(Final Version Approved by Faculty – Nov 22, 2024)

POLICY TITLE: HHP Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Annual Review and Merit Rating

SECTION I.   PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The goal of this policy is to provide a common framework and a set of detailed procedures for conducting annual faculty performance evaluations of all tenured and tenure-track (T/TT) faculty members in the Department of Health and Human Performance (HHP) at the University of Houston. This policy is intended to codify a faculty performance evaluation process that is open, fair, and transparent, which incorporates both faculty peer review and administrative review by the department chair. HHP T/TT faculty members will be evaluated based on the activities they perform in the workload domains described in the current UH Faculty Workload policy (MAPP 12.05.01). For HHP T/TT faculty members, these workload domains are research/scholarship, teaching, and service.

In addition, as per the requirements of the current UH Faculty Annual Performance Review (F-APR) policy, when creating criteria for evaluating faculty performance at UH, it is incumbent upon academic departments to ensure that those faculty activities identified as being of value to the academic unit and discipline are also clearly aligned with the strategic goals of the department, college, and university. It is also expected that the results of the departmental annual faculty performance evaluation process should inform and guide (rather than dictate) any administrative recommendations made by the department chair concerning merit-based salary adjustments for T/TT faculty members.

Further, as per the requirements of the current UH Post-Tenure Review policy, if a tenured faculty member receives an annual performance evaluation of "not meeting expectations" in any of the three faculty workload domains identified above, this may result in the initiation of a post-tenure review (PTR) of the tenured faculty member. As such, this policy has been constructed to explicitly align with the requirements of the current UH Faculty Workload, UH Faculty Annual Performance Review (F-APR), and UH Post Tenure Review policies while also providing specific evaluation criteria for assigning an annual performance rating that clearly distinguishes between faculty performance that is "not meeting expectations" and that which is "meeting expectations or above" in each of the three workload domains.

SECTION II.   EXISITING POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

This departmental policy and its accompanying procedures are based on requirements described in the following University of University policies:

University of Houston Faculty Workload policy (MAPP 12.05.01)

University of Houston Faculty Annual Performance Review (F-APR) policy (Office of the Provost)

University of Houston Post Tenure Review policy (Office of the Provost)

SECTION III.   DEFINITIONS

Numerical Score – the numerical score assigned to a faculty member reflecting the professional activities performed in a particular workload domain during the previous 12-month evaluation period. Faculty activities for the previous 12-month evaluation period are reported using the Faculty Activity Report and evaluated using the criteria detailed in Appendix 1. Faculty members are required to submit a Faculty Activity Report on an annual basis.

Annual Performance Rating – the performance rating assigned to a faculty member in a particular workload domain (i.e., research/scholarship, teaching, and service) in any given year, calculated as the mean average of the numerical scores a faculty member receives in that workload domain from the three (3) previous annual 12-month evaluation periods. Faculty members will be assigned an annual performance rating in each workload domain on an annual basis.

SECTION IV.   GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR EVALUATING T/TT FACULTY PERFORMANCE

All HHP T/TT faculty members should expect and are entitled to receive an open, fair, and transparent annual performance evaluation. In addition, HHP T/TT faculty members should expect and are entitled to their performance being evaluated using criteria that are not only appropriate to their discipline, academic rank, and professional responsibilities but that are consistently applied when evaluating HHP T/TT faculty members holding the same academic rank and similar professional responsibilities. However, any performance evaluation criteria developed by the department must be consistent with the mission of a nationally recognized, Tier One research university while being clearly aligned with the strategic goals of the department, college, and university.

While University policy states that faculty performance/activity data must be submitted by faculty members to their department on an annual basis, it is left up to departments to decide if they wish to aggregate performance/activity data from multiple 12-month evaluation periods when assigning an annual performance rating for any given year. To ensure a comprehensive and equitable assessment of faculty performance that also reflects the cyclical nature of the professional activities HHP T/TT faculty members are typically involved in, for any given year, the annual performance rating assigned to a faculty member in each workload domain will consist of the mean numerical score in that workload domain averaged across the three (3) previous 12-month evaluation periods.

For example, for any given year, the annual performance rating assigned to an HHP T/TT faculty member in the research/scholarship workload domain will be the mean of the numerical scores they received in the research/scholarship domain from the three (3) previous 12-month evaluation periods. Similarly, for any given year, the annual performance ratings assigned to an HHP T/TT faculty member in the teaching and the service workload domains will be the mean of the numerical scores they received in the teaching and service domains from the three (3) previous 12-month evaluation periods, respectively.

For newly hired or returning HHP T/TT faculty members who have not yet accrued three (3) consecutive years of numerical scores in each workload domain, annual performance ratings will be expressed as the mean average of their available numerical scores to date.

SECTION V.   EVALUATION PROCEDURES

V. (i)   Submission of Faculty Annual Activity Report and Evaluation Process Timeline

Faculty members will receive an electronic copy of the Faculty Annual Activity Report template on or before December 1 of each year. Faculty members may submit their completed activity report any time prior to the stated submission deadline. The date by which faculty members must submit their faculty activity report for the previous 12-month evaluation period is subject to change but will normally be on or before December 31 of each. Committee and department chair review of submitted activity reports will completed on or before January 31 of the spring semester. The department chair will meet with each faculty member individually to review their evaluation and discuss annual expectations during the month of February. The faculty annual evaluation process (including resolution of any disputed performance scores) will be completed by February 28 of each year.

V. (ii)   Department Chair – (%) Effort Faculty Expectations Agreement

The Department Chair will meet with each faculty member annually to discuss role and performance expectations. At this meeting, the Chair and faculty member will agree on the faculty member's workload expectations for the upcoming 12-month evaluation period expressed in terms of percent (%) effort in each of the three (3) faculty workload domains (e.g., research/scholarship, teaching, and service), with total effort to equal 100%. Under certain circumstances and only in the research/scholarship domain, a faculty member may request that the department chair approve an appropriate professional activity to serve as a substitution for one of the required activities listed as part of the minimum criteria associated with receiving a numerical score of "2", "3" or "4". The agreement on (%) percent effort expectations in each workload domain (including any substitutions made in the research/scholarship domain) will be documented between the department chair and faculty member prior to the beginning of the next 12-month evaluation period. A copy of this agreement will be provided to the review committee as part of the evaluation process.

V. (iii)   Annual Performance Evaluation Exceptions

All active tenure and tenure-track faculty members shall be evaluated annually with the following exceptions:

- faculty who are on approved, non-academic leave without pay for the entire 12-month evaluation period under review,
- faculty who have 100% effort in an administrative position.

For tenured or tenure-track faculty who are on other types of approved <u>paid leave</u> (e.g., family medical leave, extended sick leave, administrative leave), depending on the length of the approved paid leave, the evaluation period will be prorated to account for the time spent on leave.

The department or the dean may conduct annual performance reviews for department chairs and program directors according to existing practice.

<u>V. (iv)   Faculty Review Committee Composition</u>

The Committee shall have four members elected at large from the eligible faculty under CLASS bylaws, with the requirement that there be a representative from each of the four program areas currently represented in HHP. Each member will serve a three-year term, renewable indefinitely. The terms will be staggered.

The Committee shall meet immediately following the deadline for faculty members to submit their annual faculty activity report. During this organizational meeting, the Committee shall elect a Chair from amongst them, review the objectives and procedures of the review process, and set a timeline for completing their report and delivering it to the Department Chair aligned with the deadlines for the Department chair to provide merit salary and/or post-tenure review (PTR) recommendations to the Dean.

<u>V. (v)   Faculty Review Committee Evaluation Process</u>

Each committee member will independently review and score all T/TT faculty activity reports using the evaluation criteria contained in Appendix 1. Additionally, committee members will not score their own reports, and each member will score all other committee members' activity reports. Each faculty member will be scored with respect to their activities in each of the three (3) workload domains (i.e., research/scholarship, teaching, and service) during the previous 12-month evaluation period.

When arriving at numerical scores, the Committee members should take into consideration:

(a) the faculty member's rank
(b) the enumerated expectations for (%) percent effort in each workload domain documented between the faculty member and department chair as described in Section V. (ii) above
(c) the university's expectations as it relates to being a Tier One research university.

These considerations are expected to affect the committee members' scores. For example, the same annual activities may produce markedly higher scores for an assistant professor than they would for a full professor because the expectations of the department and university for faculty members of those two ranks differ considerably. Similarly, a faculty member with a 75% research/scholarship expectation should have considerably different levels of activity in the research/scholarship domain compared to another faculty member with a 10% research/scholarship expectation.

Within these conceptual guidelines, each Committee member may use his or her discretion in assigning numerical scores for the 12-month evaluation period under review. Final numerical scores may be made as decimal values. Each workload domain (i.e., research/scholarship,

teaching, and service) should receive a single numerical score that maps to the following faculty performance criterion scale dictated by the University:

> 1 - Below expectations of the department & university
> 2 – Consistent with expectations of the department & university
> 3 – Above expectations of the department & university
> 4 – Excellence considering the expectations of the department & university

Numerical scores should be made based only on the information provided in the faculty activity report. Faculty members who fail to submit a faculty activity report for the 12-month evaluation period under review will receive a score of 1 in each workload domain. The Committee members may provide written comments on their scoring forms in addition to their numerical scores. A committee member who scores a faculty member with a numerical score of 4 or a numerical score below 2 in any workload domain is required to supply a written comment explaining the rationale for their score. Scores must be assigned independently of the other Committee members. Committee members will submit their scoring forms to the Committee chair.

Once all members have completed their scoring forms, the Committee chair will review the scoring forms to identify obvious discrepancies (e.g., widely disparate scores in one workload domain for a particular faculty member) or ambiguities (e.g., scoring error or skipped score). While it is expected that scores will vary among the committee members, this review will allow the Committee chair to identify and address potential inconsistencies or conflicts that may affect the validity of the review process. The Committee chair may review these issues with the Committee for clarification as necessary, such as providing justification for disparate scores, or address them individually, such as asking a committee member to complete a missing score. Under no circumstance is the Committee chair to alter or edit the scores without the knowledge and consent of the Committee.

V. (vi) Faculty Review Committee Report to Department Chair

Once the committee scoring process is finalized, the Committee chair will compile a summary report and distribute it to the Committee members. Committee members may respond to comments submitted by other members (e.g., stating they agree or disagree with another member's comment or pointing to evidence in the activity report related to another member's comment) but may not make new comments, may not rebut comments made in response to their original comments, and may not change their scores except to correct errors. The Committee must vote to approve the final report to the Department chair, after which no edits can be made.

The final Committee report to the Department chair shall contain:

1. The average numerical score assigned by the Committee for each workload domain for each T/TT faculty member for the 12-month evaluation period under review;
2. All unedited written comments provided by Committee members (without attributing comments to specific members);
3. Annual performance ratings for each T/TT faculty member in each workload domain, calculated as the mean of the numerical scores received by the faculty member in each workload domain averaged across the three (3) previous 12-month evaluation periods.

SECTION VI.   DEPARTMENT CHAIR RESPONSIBILITIES

VI. (i)   Department Chair Rating

As per the current UH Faculty Annual Performance Review policy, the Department chair is ultimately responsible for determining a faculty member's final performance ratings for the previous year. The Department chair will rate each faculty member independently before receiving the Committee's summary report, using the same rating system as the Committee (see Appendix 1). In making their ratings, the department chair may use information in addition to that reported on the annual faculty activity form, such as existing documentation outside that was submitted by the faculty member, requested or submitted written statements, or individual interviews or discussions.

However, to ensure that peer review is meaningfully incorporated into the departmental faculty performance review process, the numerical scores independently generated by the Committee and the Department chair in each of the three (3) workload domains (i.e., research/scholarship, teaching, and service) shall be averaged to determine the faculty member's final numerical score in each workload domain for the previous 12-month evaluation period.

VI. (ii)   Disagreement between Committee and Department Chair on Final Numerical Scores

After averaging of the Committee and Department chair scores, if the Department chair disagrees with the faculty member's final numerical scores for the previous 12-month evaluation period, as per university policy, the Department chair may choose to unilaterally change the final numerical scores to more closely reflect their own evaluation of the faculty member's performance. However, in any such case, prior to the Department chair making such a change, the Department chair must provide the Committee with a written justification and rationale as to the reasons behind their decision to unilaterally change the final numerical scores for the previous 12-month evaluation period. This justification and rationale will be shared with the faculty member.

VI. (iii)   Disposition of Numerical Scores and Annual Performance Ratings

The Department chair will use the final numerical scores (expressed as decimal values) for the previous 12-month evaluation period to inform and guide any annual merit salary recommendations to the Dean. While it is expected that final numerical scores should be closely related to any merit salary recommendations, as part of their decision-making, the Department chair has the discretion to include other pertinent information beyond a faculty member's final numerical scores when making such merit salary recommendations.

Distinct from numerical scores, annual performance ratings will be calculated as the mean average of the faculty member's numerical scores in that workload domain from the three previous 12-month evaluation periods rounded down to the nearest whole number to align with the university-mandated annual performance rating scale. As per university policy regarding the post-tenure review (PTR) of tenured faculty members, in consultation with the Dean, annual performance ratings may be used to initiate additional performance reviews or actions.

SECTION VII.   REPORT TO THE FACULTY

Prior to meeting to discuss the next year's expectations with the Department chair, each faculty member will receive a written report from the Committee and the Department chair documenting their final numerical scores in each of the three (3) workload domains for the current 12-month evaluation period, any written comments from the Committee or Department chair, summary score statistics (mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum, quartiles, etc.) computed across the entire department and by academic rank, and their annual performance ratings in each of the three workload domains.

In addition, during the meeting between the Department chair and the T/TT faculty member to discuss yearly expectations, the Department chair shall explicitly reserve time during the meeting to discuss the faculty member's ongoing trajectory towards tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, promotion-in-rank from Associate to Full Professor, or in the case of Full Professors, maintaining productivity and professional growth. That discussion should include guidance from the Department chair as to whether or not the faculty member is on track to be tenured and/or promoted, as well as a discussion of what actions (if any) the Department chair suggests the faculty member take in order to ultimately receive positive recommendations from the department P&T committee and/or the Department chair for their tenure and/or promotion. The discussion between the department chair and the faculty member concerning tenure and/or promotion shall be documented in writing and acknowledged by both parties separate from the annual (%) Effort Faculty Expectations Agreement described in Section V (ii) above.

SECTION VIII. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW VS. TENURE/PROMOTION REVIEW

The T/TT faculty **annual performance review process** is designed to provide **ongoing, formative assessments** of a T/TT faculty member's yearly contributions. In contrast, the **tenure/promotion review process** is a **cumulative, long-term evaluation** of a T/TT faculty member's contributions spanning, at a minimum, the faculty member's probationary period in the department. Unlike the annual performance review process, the tenure/promotion review process determines the career progression of a T/TT faculty member (i.e., granting of tenure/promotion) while signifying their overall excellence within the institution and the academy. While both review processes are critical to the functioning of the department and university, they serve very different roles in the professional life of an academic. This is particularly true at Tier 1 research-intensive institutions where the professional expectations for T/TT faculty members outside of the teaching and service workload domains are specifically higher in terms of both research/scholarship output and impact upon institutional reputation.

While it is reasonable to assume that a tenure-track faculty member who consistently receives annual numerical scores and performance ratings of 3 or above (i.e., above expectations or excellence) throughout the course of their probationary period is on track to be recommended for tenure and promotion by the department, it must be remembered that the granting of tenure and promotion is a separate evaluation process involving both "arms-length" external reviewers, and multiple levels of internal review within the University. As such, it should be clear to those tenure-track faculty members seeking tenure and promotion that while their annual performance ratings should reflect a positive trajectory toward tenure and promotion, annual performance ratings are not considered part of the tenure and promotion review process.

Similarly, while it is reasonable to assume that a tenured faculty member seeking promotion from associate to full professor rank who consistently receives annual numerical scores and performance ratings of 3 or above (i.e., above expectations or excellence) throughout the time spent as Associate Professor is on track to be recommended for promotion-in-rank by the department, the granting of promotion-in-rank is a separate evaluation process involving both "arms-length" external reviewers, and multiple levels of internal review within the University. As such, it should be clear to those faculty members seeking promotion to full professor that while their annual performance ratings should reflect a positive trajectory toward promotion, annual performance ratings are not considered part of the promotion review process.

SECTION IX.   REVIEW AND RESPONSIBILITY

This policy must first be reviewed and agreed to by the HHP T/TT faculty, followed by review and approval from the Department chair, Dean, and Office of the Provost. Subsequently, the T/TT Faculty Review Committee will review it on an annual basis.

After annual review, if the committee believes that substantive changes to any part of the policy are required in order to: 1) bring the policy in line with superseding College or University policies, or 2) enact changes suggested by the department chair, a departmental standing committee with responsibilities involving T/TT issues, or the T/TT faculty as a whole, the committee will bring these changes to the HHP T/TT faculty for review and agreement as soon as possible, followed by review and approval of these changes by the Department chair, Dean, and Office of the Provost. All changes made to the initially approved policy must be documented in the "Revisions Log" appearing in Section IX below.

Non-substantive changes (such as date changes, wording changes that do not change the policy's intent, etc.) will require only a unanimous vote of the T/TT faculty review committee, but the Committee chair must document them in the "Changes Log" appearing in Section IX below.

SECTION X.   APPROVALS

Initial Policy Approval

Entity	Name	Signature	Approval Date
HHP T/TT Faculty	Approved by Majority Vote	NA	11/22/2024
HHP Department Chair	Craig Johnston		11/25/2024
CLASS Dean's Office			
Office of the Provost			

Revisions Log

Purpose of Revision	Name	Signature	Approval Date

EVALUATION PRINCIPLES

HHP T/TT faculty members HHP T/TT faculty members are involved in various research, scholarly, teaching, and service activities that span a diverse set of health-related disciplines, including community health promotion, sports and fitness administration, motor behavior, and exercise science. However, besides the universal expectation that all faculty instructors deliver high-quality instruction and adequately fulfill their service obligations, consistent with the goals of the department and university, T/TT faculty members are also specifically expected to conduct research and generate scholarship that is not only aligned with the Tier 1 research mission of the university but that is also recognized by the academy-at-large as being impactful and of high quality.

While there is legitimate discussion within the academy as to the most appropriate way to evaluate faculty research and scholarship, especially between disciplines, it is clear, however, that across all disciplines, there are two over-arching characteristics that the academy deems reflect the overall quality and impact of a faculty member's research and scholarship output. These relate to how and where faculty publish and/or disseminate their research and scholarship output (e.g., in peer-reviewed journals and publications or in non-peer-reviewed publications and venues), and their efforts to seek or obtain funding (e.g., external grants or contracts from various sources, philanthropic support, internal funding, etc.) to support their research agenda and related academic pursuits. In addition to these two over-arching characteristics, peer recognition of faculty members through local, regional, national, or international awards for their research and/or scholarship is also considered within the academy as an important metric of quality and impact, as well as a reputational measure important to the faculty member's institution. This is not to say that that research- or scholarly-related activities conducted by HHP T/TT faculty members which are not directly related to publication, funding, or recognition should not be valued. Rather, it is to make clear that those HHP T/TT faculty research and scholarly activities most closely aligned with the departmental and university goals of maintaining and enhancing Tier 1 research university status must and will be valued more highly than those that are not directly related to achieving those goals.

With regard to evaluating the quality of faculty efforts in the teaching domain, faculty effort is typically directed towards those areas related to a faculty member's role in the delivery of student instruction, the curation of the academic curriculum, student mentoring, and enhancing the teaching mission of the profession. While student evaluations of teaching (SETs) are recognized as being somewhat problematic from a methodological perspective, they continue to provide a broadly accepted and consistent (if not always accurate) means of evaluating student perceptions of faculty teaching and instruction. In addition, the receipt of peer-reviewed awards or recognitions related to teaching excellence also serves as an important indicator of teaching quality. As part of curating the academic curriculum, faculty members are responsible for regularly updating the content and/or instructional materials of their existing classes, redesigning previously taught classes, as well as developing new classes or academic programming depending on the needs of the academic unit. In addition to their primary responsibilities in the delivery of student instruction and curation of the academic curriculum, serving in a variety of roles faculty members play a

critical role in mentoring and advising students at all academic levels inside and outside of their departments. Further, faculty members may also expend effort towards developing new teaching materials of value to the broader academy, such as textbooks, non-academic courses, or professional training materials, and engage in community-based teaching or service, which may or may not involve internally or externally funded efforts.

With regard to evaluating faculty service, service activities can be categorized based on who benefits from that service. These categories include service related to the department, college, and university, service related to peer review of publications and grants, service related to the profession, service related to the community, service related to professional development (including mentoring of faculty colleagues), and service related to disseminating information to the general public through the media. Unlike when evaluating faculty activities in either the research/scholarship or the teaching domains (where there are at least some quantitative and qualitative performance metrics generally accepted by the academy), evaluating a faculty member's activities in the service domain is subjective, and based on factors such as the perceived importance of the service activity, or the reputational impact of performing a particular service activity to the faculty member, the department and/or the institution.

FACULTY PERFORMANCE METRICS

Numerical Scores

Each HHP T/TT faculty member will, on an annual basis, receive three (3) numerical scores reflecting the professional activities they have performed in each of their three (3) workload domains during the previous 12-month evaluation period. Numerical scores will be assigned based on the type and number of activities completed in each workload domain, where numerical scores will be directly linked to the faculty member meeting certain specified minimum criteria in each workload domain (see below).

Annual Performance Ratings

Each HHP T/TT faculty member will receive an annual performance rating in each of their three (3) workload domains. In any given year, the annual performance ratings assigned in a particular workload domain will be calculated as the mean average of the numerical scores received in that workload domain from the three (3) previous 12-month evaluation periods.

PROCEDURE FOR ASSIGNING NUMERICAL SCORES

General Considerations

The numerical scores assigned annually to an HHP T/TT faculty member are directly linked to the faculty member meeting specified minimum criteria in each of their three (3) workload domains. Additional activities reported by the faculty member that are not listed as part of the minimum criteria for a particular workload domain may be credited toward the faculty member's numerical score in that workload domain. However, such additional activities cannot be substituted for any

activity listed as part of the minimum criteria for that workload domain, nor can crediting the faculty member for these additional activities result in a numerical rating that exceeds that associated with meeting the minimum criteria required to receive the next highest performance rating. For example, a faculty member who meets the minimum criteria to receive a numerical rating of at least 2 cannot receive a numerical rating higher than 2.9 without first meeting the minimum criteria required to receive a numerical rating of 3.

In the research and scholarship domain, faculty activities directly related to the publication, funding, or recognition of research and scholarship shall be evaluated as being of higher value than those activities not directly related to these primary outcomes. In the teaching domain, faculty activities directly related to meeting the academic and operational needs of the department (i.e., high-quality student instruction, curation of the curriculum, student mentoring and advising, funded or unfunded development of new academic programming) shall be evaluated as being of higher value than those activities not directly related to the needs of the department. In the service domain, faculty activities most important to servicing the needs of the department, university, the surrounding community, and the academy-at-large will be evaluated as being of higher value than those considered less directly related to these outcomes. In addition, the reputational impact of performing a particular service activity to the faculty member, the department and the institution will also be factored into the evaluation.

The final numerical score assigned for each workload domain will initially be based on the faculty member fulfilling a minimum number of defined activities in that workload domain. In addition, when conducting their evaluations, individual committee members and the department chair have, at their discretion, the ability to assign a higher value to a particular activity in any workload domain if they view that activity as being of significantly higher quality or impact. For example, a peer-reviewed research article appearing in a broadly recognized and respected publication with a high impact factor may receive a higher score than a peer-reviewed research article appearing in a less well-known journal with a low impact factor. Similarly, receipt of a large (e.g.,> $250K) externally funded grant may receive a higher score than receipt of a small (e.g., < $30K) internally funded grant. In addition, at the discretion of the committee members and/or department chair, a single research/scholarship activity (such as publication of a very high impact journal article, or receipt of an externally funded grant of more than $1 million) may be counted as two activities relative to meeting the minimum criteria listed to receive a particular numerical score. In such cases, the committee members and/or the department chair will be required to provide a written justification for their decision as part of their evaluation.

However, neither where a peer-reviewed research article is published, nor the size/source of any grant funding received will be a factor in determining if a faculty member has met the minimum criteria for any given numerical score, unless otherwise explicitly noted as part of the minimum criteria to receive a particular numerical score.

Assignment of Numerical Scores Within Workload Domains

The following rubrics detail the type and number of faculty activities needed to satisfy the minimum criteria associated with receiving a particular minimum numerical score in each workload domain (i.e., research and scholarship, teaching and service).

Any faculty member who fails to fulfill the minimum requirements to receive a numerical score of "**2**" in any workload domain will be assigned a numerical score of "**1**" in that workload domain**.**

(A) Research/Scholarship Workload Domain

Listed below are the type and expected number of research/scholarship activities that each HHP T/TT faculty member by academic rank is expected to have completed during the previous 12-month evaluation period in order to receive, at a minimum, the corresponding numerical score. In addition, the evaluation process will factor in the terms of the (%) Effort Faculty Expectations Agreement for the 12-month period under evaluation.

Minimum criteria to receive an annual numerical score of "*2"* or above (i.e., consistent with expectations of the department and university).

Professional Activity (Research/Scholarship)	Assistant	Associate	Full
Peer-reviewed publications as First or Senior Author (accepted or published)	1	1	1
And also at least two (2) of the activities listed immediately below:			
Documented effort to secure funding to support research/scholarship activities (if no active funding)	1	1	1
Professional presentations (First or Senior author)	1	1	1
Peer-reviewed publications as Co-Author (accepted or published)	1	1	1
*Substitution Activity Approved by the Department Chair	1	1	1

* – Substitution Activity must be approved by the department chair and documented in the (%) Effort Faculty Expectations Agreement.

Minimum criteria to receive an annual numerical score of "*3"* or above (i.e. above expectations of the department and university).

Professional Activity (Research/Scholarship)	Assistant	Associate	Full
Peer-reviewed publications as First or Senior Author (accepted or published)	2	3	3
Peer-reviewed publications as Co-Author (accepted or published)	1	2	2
Professional presentations (First or Senior author)	3	3	4
And also at least one (1) of the activities listed immediately below:			
Actively Funded External Grant as PI	1	1	1
*Substitution Activity Approved by the Department Chair	1	1	1

 * – Substitution Activity must be approved by the department chair and documented in the (%) Effort Faculty Expectations Agreement.

Minimum criteria to receive an annual numerical score of "*4"* (i.e., excellence considering expectations of the department and university).

Professional Activity (Research/Scholarship)	Assistant	Associate	Full
Peer-reviewed publications as First or Senior Author (accepted or published)	3	4	4
Peer-reviewed publications as Co-Author (accepted or published)	1	2	3
Actively Funded External Grant as PI	1	1	1
Professional presentations (First or Senior author)	3	3	4
And also at least two (2) of the activities listed immediately below:			
Actively Funded External Grant as PI	1	1	1
Notice of Award of Funded External Grant as PI	1	1	1
Actively Funded External Grant as Co-I	1	1	1
*Substitution Activity Approved by the Department Chair	1	1	1

* – Substitution Activity must be approved by the department chair and documented in the (%) Effort Faculty Expectations Agreement.

(B) <u>Teaching Workload Domain</u>

In the case of the teaching workload domain, all HHP T/TT faculty members, regardless of academic rank, are normally expected to be actively involved in the delivery of student instruction, the curation of the academic curriculum, and student mentoring activities during the previous 12-month evaluation period. In addition, the evaluation process will account for differing expectations associated with academic rank and factor in the terms of the (%) Effort Faculty Expectations Agreement for the 12-month period under evaluation.

<u>Minimum criteria</u> to receive an annual numerical score of "***2***" or above (i.e., consistent with expectations of the department and university).

Professional Activity (Teaching)
Teaching Assigned Courses
Majority of Student Teaching Evaluation Scores within 1 S.D. of college or department means (whichever one is lower)
Student Teaching Evaluations generally note a positive experience
Evidence of mentoring at some level of at least one HHP student

<u>Minimum criteria</u> to receive an annual numerical score of "***3***" or above (i.e. above expectations of the department and university).

Professional Activity (Teaching)
Must first meet all minimum criteria to receive an annual numerical score of "2" (see above), and also at least two (2) of the activities listed immediately below:
Major overhaul of an existing course
Receipt of a departmental teaching award
Finalist for College or University Teaching Award
Publication(s) with student(s)
Award to student mentee (e.g. PURS, grant, fellowship)
Major accomplishment above teaching expectations (justification required)

Minimum criteria to receive an annual numerical score of "**4**" (i.e. excellence considering expectations of the department and university).

Professional Activity (Teaching)
Must first meet all minimum criteria to receive an annual numerical score of "3" (see above), and also at least one (1) of the activities listed immediately below:
Receipt of a College, University or External Teaching Award
Development of a New Course
Publication of a Textbook
Externally Funded Teaching/Instruction-Related Grant

(C) Service Workload Domain

Faculty activities in the service workload domain included those related to service to the department, college, and university, service related to peer review of publications and grants, service related to the profession, service related to the community, service related to professional development, and service related to disseminating information through the media. In addition, the evaluation process will account for differing service expectations associated with academic rank and factor in the terms of the (%) Effort Faculty Expectations Agreement for the 12-month period under evaluation.

Minimum criteria to receive an annual numerical score of "**2**" or above (i.e., consistent with expectations of the department and university).

Professional Activity (Service)
Complete assigned departmental service workload
Serve as peer reviewer for at least one journal article
And also at least one (1) of the activities listed immediately below:
Serve on a department or college committee
Serve as an ad-hoc peer reviewer on a grant (one-off)
Serve as peer reviewer for additional journal articles (1+ for Assistant, 2+ for Associate, 3+ for Full)
Other professional service activity with low commitment (< 25 hours/year, explanation required)

Minimum criteria to receive an annual numerical score of "**3**" or above (i.e., above expectations of the department and university).

Professional Activity (Service)
Must first meet all minimum criteria to receive an annual numerical score of "2" (see above), and also at least two (2) of the activities listed immediately below:
Additional responsibilities beyond assigned departmental service workload (explanation required)
Serve as Chair of a high-workload departmental committee
Serve as Chair of a College committee
Serve on a University committee
Appointed/voted board member of professional organization
Appointed Fellow of a professional organization

Serve as Chair of grant review panel (internal or external)
Serve on the Editorial Board of a recognized peer-reviewed journal
Serve as a member of an external grant review panel
Other professional service activity with moderate commitment (> 25 hours/year, explanation required)

Minimum criteria to receive an annual numerical score of "**4**" (i.e., excellence considering expectations of the department and university).

Professional Activity (Service)
Must first meet all minimum criteria to receive an annual numerical score of "3" (see above), and also at least one (1) of the activities listed immediately below:
Elected officer of nationally recognized professional organization
Receipt of external grant or donation to fund staff or other program elements not considered research or teaching related funding
Career achievement award from nationally recognized professional organization
Other professional service activity with high commitment or prestige (explanation required)

PROCEDURE FOR ASSIGNING ANNUAL PERFORMANCE RATINGS

To align with the University's faculty annual performance review and post-tenure review policies, departments are required to assign annual performance ratings in each workload domain that clearly distinguish between faculty performance that is "not meeting expectations" and that which is "meeting expectations" or above.

Annual performance ratings will be reported to the College and University using the following scale:

> 1 - Below expectations of the department & university
> 2 – Consistent with expectations of the department & university
> 3 – Above expectations of the department & university
> 4 – Excellence considering the expectations of the department & university

For any given year, the annual performance rating assigned to an HHP T/TT faculty member in each workload domain will be calculated as the mean average of the faculty member's numerical scores in that workload domain from the three (3) previous 12-month evaluation periods (rounded down to the nearest whole number).