

Executive Committee Minutes  
Friday, March 6, 2015

Present: Huan Liu (Chair), Keith Holbert (Secretary), Lenore Dai, Al Chasey, Shawn Jordan, Vikram Kodibagkar, Sule Ozev, David Allee, Cy Kuo  
Absent: Xiao Wang, Hanqing Jiang, Narayanan Neithalath, Esma Gel

1. **Approval of February Minutes.** The Minutes of the February EC meeting were approved unanimously by the Committee.
2. **Annual Evaluations.** The Committee members briefly discussed how each unit currently handles the faculty performance evaluation process.

**SEMTE** (Lenore Dai) -- Faculty submit a FAR form that includes courses taught, SCH, publications (awards/research expenditures). A diagram is distributed showing research dollars compared to the rest of the unit (not done every year).

**ECEE** (Keith Holbert) -- Faculty are asked to write a 1-page self-evaluation that includes what the faculty accomplished over the past year and what their goals are for the upcoming year. For tenured faculty this is optional; for junior faculty is not optional. Only the data for the most recent year is compiled, but the ranking is an average for the last 3 years.

**ECEE** (Sule Ozev) -- Faculty are asked to complete an Excel spreadsheet that asks for publications, honors, and internal/external service work. Some categories are already filled in such as number of classes taught and expenses. The unit personnel committee then reviews all the materials.

**ECEE** (David Allee) – Staff have to fill in a massive spreadsheet. It would be nice if the spreadsheet could be simplified.

**CIDSE** (Huan Liu) -- Three categories are used: teaching (course development/improvement, Master's students supervised) research (papers, funding, Ph.D. students supervised) and service. Faculty don't use a spreadsheet. The unit personnel committee compiles a spreadsheet. Self-evaluations are optional. Compiled information is submitted to director. ***ACTION ITEM:*** Huan will send an example form to Keith.

**SBHSE** (Vikram Kodibagkar) -- A 3-year faculty evaluation form is used. Faculty are asked to use an AMC template when submitting their CV. It's not clear how the personnel committee crunches the information. It was suggested that a perception question be included in the evaluation to determine how your fellow faculty view you and your contributions to the school.

**Poly** (Shawn Jordan/Cy Kuo) -- Poly faculty complete FAR forms that include a page each on research, teaching and service. Additional information compiled by the unit admin is student evaluations, research expenditures and an updated CV. All information is submitted to the unit personnel committee.

**SSEBE** (Narayanan Neithalath) (via 3/6/15 email) -- **Full Professors** would like some feedback from the Director on their holistic performance (sometimes service external to the University is important and it needs to be considered more effectively); have no concerns about the faculty evaluation scores - does not bother what the numbers are;

questions on how the directors are comparing faculty based on the raw numbers alone - do they have a mechanism to differentiate between specialty areas that are like chalk and cheese? Since the schools are big and contain people doing diverse types of work - some of them very traditional and some very new and upcoming areas, how is the mechanism treating everyone equitably when it comes to "absolute scores" especially for research funding? Does the directors have an advising group (a group of core full professors from different areas of specialty) to make more rational decisions than giving numbers just based on a few metrics? **Junior faculty** need more guidelines on what their evaluation numbers mean. That is, for example, where does a combined score of 3.0 put a junior faculty with respect to his/her peers. To provide more perspective to the directors, evaluations of junior faculty should be made in consultation with a senior professor in the group and provide directions (while this is done in mid-tenure review, a regular evaluation can happen annually). Towards this end, the mentorship process can be redefined. Many new faculty take teaching very seriously and contribute towards course development/improvement, but feel that the evaluation scores depend very heavily on student evaluations of teaching and does not adequately reflect their effort which might bear fruit only in course of time. They also feel that the impact of their work be more rationally ascertained. **All the faculty** who provided feedback were unanimous in their opinion that if the feedback/evaluation process need to be improved, it would necessitate more work (than less) in the part of the directors. Some faculty are suggesting that the directors have a meeting with the specialty area coordinators (that is what senior faculty leading different groups are called in our school) during the review process and delegate them to assess younger faculty in their groups better. It remains to be seen if the senior faculty are amenable to additional work.

**SSEBE** (Al Chasey) -- Faculty collect data for a spreadsheet that includes research, publications, teaching, SCH and service. A 3-year form is used. Self-evaluations are submitted that include goals for the next 3 years. **ACTION ITEM:** Al will send a copy of the form to Keith.

3. **Post-Tenure Review.** The revised PTR document will be sent to Dean Johnson for review/approval. **ACTION ITEM:** Annette will send document to the Dean.
4. **Dean's Lecture.** Under-Secretary Patricia Hoffman will visit Engineering on April 22<sup>nd</sup>. A schedule that includes breakfast (Executive Committee), lab tours, lunch, meetings (Dean, Center Chairs), seminar and dinner will be developed. **ACTION ITEM:** Sule Ozev will develop a schedule.
5. **AFSE Spring Academic Assembly.** The next Academic Assembly meeting will be held on April 10, 2015 from 2-4 p.m. (meeting 2-3 p.m.; reception 3-4 p.m.) Proposed speaking schedule: Huan (introductions; 2-3 minutes), Keith (PTR and performance evaluations; 5 minutes), Sule (Dean's Lecturer Series and Ph.D. Dissertation Award; 3 minutes). Dean Johnson will be provided with about 15-20 minutes for a state of the college update followed by Q&A.

**Next Meeting: April 3, 2015; BY 660; Lunch will be served.**