

Personnel Policy For The Department Of Psychological and Brain Sciences
January, 2003

I. INTRODUCTION AND DEFINITIONS

The personnel reviews of the Department shall consider evidence in the areas of teaching, research and creative activity, and service. Performance evaluations shall be based on merit, including contributions to the missions of the Department, the College, and the University. Evaluations must consider those areas of activity for which the approved Annual Work Plan (AWP) indicates a faculty member's responsibility, and no faculty member may be penalized for non-performance in any area of activity for which the faculty member has no assigned responsibility. Additionally, a proficient faculty member will be expected to collaborate with colleagues and students and to adhere to professional standards. In keeping with the current version of the University Red Book, each faculty member's performance will be rated on overall performance as either: 1) not proficient, 2) proficient, 3) highly proficient or 4) exceptional in accordance with the categories for annual performance defined in the College of Arts and Sciences Personnel policy. In connection with this, the word "proficient" shall be understood "to satisfy capably all the special demands or requirements of a particular situation, craft, or profession."

As noted above, annual evaluations for each faculty member must consider those areas of activity for which the approved Annual Work Plan (AWP) indicates a faculty member's responsibility. For most faculty in this Department this will include evaluations in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Definitions of each area and the evidence used to determine proficiency are outlined below.

1. Teaching: Teaching includes all work, which involves the use of the faculty's expertise to communicate subject matter to students. The essential element of teaching is the didactic relationship between teacher and students. Good teaching also involves the ability to interact effectively with students. Pedagogical procedures must be carefully planned, continuously examined, and directly related to the subject taught. Good teachers stimulate active, not passive, learning, and encourage students to be critical, creative thinkers with the capacity for lifelong learning. Evidence of proficiency in teaching may include performance evaluations from students and peers, syllabi, and other documentation.

2. Research and Creative Activity: Research involves delving into some question in that faculty member's field and seeking to add to the reservoir of knowledge. Research includes the act of knowledge creation through the publication or dissemination of original or innovative theoretical, empirical, or creative and theoretical activity. The intellectual excitement and progress that are generated through research are vital to a research university. Evidence of proficiency in research may include funded grant projects (internal and externally reviewed and funded), journal publications, books, book chapters, conference presentations, professional invitations, performance evaluations, and other documentation regarding one's research, the impact of that research, or scientific reputation, as well as other documentation.

3. Service: Service includes those tasks that are required for the functioning of the Department, College, University, community, and / or profession. Community work that does not draw upon one's professional expertise is not included. Evidence of proficiency in service may include performance evaluations, letters of recognition, and other documentation.

II. PROCEDURES FOR REVIEWS AND EVALUATIONS FOR PRETENURE AND TENURE AND PROMOTION

The review process for Pretenure and Tenure will follow the guidelines established by the College of Arts and Sciences Personnel Policy and Procedures, Article 2, Section 2.2.

III. PROCEDURES FOR REVIEWS AND EVALUATIONS FOR TERM FACULTY

The review process for Term faculty will follow the guidelines established by the College of Arts and Sciences Personnel Policy and Procedures, Article 1, Section 1.2.B.

IV. PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC CAREER REVIEWS

Periodic career reviews for tenured faculty will utilize the AWP reviews and supporting documents for each 5-year period of review. The review process will follow the guidelines established by the College of Arts and Sciences Personnel Policy and Procedures, Article 2, Section 2.4.

V. PROCEDURES FOR ASSESSING PERFORMANCE AND AWARDED POINTS FOR ANNUAL REVIEWS

1. A point system developed by the Departmental faculty shall be used for annual merit reviews in the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, and from this system will be derived a determination of overall performance as r: 1) not proficient, 2) proficient, 3) highly proficient or 4) exceptional. A copy of this system is attached. The system is reviewed and modified as needed by all faculty and the Chair in joint consultation each May.
2. The annual point allocation to each faculty member shall be tied initially to the maximum AWP percentages in each category for that faculty member (See 4.a. and 4.b., below).
3. The performance evaluation primarily considers evidence over the year under review, but also will take into consideration career trends over the previous two years in the various categories of evaluation. Evidence will include an updated (current) curriculum vitae, student and peer evaluations and testimonials for the period under consideration, and, when requested by the Personnel Committee, copies of published articles, letters-of-acceptance for articles, and other documentation of performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service.
4. The Personnel Committee and Chairperson of the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences shall use the following guidelines for assessing performance. Each provides a separate review of every faculty member's performance. These guidelines are intended to be a framework to ensure quality and consistency in the assessment of performance. Faculty have the opportunity to review and respond to each evaluation before it is submitted to the next level of review.

- a. Faculty shall submit a copy of their updated vita to the Personnel Committee of the Department¹ by December 1 for review of that calendar year's merit evaluation. Performance evaluations from the previous two years will also be taken into account.
 - b. The next step in assessing performance is a review of submitted materials by the Personnel Committee to assess proficiency in each performance category. Both tenured and non-tenured, tenure-track faculty are expected to demonstrate proficiency in each category of teaching, research, and service as assigned in their AWP.
 - c. All materials are reviewed in terms of the Merit Evaluation Form developed and adopted unanimously by the faculty of this Department (see attached form). This form is reviewed annually in May following the Merit Review period for the purpose of updating and reevaluating current criteria used by the Personnel Committee to determine Merit ratings for each faculty member. The revised form is provided to each faculty member by June of that year. In addition, all potential faculty candidates who visit the University for job interviews in this Department are provided with a copy of this form when it is reviewed with them by the department Chair.
 - d. The Department will use a point system to assess performance according to four categories: Not Proficient, Proficient, Highly Proficient, and Exceptional. It is anticipated that the necessary points required for each rating category will vary somewhat from year to year. In any given year, point ranges for each category will be based on those assigned for the preceding two years. However, the exact cutoff points will be determined by the Personnel Committee after compiling ratings on all faculty members who have submitted materials for review. Furthermore, the Merit Point System is reviewed and modified annually, providing an additional opportunity to adjust point totals for each category.
 - e. Faculty are appraised of their evaluation ratings by the Personnel Committee in a written summary. They may choose to respond to this evaluation within three days in a letter addressed to the Chair.
 - f. The ratings of the Personnel Committee are then forwarded to the Chair who reviews the recommendations and any faculty responses, and then provides a separate written evaluation regarding Merit that also utilizes information available to the Chair that may have not been available to the Personnel Committee.
 - g. The Chair's evaluation will then be provided to each faculty member, who may respond to this evaluation within three days via a letter to the Chair. The Chair will then forward the Personnel Committee and Chair's evaluations, along with all rebuttal letters, to the Dean.
5. The Dean's merit funding allotment to the Department shall be divided into two equal portions. Individuals receiving a performance evaluation of "not proficient" will not be recommended for any salary increase. For those attaining at least a 'Proficient' rating, 50% will be distributed by rank, at a rate that is proportional to the average salary for that rank. The remaining 50% will be apportioned on the basis of merit. In general, faculty ranked "highly proficient" will receive 15 percent more than those ranked "proficient", while faculty ranked "exceptional" will receive 30 percent more than those ranked "proficient." These percentages may be proportionately adjusted as needed, depending on the total allotment.

VI. PROCEDURES FOR ASSESSING PERFORMANCE OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR.

Assessment of performance of the Chair includes two parts:

(1). An evaluation of the Chair's performance as a faculty member. This will include examination of the areas on the AWP that do not include duties as Chair and must follow those guidelines that apply to other faculty.

(2). An evaluation of this individual's performance as Chair. The Personnel Committee will solicit written statements from the A&S and Graduate Deans, Provost, each of the faculty, staff, and graduate students, as to the Chair's performance in light of the Mission Statement of the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences. In addition, the Chair will include a self-evaluation that includes a list of goals and accomplishments. The Personnel Committee will distill these statements in providing their overall review to forward along with the Chair's self-evaluation, all written statements received, and other supporting material to the Dean.

¹. The Personnel Committee is composed of four full time departmental faculty members elected between May 15 and June 15 for the review to begin in January of the following calendar year. . To ensure adequate representation, two members will be elected from the Experimental program and two from the Clinical program. Committee members will each serve for 2 years, with half the committee elected in even years and half in odd years to facilitate carryover from year to year.

Name _____ Total Points _____

2002 MERIT REVIEW
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGICAL AND BRAIN SCIENCES

Instructional: Academic year 00-01 (July 1, 2000 - June 30, 2001)
Professional and Service: Calendar year 2001

	Possible Points	Points
A. Instructional and Related Activities		
1. Teaching duties		
a. Undergraduate and graduate courses		
i) First four courses (per course)..... .9		_____
Fall: _____		
Spring: _____		
Quality points to be added to each course.....0-2 ^a		_____
(Course, "Small" or "Large" & Eval #) _____		
F: _____		
S: _____		
ii) Fifth course (Fall/Spring, # _____).....11		_____
Quality points 0-4		_____
(Course, "Small"/"Large" & Eval #) _____		
iii) Sixth course (and above) (Term, course & eval #).....15		_____

Quality points. 0-5 ^a		_____

b. Large class size enrollment (60-120 = 1pt; >120 = 2pt)		_____
(Course # & enrollment) _____		
c. Guest lecturing (1 pt per 3 lectures)..... 1-3		_____
(Course & term) _____		
d. New preparation/ major revision/developing new course..1-3		_____
(Explain) _____		

2. Graduate supervisory duties		
a. Research portfolio/thesis/dissertation..... .1		_____
(primary mentor; per year with a 5 year maximum per student)		
(Names) _____		
b. Thesis/Portfolio Chair (degree awarded)..... .2		_____
(Names & dates) _____		
c. Dissertation Chair (degree awarded)..... .3		_____
(Names & dates) _____		
d. Research portfolio/thesis/dissertation..... .1		_____
committee member (degree awarded)		
(Names & dates) _____		
e. Independent Research, Readings (not one's students)..... (.5)		_____
(Name, # & term) _____		
f. Prelim committee (when administered)..... .1		_____
(Names & dates) _____		

g. Postdoctoral students..... .1
(Name) _____

3. Undergraduate supervisory duties

a. Independent Research/Readings (per semester).... (.5)
(Name, # & term) _____

b. Undergraduate honors (per semester)..... (.5)
(Name & term) _____

c. Undergraduate honors (project completed)..... .2
(Name & date) _____

4. Other related activities a-g MARK IN MARGIN OF VITA & INDICATE VITA MARK & PAGE# HERE

a. Internal grant application for..... .1
instructional support and program enhancement
(Type, amt & date) _____

b. Award of internal grant for instructional support.....1-3
and program enhancement
(Type, amt & date) _____

c. External grant application for..... .1-10
instructional support and program enhancement
(Type, amt & date) _____

d. Award of external grant for instructional support....5-20
and program enhancement
(Type, amt & date) _____

e. Publication of text..... 50 _____

f. Publications of revised text..... 20 _____

g. Publications on the scholarship of teaching..... 4-6 _____

h. College Outstanding Teacher..... 5 _____

i. University Outstanding Teacher.....5 _____

B. Research/Scholarship Activities

1. Presentations STATE MEETING (ABBREVIATE), VITA MARGIN NOTATION AND PAGE #

a. Reviewed international/national..... .3

b. Reviewed state or local..... .1

c. Invited addresses (international/national)..... .3

d. Invited addresses (regional)..... .2

e. Workshops/symposium-organizer or..... .3
presenter (national/international)

f. Workshops/symposium-organizer or presenter (regional).....2

g. Colloquium (outside University)..... .2

h. Colloquium (outside Department, within University1

Possible
Points

Points

2. Publications^b STATE JOURNAL (ABBREVIATE), VITA MARGIN INDICATOR AND PAGE#

- a. Reviewed journal..... .16-24^c _____

- b. Non-reviewed/advisory reviewed..... .4 _____

- c. Book..... .60 _____

- d. Book revision.35 _____

- e. Book chapter.16 _____

- f. Edited book (40 max, including chapters).30 _____

- g. Miscellaneous publications.1 - 6 _____

3. Research, grants and contracts - FOR ALL EXCEPT 'c' AND 'f'
STATE AGENCY / UofL TYPE, DATE SUB., AMT(Direct), % COLLABORATION (PCF), & VITA MARGIN INDICATOR, PAGE#

- a. External federal grant -- initial application
Large^h20 _____

Small^h5-10 _____

- b. External federal grant -- resubmission
Large^h10-15 _____

Small^h3-8 _____

- c. External federal grant monies (in review year):
Award/Holding grant (weighted by direct costs^{f,d}) _____

Indirect costs (1pt/\$1,500 of F&A returned to dept)^{d,e} _____

- d. External State and foundation grant (initial application) 10 _____

- e. External State and Foundation Grant (Resubmission) . . .5-10 _____

- f. External State and foundation grant monies (in review year):
Award/Holding grant (weighted by direct costs^f) _____

Indirect costs (1pt/\$1,500 of F&A returned to dept)^{d,e} _____

g. Internal grant -- application.....2

h. Internal grant -- awarded.....2

4. Contributions to the profession

a. Journal editorship..... 20

(Name of J)

b. Associate journal editorship..... 7

(Name of J)

c. Special issue editor..... 6

(Name of J & issue)

d. Editorial board reviewer..... 4

(Name of J)

e. Ad hoc journal reviewer..... 0.5-3

(.5 pt per article with cap of 3 pts)

(J and date)

f. Program committee.....3

(Identify)

g. Grant study section member.....5-10

(Identify)

h. Ad hoc grant reviewer.....1-5

(1 pt per grant with cap of 5)

(Identify)

i. Site visit team/program project reviewer..... 1-3

(Identify)

5. Other honors or contributions - IDENTIFY EACH IN BLANKS

a. National or regional presidency of a major prof society...5-10
of a major professional society

b. ABPP certification (at inception)......5

c. National/international award.....2-6

d. College Outstanding Researcher.....5

e. University Outstanding Researcher.....5

C.	Service Activities ¹ - IDENTIFY IN BLANKS PROVIDED	Possible Points	Points
1.	Committees		
	a. Personnel Committee Chair.....	.8	_____
	b. Personnel Committee Member.....	.5	_____
	c. Resource Committee Chair.....	.5	_____
	d. Resource Committee Member.....	.4	_____
	e. Undergraduate Committee Chair.....(see below)		_____
	f. Undergraduate Committee Member.....	.4	_____
	g. Diversity Committee Chair.....	.5	_____
	(see presentations below)		_____
	h. Diversity Committee Member.....	.2	_____
	(see presentations below)		_____
	i. Grawemeyer Committee Chair.....	.10	_____
	j. Grawemeyer Committee Member.....	.5	_____
	k. Executive Committee.....(see below)		_____
	l. Ad Hoc Search Committee Chair.....	.6	_____
	m. Ad Hoc Search Committee Member.....	.4	_____
	n. Ad Hoc Committee Chair (linked to above).....	.2-8	_____
	_____		_____
	o. Ad Hoc Committee Member (linked to above).....	.1-5	_____
	_____		_____
	p. College/University Committee Chair.....	.2-10	_____
	_____		_____
	q. College/University Committee Member.....	.1-5	_____
	_____		_____
	r. National/Regional/State Committee Chair.....	.2-10 ⁹	_____
	_____		_____
	s. National/Regional/State Committee Member.....	.1-5 ⁹	_____
	_____		_____
	t. Psi Chi Advisor.5	_____
2.	Administrative Responsibilities		
	a. Merit points associated with course reductions that compensate for administrative workload		
	Vice Chair20	_____
	Director of Clinical Training.....	.20	_____
	Area coordinator (other than DCT)5	_____
	b. Merit points associated with workload not compensated by course reduction		
	Undergraduate Coordinator.....	.10	_____
	Area Coordinator5	_____

(Note that the year's Honors Coordinator will receive one course credit on his/her FWLA for teaching two 1-credit sections of PSYC 400 and overseeing the Department Honors program.)

3. Other Activities

a. Organizing a major professional conference..... .6-10

b. Attending Faculty meetings..... .1

c. Undergraduate advising..... .1

d. Public presentation (1 pt per 5)..... .1-3

e. Consultation to community (U of L affiliated. 1-3
(.5 each with cap of 3)

f. Local/regional/state judges..... .1-3
(.5 each with cap of 3)

D. **Sabbatical Merit Compensation** (28 semester, 56 for year)

(To compensate for lost opportunity for teaching and service points during a sabbatical -- averaged at two courses (20) and two committees (8).)

Notes

^aOne quality point will be added for faculty receiving acceptable course evaluations (Item "Overall Average of Questions 8-16," i.e., not "Medians of ..."). For small undergraduate classes (less than 60 students) the cut-off will be 3.50, and for larger undergraduate classes (60 student or more) the cut-off will be 3.00. For graduate courses the cut-off will be 4.00. An addition point will be added for higher rankings.

For the fifth course this translates to two points for meeting the cut-offs and two more for higher rankings. For the sixth course and above, it is three points, and two points, respectively.

Also note that faculty teaching more than four courses specify on their FWLA which ones are to be considered as the first four, fifth, and so on, for these merit purposes when evaluations later become available.

^bMultiple authorships to be determined as follows: 1st Author - 100%; 2nd Author - 80%; 3rd Author - 60%; 4th Author-40%; 5th Author and beyond-20%. Students listed as authors on publications will not be counted when determining authorship ranking. If last author is senior, the faculty member needs to make the case for authorship credit.

^cQuality points (0-8 pts) are to be calibrated, in part, with IPU rankings of journals.

^dCo-PI's and investigators will be given credit on the basis of their percent collaboration on the Proposal Clearance Form.

^ePayment of department's F&A percentage will be treated as divided equally over the years of the grant for merit purposes.

^fConversion of grant direct costs received in the merit review year to points.

\$1K - 4,999	4 pts
\$5K - 29K	10 pts
30K - 74K	16 pts
75K - 124K	21 pts
125K - 249K	22 pts
250K and above	23 pts

^gA case can be made for the higher points of the range given for committees such as the APA Committee on Accreditation and the APA Ethics Committee.

^h"Large" grants are defined as "full" applications that are comparable to an NIH R01 or NSF application in format and scope that request funds to support the bulk of a lab's research efforts. "Small" grants are those for limited funding (e.g., a single line-item), funding for a smaller portion of a research program or limited proposals or pre-proposals. All grants (small and large) have to be judged as serious attempts to obtain funding.

ⁱFor year-long activities, use the date the activity started. In this, the first year of the point system, use January 1 as the start date of committees on-going on January 1, 2000.