

Guidelines for Faculty Review

Alaska WWAMI School of Medical Education

University of Alaska Anchorage

October 1, 2013

Approved by Provost Elisha Baker IV to use criteria in reviews
August 25, 2014

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	3
II.	Definitions.....	3
III.	General Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation.....	4
	(a). General Guidelines-Evaluation of Teaching.....	5
	(b). General Guidelines-Evaluation of Service.....	6
	(c). General Guidelines-Evaluation of Academic Research Activity.....	8
IV.	Evaluation of Academic Research Activity.....	9
V.	Guidelines for Faculty Workload Proposals.....	10

I. Introduction

The Alaska WWAMI School of Medical Education at the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA) has adopted the following guidelines and definitions for evaluating faculty. The WWAMI program is a partnership with the University of Washington School of Medicine, providing medical education to Alaska students. The Alaska WWAMI program also offers some undergraduate and graduate courses, and several of the faculty participate in biomedical research. The information within this document is designed to be used by faculty preparing for progression towards tenure /tenure/promotion review and by those responsible for assessing review files. This document is to be used in conjunction with the University of Alaska Board of Regents' Policies, the University of Alaska Anchorage Policies, and the UNAC and UAFT Collective Bargaining Agreements.

II. Definitions

Workloads:

In the specific guidelines which follow, it is presumed that the typical faculty appointment is 'tripartite' with teaching, research and service components; Sections III and IV of this document apply to tripartite faculty. Faculty with 'bipartite' appointments have two workload components, typically teaching and service with no formal or contractual research component. Other allocations of a bipartite workload are possible. Sections III(a) and III(b) apply to bipartite faculty.

An example of a bipartite workload is:

4:0:1 appointment (80% teaching; 00% research; 20% service)

Examples of tripartite workloads are :

3:1:1 appointment (60% teaching; 20% research; 20% service)

2:2:1 appointment (40% teaching; 40% research; 20% service)

1:3:1 appointment (20% teaching; 60% research; 20% service)

Annual Progression towards Tenure Review prior to Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

- a) All untenured faculty undergo an annual review for progression toward tenure prior to tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. These annual reviews will be carried out by the college Dean or his/her designee.

Comprehensive 4th Year Review prior to Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

Faculty completing three years of academic employment will undergo comprehensive fourth year review at the beginning of their 4th year. During the 4th year review the faculty member will be comprehensively and diagnostically reviewed by the following:

- a) WWAMI Director, at the request of the Dean of the college (UAFT faculty only)
- b) Unit Peer Committee, at the request of the Dean of the college

- c) Dean of the college
- d) University-wide Peer-Review Committee
- e) Provost
- f) Chancellor, at the written request of the faculty member

Mandatory Year to Apply for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

A tenure-track faculty member may be evaluated for tenure in any year of service, but must be evaluated for tenure by the beginning of the mandatory year at UAA. The current mandatory year for an Assistant Professor to be evaluated for promotion and tenure is the beginning of the seventh year of service at UAA (i.e., after completing 6 years of service in the WWAMI Program). If the faculty member applies for promotion and tenure prior to the mandatory year, he/she shall be evaluated on the basis of the performance expectations that would exist at the time of the mandatory tenure review. External reviews must be sought at this stage as indicated in the applicable CBA.

Refereed Publications:

Prior to publication, refereed manuscripts undergo a process of detailed review by independent experts in the field of study. The result of the review may be suggested minor, moderate, or major changes, a recommendation for immediate publication, or a recommendation against publication in the journal, volume, or book to which the manuscripts were submitted.

Editor-reviewed:

Editor-reviewed manuscripts are reviewed by one or more editors. Examples may include (but are not limited to) final reports, technical reports and conference publications.

Non-Refereed Publications:

These publications are not subjected to rigorous scientific review. Examples of non-refereed publications may include (but are not limited to) the following:

- a) Research articles in non-refereed journals
- b) Technical reports
- c) Non-refereed invited papers, reviews, responses, and editorials
- d) Articles in popular magazines which serve to enhance public support for scientific research

III. General Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

The WWAMI Director (when providing a review) and the Unit Peer Committee members (each at the request of the Dean of the college) will review in turn a faculty member's file and assess the candidate's performance in all relevant workload components for bipartite and tripartite faculty. This appraisal will note any changes or improvements required for tenure, promotion and continued professional growth. The appraisal should conclude with a recommendation for or against progression towards tenure/tenure/promotion.

Training of Reviewers: All persons serving as reviewers, including faculty members, department chairs and unit administrators, shall attend a training session prior to the first time they serve on any faculty evaluation committee or review faculty files (or if four or more years have passed since they last attended training). All reviewers must also attend a training session if there have been substantive changes in policy since their last training.

The following general guidelines apply to each of the three workload components as indicated. Accomplishments during sabbaticals and/or prior academic appointments (if negotiated at the time of hire and included in the initial Letter of Appointment) should be considered during evaluations of productivity in the three component categories.

III(a). General Guidelines-Evaluation of Teaching

Overview: Given the relative importance of teaching for all faculty, a thoughtful and thorough evaluation of this workload component is critical. The WWAMI Director or Unit Peer Committee may request the faculty to compile a teaching dossier including syllabi, quizzes, exams, and other relevant material to include in the review file to establish a basis for evaluating course content and structure. Additional metrics for the **definite promise and achievement** in teaching can include a faculty member's list of courses taught, list of graduate students, syllabi, student evaluations, peer evaluations of classroom teaching (see below), innovative techniques and pedagogies, and common final exam results. In addition, the WWAMI Director (or their designee agreed upon after consultation with the Dean of the college) may, at their discretion, observe faculty teaching for the purpose of direct peer evaluation of appropriate and effective teaching methods, delivery, course content, or other relevant information. The WWAMI Director (or designee) will subsequently provide the faculty member with a written summary of these observations and any recommendations for improvement. The faculty member should then include the WWAMI Director's (or designee's) written summary in the review file (and their response, if any, to this review). Other data, such as student evaluation forms and University of Alaska Anchorage IDEA data, will be included as part of a faculty member's teaching evaluations. Faculty should not include the written student comment sheets in their review files since, a) submitted comments seldom represent all students in one's class, and b) reviewers have no way of knowing whether the comment sheets were screened for content.

Mentoring research: *Mentoring research* is defined as the teaching of research and is properly considered a teaching responsibility. Faculty in the WWAMI School of Medical Education should mentor and involve undergraduate and/or graduate students and/or postdoctoral scientists and/or WWAMI Triple I (III) students in their research. Faculty having research workloads should include any combination of undergraduate students, graduate students and/or postdoctoral scientists in their research programs to produce refereed publications. Measures of successful mentoring include a faculty member's students garnering competitive scholarships and fellowships, completing their degree, completing Honors and graduate theses, publishing in peer-reviewed literature, delivering presentations at regional, national and international conferences, going on to more professional training, and attaining employment within their field. Mentoring will be judged commensurate with a faculty's research workload.

Annual Review of Teaching Prior to Tenure

Evaluation of the teaching component of faculty workloads (UNAC CBA article 13, UAFT CBA article 5) should follow accepted practice as defined in existing guidelines for faculty review in the applicable CBA and within the college. Measures for **definite promise and achievement** for teaching are noted above, and include those indicated for mentoring undergraduate and graduate research. Using all the data in the review file, reviewers should evaluate the faculty for **definite promise, achievement and growth** in teaching. This will help build the case for overall achievement and will help build the case for a recommendation for progression towards tenure if the data persuade the reviewer that a faculty member displays promise and achievement in teaching. Reviewers should clearly specify the problem(s) and suggest corrective steps for the faculty member to pursue before his/her next review, assuming difficulties exist.

Comprehensive 4th Year Review:

All faculty members, regardless of workload assignments, undergoing 4th year comprehensive review must meet college requisites for teaching.. Measures for **definite promise and achievement** for teaching are noted above, and include those indicated for mentoring undergraduate and graduate research.

Review of Teaching for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

To be awarded tenure and to be promoted to Associate Professor, faculty should demonstrate significant **accomplishment** in teaching. This means that any suggestions for improvement made in prior reviews have been acted upon and that reviewers detect no significant difficulties with teaching or research mentoring activities using data available in the review file. Reviewers should specify what information was used in reaching their conclusion.

Review of Teaching for Promotion to Professor

For an Associate Professor to be promoted to Professor, the candidate must demonstrate **extensive accomplishment** in teaching. Reviewers should recall that the rank of Professor is the highest academic rank the University can bestow, so additional material which may lend support to an extensive accomplishment evaluation should be included in the file. Such additional material may include (but should not be limited to): teaching awards, letters of commendation from other faculty or students, development of curriculum, development of innovative teaching methods, success at mentoring research by graduate and undergraduate students, and/or other professional recognition of teaching.

III(b). General Guidelines-Evaluation of Service

Evaluation of the service component of faculty workloads should follow accepted practice as defined in existing guidelines for faculty review in the applicable CBA and college. Using all the data in the review file, reviewers should evaluate the faculty for **definite promise or achievement** in service. This will help build the case for overall achievement in service, and will help build the case for a recommendation for progression towards tenure if the data persuade the reviewer that a faculty member displays definite promise or achievement in service. Reviewers should clearly specify the problem(s) and suggest corrective steps for the faculty member to pursue before his/her next review, assuming difficulties exist.

Service includes a combination of public, professional, service to the discipline, and university service, including WWAMI School of Medical Education, college, university and professional activities. All faculty members are expected to contribute service at the WWAMI Program, college and university levels. Moreover, it is anticipated that WWAMI Program faculty will regularly attend and participate in faculty meetings and committees and to perform other duties consistent with the Bylaws that the WWAMI Director periodically requests. Reviewers should note professional service of faculty who serve as referees or members of review committees for journals/books/grant proposals/research programs/national level centers and/or experimental facility awards since such activities necessitate substantial time commitments. While such national service is important to one's career and profession, it should not substitute or replace departmental or institutional service.

Annual Progression towards Tenure Reviews:

All faculty members undergoing 1st, 2nd, and 3rd year progression towards tenure reviews are expected to demonstrate **definite promise or achievement** in service. Measures for promise or achievement in

service can include serving on departmental and university committees, reviewing manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals in their disciplines, reviewing proposals for funding agencies, hosting and/or chairing sessions at scientific meetings, reviewing textbooks.

Comprehensive 4th Year Review:

All faculty members, regardless of workload assignments, undergoing 4th year comprehensive review are expected to demonstrate **definite promise or achievement** in service. Measures for definite promise or achievement should include a continuing record of service to the WWAMI Program's academic and professional development and contributions to college and university committees. Other measures of service with definite promise or achievement can include contributions to national service such as reviewing manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals in their disciplines, reviewing proposals for funding agencies, hosting and/or chairing sessions at scientific meetings, reviewing textbooks, and activities related to the faculty member's profession/professional development.

Review of Service for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Faculty members standing for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are expected to demonstrate **significant accomplishment** in service. The minimum level of significant accomplishment in service required for promotion to Associate Professor should include a strong and continuing commitment to WWAMI Program service as a consensus-builder and team-player in the program's academic and professional development. Other measures of **significant accomplishment** in service can include guiding contributions to the department, college, university and to the faculty member's profession/professional development. These include reviewing manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals in their disciplines, reviewing student presentations, reviewing proposals for funding agencies, involvement in committee assignments for funding agencies, chaired sessions at state and national meetings, hosting sessions at scientific meetings, and reviewing textbooks.

Review of Service for Tenure and Promotion to Professor

Faculty members standing for tenure and promotion to Professor are expected to demonstrate **extensive accomplishment** in service. The minimum level of extensive accomplishment in service required for promotion to Professor should include a leadership record of significant service as a team-player in the WWAMI Program's academic and professional development. Other measures of extensive accomplishment in service can include leadership contributions to the department, college, university and to the faculty member's profession/professional development. These include reviewing student presentations, reviewing manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals in their disciplines, reviewing proposals for funding agencies, involvement in committee assignments and/or proposal review for significant funding agencies, chaired sessions at state, national and international meetings, hosting sessions at scientific meetings, reviewing textbooks, and/or holding office in one's professional societies.

III(c). General Guidelines-Evaluation of Academic Research

To assist reviewers in ascertaining the faculty member's academic research accomplishments during the review period, the WWAMI Director may request that the faculty member include copies in his/her review file of all manuscripts that are in preparation, submission/review, in press/accepted for publication, or published. In assessing performance, primary emphasis will be placed on refereed manuscripts; editor reviewed and non-refereed research products are considered to be a secondary level of research productivity and will not be acceptable as sole criteria for assessing the faculty

member's **definite promise or achievement** in the research component of the workload or to determine progress towards tenure and promotion.

The hallmark for demonstrating research success is peer-reviewed publication of one's research results. Therefore, tripartite faculty are expected to publish in the peer-reviewed literature while at UAA. In cases where a new faculty member has research results (conducted elsewhere and prior to hire at UAA) published with a non-UAA affiliation soon after arrival at UAA, that publication will be counted in assessing research productivity. However, reviewers should note that such work does not satisfy any requirement to demonstrate *de novo* research activity while at UAA.

Since research faculty are expected to submit research grant proposals to external funding agencies on a regular basis, the WWAMI Director may also request that evidence of these submissions be included in the review file. In reviewing funding activity, external competitive grant proposals that are funded will be considered meritorious. In addition to competitive grants from external funding agencies, internal competitive grants, awards of experimental time and collaboration at national labs, observatories, or computing facilities will also be given merit. Presentations at conferences, participation in scientific discussion panels, and contributions to grant review processes can also be included for review.

In general, faculty undergoing annual review prior to tenure will be expected to demonstrate **definite promise and achievement** in research through the documentation in their file. Faculty standing for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should demonstrate **significant accomplishment** in this workload component. Each discipline has specified the standards for each level of accomplishment. In those cases where a faculty member changes workload categories, (e.g., changes from **3:1:1** to **2:2:1**) research productivity should be judged on a *pro-rated* basis taking into account the time spent in each category.

For an Associate Professor to be promoted to Professor, the candidate must demonstrate **extensive accomplishment** in research productivity beyond the accepted level for the rank of Associate Professor. Extensive accomplishment will be measured by a continued rate of success in refereed publications and the maintenance of a successful and active research program that includes funded external grants and/or awards of experimental/computational time at national labs. Each discipline has established appropriate measures for meeting this high standard, keeping in mind that the rank of Professor is the highest rank the university can award to faculty. External reviews must be sought at this stage as indicated in the applicable CBA.

IV. Evaluation of Academic Research

The WWAMI School of Medical Education has crafted specific guidelines which apply to its expectations of faculty in academic research. These guidelines are in addition to the general guidelines outlined above, and the expected output levels defined below represent *minimum* standards for progression towards tenure, tenure, and promotion. Reviewers should realize, however, that faculty members have diverse and unique research goals, and the particular accomplishments of a faculty member should be evaluated with these parameters in mind.

Research in the biomedical sciences is expected to yield the following products:

Refereed publications and, optionally, **non-refereed publications**.

While individual faculty members may demonstrate capability in research via contributions to both of these categories, productivity must include publishing in refereed journals. Refereed publications in

peer-reviewed journals are expected to be derived from work primarily conducted in, or associated with, the candidate's UAA laboratory; such publications serve as a representation of the faculty member's ability to design, conduct, and mentor novel research at the University of Alaska Anchorage.

Reviewers must recognize and understand the authorship standards in a faculty's specific discipline. It is therefore incumbent on faculty who are being reviewed to definitively explain the *authorship standards associated with their particular disciplines*.

The level of research productivity over a particular interval being reviewed for progression towards tenure, tenure, and/or promotion will be defined primarily by the number and quality of publications (e.g., impact to the field, number of citations of the work, etc.). The expected output will be dictated by the workload agreement assigned to the faculty member as well as the faculty member's rank. The projected output levels defined below represent *minimum* standards for progression towards tenure, and promotion.

Annual Progress towards Tenure Reviews:

To demonstrate **definite promise and achievement** in Academic Research, candidates for progression towards tenure must show evidence that they have begun to develop an independent research program. Such evidence may include, at minimum, the establishment of a functional research laboratory or other research infrastructure (database, etc.), evidence of an effort to obtain internal and/or external funding, and student (graduate and/or undergraduate) participation in the candidate's research program.

Comprehensive 4th Year Review

All faculty members undergoing 4th year comprehensive reviews are expected to demonstrate **growth and achievement** in Academic Research. Measures for growth and achievement can include manuscripts submitted or published, proposals submitted or funded, students (graduate and/or undergraduate) and/or postdoctoral scientists recruited for research activities in the lab and/or field, and presentations at professional conferences.

Research/ Activity Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

To demonstrate **significant accomplishment** in Academic Research, the faculty member must give evidence of contributions to the body of knowledge in the candidate's discipline and must demonstrate a continuing program of internal and/or external funding to support graduate students and research activity. Manifestations of scholarship vary in form from one discipline to another, but typically include the following:

1. Defined area of research.
2. Mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students, and supervision of post-doctoral researchers.
3. Service as a member of thesis committees.
4. Acquisition of internal and external grants.
5. Peer-reviewed publications.
6. Contributions to conferences, editorial boards, colloquia, and the like, as appropriate for the discipline.

An affirmative evaluation of a faculty member's academic research represents the conclusion that the work is of high quality, that it is a significant contribution to the candidate's professional discipline,

and that it is a measure of the candidate's potential to make continuing contributions in basic and/or applied research.

Promotion to Professor

Faculty in all workload categories must demonstrate **continuous** and **extensive accomplishment** in performance in research in order to be promoted to the highest faculty rank of Professor. All UAA reviewers should examine the faculty member's actual workload category(ies) in evaluating productivity in research and publications produced at UAA, recognizing that UAA has limited research support and infrastructure.* In addition, consideration must be given to the entire career productivity of the candidate, not limited to time at UAA only (Consideration of productivity outside of time at UAA can only be considered if negotiated at the time of hire and included in the initial Letter of Appointment).

The rank of Professor is an indication of the stature of the scientist among his/her peers, so evaluation by researchers external to UAA must be sought, where reviewers should weigh both the number and quality (e.g., impact to the field, number of citations of the work, etc.) of refereed publications produced, plus research funding received, and/or support awarded at national labs over the individual's career to determine whether "**extensive accomplishment**" has been achieved. This is very much a professional judgment issue, best left to peers for determination since quality of research can really only be judged by others in the field.

Guidelines for Faculty Workload Proposals

BACKGROUND

As defined in Article 13 of the United Academics (UNAC) Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), "workload" is the set of professional activities a unit member is required to perform to meet the requirements of a contract. The workload may consist of three parts: teaching, research, and service. Fulltime faculty are responsible for 30 workload units per academic year. Flexibility exists in the assignment of workloads to accommodate the interests and strengths of each member of the faculty, while achieving the goals of each academic and research program. The workload assignment sets a minimum level of acceptable performance for the individual and does not limit the ability of a member of the faculty to conduct his or her academic activities.

The workload for WWAMI School of Medical Education faculty is determined by the college Dean after consultation with the Alaska WWAMI Program Director and the faculty member. In determining the faculty member's workload, the Dean will consider the following factors: accountability; historical workloads, the missions and goals of academic units, including unit criteria developed for the evaluation of faculty; the level, duration, and mode of delivery of a workload activity; the requirements of externally funded contracts and grants; and whether an activity requires individual or group activity of extended contact hours. Every faculty member is required to have an approved workload in order to be paid.

WORKLOAD PROPOSALS

The annual process for approval of faculty workload assignments begins with a faculty workload proposal from the individual faculty member. Tripartite faculty members should submit an academic year workload proposal (9 months) and an “additional assignment” workload proposal (up to 3 months) for summer activities. Workload proposals are due to the Program Director by March 15.

WORKLOAD ASSIGNMENTS

After the Program Director has reviewed the workload proposal for each faculty member, the recommendation is forwarded to the Dean by April 1. The Director should balance the need for teaching, research and service in the programs of the Program in order to achieve both research and academic goals. Changes to proposals may be recommended by the Director to the Dean to support unit priorities. The Dean shall notify the faculty members of their workload for the subsequent contract period no later than the last day of the current contract period. Upon review, revision and approval by the Dean, the faculty member is notified of his/her faculty workload assignment no later than the last day of the academic year contract period. The faculty member signs the workload assignment, indicating receipt of that document. A signed copy is forwarded to the Director’s office and the Dean's office for the faculty file.

In the event of a dispute over workload, a meeting between the concerned faculty member, the Director, and the Dean will be held to address the issues. The Dean, with consultation by the Director, will make a final decision based on those discussions and notify concerned parties.

Any faculty member that fails to turn in an acceptable workload proposal by the last day of the academic year contract will be assigned a workload by the Dean (CBA Article 13.3.4.c).

Workload assignments may be changed during the course of the year. Such changes can be based on a number of factors, including changes in the individual's research funding, changes in the course offerings in the program, or unanticipated service or administrative activities of the individual. When such changes occur, a request to modify the workload assignment should be forwarded through the Director for the Dean's approval.

GUIDELINES FOR WORKLOAD PROPOSALS

The following are guidelines for initiating the faculty workload proposal for activities in the subsequent academic year:

1. Use the 9-month academic year (30 workload units) faculty workload proposal for the appropriate year. To include additional assignments in the summer, submit an “additional assignment” form for up to 3 months (10 workload units) of additional support.

2. Complete the form assigning workload units to each category. The total for the nine month period must equal 30 workload units. The workload assignment defines the 30 units of workload that you are contracted to perform, so please carefully consider your proposal.

The major categories within the annual workload are Teaching, Research and Service which are defined in section 13.1.3 of the UNAC CBA. The “Teaching Activity” category includes classroom and other teaching, as well as advising of undergraduate and graduate students.

TEACHING

Teaching workload credits for tripartite faculty are as follows

For 3:1:1 workload (3 parts teaching, 1 part research, 1 part service): 18 workload credits during the academic year

For 2:2:1 workload: 12 workload credits during the academic year

For 1:3:1 workload: 6 workload credits during the academic year

Formal course work will be credited with one (1) workload unit for each credit hour if the course has at least five (5) students. If during the semester a class has a reduced number of students, the instructor should discuss a workload revision with the Director.

A faculty member may request the addition of teaching credit for developing a totally new course, or for exceptional demands required of the person teaching the course, subject to approval of the Director. One additional workload credit will be given for stacked courses, due to the additional requirements inherent in teaching and assessing students at two levels.

The Unit Peer Committee can recommend changes a faculty member’s teaching workload credits based on recent research productivity and the faculty member’s demonstrated strengths. These suggestions will be considered by the Director and, in consultation with the faculty member, the proposed changes may be communicated to the Dean.

Teaching Workload Credit for Graduate Student Training and Postdoctoral supervision

Graduate student supervision is considered part of the teaching workload (13.1.3 of the UNAC CBA) and will be awarded credit as follows:

- Faculty can claim up to five (5) total units for each individual Master’s student and eight (8) total units for a Ph.D. student that they directly supervise. These credits can be claimed at the faculty’s discretion during the period the student is enrolled in the program.
- Committee members will receive a total of 0.5 units per year per graduate student with a cap of 2.5 total units for any individual Master’s student and four (4) total units for a Ph.D. student.
- If a faculty member uses all the credit for a given student and the student is still enrolled, no additional credit will be granted. In addition, credit for a given student

may be banked against future workloads, but only as long as the student remains enrolled.

- Postdoctoral supervision will be credited at 0.25 workload credits per person, per academic year, with a total cap of 2 for each postdoc during the postdoc's tenure at UAA.

Teaching Workload Credit for Undergraduate Student Advising and Training

The CBA acknowledges that mentorship of undergraduates enrolled in Internships, Practica, Independent Studies, Thesis or Individual Research is a Teaching Activity. The Biomedical Program proposes to use the following guidelines in the development of workloads:

- 1) General advising. Under the current advising arrangement, faculty will receive 0.5 workload credits for every 10 undergraduate students that they actively advise over the course of the semester. Active advising includes meeting with the students, and providing guidance on coursework, transfer credits, and career goals. Credit for special advising (such as pre-med advising) will be negotiated separately.
- 2) Internships. Internships require that the student work with a faculty sponsor on a project in conjunction with training by an external supervisor associated with a federal, state, or private agency. A faculty sponsor is not required to oversee the training and does not necessarily meet with the student on a regular basis. The sponsor is responsible for developing the original contract with the student, reading and grading reports, papers, posters, or talks given by the student at the end of the internship. No workload credit will be given for this activity, unless the faculty can demonstrate significant involvement and time commitment equivalent, in which case the instructor should receive 0.5 credits per student per semester.
- 3) Independent Studies (such as BIOL A497). These courses should require the student to meet for at least an hour a week with the instructor of record. The student is required to prepare an initial contract with the faculty outlining the expectations and requirements of the Independent Study and the basis for the final grade. Normally a final report will be required which should be read and graded by the instructor. The instructor should receive 0.5 credits per student per semester for each independent study.

Individual Research (such as BIOL A498). Individual Research requires mentoring and training sufficient to warrant workload credits. As with Independent Studies, the student is required to consult with the advising faculty to prepare an initial contract outlining the expectations and requirements of the Individual Research and the basis for the final grade. Students must receive a letter grade for their work. Students should be working under close supervision of the instructor of record. There should be specific tasks required for each student, which will be outlined in the contract. For example, a student may be required to turn in a literature review and project proposal near the beginning of the semester, attend weekly meetings in the lab for one hour to discuss all projects, spend a certain amount of time per week on the research (depending on the number of credits enrolled), conduct and analyze experimental data, and provide a formal report (paper, poster, talk or combination thereof) at the end of the semester. (If the research spans more than one semester, a formal report should be written at the end of each semester.)

The faculty supervisor should be required to put a substantial amount of effort into the training of each student, meeting weekly for at least an hour with each student and reading all graded material. The instructor of record for a 498 course should receive 1 workload credit per student per semester for up to 3 students per semester. There will be no cap on teaching workload allowance, as long as the activities conform to the above guidelines.
