1.0 Statement of Purpose

1.1 In compliance with University policy, the Department of Mathematics will implement and periodically revise the following workload policy.

This policy should be viewed as a Departmental specific supplement to PPS 7.05. All policies included in PPS 7.05, including standard workload credits for teaching and research are to be implemented by the Department without specific mention here. The purpose of this document is to establish general guidelines for assigning workload credits, particularly credit adjustments.

The University policy defines the minimum workload for full time faculty to be 12 workload credits. This is a minimum expectation, and it is to be understood that faculty may frequently engage in workload related activities that result in a workload report of more than 12 credits. This does not automatically result in a future workload reduction, except in exceptional circumstances as detailed in the policy.

1.2 This policy is intended to be consistent with the Departmental mission and the mission of Texas State University in the creation and dissemination of knowledge through teaching, scholarly activity, and service.

1.3 All tenured and tenure-track faculty members have professional responsibilities in teaching, research, and service beyond workload expectations.

2.0 Teaching Workload Credit

The majority of courses taught in the Department will accrue 3 workload credits, as per PPS 7.05. Instructions for calculating credit for independent study courses, thesis and dissertation supervision are also contained in PPS 7.05. To receive credit for these activities, a faculty member must serve as the instructor of record for a course. Thus credit cannot be received for independent work with students who are not registered for a course, except as detailed in other sections of this policy. Thus faculty mentoring research projects for honors theses, AMP scholars, and similar programs where they are not the instructor of record will not receive workload credit for these activities. However, these are valued contributions to the Department and are addressed in the merit and performance cycles.

Regardless of workload credit accumulation, faculty should teach at least one course per semester when not on leave.
2.1 Large class adjustment: The Department recognizes the extra time and effort involved in teaching large classes. Classes with an enrollment of over 100 will receive an adjustment to bring the total workload credit to twice the semester credit hours for the course.

2.2 Overload adjustment: Faculty are occasionally asked to teach a course above their normal teaching duties, particularly to balance the Fall versus Spring enrollment differential. Faculty who agree to do so will be assigned reimbursable workload credits, which will be returned to the faculty member during a long semester within two years from earning the credit, unless the faculty negotiates for a paid stipend, as per paragraph 13 of PPS 7.05. Every effort will be made to issue the credit as soon as possible.

3.0 Other Professional Responsibilities

Workload credits for other professional responsibilities are explained in PPS 7.05. The Departmental specific applications of these credits are listed below. The number in parentheses following each heading refers to the paragraph of PPS 7.05 under which the credit falls. In the situations below where a faculty member may apply for credit, the faculty member should provide relevant information and documentation to the Department Chair. The Chair will make the initial determination of credit. The credit will be reviewed by the Merit and Performance Committee following the regular annual review process. The committee will make a recommendation to the chair regarding whether the activity in question rises sufficiently far above standard expectations to warrant workload credit or if the credit should be discontinued. The decision rests with the chair.

3.1 Chair Assignment (27): Workload credit for the chair will be granted according to PPS 1.03.

3.2 Program Director/Program Chair (28): Faculty members who serve as a director or chair of a program (eg: MathWorks) may receive workload credit. The amount of credit should be negotiated at the time of the appointment.

3.3 Academic Activity Adjustment (29):

3.3.1 Faculty engaged in the preparation of major documents for the Department, such as a proposal for a new Ph.D. program, may receive workload credit for the activity. Such credit should be negotiated with the Department Chair at the time of the assignment.

3.3.2 Faculty developing major teaching resources for the department, such as a departmental computer instruction station, a teaching materials resource center, or other major contribution, may apply for a workload credit for the activity.
3.3.3 The faculty member with primary duties for compiling student learning outcome reports for all Departmental programs will receive a 3 credit workload adjustment each semester.

3.3.4 Faculty engaged in activities at the University level may receive workload credit as determined by the Provost.

3.4 Administrative Activity Adjustment (30):

3.4.1 The Assistant Chair will receive a 3 credit workload adjustment each semester.

3.4.2 The faculty sponsor of the Math Club may receive up to a 3 credit workload adjustment each year for maintaining an active club and assisting with the coordination of contact with Departmental alumni. Specific duties that are required for receiving this adjustment will be determined by the Student Affairs Committee.

3.4.3 The faculty member in charge of scheduling for the year will receive a 3 credit workload adjustment during the Spring semester and credit for two courses during the summer.

3.5 Academic Advising Adjustment (31):

3.5.1 The Undergraduate Academic Advisor will receive a 3 credit workload adjustment each semester and credit for one course during the summer. The Assistant Advisor will receive credit for one course in the summer.

3.5.2 The Graduate Program Advisor will receive a 3 credit workload adjustment each semester.

3.5.3 The Mathematics Education Doctoral Advisor will receive one 3 credit workload adjustment each year.

3.5.4 The Chair of the Doctoral Program Committee will receive a 3 credit workload adjustment each semester.

3.5.5 Faculty advising student research projects that lead to publications or presentations by the students but that do not fall under other categories in this document may apply to receive workload credit of 0.5 credits per research group.

3.6 Professional Activity Adjustment (33):

3.6.1 Faculty appointed or elected to local, state, national, or international boards or committees may apply to receive 0.5 workload credits. If the faculty serves as an officer in a board or national professional organization, he or she may receive 1 workload credit.

3.6.2 A faculty member serving as an editor for a mathematical journal may apply to receive 0.5 workload credits per semester. If the faculty member serves as the managing editor, he or she may receive 1 workload credit per semester. The managing editor of a mathematical journal that does not have the external resources normally provided by a publishing agency or society, such as the Electronic Journal of Differential Equations, may receive additional summer workload credit up to the equivalent of two
courses to offset the additional duties involved in this type of publication.

3.6.3 A faculty member who serves as the main organizer of a conference that has not been given credit for the conference under the grant activity category may apply for workload credit. The standard for a state or local conference is 0.5 workload credits, and for a national or international conference, 1 workload credit.

3.7 Research/Grant Activity Adjustment (34):

3.7.1 Research active faculty are automatically assigned 3 workload credits for research. Faculty who are no longer research active may elect to forgo these credits, in which case the faculty member will have a higher teaching or service load. Such a shift in responsibilities will be reflected in the merit and performance cycle with an appropriate adjustment in the relative weight of each of the three categories. All faculty are expected to remain current in their field.

3.7.2 An additional 3 workload credits for research may be assigned to faculty teaching doctoral courses if necessary to bring the faculty member’s teaching load to two courses for that semester.

3.7.3 Faculty with a particularly strong research record who are not teaching a doctoral course may apply for an additional 3 workload credits for research. Such an assignment is at the discretion of the chair, under consultation with the Merit and Performance Committee, and is dependent upon the Department’s ability to meet classroom obligations.

3.7.4 Faculty engaging in major grant funded activities may apply for up to 3 workload credits depending on the nature and scope of the activity. With prior approval, this category can be used, where appropriate and where Departmental scheduling concerns allow, as Departmental matching for grant proposals.

3.8 Research Buy Out Adjustment (35):

3.8.1 Faculty who have secured external funding that includes “buy out” time will be awarded workload credit commensurate with the grant proposal.

3.9 Graduate Mentoring Adjustment (36):

3.9.1 Faculty serving as a member (not chair) of doctoral dissertation committee may apply for 0.33 workload credits per dissertation committee for up to two semesters per student.

4.0 Service

Service is an integral part of the expectations for every faculty member. Most of the service activities engaged in by faculty do not receive workload credit; however such activity is expected of all faculty members. While the varying service loads of faculty members may not always be recognized in the workload report, greater than normal service duties can result in alterations to the merit and performance calculations.
Some service related activities do receive workload adjustments. Due to the fact that many of these activities are also related to teaching, research, or administrative duties, the service workloads are included in the other professional responsibilities section of this document.

5.0 Other

5.1.1 Faculty members will frequently have workload assignments beyond the minimum 12 credits per semester in the course of their normal duties. In most instances, this will not result in future teaching reductions. Exceptions include faculty who teach an overload one semester, as mentioned in paragraph 2.2 above. Additional exceptions are at the discretion of the Department Chair.

5.1.2 Additional circumstances may arise that warrant workload credit but are not anticipated in this document. Faculty who believe their situation falls in this category should contact the Department Chair for consultation.
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1.0 Statement of Purpose

1.1 In compliance with University policy, the Department of Mathematics will implement and periodically revise the following annual review policy. This review and revision will occur every three years.

Evaluation of faculty for each calendar year will be completed by March 1 of the following year. This policy will take effect upon the approval of the Provost.

The annual evaluation process will provide for determination of performance, merit, and post-tenure review. Annual evaluation documents may be used in the tenure and promotion process, as described in the College of Science procedures.

1.2 This policy is intended to be consistent with the Departmental mission and the mission of Texas State University in the creation and dissemination of knowledge through teaching, scholarly activity, and service.

1.3 In addition, this policy is intended to provide for self-development; identify, reinforce, and share the strengths of the faculty; provide for continuous professional development; provide for identifying and strengthening the role of each faculty member; and provide information which may be used in personnel decisions affecting each faculty member within the Department.

2.0 Evaluation Procedure

In order to accommodate the varied needs of the Department and skills of individual faculty, the following procedure is designed to allow flexibility in performance and maintain accountability to the Department and the University.

2.1 The evaluation cycle will consist of three phases:

   a. Determination of weighting for teaching, research, and service: (Normally prior to the calendar year under review)
   b. Documentation of effort: (January of the subsequent year)
   c. Evaluation of performance: (February of the subsequent year)
2.2 This policy will apply to all eligible faculty members of the Department.

2.3 Personnel Board (Performance/Merit Committee)

The members of the Personnel Board (as defined in the Faculty Handbook) will be elected by the Personnel Committee for the purpose of evaluation of eligible faculty in the areas of performance, merit, and post-tenure review.

2.3.1 Five (5) members of the Personnel Committee will be elected subject to the policies outlined in the Faculty Handbook (in conformity with the Departmental Governance outlined in the memorandum of 7/25/97 from VPAA Robert Gratz).

2.3.2 The members will be elected to three-year terms with elections being staggered. Two members will be professors, one member will be an associate or assistant professor, and two members will be at-large members.

2.3.3 Members may not succeed themselves on this Committee in the same position, and may serve no more than three (3) years in a row. They may be re-elected after a lapse of one or more election cycles. In the event of retirement, resignation, or removal of an elected member, a member may be elected to complete the term but may serve no more than three (3) years in a row.

2.3.4 Members retiring, resigning, or being removed will be replaced through an election according to 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 at the next regular meeting of the Personnel Committee following the retirement, resignation, or removal.

2.3.5 A member may be removed by mutual agreement of the Chair and the vote of the Personnel Committee. Failure of a member to follow Departmental and University policies and procedures is considered cause for removal from the Personnel Board.

2.3.6 Members will be elected in January and will begin serving their 3 year term immediately.

2.4 Determination of Weighting Phase

2.4.1 Faculty are evaluated in three areas: teaching, research, and service. Normally, teaching and research will each be weighted 40% and service will be weighted 20% when calculating merit raises based on points earned in each category. However, circumstances may arise under which tenured faculty or faculty not on the tenure-track may request alternate weightings be given to the three areas of evaluation. Faculty wishing to be considered for an alternate weighting system should request a meeting with the chair to discuss their desired changes. Any agreed upon changes will not be effective until after the next review cycle. Exceptions can be made in special circumstances, such as when a faculty member’s teaching load changes between the Spring and Fall
semesters during one calendar year. Alterations within the current review cycle cannot be requested as a means of retrospectively improving merit and performance results. Any weightings are subject to the following guidelines:

2.4.1.1 Tenure-track faculty must maintain a 40-40-20 weighting until tenure is achieved.

2.4.1.2 Research:
   2.4.1.2.1 Lecturers who are hired into positions that do not have any research requirements, may request a research weighting of less than 40%, with a 10% lower bound. Research and scholarly activity expectations for a 10% weighting can be met by staying current in the field.
   2.4.1.2.2 Tenured faculty must have a research weighting no lower than 20%. Faculty receiving more than 3 workload credits for research must have a research weighting no lower than 40%.

2.4.1.3 Teaching:
   2.4.1.3.1 Faculty teaching 3 or more courses or teaching two courses if at least one is a doctoral course must have a teaching weighting no lower than 40%. In no case should any faculty member’s teaching weighting be less than 25%.
   2.4.1.3.2 Faculty teaching more than 3 undergraduate courses may request a teaching weighting greater than 40%.

2.4.1.4 Service
   2.4.1.4.1 Faculty members at the rank of Senior Lecturer and above must have a service weighting no less than 20%.
   2.4.1.4.2 The maximum weighting for service is 40%.

2.5 Document Phase – Documentation of Faculty Effort

Each faculty member will be responsible for uploading appropriate documentary materials to the departmental TRACS site provided for this purpose by January 31 of each year. Required documentation includes a current Curriculum Vitae and an Annual Summary statement. The Annual Summary statement will have one section for each of the categories Teaching, Research and Service, with no more than two pages devoted to each category. The Summary Statement should clearly emphasize accomplishments and activities of the calendar year under review. The site for each faculty member will contain folders devoted to each of the areas of Teaching, Research and Service. The Departmental Office will place scans of all student evaluations together with the statistical data from student evaluations in this section for
each faculty member in the Teaching folder. The Research folder must contain a copy of publications accepted or appearing in the calendar year under review. Each of the Teaching, Research and Service folders must contain copies of the relevant sections from the Annual Statement. Additionally, they will each contain sub-folders for the organization of further supporting documentation. After January 31, faculty may not add materials to this file unless prior approval is granted by the Personnel Committee and the Departmental Chair.

2.6 Evaluation Phase

The Personnel Board will evaluate each faculty member in the component areas and prepare a report for the Chair reflecting a consensus rating in each category. Members of the Personnel Board will not evaluate their own performance, but will be evaluated by the other members of the Personnel Board.

Since these matters are deemed “personnel matters”, the members of the Personnel Board will maintain full confidentiality concerning voting results, recommendations, and other discussion of the Board, with the exception of reports required by this policy. Each member of the Performance/Merit Committee will sign the following statement: “As an elected representative of the faculty of the Department of Mathematics, I agree to follow the current policies of the university and department while serving on the Performance/Merit Committee” at the beginning of each review cycle. Failure to sign this statement is grounds for removal from the committee.

2.6.1 On or before February 1, the Personnel Board will receive notification from the Chair the performance/merit files of the faculty are available for review. They will begin personal review of the materials at this time.

2.6.2 In closed meetings after February 1 and before February 20, the members of the Personnel Board will review all submitted documentation and evaluate the materials on the basis of the criteria listed in the Standards of Performance in this document and their professional judgment.

2.6.3 Evaluation Categories

Preliminary evaluations will be submitted to the Chair and will serve as a basis for recommendations in the areas of performance, merit, and post-tenure review.
2.6.3.1 Performance Evaluation. In each of the areas of teaching and service, a ranking will be assigned from the following categories:

Not eligible – no evidence was submitted to support a claim of acceptable performance in this area, or the evidence was of extraordinarily poor quality.

Eligible – the evidence supports a claim of acceptable performance based on the documentation in the files.

The Chair must provide any tenured faculty member who is denied a recommendation of acceptable performance with a written list of deficiencies. The Chair also must provide a plan of professional development for the faculty member addressing these deficiencies.

2.6.3.2 Merit Evaluation. In each of the areas of teaching, service, and research/scholarly activity a ranking of “Eligible for Merit” may be assigned. The Personnel Board rates each recommendation as low, medium, or high. Individual faculty workload credits should be taken into account when deciding what constitutes meritorious achievement in each area.

2.6.3.3 Certain activities embody aspects of multiple areas under review. In such cases, candidates may include the activity under each applicable area, but the candidate should clearly indicate the category under which he or she wishes the activity to be primarily considered.

2.6.4 The Chair will prepare a preliminary recommendation for the Dean, specifically assigning recommendations on the appropriate categories as determined by the President. This would include:

Performance – recommend / do not recommend

Merit – recommend (points) / do not recommend

Post-tenure review – acceptable / unacceptable

In years when a merit cycle is activated, the Chair will give the Personnel Board a summary of the recommendations of the points recommended, explicitly broken down into points awarded for each area. To calculate the total number of points, the points per
category are multiplied by the weighting factor previously determined for that faculty member for that year and the results are added.

2.6.5 In years when a merit cycle is activated, and once the Chair has completed his preliminary recommendation, a debriefing meeting should be held with the Personnel Board for an explanation of the proposed recommendations to allow final discussion at this level. After this meeting the Chair should submit recommendations individually to the faculty.

2.6.6 Because certain evaluative information may not be available to the Personnel Board and/or because of the nature of such information, there may be a variance in the recommendations by the Personnel Board and the recommendation by the Chair. Within three days, a faculty member may, at his or her option, request a meeting with the Chair to discuss questions regarding his or her evaluation. If the faculty member gives permission, the Chair will convene the Personnel Board and present the additional information. The Personnel Board will advise the Chair and the faculty member of any adjustments or recommendations they make at this time.

2.6.7 The final assignment of points and specifics of the budgetary adjustments will be made by the Chair within the guidelines of the Budget Office, the Administration guidelines, and University policy. The Chair will submit the evaluations to the Dean in support of these recommendations.

2.6.8 Annually, the Personnel Board will release a final report to the Department once their deliberations are completed. The chair will supply the board and faculty members with an explanation of how the points correlate to recommended merit categories of high, medium, and low, once a merit cycle is completed.

2.7 Standards for Supporting Materials

In developing documentation to allow evaluation, the faculty member must offer evidence that supports claims of performance and/or merit. Since the Personnel Board and others rely upon the summaries of activity and other evidence, it is most important that the documentation reflect an accurate, fair, concise, and complete record of the faculty member’s effort during the period being assessed.

2.7.1 Assessment of Acceptable Performance in Teaching
Any faculty member whose student teaching evaluation summaries are satisfactory overall will normally be given an eligible performance rating in teaching.

2.7.1.1 Required documentation:

Each faculty member is required to distribute the Departmental student evaluation forms in each class. The summary statistics will be made available to the Committee by the Department.

2.7.1.2 Optional documentation:

A faculty member may choose to include other documentation in support of performance in teaching such as:

1. Copies of teaching activities addressing problems identified in the student evaluation summaries.
2. Student letters.
3. Peer review statements of classroom teaching.
4. Peer review statements concerning class materials (syllabi, test, etc.)

Additionally any items acceptable as documentation of merit in teaching may be considered in the determination of acceptable performance in teaching.

2.7.2 Assessment of Merit in Teaching

A faculty member should not rely solely on the basis of student evaluation summaries to achieve a meritorious evaluation in teaching. Faculty members are required to submit the complete set of student evaluation forms for each class taught in order to be considered for merit. Additional evidence submitted may include copies of student evaluations with relevant comments, letters testifying to superior teaching, and documentation of any of the following:

1. Documentation of extra preparatory effort involved in courses taught.
2. Teaching courses beyond the required load of the faculty member.
4. Supervision of student teachers.
5. Conducting independent study courses.
6. Developing and disseminating course notes, testing materials, lab manuals, computer software, and other curricular materials beyond what is normally required.
7. Developing a new course or curricula.
8. Obtaining funding for the development of new course, curricula, or teaching materials.
9. Receiving awards for teaching.
10. Documenting superior performance of students through standardized tests, subsequent courses, or career performance.
11. Increasing usage of technology in classroom or instructional activities, including computer applications, class notes, web pages, software development, multimedia instruction, or other innovations.

2.7.3 Assessment of Merit in Research and Scholarly Activity

In the assessment of a faculty member’s research program evidence should support claims indicated and clearly indicate the active pursuit, discovery, development, and evaluation of knowledge.

2.7.3.1 Documentation of Research and Scholarly Activity

In order to develop and maintain a prestigious, high quality mathematics program it is important that faculty be active in research and engaged in scholarly activities. Scholarly activities that engage students are strongly encouraged and supported.

Research and scholarly activities include:
1. Published research activities.
2. Expository works, such as textbooks.
3. Receipt of a grant or grant support for research or scholarly activity.
4. Reviewing and editing articles, texts, and grant proposals.
5. Presentations at conferences, invited talks, workshops, colloquia, etc.
6. Other documented scholarly activities, such as working with students on thesis and presentations.

2.7.3.2 Explanations Concerning Research and Scholarly Activity

1. Research and scholarly activities encompass a wide range of activities as described in Section 2.6.2.1.
Evaluating these activities, the level of the work, and the impact on the Departmental program, students, and mathematical community will be taken into account.

2. Many research projects take years to develop and come to fruition. For this reason, activities for a three-year period may be considered when evaluating Research and Scholarly Activities.

3. Refereed publications normally receive a greater weight than non-refereed publications. Publications may include, but are not limited to, research articles, conference proceedings, research monographs and treatises, and expository works such as textbooks. Both quantity and quality of work published or accepted for publication will be taken into account. The faculty member is invited to submit documentation concerning the quality of all publications and their distribution.

4. Invitations to speak at conferences and special events, workshops, and related activities add to the prestige of the Texas State program and are scholarly activities that are strongly supported.

5. Grant activity is a scholarly activity that is strongly encouraged and supported. The granting agency and the level of competition for such grants will be taken into account. An important criterion in evaluating grants is their prestige and impact upon the Texas State mathematics program and students.

6. Refereeing articles and grant proposals, and editing journals is a scholarly activity that is strongly encouraged and supported.

7. Documentation of citations of scholarly work.

8. Other documentation or activities may be included. For example, documentation of how students have engaged in research process as a result of the research will be used as both evidence of scholarly activities as well as effective teaching. Faculty may also present evidence of work in preparation, both this will be given less weight than work accepted for publication.

9. Lecturers who do not have a research requirement should document efforts to stay current in the field.

2.7.4 Assessment of Merit in Service

Professional service includes those activities that benefit the profession, the Department, and the University, but are not within the areas of teaching or scholarship.
2.7.4.1 Evaluation of Service

The following may be considered for evaluation in this area:
1. Providing administrative services, such as advising students, assisting in strategic planning, or policy development for the Department.
2. Holding office in professional organizations serving the mathematics community.
3. Participating actively in Departmental, School College, or University committees.
4. Submitting grants (equipment or scholarly activity) for internal or external funding.
5. Serving as a chairperson for sessions at professional meetings.
6. Participating or consulting in one’s area of expertise in community programs, serving public schools, contributing to city and State programs in a professional way.
7. Editorial work and refereeing of scholarly articles.
8. Serving as a judge at math and science fair events.

2.7.4.2 Documentation of Service

A short description of the activities in which the faculty member is involved. Optional letters of recognition may be considered.

2.7.4.3 Assessment of Acceptable Performance in Service

Any faculty member who performs satisfactorily normal service duties such as serving on committees, regularly attending departmental meetings, volunteering to advise students, and any other routine assigned administrative tasks will be given an eligible performance rating in service.
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1.0 Statement of Purpose

1.1 In compliance with University policy, the Department of Mathematics will implement and periodically revise the following policy regarding the appointment of Senior Lecturers.

This policy should be viewed as a Departmental specific policy. The purpose of this document is to establish general guidelines for deciding when a Lecturer is sufficiently vested in the Department to merit a title change to become a Senior Lecturer. Note that such a change does not affect the person’s salary. Senior Lecturer appointments can be made for three year terms, pending successful annual reviews and recommendations to reappoint, renewable annually. Senior Lecturers can be reappointed to subsequent three-year terms.

1.2 All Senior Lecturers have professional responsibilities in teaching and service beyond workload expectations.

2.0 Criteria for Senior Lecturers

2.1 Lecturers who have been employed by the Department of Mathematics at Texas State University for 3 or more years, who have a record of service to the Department either through Departmental committees or special assignments, who have provided evidence of good teaching, and whose Performance/Merit overall ranking is medium or higher may request a change of appointment to Senior Lecturer. Such requests should be made in writing to the Chair of the Department.

2.2 Upon receiving a request for an appointment as a Senior Lecturer, the Chair will review the Lecturer’s annual review folders for the most recent 3 year period to determine if the criteria stated above have been met. The Chair will also review Departmental needs and anticipated availability of positions. If the Chair determines that the criteria have been met and Departmental needs are sufficient to warrant a 3 year position, the chair will submit a request for a change of status from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer to the Office of the Provost. The final decision regarding the availability of a Senior Lecturer position rests with the Provost.

2.3 Once a decision has been reached, the Chair will communicate the decision to the applicant. If the change of status is denied, the Chair will state the reason.
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