

Plan of Governance
Appendix A

Department of Environmental Science and Technology
University of Maryland College Park
Policy on Faculty Workload, 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
Updated March 6, 2024

A. Teaching Workload Fulfillment

This policy fulfills the requirement that each unit has a teaching workload policy that is approved by the Dean of the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources and submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs. This policy is based on the Office of Faculty Affairs Faculty Workload Guidance (<https://faculty.umd.edu/main/resources/faculty-workload-guidance#resources-references>). The University's workload policy applies solely to tenured and tenure track (TTK) faculty for their contract workload periods (academic year for 9-month faculty and fiscal year for 12-month faculty). ENST's policy here applies to both TTK and Professional Track (PTK) faculty and includes guidance on faculty evaluation and merit pay distribution. This policy does not apply to any portion of an ENST faculty member's appointment assigned to administrative duties outside of the Department.

Workload of ENST faculty is based on the following expectations:

- 1) The baseline teaching (state-sponsored instruction time) effort for full-time equivalent (100% FTE) TTK faculty members is five (5) course units per academic year. A course unit is defined as equivalent to a three-credit course.
- 2) The baseline teaching effort for a 9-month full-time equivalent (100% FTE) PTK faculty member is eight (8) course units per academic year. The baseline teaching effort for a 12-month full-time equivalent (100% FTE) PTK faculty member is ten (10) course units per fiscal year.
- 3) The baseline teaching effort is adjusted for each faculty member according to their split appointment among the areas of research (MAES), Extension (UME), and teaching (state-sponsored instruction time), with 10% of a faculty member's total effort expected to be devoted to service.
- 4) Partial course unit allocation will be given for the following advisory instruction:
 - a) Dissertation and doctoral level individual studies (800-899), nine (9) credit hours is equivalent to one (1) course unit;
 - b) Masters thesis (799), 12 credit hours is equivalent to one (1) course unit;
 - c) Other graduate level individual studies (500-798), 18 hours is equivalent to one (1) course unit; and
 - d) Undergraduate level individual studies (100-499), 21 credit hours is equivalent to one (1) course unit, with the following exceptions: In recognition that the courses ENST388 Honors Thesis Research, ENST472 Capstone, and ENST489 Research Experience require a greater level of advisory instruction than a typical undergraduate level individual studies course, partial course unit allocation for these courses will be upweighted so that 12 credit hours is equivalent to one (1) course unit (i.e., equivalent to Masters thesis (799) advisory instruction).
- 5) Partial course unit allocation for a faculty member may count towards no more than two (2) units of teaching effort per academic (9-month) or fiscal (12-month) year.

- 6) TTK and PTK faculty members with teaching appointments equal to or greater than 20% must teach at least one instruction-based course unit per academic (9-month) or fiscal (12-month) year.
- 7) Faculty members with teaching appointments are expected to meet workload expectations on an annual basis, but faculty workload will be averaged over a three-year period in recognition of annual workload fluctuations (e.g., a higher instructional load in one year followed by a reduced instructional load in the next).
- 8) Faculty teaching loads may be adjusted according to College and University policies and procedures (e.g., sabbatical leave, Leave without Pay, Family and Medical Leave, retirement agreements, and administrative or other service assignments).
- 9) The Department Chair may adjust the teaching expectation for a faculty member by considering credit hours taught, co-teaching, class size, modality of instruction, level of instruction, disciplinary expectations, accreditation requirements, research or Extension efforts, advising, mentoring, and other factors deemed relevant in determining faculty teaching expectations. Additional workload accommodations may be given for service activities above and beyond the 10% university service expectation.
- 10) The Department Chair may approve a release of instructional expectations (i.e., course release) due to external fellowships, awards, and/or sponsored research under a standard buyout of 15% salary buyout per one (1) course unit.

B. Faculty Evaluation

The Faculty Review and Salary (FRS) Committee of the Department of Environmental Science and Technology (ENST) will provide an annual review of TTK 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 TTK faculty or PTK faculty.

C. Selection and Composition of the Faculty Review and Salary (FRS) Committee

The FRS Subcommittees will be composed of seven-eight (8) faculty, with four (4) TTK faculty in one Evaluative Subcommittee and three to four (3-4) PTK faculty in another Evaluative Subcommittee. The TTK FRS Subcommittee will be elected from the ENST TTK faculty with at least one tenured, tenure track nominee representing each of the three major program areas: teaching, research, and Extension. The PTK faculty FRS Subcommittee will be elected from the ENST PTK faculty, with at least one PTK representing each of the three-tiered PTK faculty rank series. The Department Chair shall ensure that, to the best of their ability, the final subcommittees 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 TTK and PTK 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 TTK faculty member and one PTK 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.

D. 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 generated by Faculty Success (formally Digital Measures) and a summary document of position expectations and accomplishments that states their baseline appointment split among the areas of research, Extension, and teaching, and any adjustments to it that have been approved by the Department Chair or according to College and University policies and procedures as needed. The evaluation made by the FRS Committee will reflect performance of the faculty over this three-year period.

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

Expectations of a faculty member will be based on their current appointment split, while incorporating any adjustments to their teaching load approved by the Chair or effects on their teaching load or performance in any of the areas of teaching, Extension, and research, as well as service, according to College and University policies and procedures.

Expectations and assessment of teaching productivity generally will be based upon that portion of the faculty member's appointment allocated to 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 appointment allocated to 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 appointment allocated to 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 PTK faculty members, defining excellence in performance of these specific duties will be developed by the PTK 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) Expectations of TTK and PTK faculty should generally be related to the proportion of the faculty member's appointment allocated to research (MAES), Extension (UME), and teaching (state-sponsored instruction time), with 10% of the faculty evaluation score devoted to service and the remainder based proportionally on faculty member's appointment split. However, the FRS Committee will take into consideration current job descriptions as relevant data to measure how faculty members are meeting departmental expectations.
- 2) TTK faculty with a "100%" teaching appointment (equivalent 5 course units or 15 credits per year) are still expected to spend approximately half of their time on research activities.
- 3) For evaluation purposes, only full-term courses taught should contribute to a faculty member's teaching load. 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.
- 4) 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.
- 5) 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.
- 6) 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.
- 7) 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.

F. 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 Individual Extension Plans and faculty teaching evaluations may 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.

G. 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.

H. 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 Department 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.

I. 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.

J. 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. Updated text approved by vote of faculty at the ENST faculty meeting held March 6, 2024, 18 in Favor, 1 Opposed, 0 Abstentions.