

Department of Molecular Biosciences Annual Faculty Review and Teaching Load Assignments (2016-17)

This document describes the process to be used for annual reviews and teaching load assignment for 2016-17. The election and composition of the committee is described in the MBS Governance Document.

Annual Review Process.

At the initial meeting of the Workload Committee for the academic year a Chair of the committee will be chosen by members of the full committee. A preliminary set of reviews of a representative subset of faculty members will be performed by all committee members, to be followed by a meeting to compare and discuss scores. The aim of this is to set standards and calibrate scores to achieve consistency.

Each faculty member to be reviewed will be assigned to three committee members. The Chair of the Workload Committee will arrange the assignments. The Faculty Annual Reviews (FARs) will be the primary source of information for evaluation, and it is therefore crucial that all information that a faculty member wishes to be considered in the evaluation be contained within the FAR. The FARs for the prior year will also be available to reviewers.

Scoring: Three scores will be given - for research, teaching, and service. Scores will be on a 1 to 5 scale, with 5 being the best. Scores for each faculty member will be collected by the Workload Committee chair and distributed to the committee before the final scoring meeting. Special attention will be given to cases where scores in any of the three categories differ by more than 1 point. In these cases, scores will be discussed to understand the reasons for the differences, with the option of reviewers adjusting their scores. Scores for all other faculty are open for discussion by the full committee, if any member of the committee, or the MBS Chair, so requests.

Assistant professors will be reviewed in a way consistent with their rank and year. For example, Assistant Professors are not expected to do any substantial committee work and typically do not teach in the first year. Assistant Professors will be reviewed as a separate group, after all Associate and Full Professors have been evaluated by the committee.

An overall score will be determined by weighting the category scores as follows:
For faculty with current 1/0 teaching load: 50% R, 30% T, 20% S
For faculty with current 1/1 teaching load: 40% R, 40% T, 20% S
For faculty with current 2/1, 2/2 or 3/2 teaching load: 30% R, 50% T, 20% S
Faculty w/o teaching assignment (e.g., ICMB Director, MBS Chair): 50% R, 50% S

The Department Chair will be present during the Workload Committee review process but will not vote or review. Workload Committee members and the Chair will leave the room while their own file is reviewed.

Research will be scored based on:

· Funding to support a high-quality research program (discipline-specific situations will be considered; e.g., faculty in fields more commonly supported by NSF may not be expected to have the same level of support as NIH-supported investigators).

- Publications - number, quality/impact of journals
- Undergraduate/Graduate Student/Postdoc training; contributions to increasing diversity of trainees will be considered
- Awards and recognition
- Longer-term record of research support and productivity will be considered to account for potential temporary lapses in funding or productivity
- Some general guidelines for scores are:
 - 5 - outstanding grant support and scholarship
 - 4 - two grants, multiple pubs, or one grant and very strong pubs
 - 3 - major grant, at least one publication
 - 2 - some non-federal grant support
 - 1 - no research support; a publication may or may not raise the score depending on contribution

Teaching will be scored based on:

- Amount. Overload = bonus
- Quality; based on CIS student evaluations and faculty peer reviews of teaching
- Teaching awards
- Efforts to incorporate innovative teaching methods
- Some general guidelines for scores are:
 - 5 - strong CIS scores and peer teaching evaluations, perhaps a teaching award
 - 4 - very good CIS scores and peer teaching evaluations
 - 3 - starting point for everyone; average to good CIS scores
 - 2 - below average CIS scores or peer teaching evaluations
 - 1 - weak teaching, poor CIS scores or peer teaching evaluations

Service scores: Major categories of service are service to the Department, the College, the University, and Graduate Programs; Study sections, scientific meeting organization, journal editor, reviewer, service to national organizations (e.g., ASM, ASBMB), etc. There should be some UT-related service (Department, College, or University level) for highest scores.

- Some general guidelines for scores are:
 - 5 - major responsibility and unusual service (reserved for Dean, Chair, and exceptional levels of service in multiple areas)
 - 3 - usual service (e.g., departmental committees, UT committee service, undergraduate or graduate advisor)
 - 1 - no service for UT and no major external service and no major departmental or graduate program responsibilities

“Expectation Categorization”

The Workload Committee must also categorize every faculty with respect to whether they are exceeding expectations, meeting expectation, not meeting expectations, or are performing unsatisfactorily. The Committee will rank order the average scores from above and categorization will be based on overall average scores as follows:

Exceeds Expectations: Scores ≥ 4

Meets Expectations: Scores ≥ 2.5 and < 4

Does Not Meet Expectations: Scores < 2.5

Unsatisfactory: This will only be assigned in exceptional cases after failure to address serious deficiencies or neglect of duties; it will not be assigned based on a score from a single year.

A designation of "Unsatisfactory" may be made if it is found that a faculty member has failed to meet expectations in a way that reflects disregard of previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or involves professional misconduct or dereliction of duty. An overall rating of "Below expectation" or "Unsatisfactory" must be accompanied by detailed, written explanation of the basis of the committee's decision.

If the overall Workload designation is "Exceeds Expectation", a reduction of workload in one or more areas may be recommended to the Department Chair. Course reduction may also be recommended based on the type of courses taught or service to the Department or the University. Department Chairs and Associate Chair will merit a one course reduction in teaching load. In rare cases, other substantial administrative or service duties could result in a one course reduction.

Teaching Workload Recommendations

The Workload Committee will also make recommendations, to be approved by the Chair, for teaching workload for individual faculty. This will be based on the level of research activity only, as determined by the Workload Committee, as follows:

Highly research active faculty will teach 1:0 (i.e.. one long semester with a teaching assignment, one long semester without)

Typically, faculty in this category will have major external grant funding, multiple publications in first-rank journals, and presentations of work at external seminars or national or international meetings during the 3 year period. For this and other categories, the committee will take into account that each field has different norms, so varying combinations of research contributions will be considered.

Moderately research active faculty will teach 1:1

Typically, faculty in this category will have minor external grant funding, publications, and presentation of work at a national or international meeting during the 3 year period.

Minimally research active faculty will teach 1:2 or 2:2

Faculty with research publications but no external funding are in this category.

Faculty with no research activity will teach 3:2

Faculty without research publications or a source of funding or an assigned research space are in this category (research-inactive).

With the approval of the chair, a faculty member may buy out of a course by moving salary onto grant or endowment funds. The cost for a 1-course reduction is 25% of the academic rate. Chair's Fellowships or other buyouts funded by departmental resources can reduce the teaching load by one course. Such buyouts can be used to reduce teaching load, but cannot eliminate all teaching activities (i.e. a faculty member in the research category 1 cannot use a buyout to go to a 0:0 teaching load).

Distribution of Results

Each faculty member will receive his/her individual category scores, overall score, expectation rating, and teaching load recommendation for the following academic year.

Use of Results for Merit Raises

The Department Chair will convene a meeting of the MBS Advisory Committee, which will use the Annual Review scores for determination of merit raises. Merit raises will be based on "percentage raise". The overriding goal is to award merit, however it is also acceptable to use the merit raise pool for correction of salary inequities. No faculty member will receive a higher percentage raise than any faculty member with a higher overall average score without an explicit indication that this is to correct for a salary inequity. The Budget Council will vote on approval of the merit raise recommendations. The final merit raise recommendations to the Dean will be available for review by all faculty.