

## Evaluation Approach for Faculty

Name	Instruction <sup>a</sup>	Instr Effort	Manuscripts/Grants <sup>b</sup>	Research Effort	Service <sup>c</sup>	Service faculty Effort	Total Score <sup>d</sup>	Raise Amount	Justification
A	3.5	80%	2	14%	3	6%	3.27	\$1,672	14 contact hours delivered and instruction was scored above "average" by students; peer evaluation of teaching was not conducted. Given the assigned effort to research, output in published papers (#3) and extramural funding (\$4,750) was satisfactory. Service was very good.
B	4.5	76%	4	15%	3	9%	4.29	\$2,269	15 contact hours delivered and instruction was scored very good to excellent by students; peer review conducted with very favorable rating. Given the assigned effort to research, output in published papers (#16) and extramural funding (\$44,000) was very good. Service was good.
C	3.8	68%	5	12%	5	20%	4.19	\$2,359	18 contact hours delivered and instruction was scored above "average" by students; peer evaluation of teaching was not conducted. Given the assigned effort to research, output in extramural funding was excellent (\$87,750). Service was excellent as graduate coordinator and in other committee assignments.

<sup>a</sup> Scored from low (1) to high (5) based on the average of student evaluations and adjusted based on peer review of teaching.

<sup>b</sup> Scored from low (1) to high (5) based on the number of papers published in refereed journals and in other publications, number of grants written and funded. A score of 3 is considered average. Generally, a score of 3 is assigned to a person who met expectations agreed upon by the faculty member and chair at the beginning of the year. For example, someone who met all objectives for research, a score of 3 is assigned. A person who exceeded expectations would receive a 4 or 5.

<sup>c</sup> Scored from low (1) to high (5) based on quality of service commitments (service consistent with meeting departmental/college priority). A score of 3 is considered average. Generally, a score of 3 is assigned to a person who met expectations agreed upon by the faculty member and chair at the beginning of the year. For example, someone who met all objectives for service, a score of 3 is assigned. A person who exceeded expectations would receive a 4 or 5.

<sup>d</sup> Score is composite of instruction, research and service based on quality of component weighted by faculty effort attached to the component.

Total Score = (Instruc Score) X (Instruc Effort) + (Research Score) X (Research Effort) + (Service Score) X (Service Effort)

**Example:**

Total Score = (3.5) (0.8) + (2) (0.14) + (3.26) (0.06) = 3.27  
Professor A

The Chair of each Department meets with the Dean to review the recommendations for merit raises for the faculty in the Department where a final recommendation is agreed upon. The numerical data are used as well as input from committee chairs as to the contributions of the faculty person on that committee as well as other citizenship-associated activities within the total life of the College.