University of Texas at San Antonio
College of Architecture, Construction and Planning

November 30, 2016

Guidelines for Annual and Periodic Assessment, and Workload Distribution

"CACP Workload Guidelines Document"

University of Texas at San Antonio
College of Architecture, Construction and Planning

November 30, 2016

Guidelines for Annual and Periodic Assessment, and Workload Distribution,

"CACP Workload Guidelines Document"

PREAMBLE

This document provides current and new faculty with overall guidance regarding the annual workload distribution, workload expectations, and general information regarding value standards and review processes. The College of Architecture, Construction, and Planning (CACP) has three different forms of performance review: 1) 3-year CACP minimum performance expectations, 2) annual faculty performance assessments (AFPA), and 3) tenure, promotion and periodic performance evaluations. This documents sets forth guidelines for the first review processes, the 3-year performance expectations, and describes the procedures used for the second, the AFPA. Evaluation criteria for the AFPA are set by individual departments or programs, and work in concert with the CACP 3-year minimum expectations. Guidelines and review processes for tenure, promotion, and periodic review are addressed in a separate document and are based on UTSA Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP) requirements and Provost Guidelines. The overall objective of all CACP assessment processes is to encourage and recognize high-quality, nationally and internationally-recognized faculty activities in teaching and scholarship (including research/scholarship/creative, professional, and outreach activities).

The intention exists that annual assessments be utilized as one (of several) means of assessment of progress toward tenure, promotion, and periodic assessment. **Meeting the CACP 3-year minimum performance expectations or receiving positive annual evaluations are not, in and of themselves, a sufficient indication of positive progress toward tenure or promotion. However, the process should provide faculty the opportunity to gain input for any adjustments that need to be made for successful tenure, promotion, and periodic assessment from the Chair and other mentors.**

I.   INTRODUCTION

I.A.   OVERVIEW

UTSA College of Architecture, Construction, and Planning (CACP) strives for excellence in all categories of faculty performance. In particular, the CACP recognizes the need to identify guidelines for workload distribution, and minimum expectations in teaching, scholarship (including research/scholarship/creative, professional, and outreach activities) and service related to annual assessment and periodic performance evaluations. CACP faculty members are actively engaged in the pursuit of new knowledge, or to re-approach, reframe, and reconsider existing knowledge, and to make contributions to their disciplines through scholarship that includes research, creative production, outreach, and professional activities. These guidelines are supplemental to the *UTSA Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP)* and any pertinent guidelines established by the UTSA Office of the Provost, and may be reviewed, revised and updated periodically in response to changes in the *HOP*, Provost's memo, or the CACP.

I.B. PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to establish guidelines for annual and periodic assessment, workload distribution, and minimum 3-year performance expectations that are specific to the range of work and activities present or foreseeable within the CACP. This document also responds to the important role and contributions of non-tenure-track faculty who often provide connections to the profession. These guidelines are to be used in the assessment of CACP faculty activity. As a professional college representing a broad spectrum of disciplines, the CACP values a wide range of scholarly contributions and our ongoing engagements to the profession and the public. The CACP recognizes that practice and outreach play a larger role in its disciplines than in other purely academic or scientific colleges or programs. Much of the effort of a faculty in a professional college is directed to practical application alongside the development of new knowledge. The CACP curricula are largely directed toward professional accreditation requirements with the purpose of producing graduates who will become licensed professionals of architecture, interior design, construction management, and urban and regional planning. Thus, expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service in the CACP are reflective of the important connection between academia and practice.

I.C. AUDIENCE

The audience of these guidelines is the CACP faculty, the CACP administration, the members of the Department, College, and University Faculty Review Advisory Committees, and the UTSA administration.

I.D. STANDARDS

As part of the annual and periodic assessment, as well as the tenure and promotion process, faculty members must demonstrate a commitment to being active members of the University community. This commitment, as outlined by the American Association of University Professors Statement on Professional Ethics, can be expressed in a variety of ways that include, but are not limited to, a willingness to share in the responsibilities of service and teaching, displaying professional respect for colleagues, a willingness to work collaboratively with them, and treating students with respect and in attention to their needs.

II. ANNUAL FACULTY PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL (AFPA)

II.A. OVERVIEW

Teaching, scholarship, and service are addressed as part of the Annual Faculty Performance Appraisal (AFPA). The AFPA process takes into account the yearly activity of each faculty member and considers these contributions in the larger context of the faculty member's body of work. Specific teaching and scholarship goals for each faculty member are to be developed by the individual faculty member and then reviewed and revised as necessary by the Department Chair or Degree Program Coordinator in concert with the faculty member as part of the AFPA process. University guidelines for tenure and promotion and AFPA can be found in *UTSA HOP,* Sections 2.10 and 2.11.

II.B. AFPA CYCLE

Each tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty member participates in an annual review each year that covers the previous calendar year (January 1 to December 31). This period includes the spring semester of one academic year, the summer semester of that academic year, and the next fall semester of the following academic year. However, only spring and fall semester teaching loads will be accounted for with regard to teaching loads for an "academic year". The review materials, as submitted by each member of the faculty, provide the basis for recommendations related to annual salary increases (merit), and reappointment.

II.C.   AFPA PROCESS

Each Department Chair or Degree Program Coordinator, in conjunction with a faculty review committee, will conduct the annual review of all faculty members under their direct supervision during the Spring Semester. Faculty, whose appointments are shared between one or more departments or programs, will be reviewed by the most appropriate supervisor to be determined on a case by case basis. In the case of a small program with limited faculty number, the Dean may appoint, at his/her discretion or at the respective coordinator's request, a faculty review committee from the general college faculty membership.

II.C.1.   Submission of Review Materials

The Department Chair or Degree Program Coordinator reviews the current and cumulative contributions and progress of each faculty member in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service with respect to the previously agreed upon Workload Distribution. Each year faculty members will submit review materials to the Department Chair or Degree Program Coordinator in accordance with schedule set by the Office of the Provost. Required materials (in hard copy format) for all faculty members include:

a.   Annual Activity Report: Faculty members shall provide information outlining their activities in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service and the significance or impact of such activities for the review period generated through the UTSA faculty information system. This report should include a listing of faculty activities, the extent of faculty involvement, and the context for those activities.

b.   Curriculum Vita: Faculty members shall submit an updated Curriculum Vita generated via the UTSA faculty information system or equivalent.

c.   Self-Appraisal Form and Prospectus: For each of the categories teaching, scholarship, and service, the faculty member shall provide an overall self-assessment of their activities that may include their significance or impact using the Self-Appraisal Form. The form will be provided by the Department or Program and should include, but is not limited to a narrative of the activity, faculty involvement, the context for the activity, and the relationship between the activity and the faculty's larger body of work. For the prospectus, faculty members shall outline a proposed course of development or continuation of their activities in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service for the next calendar year. Prospectus is required only for tenured and tenure-track faculty.

d.   Projected Faculty Activity Plan: Faculty will develop, in consultation with the Department Chair or Degree Program Coordinator, a time and effort projected activity plan outlining the faculty member's goals and commitments in teaching, research, and service for the following three-year period. This plan will be reviewed and updated on an annual basis in consultation with the department chair. More details about this plan are provided in section III.B of this document.

e.   Other Teaching Evaluation Instruments: The assessment of teaching for all faculty include the university-wide teaching performance assessment instrument, and an additional evaluation instrument to be developed by the department or programs, which may include but not limited to teaching portfolios, peer reviews, entrance/exit surveys, confidence surveys, and mentor evaluations. Beginning in 2012, all tenure and promotion applications will be required to include "additional format" evaluations (beyond the standard student course surveys) that may include but are not limited to teaching portfolios, peer reviews, confidence surveys, entrance/exit surveys, and mentor evaluations of at least 6 courses (which can be from multiple iterations of the same course) –

II.C.2.   Annual Review Meeting and Report (Spring Semester)

The Department Chair or Degree Program Coordinator and each faculty member shall meet to discuss the faculty member's performance and assessment ranking within the context of the three-year projection and to discuss the faculty member's assignments for the coming year (unless the meeting is voluntarily waived by the faculty member). At the meeting, the Department Chair or Degree Program

Coordinator will present a measured rationale of assessment, the AFPA Report, of the faculty member's annual activities in teaching, scholarship, and service. This assessment should reflect the review materials submitted by the faculty member, as well as any activities described in the prospectus from the previous year. Adjustments to the workload agreement, if necessary, will be arranged in accordance with the process outlined in Section III. At the end of each three-year cycle, or earlier as necessary, the Three-Year Projection will be discussed. The faculty member will receive a copy of the AFPA Report and the Projected Faculty Activity Plan, which must be signed by both the Department Chair or Degree Program Coordinator and the faculty member. The signature indicates only that the individual meeting was held and that the report was received. If the faculty member disagrees with information in the report, then she or he may add a written response to the report. The Annual Review Report and response, as applicable, is to be returned to the Dean's Office, by the Department Chair or Degree Program Coordinator. One copy of the signed report and response, as applicable, is to be retained by the Department or Program for the faculty member's personnel file. Any grievance that pertains to an individual annual review will follow process laid out in the HOP.

For Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty, the performance is first and foremost based on an evaluation of their teaching. That evaluation and the instruments of assessment are described in Section II.C.1.e. While NTT faculty traditionally only have teaching responsibilities in their contracts, their activities in the areas of scholarship and service can contribute to the quality of their teaching. These activities can also address the needs, goals, and missions of the University, College, Department, and Program. NTT faculty whose contractual obligations specify 100% teaching may elect to have activities of scholarship and service considered in their performance and assessment ranking provided those activities contribute to their teaching performance. The performance and assessment ranking made by the Department Chair or Degree Program Coordinator will reflect the review materials submitted by the faculty member. This evaluation will be distinct from the evaluation of Tenure-Track and Tenured faculty. For NTT with contractual responsibilities in the areas of scholarship and service, the self-assessment and subsequent performance will be based on the percentage of responsibility as outlined in their contract. Similar in concept to the projected work plan employed for tenure track faculty, there shall be an annual workload document for NTT faculty that addresses any expectations beyond the teaching functions for that upcoming work period. This projected workload plan will enable and support those cases where NTT are asked to participate in scholarship and outreach as part of their workload.

II.C.3.   AFPA Evaluation Score

The outcome of the AFPA is a cumulative overall assessment based on the weighted individual evaluations within each performance category and results in a calculated average numerical score. Criteria for evaluating each category are shown in Table 1 based on UTSA HOP 2.11. The weighting of each performance category is based on the agreed workload distribution effort as shown in Table 2. Eligibility for merit is based on the resulting assessment from the AFPA and is determined by the Provost.

Table 1. Evaluation Criteria for Teaching, Research and Service

For each category of activity (teaching, scholarship, service) faculty members in the CoA will be assessed according to the following:

SCORE	EVALUATION RATING	DESCRIPTION
3.5 – 5.0	Exceeds Expectations	Activities in area cumulatively exceed expectations and reflect a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for an individual with a given faculty rank in the department, unit, and discipline as outlined in the department guidelines.
2.0 – 3.499	Meets Expectations	Activities in area cumulatively meet expectations and reflect standard levels of performance for the department, unit, and discipline as specified in department guidelines.
1.0 – 1.999	Fails to Meet Expectations	Activities in area cumulatively do not meet expectations. This rating indicates a failure beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance, but of a character that appears to be subject to correction.
0 – 0.999	Unsatisfactory	Activities in area cumulatively are considered unsatisfactory; and indicate a failure to meet expectations as outlined in department guidelines for the faculty member's campus, unit, rank, and contractual obligations; and doing so in a way that reflects disregard of previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, and/or involve professional misconduct or dereliction of duty or incompetence.

III.   FACULTY WORKLOAD GUIDELINES

III.A.   OVERVIEW

For Tenure and Tenure-Track faculty, the CACP Workload Guidelines are intended to support faculty members in balancing their teaching, scholarship, and service loads consistent with their individual expertise, their developing body of work, and in balance with the needs of the Department or Program. The CACP workload guidelines, as required by the Board of Regents, constitute a minimum workload equivalence of eighteen semester credit hours of instruction for each nine-month academic year for tenure and tenure-track faculty. For NTT faculty, 12 credit hours per semester constitute a full-workload. The guidelines are in accordance with UT System Rule #31006. Workload Distributions may differ between faculty members and vary from year to year. While individual departments and programs may use the scholarship and research minimum performance guidelines included in this document to inform their AFPA processes, the two processes are considered separate.

III.B.   FACULTY WORKLOAD DISTRIBUTION AND WORK LOAD AGREEMENTS

The Workload Distribution for each faculty articulates the relative weighting of faculty activity in an agreed upon combination of teaching, scholarship, and service. Each faculty member will consult with their department chair or program coordinator to prepare a three-year Projected Faculty Activity Plan. The plan will employ a standardized form (see appendix A) that outlines the faculty member's goals and commitments in teaching, research, and service in each component year. The Projected Faculty Activity Plan forms are signed by the faculty member and approved by the chair and dean. In approving the plan, the chair and dean will consider both the faculty member's performance over the previous three-year cycle as well as evidence of potential for productivity over the plan period.

The plan will then guide the faculty member's contribution to the University, College, Department, or Program on a year-to-year basis within the Three-Year Projection. The Faculty Workload Distribution may be adjusted each year for reasons that may include a shift in faculty interests, faculty opportunities, changes in the needs of the department or college, and/or to better reflect the faculty member's productivity. Workload Distributions are used in departmental planning, annual performance appraisals, and in assessment rankings. Workload distributions follow the calendar year cycle in accordance with the AFPA cycle. The CACP has established table 2 below as a guide for Faculty Workload Distribution.

The Projected Faculty Activity Plan will be reviewed and updated on an annual basis to account for any changes or unforeseen circumstances in consultation with the department chair. Reviews of this plan will only aim to assess whether a faculty member met the minimum performance expectations over the 3-year period and do not aim to provide a comprehensive assessment of all faculty activity over this period. Faculty can choose any combination of work from Appendix B, Table B1 to demonstrate that they met their minimum performance expectation. Faculty efforts beyond this minimum expectation are immaterial to this 3-year review and do not need to be evaluated as part of it.

III.B.1. Workload Distribution Table and Notes

As a part of each AFPA prospectus, each faculty member shall make a case for a workload distribution of teaching, scholarship, and service for the upcoming academic year, to be negotiated with the Department Chair or Degree Program Coordinator in the AFPA Meeting. Workload distribution percentages indicate a relative weighting of the activity category in the AFPA process and do not indicate relative time.

Table 2. Workload Distribution

WORKLOAD TRACK	WORKLOAD DISTRIBUTION [3, 4] TEACHING / SCHOLARSHIP / SERVICE	COURSE LOAD	MINIMUM 3-YEAR SCHOLARSHIP EXPECTATIONS [7, 10]
Non-Tenure-Track A *(Teaching Only)*	100% / 0% / 0%	4/4 [5,6]	N/A
Non-Tenure-Track B *(Contract)*	60-80% / 0-20% / 20%	3/3 [5, 6] – 4/4	30 points [8, 9]
Teaching Focus A *(Tenured Only)* [1]	60% / 20% / 20%	3/3 [5]	30 points [8]
Teaching Focus B *(Tenured Only)* [1]	50% / 30% / 20%	3/2 [5]	40 points [8]
Balanced *(Tenured only)*	40% / 40% / 20%	2/2	50 points [8]
Balanced *(Tenure-track only)*	40% / 50% / 10%	2/2	60 points [8]
Research Focus A *(Tenured/Tenure-track)*	30% / 60% / 10%	2/1	80 points [8]
Research Focus B *(Tenured/Tenure-track)*	20% / 70% / 10%	1/1	100 points [8]
Administration and other *(varies)*	Varies	1/1	Varies

1. *A balanced workload distribution for tenured (40/40/20) or tenure-track (40/50/10) consists of a 2/2 course load (in accordance with disciplinary norms) which usually consists of 2 courses in each fall and spring semester or at least 4 courses over the 9-month academic year (not to include summers). For faculty teaching a design studio, each studio equals one course regardless of credit hours according to disciplinary norms. For faculty teaching courses with laboratory activities, each lecture/lab equals one course regardless of contact hours. For faculty teaching courses with additional laboratory contact hours, each lecture/lab combination equals one course regardless of total contact hours. For faculty teaching lecture/lab courses with less than 3 SCH, each lecture/lab combination equals one course regardless of the credit hours.*
2. *Teaching less than 40% requires course release for Research Focused Faculty. Course release is in accordance with activities listed in the HOP and are approved by the Department Chair or Degree Program Coordinator and the Dean. Faculty members may choose to buy-out release time in order to fulfill research obligations in accordance with the HOP and other UTSA regulations, subject to approval by the College. In accordance with the HOP, a faculty member in their first year may receive up to a two course release.*
3. *For Tenure-track and Tenured faculty, teaching should not be greater than 60% without approval by the Dean.*

4. *For Tenure-Track faculty, teaching should not be greater than 40% unless teaching resource constrictions necessitate abnormal assignment levels. In such a case, other workload categories will be altered to reflect these special circumstances and revised expectations.*
5. *Maximum 12 credit hours per semester.*
6. *For Non-Tenure-Track faculty, a course is equal to one three-credit hour increment of teaching (i.e. teaching a six credit hour course = 2 courses).*
7. *Refer to appendix B for point values and equivalencies of different forms of scholarship, research, and creative activities.*
8. *To account for the increased credit hours and contact hours of design studios, faculty who teach a 6 SCH studio for a minimum of three times over the three-year period will have their minimum research/scholarship expectations reduced by 5 points. Faculty who teach a 6 SCH studio 5 times or more over the three-year period will have their minimum expectations reduced by 10 points. Faculty who teach a 3 SCH studio for a minimum of 6 times over the three-year period will have their minimum expectations reduced by 5 points. Faculty who regularly teach other types of courses with high contact hours such as labs can request equivalent reductions in their minimum performance expectation with Chair approval.*
9. *Minimum scholarship and research expectation only apply for NTT faculty with scholarship and research expectations in their contracts.*
10. *The point expectations listed in the table are for any rolling 3-year period, with adequate progress made each year towards the total expectation.*

III.B.2. Summer Teaching

Summer teaching appointments are to be determined by the Department Chair or Degree Program Coordinator and approved by the Dean. The CoA standard full-time teaching load (1 FTE) is 9 credit hours over two Summer Sessions. A teaching load greater than 9 credit hours must be approved by the Dean. Summer teaching appointments are not normally applied towards the fulfillment of workload distribution. There may be exceptions to this policy at the discretion of the Dean.

UTSA College of Architecture, Construction and Planning

PROJECTED FACULTY ACTIVITY PLAN

Faculty Name:		Rank:

Department:

WORKLOAD OPTIONS
(Select one, total of annual activities may not exceed 100%)

Track (Check one)	Course Load	Studio Teaching (Y/N)	Workload Distribution Percentages			
			Teaching	Scholarship	Service	Administration
☐ Non-Tenure-Track A						
☐ Non-Tenure-Track B						
☐ Teaching Focus A						
☐ Teaching Focus B						
☐ Balanced - Tenured						
☐ Balanced - TT						
☐ Research Focus A						
☐ Research Focus B						
☐ Administration						
☐ Other (describe)						

QUALIFICATIONS FOR SELECTED TRACK
Please *briefly* describe scholarly, research, and/or creative activity output over the previous 3-year period that qualifies you for the track selected above. Add attachments if needed

PLAN OF WORK
Itemize and describe teaching, scholarship, and service commitments for each of the coming three years. Add attachments if needed.

	Teaching	Scholarship	Service
Year 1			
Year 2			
Year 3			

SIGNATURES

Faculty		Date:
Department Chair		Date:
Dean		Date:

* For guidelines and instructions about how to fill this form, please refer to CACP's workload guidelines document.

APPENDIX B

Point Values and Equivalencies of Scholarship, Research, and Creative Activities

*This table is used to determine whether a faculty member has met the minimum college expectations for scholarship, research, or creative activities. Faculty can use any combination of the activities below to meet these minimum expectations according to their areas of interest and professional and career goals. **For tenure-track and tenured faculty, meeting these minimum expectation does not, in and of itself, imply that the faculty member is making satisfactory progress towards achieving tenure or promotion. Faculty should refer to the college and university tenure and promotion policies and guidelines for a more detailed discussion of those expectations.***

The list included in table B1 is not meant to be exhaustive. Individual departments and programs can develop more detailed lists to be used in their AFPA processes. Departments or program can also have additional or more detailed guidelines for their faculty as long as they do not conflict with the guidelines specified in this document. These additional guidelines may include identifying specific forms of scholarly production or developing a ranking system for publication venues to meet their specific disciplinary expectations.

All point values included in table B1 for publications assume single authorship. Multi-authored publications should follow the credit percentages distribution described in table B2.

Table B1. Point Values for Scholarship, Research, and Creative Activities

Activity	Point Value	Comment [1]
Peer-reviewed conference papers (presented without proceedings)	5 points	Up to 10 points possible, with chair approval, for areas of interest in which publishing proceedings is not the disciplinary norm.
Invited presentations and Key note speeches	5 points	Up to 30 points possible for invited keynote speeches based on quality of venue. No more than one keynote speech can be claimed in this category over any 3-year work agreement period.
Peer-Reviewed Conference Paper / Proceedings published	10 points	Up to 15 points possible based on conference venue and acceptance rates.
Peer-reviewed journal articles [2]	30 points	Up to 45 points possible based on journal quality.
Published book chapter [2,3]	30 points	Up to 45 points possible based on publication and publisher quality.
Published scholarly or text book [2,3]	150 points	Up to 240 points possible based on authorship status (sole-author, co-author, editor) and publisher quality.
Published professional book [2,3]	60 points	Up to 150 points possible based on authorship status (sole-author, co-author, editor) and publisher quality.
Internal research grant [3]	5 points	Up to 10 points possible based on competitiveness.
External sponsored project [4]	10 points + 1 point / $2,500 of funding.	Up to 150 additional points possible depending on award program competitiveness, and level of recognition of award program within discipline.
Technical report for research grant	10 points	Up to 30 points possible based on report size and complexity.
Patent [2]	20 points	Up to 100 points possible based on patent content.
Design work (refereed)	15 points	Up to 45 points possible based on level of recognition and competitiveness of the review process.

Activity	Point Value	Comment [1]
Creative / professional work (published)	15 points	Up to 45 points possible based on type and level of publication.
Creative / professional work (exhibited)	15 points	Up to 45 points possible based on level of exhibition (local, regional, national, etc.)
Award for research, design, or other scholarly or professional activity (including design competitions)	10 points	Up to 150 points possible based on award source, level of recognition of award program within discipline, and level of competitiveness.
Citations	1 point each	Up to 5 points possible for significant citations (e.g. citations discussed in body of text). No more than 20 points can be claimed in this category over any 3-year work agreement period.
Evidence of sustained program of scholarship and research [5]	5 points	No more than 10 points can be claimed in this category over any 3-year work agreement period.

1. *Claiming a point value higher than the minimum for any activity requires documentation of rationale for higher value due to quality of venue, competitiveness, etc. Department chair will have the discretion to accept or deny the higher point value for any activity. If denied, the chair will provide the faculty member with a rationale for the decision.*
2. *Faculty can claim partial credit from any of these activities based on a demonstration of work in progress (e.g. completed draft, accepted book proposal, etc.). Any partial credit claimed/granted will be deducted from the overall points that can be earned for the completion of the activity*
3. *Excludes self-published books.*
4. *Funding amounts will be based on percentage of shared credit included in sponsored project routing form. If not available, this information can be obtained from the Research Service Center.*
5. *Evidence of sustained program could include professional development activities, writing and submitting book, paper or grant proposals, significance service or leadership positions in professional or academic organizations, or other evidence deemed satisfactory by the chair.*

Table B2. Shared Credit Percentages for Multi-Authored Activities

The following is the percentage of credit that can be claimed for multi-authored activities based on the order of authors. These percentages will apply if no prior agreement exists between the authors regarding the distribution of credit for the work. If such an agreement exists, it will precede the table below with regard to the distribution of points between the co-authors provided that the maximum percentage of credit claimed does not exceed what is listed in the table below for the corresponding number of authors. For activities involving authors from outside CACP, documented evidence of agreement between authors should be provided.

Number of Authors	First Author	Second Author	Third Author	4th Author or more
Single Author	100%			
Two Authors	90%	70%		
Three Authors	80%	60%	50%	
Four or more Authors	70%	50%	40%	25%