

## **Annual Faculty Performance Reviews and Merit Raise Policy Department of Chemistry**

24 October, 2015

### **Mission Statement**

The Department of Chemistry seeks to be a self-sustaining center of excellence with a community of world-class scholars, scientists, teachers, and students who are supported by stable funding and state-of-the-art facilities. The department will be broadly recognized as one of the preeminent academic centers for research and education in chemistry in the country – a department where the opportunity for scientific discovery and education is limited only by the creativity and imagination of its faculty and students. The department will serve the state and the nation by mentoring and training undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate students in the chemical and sciences so they may pursue independent careers either in the sciences or other areas and so they may make informed decisions on scientific matters that relate to public policy. We will work toward transitioning the many benefits of our research to the public sector and communicating effectively the astounding advances in chemistry that are changing the daily lives of the citizens of Texas and the world.

### **Performance, Workload, and Merit Raise Review**

In the context of achieving our departmental mission, faculty will be evaluated annually for their performance in research (measured by scholarly publications and invited lectures), external support, teaching (measured by peer and student evaluations, course development activities, etc.), and local, national, and international service. Faculty will be classified as "research active", "research minimally-active", and "research inactive" (see Addendum for definition of terms). A committee, which shall be known as the Faculty Workload and Performance Committee (FWPC), comprising four full professors appointed by the Chair, will evaluate the research, teaching and service of all tenured and tenure-track faculty on the basis of the required Annual Reports, departmental supplemental information, and any other documentation that faculty may wish to provide. The committee will complete a summary of performance (see template attached) for each faculty member. The FWPC will also recommend priorities for salary increases based upon merit.

The summary evaluation page will be submitted to the Chair, who will approve or disagree with the evaluation of the committee. The Chair may meet with the committee to determine whether differences can be resolved. If the Chair disagrees with any aspect of the FWPC evaluation, s/he can recommend a different evaluation but the evaluation of both the FWPC and the Chair must be forwarded to the Dean of the College.

The Chair will provide each faculty member with the written evaluation of the FWPC (and the Chair's evaluation, if different). The faculty member may contest the evaluation, but this protest must be filed in writing to the Chair within thirty days of receipt. The burden of proof is on the faculty member to show that the evaluation (and recommendation for remediation, if any) is unwarranted *based upon the material that was available to the committee at the time of the evaluation*. This latter point underscores that it is solely the responsibility of faculty to provide accurate and complete annual reports; *failure to do so is not an acceptable basis for contesting the findings of the committee*. Faculty who fail to provide annual reports by the due date are subject to poor evaluations, increased duties, and below average raises.

The summary evaluation of the committee, and the Chair's recommendation if different, will become a part of the active Departmental file for each faculty member. Together with

Annual Reports, the FWPC evaluations will be made available to the Budget Council for its consideration in determining annual merit raises.

Performance will be evaluated in the following categories:

- Publications & Presentations
- External Support
- Teaching
- Service

These categories will be evaluated on a scale of "Exceeds Expectations", "Meets Expectations", "Does Not Meet Expectations", and "Unsatisfactory". The general definitions for each come from the Provost's Office:

1. Exceeds expectations – a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for the institution, discipline, or unit.
2. Meets expectations – normally expected level of accomplishment.
3. Does not meet expectations – a failure beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance, but of a character that appears to be subject to correction.
4. Unsatisfactory – failing to meet expectations in a way that reflects disregard of previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or involves prima facie professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or incompetence.

An "Overall Rating" will also be provided on the basis of the four individual categories listed above and after discussion by the committee.

A rigorous and internationally visible research program that is supported by external funding and trains graduate students and postdoctoral fellows is expected. The Department appreciates the diversity of disciplines in chemistry and the numerical measures below are therefore provided only as guidelines.

### **Criteria for "Meets Expectations" for Research Active Faculty**

*Teaching:* Two organized courses/year and adequate CIS rating for the instructor (>3.5 is typical). It is desirable that one of these be an undergraduate course. See addendum for criteria for research minimally-active and research inactive faculty.

*Research:* Graduate students and/or postdoctoral fellows supported by external funding are expected. Three research-active undergraduates, supported at least during the summer by external funding, are equivalent to one graduate student. At least one active federal or other nationally competitive grant or contract. Evidence of productivity (*i.e.*, an active publication record as corresponding author in peer-reviewed journals, grant submissions, invited lectures, etc.). See addendum for criteria for research minimally-active and research inactive faculty.

*Service:* Advising, non-supervisory member of candidacy and final oral committees; one active departmental, college, or university committee. National or international service, such as editing a major journal or serving as chair of a national society committee, or organizing significant scientific meetings or symposia. See addendum for criteria for research minimally-active and research inactive faculty.

=====

*Note 1:* Chair holders or others who "buy out" of teaching shall be expected to teach one organized course/year, preferably an undergraduate class.

*Note 2:* ICMB fellows meeting above research and service criteria shall be expected to teach one organized course/year.

*Note 3:* An overall rating of "meets expectations" is possible if "below expectations" ratings are balanced by "exceeds expectations" in other categories.

### **Criteria for "Exceeds Expectations" for Research Active Faculty**

The following situations are examples that may result in a rating of "exceeds expectations" for each respective category. A rating of "exceeds expectations" in two or more individual categories may lead to an overall rating of "exceeds expectations".

*Teaching:* Teaching one or more organized courses beyond the normal expectation, developing a new course, successfully securing external funding for teaching-related activities, teaching a signature course, significantly above average teaching evaluations, or teaching awards.

*Research:* More than 10 peer-reviewed research publications in credible journals (including 2-3 articles in journals having impact factors > 9), two or more federal grants, awards, and significant plenary or keynote lectures.

*Service:* Member of the departmental P&T or FWPC committees, member of the College P&T committee, chair of other significant university or national committees, editor of a significant journal, or organizing significant scientific meetings or symposium.

The FWPC evaluations (and those of the Chair, if different) may be appealed to the Dean. This must be done in writing and within a 30 day period, as noted above.

In the case of unsatisfactory evaluations, the following procedure will be followed:

- Research active faculty with an overall workload rating of "below expectations" in two successive years are expected to teach an additional course (2/1 or 1/2).
- Research minimally-active faculty with an overall workload rating of "below expectations" in two successive years are expected to teach an additional course (2/2).
- At the discretion of the Department Chair, and upon recommendation of the FWPC, two successive years of an overall "below expectations" rating for research inactive faculty may result in a 3/2 or 2/3 teaching load.
- Regardless of teaching load, faculty who receive an overall rating of "meets expectations" will not have their load raised.

Faculty who consistently “exceed expectations” in service and research will, at the discretion of the Chair, be eligible for one semester of teaching relief. However, those who have been provided with teaching relief within the past two years will not be considered.

### **Remediation**

A “research minimally-active” faculty member who obtains a federal grant and shows evidence of productivity will be eligible for 1/1 teaching provided he/she meets expectations in all categories for two consecutive years. A “research inactive” faculty member who obtains a federal grant or shows evidence of productivity (publications/presentations) will be eligible for 2/1 teaching provided he/she meets expectations in all four categories for two consecutive years.

### **Work plan**

In some cases it will be clear that a faculty member will not be able to achieve a rating of "meet expectations" in one or more categories. Based on historical precedent, it is most likely that this failure to meet expectations will be in the areas of Publications & Presentations or External Support. In this case, the faculty member and the Chair may agree upon a specific plan to maintain the faculty member at an overall level of "meets expectations". This will likely involve additional teaching as well as substantial service. In this case, the work plan agreed to by the Chair and faculty member will be formalized in writing, signed by the Chair and faculty member, and forwarded to the FWPC. It will be incumbent upon the faculty member to provide detailed information (appended to the annual report) supporting his/her successful attainment of the metrics detailed in the agreed upon work plan.

## **Addendum to FWPC**

### **Requirements for research active faculty to *meet* workload expectations**

Publications and presentations	evidence of productivity per FWPC document
External Support	one federal grant
Teaching	1/1
Service	Per FWPC document

### **Requirements for research minimally-active faculty to *meet* workload expectations**

Publications and presentations	evidence of productivity per FWPC document
External Support	no federal grant
Teaching	2/1
Service	Per FWPC document, including attendance at Fall <i>and</i> Spring Commencement exercises <i>plus</i> other significant service activities that contribute in a meaningful way to help the department fulfill its strategic mission.

### **Requirements for research inactive faculty to *meet* workload expectations**

Publications and presentations	no evidence of productivity per FWPC document
External Support	no federal grant
Teaching	2/2
Service	Per FWPC document, including attendance at Fall <i>and</i> Spring Commencement exercises <i>plus</i> other significant service activities that contribute in a meaningful way to help the department fulfill its strategic mission.

## Faculty Performance Evaluation

Faculty Name: \_\_\_\_\_

	<b>Exceeds Expectations</b>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	<b>Does Not Meet Expectations</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
<b>Publications &amp; Presentations</b>				
<b>External support</b>				
<b>Teaching</b>				
<b>Service</b>				

Based upon your evaluation above, please make recommendations on Workload and Merit Raise. If the Performance is "Below Expectations" a modification of work load allocation involving an increase in research, teaching and/or service is justified; if "Exceeds Expectations", a reduction of work load in one or more areas (*e.g.*, some form of teaching relief and/or fewer committee assignments) is justified.

	<b>Exceeds Expectations</b>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	<b>Does Not Meet Expectations</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
<b>Overall Rating</b>				

**Summary Recommendation and Comments.**