular participation in symposia, workshops, and similar opportunities to gain new skills and approaches to demonstrate *continued effectiveness and growth* of their teaching. In other words, the candidate should have clearly demonstrated competence as a teacher.

**Research and Scholarship:** The criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure must also be met in the time period since that promotion. In addition, it is expected that faculty will have demonstrated mastery of a specialty in his or her program of research and clearly demonstrated an ability to support and maintain his or her research. A candidate for the rank of Professor should have been engaged in significant research and publication or other scholarly activities which further the knowledge of the profession, and/or have engaged in significant professional activities which have clearly established their scholarly career and their position as a *leader in the profession with a national and/or international reputation*.

Examples of such evidence might include a substantial body of published work in peer reviewed archival journals, sustained support for research program, successful supervision of doctoral students, presentation of research at prestigious conferences, significant citations of published work, authorship of texts, monographs, and other special publications, significant application of research results for the advancement of technology, leadership in professional and technical society activities, organization of symposia/sessions at professional meetings, committee leadership for professional societies and editorial board service for reputable journals.

**Service and Administration:** The candidate should have demonstrated a substantial service to the Department, School, University, and the profession at large. Substantial service to the profession can be demonstrated in a variety of ways, such as chief or associate editorship of technical journals, conference session organization, reviewing papers and proposals, membership in national or international technical

committees, chairing sessions at technical conferences, holding offices in professional societies, and so forth. The level of service should be consistent with the percentage appointment of the candidate. Service is a necessary component of the candidate's application for promotion, but it does not weigh in the promotion decisions as significantly as does the candidate's record of teaching, research and scholarship.

---

### **Section 3: Composite Evaluations and Recommendations**

Note that these and all subsequent evaluation procedures are included on the Initial Review Evaluation form as part of the documentation of evaluation procedures.

Note also that this part of the evaluation is normally completed last, after evaluation of the individual areas of effort (teaching; research and scholarship; and service and administration). The department committee must agree on the overall evaluation level for each of the three areas of teaching, research and service (Excellent, Very Good, Good, Marginal or Poor; or other ratings as specified by university policy and/or forms). For evaluation level in each category, the candidate will be assigned the highest level that receives a majority vote of those present and/or those who communicated their vote early or via proxy. The committee will determine the recommendations regarding promotion and tenure (Recommended, Not Recommended, or Not Applicable). Vote distribution must be reported for promotion and/or whether or not to grant tenure. A positive recommendation will be arrived at by a majority of affirmative votes (counting abstentions, though not recusals nor failures to vote, as non-affirmative votes).

The overall evaluation and recommendations must be supported by documentation addressing reasons for evaluation in each of the areas of effort evaluated and all types of data considered. These rationales shall be provided to the candidate with the overall recommendations reported on the Initial Review Evaluation Summary for Candidates or similar form, as required by the university.

The department chair must indicate concurrence or lack thereof with the recommendations of the department P&T committee. The Chairperson is neither eligible to vote as a member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee nor as a departmental faculty member. The chair must also document the reasons for concurrence (or lack thereof) on the Initial Review Evaluation Summary for Candidates form or in an attached letter.

#### ***Evaluation of Teaching***

The evaluation of teaching is normally led by a subcommittee of 3-4 tenured faculty members, but in no case shall less than two (2) tenured faculty members perform primary evaluation of the teaching. Based on the procedures below and the departmental criteria for promotion and/or tenure, the subcommittee will draft an evaluation of the candidate's teaching to be reviewed and approved by the P&T committee.

Multiple sources of information will be used as the basis for the evaluation of classroom teaching. The candidate's written statements describing course objectives and course content for each course from course syllabi and/or other documentation will be reviewed. Reports

byevaluators, who had observed classroom teaching over a period of several years, will be examined to evaluate the candidate's instructional methods and command of the subject matter, and commitment to student learning. Student performance in assigned homework, projects, and examinations as well as their preparation to succeed in upper level courses will provide the basis for assessing evidence of student learning. Student classroom evaluations will provide additional data on command of the subject matter, the ability to communicate effectively in the classroom, and support of undergraduate students outside the classroom. The candidate's participation in classroom teaching improvement activities such as workshops and seminars, and comments from peer evaluators, trends in student evaluation score, and teaching awards will be examined for evidence of development as a teacher. Peer letters evaluating classroom performance will be included in the P&T dossier for each candidate. Regional, National, and International awards citing the candidate for teaching excellence should be included. Regional, National and International awards garnered by the students of the candidate as a direct byproduct of his/her teaching activities should be included and will also be evaluated as an independent measure of teaching excellence.

The candidate's stated undergraduate advising record will also be used to evaluate participation in undergraduate advising. In addition, the candidate's statement and record of graduate student advising and mentoring will be evaluated. Though post-doctoral mentoring is not a requirement, any documented experience in this area will also be considered within the teaching evaluations.

Overall, the quality and quantity of teaching achievements will be evaluated in the context of the percent effort stated for teaching and the department, school and university criteria and standards. The Committee will note any and all academic years when the Candidate taught overload conditions and make allowances for such circumstances in the final teaching evaluation. The overall evaluation of teaching will rank the teaching in the standard categories: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Marginal and Poor. The distribution of the vote will be provided to the candidate.

The overall results will be reported as part of the initial evaluation and on the Department Evaluation Summary for the Candidate form.

#### *Evaluation of Professional Performance*

This evaluation is generally only applicable to librarians and is not applicable for Aerospace Engineering faculty.

#### *Evaluation of Research and Scholarship*

Based on the procedures below and the departmental criteria for promotion and/or tenure, the P&T subcommittee will draft an evaluation of the candidate's research and scholarship to be reviewed and approved by the entire P&T committee.

Research and scholarship will be evaluated with respect to the cumulative impact, quality and quantity of publications, other scholarly products and funded external grants. Normally a sustainable program of research will require publications, external funding and graduate students. Cumulatively, all publications at the University of Kansas since the candidate's last

appointment will be reviewed and rated (excellent, very good, good, marginal, poor) by members of the subcommittee. Based on external letters and citations, the professional (regional, national, and/or international) reputation will be evaluated. External evaluations will also be used as objective evidence of quality and impact of the research. The program of research will be evaluated for progress beyond that completed for the terminal degree or a prior appointment level at the University of Kansas, and the promise of continued productivity. The overall evaluation of research will rank the research in the standard categories. The distribution of the vote will be provided, if needed, per university requirements and forms.. The overall results will be reported as part of the initial evaluation and on the Department Evaluation Summary for the Candidate form.

### *External Evaluation*

The P&T committee shall obtain external reviewers from a cross section of the candidate's technical area. The process of obtaining external evaluations will follow the current university "Guidelines on Requirements for External Evaluations – Promotion and Tenure Review." From the candidate list, and from others recommended by the committee, 6-8 persons will be asked to evaluate the candidate. If less than six agreed to serve as evaluators, then additional evaluators will be identified and recruited. Agreement from at least 6 evaluators will be sought. A response by all evaluators will be requested and reminder letters and phone calls will be used to help assure that evaluations are received in timely manner. The evaluation letters and CV's of evaluators will be compiled and included in the P&T dossier for each candidate per university requirements.

Because the evaluations are to be given as confidential and are to remain confidential to the extent possible under the law, the following statement is required to be in the letters to external evaluators: "As a part of the promotion and/or tenure review process, we are soliciting assessments of Professor X's research contributions from academic colleagues and distinguished professionals. These letters will become part of the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier and are treated as confidential by the University to the extent we are permitted to do so by law." In addition, the letter to external evaluators will request that they address the areas required by the current university "Guidelines on Requirements for External Evaluations – Promotion and Tenure Review." The materials sent to the external evaluators will include the Candidate CV, selected publications (4-6), and other relevant information deemed pertinent by the departmental P&T committee.

In cases where the candidate has extended the timeline for their mandatory review year (per University policies), or other special circumstances occurring during the time period between appointment as Associate Professor to consideration for promotion to Full Professor, the Candidate and P&T Chair will discuss the option of apprising external evaluators of the special circumstances in the timing. The candidate may choose to disclose this information in the letter to external evaluators or in his/her CV, or the candidate may choose not to disclose this information to external evaluators.

### *Evaluation of Service and Administration*

The evaluation of service and administration is normally led by a subcommittee of 3-4 tenured faculty members, but in no case shall be less than two tenured faculty members perform primary evaluation of the service. Membership of the service and administration evaluation subcommittee may be the same as the teaching or research and scholarship evaluation subcommittee. Based on the procedures below and the departmental criteria for promotion and/or tenure, the subcommittee will draft an evaluation of the candidate's service to be reviewed and approved by the department's P&T committee.

The subcommittee will review the number and type of departmental, school-level, and university projects and committees served by the candidate. The subcommittee will also evaluate the number, type, and activity of regional and national service activities by the candidate, as these are important for bringing recognition to the university.

The overall evaluation of service will rank the service in the standard categories. The distribution of the vote will be provided, if needed, per university requirements and forms. The overall results will be reported as part of the initial evaluation and on the Department Evaluation Summary for the candidate form.

Service and administration activities considered in the evaluation may include, but are not limited to:

- a) Service to professional and academic societies (officer, major committees, program chair, etc.).
- b) Service as a member of the editorial board of professional journals.
- c) Service on local, state, national, and international committees.
- d) Service on major departmental, school, or university committees.
- e) Service as a program director for conferences, institutes, short courses, etc.
- f) Service in a major academic administrative position.
- g) Service in a major research administrative position (director of laboratory or institute, etc.).
- h) Service in major department administrative positions.
- i) Service as an advisor to student professional and academic societies
- j) Service on minor committees.
- k) Service in professional and academic societies
- l) Participation in KU Speaker's Bureau
- m) Speaking at civic organization meetings
- n) Reviews of others' books, articles, reports and proposals.
- o) Conducting outreach activities to and for K-12 instructors, administrators, staff and institutions

---

April 15, 2013