

**ANNUAL FACULTY MERIT REVIEW
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

(Revised version, February 2005)

I. GENERAL OBJECTIVES

- A. The purpose of these policies and procedures is to encourage planned progress by individual faculty members toward university, college, and department goals.
- B. This purpose, in turn, requires that criteria for judging performance be set in advance, that they be known to the persons to whom they apply, and that they be uniform and equitably applied.
- C. These policies and procedures recognize that teaching and research are primary responsibilities of all faculty members, and they reward other activities to the degree that they contribute to:
 - 1) the development and diffusion of knowledge, and
 - 2) the accomplishment of College goals and objectives.
- D. All members of the College faculty, other than the Dean and Associate Dean(s), are covered by these procedures and are eligible for one or both of the following types of increment:
 - X increments. Based on annual review of faculty and chairperson performance.
 - Y increments. To adjust for major inequities.
- E. All changes to these policies and procedures must be approved by a vote of the College faculty.

II. PROCEDURES – ADMINISTRATION OF SYSTEM

- A. Faculty
 - 1. Before January 15 of each year, the faculty member will prepare a Professional Data Report (PDR) for the prior three years. This report prepared using the College's ePDR System.
 - 2. Final faculty merit recommendations to the Dean will come from the College Administrative Committee. These recommendations will be based on careful review and discussion. Each chairperson will insure that all relevant contributions are considered in the committee evaluation of faculty members in his/her department.
 - 3. The guidelines for merit increases are necessarily flexible; and, consequently, legitimate differences in opinion may arise regarding 1) the level of performance achieved and 2) the relative weight which various factors shall receive in the evaluation. In this event, the faculty member has the right to an appeal hearing before the College Grievance Committee. Both the appealing faculty and the appropriate chairperson shall testify to the committee. This committee, constituted as prescribed by University policy, will be activated upon written

notice to the Dean that an appeal is requested. The results of each such hearing will be forwarded to the Dean in the form of a recommendation for/or against adjustment of the original "X" evaluation.

4. Final Bauer College increment recommendations will be forwarded by the Dean to the Provost and Chancellor.

B. Chairperson Evaluation

1. Prior to January 15th, each departmental chairperson shall submit to the Dean a PDR for the prior three years.
2. Using the evaluation instruments prescribed by the Dean, the departmental faculty shall individually and anonymously evaluate the chairperson's performance for the year.
3. These evaluations will be forwarded to the Dean who will take them into account when determining recommended increments for the chairperson.
4. The Dean will provide sufficient opportunity for discussions with departmental faculty interested in personally commenting on the chairperson's performance and departmental accomplishments.
5. Administrators who wish to appeal their recommended increments will utilize the same procedures as those available to non-administrative members.

- C.** A listing of all individual faculty member's X-ratings by category, individual overall X-ratings, recommended faculty X- and Y-increments, and individual PDR's will be kept in the Office of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, and the Office of the Chairperson of the Faculty's Department. These files will be available for examination to any evaluated faculty member for a 60-day period following the communication of the X-ratings and following the communication of the X- and Y-increments, respectively, to the Faculty. Requests for examination must be made in writing to the Chair or the Associate Dean.

III. PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

A. General

1. The annual faculty review process shall cover a 36-month performance period. Exceptions to this policy are:
 - a. All new Assistant Professors hired in the CBA who have completed the doctorate and not held a tenure-track position at another university may elect to receive a 2X evaluation during the first two yearly evaluation periods.

- b. All new faculty with previous professional rank at another university may elect to receive a 2X evaluation during the first year of evaluation.
- c. Faculty on a leave-of-absence of less than one academic year shall be evaluated in the same way that he/she would have been evaluated if he/she had not been on leave. Faculty on a leave-of-absence of at least one academic year shall be required to submit a Professional Data Report (PDR) before January 15 of any year encompassed by that leave. This report shall be the same as the report that would have been required if the faculty had not taken a leave. The Faculty member will be subject to the normal Merit Review evaluation during that review period.

However, the criteria for determining the faculty's X-rating while on leave may, at the request of the faculty member, and at the discretion of the Administrative Committee, differ from that of a faculty member not on leave. The different criteria can be chosen only if the activities performed by the faculty member while on leave differ significantly from those activities traditionally performed by faculty not on leave.

In the first evaluation after a faculty member returns from a leave-of-absence of one year or more, that faculty may elect to receive a 2X evaluation during the first evaluation period following the leave of absence.

- d. All tenured or tenure-track faculty holding administrative positions within the Bauer College, the University or the UH System, may elect to receive a 2X evaluation during the first evaluation period immediately following the administrative appointment. For the purposes of this paragraph, administrative position is defined as Department Chairs, Deans, and other faculty members whose duties, as determined by the Administrative Committee, are mainly administrative.
- 2. Performance criteria and weighting options shall be reviewed each year to insure optimum fairness, incentive, and compliance with University policy.
 - 3. Unless specifically exempted, no item or activity should be recorded in more than one year. (Double counting shall be avoided).

B. Teaching and Student Related Activities

- 1. Actual teaching load (including consideration of large classes, etc.).
- 2. Program and course development activities.
- 3. Results of teaching effectiveness reports. For purposes of evaluation, these scores will be reported as a mean adjusted raw score, rather than as a percentage ranking score.
- 4. Flexibility and versatility in teaching and scheduling requirements.

5. Ability, willingness, and availability to counsel and advise students and to stimulate their interest in the subject areas.
6. Contribution in areas of directing student research and serving on Ph.D. committees.
7. Other teaching related contributions.

C. Research Productivity

1. Research published in refereed journals. (Evaluation emphasis on quality of research, rigor of review process, etc.).
2. Non-refereed journal articles, competitive papers presented at scholarly meetings and eligible for College funding and new editions.
3. Research funds generated for the College.

D. Service Contributions

1. Commitment to Department, College, and University. Such commitment can be evidenced in many ways, including:
 - a. Quality of contribution on special projects, such as student recruiting, program coordination, symposium development, etc.
 - b. Exceptional service and contributions on Committee assignments. Committee membership does not in itself constitute service.
 - c. Overall contribution to academic development of Department, College, and University.
2. Significant contributions to professional organizations, such as officer, committee work, editorial review, etc.
3. Significant professional service activities in community.
4. Funds generated for department and College (does not include research grants which are part of research-related evaluation).

IV. EVALUATION PROCEDURES

A. "X" System

1. Each faculty member's performance will be translated into an "X" value, ranging from a low of zero to a maximum of 4X. In the mathematical calculation of individual ratings, final "X" values will be computed and reported to two decimal places with the following exceptions:

- a. When the final "X" value exceeds 3.50 it will be rounded to a value of 4.00.
 - b. When the final "X" value is less than 0.50 it will be rounded to a value of 0.00.
2. The evaluation scale is as follows:
- | | |
|------|----------------------------------|
| 4.0X | Exceptional |
| 3.5X | |
| 3.0X | Very Good |
| 2.5X | |
| 2.0X | Good |
| 1.5X | |
| 1.0X | Fair |
| 0.5X | |
| 0.0X | Substandard (No merit increment) |
3. The value of an X-increment and total increment will be determined by an absolute and percentage system.
4. Each faculty member will be notified of his/her total "X" evaluation, and the evaluation within each performance dimension: teaching, research, and service.
- B. Evaluation by Academic Rank
- Faculty members will be grouped by academic rank and evaluated against other faculty within his or her rank. The same standards and procedures will be applied to all ranks.
- C. Evaluation of Service
- Service will be evaluated based on a faculty member's overall contribution. (There will be no division in terms of internal versus external service).
- D. Evaluation of Teaching
1. The teaching dimension will be evaluated in two components: (1) the teaching effectiveness questionnaire and (2) teaching activities. The scores on the two components will be added to produce the faculty member's evaluation in teaching.
 2. The average score on the teaching effectiveness questionnaire (TEQ) for the three years will be evaluated on a rating score between 0 and 2. In order for a positive score on the teaching effectiveness questionnaire to count, it must be accompanied by a positive score on the departmental teaching activities component.
 3. Each department chairperson will assign teaching activities X ratings to faculty members in his/her department. Each chairperson will be given $1.2n$ X's (rounded up to the nearest increment of .25X) where n is the number of department faculty members reviewed, less the number of automatic 2X's given to those faculty.

Amended

December 5, 1985
May 5, 1988
August 24, 1988
August 26, 1992
October 23, 1998
December 8, 1998
May 8, 2000
February 15, 2005 (ePDR)