Procedures for Merit Evaluation

Faculty shall be evaluated annually for performance and development. The result of the annual evaluation provides evidence for recommendations on merit salary increases, promotion, and tenure. All College and Departmental policies and procedures shall be consistent with University policies and procedures. The Dean of the College is responsible for assuring that all eligible faculty are evaluated. However, the evaluation process is the function of the Chair of the Department with which the faculty member is associated.

Continuing full-time faculty will review the past year’s goals and objectives and generate a self-evaluation, and identify goals and objectives for the coming year. The suggested format for documenting goals and objectives is found in Appendix H. Self-evaluations, goals and objectives will be submitted to the Chair by February 15. Faculty evaluation meetings with the Chair will begin no later than March 15. New full-time faculty will be asked to identify draft goals and objectives for the coming year (or portion of the academic year if assuming duties within the year). The Chair and faculty member will mutually agree on goals and objectives. The final goals and objectives documents will be placed in the faculty member's personnel files in the Dean’s office within the first six weeks of the assumption of duties.

The Faculty member will be given a copy of his/her annual evaluation and will have 10 working days to reply to the evaluation in writing. The evaluation and reply, if any, will be discussed and signed by the faculty member and Chair and forwarded to the Dean’s office for placement in the faculty member’s personnel files in the Dean’s office by April 15.

When the faculty member requests, there shall be a meeting between the faculty member, the Department Chair, and the Dean. Following such a meeting, the Dean’s written review and comments will be placed in the personnel file and a copy will be given to the faculty member.

Criteria Used in Evaluating Performance and Development

The annual performance and development evaluation of faculty, used for promotion tenure, and merit pay, is based upon Policy 2.2.4, Merit Pay; Policy 2.5.1.0, Faculty Responsibilities; Policy 2.5.1.1, Descriptions of Teaching, Service, and Scholarship; Policy 2.5.1.4, Tenure; and, the five major performance criteria listed in Policy 2.5.1.2, which are: Academic Preparation, Experience, Teaching, Service, and Scholarship. The College of Science and Technology subdivides Teaching into three sub-areas, which are (a) Knowledge in the Teaching Field, (b) Quality of Teaching, and (c) Academic Advisement and Career Counseling.

Academic preparation and experience are relevant to the rank and placement of the faculty member in a department of the College of Science and Technology. For non-tenure line faculty hired without a terminal degree, continued growth in academic preparation and experience promises enhanced academic performance and as such are informative criteria. Tenure-line faculty are hired with terminal degrees and appropriate experience for their positions. Although continuing
educational growth is encouraged, additional academic preparation and experience are addressed as components of teaching, research and service.

Within the ranks of the college tenure-line faculty there are three recognizable groups – those faculty primarily supporting undergraduate programs, graduate faculty primarily supporting Master of Science programs (M.S. faculty), and graduate faculty supporting Doctor of Philosophy programs (Ph.D. faculty). Members of these groups differ in proportions of time allowed for research, service and teaching, and also in the resources made available to them for research support. Teaching, research and service are all essential to the growth and sustenance of the college, but relative contributions by faculty of these three groups differ among these criteria. The college recognizes that these differences must be reflected in the weighting of evaluation criteria. As general guidelines, the following minimal weights are expected: teaching 50% for faculty primarily supporting undergraduate programs; research 33% for M.S. faculty, and 60% for Ph.D. faculty.