

Annual Merit Evaluation Policies and Procedures

University of Colorado at Colorado Springs Department of Mathematics

Approved September 2, 2004

0. INTRODUCTION

This document delineates the UCCS Department of Mathematics' guidelines and criteria for the Annual Merit Performance Evaluations of its faculty, as required by the Laws of Regents (Article 5.B.6(A)) and the system wide University administrative policy statement, "Annual Merit Adjustments for Faculty" (dated Dec 20, 2002). A performance evaluation is a comprehensive process that begins with the identification of job responsibilities and agreement on goals and objectives, and which concludes an assessment of performance. A performance rating is a summary derived from the evaluation process. The annual merit performance rating is an important, but not sole, item of information that may be used, consistent with the Laws of Regents and University Policy, in the annual salary setting process or in comprehensive faculty evaluations. Further information regarding CU policies on merit performance ratings, salary and compensations can be found in Laws of Regents (Article 11.A), Regent Policies (Sections 11-B. & 11-F.2) and the "Compensation and Leave" Section of the CU Faculty Handbook. The purpose of this document is to describe the explicit procedures of the department's annual merit evaluation process, and to specify, to the greatest extent possible, the departmental criteria to be applied in assessing a faculty member's annual merit performance in each of the areas of teaching, research, and service.

I. BASIC PROCEDURE

a. The Chair of the Department will evaluate the performance of each faculty member in each of the three areas of teaching, research, and service. Evaluations will be completed according to the criteria specified in this document. This evaluation will be based on the faculty member's activity during the previous calendar year.

b. In general, the Chair will be guided in the faculty evaluation process by using the following weighting system: 40% teaching, 40% research / creative work, and 20% service. However, these percentages are to be viewed as guidelines, not as rigid numerical straightjackets. In applying the weights, the chair should exercise some flexibility, which adequately reflects the efforts of an individual faculty member towards the three categories (teaching, research/creative work, service) in a given calendar year. Exceptions to the above guidelines are to be made only in the following situations:

b1. Faculty who hold previously negotiated "differentiated workload" agreements will be evaluated using the appropriate weighting system of the agreement. Such agreements are described in and governed by the departmental document Faculty Workload Policy for the Mathematics Department.

b2. Faculty who hold additional administrative appointments should negotiate with the Chair and other involved individuals (e.g. Dean, Vice Chancellor), at the time the administrative appointment begins, as to how annual merit evaluations of such individuals will be constituted. This includes faculty who might serve in such administrative capacities as, for instance, Associate Vice Chancellor of the campus, Graduate Dean of the campus, or Associate Dean of the College. This also includes faculty who serve as Department Chair for some, but not all, of the annual merit review period under consideration.

b3. Faculty who hold a rank other than Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor (e.g. Senior Instructor), or who hold a less-than-full-time appointment, will be evaluated according to agreements which are consistent with their appointments, and which have been previously negotiated with the Chair.

c. The Chair will meet with each faculty member to discuss his or her performance during the year under review. Prior to this meeting, the Chair will provide to the faculty member a preliminary written evaluation of the faculty member's annual performance. The purpose of this preliminary written evaluation is to possibly expedite and facilitate the discussion of the faculty member's annual performance at the meeting. The final merit evaluation made by the

Chair might differ (i.e. be either higher or lower) from the preliminary evaluation, based on additional documented evidence supplied by either the faculty member or the Chair.

d. The Annual Merit Evaluation will be prepared in accordance with the system wide “Annual Performance Rating: Faculty, Unclassified Staff / Administrators and Officers” form, and the LAS College Faculty Evaluation Summary Sheet form.

e. The Chair’s evaluation will be based on documents including, but not limited to, the following:

1) The University of Colorado system wide “Report of Scholarly, Professional, and University Activities” (the so-called *Scholarly Report*) form for the year under review

2) A copy of the faculty member’s One Year Plan for the year under review

3) A current vita

4) Any supporting documents which help to clarify or explain the information given in the Scholarly Report. This might include self-assessment report of the faculty member’s own annual performance. It might also include comments regarding how the faculty member’s activities compare to the activities reflected in the faculty member’s previously approved One Year Plan. Additional supporting documents might also include indications of significant time spent in various service activities, evidence of contributions to teaching and impact on student learning (including, for example, new courses or methods developed, specific teaching innovations, or written and numerical information gleaned from FCQ’s), or information about research work which otherwise goes unrecorded in the Scholarly Report (e.g. efforts in projects which are in various stages of development, papers in final stages of preparation for submission, the strength of a specific journal, or importance of a specific conference invitation).

5) If pertinent documents which are not supplied to the chair by the faculty member are used by the chair in the evaluation process, then the chair must indicate this, together with appropriate rationale, and provide copies of said documents, to the faculty member.

f. A faculty member may appeal his/her evaluation by submitting a timely written appeal to a Departmental Grievance Committee. If a Primary Unit Evaluation Committee has been constituted during the germane academic year, then the PUEC will serve as the grievance committee. If a PUEC has not been constituted during that academic year, a special grievance committee will be constituted by a vote of the tenured department faculty. The grievance committee should meet with the appealing faculty member and with the Department Chair, and should consider the documents, on which the evaluation was based, to determine if there was a substantial miscalculation. If the committee finds that there was a substantial miscalculation, then the faculty member, Department Chair, and grievance committee will discuss the matter with the LAS Dean. The LAS Dean will be responsible for making final judgment in the matter.

II. TIMETABLES

In normal circumstances the timetable for submission of the aforementioned documents to the Chair will be the end of January. The Chair will complete the preliminary written evaluations generally during weeks 3 and 4 of spring semester. The Chair will meet with faculty to discuss the preliminary evaluations, and to produce a final performance rating, generally during the first two weeks of March.

Annual Performance Rating and Faculty Evaluation Summary Sheets are generally due in the LAS Dean’s office by the end of Spring Break.

In normal circumstances, the faculty will submit her/his proposed One Year Plan for the next academic year along with the documents mentioned in 1e above. This one year plan is submitted on the college form “Faculty One Year Performance Plan”. The Chair and faculty will then discuss this new one-year plan during the annual meeting, and complete the forms as indicated therein.

III. SITUATIONS IN WHICH A FACULTY MEMBER IS NOT IN “FULL TIME RESIDENCE” FOR THE ENTIRE YEAR UNDER REVIEW

IIIa. Situations in which the faculty member is in fulltime residence for one semester of the year under review. (This includes, for example, faculty who are on sabbatical or leave for one of the semesters under review, and also includes new faculty in their first year in the department.) In these situations it is incumbent on the faculty member to arrange in advance of the leave as to how the faculty member will be evaluated. Typically the faculty member's annual evaluation will be based on his/her performance during the in-residence semester, extrapolated to the entire year. In addition, faculty can supplement this assessment process by submitting any germane work completed during the absence.

IIIb. Situations in which the faculty member is not in residence for any full semester during the year under review. (This includes faculty on leave during such a time frame.)

IIIb1. Work accomplished during any sort of leave associated with professional work is to be treated to the greatest extent possible as if the faculty member were in residence during that time. These include, for example, honorary leaves for the purpose of accomplishing research and/or teaching and/or service, and leaves to serve as professor at another campus (unpaid here, but paid elsewhere). If the faculty member wishes to be evaluated for merit considerations for accomplishments completed during such a full calendar leave of absence, a report on activities must be provided according to the same deadlines as those used by in-residence faculty described in Sections II and I.

IIIb2. Faculty who take leaves for personal reasons do not qualify for consideration for a merit increase. These include leaves for personal development, health reasons, to travel for pleasure, and other similar reasons.

IIIb3. Under rare circumstances, it may be necessary to view a leave as partly professional and partly non-professional (personal). In such cases, merit salary determinations must be made in advance, and must be agreed upon in writing by the faculty member, the Chair, and the Dean.

IV. SOME GENERAL REMARKS ABOUT EXPECTATIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS

It should be noted that the expectations of the Chair may vary according to individual faculty member's roles within the Department, the professorial rank, and the number of years of experience. For instance, a Senior Professor would be expected to take a leadership role for a high service rating, whereas this role would not be expected of a junior faculty member. It is expected that all tenured and tenure-track math faculty members are "professionally active" or "growing" in teaching, research and service. Indications of this activity or growth should be evident in the Scholarly Reports submitted by each faculty member.

V. MERIT RATING GUIDELINES

Each faculty member will receive a total evaluation score on a scale of 0-4 determined by a weighted average of merit ratings in each of the three areas: teaching, research, and service. The merit rating guidelines listed below will be followed in evaluating the faculty. Each descriptive term is intended to indicate a range of performance. The Chair may elect to use a continuous or discrete scale at his/her option. The submitted documents will be used to determine the score in each area. This evaluation will be based on the faculty member's activity during the previous calendar year.

The CU system-wide ratings of "Outstanding", "Exceeding Expectations", "Meeting Expectations", and "Below Expectations" are to be interpreted in this document as follows. (The semicolon placed between various descriptors is to be interpreted as "or")

TEACHING:

	3.5-4.0	Outstanding: strong contributions to the teaching program of the department; evidence of extremely strong positive impact on student learning.
	2.5-3.4	Exceeding expectations: significant contributions to the teaching program of the department; evidence of significant impact on student learning.
	1.5-2.4	Meeting expectations: positive impact on student success; overall good teaching performance; carries out normal duties of effective teachers
	0.0-1.4	Below expectations: lack of willingness to teach courses based on departmental need; documented problems with teaching; generally a negative impact on student learning.

RESEARCH:

	3.5-4.0	Outstanding: a productive research agenda including high quality publications in refereed journals or other significant activity such as grants funded, major invited talks given, or research awards or recognition received.
	2.5-3.4	Exceeding expectations: substantial research work (indicated by, for example, papers accepted in peer reviewed journals, grants obtained, positive referee reports on submitted articles, positive reviews of research grants, etc.); other activity such as talks at conferences or other Universities
	1.5-2.4	Meeting expectations: research activities consistent with the production of research articles; research activities undertaken in order to learn additional subject areas and expand research topics
	0.0-1.4	Below expectations: little or no research activity of any kind.

SERVICE:

	3.5-4.0	Outstanding: important contributions to the Department, College, University, mathematics community, or community at large in a professional role. Indication of leadership or positive impact of service.
	2.5-3.4	Exceeding expectations: significant contributions at some level (e.g. Department, College, campus, community).
	1.5-2.4	Meeting expectations: solid, reliable service.
	0.0-1.4	Below expectations: limited service and contributions.

The descriptions accompanying the numerical ratings above are intended to convey a general sense of the meaning of each score. In general, no descriptive criterion by itself is necessary or sufficient for a given score. However, the Chair should, to the greatest extent possible, make an effort to be uniform and systematic about how each faculty member's contribution to each of the areas of teaching, research and service is being evaluated, in order to ensure a fair evaluation process.

The weighted average of these scores will be computed, and the resulting weighted score will be recorded on the LAS College Faculty Evaluation Summary Sheet form in the indicated place, and the corresponding rating will be placed at the "Annual Performance Rating: Faculty, Unclassified Staff / Administrators and Officers" form. (See Ib above regarding appropriate weighting). The annual performance rating will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file and is subject to disclosure under the Colorado Open Records Act. Non-tenured faculty members should note that according to the Laws of Regents (Article 11.A.1(F)), consistently "outstanding" or "exceeding expectations" annual merit performance ratings shall not form the sole basis for tenure.