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I. Introduction
The procedures and processes described in this document constitute the framework for pre-tenured and tenured faculty evaluation in the A. R. Smith Department of Chemistry. The procedures and processes are subject to modification, adjustment, or amendment as the department’s faculty evaluation system evolves.
Table 1 summarizes the relative level of emphasis in each of the three areas of professional activity expected for full time tenure track (pre-tenured and tenured) faculty members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Activity</th>
<th>Pre-tenure Proposed Goal</th>
<th>Tenured Proposed Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Activities</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10-20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-tenured faculty and tenured faculty members: The full time teaching load is 12 contact hours per semester, with possible reductions for reassigned time. Reassigned time will be awarded in accordance with the College of Arts and Sciences reassigned time guidelines, faculty handbook, or contract/award replacement buy-out. The reduced load will be the specified teaching load for that faculty member for that semester. All faculty members are expected to perform service to the Department, College and/or University, and may be involved in professional service and/or outreach to the community. Tenured Faculty may negotiate with the chair of the department a re-distribution of her/his emphasis. However, all tenure track faculty evaluations will be based on the three areas of professional activity expected for full-time tenure track faculty.

II. Annual Reports
Each faculty member will upload her/his annual report via the appropriate University software program. Additionally, electronic and paper versions of required Departmental supplemental report(s) and the College of Arts and Sciences reassigned time report will be submitted by the deadline established by the chairperson. The latter will be used to assess whether or not the faculty member will receive reassigned time for scholarship for the upcoming academic year.

The Annual Report evaluation will be based on the faculty member’s professional activities throughout the entire year so as to ensure that scholarly and service activities carried out in the summer are not excluded from consideration. Evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service are described below.
A. Teaching

The minimum expectations for each faculty member include grading, preparation of lecture notes, presentations, demonstrations, homework and handouts for pre-existing courses. These expectations are part of the required job duties and will not be evaluated for points. Grading should be fair, consistent, and timely. Course syllabi should be written in a manner that allows students to determine their standing in the course. Faculty members must minimally provide the University’s mandated office hours per week and post final grades by the registrar’s deadline. Maintenance of online course site(s) through the University provided technology is encouraged.

The criteria for measuring teaching are as follows:

1. Student Evaluations:
   Every student evaluation contains the following questions:
   - How would you rate your instructor? (Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor)
   - Would you recommend your instructor to another student? (Yes, No)

   Points are earned from student evaluations according to the following equation,

   \[
   \text{Student Evaluation Points} = \left( \frac{\text{Faculty Teaching GPA}}{\text{Average Department Teaching GPA}} + \frac{\text{Percent Who Would Recommend}}{\text{Average Department Percent}} \right) \times 0.5
   \]

   where Faculty Teaching GPA and Percent Who Would Recommend are compared to Departmental averages. The Departmental averages include evaluations from all full-time faculty (tenure-track and non-tenure track), and are calculated as the arithmetic mean of the individual teaching GPA or percent recommendation, respectively, of each faculty member.

   The Faculty Teaching GPA is calculated according to the following equation,

   \[
   \text{Faculty Teaching GPA} = \frac{\%\text{Excellent}(4.0) + \%\text{Very Good}(3.0) + \%\text{Good}(2.0) + \%\text{Fair}(1.0) + \%\text{poor}(0.0)}{100}
   \]

   where \%Excellent equals the percentage of students that rated the faculty as Excellent, \%Very Good equals the percentage of students that rated the faculty as Very Good, and so on. These percentages are based on ALL of the student evaluations submitted during the academic year. In other words, a faculty who teaches 200 students in CHE 1101, 40 students in CHE 1110, and 20 students in CHE 3000 in one academic year could conceivably receive 260 evaluations. If the faculty receives 200 Excellent ratings, then the \%Excellent would be 200/260 x 100, or 76.9% (assuming all 260 student evaluations were submitted).

   2. Excellent instructor rating percentage above departmental average:
      up to 2 points

   3. Teaching a course other than independent study in an excess of the specified load:
      0.5 points for each contact hour over specified load.
4. Voluntarily (by student request) teaching an independent study course (extra course taken as
teaching overload; not part of undergraduate student research):
   1 point per course

5. Existing course taught for the first time:
   1 point per course

6. Developing new or special topics courses (courses that have never been offered at ASU, could
   be on-line or in person instruction):
   3 points per course

7. Developing or using innovative teaching techniques (for example i-clicker, active learning
techniques etc.):
   1 point

8. Providing after-hours review help sessions; not part of the minimum requirements for
teaching; number of points depends on total number of review hours held per semester:
   1 to 2 hours: 0.5 point, 2 to 5 hours: 1 point; 6 to 12 hours: 2 points

9. Substantial revision of an existing course:
   0.5 to 2 points

10. Interdisciplinary teaching- teaching a course in another department in which the material is
    interdisciplinary or team teaching cross-disciplinary courses with faculty from other
departments:
    1 point

11. Guest lecturer- depends on the number of lectures:
    0.25 points (1 guest lecture) to 1 point for 4 or more lectures

12. Honors courses or Honors contracts, if they are not part of the regular teaching load:
    0.5 to 2.0 points

13. Distance learning/teaching:
    1 point per course

14. Development of service learning projects:
    1 to 2 points

15. Class trips:
    0.25 to 0.50 points depending on the activity

16. Professional development:
    up to 3 points
17. Supervision of student researchers:
    0.5 point for each active student per semester (active student means a student who works a minimum of 3 hours per week for at least ¾ of the semester) for a maximum of 4 points

18. Supervision of student written grant proposals (e.g. OSR grants), $100 or above:
    0.5 point per proposal for a maximum of 2.0 points

19. Supervision of honors thesis:
    0.75 points per semester the student is registered in CHE 4510 honors thesis

20. Second reader on Honors thesis:
    0.5 points for being second reader; 1 point if the faculty member also helps with editing of the thesis

21. Teaching Awards:
    State Teaching Award: 3 points; University Teaching Award: 2 points; College Teaching Award: 1 point

22. Teaching efforts not covered above:
    up to 2 points.

The points earned in this category are added and then converted to a qualitative descriptor according to Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Descriptor</th>
<th># of points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meritorious</td>
<td>Above 10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commendable</td>
<td>7.5 to 10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>4.5 to 7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs improvement</td>
<td>3.0 to 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unacceptable</td>
<td>Below 3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Scholarship

A major goal of the department is to encourage and support the development of faculty members as productive scientists. Scholarship is defined as any activity that contributes to the body of knowledge in an individual’s field of expertise and ultimately exposes this contribution to the scrutiny of her or his peers. We encourage our faculty to develop an active research program and work with undergraduate students on original research projects.

To award reassigned time for scholarship, the department chairperson will follow the College of Arts and Sciences reassigned time for research guidelines. Products for reassigned time include (adapted from College of Arts and Sciences): Journal articles; funded external grant proposals; unfunded external proposals with high priority scores; books or substantial portions thereof, including textbooks, book chapters, editing of scholarly editions, multi-volume works, or scholarly journals; and products granted patents or commercial licenses. In order to be awarded
reassigned time, it is expected that a faculty member will have two products every three years. Newly hired tenure track faculty initially will be given reassigned time and three years to meet the criteria.

The criteria for measuring scholarship are as follows:

1. **Active research program:**
   3 points (It is required that faculty members submit drafts for work in progress to document research work. The same manuscript in preparation cannot be submitted in two consecutive years or later.)

2. **Grants:**
   a. **Submitted external proposals**
      Points are awarded for the year the proposal was submitted. Faculty should provide a brief explanation of their level of effort for proposal preparation when requesting points in this category. (Please note that the College of Arts and Sciences reassigned time guidelines typically will count only those proposals that are funded or that receive a high priority score. The assignment of points for a product in an annual evaluation does not guarantee that the product will count towards the bestowal of reassigned time. Faculty are asked to submit reviews of all proposals to the Department chair, once available. High priority reviews of unfunded proposals are not eligible for additional points.)
      PI: 1-3 points, Co-PI: 0.5 to 2 points and Senior Personnel: 0.5 to 1 point

   b. **Funded external proposals:**
      Points are awarded for the year that the grant first was awarded. As shown in Table 3, points are awarded based on the amount of award and the role of the faculty in writing the proposal. The chairperson may request the PI to estimate the level of effort of all persons involved in the preparation of the external grant proposal. Points should be requested under part a for submitting an external proposal, as well as under part b if the proposal is funded. These points from parts a and b do not have to be awarded in the same year, depending on the start date of the grant.

   c. **Funded internal grant proposals**
      Examples include but are not limited to: URC, Energy Center, URA etc. (Student-written OSR grants should not be listed here; they should be listed under number 18 in the Teaching Category.)
      $1,000 up to $50,000: 1 to 5 points
d. Funded external grant administration:
   1-2 points: documentation of this effort should be submitted with the annual report.

3. Publications:
The criteria in Table 4 are used to evaluate publications, including both original research and review articles. A five-year journal impact factor average should be used if available. If a primary journal in a faculty member’s field has an impact factor that does not reflect the importance of the work, the faculty member may provide a written statement to the chairperson with reasons why the publication should be considered for a higher number of points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Impact Factor</th>
<th># of points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than 6</td>
<td>8 to 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 6</td>
<td>4 to 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>up to 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Patents:
5 points

5. Book Chapters:
6 to 10 points

6. Development of a textbook:
8 to 12 points

7. Presentations: (Faculty are asked to provide the title of each presentation for which they are requesting points. While presentations are an integral part of the scholarly endeavors of our faculty and students, typically, presentations will not count towards reassigned time as outlined in the College of Arts and Sciences guidelines).
   a. National or International Conference:
      - Student poster presentation: 2 points
      - Student oral presentation: 2.5 points
      - Faculty poster presentation: 2.5 points
      - Faculty oral presentation: 3 points
   b. Regional conference (for example Regional Meeting of the Southeast American Chemical Society - SERMACS) or an invited research presentation at another institution:
      - Student poster presentation: 1 points
      - Student oral presentation: 1.5 points
      - Faculty poster presentation: 1.5 points
      - Faculty oral presentation: 2 points
   c. Local meeting (for example Appalachian State University Celebration of Student Research and Creative Endeavors) or Regional State of North Carolina Undergraduate Research and Creativity Symposium (SNCURCS): 0.5 point

The points earned in this category are added and then converted to a qualitative descriptor according to Table 5. (Given the discrepancies between activities that are counted in the present
document and in the college reassigned time guidelines, high rankings within the department will not necessarily translate into reassigned time from the college. The College of Arts and Sciences reassigned time guidelines should be consulted when considering products for reassigned time.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Descriptor</th>
<th># of points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meritorious</td>
<td>Above 10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commendable</td>
<td>7.0 to 9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>4.0 to 6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs improvement</td>
<td>3.0 to 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unacceptable</td>
<td>Below 3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Service
Service is defined as any faculty contribution to the Department, College of Arts and Sciences or University requiring the use of one’s professional expertise that is not defined as being within the areas of teaching or scholarship. Outreach to the public schools, the community and the profession are also included as eligible service activities.

1. Departmental committee service:
   To obtain points for service in a departmental committee, the committee chair must summarize the accomplishments and frequency of meetings in the annual report. Faculty members will be awarded points if their committee has been active during the academic year.
   a. High productivity/very active:
      2 points; Chair of the committee: 3 points
   b. Low productivity/average activity:
      0.5 to 1 point; Chair of the committee: 1 to 2 points
   c. Inactive-did not meet during the academic year:
      0 points
   d. Departmental Personnel Committee Member:
      2 points
   e. Departmental Personnel Committee EOA
      1 point
   f. Departmental Personnel Committee Secretary:
      1 point
   h. Search Committees:
      Members of the search committee are awarded points depending the number of searches Tenure Track or Non Tenure Track.
      1 point per Non Tenure Track search and 2 points for Tenure Track search

2. Other Service to the department:
   a. Participation in open house and participation in recruiting efforts:
      1 point
   b. Advisor of a student club or student organization:
      0.5 to 2 points
   c. Seminar Coordinator:
      2 points
d. Seminar host:  
   0.5 points

e. Library liaison:  
   0.5 points

f. Graduation reception organizer:  
   1 point

g. Laboratory coordinator (depending on enrollment):  
   2-4 points

h. Peer observer/evaluator:  
   1 point per observation/evaluation

i. Combined Campaign representative:  
   0.5 points

j. Organizer of a campus workshop (for example through the Hubbard Center or Graduate School):  
   2 points

3. Academic Advising assignments:  
   a. 5 to 10 students: 1 point
   b. 11 to 20 students: 2 points
   c. 21 to 30 students: 3 points
   d. 31 to 40 students: 4 points
   e. > 40 students: 5 points

4. Student teaching supervision/observation:  
   1 point per student per semester that the faculty supervises or observes student-teachers

5. College or University Committee:  
   a. Member of a committee: 1 to 2 points
   b. Chair of a committee (# of points depend on responsibilities): 1 to 3 points
   c. Faculty Senate member: 1 to 2 points (depending on involvement)
   d. Faculty Senate Chair: 4 points
   e. Sigma Xi Officer: 1 point
   f. Service to another unit: up to 4 points

6. Community involvement/outreach:  
   a. Elementary or high school science club advisor/organizer:  
      1 to 3 points (depending on involvement)
   b. Demonstration and presentations to K-12 schools:  
      1 point per event, negotiable with Department Chair
   c. Science fair judge:  
      1 point
   d. Providing a teacher workshop:  
      1 to 3 points (depending on involvement)

7. Service to the Profession:  
   a. Journal Peer reviewer:  
      1 point per manuscript reviewed
   b. External grant proposal reviewer:  
      1 point per grant/contract reviewed
c. External Panel Reviewer:
   2 to 3 points depending on level of work required

d. Editor of a journal:
   2 to 3 points depending on number of manuscripts processed per year

e. Officer of a professional society:
   1 to 3 points depending on level of work required

f. Session chair at a professional meeting:
   0.5 to 2 points per session chaired

g. Conference Organizer:
   2 to 3 points depending on size and complexity of conference and level of work required

8. Service efforts not covered above:
   up to 3 points

The points earned in this category are added and then converted to a qualitative descriptor according to Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Descriptor</th>
<th># of points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meritorious</td>
<td>Above 22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commendable</td>
<td>15.0 to 21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>8.5 to 14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs improvement</td>
<td>5.0 to 8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unacceptable</td>
<td>Below 5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Merit Pay

A. Overall Evaluation Summary

The overall evaluation summary will be used to determine a faculty member’s eligibility for merit pay, but will not be used as specific criteria for judging applications for tenure, promotion, and/or reappointment.

Following submission of the faculty member’s annual report and completion of the subsequent conference, the chairperson will make an initial evaluation that will be reported to the faculty member on the Individual Faculty Evaluation Summary form. The qualitative descriptors earned in teaching, scholarship, and service will be converted to numerical scores as shown in Table 8. The numerical scores in the three areas will then be averaged and rounded to the nearest whole number. Finally, an overall qualitative descriptor will be assigned according to Table 8. For example, a faculty who is meritorious in teaching, commendable in scholarship, and acceptable in service, would have an average score of (4+3+2)/3=3, which equals an overall evaluation of commendable. To be eligible for merit pay, the overall evaluation must be acceptable (2) or better.
Table 8  Conversion of Qualitative Descriptors in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service to Points.  The point values shown here are used to find an overall evaluation that determines eligibility for merit pay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Descriptor</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meritorious</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commendable</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs improvement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unacceptable</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through a follow-up meeting, if requested, there will be an opportunity for further discussion and modification, if warranted, of the chairperson’s initial evaluation. Criteria that can be considered are the faculty member’s evaluations in each of the three areas (teaching, scholarship, and service), their defined role (reassigned efforts outside the department), and the congruity between the faculty member’s stated goals and actual achievements during the evaluation year. If a faculty member’s overall evaluation suffers due to assignments outside the department, the department chairperson can make a note to this effect in the overall evaluation summary. The overall evaluation may be adjusted accordingly but points in individual categories will not be modified.

B. Merit Pay Calculation

The eligible faculty member’s evaluation in each of the three areas (teaching, scholarship, and service) will be converted to a numerical score as indicated above for the Overall Evaluation Summary (Table 8). The three numerical scores of the faculty member will be summed and a departmental sum (of eligible TT faculty) will be obtained. For example, the faculty described above who was meritorious in teaching, commendable in scholarship, and acceptable in service would have a sum of 4+3+2=9. An individual TT faculty member’s merit raise is calculated using the formula:

\[
\text{Merit Raise} = \left( \frac{\text{Sum of Individual’s Numerical Scores}}{\text{Sum of Numerical Scores for Eligible TT Faculty}} \right) \times \text{Dollars Available for TT Merit Raises}
\]

In those years in which merit pay is available, the total merit pay allocation to the department will be separated into two portions, one to be used for merit pay for tenure track faculty, and one to be used for merit pay for non-tenure track faculty. It is recommended that the relative sizes of the merit pay portions for these two groups be proportional to the total salaries in the two groups. If this recommendation is not followed, the chair of the department will report to the faculty the reason(s) for the alternate splitting. Once the merit pay pool has been split, the merit pay will be allocated to each eligible faculty member according to the appropriate evaluation procedure for each group unless external circumstances dictate the allocation of faculty pay increases.

III. Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment

These guidelines are intended to serve the faculty member applying for reappointment, tenure or promotion as well as the Department of Chemistry Personnel Committee and the Departmental Chair in their consideration of personnel decisions. For the purposes of tenure, promotion, and reappointment the three areas to be considered are teaching, scholarship and service and they are
considered over a period of multiple years. Teaching and service will be assessed as indicated for annual evaluations, with consideration of additional materials such as peer evaluations of teaching and letters of support. Scholarship will be judged on the basis of scholarly products. The following are representative scholarly products that will be accepted for tenure and promotion purposes: journal articles in peer-reviewed journals with appropriate impact factor; funded external grant proposals; unfunded external proposals with high priority scores; books or substantial portions thereof, including textbooks and book chapters; editing of scholarly editions, multi-volume works, or scholarly journals; and products granted patents or commercial licenses. Credit towards the promotion and tenure timeline or for scholarly products generated while serving in a tenure-track position at another university may be awarded to a successful candidate for a tenure-track position at ASU. In order to be valid, such credits toward promotion and tenure will require the approval of the dean and provost. Furthermore, any time served or scholarly products generated in a tenure-track position at another university that are planned as credit toward promotion and tenure at ASU, must be listed in faculty member’s initial contract or in an official memo of understanding prior to the faculty member beginning service to ASU. If credit towards time is approved the timeline indicated on the initial contract cannot be amended.

The following are the minimum standards required in order to be considered for re-appointment, promotion or tenure.

A. Reappointment of a Tenure-Track Faculty Member:

The following criteria will be used in considering reappointment of a tenure-track faculty member who is in her/his 3rd year of the four-year contract. The reappointment will be for a three-year contract. These criteria are based on the faculty member’s performance since the original date of hire. The minimum requirements to be considered are as follows.

1. Teaching
   Rankings must show consistent high quality or general improvement over time from the faculty member’s first year of teaching through the fall of the 3rd year. At least one ranking of commendable (or better) is required.

2. Scholarship
   At least two scholarly products are required.

3. Service
   A ranking of acceptable (or better) for at least one year is required.

B. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

The following criteria will be used when evaluating tenure and promotion to associate professor. These criteria are based on the faculty member’s performance since the original date of hire. The minimum requirements to be considered are as follows.

1. Teaching
   A ranking of commendable (or better) for at least three years is required, with no more than one ranking below acceptable. Rankings must show consistent high quality or general improvement over time.
2. Scholarship
At least four scholarly products are required, from which at least one must be a peer-reviewed publication in the faculty member's primary research area with appropriate impact factor.

For tenure and promotion purposes faculty members are expected to publish original peer-reviewed research articles in the area for which they were hired or in a related area. A faculty member may develop research interests in an area of specialization other than that for which the faculty member was hired. Therefore if the publications are in an area of specialization other than that for which the faculty member was hired, the member applying for promotion and/or tenure must justify this change.

For tenure and promotion purposes publications appearing after the faculty member was hired at ASU, but resulting from post-doctoral or doctoral work, will count as scholarly products if the faculty member completed or continued the research here at ASU. If all of the work and research results for the publication were completed at the other institution and the faculty member did not continue the project or analyze results at ASU, and if the publication is the **sole publication product** that the faculty is submitting for tenure and promotion, it will not count for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. This means that the faculty member should have publications from research results obtained during her/his time at ASU and preferably they should be with undergraduate students.

3. Service
A ranking of acceptable (or better) for at least three years is required.

C. Promotion to Full Professor:
Applications for promotion to full professor must include a discussion of progress in all three areas (teaching, scholarship, and service) **since promotion to associate professor**. The applicant must demonstrate clear evidence of excellence in all three areas and must have demonstrated leadership in the area of teaching and scholarship. The following criteria will be used when evaluating promotion to full professor. These criteria are **based on work since promotion to associate professor**. The minimum requirements to be considered are as follows.

1. Teaching
At least one ranking of meritorious and at least four additional rankings of commendable (or better) are required since promotion to associate professor. These rankings do not have to be obtained in consecutive years.

2. Scholarship
At least four products are required since promotion to associate professor. At least one of these must be an externally funded proposal as a PI or CoPI, and at least two must be peer-reviewed publications with appropriate impact factors in the applicant's primary research area. These publications must result from work performed at ASU or originated while at ASU (e.g., collaborative work with researchers at other institutions). If the publications are in an area of specialization other than that for which the faculty member was hired, the member applying for promotion and/or tenure must justify this change. It is also required that the applicant has made at least one presentation at a national or international meeting.
3. Service

At least one ranking of meritorious and at least four additional rankings of commendable (or better) are required since promotion to associate professor. These rankings do not have to be obtained in consecutive years.