

## Faculty Evaluation Process – Epstein ISE Department

### Computation of Overall Score

Each faculty member's overall rating is computed as a weighted combination of the individual's ratings for teaching, research and service. Under normal circumstances, when the faculty member has a full teaching load, the weighting will be:

**Base Weights:          Research:   .40    Teaching:   .40    Service:      .20**

In cases where the faculty member has bought out of courses through research funding (or through reduced load for new professors, or by agreement with the Dean of the School), the weights are adjusted by increasing the research weight by .13 for each course bought out and decreasing the teaching weight by .13 for each course bought out:

### Adjusted Weights Due to Research Buy-out

Courses	Research	Teaching	Service
2	.53	.27	.20
1	.67	.13	.20
0	.80	.00	.20

In cases where the faculty member has negotiated a reduced teaching load with the chairman due to an extraordinary service commitment, the service weight is increased by ~~.05~~[.13] for each course and the teaching weight is decreased by ~~.05~~[.13]:

### Adjusted Weights Due to Extraordinary Service Commitment

Courses	Research	Teaching	Service
2	.40	.27	.33
1	.40	.13	.47
0	.40	.00	.60

In rare cases where teaching load is reduced both due to research buy-out and extraordinary service commitment, then both service and research weights are adjusted according to the .13 per course formula.

Any change from the above formula for an individual faculty member requires approval of the chairman prior to August 1 of the calendar year being evaluated. Changes shall only occur under unusual circumstances reflecting added commitments to teaching, research or service. In no case shall the research or teaching weight fall below .13 for tenured faculty, and in no case shall the service weight fall below .10 for tenured faculty.

The faculty evaluation committee shall be informed of the weights used for each faculty member prior to completing their evaluation. Research, teaching and service productivity shall be evaluated relative to the time commitment for each category. For instance, any

faculty member who buys out of courses with research funds will be expected to have a higher research productivity. This shall be reflected in ratings assigned to individual faculty members. However, quality expectations shall be independent of the weights.

## RESEARCH

**Purpose:** To assess the faculty member's contribution to the department through scholarly research. Highest importance is given to research that enhances the department's reputation in the academic and professional communities and leads to involvement of students in significant research projects. The research rating is also intended to recognize a faculty member's leadership in developing research initiatives that benefit the department as a whole.

**Criteria:** The primary indicator of scholarly research is publication through refereed journals or, in work related to computer science or other rapidly changing disciplines, refereed conference proceedings. Other criteria include: (1) the measured selectivity of refereed conference proceedings, (2) refereed book chapters, (3) books (4) funded research projects (where possible, projects that provide ongoing support for ISE students), (5) non-refereed publications arising from funded research (including reports, non-refereed book chapters, and conference papers), (6) other products of funded research (such as patents, hardware or software), (7) presentation of research at conferences, (8) research monographs, (9) awards or other recognition for research and (10) leadership of major research initiatives. The assessment should also reflect progress on long-term research projects that do not immediately result in refereed publication, sole authorship versus joint authorship, and the number of courses taught per year. The criteria are intentionally non-numerical. Flexibility is needed in assessing the quality and productivity of a faculty member's research.

**Horizon:** The research rating is based on a rolling horizon of 3-years, with greatest weight given to the most recent year (.5 for the current year, .3 for the previous year, and .2 for the year before). Special consideration is given to faculty members who received their Ph.D. within this horizon.

**Ratings:** The following ratings approximately characterize a faculty member's performance on a scale of 1 to 5. The actual rating should account for the full spectrum of accomplishments. However, the maximum rating for a faculty member who has been unproductive through refereed publications is 2, and the maximum rating for a faculty member who has no research funding is 4, unless the faculty member has demonstrated exceptional leadership of research initiatives.

5      High level of research productivity and quality, as reflected in refereed publications and other research activity.  
Record of significant continuing research funding, with involvement of graduate students in projects.  
Demonstrated leadership of research initiatives.

or

Exceptionally high level of productivity and quality, as reflected in refereed publications and other research activity.  
Ongoing research funding, with graduate student involvement.

- 4 Exceptionally high level of productivity, as reflected in refereed publications and other research activity.  
No research support.
- or
- High level of productivity and quality, as reflected in refereed publications and other research activity.  
Ongoing research funding, with graduate student involvement
- or
- Moderate level of productivity, through high quality refereed publications and other research activity.  
Record of significant continuing research funding, with involvement of graduate students in projects.
- 3 Moderate level of productivity, through high quality refereed publications and other research activity.  
Ongoing research funding, with graduate student involvement
- or
- High level of productivity and quality, as reflected in refereed publications and other research activity.  
No research funding
- 2 Moderate level of productivity, through high quality refereed publications and other research activity.  
No research funding
- or
- Minimal level of productivity through high quality refereed publications or other research activity.  
Record of significant continuing research support, with involvement of graduate students in projects.
- 1 Minimal level of productivity through high quality refereed publications or other research activity.  
No significant research funding (i.e., no ongoing research assistant support).

## **SERVICE**

**Purpose:** To assess the faculty member's contribution to the department and university through activities that are not directly reflected in research or teaching. Highest importance is given to activities that increase the stature of the department in the professional community and university, and to activities that contribute to the successful functioning of the department.

**Criteria:** The service rating shall reflect the following types of activities:

- 1) Service to the Profession, including journal editorship, participation and leadership in professional committees and societies, proposal review and article review.
- 2) Service to the Epstein Department: Activities that contribute to the success of the department, including administrative duties, participation and leadership in committees, and development of new initiatives.
- 3) Service to the Viterbi School: Activities that contribute to the success of the school, including administrative duties, participation and leadership in committees, and development of new initiatives.
- 4) Service to the University: Activities that contribute to the success of the school or university, including administrative duties, participation and leadership in committees, and development of new initiatives.
- 5) Service to the Community: Activities that improve the stature and recognition of the department, school or university through community outreach and service to government.

Primary importance will be given to actual achievements in each of the above areas and secondary importance given to time commitment.

**Horizon:** The service rating is based primarily on a single calendar year, with secondary importance given to activities in the two prior years.

**Ratings:** The following ratings approximately characterize a faculty member's performance on a 1 to 5 scale. The actual rating shall account for the full spectrum of accomplishments. To achieve the maximum possible rating of 5, it isn't necessary for the faculty member to be active in all five areas of service. Excellence in one area can compensate for lack of activity elsewhere.

- 5 High level of service achievement through leadership positions on and off campus. Fulfillment of all basic faculty obligations (participation in department meetings, maintaining student contact, etc.)
- 4 Strong service achievement, through leadership of campus committee(s) and through professional activity (such as editing special issue of journal, service on editorial board, etc.). Fulfillment of all basic faculty obligations (participation in department meetings, maintaining student contact, etc.).
- 3 Average level of service achievement through campus committees and professional activities, such as chairing sessions at conferences, journal review, etc. Fulfillment of all basic faculty obligations (participation in department meetings, maintaining student contact, etc.).
- 2 Minimal service commitment, including participation on committees when requested and some journal review activity. Fulfillment of all basic faculty obligations (participation in department meetings, maintaining student contact, etc.).
- 1 No service contribution or insignificant contribution in all of the five areas.

# Epstein ISE Department Merit Evaluation

Updated 3/17/97 [6/8/05]  
 Printed 3/17/97

## - Teaching Evaluation

### Graduate

Rating	Range
5.0	5.00 4.56
4.5	4.55 4.37
4.0	4.36 4.21
3.5	4.20 4.08
3.0	4.07 3.93
2.5	3.92 3.71
2.0	3.70 3.51
1.5	3.50 3.11
1.0	3.10 0.00

### Undergraduate

Rating	Range
5.0	5.00 4.36
4.5	4.35 4.19
4.0	4.18 4.01
3.5	4.00 3.86
3.0	3.85 3.66
2.5	3.65 3.51
2.0	3.50 3.31
1.5	3.30 2.96
1.0	2.95 0.00

## Process:

1. Use ratings shown to establish a starting rating.  
 Use three-year instructor ratings from AFR.  
 Weight averages by class size (student units)  
 Weight averages across current / recent years (.5, .3, .2).  
 Delete DEN groups and all classes < 5 students unless the DEN average exceeds the corresponding on-campus average.
2. Adjust from average of starting ratings for such factors as:  
 Class size.  
 DEN offering, especially interactivity requirements.  
 Latest year's students' evaluations.  
 Direct comments from students.  
 Class format – such as seminars, project courses.  
 New course development/innovation/preparation.  
 Course difficulty and subject matter.  
 Supervision of doctoral students.
3. Only in unusual cases would the adjustment exceed one rating point in either direction.
4. Keep in mind the end objective – do not get caught up in the numbers.