

Criteria for Faculty Evaluations

Spatial Informatics, School of Computing and Information Science

1. Statement of Purpose

The stated goal of the University of Maine is quality public higher education. This goal is to be met through the University's efforts in the general areas of teaching, research, and service.

Consonant with the goal of the University, the goal of the *Spatial Informatics faculty* in the School of Computing and Information Science is to provide high quality programs in disciplines related to Spatial Informatics, including Spatial Information Science and Engineering, and Information Systems, with the objectives of:

- preparing individuals to become professional practitioners of spatial informatics;
- advancing the professional competence of spatial informatics engineers and scientists to high levels by means of graduate education;
- enabling practicing scientists and engineers in spatial informatics to keep abreast of current developments by means of continuing education;
- conducting research for the advancement of knowledge in the profession and in support of the educational programs;
- encouraging implementation of significant research findings;
- serving the University, the local community, the State of Maine, and the nation through professional activities;
- promoting and advancing the profession of spatial informatics; and
- seeking to assure that the profession of spatial informatics is continually responsive to the ever-changing needs, desires, and aspirations of society

The purpose of this document is to provide criteria for evaluating Spatial Informatics Faculty. Each individual will be assessed on their contributions toward achieving the goals and objectives of the spatial informatics faculty and the School of Computing and Information Science. It is also expected that these criteria will be used as the common basis for making decisions concerning promotion, tenure, and other University rewards and compensations.

2. Framework for Evaluation

Spatial Informatics within the School of Computing and Information Science is a heterogeneous unit comprised of several program areas. Differing faculty contributions within Spatial Informatics and the school at any given time, and changing contributions by a given Spatial Informatics faculty member over time, may be a desirable and practical necessity for Spatial Informatics and the School to operate and grow in an orderly manner. Diversity of faculty talents and interests is a strength that is to be preserved and orchestrated for the betterment of the School, the University, and the individual.

3. Evaluation Criteria and Levels of Performance

The three categories for evaluating performance are teaching, research, and service. The criteria for evaluations within each category shall be identical for all faculty members, but it is not expected that all faculty attain the same level of performance in each category. In weighing an individual's contributions, recognition shall be given not only to the accomplishments achieved, but also to the constraints and the opportunities affecting the achievements as a consequence of that individual being a member of program and school teams.

The strength of the Spatial Informatics faculty within the school lies in the effective combination of teaching, research, and service. Because it is unrealistic to expect that all faculty will demonstrate outstanding performance in all three areas, it is expected that criteria for promotion and tenure can be fully satisfied in a number of ways within the judgmental jurisdiction of the peer committee. The criteria outlined below are for a standard 50% research, 50% teaching appointment, and at all reappointment and promotion points, the Peer Committee will adjust expectations within the criteria for consideration of faculty members with appointments that vary from this standard.

3.1. Teaching

The evaluation of a faculty member's teaching is based on evidence from the faculty member's peers, school director, students through course evaluations, advisees, and other constituents such as employers of program alumni. A faculty member's performance in teaching is rated as *satisfactory* or *excellent* as follows. Failure to achieve at least satisfactory is considered to be *below satisfactory* performance.

Satisfactory: For satisfactory performance, the faculty member must over the considered time period:

- Have established a record as an effective teacher in graduate and, if such duties are assigned, undergraduate classes taught by the faculty member as evidenced by overall positive course evaluations from undergraduate and graduate students; occasional negative outliers may be compensated by evidence of significant improvement in subsequently taught classes;
- Have demonstrated effectiveness in the advising and/or mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students as evidenced by:
 - Contributions to graduate student advising by serving on MS and PhD committees in the School and/or closely related disciplines demonstrated through student accomplishments, participation in advisory committee meetings, input to defenses, etc.;
 - Advising of undergraduate students (if such duties are assigned) as demonstrated by course and curriculum advising of those students assigned to the faculty member and involving undergraduate students in teaching and research, supervising capstone projects or honors theses, professional guidance, or similar activities;
 - Mentoring of undergraduate or graduate students (although not as formally assigned adviser) in teaching, research or related scholarly or professional pursuits;

- Other evidence indicative of satisfactory teaching, advising, and mentoring contributions will also be considered, including the following:
 - Written and signed student comments;
 - Written evaluations of classroom visits by peers;
 - Teaching innovations, including design and approval of new courses or use of innovative methods of instruction;
 - Contributions to student recruitment and retention;
 - Continuing education activities such as participation in teaching workshops or conferences.

Excellent: Excellent teaching goes beyond satisfactory teaching as indicated by substantial evidence of any of the following kinds:

- Record as an excellent teacher in graduate and, if such duties are assigned, undergraduate classes taught by the faculty member as evidenced by consistent above satisfactory course evaluations from undergraduate and graduate students;
 - Note: Although not the sole source of evidence, “consistent above satisfactory course evaluations” may be evidenced by course ratings above the mean compared to unit peers and/or course rating averages of 4.0 and above.
- Effective supervision of graduate and, if applicable, undergraduate students as demonstrated by chaired M.S. or Ph.D. committees, completed theses, student graduation, joint publications with students, student awards, successful student job placement, advancement to competitive PhD programs, etc.;
- Receipt of internal or external funding for improvement of teaching;
- Submission of internal or external grant proposals for improvement of teaching;
- Significant contributions to student recruitment and retention;
- Receipt of teaching or advising awards;
- Scholarly activities in teaching and learning, such as presentations or publications.

3.2. Research

Faculty involvement in research is an essential component of a high-quality program and represents one of the avenues by which an individual can contribute to the growth of the faculty unit, the school, and the field. A faculty member's performance in research is rated as satisfactory or excellent as follows. Failure to achieve at least satisfactory is considered to be below satisfactory performance.

Satisfactory: For satisfactory performance, the faculty member must over the considered time period:

- Have demonstrated development of a significant research program in scholarly contributions related to Spatial Informatics or a closely related field;
- Have established a track record of sound scholarship as evidenced by publication of research results in recognized peer-reviewed outlets. Faculty members are typically expected to have co-authored on average, over the considered time period, at least 1 peer-reviewed publication per year in professional journals or in publications (e.g., conference proceedings or post-conference publications) published in connection with recognized national or international meetings, where the full article is submitted for peer review;

- Note: Faculty members with an assigned course load of five or more courses per academic year are expected to have co-authored on average, over the considered time period, at least 1 peer-reviewed publication every two years in professional journals or in publications (e.g., conference proceedings or post-conference publications) published in connection with recognized national or international meetings, where the full article is submitted for peer review.
- Have actively engaged in obtaining adequate resources to support research activities, as evidenced by:
 - Preparation and submission of research proposals to internally or externally funded competitive grant programs; or
 - Receipt of internal or external research grants from sources such as government agencies, foundations, or industry;
- Other evidence indicative of satisfactory research contributions will also be considered, including the following:
 - Presentations (talks and posters) at recognized professional meetings;
 - Other scholarly publications including book chapters or books, edited volumes, non-peer-reviewed articles, short papers, abstracts, editorials, letters, etc.;
 - Publication of technical or user-oriented reports;
 - Publication of data or software or similar research artefacts of use to research and user communities;
 - Involvement in the commercialization of research results, including applications or awards of patents;
 - Direction of student research as indicated by completed theses and dissertations.

Excellent: Excellent research goes beyond satisfactory research as indicated by substantial evidence of any of the following kinds:

- Be recognized nationally or internationally as a researcher in the professional community as evidenced by evaluations from the Peer Committee, external letters, and/or a high number of citations by others to the scholarly works of the individual;
- Sustained high research productivity as indicated by:
 - The faculty member co-authors considerably more than the satisfactory number of peer-reviewed scholarly publications; or
 - The faculty member publishes peer-reviewed publications in a variety of top outlets as measured by their impact factor or other accepted ratings of journals (for professional journals; relative to the subarea of interest) or acceptance rate (when published in connection with professional meetings);
 - The faculty member publishes single-authored or first-authored peer-reviewed publications, or peer-reviewed publications with an advised or mentored student as first author;
- Award of significant research grants;
- Publication of books or other monographs that organize the field, advance the state-of-the-art, or significantly influence teaching in the field through well-respected national or international publishing outlets;
- National or international prizes recognizing the faculty member's research or scholarship;
- Invited presentations and keynotes at recognized national or international professional meetings;

- Internal or external research or scholarship awards for graduate students supervised by the faculty member.

3.3 Service

Service activities appropriate for the evaluation of faculty members are broadly defined to include service to the department and campus community and professional service to various levels of government, professional communities, and to the general public. Evidence will include documentation of titles or roles of faculty member, names of committees, organizations, publications, documents, meetings, etc. as well as numbers of instances and dates as appropriate. A faculty member's performance in service is rated as *satisfactory* or *excellent* as follows. Failure to achieve at least satisfactory is considered to be *below satisfactory* performance.

Satisfactory: For satisfactory performance, the faculty member must over the considered time period:

- Have contributed to the governance, planning, and programs of Spatial Informatics, the School, the College, the University, or the University System through committee work;
- Have contributed to the professional community as evidenced by some of the following:
 - Peer-reviewing manuscripts for professional journals or conferences;
 - Peer-reviewing grant proposals or serving on review panels for funding agencies;
 - Chairing or serving on the editorial board of a recognized professional journal;
 - Editing a professional book or special volume of a journal;
 - Serving on the program committee of recognized national or international professional meetings;
 - Organizing, chairing or contributing to the organization of recognized professional meetings, such as conferences, seminars, workshops, symposia;
 - Serving in an official capacity for a professional society;
 - Supporting a student organization such as by serving as advisor;
 - Supporting academic program review such as by participating as a member of an accreditation team or other program review committee;
- Other evidence indicative of satisfactory service contributions includes the following:
 - Professional consulting;
 - Serving as an advisor or as a member of an advisory committee for private industry, government or non-profits at the international, national, state, or local level;
 - Serving on a thesis committee for a student in another department or serving as external committee member for a student at another institution;
 - Outreach to industry, government, K-12, or the general public that makes information or expertise of the University available to professionals or the public via short courses, seminars, public lectures, or similar means.

Excellent: For excellent performance, the faculty member must show substantial service activities both within and outside the University, evidenced by activities listed under satisfactory service performance.

4. Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Reviews

The outlined criteria are applied by the Peer Committee for all tenure and promotion cases and for all post-tenure reviews.

4.1. Constitution of the Peer Committee

The Spatial Informatics Peer Committee is constituted of all members of the School of Computing and Information Science of the sought or a higher rank and whose primary responsibilities lie with the Spatial Information Science and Engineering graduate programs. A consultative non-voting member may be added from each of the other SCIS faculty units (i.e. Computer Science and New Media) at the invitation of the Spatial Informatics faculty peers on the committee. The peer committee also has discretion to expand its membership beyond the bounds of the School through 2/3 majority vote.

4.2. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Granting of tenure and promotion from assistant professor to associate professor requires that the faculty member has demonstrated excellent performance either in research or teaching and satisfactory performance in the other two areas. The faculty member should demonstrate high promise for continued development and growth. Normally, the evaluation of the performance will be based upon information and documentation supplied by the faculty member, by the peer committee, by letters from peers external to the University of Maine System, and/or by other sources from within the University.

If consecutive reappointment evaluations result consistently in excellent scores in all three areas, the Peer Committee may suggest its support for an early tenure and promotion case at the candidate's next reappointment cycle.

4.3. Promotion to Professor

Promotion from associate professor to professor requires a record of excellent performance since promotion to Associate Professor in either teaching or research and satisfactory performance in the other two areas. The faculty member must be recognized by peers as having made a significant contribution to her/his area of expertise at a national or international level, demonstrate leadership abilities, and enhance the reputation of the University of Maine. Moreover, the faculty member must demonstrate a likelihood for continued excellence. The level of accomplishment will be determined from evaluation of the unit member's reputation among knowledgeable individuals external to the University as well as evaluation of information and documentation supplied by the unit member relevant to activities in teaching, research, and service.

4.4. Granting Tenure at Rank

If hired at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor without tenure, granting of tenure requires satisfying the same criteria as required for promotion to the rank. The period of time prior to review for tenure is typically a matter of negotiation as part of the hiring process.

4.5. Post-Tenure Reviews

The expectation is that all Spatial Informatics faculty members will make sustained contributions toward the goals and objectives of Spatial Informatics and the School. The considered period of evaluation begins at the last promotion or the last post-tenure review, whichever is more recent. An above satisfactory post-tenure summary (PTS) requires excellent performance in one area and at least satisfactory performance in the other two areas.

A satisfactory PTS is given for satisfactory performance in all three areas (teaching, research, service). If the faculty member does not meet the criteria for satisfactory performance in either research or service (but not in both), while performing at an excellent level in one of the other areas, it is at the discretion of the Peer Committee to rate the overall performance as satisfactory or below satisfactory.

4.6. Reappointment and Post Permanent Appointment Review of Lecturers

Reappointment of lecturers requires that the faculty member has demonstrated satisfactory performance in teaching and satisfactory performance in service at the university since the last reappointment. For a lecturer, service contributions to the profession are not required for a satisfactory or excellent performance in service.

Reappointment of lecturers ends after six years. At that point, Lecturers are regularly reviewed using the same cycle and process for Post-Tenure Review. A satisfactory PTS is given for satisfactory performance in both areas of teaching and service. If the faculty member does not meet the criteria for satisfactory performance in one of the areas while performing at an excellent level in the other area, it is at the discretion of the Peer Committee to rate the overall performance as satisfactory or below satisfactory.

Approved by Spatial Informatics Faculty on March 26, 2018

Approved by Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost on April 30, 2018

Faculty Evaluation Checklist and Summary for the Period of Evaluation

Peer Committee Evaluation of _____

Date: _____

Note: In the following checklist, a response of “yes” typically indicates substantial positive evidence, “partially” indicates significant positive evidence, and “no” indicates little or no evidence.

Based on the evidence provided and solicited, the individual is assessed by the peer committee as follows:

1. TEACHING

a. Effective Teacher

Yes _____, Partially _____, No _____

Comments:

b. Effective Advisor

Yes _____, Partially _____, No _____

Comments:

c. Additional substantial evidence justifying rating of excellence

Yes (substantial) _____ Partially (significant) _____ No (little or none) _____

Comments:

d. Overall peer committee teaching assessment based on a through c.

Note: Assessment under a through c may be at the level of *Partially* or *No* in one or more categories and still result in an overall rating of satisfactory or excellent when the entire body of evidence is taken into consideration.

Below satisfactory _____

Satisfactory _____

Excellent _____

Comments/Explanation:

2. RESEARCH (not evaluated for reappointment of a lecturer)

a. Significant research program

Yes _____, Partially _____, No _____

Comments:

b. Track record of sound scholarship

Yes ____, Partially ____, No ____

Comments:

c. Engaged in obtaining resources to support research

Yes ____, Partially ____, No ____

Comments:

d. Other evidence indicative of satisfactory research contributions

Yes ____, Partially ____, No ____

Comments:

e. Additional substantial evidence justifying rating of excellence

Yes (substantial) ____ Partially (significant) ____ No (little or none) ____

Comments:

f. Overall peer committee research assessment based on a through e.

Note: Assessment under a through e may be at the level of *Partially* or *No* in one or more categories and still result in an overall rating of satisfactory or excellent when the entire body of evidence is taken into consideration.

Below satisfactory ____

Satisfactory ____

Excellent ____

Comments/Explanation:

3. SERVICE

a. Contributed at university to governance, planning, and programs

Yes ____, Partially ____, No ____

Comments:

b. Contributed to the professional community (not required for lecturer)

Yes ____, Partially ____, No ____

Comments:

c. Other evidence indicative of satisfactory service contributions

Yes ____, Partially ____, No ____

Comments:

d. Additional substantial evidence justifying rating of excellence

Yes (substantial) ____, Partially (significant) ____, No (little or none) ____

Comments:

f. Overall peer committee service assessment based on a though d.

Note: Assessment under a through d may be at the level of *Partially* or *No* in one or more categories and still result in an overall rating of satisfactory or excellent when the entire body of evidence is taken into consideration.

Below satisfactory ____

Satisfactory ____

Excellent ____

Comments/Explanation:

I. TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Summary of Performance in:

Teaching: Below satisfactory ____, Satisfactory ____, Excellent ____

Research: Below satisfactory ____, Satisfactory ____, Excellent ____

Service: Below satisfactory ____, Satisfactory ____, Excellent ____

Excellent performance either in research or teaching and at least satisfactory performance in the other two areas.

Yes ____

No ____

Comments/Explanation:

II. PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Summary of Performance in:

Teaching: Below satisfactory ____, Satisfactory ____, Excellent ____

Research: Below satisfactory ____, Satisfactory ____, Excellent ____

Service: Below satisfactory ____, Satisfactory ____, Excellent ____

Excellent performance either in research or teaching and at least satisfactory performance in the other two areas since promotion to Associate Professor.

Yes ____

No ____

Comments/Explanation:

Recognized by peers as having made a significant contribution to her/his area of expertise at a national or international level.

Yes

No

Comments/Explanation:

III. GRANTING TENURE AT RANK

If granted rank of **Associate Professor** but not tenure when hired, candidate now meets the criteria listed above under I. TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Yes , No

Comments/Explanation:

If granted rank of **Professor** but not tenure when hired, candidate now meets the criteria listed above under II. PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Yes , No

Comments/Explanation:

IV. POST TENURE REVIEWS

Summary of Performance in:

Teaching: Below satisfactory , Satisfactory , Excellent

Research: Below satisfactory , Satisfactory , Excellent

Service: Below satisfactory , Satisfactory , Excellent

Post-tenure summary (PTS) is *excellent* since the last evaluation: Excellent either in research or teaching and at least satisfactory performance in the other two areas.

Yes

No

Comments/Explanation:

Post-tenure summary (PTS) is *satisfactory* since the last evaluation with at least satisfactory performance in all three areas.

Yes

No

Comments/Explanation:

Post-tenure summary (PTS) is *satisfactory* since the last evaluation with the candidate NOT achieving at least satisfactory performance in either research or service while performing at an excellent level in one of the remaining two areas. (i.e. excellent in research or teaching while below satisfactory in service or excellent in service or teaching while below satisfactory in research).

Yes

No

Note: A judgement call is made by the peer committee as to whether the extent of excellence in one area more than counters the extent of below satisfactory in the other area.

Comments/Explanation:

V. REAPPOINTMENT OF A LECTURER

Summary of Performance in:

Teaching: Below satisfactory ____, Satisfactory ____, Excellent ____

Service: Below satisfactory ____, Satisfactory ____, Excellent ____

Satisfactory performance in teaching and service since last reappointment.

Yes ____

No ____

Comments/Explanation:

POST PERMANENT APPOINTMENT REVIEW (PPAR) OF A LECTURER

Summary of Performance in:

Teaching: Below satisfactory ____, Satisfactory ____, Excellent ____

Service: Below satisfactory ____, Satisfactory ____, Excellent ____

Post-permanent appointment review (PPAR) is *excellent* since the last evaluation: Excellent either in teaching or service and at least satisfactory performance in the other area.

Yes ____

No ____

Comments/Explanation:

PPAR is *satisfactory* since the last evaluation with satisfactory performance in both areas.

Yes ____

No ____

Comments/Explanation:

Post-tenure summary (PTS) is *satisfactory* since the last evaluation with the candidate NOT achieving at least satisfactory performance in service while performing at an excellent level in teaching.

Yes ____

No ____

Note: A judgement call is made by the peer committee as to whether the extent of excellence in teaching more than counters the extent of below satisfactory performance in service.

Comments/Explanation: