

Memo To: All UH-Downtown/PS Holders

UH-Downtown/PS 10.A.05

Issue No. 4

From: Max Castillo, President

Effective date: 1/1/07

Page 1 of 3

Subject: Faculty Performance Evaluations

1. PURPOSE

This PS states the policy and procedures for faculty performance evaluations, whose primary goals are to promote the highest standards of professional excellence, to provide a record of individual achievement, to promote professional development, and to increase the administrators' awareness of the professional activities of the tenured and tenure-track faculty.

2. DEFINITIONS

No applicable definitions available.

3. POLICY/PROCEDURES

3.1 Operating Details

3.1.1 The evaluation of each faculty member's performance is based upon an assessment of activities in three areas:

3.1.1.1 teaching and instruction, 50% of the total evaluation calculation, or a weight factor of 0.50, and

3.1.1.2 scholarly/creative activities, 25%, or a weight factor of 0.25, and

3.1.1.3 service/professional activities, 25%, or a weight factor of 0.25.

The department chair and all tenured and tenure-track faculty of each department shall be involved in developing the criteria used to assess performance in each of the three areas. In the annual self-evaluation, a faculty member must clearly articulate activity in each of the three areas and provide supporting evidence of that activity to the chair and faculty reviewers.

To ensure consistency, each chair submits the department's criteria and determinations concerning the three areas to be used for the following year to the faculty of the department, to the appropriate dean, and to the Vice President for Academic Affairs by December 15. For example, in December 2006, the chair submits the criteria that will be used to assess the performance of faculty in calendar year 2007, the report for which will be submitted in January 2008. If such updated criteria have not been submitted, the faculty shall use the criteria in effect the previous year.

3.1.2 The evaluation is conducted by the faculty member's department chair, who consults with faculty reviewers and informs the appropriate dean of the faculty member's preliminary numerical score in each of the three areas and the faculty member's total merit-category rating in

order to ensure ratings are justified by and consistent with the department's criteria.

3.1.3 In calculating the rating, 10 points are allotted to teaching, 10 points to scholarly/creative activities, and 10 points to service/professional activities. Whole-number numerical ratings ranging from 1 to 10 are assigned by the chair for each of the three areas of assessment. As noted in 3.1.1, detailed evidence must be submitted by the faculty member in each area of activity. Ratings for the three areas are combined using the weight factors specified in 3.1.1 above to place each faculty member in rating categories where 10 is assigned to the highest overall faculty performance category and 1-3 to the lowest overall faculty performance category. Faculty whose evaluation places them in the lowest category of teaching or whose overall evaluation places them in the overall lowest category will begin the development plan specified in the Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty, PS 10.A.16, Section 2.2.1.

3.1.4 Merit raises are composed of two equally weighted parts. One part is based on the previous-year base salary and the other part is based on a fixed dollar amount that does not depend on the previous-year base salary. The variable *x*, used in the formulas below, is the maximum proportion of a faculty member's previous-year base salary to be used in the merit raise calculation. The variable *y*, used in the formulas below, is the maximum fixed dollar amount to be used in the merit raise calculation.

The amount of money available for raises based on faculty performance each year shall be allocated using the following formulas:

The variable *x* is defined as follows:

$$x = \frac{0.5 \times (\text{total money available for merit raises})}{\sum_{i=1}^n (\text{merit factor})_i \times (\text{previous year base salary})_i}$$

where: *x* = maximum proportion of previous year's base salary to be included in the merit raise
i = subscript identifying a specific faculty member
n = total number of faculty eligible for merit raises

The variable y is defined as follows:

$$y = \frac{0.5 \times (\text{total money available for merit raises})}{\sum_{i=1}^n (\text{merit factor})_i}$$

where: y = maximum dollar factor to be included in the merit raise

i = subscript identifying a specific faculty member

n = total number of faculty eligible for merit raises.

Exhibit B contains the specific merit categories, merit factors, and merit raise formulas that should be used in allocating funds for faculty merit raises. Exhibit B also contains a sample calculation.

3.1.5 All faculty members, both probationary and tenured, write an annual report detailing activities performed in the three areas of teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service/professional activities (see Sections 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, and Exhibit A for report guidelines). The faculty member should consult the appropriate department chair for specific departmental guidelines for preparing the report.

3.1.6 Probationary faculty members should be cognizant of the tenure policy. The annual performance reports help chairs and departmental tenure committees in assessing progress toward tenure.

3.1.7 At the appropriate time (see paragraph 3.5), the chair will submit detailed written reports to faculty members explaining the overall merit-category rating assigned in all three areas. These reports should suggest activities to improve performance in specific areas if need for improvement is indicated.

3.1.8 After issuing written reports, the chair schedules meetings, which may be waived by written mutual consent, with individual faculty members to discuss the reports. Probationary faculty members and chairs may discuss progress toward tenure at these conferences.

3.1.9 Any faculty member who is dissatisfied with the rating assigned by the chair may request a performance review by a committee of at least three tenured faculty members in the department. If a department has an insufficient number of tenured faculty members, then those eligible to serve on this committee must have a minimum of three years of tenure-track service at UH–Downtown. The review committee is elected by each department's tenured and tenure-track faculty excluding those with administrative ranks of chair or higher, with the election held prior to December 15 in the semester before the evaluation process

begins. This committee reviews the faculty member's performance and evaluation and makes its recommendation to the dean separate from the chair's. A faculty member dissatisfied with the dean's resolution of the issue may undertake formal grievance procedures.

3.2 Evaluation of Teaching/Instructional Performance

All faculty members write a report detailing all teaching and instructional activities for the evaluation period. These activities must be documented upon request. The report itself should consist of a brief list of activities. See Exhibit A to this PS for a list of teaching/instructional activities that may be included. In assessing teaching/instructional performance, the chair reviews evidence concerning the faculty member's performance in terms of the evaluation criteria developed by the department.

3.3 Evaluation of Scholarly/Creative Activities

Faculty members' contributions to the development of knowledge and/or to the reputation of the university are important. All faculty members write a report detailing scholarly/creative activities that were undertaken during the evaluation period. These activities must be documented. The report itself consists of a list of activities. See Exhibit A to this PS for a list of activities that might be included. In assessing scholarly and creative activities, the chair reviews evidence concerning the faculty member's performance in terms of the evaluation criteria developed by the department.

3.4 Evaluation of Service

Because the mission of UH-Downtown is service as well as teaching, all faculty members write a report detailing activities serving the university, the profession, and/or the community undertaken during the evaluation period. These activities must be documented. The report itself consists of a list of activities. See Exhibit A to this PS for a list of activities that might be included. In assessing service contributions, the chair reviews evidence concerning the faculty member's performance in terms of the evaluation criteria developed by the department.

3.5 Timetable*

December 15 Elections of departmental review committees have been completed. Departments submit evaluation criteria for the following calendar year to faculty of the department, the appropriate dean, and the VPAA/Provost.

January 15	Faculty members submit reports listing activities for the previous calendar year.
February 20	Chairs submit preliminary ratings to their dean.
February 25	Chairs submit written formal ratings and written reports for each of the three evaluation areas to their dean and to the individual faculty member (see paragraph 3.1.5).
March 10	Chairs have completed conferences with the faculty members in their department.
March 15	Faculty members wishing a review of their rating(s) have notified their chair, their department review committee, and their dean.
April 10	Department review committees have reported their recommendations to their department chair, to their dean, and to each individual faculty member requesting a review.

* Note: If a date falls on a weekend or holiday, the deadline is deferred until the next business day.

4. REVIEW AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Responsible Party: (Reviewer): Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost

Review: Biannually

Signed original on file in Employment Services and Operations.

Exhibits:

Exhibit A: Faculty Evaluation Reports

Exhibit B: Merit Categories, Corresponding Merit Factors and Merit Raise Formulas, and Example Case

Policy History

Issue #3: 12/15/87

FACULTY EVALUATION REPORTS

Each faculty member should consult the appropriate department chair for specific departmental guidelines for preparing the report and the required documentation. The following list includes examples of items that might be reported in the evaluation.

- I. The report of teaching/instructional activities might include items such as the following:
 - A. Statement of student evaluations
 - B. Statement of peer evaluations
 - C. Development of new courses or programs
 - D. Revision or refinement of existing courses or programs
 - E. Development of improved teaching materials
 - F. Additional formal training in one's teaching field or in a related area (both credit and non-credit courses)
 - G. Samples of graded student work.
 - H. Preparation of proposals for external funding for instructional materials or activities.
 - I. Other teaching/instructional activities

- II. The report on scholarly/creative activities might include items such as the following
 - A. Scholarly publications
 - B. Research and writing activities
 - C. Presentation of papers at professional meetings
 - D. Juried shows
 - E. Performances
 - F. Book reviews
 - G. Textbooks
 - H. Preparation of proposals for external funding for scholarly or creative activities.

- III. The report on service activities might include items such as the following:
 - A. Services to the institution
 1. Activities involved in student advising and counseling
 2. Sponsorship of or participation in student activities or organizations
 3. Activities involved in student recruitment or retention
 4. Services to the division and/or department
 - a. Committee activities not previously addressed
 - b. Other
 5. University-wide services
 - a. Committee activities not previously addressed
 - b. Official institutional representation
 - c. Other
 6. Preparation of proposals for external funding for university-related activities and initiatives.
 7. Other services to the institution
 - B. Services to the profession and the community
 1. Membership in professional organizations
 2. Panel appearances, program participation, and/or other activities in professional organizations
 3. Committee assignments and offices held in professional organizations
 4. Attendance at professional meetings
 5. Professional consultation in one's role as a professional educator or in one's role as a specialist in a particular discipline
 6. Presentations to community groups in one's role as a professional educator or in one's role as a specialist in a particular discipline
 7. Service on civic committees, boards, etc., in one's role as a professional educator or in one's role as a specialist in a particular discipline
 8. Other services to the profession or to the community

Merit Categories, Corresponding Merit Factors and Merit Raise Formulas, and Example Case

Merit Category	Merit Factor	Merit-Raise Formula
10.00	1.000	$1.000[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
9.75	0.9625	$0.9625[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
9.50	0.9250	$0.9250[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
9.25	0.8875	$0.8875[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
9.00	0.8500	$0.8500[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
8.75	0.8125	$0.8125[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
8.50	0.7750	$0.7750[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
8.25	0.7375	$0.7375[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
8.00	0.7000	$0.7000[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
7.75	0.6625	$0.6625[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
7.50	0.6250	$0.6250[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
7.25	0.5875	$0.5875[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
7.00	0.5500	$0.5500[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
6.75	0.5125	$0.5125[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
6.50	0.4750	$0.4750[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
6.25	0.4375	$0.4375[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
6.00	0.4000	$0.4000[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
5.75	0.3625	$0.3625[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
5.50	0.3250	$0.3250[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
5.25	0.2875	$0.2875[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
5.00	0.2500	$0.2500[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
4.75	0.2125	$0.2125[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
4.50	0.1750	$0.1750[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
4.25	0.1375	$0.1375[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
4.00	0.1000	$0.1000[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
3.75	0.0750	$0.0750[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
3.50	0.0500	$0.0500[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
3.25	0.0250	$0.0250[(x)(\text{previous year base salary}) + y]$
3 and below	0.0000	No merit raise; state-mandated raise only

Example Merit Category, Merit Factor and Merit-Raise Formula Calculations

Assume a rating of 9 for teaching and instruction, 2 for scholarly/creative activities and 8 for service/professional activities, and an academic year salary of \$54,000.

$$9 \times 0.50 = 4.5$$

$$2 \times 0.25 = 0.5$$

$$8 \times 0.25 = 2.0$$

Merit Category = 7.0 This value would then be used in the Merit-Raise equation as follows:

$$\text{Merit-Raise} = 0.55[(x)(\$54,000) + y]$$

The values for x and y will depend upon the total amount of money available for merit raises in a particular year, the number of faculty receiving merit ratings, the merit factors for each faculty member, and the current academic year salary for each faculty member. Half of the merit raise will be based on a percentage raise controlled by the value of x and the other half will be a fixed dollar raise controlled by the value of y , in conjunction with the faculty member's merit factor and current academic year salary.

Assume that \$400,000 will be used for faculty merit raises next year. According to this procedure, \$200,000 would then be utilized for percentage raises and \$200,000 for fixed dollar amount raises. The actual amount of the raise would be determined using the faculty member's merit factor, their academic-year salary, and the calculated values for x and y .

$$x = \frac{(0.5)(\$400,000)}{\sum_{i=1}^n (\text{merit factor})_i (\text{current academic year salary})}$$

$$y = \frac{(0.5)(\$400,000)}{\sum_{i=1}^n (\text{merit factor})_i}$$

In the above formulas n represents the number of faculty included in the merit raise calculations (for these calculations assume $n=200$). The \sum (summation) in the expression for x is the sum of each faculty member's merit factor multiplied by their current academic year salary. If the merit factor is 0.55 based on a merit category of 7.0 and the 9-month salary is \$54,000, then the portion of this faculty member's product included in the \sum expression is $(0.55)(\$54,000) = \$29,700$.

Assume now that the sum of the products for each of the 200 faculty included in the evaluation is \$6,270,000*, then

$$x = \frac{\$200,000}{\$6,270,000} = 0.0319$$

and for this example assume the \sum of the merit factors in the expression for y for the 200 faculty in the evaluation is 110, then

$$y = \frac{\$200,000}{110} = \$1,818.18$$

Using these values for x and y the total merit raise for this faculty member would be:

$$\text{merit raise} = \text{merit factor} [(x)(\$54,000) + y]$$

$$\text{merit raise} = 0.55 [(0.0319)(\$54,000) + \$1,818.18]$$

$$\text{merit raise} = 0.55 [\$1,722.60 + \$1,818.18] = 0.55[\$3,540.78]$$

merit raise = \$1,947.43

Thus, this faculty member's academic-year salary for the next year should be $\$54,000 + \$1,947.43 = \underline{\$55,947.43}$ assuming no additional pay for promotion or other special pay adjustment.

*Note: The sum of \$6,270,000 is equivalent to having 200 faculty included in the Σ , all with merit ratings of 7.0 (which corresponds to a merit factor of 0.55) and average academic-year salaries of \$57,000. The sum of the 200 merit factors for this example is $200 \times 0.55 = 110$.