

Merit Rating Criteria for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty
Department of Mathematics
February 8, 2018

The numerical rating for each faculty member will be based on a weighted average of numerical ratings for research, teaching, and service. The numerical rating will be in the range of 1 to 5, with 1 being the highest score, and will reflect the performance of the faculty member during the review period (i.e. a given calendar year). Faculty members with “expected” performance in research, teaching, and service will typically be in the third group “good performance”, see the description of the ratings below.

1. Extraordinary Performance

Faculty in this category are performing at or near the top of their field in mathematics in a given year and they also meet several of the following criteria: an above-average production of papers typical in their field or a major research monograph, major funding from external sources, major publications in top journals, a large number of external talks or several significant invited conference lectures, a major national/international research-based award, a larger than average number of graduate students under supervision or co-supervision, mentoring of postdocs or junior faculty, innovative or extraordinary teaching (e.g., supervision of honors thesis), a major service to the profession (e.g., managing editor of a journal) and the department (e.g., lead-PI for an educational grant, vice chair, DGS, DUS), or the university (e.g., major responsibilities in the Faculty Senate or Faculty Council).

2. Strong Performance

In addition to an active research program, placement in this category reflects: strong external grant support, awards/prizes for accomplishment in research, publications in high quality journals, publication of a book or conference proceedings, high professional visibility (plenary/main invited talks at major conferences, colloquia at highly ranked universities), supervision of graduate students and postdocs, excellent teaching, excellent service to the profession (e.g., journal editor) and the department or the university.

3. Good Performance

This category encompasses those who demonstrate good performance as evidenced by a combination of the following: internal or external grant support or active pursuit of funding opportunities (submission of proposals), publication of at least one article in a good quality journal, professional visibility as indicated by several invited or contributed talks, involvement in mentoring of graduate students and/or postdocs, strong teaching record, and strong service to the profession and the department or the university.

4. Acceptable Performance

Placement in this category is for those who make positive contributions in the areas of research, teaching, and service to the department and profession. Although active in research, these faculty members are not funded by a research grant and they have not applied for funding in a given year. However, they publish papers, mentor students and/or postdocs, and give research talks at professional meetings and seminars/colloquia.

5. Fair Performance

This category includes those without notable achievements in research, teaching or service. Faculty in this area have not published in recent years, have not mentored graduate students or postdocs, they lack external support and are not actively applying for it, and have not presented research talks.

Main Categories of Evaluation

Research:
Quality and quantity of publications (journal articles, monographs, proceedings)
Research Funding (total amount of current grants, submitted proposals)
Supervision or co-supervision of graduate students, Reading courses, Independent research projects, Dissertation committees, etc.
Mentoring of postdocs and junior faculty
Research-based honors and awards
Visibility (contributed and invited talks at conferences, seminars, colloquia, etc.)
Teaching:
Classroom teaching evaluation scores and student comments
Curriculum development, Course design, etc.
Undergraduate/major advising
Number of supervised undergraduate research projects, Independent studies, Honors theses, REUs, Reading courses, etc.
Teaching awards
Service:
Service to the department (committee work, committee chair, major service such as DUS, DGS, SACS, involvement in faculty hiring, help with interviews of candidates, etc.)
Service to Vanderbilt (committee work, such as the PTRC, significant contributions at the College level, or the leadership of important programs or centers within Vanderbilt)
Organization or co-organization of professional meetings, conferences, seminars, special sessions, submission of proposals for external conference funding
Journal editorship, other major contributions to profession
Refereeing of journal papers, Participation in NSF review panels, etc.
Involvement in major funding proposals for department
Service-related awards

Remarks

- 1) Publications are counted in the year when accepted. Prizes and awards are counted in the years when announced.
- 2) The evaluation of research productivity is based, among other things, on the number of published papers and on the quality of journals where they appear. The evaluation is designed to reflect the work the faculty member has done during the review period, even if no new publication has been accepted or submitted in a given year. In this case, a reference point for the evaluation

will be projects described in the TRS report under “work in preparation”. However, a submitted paper or work in preparation will receive lower rating than published or accepted peer-reviewed work.

3) A faculty member will receive higher teaching rating if he/she receives above-average teaching evaluations, if there are significant contributions to curriculum development and non-classroom teaching activities, such as directed study or reading courses for undergraduates, and supervision of undergraduate research projects. Lower ratings will be given to faculty with lower than average teaching evaluation scores and significant (in view of the chair) student complaints about the quality of teaching. Adjustments for hard-to-teach courses will be made.

4) The number of students taught will be taken into account and reflected in the numerical rating corresponding to teaching.

5) Concerning the service component of the rating, the following activities will be also highly valued: (a) Undertaking special service projects within the department, (b) Major national leadership activities, (c) Major outreach activities, such as the publication of a popular book or several popular articles, significant public lecture activities, and (d) Assistance with random emergencies in the department, e.g., agreeing to teach an overload in case of a sudden need.

Final Numerical Ratings

The final numerical rating for a faculty member will be obtained as a weighted average of the ratings for research, teaching, and service. The weights will depend on the seniority of the faculty member. In particular, the weights are given in the following table:

	Research	Teaching	Service
Tenured faculty	55%	25%	20%
Tenure-track faculty	65%	25%	10%

The weighted averages will be subsequently quantized/adjusted to arrive at an integer in interval [1, 5]. The decision to round these averages up or down will be decided by a number of criteria. For example, winning a major prize in research will trump all or most criteria listed above. Other factors influencing the final adjustments will include the seniority of the faculty, his/her pay rate, and teaching load in a given year. In general, faculty members with lower teaching loads or those who have had a sabbatical leave in a given year will be expected to be more productive in research than the faculty with the standard or higher load. Other adjustments will be made as appropriate. For example, junior faculty will not be penalized for not having graduate students.

Merit Rating Criteria for Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Principal Senior Lecturers
Department of Mathematics
January 11, 2019

The numerical rating for each faculty member will be based on a weighted average of numerical ratings for teaching and service. The numerical rating will be in the range of 1 to 5, with 1 being the highest score, and will reflect the performance of the faculty member during the review period (i.e. a given calendar year). Faculty members with “expected” performance in teaching and service will typically be in the third group “good performance”, see the description of the ratings below.

1. Extraordinary Performance

This category normally includes faculty members whose contributions to the department include several of the following: exemplary teaching (e.g., as evidenced by student teaching evaluations), innovative teaching (e.g., new courses, supervision of senior thesis), teaching awards, extraordinary commitment to students (e.g., as evidenced by undergraduate advising, independent studies, etc.), and extraordinary service to the department, the university, or the profession. Contributions to research (e.g., publications, invited talks) would be included here, but are not required.

2. Strong Performance

Placement in this category reflects excellent performance in teaching and service as evidenced by several of the following: excellent teaching (e.g., as evidenced by student teaching evaluations), strong commitment to students, excellent service to the department, the university, or the profession. Contributions to research would be included here, but are not required.

3. Good Performance

This category encompasses those who demonstrate good performance as evidenced by a combination of the following: strong teaching (e.g., as evidenced by student teaching evaluations), good service to the department, the university, or the profession.

4. Acceptable Performance

Placement in this category is for those who make some positive contributions in the area of teaching and service.

5. Fair Performance

This category includes those faculty members who have reasonably fulfilled their assigned duties, but who rarely contribute to teaching or service in the department beyond those assignments.

Main Categories of Evaluation

Teaching:
Classroom teaching evaluation scores and student comments
Curriculum development, Course design, etc.
Undergraduate/major advising
Number of supervised undergraduate research projects, Independent studies, Honors theses, REUs, Reading courses, etc.
Teaching awards
Service:
Service to the department (committee work, committee chair, major service such as DUS, SACS, involvement in faculty hiring, help with interviews of candidates, etc.)
Service to Vanderbilt (committee work, significant contributions at the College level, or the leadership of important programs or centers within Vanderbilt)
Organization or co-organization of professional meetings, conferences, seminars, special sessions
Outreach activities
Involvement in major funding proposals for department
Service-related awards

Remarks

- 1) Prizes/awards/publications are counted in the years when announced/accepted.
- 2) A faculty member will receive higher teaching rating if he/she receives above-average teaching evaluations, if there are significant contributions to curriculum development and non-classroom teaching activities, such as directed study or reading courses for undergraduates. Lower ratings will be given to faculty with lower than average teaching evaluation scores and significant (in view of the chair) student complaints about the quality of teaching. Adjustments will be made for hard-to-teach courses and extraordinary student comments (positive or negative).
- 3) The number of students taught will be taken into account and reflected in the numerical rating corresponding to teaching.
- 4) Concerning the service component of the rating, the following activities will be also highly valued: (a) Undertaking special service projects within the department, (b) Major national leadership activities, (c) Major outreach activities, such as the publication of a popular book or several popular articles, significant public lecture activities, and (d) Assistance with random emergencies in the department, e.g., agreeing to teach an overload in case of a sudden need.

Final Numerical Ratings

The final numerical rating for a faculty member will be obtained as a weighted average of the ratings for teaching and service. The weights will depend on the seniority of the faculty member and are given in the following table:

	Teaching	Service
Lecturers	100%	0%
Senior Lecturers	90%	10%
Principal Senior Lecturers	80%	20%

The weighted averages will be subsequently quantized/adjusted to arrive at an integer in interval [1, 5]. The decision to round these averages up or down will be decided by a number of criteria. Factors influencing the final adjustments will include the seniority of the faculty, his/her pay rate, and teaching load in a given year. Other adjustments will be made as deemed appropriate by the chair.

Merit Rating Criteria for Postdoctoral Scholars
Department of Mathematics
January 11, 2019

The numerical rating for each postdoc will be based on a weighted average of numerical ratings for research and teaching. The numerical rating will be in the range of 1 to 5, with 1 being the highest score, and will reflect the performance of the postdoc during the review period (i.e. a given calendar year). Postdocs with “expected” performance in research and teaching will typically be in the third group “good performance”, see the description of the ratings below.

1. Extraordinary Performance

This category normally includes those whose achievements include several of the following: external research grant support (e.g., individual 3-year NSF/NSA grants), active pursuit of external grant opportunities (including submission of proposals), awards/prizes, publications in top journals, research monograph, extraordinary professional visibility (e.g., several plenary/invited talks at major conferences), innovative or extraordinary teaching (e.g., as evidenced by student teaching evaluations). Excellent service to the profession (e.g., organization of workshops or conferences), the department (e.g., organization of departmental seminars), or the university could be included here, but is not required.

2. Strong Performance

Placement in this category reflects excellent performance in research, teaching and service as evidenced by several of the following: external grant support (typically for research), actively pursuing internal or external grant opportunities (including submission of proposals), awards/prizes, publications in high quality journals, publication of a book or conference proceedings, strong professional visibility (e.g., plenary/invited talks at major conferences or major universities), excellent teaching (e.g., as evidenced by student teaching evaluations). Strong service to the profession, the department or the university could be included here, but is not required.

3. Good Performance

This category encompasses those who demonstrate good performance as evidenced by several of the following: internal or external grant support (including conference grants), actively pursuing external grant opportunities (including submission of proposals), publication of at least one article in a good quality journal, professional visibility as indicated by invited talks, strong teaching record (e.g., as evidenced by student teaching evaluations). Service to the profession, the department or the university could be included here, but is not required.

4. Acceptable Performance

Placement in this category is for those who make some positive contributions in the area of research and teaching.

5. Fair Performance

This category includes those without notable achievements in research and teaching but who fulfill their assigned duties capably.

Main Categories of Evaluation

Research:
Quality and quantity of publications (journal articles, monographs, proceedings)
Research Funding (total amount of current grants, submitted proposals)
Research-based honors and awards
Visibility (contributed and invited talks at conferences, seminars, colloquia, etc.)
Other research-related activities
Teaching:
Classroom teaching observations, evaluation scores, and student comments
Independent studies for students, reading courses, etc.
Teaching awards

Remarks

- 1) Publications are counted in the year when accepted. Prizes and awards are counted in the year when announced.
- 2) The evaluation of research productivity is based, among other things, on the number of published papers and on the quality of journals where they appear. The evaluation is designed to reflect the work the postdoc has done during the review period, even if no new publication has been accepted or submitted in a given year. In this case, a reference point for the evaluation will be projects described in the TRS report under "work in preparation". However, a submitted paper or work in preparation will receive lower rating than published or accepted peer-reviewed work.
- 3) A postdoc will receive higher teaching rating if he/she receives above-average teaching evaluations. Lower ratings will be given to postdocs with lower than average teaching evaluation scores and significant (in view of the chair) student complaints about the quality of teaching. Adjustments for hard-to-teach courses will be made.
- 4) The number of students taught will be taken into account and reflected in the numerical rating corresponding to teaching.

Final Numerical Ratings

The final numerical rating for a postdoc will be obtained as a weighted average of the ratings for research and teaching. The weights are given in the following table:

	Research	Teaching
Postdocs	75%	25%

The weighted averages will be subsequently quantized/adjusted to arrive at an integer in interval [1, 5]. The decision to round these averages up or down will be decided by a number of criteria. For example, winning a major prize in research will trump all or most criteria listed above. Other factors influencing the final adjustments will include teaching load in a given year. In general,

postdocs with lower teaching loads in a given year will be expected to be more productive in research. Other adjustments will be made as deemed appropriate by the chair.