

Department of Mathematical Sciences Sustained Performance Guidelines

“Exceeds Expectations”: A faculty member whose score, S , as calculated below, is at least 3.8.

“Meets Expectations”: A faculty member whose score, S , is at least 3.0.

“Fails to Meet Expectations”: The department strives to assign faculty to showcase their strengths. Consistent ratings below 2.0 demonstrate that the faculty member is not meeting expectations.

The department annual evaluations for research, service, and teaching are awarded on a 5-point scale, (1) unsatisfactory, (2) needs improvement, (3) good, (4) excellent, and (5) outstanding.

The annual evaluation is a weighted average of the ratings on the individual areas, depending on the assignment and performance. From these yearly evaluations, two averages should be calculated. The first average, U , is the simple unweighted average of the seven overall yearly averages. The second average, W , assigns double weight to the last three years and single weight to the first four years of the period under study. The faculty member’s score, S , is the better of U or W .

The departmental review committee, whose membership varies from year to year, tries to take into account various activities that contribute to the overall mission of the university but might not be considered to fit directly into one of teaching, research, service, or might not appear on the faculty member’s official assignment. These may include, but are not limited to: refereeing, conference organization, developing on-line courses, recruiting trips, math days, math circles, other outreach activities, problem-solving group, D.I.S. students, mentoring. The college committee may slightly raise a faculty member’s score S if it feels these activities warrant such an increment.

Also, if the faculty member has supervised Ph.D. students to completion, produced an excellent paper, or received external funding since the last SPE, this may not be adequately considered by the above method, and a higher score S should be assigned. Other indications, such as a positive slope in the faculty member’s rating should also be considered. If the faculty member made scientific contributions of sustained impact, this shall be considered by the committee.

Evaluation File. The documentation used for the SPE will be included in a confidential file, to be stored in the office of the Dean. The file will contain:

- A current curriculum vita that clearly highlights accomplishment in teaching, scholarship, and service during the period under review. *[To be provided by the faculty member.]*
- Copies of the faculty member’s last seven annual assignments and annual evaluations. *[To be provided by the department.]*
- A copy of the last SPE, if one exists. *[To be provided by the department.]*
- A brief (2 page) narrative from the faculty member.

Evaluation Committee. The evaluation will be conducted by a committee of three tenured faculty members, to be appointed by the Chair, and approved by a vote of tenured faculty. At least two members will be full professors. [After the first year,] at least one member will have served previously on an SPE Committee.