

Department of Chemistry Faculty Annual Performance Review Policy  
Approved by Chemistry Faculty Vote: January 30, 2017

The policy and procedures for faculty annual performance review complies with the Franklin College policy, dated November 2016, and the Academic Affairs Policy 1.06-1, <http://provost.uga.edu/index.php/policies/academic-affairs-policy-manual/1-06-1-written-annual-review>. The procedure for the annual evaluation:

1. By the end of each calendar year, faculty members must enter all of their research, teaching, and service activities into the UGA Elements website, accessed at <https://uga.elements.symplectic.org/login.html>.
2. Each faculty member must print a report of their annual activities from within Elements for the calendar year, and submit this to the head of Chemistry by the end (Friday) of the first full week of January.
3. In addition, each faculty member must print an activities report using the approved departmental template (attached). This report distinguishes activities that are not clearly separated in the Elements reports, for example, departmental seminars from invited presentations at conferences/meetings/workshops, or from contributed presentations at conferences/meetings/workshops. The activities reported in this document must be documented in Elements and in the Elements report. This report is submitted at the same time as the Elements report. These reports are submitted electronically to the head's assistant, with a copy to the head.
4. Once their activities report has been submitted, a faculty member should schedule a meeting with the head to review their annual performance. The head will prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member in advance of the meeting, which will serve as the basis of discussion. These meetings are generally scheduled for the months of January or February.
5. Faculty members will sign the written evaluation to acknowledge that they have been offered the chance to read and discuss the document. As a result of the discussion, the head and faculty member may agree to a revision of the evaluation. In this case, the faculty member will sign the revised document instead.
6. In cases where there is disagreement between the faculty member and the head, the faculty member may reply in writing to the evaluation, and this response will be attached to the document.
7. The head will acknowledge, in writing, the receipt of written responses, and note any changes to the evaluation as a result of the responses.

For tenured or tenure-track faculty, the annual performance evaluation is based on the published departmental criteria for tenure and promotion, <http://www.chem.uga.edu/system/files/ptc.pdf>, and for post-tenure review, <http://www.chem.uga.edu/departmental-operations/by-laws#PTR>. Briefly stated, tenured or tenure-track faculty are expected to be active and productive researchers, competent instructors, and contributors of service to their department, university, and profession. Annual

evaluations will review the accomplishments and contributions of tenured/tenure-track faculty in all three areas, namely research, teaching, and service. The guidelines for the head's preparation of the written annual evaluation:

1. The written evaluation will contain four sections; Research, Teaching, Service, and Summary. The head will provide a narrative for each section based on the activities reported by the faculty member. In addition, the head will provide a rating for each section; Meets Expectations, Exceeds Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations.
2. Performance expectations are based on promotion and tenure criteria, or post-tenure review criteria, as stated above.
3. Most faculty in the Department of Chemistry have formal assignments (EFT) that are weighted toward research, and for them, this category contributes significantly to their overall review. Evidence of research performance is based on a number of documented activities, including grant awards, submission of proposals, peer-reviewed journal articles, submitted articles, published or submitted books or book chapters, invited seminars, invited presentations at international, national, or regional meetings (with weighting for keynote or plenary lectures), contributed presentations, awarded patents, patent applications, and research awards. The overall rating for research is based on the quality and quantity of activities. "Quality" is based on accepted standards, for example, impact factor of journals, standing of departments/universities extending seminar invitations, size and scope (international, national, regional) of a scientific conference/meeting/workshop, significance of an award (weighted for impact as judged by the international, national, regional, or university scope of the award).
4. A rating of "meeting research expectations" requires clear evidence of research activities commensurate with achieving or maintaining a national reputation for one's research program, as a minimum. Specifically, a faculty member is expected to disseminate the products of their research, through publication of scientific articles in peer-reviewed journals and presentation of their research at scientific meetings, conferences and workshops, and to obtain external funding to support these research activities. To meet research expectations, a faculty member must meet the base level of output in two of the three following categories.
  - a. The expected base level of publication output, based on promotion guidelines, is 10 peer-reviewed journal articles over a five-year period, that is, an average of two articles per year. Alternatively, one may substitute the publication of a peer-reviewed book chapter or book for a journal article. Faculty who average less than two peer-reviewed articles per year over a three-year period are not meeting publication expectations.
  - b. The expected base level of presentation activity is a minimum of one presentation per year at a scientific meeting, conference, or workshop with a national or international scope. Alternatively, one may substitute an invited presentation at a regional meeting, or an invited departmental seminar at an R1 academic institution.
  - c. Grant funds must be adequate to support the level of activity required to maintain one's national research reputation. A base level of external funding to

support a research group is \$50,000 (total costs) per year as PI, co-I, or participating investigator. Where funding is jointly held, the amount contributing to faculty member's funding level is based on their percentage of the award. Faculty who have less than \$50,000 in either the year of the review, or averaged over a three-year period, are not meeting funding expectations.

- d. Assistant professors in the first three years of their initial faculty appointment are not held to these research standards. They are expected to exhibit clear evidence for building a research program, for example, submission of research proposals, progress in the construction of research instrumentation, recruitment of graduate students into their group, etc.
5. A rating of "exceeds research expectations" will be applied for faculty members who greatly exceed the base level of publication activity, funding, or can provide clear evidence of recognition of their research accomplishments at a national or international level. Excelling in two or more of the following categories constitutes exceptional research output, and will be recognized with a rating of "exceeds research expectations".
  - a. Publication of more than seven journal articles during the one-year review period. The department head can use their discretion to give extra credit for papers of exceptional impact.
  - b. Grant funds in excess of \$400,000 (total costs) in a year (when averaged over the life of the grant.)
  - c. Invited presentations at five or more national or international meetings, conferences, workshops, or departmental seminars at R1 universities during the one-year review period.
  - d. Receipt of a national or international research award.
  - e. Appointment as member/fellow of a prestigious national/international society (NAS, ACS Fellow, AAAS Fellow), in the year of the appointment.
6. Teaching contributions are rated using a number of factors, including student evaluations, the number of students taught, the teaching load relative to expectation (one course per semester for most faculty), the development of new courses or new teaching methods, and teaching awards. Other factors that are counted toward teaching activity include mentoring in research (graduate and undergraduate students, postdoctoral researchers), and the graduation of doctoral and Master's students.
  - a. A faculty member's teaching "meets expectations" if they instruct the expected number of courses in a year (an average of one course/semester for most chemistry faculty; one course teaching release is provided to the head, associate head, and some faculty with chaired or special professorships), and achieve satisfactory student evaluations for their assigned courses.
  - b. To "exceed expectations" in teaching, a faculty member must demonstrate extra effort or achievement through one of the following metrics:
    - i. Receipt of a teaching award
    - ii. Teaching evaluations that are statistically and quantitatively better than the historical scores for a course of the same level (1000-2000 level, 3000-4000 level, 6000-8000 level).

- iii. Teaching impact compared to departmental averages, in the year of review; “teaching impact” is based on the number of students that were taught, the number of graduate students that were mentored, or the number of graduate students that completed their degrees.
  - iv. Completion of a significant course development (creation of a new course, development of new course materials, completion of a textbook, etc.)
7. Service, while not formally budgeted for most faculty, is expected for faculty members. Service activities include participation in committees at the departmental, college, university, or professional organization level (with extra credit for chairing committees), editorships of journals or books, or membership on editorial advisory boards of journals. Other important contributions to service include organizing meetings or symposia, or serving on scientific advisory committees. Review of proposals and publications are also important service contributions. Service contributions are weighted according to the amount of work performed, and the scope and impact of the activity.
8. The Summary rating will take into account all of the above categories, and the assigned distribution of effort between teaching, research, and service. In general, a summary rating of “meets expectations” is provided to faculty that meet expectations in two categories (Research, Instruction, Service). Most Chemistry faculty members are assigned 0.5 EFT in research and 0.25 EFT in instruction. In this case, a summary rating of meeting expectations requires only that they meet or exceed expectations in Research. To earn a summary rating of “exceeds expectations”, they must exceed expectations in Research plus one or more of the other categories of teaching and service.
9. **Relationship of the annual review to promotion and tenure.** The annual review provides guidance to faculty members regarding their progress toward promotion and/or tenure. However, promotion and tenure have higher expectations than the annual review, and meeting annual expectations over the period of review does not guarantee success in promotion or tenure. One must excel at research and demonstrate teaching effectiveness in order to be promoted. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure requires also that one has achieved a national reputation in his/her research area, while promotion to Full Professor requires one to achieve an international reputation. In either case, external letters establish the quality of one’s research program, and are essential components in the promotion and or tenure decision.