1. Purpose:

The purpose of the following procedure, established by the ISyE Department Executive Committee in accordance with FP&P 5.21, is to define the general policies, guidelines, and steps followed for the annual review and performance evaluation of every faculty member for the purpose of determining recommended merit salary increments, which are transmitted through the ISyE Chair to the Dean of the College of Engineering.

2. Scope:

This procedure addresses the process for soliciting annual activity reports from faculty members, the review and evaluation of the activity reports by the ISyE Executive Committee, and the assignment of one or more members of the ISyE Executive Committee to serve as members of the Merit Review Committee with primary responsibility for determining recommendations of faculty members’ merit salary increments.

3. Related Procedures and Other Documentation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure No.</th>
<th>Description of Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISyE P 04.1</td>
<td>Mentoring and Annual Review of Probationary Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Documents
Faculty Policies and Procedure (FP&P) University of Wisconsin-Madison, Chapter 5 – Departmental Faculties http://wiscinfo.doit.wisc.edu/secfac/governance/fpp/chapter_5.htm
Principles and Definitions for Assigning Faculty Workload in Industrial Engineering
4. **Policy and Guidelines:**

4.1 Under UW-Madison Faculty Policies and Procedures 5.21.D, the periodic review of the performance of every faculty member and the annual determination of recommendations for merit salary increments is the responsibility of the ISyE Executive Committee. The ISyE Department Chair is the agent of the ISyE Executive Committee for the purposes discussed in this document. References in the remainder of this document are to the Chair in that capacity.

4.2 The ISyE merit review process shall provide for a faculty member to be heard on his or her own case, if he or she wishes, and for the faculty member to be informed of the outcome of the review (5.21.D.1)

4.3 The ISyE Executive Committee will conduct and provide for an annual written evaluation of every probationary faculty member beginning with the second year of their initial appointment in accordance with Mentoring and Annual Review of Probationary Faculty, ISyE P 04.1. (See Note 1)

**NOTE 1:** In a year in which a renewal/promotion review is being carried out in accordance with Mentoring and Annual Review of Probationary Faculty, ISyE P 04.1, this annual evaluation shall normally be part of the renewal/promotion review. (5.21.D.2)

4.4 The functions of the ISyE Executive Committee in reviewing and evaluating faculty members for merit increases will be performed in an impartial manner. Any member of the ISyE Executive Committee may at any time disqualify himself or herself from any review. (5.21.D.3)

4.5 The ISyE Executive Committee establishes a Merit Review Committee, composed of the current ISyE Chair and two or more elected Executive Committee members with primary responsibility for determination of performance evaluation and recommendations of faculty members’ merit salary increments.

**NOTE 2:** The two elected members of the Merit Review Committee are nominated and elected annually by the Executive Committee.

4.6 In the case of ISyE faculty members with split appointments, the ISyE Chair is responsible for negotiating a recommended merit salary increment with the Dean or chair of the other college or departments.

4.7 New faculty members who have had only one semester or less on the payroll – and often little or no teaching or service assignments in that time – will not be rated in the categories of teaching, research, and service in the usual manner. Instead, these faculty members will receive a merit salary increment equal to the average of the merit pot or higher (as appropriate).

4.8 It is the responsibility of the ISyE Chair to regularly review faculty members’ salaries for possible inequities. However, it is not the role of the merit “pot” alone to take care of salary inequities. When such an irregularity is identified, the Merit Review Committee may request the ISyE Chair to work with the Dean in an attempt to solve the problem.
5. Procedure:

Faculty Workload Allocation

5.1 Near the end of the fall semester, the ISyE Chair sends a written request to all ISyE faculty members to submit a brief proposal of their intended workload distribution for their twelve equivalent course credit hours of instruction each semester for the upcoming calendar year.

NOTE 3: The normal workload for a full-time faculty member paid 100% on instructional funds is a minimum of twelve equivalent course credit hours of instruction each semester. Six equivalent course credit hours are normally allocated as “teaching” for an assignment of two group classroom sections per semester, and at least two individual instruction sections at the undergraduate and/or graduate level per semester. The other 6 equivalent course credit hours per semester are normally allocated as 3 credits of “research” and 3 credits of “service – both internal and external”. The workloads proposed by faculty members may vary from this “normal allocation” due to planned teaching buyouts or reductions, sabbaticals, special assignments, and other factors.

NOTE 4: The initial proposed plan of workload allocation might need to be updated during the year based on unforeseen opportunities or needs. The actual workload allocation for the year will be used as a basis for determining the merit score as defined in Note 7 of this document.

5.2 The ISyE Chair summarizes the individual faculty members’ workload proposals and presents the results for review and approval by the ISyE Executive Committee at the January meeting.

Annual Activity Reports Solicitation and Rating

5.3 At the start of the spring semester, the ISyE Chair sends a written request to all faculty members to prepare and submit a written record (report) of their accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research, and internal/external service activities for the previous calendar year. The request also asks for an updated resume, and an additional section at the end of the annual report that highlights activities that made particular contributions toward meeting the ISyE Department’s strategic plan and/or specific strategic objections.

The ISyE Chair will also send a request for nominations of two members of the Merit Review Committee. The two members will be elected at the February faculty meeting.

5.4 In mid-February, the ISyE Chair sends copies of the submitted ISyE faculty members’ activity reports to all members of the ISyE Department faculty, and requests that Executive Committee members rate the performance of all faculty members (except themselves and the Department Chair) in the categories of teaching, research, internal service, and external service.

NOTE 5: Faculty members’ performance is rated on three levels: EE (Exceeds Expectation), ME (Meets Expectation), and BE (Below Expectation).
NOTE 6: In its evaluation and rating, the Executive Committee is to primarily consider performance during the preceding twelve months (calendar year); however, the stochastic nature of such accomplishments as grants received, PhD students graduated, publications, etc., as well as merit total amount necessitate some consideration of immediate past evaluations and allocations. Likewise, in establishing reasonable performance expectations, the Executive Committee shall take into account each faculty member’s rank and experience.

5.5 When the rating process is completed by each member of the ISyE Executive Committee, the scoring sheet is submitted to the ISyE Department Administrator. The raw scoring sheets can only be accessible to the Department Chair and the Department Administrator. The Department Chair will work with the Department Administrator to calculate the average score of each faculty member in the four categories based on the raw scoring sheets. The average and the distribution of the scores will be presented to the members of the Merit Review Committee, and the overall merit review score is then determined for each faculty member. See Note 7.

NOTE 7: In determining the overall merit review score, the Merit Review Committee will study carefully the annual report, deliberate the whole case in meetings, and weigh in the ratings from Executive Committee members. The overall merit review score will be rated as EE, ME, and BE and a written explanation will be provided.

NOTE 8: The final merit review scores of the two faculty members on the Merit Review Committee will be determined by the Department Chair, and their rating scores by the Executive Committee.

5.6 The ISyE Chair sends a notice to ISyE faculty members that states their merit review scores are available and asks if faculty members want to be informed of their results. The ISyE Chair also offers to meet and discuss the results with faculty members, and personally commends ISyE faculty members with high scores for their exceptional performance.

Merit Allocation

5.7 After the merit review scores are determined, the ISyE Chair convenes the Merit Review Committee and asks each member of this committee to individually recommend an allocation of the merit “pot” for ISyE faculty members, primarily determining percentage increases from the average merit score.

5.8 The individual salary increase recommendations are then reviewed, and final recommended merit salary increments are determined and transmitted to the Dean by the ISyE Chair.

5.9 For academic staff and other personnel appointed in the ISyE Department, the ISyE Chair consults with their immediate supervisor(s) (if any) to determine recommended merit salary increments, which are then transmitted to the Dean.
NOTE 9: In some cases, Campus or College policy may set floors on percentage increase levels for certain faculty members (e.g. in case of promotion). As the dollar amount of the merit pot is fixed, if the mandated percentage levels for these faculty members are higher than what they would otherwise have received, then the amounts available for other faculty members will be disproportionately decreased. Also, as the primary measure used is the percentage increase, variations in salary levels within the department may cause some faculty members with average merit review scores to receive less than the average dollar increase in a particular year.

END OF PROCEDURE