

Faculty Workload Guidelines and Annual Performance Review Policy

Department of Chemistry, updated September 2026

PART I: Faculty Workload Guidelines

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

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

A general timeline for conducting the workload uploading process by faculty member.

The NSM will send upload links to individual faculty members, clearly identifying the deadline for entering expected workload information.

General guidelines for research, teaching, and service activities.

Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

Research, typically 40-60. Activities include but are not limited to:

1. Supervising students, postdocs, and staff on research
2. Leading research activities on one or more funded projects, and writing proposals
3. Developing tools and methods that enhance UH research and innovation
4. Writing research articles and presenting results at professional conferences
5. Pioneering new research initiatives or establishing new research centers

Teaching, typically 30-40. Activities include but are not limited to:

1. Teaching undergraduate- and graduate-level courses
2. Mentoring graduate students and undergraduates in the lab
3. Exploring new pedagogical content or platforms for educational purposes
4. Participating in graduate students' oral qualifying exams and thesis defenses
5. Organizing activities to enhance student learning

Service, typically 10-20. Activities include but are not limited to:

1. Serving as a member of various departmental, college, or university committees
2. Participating in graduate students' oral qualifying exams
3. Organizing conferences or hosting events that relate to research or education
4. Reviewing for scientific journals
5. Reviewing for national, international, and private foundations that support research
6. Serving as a board member for research organizations
7. Editing for scientific journals
8. Serving as judge or panelist for activities that promote research and teaching

Please make sure your total workload is 100.

Non-Tenure-Track Instructional Faculty

Research, typically 0-10. Activities include but are not limited to:

1. Participating in research projects via collaborations
2. Contributing to research papers or other research outputs

Teaching, typically 70-80. Activities include but are not limited to:

1. Teaching undergraduate lecture or lab courses
2. Teaching large sections (>100 students) of service courses
3. Providing extra help sessions for undergraduate students
4. Developing new educational tools or platforms
5. Designing new courses and improving the curriculum
6. Modernizing procedures or developing new experiments for lab courses
7. Leading or coordinating other efforts to enhance education

Service, typically 10-20. Activities include but are not limited to:

1. Serving as a member of various departmental, college, or university committees
2. Organizing conferences or hosting events that relate to education
3. Serving as a judge or panelist for activities that promote research and teaching
4. Engaging in outreach activities that benefit chemistry education for the public

Please make sure your total workload is 100.

Non-Tenure-Track Research Faculty

Research, typically 70-80. Activities include but are not limited to:

1. Operating major instrumentation for research
2. Maintaining and upgrading equipment as needed
3. Providing technical expertise to assist research groups
4. Contributing scientific insights to research projects
5. Managing appropriate user sign-up and billing systems
6. Participating in professional conferences and other scientific activities
7. Performing independent research

Teaching, typically 10-20. Activities include but are not limited to:

1. Training graduate students and other researchers on using instrumentation
2. Organizing special help sessions for users
3. Assisting students with troubleshooting hardware and software

Service, typically 0-10. Activities include but are not limited to:

1. Serving as a member of various departmental, college, or university committees
2. Reviewing for scientific journals
3. Serving as judge or panelist for activities that promote research and teaching

Please make sure your total workload is 100.

PART II: Faculty Annual Performance Review Policy

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

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

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

The Department-approved Merit Review Form is sent electronically to tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track Professors, Associate Professors, and Assistant Professors in the Department by December 10th of the year to be reviewed. The faculty members must submit their completed Merit Review Forms electronically to the Associate Chair of the Department (or his/her designee) no later than 5 PM on January 10th of the following year. Faculty members who do not submit their completed Merit Review Form by the deadline will be identified as Not Meeting Expectations. In the event of an emergency, a faculty member may request extra time from the Department Chair to complete the Merit Review Form. The Chair's decision whether to accept a late submission is at his or her sole discretion and the decision is final. The Chair will make the review scores available to individual faculty members by February 10th of the following year. Reviewing details will be provided if requested in writing by the individual faculty members to the Chair. Such requests must be made within 5 working days of the review scores becoming available.

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

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

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

The Department of Chemistry Executive Committee, which is elected by following the Departmental Bylaws, is solely responsible for conducting the APRs of tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track Professors, Associate Professors, and Assistant Professors. The Committee members score each faculty member in the Department on a scale of 0–100 in each of three categories: research, teaching, and service. Committee members do not score themselves, the Chair, Associate Deans, or any joint faculty members whose primary appointment is outside the Department. In the research category, research funding (especially external federal funding); research publications (especially peer-reviewed publications in high-impact journals); and invited and contributed seminars are used to determine a research score. To arrive at a score in the teaching category, student teaching evaluations are assessed taking into account class size and the academic level of instruction. When it is

appropriate, new courses and curriculum development are included in determining the teaching score. Mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students may also be considered as teaching components. Documented service to the Department, College, University, scientific community, and broader community are used to determine the service score.

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

Not applicable.

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

Each member of the Executive Committee scores the faculty separately in the three categories on a scale of 0–100 (by using an Excel spreadsheet designed specifically for the merit review process). The scores in each of the three categories are weighted in the spreadsheet: 1) 60% research, 30% teaching, and 10% service for research-track faculty members; 2) 80% teaching and 20% service for teaching-track faculty members; 3) 80% research and 20% teaching for non-tenure-track research faculty members. An overall score on a scale of 0–100 for each faculty member is computed on this basis. Tenured faculty members are scored separately from tenure-track faculty members. The Executive Committee members send their completed Excel spreadsheets to the Associate Chair for compilation; the Associate Chair then sends the averaged score sheet to the Chair. The Chair numerically adjusts the Committee member's scores, if necessary, to make each Committee member's overall average score 50 for the Department's tenured faculty members. The numerical adjustment ensures that each Executive Committee member's assessment is weighted equally when computing a final score for each faculty member. The Chair combines the scores submitted by the Committee members and averages them to arrive at a final score of 0–100 for each faculty member in the Department. The 0-100 scale will be converted to Excellent, Good, Fair, and Not Meeting Expectations at the discretion of the Chair. A suggested scale is 60-90 for Excellent, 30-59 for Good, 10-29 for Fair, and a score below 10 (not including 10) is usually considered as Not Meeting Expectations. In the event that a faculty member is deemed as Not Meeting Expectations, the final evaluation will articulate, in writing, the reasons for this determination.

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

The overall score on a scale of 0–100 for each faculty member, obtained by averaging the separate scores provided by the Executive Committee members as described above, is the *sole* basis for ranking the tenured faculty members. Tenure-track faculty members' scores are used only to provide feedback to the Chair and Executive Committee on their progress toward tenure.

The policy must provide an avenue for faculty members to provide timely comment on the final outcome of their APR to their departmental chair, including a description of how they can

dispute/grieve their final performance score/departmental ranking. Faculty members will be provided individual performances scores and departmental quartile rankings as soon as reasonably possible after the end of the spring academic semester.

The Chair will make the review scores available to individual faculty members by February 10th of the following year. A faculty member may dispute his or her quartile ranking by providing a letter outlining the reason(s) for the grievance to the Chair or any member of the Executive Committee within 5 working days of receiving their scores becoming available. Upon receiving the faculty member's request to dispute his or her ranking, a meeting of the faculty member with the Executive Committee will be arranged within 5 working days. At the meeting, the faculty member may present evidence verbally or in writing to the Executive Committee that disputes his or her ranking. Within 5 working days following the meeting, the Executive Committee will issue a written ruling on whether the faculty member's ranking will be adjusted. The Committee's decision is final.

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

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

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

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