Notes on Faculty Standards and Faculty Evaluations

Edited on November 29, 2000

The following descriptors are useful in describing each faculty member's performance in teaching, in research, and in service: ABOVE EXPECTATIONS, AT EXPECTATIONS, BELOW EXPECTATIONS, and UNSATISFACTORY. I have tried to list some of the attributes that I believe might be appropriate for reporting a faculty member's level of achievement using these descriptors.

TEACHING

ABOVE EXPECTATIONS

Clearly acknowledged excellent teaching contributions (one measure might be course performance ratings above School averages) plus active contributions to undergraduate student advising plus leadership position in curriculum innovation at the School as well as at the departmental level, in improvement in course delivery, or in improved evaluation of student performance.

AT EXPECTATIONS

Acknowledged good teaching contributions (one measure might be course performance ratings at or near School averages) plus active contributions to undergraduate student advising plus activity in curriculum development, innovation, or course improvement.

BELOW EXPECTATIONS

Clearly questionable quality of teaching contributions (one measure might be course performance ratings below School averages) plus little or no measurable contributions to undergraduate student advising plus minimal demonstrable activity in curriculum development, innovation, or course improvement.

UNSATISFACTORY

Teaching quality clearly below expectations (one measure might be course performance ratings significantly below School averages) plus minimal or no contributions to undergraduate student advising plus no activity in curriculum development, innovation, or course improvement.

RESEARCH

ABOVE EXPECTATIONS

Acknowledged or emerging reputation for scholarly excellence plus three or more archival papers published per year (also two or more papers in conference proceedings per year would be desirable) plus support of three or more graduate students through external sponsored research.

AT EXPECTATIONS

Acknowledged or emerging reputation for scholarly excellence plus two or more archival papers published per year (also one or more papers in conference proceedings per year would be desirable) plus support of two or more graduate students through external sponsored research.

BELOW EXPECTATIONS

Minimal scholarly activity plus one archival paper published per year plus support of less than two graduate students through external sponsored research.

UNSATISFACTORY

No scholarly activity and no archival papers published and no papers in conference proceedings and no graduate students supported through external sponsored research.

SERVICE

ABOVE EXPECTATIONS

Leadership position in committee work of Department, School, and University plus significant contributions to external national professional activities

AT EXPECTATIONS

Active contributions to committee work of Department, School, and University plus contributions to external national professional activities

BELOW EXPECTATIONS

Minimal contributions to committee work of Department, School, and University and no measurable contributions to external national professional activities

UNSATISFACTORY

No contributions to committee work of Department, School, and University and no measurable contributions to external national professional activities

For a faculty member's overall performance to be AT EXPECTATIONS, I believe that a faculty member must demonstrate adequacy in teaching performance, be active in advising students, have demonstrable scholarly activity (measured by published archival papers and conference papers), be an active contributor to generating external support for the research and/or teaching activities of the School, contribute to the service requirements of the Department and School, and have some level of external professional activity. In considering the support of research, I have tried to quantify the amount of expected scholarship in terms of publications and the amount of external support or sponsored research support expected in terms of graduate students supported (not in terms of research dollars). Total lack of research support or total lack of concentrated effort to win external support is below my level of expectation for VUSE faculty.

These attributes are suggested as a guide when considering the level of performance of an individual faculty member. Obviously, all faculty members are not the same, nor do they contribute in identical ways to the success of a department. Careful judgment should be used in determining a faculty member's performance. However, average contributions should not be labeled as outstanding. Vanderbilt faculty

should be expected to perform at levels commensurate with their peers at leading schools of engineering and to perform at levels that will make VUSE competitive with the leading schools of engineering. Any lesser expectation will ensure mediocrity for VUSE.