

Department of Molecular Biosciences Annual Faculty Review and Teaching Load Assignments (2026-2027)

This document describes the process to be used for annual reviews and teaching load assignments beginning with 2026-2027. The election and composition of the Workload Committee is described in the MBS Governance Document.

Annual Review Process

Prior to the first Workload Committee meeting for the academic year, a Chair of the committee will be appointed by the Department Chair. The Workload Committee should include at least one teaching-intensive faculty member, either elected or appointed by the Department Chair. Should the Committee Chair deem it necessary, 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.

Each faculty member to be reviewed will be reviewed by four committee members. The Chair of the Workload Committee will assign faculty files to three committee members. Additionally, the Chair of the committee will review and score the files of all faculty members to add consistency to scoring. The MBS Faculty Annual Reviews (MBS FARs) will be the 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 recorded—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 Faculty Affairs Coordinator and distributed to the committee before the final scoring meeting. Committee members will not be allowed to see their own scores. During the final scoring meeting, the record of every faculty member will be discussed, with special attention given to cases where scores in any of the three categories differ by more than 1 point. All committee members can participate in the discussion of each faculty member, but only assigned reviewers provide scores. After discussion, the committee members who evaluated the faculty member will have the option to adjust their scores (this can be done publicly or privately to the Faculty Affairs Coordinator). Final scores will be the average of the four scores (Workload Chair and three Reviewers).

Faculty rankings by score will be used in two ways: (1) to inform the Department Chair regarding merit raises; (2) to serve as a starting point for the Department Chair in assigning ratings of Exceeds, Meets, or Does Not Meet Expectations. Scores will be kept confidential and will not be communicated outside of the department.

In addition to the scores and ratings, the Workload Committee will provide brief commentaries about the basis for the assignment of particular scores. The Department Chair can use these commentaries to inform their decision-making process regarding the assignment of rankings and raises.

The Workload Committee will provide suggestions to the Chair for communications to faculty whose scores are close to or below the minimum score for meeting expectations, on how to increase their contributions to the Department and the University.

Assistant Professors will be reviewed in a way consistent with their rank and year. For example,

Assistant Professors are not expected to do substantial committee work and typically do not teach in the first year. Assistant Professors will be reviewed together as a group after the discussion and review of Associate and Full Professors.

All MBS faculty, except those who do not teach formal classes and those who are classified as teaching-intensive (teaching 2:2 or 3:2), will be assigned a final numerical score by the Workload Committee using the same quantitative method: 50% Research / 30% Teaching / 20% Service. This final score will be used by the Department Chair to assign ratings of Exceeds, Meets, or Does Not Meet Expectations.

Faculty members who do not teach formal classes or are classified as teaching-intensive (teaching 2:2 or 3:2) will be given numerical scores in each category and will be evaluated holistically to assign ratings of Exceeds, Meets, or Does Not Meet Expectations. Additional details are provided below.

The Department Chair and the Associate Chair for Undergraduate Education will attend Workload Committee meetings for information purposes but will neither vote nor review. Workload Committee members and the Department Chair will leave the room while their own files are 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. All faculty are strongly recommended to have a Google Scholar page and list it on their FAR to aid the committee in assessing publications.
- Mentoring of undergraduates, Graduate Students and Postdocs
- Awards and recognition
- Some general guidelines for scores are:
 - 5 – Outstanding grant support and scholarship
 - 4 – Multiple grants and external support, multiple pubs, or one grant and a very strong publication record
 - 3 – Lead PI on a major grant, adequate publication record
 - 2 – Some external, non-federal grant support (co-PI or subcontractor on a grant)
 - 1 – No research support; publication record may or may not raise the score depending on contribution

Teaching will be scored based on:

- Amount. Overload = bonus. Score increase will depend on the particular contribution.
- Quality; based on CES student evaluations, faculty peer reviews of teaching, grade distributions/inflation
- Class size and format. Scores can be boosted for teaching large classes
- Teaching awards
- Efforts to incorporate innovative teaching methods
- Some general guidelines and considerations for scores are:
 - 5 - Outstanding CES scores and peer teaching evaluations; undertook extra teaching; received a teaching award

- 4 - Very good CES scores and peer teaching evaluations, assisted in extra teaching; perhaps a teaching award
- 3 - Undertook assigned teaching; good CES scores: this is the starting point for everyone
- 2 - Below average CES scores or peer teaching evaluations; did not fully accomplish assigned teaching
- 1 - Weak teaching or did not undertake assigned teaching; poor CES scores or peer teaching evaluations

Notes about Teaching scores:

- 1) The number of courses a faculty member is teaching will be considered. For example, a minimally research-active faculty member teaching 1:2 with good CES scores and positive peer observations, and a research-active faculty member teaching 1:0 with good CES scores and positive peer observations, will both be scored as “3” for teaching because they met expectations by performing their assigned teaching.
- 2) Summer teaching shall be considered a component of the quality of teaching but does not contribute to the normal 9-month teaching workload. In other words, teaching a summer class does count as an overload.
- 3) Teaching large classes (>50 students) and very large classes (>100 students), especially those involving a substantial lecture component, will be viewed positively and can merit score increases depending on course format.
- 4) Contributing (financially or substantively) to an FRI or similar course will be viewed positively and can merit score increases.

Service scores:

Major categories are service to the Department, the College, and the University, to Graduate Programs; study sections, the organization of scientific meetings, in an editorial capacity (e.g., journal editor, reviewer) as well as to national organizations (e.g., ASM, ASBMB, ASPB, etc.), and to scientific societies and the scientific community. The writing of textbooks is generally considered within the service category. Service that is compensated financially should be included and weighted without regard to the existence or level of this compensation. Everyone is expected to perform UT-related service (Department, College, or University level).

- Some general guidelines for scores are as follows (with intermediate scores based on service contributions and assigned on an individual basis):
 - 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

Evaluation of Mentoring:

Mentoring is considered an important component of faculty workload, and faculty are expected to offer and provide mentoring as a normal part of their research, teaching and service activities. Mentoring can take many forms; for example, mentoring of undergraduates, graduate students and postdocs in lab, mentoring of junior faculty at UT Austin or outside of UT Austin, or serving

as a mentor/adviser for a student group. The university requires that each faculty member provide a statement that summarizes their accomplishments and goals related to mentoring. The Workload Committee will read the mentoring statements submitted by faculty and will adjust scores assigned to the service category as follows:

1. If a faculty member does not submit a mentoring statement, the service score will be lowered by one point.
2. If a faculty submits a mentoring statement, the service score will remain unchanged.
3. If a faculty submits a mentoring statement and the workload committee deems mentoring activities to be exemplary (>1.5 hours per week, beyond those assigned as service), the service score will be raised by up to one point.

“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

The contributions of faculty who do not teach and faculty who are classified as teaching- intensive (2:2 or 3:2) will be given numerical scores in each category and will be evaluated holistically to assign ratings of Exceeds, Meets, or Does Not Meet Expectations.

Note that the rankings assigned by the Workload Committee are advisory to the Department Chair.

Assessments of Does Not Meet Expectations will not be given arbitrarily and will be accompanied by a written summary of the reasons for the assessment and changes that need to happen for expectations to be met in succeeding years.

Unsatisfactory: This rating will be assigned only 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 "Does not meet expectations" or "Unsatisfactory" must be accompanied by a 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. Associate Chairs will merit a one course reduction in teaching load (not dropping below the minimum of 1:0). 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 Department 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 2:1 or 2:2

Faculty with research publications but no external funding are in these categories. Typically, faculty with a 2:1 workload 1) have recently published research from their lab (within three years); 2) have recently presented research at one or more conferences, either personally or through lab personnel; and 3) are writing and submitting grant applications with a reasonable frequency. Considered on the whole, there should be evidence of sustained research activity that appears to be building toward the gain of external funding.

Faculty with no research activity will teach 3:2

Faculty without assigned research space are in this category (teaching-intensive faculty).

With the approval of the Department 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 research category 1 cannot use a buyout to go to a 0:0 teaching load).

Distribution of Results

Each faculty member will receive their expectation rating, and teaching load recommendation for the following academic year.

Use of Results for Merit Raises

The Department Chair will use the Annual Review scores for determination of merit raises. Merit raises will be based on "percentage raise". The overriding goal is to reward achievement

however it is also acceptable to use the merit raise pool for correction of salary inequities.

Guidelines for * Teaching-Intensive (2:2 and 3:2) Tenured Faculty to Meet Expectations

(*Applies to less research-active faculty also.)

These faculty members are expected to strive for excellence in teaching and contribute meaningful and significant service.

To Meet Expectations, a teaching-intensive tenured faculty member must at a minimum:

- Teach their course load as assigned by the Workload committee.
- Earn positive teaching evaluations (peer evaluations and CES) for all of their courses.
- Perform substantial service at Department, College, and/or University levels.

Insofar as the major component of the mission of the Department is the performance and dissemination of impactful research in the molecular biosciences, meritorious performance on the part of teaching-intensive tenured faculty who no longer direct active research programs will be assessed on the basis of a compensatory commitment to excellence in teaching and service. Teaching-intensive faculty who Meet Expectations can receive raises for truly outstanding teaching and/or service. In exceptional cases, these faculty can Exceed Expectations, for example through teaching-related activities with wide-ranging national impact.

The following lists (see next page) include examples of the kinds of Teaching and Service activities expected of teaching-intensive (and less research-active) faculty. A teaching-intensive faculty member can Meet Expectations by performing different combinations of these activities, and others not listed here: These are NOT exhaustive lists by any means. One person cannot possibly do everything on these lists. No formula exists; however, the Workload Committee will be looking for evidence that faculty members are actively engaged in teaching and service. Faculty members in doubt are encouraged to talk with the Department Chair about their particular situation.

RESEARCH

Maintain a research program that integrates undergraduate research experiences.

TEACHING

- Teach courses crucial for degree plans, and for which you are uniquely qualified.
- Teach courses that stretch your expertise.
- Teach large classes.
- Teach several different courses as needed and note this in your MBS FAR.
- Make sure that your courses are reviewed critically by your peers every semester. Discuss the reviews and document in your MBS FAR how you plan to use them to improve your teaching.
- Document in your MBS FAR how you have improved the content or conceptual framework of your course and/or your teaching methods.
- Receive excellent peer teaching evaluations and CIS/CES scores. (As a general guideline, CIS/CES should be at least 3.5 for a large lower division course and 4.0 for a smaller upper division course.)

- Develop a new non-majors biology course.
- Develop a new Signature Course.
- Innovate your teaching methods and course materials in exciting ways.
- Find out what's happening at the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) and/or Office of STEM Education Excellence (STEMx). In your teaching, use CTL and/or STEMx programs to help undergraduates do better in their courses and/or develop a new program with the CTL to help students in your field.
- Attend national meetings about teaching and share what you learn with colleagues.
- Obtain grant funding for a course innovation project.
- Further your own education (cover your weak spots or update your knowledge) in a way that helps your teaching, for example by taking online courses or auditing classes at UT.

SERVICE

- Take an active role in teaching innovation in CNS.
- Evaluate the teaching of your peers.
- Participate in CNS and UT graduation every year.
- Get yourself elected to Faculty Council on a committee that does work you're interested in.
- Do outreach activities in the Austin Community relating to science teaching.
- Volunteer to serve on time-consuming MBS committees such as Teaching Evaluation or the Workload Committee.
- Volunteer with various honors groups to be on steering/recruitment committees, mentor students, hear presentations, etc.
- Volunteer to help with undergraduate recruiting.
- Volunteer to serve as a faculty adviser for a degree plan.
- Join the MBS Course and Curriculum Committee.
- Write a textbook or other teaching materials used widely within or outside UT.

Non-tenure track research faculty

Non-tenure track research faculty members will be evaluated annually by the workload committee. Evaluations and scoring will use the MBS FAR and will be conducted in two areas: research and additional contributions, which may include teaching and/or service. To generate a single score, these two categories will be weighted as: 80% research / 20% additional contributions. The scoring scales of 1-5 will be used as defined above, with the same cutoffs:

Exceeds Expectations: Scores > 4

Meets Expectations: Scores > 2.5 and < 4

Does Not Meet Expectations: Scores < 2.5