

**Merit Memo Part One:
Annual merit evaluation**
22 March 2018

It is time to begin work on the annual evaluation and merit exercise for faculty. This is a two-part process that includes: 1) annual evaluation of faculty contributions during 2017, and 2) allocation of the merit pool to professorial faculty in the form of salary increases, which become effective Sept. 1.

This memorandum addresses the first part of this process by laying out the principles that should guide departmental and programmatic evaluation of faculty members. (New this year, it includes guidance on full-time lecturer evaluation in accordance with the union contract.) The second part of the process, which takes into account considerations of equity and market forces, is addressed in a separate communication to chairs and directors.

This memo will be posted on the CAS website; all faculty should be familiar with its contents so they understand the norms and structure of this process. Please contact Richard Wright, Laura Wipf, or your appropriate divisional Associate Dean for further information or assistance.

General principles

Our annual review is based on peer evaluation of faculty work over the past year and should be framed by these general principles:

The commitment to merit-based salaries for professorial faculty reflects the fundamental reality that our excellence depends on hiring, rewarding, and retaining the best faculty – those who contribute most successfully to the university’s missions of research and education. Through the merit process we recognize those who, through their work, have had a significant impact on our students, the University, their scholarly field, and the larger world. Evaluations, while driven by accomplishments during the most recent review period, must also reflect long-term and continuing contributions.

Each unit should establish an open, transparent, and fair means of evaluating the relative merits of its individual faculty members. It is good practice to involve a faculty committee, either appointed by the Chair or elected by the faculty, to assist with evaluation, in order to avoid bias and allow development of departmental norms about judging relative merit, and to provide feedback to each faculty member about his or her evaluation. In any case, the faculty should be fully informed of the process used by the unit.

The annual evaluation provides an opportunity to recognize faculty members’ outstanding performance and to advise them on areas in need of improvement.

Each faculty member should be notified about his or her evaluation by the end of spring semester. Although the approach may differ by unit, this notification should at a minimum include the faculty member's relative rating (e.g., below average, average, above average) and a brief summary of the rationale referenced below; it does not need to include a numerical rating. Although it is best practice for the chair or members of the departmental review committee to meet with the faculty member, the department may elect to hold this meeting after new salaries are announced.

Departments and programs should evaluate full-time lecturers according to the guidelines below. Full-time lecturers will now receive the Automatic Annual Wage Adjustment as outlined in the union contract. The contract details two additional merit pools that go beyond the Automatic Annual Wage Adjustment: the Distinguished Service Recognition Pool and the Excellence in Teaching Merit Pay Fund. Information on the distribution of these pools is included in the second memo provided to Chairs and Directors.

Guidelines for evaluation

Departments and programs are responsible for creating and communicating clear norms and practices about typical annual expectations, as well as grounds for merit assessment for faculty who are outside the tenure track, including practitioner faculty and faculty whose positions do not include expectations about research (e.g., full-time lecturers).

In all cases, assessment must be based on evidence rather than on general impressions. Evaluations should draw on the Faculty Annual Report and curriculum vitae as well as other available documentation, such as peer and student teaching evaluations; evidence of the impact of scholarly work, such as reviews of publications or proposals; professional honors; and evidence of the quality of service. Because merit evaluations are based on documentation, faculty who do not complete a FAR are normally not eligible for merit increases.

Departments and programs should avoid counting and rewarding the same work multiple times. The major credit for a publication should be given for the year in which the actual publication occurred, not in advance while it is "in press." Departments and programs should distinguish clearly between works they regard as original works of scholarship, other scholarly activities, and other kinds of intellectual and creative work and publication.

Although the evaluation originates in a faculty member's home department or program, faculty should be evaluated on the basis of their full range of professional contributions regardless of whether they take place specifically in the home department or program, in another department or program, or in the College or wider University. Departments and programs should request input from other units that have had an opportunity to observe or benefit from the contributions of their faculty. The chairs and directors of those programs and departments, in turn, should provide brief evaluations of these contributions to the faculty member's home department or program.

Criteria for evaluation

Annual evaluation should include the following criteria, applied as appropriate given expectations based on the individual's discipline(s) and department/program, job title and expectations, rank and time in rank, and other institutional roles and obligations:

- Contributions to teaching and curriculum development, including teaching effectiveness, number of students taught, curricular and pedagogical innovation, contribution to core teaching needs both inside the department and across the College and University;
- Service to the programs and administrative work of the University other than teaching and research (including service outside the department on College and University assignments);
- Professional recognition, honors, and awards;
- Advising, counseling, and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students*;
- Research and other scholarly productivity, as evidenced by both published work and significant progress toward publication*;
- Professional service and contributions beyond the University*;
- Success in generating external funding in support of research or other programs*;
- Other contributions and activities as appropriate, including those called out for specific focus by the Provost*.

These criteria are not weighted equally in the annual evaluation process; departments and programs will be asked to submit an explanation of their processes that indicates the weight assigned to each component. The asterisked criteria may or may not apply to full-time lecturers, depending on their assigned responsibilities, but should be considered when relevant.

Evaluation blurbs and ratings

Every faculty member's evaluation will include a rating and a brief statement of the rationale for the rating. The rationale and these ratings should be used to give meaningful feedback to faculty for the purposes of recognizing strength and encouraging improvement, where needed:

1. **Underperforming.** Did not fulfill the obligations of the position, inadequate or low quality teaching, scholarship, and/or professional service this year. Or did not fill out a FAR.
2. **Below average.** Performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or professional service this year was somewhat below the departmental norm.
3. **Average.** Performance in teaching, scholarship, and professional service this year was around the norm for the department.
4. **Above average.** Performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or professional service was above the departmental norm this year.
5. **Outstanding.** Extraordinary performance and/or recognition.

Typically, a departmental review committee will assign one of the above ratings to each faculty member and provide a brief rationale for that ranking to the Chair or Director. In the second step of this process, the Chair will have an opportunity to add any additional considerations related to equity, market factors, or retention for professorial faculty.

Cc: CAS Department/Program Administrators
Nancy Ammerman, Associate Dean of the Faculty for the Social Sciences
Joe Bizup, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs and Policies
Karl Kirchwey, Associate Dean of the Faculty for the Humanities
Stan Sclaroff, Associate Dean of the Faculty for the
Mathematical and Computational Sciences
Mike Sorenson, Associate Dean of the Faculty for the Natural Sciences
Juliana Walsh Kaiser, Associate Dean of Finance & Administration
Richard Wright, Assistant Dean, Faculty Actions
Laura Wipf, Director, Faculty Actions
Paula Wasson, Director, Financial Administration, Business Office