

Annual Review Metrics for Post-Tenure Faculty
Department of Pharmacology
DRAFT

To comply with University policy, beginning in the 2011-2012 academic year, the Department of Pharmacology will review each primary member of the tenured faculty annually. The procedure for the review has been detailed in a separate document and will not be reiterated herein.

The primary purpose of the annual faculty review process is to set goals for the coming year, to evaluate completion of goals from the previous year, where relevant, to recognize excellence in research, teaching and service, and when necessary, to assist faculty in developing mechanisms to set new professional priorities. The Carver College of Medicine mandates that the DEO evaluate performance in each of three mission areas, and in the case of a significant deficiency in research, teaching or service/administration, the DEO must provide documentation for review by the Dean of the Carver College of Medicine. The faculty member would provide a written response for review by the Dean.

The guiding principal for the annual reviews in Pharmacology will be establishing and evaluating goals. For Associate Professors, annual goals should be progressive thus advancing the faculty member toward promotion to Professor. For Professors, goals should significantly advance their professional activities (i.e. establish new research directions, improve curriculum, increase competitiveness for awards, etc). Annual goals are to be agreed upon by both the faculty and DEO.

Each post-tenure faculty member will be evaluated on the following scale:

- Meets or exceeds expectations
- Cause for concern
- Significant deficiency

Because each faculty prioritizes the components of the academic mission differently (i.e. some may primarily teach while others primarily perform research), the evaluations will be weighted in favor of their effort distribution. Thus, if a faculty member indicates that his/her professional time is spent in a proportion of 60% research, 30% teaching and 10% administration/service, he/she will be evaluated on the basis of the unit norm. Similarly, those indicating a 0% research, 80% teaching, 20% service will be reviewed with an eye toward teaching effectiveness although scholarship in teaching will also be considered, in particular for Associate Professors.

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP

The following guiding principals will be used in the evaluation of research and scholarship.

1. Faculty are expected to support their research activity with externally funded projects.
The CCOM has established that all research faculty have a minimum of 50% salary offset on grants to provide protected time for research. To meet expectations, faculty will be required to offset $\frac{2}{3}$ of their stated effort in research. It is expected that faculty will be submitting high quality grant proposals with sufficient frequency to attain or exceed this goal. The Department of Pharmacology Incentive Plan details how

exceeding expectations in this category can provide financial gain to the faculty or his/her research program ¹. There will be a cause for concern for faculty covering less than $\frac{2}{3}$ salary offset of their stated effort to research. This concern could be relieved if the faculty member can show that high impact research is in progress in a funded project, and/or that strong preliminary data have or are being obtained to support a new or revised grant proposal. In the current funding environment, underfunded faculty members are expected to submit grant proposals about three times a year to maximize their chances for success. It would also be cause for concern if, despite frequent grant submissions, peer reviews indicated that the proposals are not competitive. Addressing this concern will require sharing peer review reports with the DEO. If the same concern arises annually, the DEO may conclude that there is a significant deficiency in research. Faculty exhibiting $\frac{1}{3}$ salary offset or less of their stated effort to research will constitute a significant deficiency.

2. Faculty members are expected to publish scholarly work.

Providing a definitive metric on the number of publications per year is problematic as this can differ by discipline, by the number of funded projects, and by attempts to publish scholarly work in high impact journals. In general, the scholarly output should be proportional to the number of funded projects and should be of sufficient quality and quantity to ensure the faculty remain competitive for renewing grants or obtaining new grants. Because a definitive metric is required, publishing one scholarly paper per year per funded research project will be deemed as meeting expectations, whereas publishing, on average, less than one paper per year would be cause for concern. A potential concern regarding publication frequency would be alleviated by publishing in journals of high impact ². There is a recognition that publishing in high impact journals takes substantially more effort than publication in lower impact journals. A pattern of no or low quality (IF<3) publications will constitute significant deficiency. Because a spirit of collaboration is encouraged, non-senior authored papers will be considered to meet or exceed expectations as long as the faculty also has senior authored publications, or has a sufficient number of collaborative publications to offset the lack of senior authored publications. Nevertheless, having only collaborative non-senior author publications in multiple successive years could be cause for concern.

3. Faculty, in particular Associate Professors should evidence national and international recognition.

Publishing high quality research should advance their national and international recognition as evidenced by honors and awards, editorial board appointments, study section assignments, etc. Although not a specific metric in annual evaluations, Associate Professors should recognize the importance of this in terms of promotion to Professor. Professors should recognize the need to demonstrate exceptional international recognition if they are to advance to established or named Professorships or Chairs, if and as, they become available.

¹ See approved Department of Pharmacology Basic Science Incentive Plan.

² Impact factor calculations are imprecise. In general, journals with low impact are those with an impact factor less than 3. Faculty should publish research findings in journals with an impact factor greater than 3, and are encouraged to publish in journals with impact factors at or greater than 7. Of course, there is recognition that some highly respected journals (i.e. JBC) have impact factors that are artificially low. Faculty who routinely publish in high impact journals (IF>10) should have a competitive advantage in the current funding environment.

TEACHING

The range of teaching activities in the Department of Pharmacology varies greatly. The range of didactic lecture hours ranges from approximately 12 (for research intensive faculty) to nearly 100 for full time educators. Moreover, research intensive faculty can spend hundreds of hours annually mentoring undergraduate students, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows in research. It has been estimated that a full time didactic teaching load can range from 200-250 hours including associated preparation time and student mentoring/evaluation. All faculty are initially presumed to conform to unit norm effort distributions until they can justify otherwise. At the unit norm of 60% research, 12 to 20 didactic hours in departmental courses are typically assigned as the annual teaching load. Faculty (in particular Professors) with substantial salary offset protected by research may be eligible for reduced didactic teaching. Although the same is true of Associate Professors, maintaining sufficient teaching for promotion to Professor is essential. Teaching effort may be adjusted upward in response to reduced salary offset after sufficient time has elapsed to allow the faculty to remediate the concern.

The following teaching categories will be evaluated using the same three point scale:

1. Student evaluations
2. Peer evaluations
3. Didactic and research laboratory teaching load

Faculty should be rated as effective teachers by students and peers, and the magnitude of their teaching should be in proportion to their reported effort distribution. Student and peer evaluation scores indicating poor teaching effectiveness will be a cause for concern, and a lack of improvement over time will be considered a significant deficiency.

SERVICE AND ADMINISTRATION

Like teaching, the range of service activities in the department varies widely. It is expected that all faculty participate in a substantive way to service in the department, college and university. Moreover, it is expected that research faculty participate in activities which benefit the scientific community at large (i.e. peer reviewing of papers and grants, participation in committees in national societies or associations etc), and educators participate in activities which further the educational mission of the department (i.e. course director), university (i.e. curriculum committee) and/or beyond. Some major service commitments (i.e. course directors) can provide credit to salary offset counted toward annual salary bonuses or enrichment fund deposits³, whereas others are rewarded with administrative differentials (i.e. Associate Chairs). Lack of participation in the service activities of the department, college or university in any given year will be cause for concern, whereas a pattern of little or no service over a period of years will be considered a significant deficiency.

³ See approved Department of Pharmacology Basic Science Incentive Plan.