

Merit Evaluation Procedure, Fall 07
Dept of Computer Science

11-2-07

Evaluations carried out in the spring semester of 2008 will proceed following the *2007-2008 Compensation Calendar*; they will be governed by the philosophy set forth in *Compensation 101 07-08* and guided by the advice of the CNAS Personnel Committee as stated in *CNAS-Help for Compensation Plan Revisions*. This document outlines procedures followed by the Computer Science Department, in accordance with the overall University and CNAS procedures.

Department Personnel Committee

The Department Personnel Committee will consist of 3 tenured faculty members appointed by the Dept Head. Committee members will serve staggered 3 year terms, so that 1 member is new each year (for the 2007-2008 academic year, 1 member will be appointed to a 1 year term, 1 to a 2 year term, and 1 to a 3 year term). Appointments will rotate through the department, with each tenured faculty member serving on the Committee. No member of the faculty will serve a second term until all tenured faculty members have served. Each Committee member will serve as Chairperson during his or her second year on the committee. If a member of the Committee is unable to serve during a given year, a replacement (for that year) will be appointed by the Dept Head.

In accordance with the timetable outlined in the Compensation Calendar for Academic Units, and the procedures specified by the Implementation of the Compensation Plan, the Committee will prepare narrative assessments of each faculty member being reviewed, and will assign a tentative numerical rating on each of the three performance dimensions (committee members will not assess themselves). The Chairperson will forward these narrative assessments and numerical ratings to the Dept Head.

The Dept Head will meet with the Committee to discuss the assessments and ratings and will then prepare a composite performance rating, for each faculty member under review, that takes into account the percentage weights for each of the three categories (teaching, research, and service) agreed upon previously by the faculty member and the Dept Head.

The Dept Head will provide feedback to the faculty member, as prescribed by the Implementation document. Appeal procedures will follow those prescribed by the Implementation document.

Evaluation Criteria

The Department Personnel Committee and the Dept Head will take into account the following criteria when determining numeric ratings for the three performance dimensions. It is understood that no list of criteria can be exhaustive. If a faculty member believes there are other accomplishments that should be considered, he or she will point those out in his or her annual report. Ratings will be interpreted as follows:

- 5: Exceptional; results consistently exceed expectations
- 4: Commendable; results frequently exceed expectations
- 3: Competent; results consistently meet expectations
- 2: Needs Improvement; results sometimes fail to meet expectations
- 1: Unsatisfactory; results generally fail to meet expectations

Teaching

The following are required for a rating of 3. The Dept Personnel Committee or Dept Head may request evidence that any or all of these criteria have been met. If these criteria are met with a level of teaching that is clearly outstanding, then the rating may be higher than 3.

- Prepares appropriate syllabi and teaching materials
- Meets classes reliably
- Competently communicates appropriate material to classes
- Provides fair and timely feedback to students
- Effectively advises students regarding their academic programs
- Maintains currency of knowledge in computer science
- Evaluations by students reflect quality teaching; in general, it is expected that categories related to teaching will average better than a rating of neutral (3)

The following will be considered for ratings above 3. Meeting one or more of these criteria does not automatically guarantee a rating higher than 3.

- Has created a new course (or courses) not taught previously at MSU
- Has taught a course (or courses) he or she has not taught previously
- Has attended professional development seminars or workshops focused on teaching
- Shows effective innovation in teaching and/or in preparation of teaching materials
- Has submitted one or more equipment grant applications to support teaching
- Has received one or more equipment grants to support teaching
- Is actively writing or editing a teaching textbook
- Has a published teaching textbook
- Has supervised an ongoing thesis
- Has served on a thesis committee

Research

Any of the following will lead to a rating of 3. Meeting multiple criteria may result in a rating higher than 3, although this is not guaranteed – for example, multiple publications in regional conferences are not likely to be rewarded with a rating higher than 3. It is also possible that meeting one of these criteria may result in a rating higher than 3 – for example, one publication in a particularly prestigious venue may result in a higher rating than 3.

- Has published or contributed (as an author) to a research book
- Has supervised a successfully completed thesis
- Has received an external or internal research grant
- Has a peer-reviewed publication in a regional conference or journal
- Has a peer-reviewed publication in an international conference or journal

The following will also be considered by the Personnel Committee and Dept Head in assigning a research rating. Meeting one or more of these criteria does not, in itself, guarantee a rating of 3, and does not guarantee a rating above 3 in conjunction with meeting criteria listed above.

- Has developed software or a web site used in research
- Has performed scholarly activity that has potential to lead to peer-reviewed publication

- Is actively writing, editing, or contributing written material to a research book
- Has submitted a research grant application
- Has attended research conferences or seminars

Service

The following will result in a level of 3.

- Has served effectively on Department, College, and/or University committees; effective service implies regular attendance (where possible) and active participation in meeting committee objectives. A committee chairperson may be asked for an evaluation of a faculty member's service.
- Has performed service duties negotiated with the Dept Head

The following will be considered for ratings above 3. Meeting one or more of these criteria does not automatically guarantee a rating higher than 3.

- Has served on one or more subcommittees
- Has served as chair of one or more committees
- Has served on the executive committee of a Department, College, or University committee
- Has performed computer science-based consulting for outside organizations
- Has submitted one or more service grant applications (e.g., for scholarships)
- Has received one or more service grants
- Has participated in recruiting activities for the Department or University
- Has participated in professional development activities related to service
- Has performed service to the community. This service must be related to the computer science profession; examples are as follows, but may include other activities
 - Has promoted computer science to K-12 students
 - Has promoted the understanding of computer science or the computing profession to the wider community
- Has performed effective service to the computer science profession; examples are as follows, but may include other activities
 - Reviewed articles for conferences and/or journals
 - Has served on the editorial board for one or more journals
 - Has served on the organizing board for one or more conferences
 - Has served as an officer in one or more professional organizations
 - Has performed assessment tasks for professional organizations
 - Has served as an official in local or national programming contests
 - Has reviewed a book related to computer science