

Process for Annual Evaluation and Merit Salary Review of Tenure-track and Post-tenure Faculty (TTF)

Department of Computer and Information Science

June 3, 2014

OVERALL PURPOSE and PROCESS

The CIS Department's elected Personnel Committee (PC) performs a yearly review of all faculty members based on annual activity reports and other gathered information to provide feedback and guidance in performance. Faculty cannot opt-out of this evaluation, including those on the Tenure Reduction Program. (The only exception is the CIS Department Head who is evaluated by the CAS Dean.)

The results of this evaluation are given to the CIS Department Head. The Department Head communicates the results of the evaluation to each individual faculty member and possibly to the TTF members as a whole as an anonymous report. When merit funds are available, the Department Head makes the distribution and reports to the CAS Dean the overall evaluation of each TTF faculty. Regardless of appointment or FTE, each faculty member is eligible for consideration for the highest merit rate. Faculty who meet or exceed expectations will receive some merit increase. The Department's general policy is to maintain an equitable and merit-oriented salary distribution, while responding to issues of equity, parity, compression, inversion, and retention in overall salaries. (We note that merit pay evaluation often covers more than one year. In that case, individual annual reports are used or a special period of evaluation may be created.)

CRITERIA

The expectations of performance for TTF faculty are outlined in the CIS Procedures and Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure. January 12, 2011. See CIS Faculty wiki: <https://faculty.cs.uoregon.edu/index.php?n=Main.Policy?action=download&upname=110111CISPandT.pdf>

For satisfactory performance, faculty in each rank must maintain these general criteria:

- Impact of scholarly research activity
 - Initiate and maintain a significant body of ongoing work and define a reasonable program for future research.
 - Establish and maintain a strong publication record in leading scholarly journals and conference/workshop proceedings that are peer-reviewed;
 - Demonstrate an ability to lead and obtain grant support for research;
 - Have substantial direct interaction with and supervise successful graduate students, primarily doctoral students.
- Quality of teaching
 - Teach the CIS 3.5 course load with satisfactory student and peer evaluation;
 - Contribute to the departmental curriculum as a whole;
 - Have a commitment to effective and respectful interaction with students.
- Effectiveness of institutional and academic service

- Participate in the governance of the CIS Department by serving on committees;
- For Associate and Full Professors, demonstrate occasional CIS committee leadership;
- Participate in the governance of the University by serving on committees
- Participate in visible service to the profession

During the evaluation process, these criteria will be defined in more detail as to quantity and quality expectations. For merit increase, a faculty member's performance must meet or exceed the expected satisfactory performance. For less than satisfactory, performance must be below these expectations. Consideration will be made for unusual individual situations such as reduced or increased teaching loads, course buyout or administrative work.

DISTRIBUTION OF EFFORT

For post-tenure faculty, the following weighting is applied to the evaluation: 40% for research, 40% for teaching, and 20% for service. For pre-tenure faculty, the weighting is: 50% for research, 40% for teaching, and 10% for service.

Individual variation: Consideration will be made for unusual individual situations such as reduced or increased teaching loads, course buyout or administrative work.

Career variation. Faculty legislation, adopted in 1999, revised the policy for post tenure review. The relevant legislative section is as follows:

"The nationally recognized criteria for obtaining indefinite tenure place approximately equal emphasis on demonstrated excellence in teaching and research, and considerably less emphasis on service. As tenured faculty progress through their careers, however, some may redirect their energies. Some may, for example, devote proportionately more time to teaching, advising, administration, and University service than they did as assistant professors. Consequently, expectations for, and the goals of, individual faculty members may also change. For the purpose of post-tenure review, the fundamental criterion is demonstrated excellence in meeting the expectations and goals established jointly by the faculty member and his or her department or program."

Similarly, adjustments should be made for semi-retired faculty working on the Tenure Reduction Program (TRP) at 0.33 FTE defined by the University as a 2-course/year load rather than the usual CIS load of 3.5 courses. (Note: This assumes a full-time teaching load of 6 courses.)

PROCEDURE

The departmental procedure for the annual evaluation of faculty has the following steps: collection of information, evaluation by the PC, and evaluation by the Department Head.

Collection of Information

The CIS Department believes that effective faculty evaluation depends on obtaining comprehensive information about each faculty member of their teaching, research, and service activities. Information will be collected from both the individual faculty member and from the

CIS Department support staff.

When solicited by the PC by the end of Winter quarter of each academic year, each TTF faculty member will provide the following information for annual evaluation:

- *CIS Annual Activity Report*. This report documents the achievements of the faculty member with regard to the criteria used for evaluation. This may take the form of an automated document (Excel or XML). The data collected in this document and process may be revised by the Ad Hoc Personnel Policy Committee and submitted to the CIS Faculty for approval as a Major Decision. (See CIS Constitution.)
- *Curriculum vitae (CV)*. This is an up-to-date document.
- Personal Assessment and Objectives Statement. This narrative of 2 pages or less gives the assessment of achievements in the past year and objectives for the coming year. The statement will be part of their evaluation record and is intended primarily as an opportunity for self-evaluation and envisioning future goals.

The CIS Department will provide for each faculty member:

- Summary of student evaluation scores from classroom teaching with each course showing: Instructor and Department Mean for University Questions and Instructor and Department Mean for Department Questions (CIS Office Manager)
- Copies of signed comments from student evaluation (CIS Office Manager)
- Copy of peer review of classroom teaching report (CIS Office Manager)
- Grant activity report (Grants/Contracts Technician)

It should be noted that the UO Office of Academic Affairs considers Annual Activity Reports and CVs publicly available documents. Other information gathered for these processes are considered confidential.

Evaluation Process by the PC

After the required information has been gathered, the PC will review each faculty member individually. A score will evaluate each criterion within the major categories of research, teaching and service both quantitatively and qualitatively. For example, a faculty member is expected to publish 2 peer-reviewed publications annually. The mapping from criteria to scores will be made available and approved by TTF faculty as part of the Personnel Policy process. An overall score will be assigned for that faculty member. Finally, the individual's score will be placed in one of five categories: seriously below expectations, below expectations, meets expectations (satisfactory), exceeds expectations, or highest expectations. The PC will review the final results of the evaluation process and produce a report summarizing the outcomes for each faculty member. It is the intent that the PC will not give an independent evaluation of any faculty member, but for faculty above and below satisfactory performance will write a brief commentary. The report will be provided to the CIS Department Head.

Evaluation Process by the Department Head

For merit salary increases, the Department Head uses the committee's rating since the last merit increase to construct a distribution of any available funds for salary increases, within the constraints of guidelines obtained from the College and the University with respect to the

separation of Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) and merit raises. Regardless of appointment or FTE, each faculty member is eligible for consideration for the highest merit rate. Faculty who meet or exceed expectations will receive some merit increase.

The distribution of merit raises usually follows the committee’s ranking very closely, although occasionally the Department Head may factor in additional information. The resulting distribution is usually discussed between the Department Head and the chair of the Personnel Committee before it is submitted to the College. While the CIS Department Head has authority to decide salary distribution, it is expected that the resulting distribution will reflect the annual faculty evaluation reports in an equitable manner. The CIS Department Head will discuss the resulting distribution with the Personnel Committee before it is submitted to the CAS Dean.

Finally, the Department Head makes the distribution and reports to the CAS Dean the overall evaluation of each TTF faculty, rating each in the research, teaching, and service categories as exceeds expectations (3 pts), meets expectations (2 pts), and below expectations (1 pts). That will then be combined with the percentage weight of each performance level to give a weighted average. An Associate Professor meeting expectations in all areas of performance will receive a weighted average of 2.0. (See Figure 1.) In instances of especially meritorious or unsatisfactory achievement, the Head may provide a short narrative.

	Expectations				Weight (% x pts)
	Exceeds (3 pts)	Meets (2 pts)	Below (1 pts)	N/A	
Research (40%)		2			.8
Teaching (40%)		2			.8
Service (20%)		2			.4
				Weighted Average	2.0

Figure 1: CAS TTF Merit Summary (Example for CIS Associate Professor)

The Department Head communicates the results of the evaluation to each individual faculty member and possibly to the TTF members as a whole as an anonymous report. At a minimum the amount of the raise must be communicated to the faculty member.

DOCUMENTATION

The results of each individual’s annual evaluation and/or merit review will be documented in an individual report (scoring sheet) and retained in a personnel folder for each TTF and NTTF member. These folders will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the CIS Office Manager’s office. These documents are considered confidential.

All policies and procedures relating to annual and/or merit review of TTF and NTTF staff will be maintained on the CIS Faculty wiki under “Policies”. They will be available to all TTF and NTTF members.