State of Purpose

1. In accordance with PPS 8.09, Performance Evaluation of Faculty and Post-Tenure Review, the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry has established the following plan for the annual evaluation of faculty. It is the stated purpose of this plan to use the annual evaluation to improve the core processes of the department, i.e., teaching, research and service and to allow for the professional growth of the faculty, consistent with the mission of Texas State University.

Basic Tenants

2. Faculty will be evaluated every calendar year based upon the expectations of the department as defined by the Personnel Committee for each category of faculty: tenure-track, tenured, non-tenure track (e.g. modified retired), and temporary/part-time.

Normal Faculty Expectation Parameter Weights:

- Tenure-Track Faculty
  - first two years: 60% Teaching, 40% Research
  - third year: 50% Teaching, 40% Research, 10% Service
  - fourth year on: 40% Teaching, 40% Research, 20% Service

- Tenured Faculty Seeking Promotion
  - 40% Teaching, 40% Research, 20% Service

- Tenured Faculty Not Seeking Promotion
  - 40%-70% Teaching, 0-50% Research, 10%-40% Service

- Non-Tenure Track Faculty
  - 80%-100% Teaching, 0-20% Service

- Temporary/part-time faculty
  - 100% Teaching

Individual parameter weights will be agreed on between each faculty member and the chair by December 15th of the preceding year.

3. The evaluation process will include the following components:

For tenure-track and tenured faculty -
a. Submission of a completed annual Activity Report Summary (Appendix A), a current Texas State vita and supporting documentation (Appendix B). Current student evaluations (mandatory according to the Texas State University Faculty Handbook) will be available in the department office; past years’ evaluations are the responsibility of individual faculty members.
b. Faculty Evaluation Committee evaluation
c. Chair evaluation
d. Dissemination of evaluation to the reviewed faculty
e. Use of evaluation to improve performance

Faculty in modified retirement may opt to remove themselves from consideration for merit by allowing the Faculty Evaluation Committee to accept their annual teaching evaluations as the basis of evaluation.

Temporary/part-time faculty are hired solely to teach selected classes and will be evaluated on that basis. Such faculty should only complete the teaching portion of the annual evaluation form and are not required to submit a vita.

4. Teaching, Research, and Service will be summarized by one of five rating categories.*
   a. Greatly exceeds expectations
   b. Exceeds expectations
   c. Meets expectations
   d. Does not meet expectations

*an overall rating of meets expectations will be considered the norm for meeting performance raise criteria; category assessment ratings are listed in Appendix C.

5. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will consist of three members of the Personnel Committee elected to three-year rotating terms. Each committee member will evaluate all the faculty files (excepting his/her own), meet and prepare the final committee report using the form in appendix A and submit the report to the Chair. Note that summary reports for individual committee member will be prepared by the other two members.

   **Criteria for Review of Teaching**

6. Good university instructors at both the graduate and undergraduate levels are expected to have the following skills: 1) they should be competent in their discipline and have the ability to articulate material to the students in both the traditional lecture format and in one-on-one situations, 2) they should be effective in organizing their course work and in clearly outlining their policies, procedures and goals to the students, 3) they will maintain high academic standards and act in accordance with university regulations, and 4) experienced instructors should be able to demonstrate instructional design skills.

   The following represent examples of activities which demonstrate teaching effectiveness:
1. Content expertise judged by:
   • Course syllabi
   • Assignments
   • Tests

2. Instructional delivery skills judged by:
   • Student and peer evaluation of teaching
   • Effective coordination of multiple section laboratories and instructional assistant training
   • Effective maintenance of equipment for teaching labs

3. Instructional design skills judged by:
   • Receipt of school, university, state or national awards for teaching excellence.
   • Obtaining external or internal funding to develop new courses, enhance existing courses or labs.
   • Development and use of lab manuals, computer software, innovative methods, and other curriculum materials.
   • Publication of lab manuals, computer software, and other curriculum materials adopted for use at Texas State or other universities.

    Criteria for Review of Research/Scholarship

7. Establishing a successful research program is an essential component for tenure and promotion. Research that directly benefits the professional development of the faculty member, the education of students and the stature of the department, college and university. The evaluation of research will be based upon published research, financial support obtained to support research, impact upon student learning and other research activities.

    The following represent specific activities that demonstrate an effective research program.

1. Major Activities:
   • Publication of scholarly articles in peer-reviewed journals – evaluation will be based upon the quality and number of publications published during the review period
   • Obtaining external research funding – evaluation will be based on the number and significance (award amount and source) during the evaluation period
   • Student participation in research – evaluation will be based upon the number and quality of completed masters’ theses supervised during the evaluation period, student co-authors and undergraduate research reports (required by the American Chemical Society for certified chemistry BS degrees)

2. Other Activities:
• Receipt of school, university, regional, or national awards for research excellence
• Publication of books, or monographs that have been reviewed and accepted by the editorial staff of a publishing company
• Approval of a patent application
• Presentations at professional meetings
• Publication of invited chapters in scholarly books
• Invited presentations to external organizations

Criteria for Review of Service.

8. There are many tasks that university faculty undertake which do not fall into the categories of teaching or research and yet are critical to the smooth operation of the department, school, and/or university. These service tasks are also important, although, in general, less so than the “core process” of teaching and research. The following represent specific activities that demonstrate effective service to the department and/or university:

1. Institutional:
   • Effectively chairing departmental, school, or university committees
   • Effectively serving on departmental, school, or university committees
   • Academic advising on the undergraduate or graduate levels
   • Arranging demonstrations and other activities for student groups invited to Texas State
   • Speaking to campus groups, student groups, at homecoming or other alumni activities
   • Chairing or serving on local arrangement committees for local and regional meetings
   • Serving on committees for honors theses and master’s theses
   • Participating in activities related to student recruiting
   • Serving as an advisor for student organizations

2. Professional:
   • Reviewing manuscripts for journals
   • Serving on a grant review panel for funding agency
   • Reviewing manuscripts of scholarly books for publishing company
   • Serving as editor, section editor, or editorial board member for a scholarly journal
   • Organizing sessions for professional meetings
   • Serving as an officer for regional or national professional organizational

3. Community Service:
• Organizing demonstrations and similar activities at elementary, middle, or high schools
• Assisting or judging at area science fairs, contests, shows, or exhibits
• Making public appearances and serving as a representative of the university
• Speaking in local schools or at meetings of local organizations
• Other activities in the community in which a faculty member donates his or her recognized area of expertise without pay

Criteria for Collegiality Assessment

9. Collegiality

For the purposes of this evaluation, it is important to judge collegiality in a positive manner separate from overall performance and productivity. Therefore, collegiality will be defined as a measure of the effect a faculty member’s interactions has on their colleagues’ professional productivity. A general measure of positive collegiality would be the demonstration of interactions that encourage and stimulate higher performance in teaching, research or service. Collegiality should be judged as being either positive or negative (and possibly neutral) and should not be based upon personal likes or dislikes.

Procedure

10. The faculty evaluation committee members will submit documentation to the Chair in the form of a faculty evaluation form (see Appendix D). The Chair will include documentation indicating in-class evaluation of faculty members teaching and will fill out the summative evaluation form (see appendix E) which will be kept on file. The faculty evaluation committee will also conduct in-class evaluations as appropriate. These will form the basis for a Chair/faculty conference to go over the results and map out a strategy to improve performance in any areas deemed unsatisfactory. Each faculty member will have the opportunity to review and comment upon the summary evaluation before it is placed in the department files.

Calendar

By Feb. 1: Faculty submits evaluation materials.
By March 1: Faculty Evaluation Committee submits recommendations to Chair.
By March 30: Chair reviews faculty files.
By April 15: Chair meets with individual faculty to discuss his/her evaluation and to map out a strategy to improve performance in any areas deemed unsatisfactory.

Disposition of Performance Review Files
11. Performance review files will be retained by the department for a period of three years. The files will be returned to the faculty member for tenure or promotion applications or after three years. It should be noted that all of these files whether in the possession of the department or the individual faculty member are subject to public disclosure under the Texas Open Records Act.

Appendices:

A. Annual Activity Report Summary
B. Supporting Documentation
C. Assessment Ratings
D. Faculty Evaluation Committee Assessment Form
E. Chair Assessment Form
Appendix B: Examples of Supporting Documentation

a. Teaching - grade distributions, syllabi, and class material developed, i.e. instructional technology material, handouts, tests, etc.

b. Research - copies of peer-reviewed publications published or accepted for publication, proposals submitted but not funded, meeting abstracts, seminar notices, copies of books, patents, students research reports, theses etc.

c. Service - appointment letters for committee assignments, copies of any recruitment material produced, advising materials etc.
Appendix C: Assessment Ratings

a. A rating of greatly exceeds expectations in any category will indicate that the faculty member involved has a well-documented file showing activity considerably above the departmental expectation in that area. This could be due to very high productivity in just a few areas outlined in sections 3-5 or due to extensive breadth of activity.

b. A rating of exceeds expectations in any category will indicate that the faculty member involved has a well-documented file showing activity above the departmental expectation in that area. This could be due to high productivity in just a few areas outlined in sections 3-5 or due to breadth of activity.

c. A rating of meets expectations in any category will indicate that the faculty member involved has a well-documented file showing activity at the departmental expectation in that area. This could be due to productivity in just a few areas outlined in sections 3-5 or due to breadth of activity.

d. A rating of does not meet expectations in any category will indicate that the faculty member involved has a documented file showing activity below the departmental expectation in that area.

e. A rating of unacceptable in any category will indicate that the faculty member involved has a documented file showing activity well below the departmental expectation in that area. Such a rating will trigger a negotiated improvement plan.
APPENDIX D: Faculty Evaluation Committee Assessment Form

ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

Student Evaluations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPT</th>
<th>Sem</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>COURS SUB</th>
<th>CS 95% CL</th>
<th>INST SUB</th>
<th>IS 95% CL</th>
<th>COURSE TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

GREATLY EXCEEDS MEETS DOES UNACCEPTABLE
EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS EXPECTATIONS NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS

ASSESSMENT OF SCHOLARSHIP

Number of Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles (principle author): __________
Number of Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles (not principle author): __________
Number of Proceedings Articles: __________
Number of Presentations at Meetings/Invited: __________
Number of Continuing Grants: __________
Number of New Grants: __________
Number of Undergraduate Students: __________
Number of Graduate Students: __________
Number of Completed Theses: __________
Number of Post-doctoral Researchers: __________

Comments:

GREATLY EXCEEDS MEETS DOES UNACCEPTABLE
EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS EXPECTATIONS NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS
ASSESSMENT OF SERVICE

Number of Departmental Committees: ___________
Number of University Committees: ___________
Number of Off-Campus Service Activities: ___________

Comments:

GREATLY EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS           MEETS EXPECTATIONS           DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS
EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS                      MEETS EXPECTATIONS           UNACCEPTABLE

ASSESSMENT OF COLLEGIALITY

positive ____    neutral ____    negative ____

Comments:
APPENDIX E: Chair Assessment Form

Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry                       Summative Evaluation
Name__________________________                             Annual Performance Evaluation
Activities for 20_____  

• ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING  

Instruments used (place a check by all the evaluative instruments employed) :
class GPA___, grade distribution ___, student evaluations___, awards___, peer evaluations
___, self evaluation___, normative exams___  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREATLY</th>
<th>EXCEEDS</th>
<th>MEETS</th>
<th>DOES</th>
<th>UNACCEPTABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>NOT MEET</td>
<td>EXPECTATIONS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:  

• ASSESSMENT OF SCHOLARSHIP (an exceeds expectations evaluation requires student involvement, external grant support and peer-reviewed publications). Place a # by undergraduates and * by graduate students who are coauthors on publications and presentations.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREATLY</th>
<th>EXCEEDS</th>
<th>MEETS</th>
<th>DOES</th>
<th>UNACCEPTABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>NOT MEET</td>
<td>EXPECTATIONS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:  

• ASSESSMENT OF SERVICE  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREATLY</th>
<th>EXCEEDS</th>
<th>MEETS</th>
<th>DOES</th>
<th>UNACCEPTABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>NOT MEET</td>
<td>EXPECTATIONS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:  

Printed 11/27/2012
• COLLEGIALITY

positive ____ neutral ____ negative ____

Comments:

• PERFORMANCE REVIEW ASSESSMENT

MEETS _____ DOES NOT MEET _____ DEPARTMENTAL EXPECTATIONS

CHAIR: ___________________ Date of review: ___________________

I concur ____/ disagree ____ with this assessment ____________________________________

(Faculty member's signature)

If you disagree with this assessment you must provide your reasons below.
Statement of Purpose

1. In accordance with University Policy (PPS 7.10), the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry has established the following plan for the recommendation of faculty merit awards.

Basic Tenets

2. Faculty will be evaluated annually according to CBPPS 01.01, Performance Evaluation of Faculty, and summary evaluations will be completed after the Provost announces the availability of merit funds. In the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, scholarly accomplishments are of particular value to its goals and aspirations. Therefore, excellence in this category will receive the highest weight in determining overall merit.

3. Merit rankings will be calculated during the annual performance review by the Faculty Evaluation Committee according to CBPPS 01.01. The performance review results will be used in the following formula to calculate merit rankings: Rankings of greatly exceeds expectations, exceeds expectations and meets expectations will have a value of 3, 2 and 1, respectively, and will be multiplied by the category rankings of 4 for research, 2 for teaching and 1 for service. An intermediate ranking will receive a value 0.5 greater than the base score. The sum of the totals for all three categories (teaching, research, and service) will be the ranking used to determine merit. The average annual merit ranking will be used for the merit evaluation time period defined by the Provost during each merit cycle. Total merit funding is determined as a set percentage of the eligible faculty salaries. Therefore, the computed merit rankings are relative and will be factored in order to distribute the available funds in as equitable of a manner as possible.

Procedure

4. The Faculty Evaluation Committee members will submit annual performance evaluations to the chair. The chair will apprise each faculty member of the chair and the committee’s rankings during the annual chair/faculty conference. Faculty members will have the opportunity to contest the ranking in writing one week from the date of the conference. Every year that merit awards are to be given, the chair will review the annual performance evaluations and calculate potential merit raises for the established time period. The chair and committee will meet and discuss the rankings, any appeals of annual rankings, and then the chair will decide upon the final department recommendations based upon the Faculty Evaluation Committee’s performance evaluations, the determined merit rankings, and the chair’s perception of the faculty member’s contributions to the department during the time period under consideration. The chair will inform each faculty member and the Faculty Evaluation Committee of the final recommendations. Faculty members who believe their
accomplishments have been undervalued have 5 working days to request a meeting with the chair to discuss their merit recommendation. The procedures for further appeals are found in PPS 7.10. After the five day period, and after resolution or denial of appeals, the recommendations will be forwarded to the Dean of the College of Science.
University policy defines the minimum workload for full time faculty to be 12 workload credits, WLC (1 WLC = 1 semester credit hour or equivalent). The university policy, PPS 7.05, allows for flexibility in workload assignments for faculty but also states that all tenured and tenure-track faculty members have professional responsibilities in teaching, research and service beyond workload expectations. This policy establishes general guidelines for assigning workload credit. Specific workload credit assignments are made at the discretion of the department Chair.

This policy applies only to tenured and tenure track faculty. Temporary faculty are hired on a per-course basis.

**Teaching Workload Credit**

Except in specific cases, class and laboratory coordination assignments normally accrue 3 WLC. Assignments requiring more time and/or effort typically receive extra WLC, while assignments requiring less time and/or effort typically receive fewer than 3 WLC. Assignments that are viewed as “light duty” are normally rotated among interested faculty with expertise in the subject. Faculty who are fully research active (i.e., Research Active 4 classification, see below) will normally be assigned two class sections or a combination of class and laboratory coordination totaling 6 WLC per semester, and will normally be assigned 6 WLC for research and scholarly activities. Non-research active faculty will be normally assigned 4 class sections or a combination totaling 12 teaching WLC. Research active faculty with reduced research expectations (i.e., Research Active 1-3 classifications) will normally be assigned more than 6, but fewer than 12 teaching WLC per semester, based on classification (see Appendix II).

**Large Lecture Classes** – Teaching-theater classes with enrollments exceeding 150 require extra preparation, grading, and student interaction, and normally receive 6 WLC. WLC in these classes is based on the projected enrollment when class schedules are finalized.

**Laboratory Supervision** – Laboratories with large numbers of sections, students, and/or instructional assistants will receive up to 6 additional WLC. Laboratories requiring substantial lab report grading, in-lab teaching, instructional assistant training and supervision, and/or development of new experiments may receive 1.5 or more additional WLC. In the event that the curriculum of a laboratory course requires major revision, additional WLC may be assigned based on the nature, scope and extent of the revision.
**Special Circumstances** – Up to 3 additional WLC may be assigned at the discretion of the Chair in special circumstances. Examples of such circumstances include, but are not limited to: (1) a first-time teaching assignment requiring substantial extra preparation; (2) substantial development of innovative classroom techniques, laboratory methods, and/or curriculum; and (3) special assignments of high significance to the Department.

**Specific Classes** – *Appendix I* identifies classes and laboratory assignments having WLCs that normally differ from 3.0.

**Special Department Needs** – Situations may arise when the Chair is required to assign teaching WLCs to one or more faculty that exceed the norm, in order to meet Departmental teaching obligations. When this is necessary, priority will be placed on compensating the affected faculty member by assigning an equivalent reduction in teaching WLC in a subsequent semester.

**Buy Out of Teaching Workload** – With approval of the Chair, research-active faculty with sufficient grant support may buy out 3.0 teaching WLC in exchange for 3.0 research WLC, contingent on the successful hiring/assignment of a qualified instructor to teach the affected class.

**Service Workload Credit**

Additional service WLC may be given for service assignments that require a great deal of extra time and effort, and benefit the academic goals of the department. Service WLCs are normally offset by a reduction in teaching WLC. *Ad hoc* service WLCs are normally assigned only when the offset of teaching WLCs does not necessitate a teaching overload for other faculty. *Advising* is a recurring service activity that is foundational to the Department’s educational mission. Service WLCs that are regularly assigned for Advising are included in *Appendix I*.

**Research Workload Credit**

Research WLC will be assigned based on research productivity. Historical precedent indicates that 10 research WLC should generate one peer-reviewed publication. *Tenure-track* faculty will automatically receive 6 workload credits for research since university expectations require a commitment of 6 research WLC in order to be tenured.

*Appendix II* defines faculty research classifications and corresponding expectations.

**Oversight & Appeals** - The personnel committee will monitor workload assignments and make recommendations for adjustments in class and lab assignments to the department Chair. A faculty member who feels that his/her workload has not been assigned in a fair and reasonable manner—over the course of one year or longer—may appeal to the personnel committee. The personnel committee may respond to the appeal by making appropriate recommendations to the Chair.
Appendix I
Teaching and Service WLCs

Most lecture courses in the Department are assigned 3.0 WLC per semester. Courses that are typically exceptions to the 3.0 WLC assignment and all laboratory workload credits are identified in this Appendix.

Lower Division Laboratory Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUR</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Number of sections</th>
<th>WLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1141</td>
<td>Gen. Chem. Lab I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1142</td>
<td>Gen. Chem. Lab II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1430</td>
<td>Chemistry non-science majors lab</td>
<td>&lt;6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2130</td>
<td>Lab techniques in Org. Chem lab</td>
<td>6-19</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2150</td>
<td>Biochem and Metabolism lab</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2141</td>
<td>Organic Chemistry I lab</td>
<td>≥ 30</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2142</td>
<td>Organic Chemistry II lab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upper Division Laboratory Courses

Note: base WLC for the following is one section of laboratory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUR</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>WLC</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3245</td>
<td>Phys. Chem. Lab</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>add 1.5 per extra section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3275</td>
<td>Biochemical Techniques</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>add 1.5 per extra section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3276</td>
<td>Experimental Biochemistry</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>add 1.5 per extra section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3410</td>
<td>Quantitative Analysis (Lab ONLY)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>add 1.5 per extra section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4231</td>
<td>Advanced Lab I</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>add 1.5 per extra section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4241</td>
<td>Advanced Lab II</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>add 1.5 per extra section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4481</td>
<td>Advanced Biochem Lab I</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>add 1.5 per extra section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4482</td>
<td>Advanced Biochem Lab II</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>add 1.5 per extra section</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classes with normal WLC less than 3.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUR</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>WLC</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5110</td>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5295</td>
<td>Prof. Devel. of Grad. Asst.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5395</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Research</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>normally taught by Graduate Advisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advising is one service activity that is foundational to the Department’s educational mission. Service WLC is regularly assigned for Advising.

Normal Service WLC Assigned for Advising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>FALL WLC</th>
<th>SPRING WLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Advisor</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Advisor</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.0 (includes summer)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II
Faculty Research Classification and Expectations

Normal Research WLC – Research WLC is normally assigned on the basis of the faculty member’s research-active status, according to the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Normal Research WLC/semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Active 4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Active 3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Active 2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Active 1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Research Active</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation – Tenure-track faculty are automatically classified as Research Active 4. Tenured faculty who were considered research faculty effective September 1, 2007 will initially be classified as Research Active 4. The initial research classification of tenured faculty may be altered by negotiation between the faculty member and the department Chair.

Evaluation cycle – Regular evaluations will be based on research productivity, averaged over the preceding five years. For example, the Spring 2015 evaluation will evaluate average research productivity over calendar years 2009-2014. Due to predictable delays between completing a research project and publication of its results, evaluations will be based on research WLC with a one-year offset. In the above example, the Spring 2015 evaluation will take into account research WLC in 2008-2013.

The first formative evaluation will occur in Spring 2008. For faculty with weak productivity records prior to 2008, evaluations through Spring 2010 will give special consideration to research productivity after 2007. This is clarified in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation (Spring)</th>
<th>Research Productivity Years</th>
<th>Research WLC Years</th>
<th>Special Consideration Years*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Special consideration is given to productivity during and after 2008 for tenured faculty with weak research productivity prior to 2008.

Faculty research classifications and corresponding expectations are defined below. Based on historical antecedents, the equivalent of one peer-reviewed publication was generated per 10 research WLC. Equivalencies and other details are included below.

Beginning Spring 2008, faculty who have not met expectations consistent with their research classification will be given an opportunity to improve their research productivity
over a two-year period. A formative evaluation of each faculty member will be provided by the chair based on past research productivity beginning in Spring 2005. The faculty member will provide a synopsis of research plans for 2008-2010. Research WLC assignments will be unchanged, and a plan detailing specific goals and objectives will be negotiated between the faculty member and the department Chair. In Spring 2009, the first summative evaluation will occur to determine whether the faculty member is making progress. At that time, a second formative evaluation will occur describing goals and objectives for the following year. The presumption is that all faculty will continue as research active 4. In Spring 2010, the summative evaluation will be consistent with actual research productivity averaged over the preceding five years. Research active classifications will then be reevaluated.

* Research Active faculty whose productivity does not meet expectations for their research classification for three consecutive annual reviews will be assigned a lower classification, consistent with actual performance over the preceding five years.

* Research Active 1-3 faculty whose productivity exceeds expectations for their research classification for three consecutive annual reviews will be assigned an upgraded classification, consistent with actual performance over the preceding five years.

**Research Expectations**

The general guideline is that nine accumulated research WLCs are expected to result in one peer-reviewed publication or its equivalent.

The stated expectation is based on historical research productivity when the normal faculty research assignments were 3 WLC per semester. The underlying assumption is that research productivity should be directly proportional to the number of research WLCs received.

The underlying assumption that every nine research WLCs should result in research productivity equivalent to the publication of one peer-reviewed research paper as corresponding author should be reviewed and evaluated five years after 6 WLC per semester has become the normal assignment for active research faculty, i.e., in the 2012-2013 academic year.

**Equivalencies.** Research is multi-faceted and productivity cannot be properly assessed simply by counting the number of publications on a CV. Because the general guideline (above) is expressed in terms of publications, the table below identifies other research accomplishments and their “equivalencies.” Inevitably, a system of numerical equivalencies contains arbitrary elements; therefore, flexibility is warranted when evaluating research productivity based on a numerical equivalency system.

**Table 1. Accomplishments and equivalency credited toward publications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accomplishment</th>
<th>Equivalency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed research publication as <em>corresponding</em> author</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed publication as corresponding <em>or</em> contributing author in a</td>
<td>add 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishment</td>
<td>Equivalency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent (issued)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology transfer</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published Peer-Reviewed Abstract/Preprint and/or Oral/Poster Presentation at a National Professional Meeting</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Professional Reports</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Thesis (completed and filed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Competitive Research Grant (new), PI (equivalency may also be increased, based on funding source and amount)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Competitive Research Grant (new), co-PI</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-competitive contracts</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Research Grant (new)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Research Seminar</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate or Graduate Research, culminating in a written report (except in an MS thesis), or in the preparation and presentation of a research poster</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To maintain 6 research WLC per semester, a minimum of 6 publication equivalents must be maintained upon accumulation of 54 research WLC, 4.5 publication equivalents must be publication related and accrued from equivalencies in Table 1.