

Annual Faculty Review Process Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology

This document summarizes the annual faculty review procedures, policies, and performance expectations for the Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology, both pre-tenure and post-tenure Faculty. This does not include policies and procedures for the 3rd year and tenure reviews of tenure-track faculty that are established by the University. The procedures are written from the standpoint of timeline for administrative oversight, data collection, deadlines for faculty material, metric policies and expectations, and formal review of faculty with the DEO. Although this policy has adapted to include new metrics over the years, it has been in place since 2004.

Tenure-track Assistant Professors

November 1: Faculty are contacted to submit their annual review materials by December 1.

Review materials include:

- Updated CCOM CV
- Personal Assessment of previous year (teaching, research, and service) and goals for upcoming year
- Mentoring Statement

December-January: Once collected, the DEO review report is written, goals established, and shared with the faculty member.

January- February: DEO meets individually with faculty, changes can be made to the report, and the report is signed by the DEO and the faculty member. Review is entered into Workflow. The report is due by the end of February to CCOM Faculty Affairs.

Performance Expectations: Assistant Professors are expected to excel in all three missions of the Department, including research, teaching, and service. Expectations in these missions include the following:

Teaching: No formal teaching during the first year of appointment is expected; however, Assistant Professors are encouraged to engage in small group graduate education (i.e., graduate program organized journal-driven seminar series, etc) in an effort to attract students to their laboratory. Assistant Professors should accumulate at least 11-12 annual lecture hours by the promotional year (averaging the addition of 3-4 lectures in years 2-5 of rank). Although there is no hard and fast rule, Assistant Professors are expected to maintain one major teaching effort in a single course over at least three years (including 5-6 lectures), as opposed to a few guest lectures in a large number of courses. There are no formal requirements for course directorship, but the development of new curriculum/courses is viewed as highly favorable. For Anatomy and Cell Biology, the Critical Thinking Course Sessions are the equivalent of lectures hours. Teaching quality, as reviewed by peers and students, should average excellent to outstanding by the promotional year.

Research: Assistant Professors must acquire independent external funding in the form of an NIH RO1/PO1 or NSF grant. Multiple grants are viewed as highly favorable for promotion and tenure. Obtaining Foundation grants are beneficial, but such grants alone are unlikely to support promotion and tenure. For those Assistant Professors lucky enough to obtain large external grants early in their careers (year 1-2), demonstration of potential to renew grants or obtain additional funding will become critical as the tenure and promotion year approaches. Thus, Assistant Professors must strive to acquire multiple major grants through sustained grant submissions. Scholarly work in the form of independent publications is also extremely important, not only for competitiveness in obtaining grants, but also for tenure and promotion. On average, it is expected that Assistant Professors have 5 corresponding author publications originating from their laboratory by the time they come up for promotion and tenure. It is also expected that the number of publications will be bolstered through

additional collaborative publications for which the faculty member is not the corresponding author. This number will also be influenced by the quality and impact of the reported work. A steady publication stream of publications is also important, as opposed to many publications in the final year. However, considerations for the type of research and length of research studies will also be taken into account when evaluating the timing of publications. There is no formal requirement for the number of graduate students mentored at the time of tenure and promotion, however, graduate student mentoring is strongly favorable to tenure and promotion decisions. Post-doctoral mentoring is also viewed as positive, but does not offset the need to prove effectiveness in mentoring graduate students.

Service: Assistant Professors need to demonstrate their ability to work in groups toward common goals of the University, the College of Medicine, and/or the Department. This most often takes form as participation on committees and other service-oriented work such as graduate thesis committees and comprehensive exams, graduate admission committees, faculty recruitment committees, seminar series committees, etc. Service outside the University should also be demonstrated in the form of grant and manuscript reviews and society involvement.

Tenured Faculty

February 1: Faculty are contacted to submit their annual review materials, review their teaching effort, grant submissions, and publications for the past calendar year. Teaching, manuscripts, and grant submissions are administratively collated by the department into metric tables and provided to the faculty for review. Updates and corrections to the departmental data, as well as personal assessments, are due by March 1.

Review Materials Include:

Review materials provided by faculty

- Updated CCOM CV
- Personal assessment of previous year (challenges and obstacles, teaching, research, and service) and goals for upcoming year. A department form is used for this.

Teaching Spreadsheet

- Faculty review current teaching obligations and projected teaching obligations for the upcoming year. Faculty are provided all teaching obligations for the department and its entire faculty. Corrections are made on the hard copy and changes centrally entered once confirmed. (*Teaching obligations are also sent to Assistant Professors at this time for review*). This information is entered into the OSAC database at the beginning of each semester and changes/corrections made as necessary throughout the year.
- Faculty are asked to report if they are on any thesis/comps committees (along with student name and graduate program) for the OSAC teaching database. (5 hours/student/semester) *Faculty are also asked this again in the fall.

Publications

- The faculty member reviews a rolling list of his/her publications (2004-present) for accuracy. This information is collected centrally for the departmental quarterly newsletter.

Once this information is collected, changes (if any) are entered into the teaching and publications spreadsheets. If there are questions regarding the accuracy of teaching hours, the course director is contacted to verify information. This information is then updated in the master composite metrics document to determine faculty effort in various missions. The DEO meets individually with faculty in April to discuss the previous year and set goals for the upcoming year. The date of the review is entered into Workflow (these are due to CCOM by May).

The DEO incorporates the evaluation of faculty into the annual salary letter. This is done for two reasons. First, the metrics used to evaluate tenured faculty influence the annual salary raise (note Assistant Professors are not given the metric data and this is not directly used to calculate salary raises). Second, the decision for current and potential future salary raises are linked to the goals and expectations of the annual review. The annual salary letters include overall assessment of the faculty over the past year (both positive and negative). The letter also includes goals and expectations for the upcoming year—most often, these goals are agreed upon by the faculty member and DEO, but in some cases the DEO goals may take precedent over faculty goals. Differences in opinion about goals are specified in the letter along with the rationale for the DEO decision on goals.

Departmental Metrics for Evaluating Associate Professors and Full Professors. The DEO of the Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology utilizes a metric system that calculates the Faculty Activity Ratio (FAR). This system rewards effort in the three major missions of the department including teaching, research, and service. Faculty performance is evaluated on a relative scale to faculty peers within the department. This metric system was adopted to allow faculty to excel in teaching or research, based on the faculty's strengths and the needs of the department. For example, Professors within the department who no longer have active research programs can remain in good standing by expanding their teaching roles. By contrast, faculty with active and well-funded research programs have significantly reduced teaching loads to enable greater growth potential in research. The department also has specialized service teaching for five colleges in the area of gross anatomy and not all faculty within the department are qualified to teach in these courses. In this regard, the department has five lecturers who carry much of the service teaching mission and the current metric system evaluates performance of these faculty together with post-tenure faculty. It should be noted, however, that expectations for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor are outside the metric system that evaluates annual faculty performance. Thus, special consideration for performance of Associate Professors in all mission areas must be taken into account to assure timely promotion to the rank of Professor. FAR metric expectation for Associate Professors, Professors, and Lecturers is $\geq 75\%$. Details for performance expectations of Associate Professors and Professors are outlined below.

Performance Expectations (Associate Professors): Although Associate Professors with a FAR $\geq 75\%$ will be considered in good standing within the department, it is important that this rank excels in research, teaching and service required to support promotion. Not all missions need to be equally weighted, but Associate Professors must obtain an International reputation in Teaching and/or Research for promotion to Professor.

Teaching: Teaching by Associate Professors continues to be extremely important for promotion. Faculty at this rank should strive to carve out a specialized expertise in teaching by directing courses and/or the creation of new courses. There is no formal requirement for whether teaching must be in service areas of the Department or in graduate education. However, it is anticipated that faculty with strong research programs will emphasize graduate education, thereby gaining synergy between these two missions. The extent of an Associate Professor's teaching load will be influenced by the size of his/her funded research program.

Research: In general, it is expected that faculty at this rank will publish at least 2 papers per year. The number of publications is obviously influence by the quality and impact of the reported research. Associate Professors should strive to maintain two major grants in the form of RO1s, PO1s, and/or NSF grants, with the goal of achieving at least 60% salary coverage. Sustained evidence of continual funding through the renewal of grants and/or the acquisition of new grants is required for promotion to the rank of Professor. Continued teaching in the laboratory in the form of mentoring post-docs, graduate students, fellows, and undergraduates is also important for promotion.

Service: Service to the Department, CCOM, and/or The University is expected to increase at the rank of Associate Professor. This can take form as leadership roles in education, extramural grant reviews, intramural grant

reviews, group-oriented research, involvement in societies, and intramural administrative service. By the time of promotion, Associate Professors should have built a strong list of these activities over a sustained period.

Performance Expectations (Professors): At the rank of Professor, it is expected that some level of differentiation will occur in the performance expectations within various missions. Expectations regarding the FAR metric remain at $\geq 75\%$, however, faculty can achieve this level through primarily teaching or research. For example, Professors who no longer maintain an active research laboratory will primarily achieve this FAR level through teaching and service. By contrast, faculty who achieve this level through research metrics will not be required to perform significant teaching. Although the FAR metric is designed to accommodate differentiation among Professors in terms of the major missions of the Department, it is not meant to discourage excellence across missions. Expectations among Professors with educational emphasis include sustained excellence in peer and student teaching evaluations, leadership in education in terms of course directorships, and sufficient classroom teaching hours to maintain a FAR $\geq 75\%$. Expectations among Professors with research emphasis include sustained funding, grant submission, and publications required to maintain a FAR $\geq 75\%$. It is understood that reporting of scholarly work in the form of publications will be directly linked to the ability of faculty to maintain funding. Thus, there is no formal expectation of publications per year at this rank, despite the fact it is rewarded in the FAR metric. Transition from research to teaching emphasis is expected to occur for some faculty later in their careers. During such transitional years when a Professor has lost funding, bridging may occur if the faculty member is maintaining a steady stream of grant applications ($\geq 30\%$ as determined by the FAR; equal to two RO1s and two Foundation grants, or 3 RO1s per year). However, repetitive bridging will not occur in sequential rounds of grant renewals. Transitional years of absent grant funding will be permitted for up to 3 years, but only if the follow occurs: 1) the faculty member maintains a steady stream of grant applications ($\geq 30\%$ as determined by the FAR), 2) grant reviews are encouraging, and 3) the faculty member maintains an overall FAR $\geq 75\%$ through supplementation with teaching by year 2 in the lapse of funding. By year 3 in a lapse of grant funding, Professors will be required to engage in teaching efforts of the Department or other units sufficient to achieve a FAR $\geq 75\%$.

Administrative Process For Determining Effort Allocation and Productivity

JANUARY

Teaching Spreadsheet: The teaching spreadsheet (with linked excel files) is checked for accuracy and individual faculty sheets are updated prior to being sent to faculty for review.

Publications: The publications spreadsheet is updated each time the ACB Points of Interest (POI) Newsletter (quarterly) is distributed. PubMed searches along with querying faculty for the POI is performed throughout the year. In January, the publications' impact factor is entered. Impact Factors are gathered from the ISI Web of Knowledge website <http://admin-apps.webofknowledge.com/JCR/JCR?PointOfEntry=Home&SID=2FBFo6KljN1ldMaAdec>. Relative metric effort for publications is giving to faculty based on their three criteria: 1) non-corresponding author, 2) corresponding author, and 3) impact factor of publication.

Corresponding author manuscripts are weighted 5 times more heavily than non-corresponding co-author manuscripts. In this calculation a corresponding author manuscript of Impact Factor = 5 is weighted to 2.5% effort (52 hrs in a 2080 hr work year). It is recognized that this underestimates the effort required to generate such a publication, however, most publications are performed under the context of funded grants and this effort is also accounted for elsewhere as % salary on grant. A rolling average of three years is used to calculate the relative percent effort assigned to publications. This effort is entered into the overall summary metric table.

Impact Factor (IF) Equation for Weighting Effort for Publication:

- Non-corresponding co-author: Impact Factor x 1
- Corresponding author: Impact Factor x 5
- (Sum of the three previous years IF multiple)/3 x 0.1 = publication effort percentage
(i.e. FY12 impact factor is the average of 2009, 2010, 2011)

Example 1

Corresponding Author	Faculty Member	Impact Factor	IF x Multiple	Year
John Doe	John Doe	5	25	2009
Bill Jones	John Doe	5	5	2010
John Doe	John Doe	25	100	2010
John Doe	John Doe	5	25	2011
Bill Jones	John Doe	15	15	2011
Total Publication % Effort			5.7	FY12

Example 2

Corresponding Author	Faculty Member	Impact Factor	IF x Multiple	Year
John Doe	John Doe	5	25	2009
John Doe	John Doe	5	25	2010
John Doe	John Doe	5	25	2011
Total Publication % Effort			2.5	FY12

The total publication effort is entered into the Faculty Activity Ratio (FAR) composite metric table.

Faculty Activity Ratio (FAR)	Extramural Offset of Total Salary	Publications	Grant Applications % Effort	Grant Applications R01/PO1 (10%)	Grant Applications Other (5%)	Directorship Percentage	Earned Teaching Activity	Total Teaching Credit	Curriculum Lecture Hours	Curriculum Lab Hours (non-Gross Lab)	Curriculum Lab Hours Gross Lab	Curriculum Tests	Other Major Service
77.0%	50.0%	7.0%	15.0%	1	1	2.0%	3.0%	63	6.5	3	0	2	0.0%

FEBRUARY

Faculty are contacted February 1 to submit their annual review materials, review their teaching obligations and publications list by March 1.

MARCH

The teaching and publications spreadsheets are updated to reflect any changes submitted by faculty and/or course directors.

Teaching hours for the spring semester are entered into the OSAC Teaching Database.

Teaching hours are entered into the FAR composite sheet.

- Curriculum lecture hours are credited 6 hours/lecture
- Curriculum lab hours (non-Gross lab) are credited 2 hours/lab hour
- Curriculum lab hours (Gross Lab) are credited 3 hours/lab hour
- Curriculum tests are credited 9 hours/test hour
- These hours are added together to determine the **Total Teaching Hours**
- Total Teaching Hours/2080 = **Earned Teaching Activity** percentage

Faculty Activity Ratio (FAR)	Extramural Offset of Total Salary	Publications	Grant Applications % Effort	Grant Applications R01/PO1 (10%)	Grant Applications Other (5%)	Directorship Percentage	Earned Teaching Activity	Total ECG Teaching Hours	Curriculum Lecture Hours	Curriculum Lab Hours (non-Gross Lab)	Curriculum Lab Hours Gross Lab	Curriculum Tests	Service
77.0%	50.0%	7.0%	15.0%	1	1	2.0%	3.0%	63	6.5	3	0	2	0.0%
Credit hours									6	2	3	9	

Extramural Offset of Total Salary and Grant Applications: The Departmental Administrator provides data to include individual faculty's **extramural salary support** and how many **grants** faculty have submitted for the calendar year. Faculty are given 10% effort for each RO1/PO1 submitted and 5% for other grant applications.

Faculty Activity Ratio (FAR)	Extramural Offset of Total Salary	Publications	Grant Applications % Effort	Grant Applications R01/PO1 (10%)	Grant Applications Other (5%)	Directorship Percentage	Earned Teaching Activity	Total ECG Teaching Hours	Curriculum Lecture Hours	Curriculum Lab Hours (non-Gross Lab)	Curriculum Lab Hours Gross Lab	Curriculum Tests	Service
77.0%	50.0%	7.0%	15.0%	1	1	2.0%	3.0%	63	6.5	3	0	2	0.0%

Directorship Percentage: Faculty who serve as Course Directors or Co-Course Directors are given credit for this effort. (# Weeks course runs/52 x % to direct = Yr adjust % Effort). The % effort to direct various course was historically determined by discussion with the department. Directorship percentage for new courses is determined in consultation with the DEO and director. Directorship percentages are relative to the most labor-intensive course in the department (Medical Gross Anatomy, 50%).

Courses	Director	Semester	% to Direct	Length (wks)	Yr Adjust % effort
Principles of Human Anatomy	CD	Fall	40%	17	13.1%
Principles of Human Anatomy	CD	Spring	40%	17	13.1%
Hum Anat Phys Path Asmt Adv Pract Nsg	CoCD	Summer	50%	11	10.6%
Physical Therapy Human Gross Anatomy	CD	Fall	40%	17	13.1%
Human Anatomy Lab for Health Professionals	CoCD	Spring	12%	17	3.9%
Human Anatomy Online*	CD	Fall	25%	17	8.2%
Human Anatomy Online*	CD	Spring	25%	17	8.2%
Human Anatomy Online*	CD	Summer	25%	11	5.3%
Medical Neuroscience	CD	Spring	45%	17	14.7%
Topics in Molecular and Cellular Biology	CoCD	Fall	5%	17	1.6%
Mouse Models of Cancer	CD	Spring	5%	17	1.6%
HOS Medical Histology	CD	Spring	35%	17	11.4%
General and Oral Histology	CD	Spring	30%	17	9.8%
Dental Gross Anatomy	CD	Spring	45%	17	14.7%
Anatomy Lab for Health Professionals	CoCD	Spring	12%	17	3.9%
Cell Migration	CoCD	Spring	20%	3	1.2%
Medical Gross Anatomy	CoCD	Fall	50%	5.7	5.5%
Medical Gross Anatomy	CD	Fall	50%	17	16.3%
Advanced Human Anatomy	CD	Spring	10%	8	1.5%
Anatomy for PA and Allied Health	CD	Summer	40%	10	7.7%
Cell Migration	CoCD	Spring	20%	3	1.2%
Genetic Analysis of Biological Systems	CoCD	Fall	5%	17	1.6%
ACB Critical Thinking in Cellular Physiology*	CD	Spring	30%	5	2.9%
ACB Critical Thinking in Biochemistry*	CD	Fall	30%	5	2.9%
ACB Critical Thinking in Cell Biology*	CD	Fall	30%	5	2.9%
ACB Critical Thinking in Development*	CD	Spring	30%	5	2.9%
ACB Critical Thinking in Genetics*	CD	Fall	30%	5	2.9%
ACB Critical Thinking in Molecular Biology*	CD	Spring	30%	5	2.9%
*Directorship percentage includes all exams and grading of other course material					

The faculty member's yearly-adjusted percentage effort for directorships is added to the FAR composite sheet.

Faculty Activity Ratio (FAR)	Extramural Offset of Total Salary	Publications	Grant Applications % Effort	Grant Applications R01/PO1 (10%)	Grant Applications Other (5%)	Directorship Percentage	Earned Teaching Activity	Total ECG Teaching Hours	Curriculum Lecture Hours	Curriculum Lab Hours (non-Gross Lab)	Curriculum Lab Hours Gross Lab	Curriculum Tests	Service
77.0%	50.0%	7.0%	15.0%	1	1	2.0%	3.0%	63	6.5	3	0	2	0.0%

Service: Faculty who have extra duties that take significant daily effort are given credit. The FAR does not attempt to account for all service, but rather significant service items that are within the major missions of the Department and CCOM. Since expectations for the FAR are set at 75% for the department, it is assumed that at

least part of the remaining 25% of a faculty member’s effort is allocated to smaller service items and other scholastic activities not accounted for by the metric system. Examples of major service include: Graduate Program Director, CCOM Medical Student Admission Committee, CCOM Executive Committee, etc. Specialized service such as creating a new web site for service-teaching courses, creating a new course, etc., are determined in consultation with the DEO. This is reflected on the **FAR Composite Sheet under “Service.”**

Faculty Activity Ratio (FAR)	Extramural Offset of Total Salary	Publications	Grant Applications % Effort	Grant Applications R01/PO1 (10%)	Grant Applications Other (5%)	Directorship Percentage	Earned Teaching Activity	Total ECG Teaching Hours	Curriculum Lecture Hours	Curriculum Lab Hours (non-Gross Lab)	Curriculum Lab Hours Gross Lab	Curriculum Tests	Service
77.0%	50.0%	7.0%	15.0%	1	1	2.0%	3.0%	63	6.5	3	0	2	0.0%

FACULTY ACTIVITY RATIO (FAR): **The Faculty Activity Ratio = Extramural Offset of Total Salary + Publications + Grant Applications % Effort + Directorship Percentage + Earned Teaching Activity + Service.** The composite is sorted by highest to lowest FAR, blinded, and may be shared with faculty during their individual review meeting with the DEO in April. This ratio is taken into consideration for goal planning and salary increases. The FAR and relative ranking within the department is written into the annually evaluation/salary letter and faculty are given the opportunity to review the document and calculations with the DEO. Non-tenured Assistant Professors are included in this spreadsheet, but are separated from the ranking of tenured faculty and lecturers. The FAR calculations are not shared with faculty until they reach tenure, at which point the FAR influences their standing in the department.

Faculty Activity Ratio (FAR)	Extramural Offset of Total Salary	Publications	Grant Applications % Effort	Grant Applications R01/PO1 (10%)	Grant Applications Other (5%)	Directorship Percentage	Earned Teaching Activity	Total ECG Teaching Hours	Curriculum Lecture Hours	Curriculum Lab Hours (non-Gross Lab)	Curriculum Lab Hours Gross Lab	Curriculum Tests	Service
77.0%	50.0%	7.0%	15.0%	1	1	2.0%	3.0%	63	6.5	3	0	2	0.0%

APRIL

Individual annual review meetings are scheduled and held with the DEO. Any changes following these meetings are adjusted in the spreadsheets explained above and updated sheets are distributed, if necessary, for review. Faculty that disagree with the DEO’s evaluation of their performance shall have the opportunity to discuss their objections with the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs within the CCOM.

MAY

All annual reviews are documented with CCOM.

JUNE

Teaching hours for the summer semester are entered into the OSAC Teaching Database.

Faculty salary letters are prepared to be mailed by July 1. In addition to their salary information, these letters summarize conversations during the annual review with the DEO, outline goals for the upcoming year, and contain their Faculty Activity Ratio information and ranking within the department.

SEPTEMBER

Teaching hours for the summer semester are entered into the OSAC Teaching Database.

Faculty are asked to report if they are on any thesis/comps committees (along with student name and graduate program) and this is entered into the OSAC Teaching Database (5 hours/student/semester).

ONGOING

Course Directors submit teaching evaluations at the end of each semester. One complete copy of the course evaluation is filed in the course binder and individual reviews are put in the faculty's review binder. This information is used for 5 year post-tenure reviews and tenure and promotion.