

Plan of Governance
Appendix A

Department of Environmental Science and Technology
University of Maryland College Park
Policy on Faculty Evaluation and Merit Pay Distribution
Updated July 9, 2007
Updated October 15, 2010
Updated March 17, 2011
Updated April 24, 2014
Updated January 30, 2019
Updated February 10, 2021

Faculty Review and Salary (FRS) Committee

The Faculty Review and Salary (FRS) Committee of the Department of Environmental Science and Technology (ENST) will provide an annual review of tenured, tenure-track and professional-track faculty by departmental colleagues and will make recommendations regarding merit pay distribution to the Department Chair. The FRS Committee will assess individual faculty contributions to the research, teaching, Extension education, and service missions of the Department. Evaluation of individual faculty members shall be performed by one of two Evaluative Subcommittees composed of their peers based on their appointment as either tenured, tenure-track faculty or professional track faculty.

A. Selection and Composition of the FRS Committee

The FRS Subcommittees will be composed of 8 faculty, with 4 tenured, tenure-track faculty in one Evaluative Subcommittee and 4 professional-track faculty in another Evaluative Subcommittee. The tenured, tenure-track FRS Subcommittee will be elected from the ENST tenured, tenure-track faculty with at least one tenured, tenure track nominee representing each of the three major program areas: teaching, research, and extension. The professional track faculty FRS Subcommittee will be elected from the ENST professional-track faculty, with at least one professional-track faculty representing each of the three-tiered PTK faculty rank series. The Department Chair shall ensure that, to the best of their ability, the final committees are commensurately representative membership from the different ranks, professional endeavors, and various scholarly interests of the ENST faculty. Gender, ethnic and racial representation also should be considerations. All terms of service on the FRS Committee are governed by the term limit and non-participation requirements set forth later in this section. The Department Chair will review the makeup of the FRS Committee over the previous five years to assure that a reasonable representation of faculty diversity has been achieved. The FRS Committee members will be elected by tenured, tenure-track and professional-track faculty, respectively, casting secret ballots for one person in each of the open categories each year. Elected committee members will serve a two-year term. The Department Chair shall select two Co-Chairs, one tenured, tenure-track faculty member and one professional track faculty member from the committee members serving their second year on the FRS Committee to chair the two respective Evaluative Subcommittees. The chair of the ENST Mentoring and Diversity Committee and the chair of the ENST APT Committee cannot simultaneously serve as a member of the FRS Committee, because these individuals will be designated as members of the FRS Appeals Committee, should the FRS Appeals Committee be convened. Faculty members who have University or College service requirements that require significant time and effort, (ex. College or University APT Committee, Administrative Appointment, etc.) may request a waiver from being a member of the FRS Committee. FRS Committee

members who have completed their terms of service are not eligible to be elected to a new term on the FRS Committee until he or she has had at least two consecutive years of absence from the committee.

B. Materials to be Evaluated by the FRS Committee.

Each year, on the date set by the Department Chair, every faculty member will submit to the Department Chair, for use by the FRS Committee, an abbreviated current CV covering the time period of the previous three calendar years and a position description including percentages written and updated by faculty member as needed). The evaluation made by the FRS Committee will reflect performance of the faculty over this three-year period. A current position description for each faculty member will be used to guide the evaluation process.

C. Evaluation Criteria and Principles to be Used by the FRS Committee

Expectations and assessment of teaching productivity generally will be based upon that portion of the faculty member's time spent in teaching activity (including courses taught and advising). Emphasis should be placed upon both the effort and quality of teaching. Consideration should be given to innovation, course development, development of teaching materials (including the writing of text books and lab manuals, online resources etc.), peer evaluations, and student evaluations/feedback.

Expectations and assessment of research productivity will be based upon that portion of the faculty member's time spent in research activity (not assigned to teaching or extension responsibilities). Note below under "principles" that, consistent with campus-wide standards, faculty with a full teaching load are still expected to spend approximately half of their time on research. Productivity in research will be based on success in publication and in acquiring funding. Consideration will be given to the number of publications (or those accepted for publication) and especially the quality or reputation of the venues where they are published. Assistant Professors may include manuscripts submitted for publication and currently in the review or revision process as elements of the 3-year CV submitted for annual FRS Committee review for the first two annual reviews following his/her initial appointment as Assistant Professor. With respect to extramural funding, the degree of competitiveness, the reputation of the granting agency, and the level of contribution to the proposal effort by each investigator, should all receive consideration, in addition to the size of award itself. Assistant Professors may include proposals for external funding that have been submitted and are currently under review by external funding agencies as elements of the 3-year CV submitted for annual FRS Committee review for the first two annual reviews following his/her initial appointment as Assistant Professor. For all faculty, special recognitions associated with research activity, such as awards, prizes, fellowships and patents, should also be considered.

Expectations and assessment of Extension productivity will be based upon that portion of the faculty member's time spent in Extension activity. Productivity in Extension will be based on the quality, effectiveness, and impact of the Extension program. Consideration will be given to the number and quality of: active Extension programs; workshops or training programs conducted; manuscripts published or accepted for publication in scholarly Extension education journals, trade journals, electronic/web-based publications. etc.; invited presentations; preparation of educational materials for wide distribution or public domain; Extension focused books or chapters published or accepted for publication; etc. Audiences and venues are expected to vary according to program objectives. The impact of extension programs on the target community and/or citizenry should be clearly documented and weighed heavily in the assessment of productivity. It is expected that Extension programs be supported by external funding, wherein the degree of competitiveness and the level of contribution to the proposal effort by each investigator should receive consideration, in addition to the size of award itself.

Contributions to service may occur within the university or may be local, state, national or international in scope. Service contributions that should be considered include committee memberships and positions of leadership, offices held in professional organizations, advising of student organizations or assistance provided to public service organizations and area schools. Service includes activities related to environmental justice and/or service to diverse communities. The level of responsibility and time commitment made in various service endeavors should be considered.

Due to the unique nature of specific duties included in the job descriptions of Professional Track Faculty members, defining excellence in performance of these specific duties will be developed by the Professional Track Faculty. Individual faculty are evaluated on a weighted evaluation scale based on specific duties and the percent of their appointments for each of these duties.

The following principles reflect the philosophy of University of Maryland and ENST and should be considered by the FRS Committee during the faculty evaluation process.

- 1) UMD tenured, tenure-track faculty are expected to contribute in the following areas: teaching; Extension education and outreach; research; and service, with 10% of the faculty evaluation score devoted to service and the remainder based on the proportion of their faculty appointment.
- 2) UMD tenured, tenure-track faculty teaching "100%" (5.5 "course units" or 16.5 credits per year) are still expected to spend approximately half of their time on research activities.
- 3) Expectations of tenured, tenure-track and professional track faculty should generally be related to the proportion of the faculty member's appointment funded from Instruction/Teaching, Research/MAES, and/or Extension/MCE budget resources. However, the FRS Committee will take into consideration current job descriptions as relevant data to measure how faculty members are meeting departmental expectations.
- 4) For evaluation purposes, the percent teaching load of faculty should be based upon full-term courses taught. Courses that are offered, but not taught, do not contribute to the teaching load. Team-taught and modular courses will be pro-rated according to each instructor's contribution.
- 5) Although the writing and submission of grant proposals may represent a major effort, the assessment of productivity evidenced by grants should focus solely on those actually awarded.
- 6) Although the writing and submission of manuscripts may represent a major effort, the assessment of productivity evidenced by publications should focus solely on those published or accepted for publication.
- 7) Publications lead-authored by supervised graduate and undergraduate students and post-docs should be taken to represent primary contributions of the faculty advisor and should be noted as such on the CV.
- 8) International teaching, research, Extension or service activities are highly valued by the College and the University and should be highlighted as such under the appropriate teaching, research, Extension or service portion of the faculty member's CV.

D. Operations of the FRS Committee

Prior to Spring Break, the Department Chair will convene an orientation meeting during which the criteria for evaluation will be reviewed and how the 3-year CVs of all faculty and other supporting documentation will be distributed to all FRS committee members. Additional materials including teaching evaluations, Individual Extension Plans, and information from Digital Measures be requested by the FRS Committee. These documents should be kept strictly confidential, shall not be duplicated, and shall not be shared beyond the FRS committee. At the orientation meeting, the date of the FRS Committee evaluation meeting shall be established, ensuring that all members of the FRS committee can be present. The FRS Committee evaluation process shall be completed before April 15th of each year.

All members of the FRS Committee are responsible for reviewing the documentation of all members of the ENST faculty. Each of the two Evaluative Subcommittees shall work independently for the evaluative process, following the same rules. At the orientation meeting, FRS Committee members will be assigned as primary or secondary reviewers for an appropriate portion of the ENST faculty members. Based upon the documentation provided, it will be the responsibility of primary and secondary reviewers to prepare a short summary of the accomplishments, strengths, and weaknesses of each of the assigned faculty members during the last three years; this summary will be presented verbally to the Evaluative Subcommittee during the evaluation meeting.

At the evaluation meeting, with all Evaluative Subcommittee members present, faculty members will be evaluated one at a time. The subcommittee members assigned to do so will present a short verbal summary of the accomplishments, strengths, and weaknesses of that faculty member over the last three years, which will be followed by an open discussion by all members of the subcommittee. The summary presented and ensuing discussion will be reflected in notes recorded by an administrative representative of the Department Chair.

When the discussion of each individual faculty member is concluded, all members of the subcommittee will evaluate that faculty member by casting a secret ballot using a scale of whole numbers from 1 (weakest) to 10 (strongest) which will be tallied and recorded. Ballots will be collected and tallied in such a manner as to maintain secrecy. When members of the subcommittee are being evaluated, the individual under consideration shall excuse themselves from the room and the same procedures followed. At no time shall any member of the FRS committee know his/her score or ranking. As stated above, during the discussion, the Department Chair's administrative representative should record a brief summary of the discussion, identifying the major strengths, weakness, and contributions of the faculty member, including the individual scores as well as the average score from the committee. A report will be prepared from the notes taken that will aid the Department Chair in making merit pay distributions, as well as providing input for annual review with each faculty member. The preliminary notes will be destroyed and the summary report will be kept in the in the Department Chair's office until the appeal period has passed, after which the report should be destroyed. All 3-year CVs and other support documentation should be collected and returned to the Department Chair's office for storage and/or disposal.

E. Reporting Evaluation Outcomes by the FRS Committee

After the evaluation and voting of the subcommittee has been completed and each faculty member is assigned an averaged numerical score, the subcommittee will sort the average numerical scores (that are not associated with faculty names) into four categories: non-meritorious; meritorious; highly meritorious; exceptionally meritorious. It is understood that the distribution of numerical scores is not intended to ensure population in each category. If any faculty member does not submit 3-year CV by the designated date, the subcommittee will not conduct a review of such individuals and the delinquent faculty will be included in a fifth category entitled, "review materials not submitted." Faculty included in the "review materials not submitted" category will not be eligible to receive a merit- based salary adjustment for the next fiscal year. The subcommittee will provide the results of these deliberations to the Department Chair in the form of an alphabetical list of faculty names within each evaluation category. Faculty shall not be listed by evaluation score-order within each category. The subcommittee will also provide recommendations regarding the proportional distribution of available merit salary increase among the evaluation categories (example: 0x, 1x, 2x, 3x). The Chair will then use this information, along with the narrative report of the committee's discussions, in assigning merit pay allocations as described below. The Chair will certify and obtain certification from the subcommittee that they have followed the Department's plan, or indicate areas where they have deviated from the plan with a rationale.

F. Distribution of Merit-Based Salary Allocations

For each individual, evaluations determined by the respective Evaluative Subcommittee since the last merit-based salary allocation will be averaged, and the mean evaluation scores will be used by the Department Chair to allocate 55 percent of the merit-based funds provided to the Department through the Dean. These allocations will be made in dollar increments rather than percentages of current salary. The remaining 45 percent of the available merit funds will be allocated at the discretion of the Department Chair. Following allocation of the merit pay funds, the Department Chair will meet with and report to the FRS Committee his or her final salary recommendations to be submitted to the Dean. The Chair will evaluate the salary structure of the Department and consult with appropriate administrators (Dean and Provost) to address any salary compression or salary inequities that have developed in the unit.

After all department salary adjustments have been approved by the College fiscal office, faculty will receive a letter from the Department Chair indicating their new salaries and showing the adjustments in salaries due to across-the-board cost of living adjustments and to merit-based increases. The Chair will send a letter to each faculty member containing a) his/her merit pay, b) the Evaluative Subcommittee evaluation of the faculty member, c) the evaluation results of the Chair's evaluation and/or the Dean's evaluation for any administrative appointment, d) notification of the right to request a meeting with the Chair, and e) notification that the decision may be appealed. In addition, the Department Chair will discuss results of the faculty review with each individual as part of an annual performance review. Faculty performance review will be completed prior to the end of the spring semester.

F. Appeals

Within 10 days of the notification of their merit pay allocation, any faculty may request an appeal for review of their merit allocation by submitting a letter to the ENST Department Chair. The appeal will be heard by the FRS Appeals Committee that will comprise the ENST Department Chair, the Chair of the ENST Mentoring and Diversity Committee, and the Chair of the ENST APT Committee. A decision will be rendered by a majority of the members of the FRS Appeals Committee and the decision of the FRS Appeals Committee is final.

G. Approvals

Approved by majority vote of faculty in attendance at ENST faculty meeting held February 23, 2007. Updated text approved by majority vote of faculty in attendance at ENST faculty meeting held October 15, 2010. Updated text approved by 2/3 majority vote of faculty at the ENST faculty meeting held March 17, 2011, as per Section 5.B. of the ENST Plan of Governance. Updated text approved by unanimous vote of faculty at the ENST faculty meeting held January 30, 2019. Updated text approved by unanimous vote of faculty at the ENST faculty meeting held February 21, 2021.