

Department of Chemistry Faculty Annual Performance Review Policy
Revised November 16, 2022

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>.

I. 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 prepare an electronic report containing:
 - a. their annual activities from within Elements for the calendar year
 - b. An activities report using one of the approved departmental templates (separate templates for tenured/tenure track faculty and for non-tenure track faculty are appended to the bottom of this document). 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.
 - c. A one-page document of their student success activities in teaching, research, and service.
3. These reports (Activities, Student Success Activities, Elements report) should be combined into a single PDF document and submitted electronically to the head's assistant and to the head by the end (Friday, COB) of the first full week in January.
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. The evaluation of a faculty member with a joint appointment in another PTU or a secondary appointment of at least 25% in an Institute will involve consultation between the head/director of both units, according to the procedures outlined in the faculty member's memorandum of understanding."
7. The written evaluation will contain sections for all areas in which faculty can contribute; Research, Teaching, Service, and Administration, as well as a Summary. The head will provide a narrative for each section based on the activities reported by the faculty

member. If a faculty member has no FTE for a category, this will be noted in corresponding section of the review. The head will provide a rating for budgeted effort in Research, Teaching, Administration and Service (including non-budgeted service effort for tenure-track faculty), and also an Summary rating, using a 5-point scale; 5 – Exemplary; 4 - Exceeds Expectations; 3 - Meets Expectations; 2 – Needs Improvement; 1 - Does Not Meet Expectations.

8. The Summary rating is the average of the rating for the categories for which the faculty member is budgeted, weighted by the fraction of FTE assigned to each. An additional upward adjustment to the summary rating may be made for service contributions, as described below under Evaluation Criteria. Summary ratings are rounded to integer values following standard conventions (i.e., tenths digit <5, round down; if tenths digit is ≥5, round up).
9. 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.
10. The head will acknowledge, in writing, the receipt of written responses, and note any changes to the evaluation as a result of the responses.
11. **Consequence of Needing Improvement or Not Meeting Expectations.** For all faculty a score of 1 or 2, overall or in any area, requires a one-year Performance Remediation Plan (PRP), as per University and Board of Regents policy. The PRP will be developed according the guidelines of the revised Academic Affairs Policy 1.06.1 – Written Evaluation Policy. For tenured faculty, two consecutive years of 1 or 2, overall or in any area of effort exceeding 10%, leads to an accelerated post-tenure review.
12. **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. For tenured/tenure-track faculty, one must demonstrate excellence in research and provide evidence of 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. Promotion expectations vary for non-tenure track faculty according to their specific classification, and these are discussed in more detail in section II.B below.

II. EVALUATION CRITERIA

A. Evaluation of tenured and tenure-track faculty

For tenured or tenure-track faculty, the annual performance evaluation is based on the published departmental criteria for tenure and promotion,
https://chem.uga.edu/sites/default/files/ChemistryUnitCriteria_2015.pdf,

and for post-tenure review, <http://www.chem.uga.edu/departamental-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 areas, namely research, teaching, and service. Those with administrative FTE will also be reviewed in this area as well. The guidelines for the head's preparation of the written annual evaluation:

1. No tenure-stream faculty in Chemistry are assigned FTE for service, but they are nevertheless evaluated for their service activities. As an incentive to engage in service activities, the Summary rating will be increased by 0.33 points for Meeting Expectations in Service, 0.5 points for Exceeding Expectations, and 0.75 points for Exemplary service contributions. There are no deductions in the Summary rating for not meeting expectations or needing improvement in service.
2. Faculty are expected to participate in student success activities. Those who provide no evidence of student success activities will have their Summary rating reduced by 1 point.
3. Performance expectations are based on promotion and tenure criteria, or post-tenure review criteria, as stated above.
4. Research: Most faculty in the Department of Chemistry have formal assignments (FTE) that are weighted toward research, and for them, this category contributes significantly to their Summary rating. 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).
 - a. 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.
 - i. 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.

- ii. 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.
- iii. 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.

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.

- b. A rating of "Needs Improvement" in research will be applied to faculty who can provide evidence of output in only one of the categories listed above for meeting research expectations, while those with no output will be rated as "Does Not Meet Expectations".
- c. A rating of "Exceeds Expectations" in research 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".
 - i. 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.
 - ii. Grant funds in excess of \$400,000 (total costs) in a year (when averaged over the life of the grant.)
 - iii. Invited presentations at five or more national or international meetings, conferences, workshops, or departmental seminars at R1 universities during the one-year review period.
 - iv. Receipt of a national research award.
- d. A rating of "Exemplary" for research performance is commensurate with extraordinary funding, or recognition of one's scientific standing with a particularly prestigious international award or society membership. To be rated

“exemplary”, the faculty member must meet the qualifications for “Exceeds Expectations” in research and in addition, meet one of the conditions below.

- i. Grant funds in excess of \$1,000,000 (total costs) in a year (when averaged over the life of the grant.)
 - ii. Receipt of an international research award.
 - iii. Appointment as member/fellow of a prestigious national/international society (NAS, ACS Fellow, AAAS Fellow), in the year of the appointment.
5. Teaching: 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 “Does Not Meet Expectations” if they do not instruct the expected number of courses in a year, when averaged over a three-year period. A faculty member whose course assignment is altered unexpectedly, for example cancellation for under-enrollment, or reduced for health or family matters, will not be penalized.
 - b. A faculty member’s teaching “Needs Improvement” if they instruct the expected number of courses in a year, but receive student evaluations for their assigned courses that are well below (more than two times the standard deviation) for the historical average for the course in question.
 - c. 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.
 - d. To “Exceed Expectations” in teaching, a faculty member must demonstrate extra effort or achievement through one of the following metrics:
 - i. 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).
 - ii. Teaching impact above the departmental average 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.
 - iii. Receipt of a university or local (e.g. NE Georgia ACS) teaching award.
 - e. To be rated “Exemplary” in teaching, a faculty member must meet the standards of “Exceeds Expectations”, and also show evidence of one of the following:
 - i. Receipt of a national or international teaching award.
 - ii. Completion of a significant course development (creation of a new course, development of new course materials, completion of a textbook, etc.)

6. Administration: Only a few tenure-track faculty are budgeted for administration. These include the head, associate head, and graduate coordinator. To be rated below “Meets Expectations”, there must be clear evidence of mismanagement of their administrative duties. A faculty member who performs their expected administrative duties effectively will be rated “Meets Expectations”. To “Exceed Expectations” in administration, one must provide evidence of some innovative activity. There are many possible ways to demonstrate exceptional administrative activity, and the reviewee can provide a narrative in their activities report that outlines their contributions in the administrative area. To be rated “Exemplary” in administration, the faculty member must provide two or more examples of activities that go beyond the expected level of effort for managing the facilities or personnel to which they have been assigned.
7. Service: While not formally budgeted for most faculty, service is expected for tenure stream faculty members, and will contribute to their Summary rating as described above in item (3) of the review criteria. Service activities are weighted according to the amount of work performed, and the scope and impact of the activity, and include:
 - a. Service as the departmental graduate coordinator (10 points), undergraduate coordinator (5 points), or associate head (5 points)
 - b. Service on a departmental (standing or *ad-hoc*) (1 point), college or university committee (2 points), with 1-point extra credit for serving as chair
 - c. Service on a graduate student advisory committee other than members of the faculty member’s research group (1 point for serving on 1-5 committees, 2 points for serving on 6-10 committees, 3 points for serving on more than 10 committees)
 - d. Service on a professional society committee (1 point)
 - e. Editorship of a journal or book (2 points)
 - f. Membership on a journal editorial advisory board (1 point)
 - g. Organizing a meeting or symposium (2 points)
 - h. Chairing an oral session at a meeting of a professional society (1 point)
 - i. Service on the scientific advisory committee of a meeting (1 point)
 - j. Proposal review (1 point per proposal)
 - k. Membership (standing or *ad-hoc*) on a study-section or review panel for a federal funding agency (2 points)
 - l. Journal article peer-review (1 point per review)
 - m. Activities supporting alumni relation and related development effort
 - n. Activities that promote science or education in the local community (1 point)
 - o. Other activities that serve the university, local community, or the profession

A faculty member who provides no evidence of service will receive a rating of “Does Not Meet Expectations” in this category. A faculty member who receives 1-2 points for service activities will be rated as “Needs Improvement”. Exceptions will be made for faculty who are within their first three years of appointment at UGA. Until they have had a chance to establish themselves, new faculty will receive a rating of “Meets Expectations” in service. An established faculty member “Meets Expectations” for

receiving 3-10 service points. A faculty member “Exceeds Expectations” for receiving 11-20 service points, and “Exemplary” if they receive more than 20 service points.

B. Evaluation of Non-tenure-track faculty

1. The corps of non-tenure track faculty include lecturers, academic professionals, and research scientists. The FTE distribution varies considerably for these ranks, and may include instruction, research, administrative, and service components.
2. Annual evaluations of non-tenure-track faculty is based on the published university guidelines for appointment and promotion. For lecturers, the documentation is found at:
https://provost.uga.edu/resources/documents/LecturerAppointmentPromotionGuidelines_FINAL2021.pdf
for academic professionals:
https://provost.uga.edu/resources/documents/Faculty_Affairs/faculty_hiring_and_appointments/guidelinesapptpromotionacademicprofessionals.pdf
and for research scientists:
<https://research.uga.edu/docs/policies/research/Research-Scientist-Appointment-Promotion.pdf>
3. Research scientists have no instructional FTE, and will be evaluated only on their research and administrative contributions, as weighted by their FTE distribution.
4. Most lecturers have 100% of their FTE assigned to instruction. For those with 100% instructional FTE, the evaluation will focus only on their instructional accomplishments.
5. Academic professionals have less than 50% FTE assigned to the combination of instruction and research, with the balance being budgeted for administration. They will be evaluated only for their budgeted efforts.
6. Teaching: Teaching contributions are rated using a number of factors, including student evaluations, the number of students taught, the teaching load relative to expectation (three courses per semester for most lecturers, one course per semester for academic professionals, none for research professionals), the development of new courses or new teaching methods, and teaching awards.
 - a. A faculty member’s teaching “Does Not Meet Expectations” if they do not instruct the expected number of courses in a year, when averaged over a three-year period. For lecturers, the expected number of courses is three per semester or 6 per year. A faculty member whose course assignment is altered unexpectedly, for example cancellation for under-enrollment, or reduced for health or family matters, will not be penalized.
 - b. A faculty member’s teaching “Needs Improvement” if they instruct the expected number of courses in a year, but receive student evaluations for their assigned courses that are well below (more than two times the standard deviation) for the historical average for the course in question.
 - c. A faculty member’s teaching “Meets Expectations” if they instruct the expected number of courses in a year (an average of three courses per semester for most lecturers, and achieve satisfactory student evaluations for their assigned courses.

- d. To “Exceed Expectations” in teaching, a faculty member must demonstrate extra effort or achievement through one of the following metrics:
 - i. 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).
 - ii. Teaching impact above the departmental average, in the year of review; “teaching impact” is based on the number of students that were taught.
 - iii. Receipt of a university or local (e.g. NE Georgia ACS) teaching award.
 - e. To be rated “Exemplary” in teaching, a faculty member must meet the standards of “Exceeds Expectations”, and also show evidence of one of the following:
 - i. Receipt of a national or international teaching award.
 - ii. Completion of a significant course development (creation of a new course, development of new course materials, completion of a textbook, etc.)
- 7. Research: Only Research Scientists and Academic Professionals can have FTE in research. Research responsibilities vary widely for non-tenure track faculty, and it is impossible to specify a single set of criteria for evaluating Research Scientists and Academic Professionals. A position-specific set of responsibilities exists for each faculty member, as per university guidelines, and the evaluation will be made relative to these expectations.
- 8. Administration: Administrative contributions for non-tenure track faculty cover a broad range of possible activities, including management of core facilities, supervision of undergraduate teaching laboratories, and supervision of personnel. To be rated below “Meets Expectations”, there must be clear evidence of mismanagement. A faculty member who performs their expected administrative duties effectively will be rated “Meets Expectations”. To “Exceed Expectations” in administration, one must provide evidence of some innovative activity or improvement to the facility or laboratory under management. Examples include receiving funding for major instrumentation, writing a proposal for improvement of a facility or a laboratory, or developing software tools for improving customer access to a facility or the data that it provides. There are many other possible ways to demonstrate exceptional administrative activity, and the reviewee can provide a narrative in their activities report that outlines their contributions in the administrative area. To be rated “Exemplary” in administration, the faculty member must provide two or more examples of activities that go beyond the expected level of effort for managing the facilities or personnel to which they have been assigned.
- 9. Service: No non-tenure track faculty have more than 10% service FTE.
 - a. The evaluation of service effort for those having FTE in this category will use the point scale described for tenure-stream faculty in Section II.A.7. The reviewee will “Meet Expectations” if they are rated with one point of a service using the scale provided in Section II.A.7. For example, serving on a departmental committee would earn 1 service credit. A non-tenure track faculty member will “Exceed Expectations” if they earn 2-4 points of service credit, for example, by chairing a departmental committee, or serving on a college or university-level

committee. To be rated “Exemplary” in service, a non-tenure track faculty member must earn 5 or more service credits. Other activities that serve the university, local community, or the profession will be assigned credit on an *ad-hoc* basis, according to the significance of the service and the amount of effort associated with this activity. A non-tenure track faculty member with service FTE who earns no service credit in a year will be rated “Needs Improvement”.

- b. Non-tenure track faculty without service FTE will have a narrative for Service that stipulates the reviewee “is not budgeted for activity in this category”. However, if they report voluntary service contributions worth 1-4 points using the scale provided in Section II.A.7, they will “Exceed Expectations” for this activity, and receive a 0.33 point addition to their Summary rating. For service contributions worth 5 or more points, the reviewee will be rated as “Exemplary”, and receive a 0.5 addition to their Summary rating. Final Summary ratings will be rounded to the nearest integer.

{TEMPLATE FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY}

{DELETE ALL TEXT BETWEEN AND INCLUDING "{}" BEFORE SUBMITTING. }

YOUR NAME

Activities Report

Rank or Title

1 January 2021 - 31 December 2021

ADMINISTRATION

{List any administrative titles and or duties}

INSTRUCTION

Course No: CHEM XXXX

Course Title:

Credit: *{list credit hours here}*

Date: *{Semester and year}*

Enrollment: *{number of enrolled students}*

Evaluation: *{provide instructor evaluation rating}* (provide number of respondents) (scale: 1-5, 5 = Excellent, 1= Poor)

{Example:

Course No: CHEM 8810

Course Title: Mass Spectrometry

Credit: 3

Date: Fall 2017

Enrollment: 18

Evaluation: 4.54 (13 respondents)}

Courses Developed or Redesigned

Undergraduate Students Supervised

Graduate Students Supervised

Postdoctoral Associates Supervised

Instruction-Related Service

Served on Graduate Student Advisory Committees (not including students in my research group): *{List of students}*

{List other instruction-related service }

RESEARCH

Books Authored

Books Edited or Co-edited

Book Chapters Authored

1.

Journal Publications (underlined numbers indicate refereed publications)

1.

Publications in Press (underlined numbers indicate refereed publications)

1.

Publications Submitted

1.

Patents Submitted/Awarded

Keynote or Plenary Lectures

Invited Presentations at Scientific Meetings

1.

Invited Seminars

1.

Contributed Presentations at Scientific Meetings

1.

*International Meetings/Travel/Visitors (underlined numbers indicate invited participation)
{these can duplicate invited contributed meetings above.}*

1.

Grant Support

Active

Title:

PI:

Source:

Grant No:

Dates:

Amount: {List total or direct costs, but indicate which; if you are a co-I, list also your amount too, for example **Amount:** \$10,679,496 (total), Amster portion \$625,000 (direct) }

Submitted

Title:

PI:

Source:

Grant No.:

Dates:

Amount Requested:

Outcome: {for example, not awarded; or pending, impact score 12 (1%) }

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

Departmental Committees

College and University Committees

HONORS AND AWARDS

US

International

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS

{TEMPLATE FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY}

{DELETE ALL TEXT BETWEEN AND INCLUDING "{}" BEFORE SUBMITTING. }

Name

Activities Report

Title

January 1, 2021 – January 1, 2022

ADMINISTRATION

{List any administrative titles and or duties}

INSTRUCTION

Course No:

Course Title:

Credit:

Date:

Enrollment:

Evaluation/Respondents:

Course No:

Course Title:

Credit:

Date:

Enrollment:

Evaluation/Respondents:

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

Course / Instructional Innovations

Publications

Other Scholarly Activities

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Meetings attended

Workshop participation

SERVICE

Departmental, College or University Committees

Other Professional Service

RECOGNITIONS

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS