

General Annual Performance Review Policy Department of Chemistry, updated June 2024

Who is covered by the Annual Performance Review (APR) policy (Note: all faculty ranks including part-time faculty who are listed as instructor-of-record are required to undergo an APR under SACS accreditation standards).

Tenured and tenure-track Full, Associate, and Assistant Professors and non-tenure track Full, Associate, and Assistant Instructional and Research Professors are covered by the Department of Chemistry APR policy.

A general timeline for conducting the APR process that details any specific deadlines for submission of materials, completing the review process at the departmental and/or college level (if applicable), as well as an expected date for when faculty members may expect to receive the final outcome/score of their APR.

The Department-approved Merit Review Form is sent electronically to tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track Professors, Associate Professors, and Assistant Professors in the Department by December 10th in the year to be reviewed. The faculty members must submit their completed Merit Review Forms electronically to the Associate Chair of the Department (or his/her designee) no later than 5 PM on January 10th of the following year. Faculty members who do not submit their completed Merit Review Form by the deadline will be given a Not Meeting Expectations review grade. In the event of an emergency, a faculty member may request extra time from the Department Chair to complete the Merit Review Form. The Chair's decision whether to accept a late submission is at his or her sole discretion and the decision is final. The Chair will make overall review grades (on a 0–100 point scale; see below) available to individual faculty members upon request by February 10th of the year following the year reviewed. A faculty member may also request summary scores in the Research, Teaching, and Service categories. Requests for summary scores must be made within 5 working days of the review grades becoming available.

A clear description of the process utilized for collecting faculty performance and productivity data including the time-period covered by the APR.

The faculty members enter their information on research, teaching, and service covering the calendar year under review into the Merit Review Form.

A clear description of how performance data will be assessed and who is responsible for conducting the review at the departmental level. The description should clearly define any quality measures or assessment rubrics that the department has chosen to assess faculty performance in each of the three domain(s) being assessed (i.e. research/scholarship, teaching/instruction and/or service).

The Department of Chemistry Executive Committee, which is elected by following the Departmental Bylaws, is responsible for conducting the APRs of tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track Professors, Associate Professors, and Assistant Professors. The Committee members score each tenured and tenure-track faculty member in the Department on a scale of 0–100 in each of three categories: research, teaching, and service. The Committee members score the non-tenure track faculty members in two of the three categories depending on the faculty member's assigned duties. Committee members do not score themselves, the Chair, or any member of the faculty whose primary

appointment is outside the Department (e.g., Associate Deans). In the research category, research funding, especially external federal funding; research publications, especially peer-reviewed publications in high-impact journals; and invited and contributed seminars are used to determine a research score. To arrive at a score in the teaching category, student teaching evaluations are assessed taking into account class size and the academic level of instruction. When it is appropriate, new courses and curriculum development are included in determining the teaching score. Mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students may also be considered as teaching components. Documented service to the Department, College, University, scientific community, and broader community are used to determine the service score.

If there is a further level of review/assessment at the college level, the document must also contain a clear description of the basis of the college level review process and who (in addition to the Dean) is involved in that review process.

Not applicable.

*Regardless of how any individual department chooses to assign a value or score to each of the performance domains assessed (i.e., research/scholarship, teaching/instruction, and/or service), the policy must describe how these separate domain values/scores are aggregated in order to generate a single **numeric** performance score for an individual faculty.*

Each member of the Executive Committee scores the faculty separately in the three categories research, teaching, and service on a scale of 0–100 by using an Excel spreadsheet designed specifically for the merit review process. The scores in each of the three categories are weighted in the spreadsheet, 60% research, 30% teaching, and 10% service for research-track faculty members and 30% research, 60% teaching, and 10% service for teaching-track faculty members, and an overall score on a scale of 0–100 for each faculty member is computed on this basis. Tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track faculty members are scored separately. The Executive Committee members send their completed Excel spreadsheets to the Chair for compilation. The Chair numerically adjusts the Committee member's scores, if necessary, to make each Committee member's overall average score 50 for the Department's faculty members. The numerical adjustment ensures that each Executive Committee member's assessment is weighted equally when computing a final score for each faculty member. The Chair combines the scores submitted by the Committee members and averages them to arrive at a final score of 0–100 for each faculty member in the Department. On the 0-100 scale, >60 is considered Excellent, 30–59 Good, 10–29 Fair, and <10 Not Meeting Expectations. In the event that a faculty member is deemed as Not Meeting Expectations, the final evaluation will articulate, in writing, the reasons for this determination.

The policy must describe how the single numeric performance score for each faculty is used to generate a rank order based on overall performance for all faculty in an individual department, including any additional information if any that will be taken into consideration when generating the final departmental rank order (over and above numeric performance scores).

The overall score on a scale of 0–100 for each faculty member, obtained by averaging the separate scores provided by the Executive Committee members as described above, is the *sole* basis for ranking the Department faculty members within the three groups: tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track faculty.

The policy must provide an avenue for faculty members to provide timely comment on the final outcome of their APR to their departmental chair, including a description of how they can dispute/grieve their final performance score/departmental ranking. Faculty members will be provided individual performances scores and departmental quartile rankings as soon as reasonably possible after the end of the spring academic semester.

The Chair will make overall review grades (on a 0–100 point scale; see above) available to individual faculty members upon request by February 10th of the year following the year reviewed. A faculty member may also request summary scores in the Research, Teaching, and Service categories. Requests for summary scores must be made within 5 working days of the review grades becoming available. A faculty member may dispute his or her summary score by providing a letter outlining the reason(s) for the grievance to the Chair or any member of the Executive Committee within 5 working days of receiving his or her grade. Upon receiving the faculty member's request to dispute his or her grade, a meeting of the faculty member with the Executive Committee will be arranged within 5 working days. At the meeting, the faculty member may present evidence verbally or in writing to the Executive Committee that disputes his or her summary score and/or scores within the three categories graded by the Executive Committee. Within 5 working days following the meeting, the Executive Committee will issue a written ruling on whether the faculty member's score will be adjusted. The Committee's decision is final.

By the last working day in January, department chairs/unit heads or other appointed persons must complete a preliminary assessment of tenured faculty and submit to Faculty Affairs in the Provost's Office an estimated number of faculty who are likely to be rated as Not Meeting Expectations in any professional domain in which they have responsibilities.

Based on the submitted data, the Chair will perform a preliminary assessment of tenured faculty and submit the number of faculty who are likely to be deemed Not Meeting Expectations to the Provost's Office.

Each department or college will be required to provide a copy of their faculty annual performance review (APR) policy to all members of their departmental faculty (including tenured, tenure-track, instructional, clinical and research faculty). Each department and/or college APR policies will also be uploaded to a central secure SharePoint site maintained by the Office of the Provost (web address to follow later) by the same date.

The final approved form of the F-APR policy will be posted on the Departmental website.