

## Annual Merit Assessment Proposal by SEFS PMT Committee 4/15/14

To assess whether each member of the SEFS faculty is considered “meritorious” by the annual PMT-committee’s evaluation, we propose an alternative to the current merit evaluation process that simplifies the process of submitting and confirming collected materials by each faculty member, and increases the role of the PMT committee in providing collegial review of faculty accomplishments. The proposed changes anticipate revisions to the merit process currently being considered by the UW Faculty Senate, facilitate the School’s annual updating of faculty accomplishments, and allow junior faculty to annually assemble materials that will be needed for promotion reviews.

The PMT committee will annually evaluate three items that combine institutionally collected data with those assembled by the each faculty member.

1. **A Personal Statement.** The annual merit evaluation builds off of thoughtful and early discussion between the faculty member and the Director concerning work planning. The personal statement reflects what the faculty member has accomplished and perhaps why these accomplishments may not be in synch with the PMT thresholds discussed below. Through work planning, the faculty member and Director agree upon how research, teaching, and service activities will be balanced, and delineate any expected tradeoffs in more finely articulated scholarly activities, for example class load versus graduate mentoring, grantsmanship versus publication, or contribution to a government report versus publication in journals. These agreements are critical to the consideration given to each faculty member by the PMT committee and must be stated in the annual personal statement. This 1-page statement should include 1) the faculty member’s annual goals consistent with their work plan, 2) accomplishments of goals, 3) an explicit synopsis of their service activities, 4) mitigating circumstances they wish the committee to consider in trading off attainment of PMT thresholds, and 5) accomplishments of which they are especially proud and that they wish the committee to consider in their ranking of highly meritorious faculty.
2. **A 3-Year CV.** Consistent with past SEFS merit evaluations, the PMT committee considers a 3-year period as the ‘cumulative’ record. The CV for this time period can be in a format useful to the faculty member, but must include a list of publications. A list of service activities could be provided here in lieu of such in the personal statement.
3. **Institutional Data.** The Director will provide to each faculty member a copy of their work plan and the institutional record of their research and teaching activities. These documents will include a list and dollar amounts of grants submitted and grants received; a list of classes taught including their relationship to degree requirements, student credit hours generated, and student evaluation scores; a list of graduate student committee memberships; graduate students that have graduated during the current 3-year evaluation period; and a list of students enrolled in undergraduate

research or capstone experiences. All institutional materials will be provided to faculty for review and suggested adjustment prior to reporting to the PMT committee.

### **The Review Process**

Each member of the PMT committee will evaluate each faculty member independently. The PMT committee will summarize the evaluations and submit a summary of their findings in writing to the director, with a copy to the faculty member. We describe below a two-step evaluation process by which the PMT committee proposes to first classify faculty members as either meritorious or non-meritorious, and second identify and rank highly meritorious faculty. Evaluation by the PMT committee is advisory to the Director.

We propose using a threshold in the evaluation of merit versus no merit that is (1) simple and measured from most standard faculty CVs, (2) tailored to each faculty member's work planning, (3) encourages careful and flexible review by the PMT committee to consider the diversity of accomplishments by our faculty across areas and disciplines, (4) provides constructive feedback to faculty, (5) encourages meaningful work planning between the Director and the faculty, (6) rewards expected performance in teaching, research and service, (7) builds trust among faculty, and (8) reflects SEFS's vision to *provide world-class, internationally recognized knowledge and leadership for environmental and natural resource issues*.

The PMT committee will make its annual recommendation to the Director concerning faculty merit in the following way:

1. Each member of the committee will review the annual work plan, institutional data, a 3-year CV, and the personal statement for each faculty member. To be fully considered, the CV and personal statement should address the dimensions used to evaluate Research Performance, Teaching Performance, and Service (see below for distinct dimensions within these categories that have quantitative expectations). In particular, the CV must contain a list of publications, as these will not be provided by the institutional data, and the Statement and/or CV must contain an accounting of service to the School, College, University, and greater community. It is recognized that faculty appointments differ in duration (9 month vs. 11 month, etc.) and type (state-funded versus research, for example), but because the proposed system explicitly incorporates the annual work plan into the faculty expectations, all faculty will be held to the same standards and evaluated equally. The minimum standards required to attain merit were designed to be attainable by the standard 9-month appointment that define the majority of faculty.
2. Each member of the committee will compare the work plan, institutional record, CV, and personal statement to a merit threshold that reflects a SEFS faculty member's minimum performance as weighted by their Director-approved effort allocation. Each annual evaluation will consider average

productivity in research, teaching and service accumulated over the prior 3-year period. Crossing the threshold in research, teaching, and service (unless modified by the annual work plan allocation) is required to obtain a meritorious review. Evaluation of merit / no merit will require a unanimous decision by the committee. (In the rare event that a unanimous decision cannot be reached, the split decision will be recorded and results passed on to the Director without a recommendation for a final decision.) The merit threshold is defined as follows:

a. Research Performance (the peer-reviewed product threshold value reflects an annual work plan that stipulates 40% research; targets for lower or higher annual stipulations would be proportional to this, e.g., a 20% research work effort would be evaluated at threshold level half of that stated below and an 80% research work effort would be evaluated at levels twice that stated; evidence of application for or receipt of some research support as stipulated in items ii and iii should be realized by all faculty with any amount of research specified in their annual work plan). Standards in the first dimension and either the second or third dimension below must be reached to earn merit, however the committee will read each faculty member's work plan and personal statement to understand mitigating circumstances and alternative measures to those stated below. These may include, for example, emphasis on publication over grantsmanship in certain years. For a work plan expressing 40% effort on research:

i. An average of 2 peer-reviewed products per year (the gold standard product is a paper published in journals recognized by SCOPUS or WEB OF SCIENCE or patent issued by the US Patent Office). However, in lieu of this standard, faculty may suggest other comparable accomplishments consistent with their work plan such as writing of a scientific book, commissioned report, an exhibit for legal proceedings, etc.).

Plus

ii. Evidence of application for research support as PI or Co-PI.

OR

iii. Evidence of success in obtaining support for research group as PI, CO-PI, or Senior Personnel.

b. Teaching Performance (the threshold values reflect an annual work plan that stipulates 40% teaching; targets for lower or higher annual stipulations would be proportional to this). Standards in each of the first two dimensions and either the third or fourth below must be reached to earn merit, however the committee will read each faculty member's work plan and personal statement to understand mitigating circumstances and alternative measures to those stated below. These may include, for example, emphasis on teaching more courses or on generating student credit hours rather than graduate mentoring or undergraduate mentoring, in certain years.

- i. Fulfillment of teaching 1 course per quarter, with participation in core and required classes as stipulated by the Director.

AND

- ii. Success in teaching above courses as evidenced by adequate student evaluation scores (>3.0 on adjusted median scores for evaluation items 1 through 4; or sustained improvement in scores), expected enrollment (note: exceptional generation of SCHs may be grounds for high merit), and innovation.

Plus

- iii. Evidence of effective graduate student mentoring (supervision of at least 1 student per year and graduation of at least one student during the 3-year review period) as indicated by a list of student committees served on, students chaired, students graduated, and students funded by the faculty member.

OR

- iv. Evidence of adequate and effective undergraduate student mentoring, including support of formal capstone series (e.g., restoration ecology capstone), completion of student projects and capstones (e.g., currently faculty teaching in ESRM should mentor at least 1 capstone student per year).

c. Service and Outreach Performance

- i. Evidence of service to School, College, University, and wider professional and lay community as required by contract. In review of meeting this threshold the Director will discuss faculty participation on committee with relevant committee chair.

Note: Faculty with substantial administrative service work components should only provide the PMT committee with evidence of their non-administrative service here. The committee will evaluate administrative faculty based upon research, teaching, and non-administrative service as stipulated by the faculty member's annual work plan (e.g., if the faculty is on a 60% administrative appointment, we evaluate them based on attaining 40% of the standard thresholds in teaching, research, and non-administrative service). Evaluating the quality of administrative service is beyond the purview of the PMT committee and is done by the particular faculty member's supervisor.

3. Those faculty members whose efforts exceed the minimum threshold in each category will receive a recommendation of 'meritorious' that is forwarded to the Director.
4. Those faculty members who fail to exceed the minimum threshold (as adjusted by work plan weights) for a first time and who have offered no compelling extenuating circumstances (those concurred by the Director) will receive a recommendation of no merit by the committee, which will be

- forwarded to the Director. Consistent with UW faculty code, at the option of the faculty member affected, the Director shall, after consultation with the faculty member, appoint an ad hoc committee of School faculty of superior (or, in the case of full professors, equal) rank or title to the faculty member. This ad hoc committee shall meet at its earliest convenience with the faculty member and review more fully the record and merit of that faculty member. The ad hoc committee shall, upon completion of its review, report in writing the results to the faculty member and Director and the committee shall advise them what actions, if any, should be undertaken to enhance the contributions and improve the merit ranking of this colleague, or to rectify existing misjudgments of his or her merit and make adjustments to correct any salary inequity. The faculty member may respond in writing to this report and advice within 21 calendar days to the Director and committee (unless upon the faculty member's request and for good cause the response period is extended by the Director). The ad hoc committee's report and advice, the faculty member's written response (if any), the response by the Director, and any agreement reached by the faculty member and the chair shall be incorporated into a written report.
5. For any faculty who receive two consecutive non-meritorious rankings, consistent with the UW faculty code, the Director shall, after consultation with the affected faculty member appoint a committee and charge it as above to review, report, and respond (as stipulated above) to the record of merit.
  6. The PMT committee will designate the top faculty performances as highly meritorious and pass this list to the Director. Within each faculty member's annual materials, but especially as called out in the annual faculty statement, the committee will look for performance well beyond what was expected during work planning. The case for high merit will be built around the evidence that the faculty member has made positive scholarly impacts in the School, at the UW, in the region, in the nation, and for the planet.
  7. Materials will be reviewed independently for high merit by all members of the PMT committee and ranked. Each member of the committee will provide their top five candidates in rank order for group discussion. Initially all candidates recommended by all committee members will be arranged according to their average ranking (rank 1 through 5 from each committee member; 6 if the candidate is not listed by a particular member). The committee will discuss these ranks and create a unanimously agreed upon list of highly meritorious faculty in rank order for the Director's consideration.
  8. The PMT committee will not consider its own members for allocation of high merit. However, those on the committee wishing to be so considered will submit their statement directly to the Director for assessment in relation to the ranked list provided by the committee.

