

**EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY**  
**College of Business and Technology**  
Department of Accounting, Finance, and Information Systems  
Department of Management, Marketing, and Administrative Communication

**Faculty Merit Evaluation Policy and Processes**  
*Adopted November 10, 1999*

**I. Introduction**

The College of Business and Technology's Business Departments, i.e. the Department of Accounting, Finance, and Information Systems (AFIS), and the Department of Management, Marketing, and Administrative Communication (MMAC), will be governed by a uniform, comprehensive policy that establishes procedures and standards by which faculty effectiveness shall be assessed on an annual basis. This policy is set forth in this document.

Evaluation is an important component of the professional life of a business faculty member. Just as it is an essential responsibility of teaching faculty to evaluate their students, so is it equally important that faculty themselves routinely and systematically undergo self- and peer evaluation. This evaluation is designed to be a positive process that identifies faculty performance objectives and achievements that warrant reward and provides encouragement and direction for the amelioration of deficiencies. It is not designed to be punitive. It does, however, set high standards that are compatible with the mission and values articulated and held by the Faculty of the Business Departments and other stakeholders. It is also aimed to meet accreditation standards for a quality business program.

Every full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty member not in his/her retirement year must participate in the merit evaluation process. Faculty should view this as a professional responsibility to be discharged conscientiously, objectively, and rigorously. Faculty are expected to provide clear, complete, concise, well-organized, honest, and meaningful narrative statements and documentation as required throughout the process.

Merit evaluation is performed by the department chairs and the Dean of the College of Business and Technology. It shall not discriminate on the basis of age, race, color, religion, gender, disability, or national origin.

**II. Procedures for Merit Evaluation of Faculty in the COB&T Business Departments**

This section contains specific procedures involved in the overall evaluation process.

A. Document Contents

This document:

- i. Describes the written evaluation system, including specific criteria and policies, for merit evaluation of faculty in the COB&T Business Departments.
- ii. Provides policies regarding such issues as merit for visiting faculty, merit for faculty with reassignment time, and the distribution of merit funds.
- iii. Defines satisfactory and meritorious performance in each of the three areas of evaluation -- instruction, intellectual contribution, and service.
- iv. Must be submitted for review and approval to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- v. Must be submitted to a periodic Merit Pay Policy Committee review as recommended by the Dean of the College.
- vi. Will take effect beginning with the evaluation period January 1, 2000 through December 31, 2000 and affect merit increments distributed during Spring 2001 that will be included in 2001-2002 academic year contracts.
- vii. Table of Contents

I. Introduction	01
II. Procedures for Merit Evaluation of Faculty	
A. Document Contents	02
B. Uniform Standards - Evaluation Scale	03
C. Post-Tenure Review and This Merit Standard	03
D. Written Sources of Information	04
E. Role of the Faculty Member	04
F. Role of the Department Chair	05
G. Role of the Dean	06
H. The Appeal Process	06
I. Merit Policy for Visiting Faculty	06
J. Merit Pay for Faculty with Reassignment Time	06
K. Merit Consideration for Faculty with Terminal Contracts	07
L. Distribution of Merit Funds	08
M. Systematic Review and Changes to Document	09

III. Merit Evaluation Performance Criteria	
A. Performance Criteria and Assessment for Instruction	06
B. Performance Criteria and Assessment for Intellectual Contribution	09
C. Performance Criteria and Assessment for Service	11
IV. Glossary of Terms	14
V. Appendices	
A. Faculty Member Merit Self-Evaluation Form	15
B. Subject Area Peer Portfolio Review	16
C. Faculty Member Merit Evaluation Summary	17
D. Exit Surveys	18
E. Peer Summary of Exit Surveys of Instruction	23
F. Subject Area Peer Class Visitation	24
G. Illustration Showing How Merit Funds Will Be Allocated	25

## B. Uniform Standards - Evaluation Scale

The merit evaluation of faculty, is based on the calendar year, with the exception of allowances for previous work as described in Section III of this document. To receive merit pay, a faculty member must meet the minimum satisfactory performance requirements in *each* of the three evaluation areas -- instruction, intellectual contribution, and service -- and demonstrate meritorious achievement *in at least one* of the three areas.

The merit evaluation scale in the three evaluation areas -- instruction, intellectual contribution, and service -- is

Meritorious Performance (Highest Level, Mid Level, Lowest Level)  
Satisfactory Performance  
Unsatisfactory Performance

Section III of this document provides scale details in each of the three evaluation areas.

## C. Post-Tenure Review and This Merit Standard

This merit evaluation process has been designed for the purpose of recognizing individual excellence, creating incentives for significant performance areas and distributing merit funds. This process has created a threshold of minimum satisfactory assessment in all three areas (instruction, intellectual contribution and service). It is the consensus of business program faculty that an unsatisfactory assessment in the instruction category or in the instruction category and intellectual contribution and/or service is the threshold required for post tenure review purposes. Unsatisfactory intellectual contribution and service ratings alone will not trigger institutionally-developed post tenure review processes. Post tenure review is designed to focus on instructional development if and

when critical deficiencies in that area are determined. With an institutional focus on teaching, we must balance the long-standing rights of tenured faculty against accountability for excellence in our primary mission of instruction.

#### **D. Written Sources of Information**

*At a minimum*, written sources of information submitted for evaluation must include

- i. **An annual merit self-evaluation**, itemizing the faculty member's evaluation-year achievements in instruction, intellectual contribution, and service using the Faculty Merit Self-Evaluation Form (Appendix A).
- ii. **A course portfolio** for all classes taught that includes syllabi, examinations, grade distributions, examples of student work, etc.
- iii. **Performance objectives** agreed on by the Dean, department chair, and faculty member for faculty with released time.
- iv. A current **Faculty Member Performance Plan** approved by the faculty member's department chair.

#### **E. Role of the Faculty Member**

- i. Each faculty member must have on file a current Faculty Performance Plan approved by his/her department chair. This plan will be updated at the discretion of the Dean, chair, or faculty member. Any faculty member judged unsatisfactory in any of the three evaluation areas must update his/her Faculty Performance Plan. In formulating the Plan, each faculty member must consult with his/her chair, as well as consider this merit document, particularly Section III Merit Pay Guidelines. Faculty Performance Plans must be formulated to be compatible with and designed to help accomplish the strategic goals of the College as set forth in the Business Departments' Mission Statement.
- ii. Each faculty member not in his or her retirement year must participate in the merit evaluation process. He/she is required to provide written materials and documentation so that evaluation of performance can be made in the three evaluation areas. This participation includes completing the self-evaluation form designed for this purpose (see Appendices to this document).
- iii. Each faculty member will meet with his/her department chair to discuss the results of the annual merit evaluation. Each faculty member must sign his/her Faculty Member Merit Evaluation Summary form (Appendix C) to indicate that it has been "seen and noted." The signature does not indicate agreement or disagreement.

- iv. If a faculty member wishes to appeal his/her merit evaluation, he/she must follow the Appeal Process outlined in Section II. of this document.

#### **F. Role of the Department Chair**

Each chair will

- i. Provide a copy of this document with appendices to each faculty member in his/her department.
- ii. Assist faculty members in his/her department in the construction of their Faculty Performance Plans and approve each plan.
- iii. Carefully and objectively evaluate all faculty members in his/her department, including a complete review of the following documents, as well as other relevant materials.
  - Faculty Merit Self-Evaluations (Appendix A)
  - Subject Area Peer Portfolio Reviews and Student Exit Survey results. (Appendix B )

The department chair is the official merit evaluator for the department; however, the chair will rely heavily on the results of peer reviews and objective assessments in forming his/her evaluation.

- iv. Prepare a Faculty Member Merit Evaluation Summary (Appendix C) for each faculty member in his/her department at the completion of the evaluation process. The Summary is prepared after the chair reviews all faculty merit documents and is based on the evaluation system established in this document. The chair must notify each department faculty member in writing of the results of the merit review and review the outcomes of the process personally with each faculty member in an evaluation conference that concludes with the faculty member signing his/her Faculty Member Merit Evaluation Summary (Appendix C). The chair provides the faculty member with a copy of his/her Summary.
- v. Provide the Dean written merit evaluations (Appendix C), along with course portfolios, intellectual contributions, and other supporting documents for each faculty member in his/her department.
- vi. Attempt to resolve disputes over merit evaluations. If a faculty member wishes to appeal his/her merit evaluation, the faculty member must do so in writing to the chair within five (5) working days of receipt of Appendix C. The chair and faculty member are encouraged to resolve their differences over merit evaluations within this period. However, if the faculty member and chair cannot resolve the differences, the faculty

member's appeal is heard by the Department Merit Appeal Committee as expeditiously as possible.

- vi. Provide a written statement to each faculty member in the department identifying the range of merit scores in each of the three evaluation areas and the scores of each faculty member in each evaluation area, listed in descending order.

#### **G. Role of the Dean**

- i. In keeping with sound principles of academic management, standards and guidelines require that the Dean have jurisdiction or participating control over all College programs and faculty. Eastern Kentucky University's policy gives college deans the discretion to accept or reject faculty merit pay recommendations forwarded by department chairs.
- ii. In those instances where the Dean disagrees with a chair's recommendations, the Dean will provide a written explanation of the basis for that disagreement to the chair.

#### **H. The Appeal Process**

- i. Each department will elect a three member Appeal Committee by majority vote of departmental faculty. Only tenured faculty are eligible for service on this Committee.
- ii. Upon a written appeal by any faculty member the Appeal Committee will solicit oral and written arguments from those concerned, and will communicate recommendations concerning adjustments in merit ratings to the appellant, the department chair and the Dean.

#### **I. Merit Policy for Visiting Faculty**

Visiting faculty will also be evaluated using the criteria specified below.

#### **J. Merit Pay for Faculty with Reassignment Time**

**Sabbatical Leave** For purposes of merit pay evaluation during the sabbatical period, before taking sabbatical leave the faculty member must enter into a written agreement with the department chair as to objectives to be pursued while on leave. Normally this agreement would be approved by the College of Business and Technology Sabbatical Leave Committee. To be classified as satisfactory or above, the faculty member must accomplish these objectives.

**Sick Leave** Faculty members on sick leave will be subjected to the same merit pay evaluation criteria as other faculty members not on sick leave.

#### **Reassignment Time Other Than Sabbatical Leave**

Faculty are sometimes reassigned from instruction to enable concentration on specific duties such as research, administration, or service. At the discretion of the Dean or chair, reassignment may require a written agreement that delineates the purpose and objectives to be accomplished. To be classified as satisfactory or above, these objectives must be accomplished.

#### **K. Merit Consideration for Faculty with Terminal Contracts**

It is recognized that some tenure track faculty receive terminal contracts to serve one remaining year. A merit pay increase will not be granted for the terminal contract year.

#### **L. Distribution of Merit Funds**

Merit distributions for Business Faculty will originate from a single pool of funds common to both Business Departments. Prior to each evaluation year, the Dean will announce to the Business Faculty the distribution of the merit pool across the three areas of instruction, intellectual contributions and service. Appendix I illustrates the method for distributing merit funds.

Within the three meritorious rankings, it is recommended that "Meritorious: Mid Level" rankings receive twice that of "Low" rankings, and "High" rankings receive three times that of "Low."

#### **M. Systematic Review and Changes to Document**

This document may need to be altered due to changes in University policy or external requirements unforeseen by the faculty. Alterations may be requested by the Dean or through proposals by a single faculty member or committee. All changes are subject to majority vote by all business program tenured and tenure track faculty. The timing of the enactment of changes should be decided at the time of the vote. This document will, however, be entirely reviewed by the faculty at least once during any five-year period.

### **III. Merit Evaluation Performance Criteria**

#### **A. Performance Assessment of Instruction**

The following guidelines are to be used by Subject Peer Review Committee and Chairs to identify satisfactory and meritorious instruction.

- i. Subject Area Peer Review Committees for (1) Finance and Quantitative Methods, (2) Marketing, (3) Management, and (4) Administrative Communication will consist of all faculty in each respective subject area, except that those who are teaching in more than one of these areas will select the single committee on which he or she will serve. Five member committees will be elected for (5) Accounting and (6) Information Systems by their respective faculties.
- ii. To assess instruction, Subject Area Peer Review Committees shall review the following:
  - a. Course portfolios submitted by faculty.
  - b. A listing of new course developments (new for the individual faculty) or curricula.
  - c. The results of exit surveys of graduating students.

Each semester, the Business Programs (BBA, MBA, and Associate degrees) will survey a students just prior to graduation. This survey will be administered by the Dean's office, or the Dean's delegate. The students surveyed will consist of those who are expected by the College to receive their degrees at the end of the semester<sup>1</sup>. {The student survey instruments for both undergraduates and graduates are presented in Appendix D.}

- d. The results of a class visitation reviewed by members of the Peer Review Committee and Chair.

Each nontenured faculty member will have one class visited per semester by one (or two) members of the Peer Review Committee. Each tenured Assistant and Associate Professor will have one class visited per year. Each tenured Full Professor will have one class visited every other year. The courses to be visited will be suggested by the faculty member, but will be selected by the Committee. One member of the Committee will visit unless either the Committee or faculty member prefers two. The Chair has the discretion to visit or not. Once the course or courses are selected, the faculty will nominate three possible visitation dates, and the Committee and Chair will select one date from the three nominated.

- iii. Each faculty member with instructional responsibilities, including Chairs and Associate Dean, will participate in the peer review process. This process consists of a Peer Review Committee examination of course portfolios from every class taught during the evaluation year, a review of the student surveys, and a review of the results of class visitations. Summaries of these reviews, along with any other objective evidence submitted by the

---

<sup>1</sup>For Spring Semesters, students who are expected to graduate during the Summer will be included.



instructor, such as evidence of teaching awards, will be used by the Chair (or for Chair or Associate Dean evaluation, by the Dean) to establish the faculty member's instructional rating.

iv. To achieve rating of Satisfactory or above, the faculty member must be judged by the Peer Review Committee and Chair as having met the following performance criteria:

a. The faculty member must distribute syllabi by the second meeting, meet with classes regularly according to the College's schedule, and regularly hold two office hours per course per week.

b. The faculty member must distribute syllabi that clearly articulate the course objectives agreed upon by the College's Business Faculty for core courses, and agreed upon by the subject area's faculty for other multi section courses. The course objectives for other courses must be judged by the Peer Review Committee as appropriate.

c. Exams and student assignments must conform to the objectives referred to in b.

To achieve the rating of Meritorious : Low Level, the faculty member must meet the criteria for satisfactory, and the content of the faculty member's courses must be judged by the Chair and Peer Review Committee as being rigorous and well organized. Student assignments must also be clear, demanding and well organized.

To achieve the rating of Meritorious : Mid Level, the faculty member must meet the criteria for Meritorious : Low Level, and be judged by the Chair as having either borne significantly more responsibility for curricula delivery than the norm for that department, or have particularly distinguished themselves through the student survey, and class visitation review results.

To achieve the rating of Meritorious : Highest Level, the faculty member must satisfy the criteria for Meritorious : Mid Level, and have been selected by the University for an excellence in teaching award during the evaluation year, or during the previous two years. Alternatively, the faculty member may receive an excellence in teaching award from the CB&T Dean for that evaluation year.

## **B. Performance Criteria and Assessment for Intellectual Contribution**

The Dean of the College will rank journals and other business publication outlets into four categories ( A the most prestigious and D the least prestigious) in each subject area. To form these rankings, the Dean will consult published rankings, solicit rankings from other universities, and solicit the opinions of business faculty. All peer reviewed business related journals and other eligible outlets will be classified either before or after publication by faculty, i.e. a standing list will be maintained, but it will

be extended as faculty find new outlets. To be eligible, the contribution must meet the AACSB requirements of being peer reviewed and being generally "available for public scrutiny by academic peers or practitioners." (See AACSB Standards for Accreditation, page 29.) Besides peer reviewed business-related journals, contributions might possibly include business-related research monographs, scholarly books, proceedings from scholarly meetings, papers presented at academic meetings, contributions to the College's Working Paper Series, textbooks, published cases with instructional materials, instructional software, or published book reviews. All contributions, however, must meet the AACSB Standards for peer review.

i. Intellectual Contribution Categories

**Category A** includes those refereed journals recognized by the discipline as being of the highest prestige. The journals included in this category should be restricted to those that consistently publish the most important articles in that discipline. This category also includes texts and scholarly books published by significant publishing companies such as Dryden, Prentice Hall, and Irwin-McGraw-Hill, etc.

**Category B** includes peer reviewed journals that are somewhat less prestigious than Category A. This category also includes major revisions of significant texts.

**Category C** includes still less prestigious peer reviewed journals that typically publish follow-up quality articles and nationally recognized peer reviewed practitioner journals. A publication of a chapter in a significant text would also be included. Paper presentations at the top national level conferences are also included.

**Category D** includes paper presentations at nationally recognized regional conferences with accompanying proceedings publication or publication in the CB&T Business Working Paper Series. These conferences must be peer reviewed, and participating faculty must show evidence of peer review. This category also includes the lowest level of peer reviewed academic journals or academic/practitioner journals deemed acceptable by the Dean. It also includes peer reviewed book reviews published in academic journals and all other intellectual contributions that meet the AACSB peer review criteria.

ii. It is recommended that a faculty member's intellectual contribution effort be classified by the chair using the evaluation scale below. It is also recommended that Chairs use their discretion in rewarding faculty members with several contributions in any category, however, multiple D contributions, no matter the number, are not equivalent to a single Category A or B contribution.

iii. Evaluation Scale:

To achieve rating of Satisfactory or above, the faculty member must achieve one of the following:

- a. A Category A, B, or C contribution during the evaluation year or in the previous year.
- b. A Category D publication (proceedings, Working Paper Series or other contribution) during the evaluation year.

The A, B, C and D categories of contributions place faculty in one of the following depending upon the type.

Type "A" contributions are meritorious for two years at the Highest Level.

Type "B" contributions are meritorious for two years, one year at the Highest Level and one year at the Mid Level.

Type "C" contributions are meritorious for two years, one year at the Mid Level and one year at the Lowest Level.

Two type D contributions (one of which is a journal publication) is meritorious for two years, both at the Lowest Level. For this case, alternating a D journal publication one year with a second year of another type of D contribution, and then back to the journal publication and so on, will earn the Lowest Level for the second and subsequent years.

C. Performance Criteria and Assessment for Service

- i. Performance criteria include
  - a. Advising and mentoring
  - b. Service on program, Department, College, and University committees
  - c. Leadership of program, Department, College, and University committees
  - d. Noteworthy accomplishments on any of these committees
  - e. Active involvement in scholarly and/or practitioner or professional organizations
  - f. Leadership in professional organizations
  - g. Consultation with businesses
  - h. Service to the community and region (e.g., boards, civic groups, business groups)

ii. Merit Assessment and Evaluation Scale

It is recommended that a faculty member's service contribution be classified by the

chair using the evaluation scale below. A faculty member must first meet the satisfactory requirement in order to be considered for classification as "Meritorious" at any of the three merit levels -- Highest Level, Mid Level, Lowest Level.

**Satisfactory** To be classified as Satisfactory, the faculty member must have performed service outside the University of a professional nature within the evaluation year or the previous year, and diligently served on all assigned and elected committees (Department, College, University).

**Meritorious: Lowest Level** To be classified Meritorious: Lowest Level the faculty member must have met the Satisfactory criteria and contributed substantial time and effort to Department, College, and/or University committees. Alternately, the faculty member could meet the Satisfactory criteria and contribute substantial time and effort on important issues while serving the public, business, or academic community in a professional capacity. Examples of this include reviewing several papers for an academic journal or academic organization.

**Meritorious: Mid Level** To be classified Meritorious: Mid Level the faculty member must meet the Meritorious: Lowest Level criteria and show distinct leadership in Department, College, or University service. Alternately, the faculty member must show distinct leadership in professional service. Examples of leadership include serving as a track chair of a prestigious nationally recognized academic meeting; serving as an editor or on an editorial board of a journal that qualifies for an intellectual contribution; or serving as the chair of important University and College committee that addresses difficult, substantive, and time consuming tasks; or obtaining substantial external funding for the College. For all cases then, evidence of substantial effort must be provided.

**Meritorious: Highest Level** To be classified Meritorious: Highest Level the faculty member must show leadership in College, University, or professional service that is deemed well above that expected of COB&T faculty (AFIS and MMAC). Examples are being elected as an officer of a prestigious nationally recognized academic organization or President of the ECU Faculty Senate.

It is recognized that service and intellectual contributions may appear to overlap in a grey area where it is difficult to distinguish one from the other. In order to distinguish, consulting reports and other professional efforts that do not meet the AACSB requirements of peer review and of being generally available for public scrutiny, will be considered for service recognition, but not considered as intellectual contribution. Some examples of service efforts include writing book reviews for publishers ( as distinguished from publishing a book review in a peer-reviewed journal), writing professionally used software that does not otherwise meet the AACSB requirements for intellectual contributions, obtaining research grants,

publishing articles that do not meet the above mentioned AACSB requirements, presenting non-peer reviewed papers to professional meetings, serving as a discussant or moderator at academic meetings, serving as an editor or reviewer for a journal.

#### IV. Glossary of Terms

AFIS	College of Business and Technology, Department of Accounting, Finance, and Information Systems
Annual Self-Evaluation	Faculty member provides narrative and documentation for current merit-year achievements in instruction, intellectual contribution, and service.
College	College of Business and Technology
Course Portfolio	The faculty member assembles a course portfolio for all classes taught during a semester. The portfolio includes syllabi, examinations, grade distributions, examples of student work, etc.
Current Merit Year	Evaluation year begins 1/1/200x and ends 12/31/200x.
Department Appeal	Committee formed in each department (AFIS and MMAC) with three members elected by the Department's faculty.
Evaluation Areas	Instruction, Intellectual Contribution, Service.
Evaluation Scale	Meritorious Performance: Highest Level, Mid Level, Lowest Level Satisfactory Performance Unsatisfactory Performance <i>Note: In order to achieve merit, a faculty member must achieve a minimum of satisfactory in all evaluation areas and a meritorious in at least one area.</i>
Faculty Performance Plan	Developed by the faculty member with assistance of department chair; approved by faculty member's chair, updated as needed.
MMAC	College of Business and Technology, Department of Management, Marketing, and Administrative Communication
Merit Year (MY)	Also, evaluation year. Begins 1/1/200x and ends 12/31/200x; next Merit Year begins 1/1/200x+1.
Previous Merit Year	Also, previous evaluation year. If the current evaluation year is 2001, the previous year is 2000.
Previous Two Years	If the current merit evaluation year is 2002, then the previous two years are merit years 2001 and 2000.
Subject Area Peer Review Committee	Committee of faculty from each subject area for peer review of instruction.

Appendix A

Faculty Member Merit Self-Evaluation Form

Faculty Member: \_\_\_\_\_ Department: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Merit Period from \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_

*The faculty member must provide his/her department chair with a narrative statement and appropriate documentation for each of the three evaluation areas. This form identifies the key points to be addressed.*

**Instruction**

Evidence of merit in instruction includes the following materials. Some materials may be in Course Portfolios and should be so noted.

- a. Evidence of sound course design and implementation. This evidence will include syllabi, exams, and student assignments.
- b. Narrative explanations of any innovative or creative methods of instruction.
- c. Listing of classes instructed and copies of grade distributions for each class.
- d. Explanations of new courses instructed and curricula developed.
- e. Other information that demonstrates meritorious performance in instruction.

**Intellectual Contribution**

Evidence of intellectual productivity in Categories A through D; for example, copies of published papers.

**Service**

For all cases of external service, evidence should be presented of the effort involved. For example, service on a conference program committee should be documented by copies of papers reviewed, a review of the sessions organized, as well as a copy of the program - listing of the committee members. Paper reviews for journals should be accompanied by a copy of the paper, the review, and the letter from the editor requesting the review.

For internal service (department, college, and university) the faculty member should submit a brief narrative statement of the issues dealt with, the task completed and his/her personal contribution.

**Appendix C**

**Faculty Member Merit Evaluation Summary**

Faculty Member: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_ Rank: \_\_\_\_\_

Years of Service at ECU: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation Period: \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_

*This summary is to be completed by the department chair, discussed with the faculty member, signed by the chair and faculty member, and filed in the faculty member's personnel file with copies to the faculty member and COB Dean.*

**A. Instruction**

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meritorious Highest Level	Meritorious Mid Level	Meritorious Lowest Level	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory

Comments:

**B. Intellectual Contribution**

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meritorious Highest Level	Meritorious Mid Level	Meritorious Lowest Level	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory

Comments:

**C. Service**

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meritorious Highest Level	Meritorious Mid Level	Meritorious Lowest Level	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory

Comments:

Signature of Faculty Member: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

*(Signature denotes receipt of evaluation)*

Signature of Department Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_