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Annual Merit Evaluation:

The annual merit evaluation of faculty is first conducted in the individual departments or programs by the chairs/directors and the appropriate departmental/program committees. Each regular (tenured/tenure-track) and full-time instructional faculty member is evaluated in each of the categories of teaching, research and service. An overall evaluation rating is also determined. The evaluation ratings are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Far Exceeds Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For tenured faculty, an overall rating of “below expectations” or “unsatisfactory” triggers a post-tenure performance review and plan according to the University of Colorado requirements (see [http://www.colorado.edu/engineering/sites/default/files/Procedures-for-PTR.pdf](http://www.colorado.edu/engineering/sites/default/files/Procedures-for-PTR.pdf)).

Of course, the good work performed by faculty members in each area (teaching, research and service) is appreciated and important. Thus, starting with 2011 performance evaluations, engineering faculty rated “below expectations” or “unsatisfactory” in any category will be asked to develop an improvement plan in that category. If the improvement plan in not successful in the next two annual reviews, then an overall rating of “below expectations” or “unsatisfactory” may result, even if the faculty member’s performance in the other areas meets or exceeds expectations, especially in light of the expectation that tenure-line faculty members should have meritorious or excellent contributions in all areas.

For the purposes of annual merit evaluation, the efforts and accomplishments of tenure-track faculty are normally assessed according to a standard formula of 40% teaching, 40% research and 20% service. An exception is that a faculty member on leave, sabbatical or faculty fellowship primarily related to research for one semester in a calendar year is normally assigned weightings of 10% teaching, 80% research and 10% service for that semester, or 25% teaching, 60% research, and 15% service for the entire year when combined with a standard semester. Changes by not more than 15% in teaching or research, or 10% in service, may be negotiated with the Department Chair. Larger changes in weightings require a written or email request, with justification and approval by the Chair and the Dean. These larger changes are generally restricted to special administrative appointments such as Department Chair, Faculty Director, or Associate Dean, or to faculty with a short-term emphasis on teaching, research or service to meet a particular need or for career development. In all cases, proportionate adjustments in performance expectations will be made when a faculty member’s weightings for evaluation are different from the standard. Similarly, increased teaching loads may be provided for faculty members who have lower research activities or evaluations.
The Chair/Director of each department/program then meets with the Dean and one or more of the Associate Deans to review the merit evaluations of the faculty. The deans have the discretion to adjust the ratings, in consultation with the Chair/Director, to ensure fairness for each individual and consistency with college-wide standards.

**Annual Merit Increases**

Each department and academic program is provided a raise pool by the Dean. The unit raise pool reflects the overall performance of the unit. The overall merit rating, which may be averaged over two or more years, is used by the department or program to determine a general-merit salary increase for each faculty member in the unit, using the constraint that the total raise pool for the unit is fixed.

**Career Merit Equity Adjustments:**

The College has an annual career-merit equity evaluation and salary adjustment process that compares the salary of each faculty member with others in the College with similar career merit and experience. The process is based on a curve fit of all salaries to career merit (the average of the five most recent annual merit ratings) and professional experience (years since PhD degree, with adjustments for non-traditional careers approved by the Dean). Once the curve fit has been done, any faculty member whose salary is below the predicted salary by more than 5% has a salary equity adjustment calculated that is up to 25% of the difference between 95% of the predicted salary and the actual salary. A discipline-specific factor may also be introduced to adjust the predicted salary for disciplines with national average salaries that differ from the average of other college disciplines. The salary equity adjustment is added to the annual merit raise.

The process is designed to bring the salary close to a 5% bound of the predicted salary over multiple years. The curve fit to the salary data for the current year is given in Figure 2. No more than 10% of the general merit raise pool is generally used to make the career merit equity adjustments.

Once the total raises have been determined, they are reviewed by the Dean to ensure overall integrity of the results. The raises are then reported to the Provost’s Office.
Salary Grievance Process:

1. A faculty member who wishes to file a salary equity grievance shall notify the supervisor (Department Chair or Program Director) in writing of his or her grievance and the basis for a claim of inequity. A valid grievance must satisfy the following criteria:

   - Grievances must be based on total salary, not annual raises.
   - The grievance must be based on a comparison between the salary of the grievant and the salaries of all other faculty members of comparable career merit and experience level in the same unit whose salaries are determined within the unit.
   - A grievant should compare his or her salary to the unit as a whole. A higher salary paid to one faculty member may not form the basis of a grievance, if the grievant is equitably paid in comparison to most other faculty members in the unit with comparable career merit and experience level. Nothing in this paragraph, however, should be interpreted as barring a grievance based on evidence of racial or gender bias within the unit.
   - A difference in salaries between two faculty members in the same unit may not, in and of itself, form the basis for a grievance, even if the two faculty members have been working in the unit for the same number of years.
   - The grievance may not be based on a comparison with faculty members in other units, unless other units are needed to provide a sufficient pool for comparison purposes and these other units are in fields similar to that of the faculty member as approved by the Dean.

2. The Department Chair (or Program Director), in consultation with the Associate Dean for Education and/or the Associate Dean for Research, will develop a response to the grievance. The response must be in writing and include an explanation of the decision on whether or not the grievance is justified and a recommendation to the Dean on a salary adjustment, if any.

3. Deadlines have been established to insure that all grievances filed be resolved expeditiously. Salary equity grievances must be filed in writing by September 15 for resolution during that academic year. The department or primary unit will complete its evaluation by November 1. If the grievant is not satisfied with the primary unit’s response, the grievant may appeal to the Dean no later than November 15. The Dean must complete his or her appeal by January 1. If the grievant is not satisfied with the Dean’s response, an appeal must be made to the Campus Salary Equity Appeals Committee no later than January 15. The Salary Equity Appeals Committee will complete its evaluation by April 1. A salary adjustment, if any, will not be retroactive but instead will be implemented in the subsequent raise cycle(s).

4. The Salary Equity Evaluation System process is applicable only to career-merit salary grievances, and grievances may not be made solely on an annual raise or merit evaluation (see the following section for appeals of annual evaluations).

5. The College shall maintain a salary equity electronic file that includes a copy of the campus policy, a copy of the College’s procedures for determining salaries, a copy of the College’s salary grievance procedure, the most recent college regression analysis of career merit and experience level, and career merit information (average of five most recent annual merit ratings, and years since PhD degree) for each faculty member. Data in the file pertaining to
faculty in the same department or primary unit are to be made available for inspection to any faculty member in the College upon request.

**Appeal of Annual Evaluation**

The College of Engineering and Applied Science has a formal process to appeal an annual evaluation of “Below Expectations” or “Unsatisfactory”, as described below. If a faculty member receives an evaluation of “Meets Expectations”, or above, and yet feels his/her rating does not reflect the contributions made during the past year, then s/he should discuss it with the Chair/Director, who, in turn, will discuss it with the Dean, if an adjustment may be warranted. Any changes in an annual rating will be made in the college records but will not lead to a change in salary during that year’s raise cycle (unless the adjustment is made prior to the finalization of the college raise data).

Evaluations of “Below Expectations” or “Unsatisfactory” (either for the overall rating or for a single category) may be appealed by sending a request and justification to the Dean and the Department Chair or Program Director. In consultation with the Chair or Director, the Dean will appoint a faculty committee to review the appeal. Appeals must be submitted in writing by the first day of the following fall semester (one week before classes start). A further appeal to the Dean may be submitted with additional justification by the faculty member or by the Department Chair or Program Director within one week of the decision of the faculty review committee. All appeals should be resolved by October 15. A successful appeal, in which the evaluation is changed to “Meets Expectations”, or higher, will not provide for a salary adjustment or remove the requirement for an improvement plan.
The base level for a faculty member’s merit review in teaching performance will be determined by the “Instructor Rating”, as reported on the faculty member’s Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs) during the evaluation period. This rating will be adjusted to account for the level, and to the extent possible, the size and difficulty of the course. In particular, the “Course Rating” will be considered as a measure of the perceived quality of the courses offered by the faculty member. To provide a common baseline between departments, course and instructor ratings near the college average for courses of roughly average size and level will correspond to a base rating in the middle of the range “Meets Expectations”.

1. The following are the major factors that must be considered for each faculty member for possible adjustments to the base rating, especially to achieve a rating in the range “Exceeds Expectations”:

   a. Feedback from students in courses taught during the evaluation period, other than that provided by numerical FCQ ratings, such as written comments on FCQs, letters from students, class interviews, or other measures. Each department should consider at least one such additional type of feedback as part of its merit review of its faculty.

   b. Significant contribution to curriculum, course or laboratory development, especially when this contribution is or will be used by other faculty or courses. Examples of such contributions include leadership in campus-wide, college-wide or department-wide curriculum or laboratory development, e.g., ITL leadership, development of new core courses for the department, or development of experiments, demonstrations, or software used widely in courses.

   c. Scholarly work in engineering education. Although the quantity and quality of a faculty member’s scholarly work in engineering education should be evaluated under the research evaluation criteria, the adoption of such work in promoting teaching excellence should be considered under the teaching evaluation criteria. For example, authoring a textbook used by others may be a significant contribution in both categories. Similarly, high quality, peer-reviewed journal and conference articles related to engineering education may impact both teaching and research evaluation categories.

   d. Mentoring students in independent study and research. Mentoring and supervising individual students in independent study and research projects provide important contributions to the broad education of students. A faculty member with a teaching rating of “Exceeds Expectations” typically provides effective guidance to several undergraduate and graduate students each year. Both the number of students and the nature of the faculty member’s involvement should be considered.

   e. The size and difficulty of the classes taught.
2. Other factors that should be considered in the teaching evaluation of faculty include the following:

   a. Longer-term feedback from students in previous courses, if such feedback is available. Examples of such feedback include alumni surveys, exit interviews with students, faculty input, and letters solicited as part of reappointment, tenure, and promotion reviews.

   b. Educational activities for students beyond normal courses that have significant teaching components. These activities might include leading a project in a student society (e.g. robo-car), organizing ongoing student educational groups, and K-12 outreach activities.

   c. Obtaining and leading educational grants.

   d. College, campus, university, and national teaching awards.

   e. Positive trends in teaching performance, particularly when this trend is the result of a concerted effort on the part of the faculty member, such as participation in one or more programs for faculty designed to promote excellence in teaching.

   f. Significant participation in engineering education at the state or national level, e.g., ASEE activities.
Research productivity will be measured in terms of publications, invited lectures, conference presentations, research awards and expenditures, and research student supervision. In addition to quantity, the quality of research is an important factor. Therefore, comments that are provided by the various departments’ evaluation committees regarding the quality of the research that is being conducted are particularly valuable, as is the receipt of awards and citations for research. Specific research performance measures include the following:

1. **Publications and Presentations** - Expected performance as measured by the number of publications may vary from one discipline or department to another. Seminal publications are more important than the publication of numerous articles of less importance. Archival and peer-reviewed journal publications are generally more important than conference publications, which may be peer-reviewed or not reviewed. However, in some fields, critically peer-reviewed proceedings papers are recognized as a main form of scholarly output. For these fields, “journal-equivalent” proceedings papers should be identified. Textbooks and books related to fundamental and applied subjects are also weighted highly by the College. As a rule of thumb, one book chapter may have similar weight as one journal paper. Monographs or proceedings carry less weight, especially if they comprise edited collections of papers authored by others. Scholarly papers related to topics in engineering education are also given weight. Additional scholarly output includes licensed software, patents, and oral or poster presentations of research results at professional conferences.

2. **Funding** - Research awards and expenditures are expected to be at a level that is sufficient to support the activities of a research group comprised of several graduate students and postdocs, including its infrastructure in terms of equipment, supplies, conference travel support, etc. Faculty who participate in research center activities or block-funded grants or contracts are expected to provide significant contributions to the activities, in terms of both collaboration on research and generation of funding, which will be given appropriate attribution when assessing annual research expenditures and output.

3. **Students** - It is expected that a successful research program will include participation of undergraduate students as well as graduate students, and in some cases, post-doctoral researchers, professional research assistants or senior research associates. While advising, mentoring, and individual training of graduate students (MS, PhD) are integral parts of the faculty’s research activities, these activities are also assessed as part of the faculty member’s teaching effort. Graduation of PhD students and their placement will be specifically noted in evaluation of the faculty member’s research record as a successful outcomes metric.

4. **Research Awards** - College, campus, university, and national awards or recognitions for research are important external measures for excellence of a research program.
Rating Metrics

A faculty member whose research performance is rated as “Exceeds Expectations” would typically have the following metrics or attributes:

- Approximately 3-6 reviewed journal or journal-equivalent publications per year.
- Approximately 3-6 conference presentations and 1-2 invited lectures per year.
- Two or more grants or contracts in force, and research expenditures typically about $250K to $400K per year.
- Graduates at least one Ph.D. student every other year, and advises typically 4-6 graduate students.
- Approximately 3-6 journal or equivalent articles under review or in press and 3-6 research proposals pending or denied.

A rating of “Meets Expectations” reflects a sustained activity in the above categories but at a lower level, while a rating of “Far Exceeds Expectations” reflects a much higher level of productivity and/or quality measures of excellence such as a major research award. Research accomplishments from summer activities, whether paid or unpaid, are included in the annual evaluations and ratings.

These metrics may vary by discipline and may reflect differences in a faculty member’s particular research program. For example, experimental research, which often takes several years to develop and generate outcomes in terms of journal papers, etc., will necessarily yield a different pattern of publication output. Similarly, faculty members who engage in high-risk research or research in rapidly developing fields may have publication records that deviate significantly from the norm.

Leave Considerations

For faculty on sabbatical or professional leave, with a focus on research, it is typical to adjust the weightings for that period to 80% research, 10% teaching and 10% service, with the small teaching and service weights reflecting student supervision and professional service, respectively. Under these conditions, a higher level of productivity is expected in the determination of the research rating, particularly in “front-end” metrics such as conference presentations, paper submissions, and proposal submissions. For a leave of absence without a focus on research (e.g., medical leave or a business venture), then the research (and other) ratings are typically “meets expectations”, unless there are residual accomplishments (such as papers appeared and awards received) that dictate otherwise.
ANNUAL MERIT REVIEW – SERVICE EVALUATION CRITERIA
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The service component is divided into two areas:

1. **Internal Service to the University of Colorado** - Faculty should be involved in various departmental, college and/or university committees or other service activities. Chairing a major committee, directing a center, and the extent and effectiveness of participation are given additional consideration. Academic advising and outreach/recruiting activities are also elements of university service.

2. **External Service** - External service brings recognition to the faculty member, his or her department, the College and the campus. The extent of service on professional committees, panels, or boards, as a journal editor, and as a reviewer, is considered. The importance of these activities and offices held, as well as information on the quality of this service, is factored into the assessment. Contributed consulting activities are regarded as service, whereas paid consulting has its own compensation and is not considered in the service evaluation. Volunteer activities in the public sector are good citizenship and are recognized in the evaluation of service.

**Rating Metrics**

For a rating of ‘meets expectations’ in service, a faculty member should provide effective service on several departmental, college or university committees or activities, including at least one substantial role, and also be an effective advisor. The faculty member should also provide effective and visible external service in one or more areas, such as chairing 1-2 sessions per year at professional conferences and serving on one or more national review or planning committees.

For a rating of “Exceeds Expectations”, the faculty member should be a highly effective leader of a major departmental, college or university activity or committee, and provide substantial external service such as organizing a major symposium, chairing a national program committee, or serving as editor of a significant journal.