

Department of Biology
College of Letters, Arts and Sciences

May 31, 2009

**UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT COLORADO SPRINGS
DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY
CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE
2009**

Approved by the Provost: May 18, 2009

INTRODUCTION

Standards and processes for reappointment, promotion and tenure of faculty are governed by Article V and Appendix A of the Laws of the Regents. These are further delineated in a series of CU Administrative Policy Statements. Campus guidance is supplied in UCCS Policy # 200-001. These documents require the establishment of departmental criteria which are used throughout the review process.

The criteria are to be considered guidelines for the general review of candidates toward reappointment, promotion and tenure in the Department of Biology at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in our discipline. Each candidate's case will be reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances. The department is committed to quality teaching, strong scholarship, and effective service to the university, the profession and the community. The evaluation process assumes: possession of an appropriate terminal degree; competent education and training in the discipline(s); conduct which reflects the professional and academic standards for generating, validating, disputing, and transmitting knowledge; and an appreciation of and respect for the rights, duties, and privileges associated with academic freedom and collegial responsibilities.

When these criteria are applied to faculty who were granted time toward tenure, the years granted toward tenure shall be considered equivalent to work performed at UCCS. While a faculty member's career record will be considered in personnel actions described here, the main emphasis of evaluation will be on work performed at UCCS and, in particular, progress since the last review.

The department at this time will not be using the FRS, but may choose in the future to incorporate it into this document.

PROCESS

1. As the Primary Unit, the Biology Department faculty will be responsible for the primary review of all departmental faculty reappointment, tenure and promotion.
2. The Chair of the Biology Department will meet with each candidate for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to inform them of the procedures, how to construct a dossier and to solicit recommendations for possible external reviewers (when appropriate) and evaluation committee members. Candidates will be directed to the appropriate websites for regental and campus procedures and formatting.

3. The candidate and the Biology Chair will select an Evaluation Committee (formerly known as the primary unity committee) that is appropriate to perform the review of the qualifications of the candidate for reappointment, tenure and promotion. The Evaluation Committee must contain no fewer than 5 members and the majority of those members will come from the Biology Department. Other members from other academic units may be selected when their area of expertise allows for sound judgment of the candidates' record.
4. The Evaluation Committee for reappointments, tenure and promotion to associate professor reviews will typically include only tenured faculty. Review for promotion to full professor requires inclusion of only full professors on the evaluation committee.
5. For Comprehensive Review and Tenure the candidate must provide the Evaluation Chair with a list of 12-15 possible outside reviewers (including addresses, telephone, fax, email information, a brief biography of each, and a statement of past interactions with the candidate). The Department Chair or Evaluation Committee can select from that list and may add to it. The candidate has the right to request that specific people not be asked to be external reviewers. External reviewers should be selected because of their ability to provide an unbiased assessment of the candidate in the areas of scholarly research and teaching. Former advisors, collaborators, co-authors, mentors, and former colleagues must not constitute a majority of the solicitation letters. The Dean must approve the list of reviewers. The Department will require the recommended number of external letters as listed in the campus guidelines. The external reviewers' letters will remain confidential and will not be made available to the candidate under any circumstances. The Evaluation Chair will provide a redacted summary of the external reviewers' comments to the candidate.
6. The candidate will submit a dossier for review. If a dossier is not submitted then the candidate will not be considered for reappointment or promotion.

The dossier will include evidence to show that the candidate has met the criteria for the review. While the candidate may provide additional significant material about their entire career, the material should focus on activities since the date of the last appointment, reappointment, tenure and/or promotion. Examples of appropriate materials that maybe submitted for evaluation to determine if department criteria have been met are included in the Appendix. At each review, the evaluation committee will use multiple means of evaluating teaching. The dossier should include the following information as well as other evidence that the candidate wants to submit: (1) an updated curriculum vitae following the format required in the campus policy; (2) a self evaluation statement of the candidate's entire record, dossier, and plans for the next 3-5 years covering each area of teaching, scholarship and service; (3) a teaching portfolio which will include a teaching philosophy, FCQ summaries, FCQ individual sheets for 3 most recent years (in a separate binder); and at least two other means of evaluation; (4) a research portfolio which demonstrates scholarship activity; and (5) evidence demonstrating service activity.

7. The Evaluation Committee will perform the evaluation of the candidate's qualifications. They will vote on whether the candidate meets qualifications, and present the results of their vote to the Biology tenured faculty (i.e. how many voted for and how many voted against). Individual votes are to remain confidential and only a summary report of the number of votes for and against the decision will be made public.

The chair of the Evaluation Committee will write a letter to the Dean that details: the composition of the committee, the committee's vote, and the committee's shared rationale for the vote. The letter will explain clearly and with evidence the reasons for its recommendation and must specifically address how the candidate's record of teaching, scholarship and service meets the primary unit standards and criteria and the criteria and standards in University policy.

The chair of the Evaluation Committee will meet with the candidate and provide a copy of the letter and a summary of the committee's decision as soon as possible.

8. When not serving as the Evaluation Chair, the Biology Department chair can provide a separate evaluation that provides a thorough, careful and independent evaluation of the applicant in the three areas of teaching, scholarship and service. The department chair will meet with the candidate as soon as possible to discuss their evaluation and provide a copy of the letter to the candidate.
9. In the case of tenure decisions, the Evaluation Committee Chair will bring to the full tenured Biology faculty the results of the committee discussion and decision, and solicit a vote from the entire tenure-track faculty. The vote of the faculty will be provided in the evaluation committee's letter. If the faculty and Evaluation Committee disagree (i.e. one committee recommends tenure, the other committee does not) the outcome of the faculty vote will be detailed in the evaluation committee's letter to the Dean that describes the rationale for the positive as well as negative votes. The full tenured faculty vote will only occur in the case of tenure decisions; all other decisions are based on the vote of the Evaluation Committee.
10. In the event that the first level review of the Evaluation Committee's procedure leads either the Dean's Review committee or the Dean to disagree with the decision, the Dean will initiate a discussion about the disagreement with the Department Chair and the Chair will call a meeting. If the promotion is for tenure, then all tenured biology faculty are convened to reconsider the decision. For promotion to full professor, only the full biology professors are convened to reconsider, for all others, the evaluation committee reconvenes along with the Department Chair to reconsider. If faculty outside the department serves on the Evaluation Committee they will be asked to convene with appropriate biology faculty for decision reconsideration. The Department Chair will write a letter summarizing the results of the department's reconsidered judgment to the Dean and the Dean's Review Committee.
11. Any processes not directly addressed will use the campus and university processes and guidelines as outlined in the appropriate UCCS policies, Regents Laws and policies, and CU Administrative Policy statements.

Criteria

The Biology Department recognizes that scholarship can take many forms. Our department emphasizes fundamental discover, scholarly work which integrates existing knowledge, and applied research. The Biology Department recognizes both classroom teaching and individualized teaching activities. The department recognizes service to the CU system, campus, department, community and to our respective professions.

The Biology Department will consider the following criteria when reviewing candidates for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. Candidates should submit dossiers that demonstrate how they have met the criteria. At initial and comprehensive reviews the department may also take into account issues of material bearing such as strategic goals of the department, college and campus when deciding on reappointment.

INITIAL REVIEW

The candidate's total record, including teaching, scholarship and service, shall be evaluated. The candidate must show sufficient potential of future success to justify reappointment. At this level of review, candidates should provide evidence of the initiation of systematic efforts to establish a strong program of teaching and research and demonstrate departmental citizenship.

Teaching

The candidate is expected to meet the Meritorious teaching criteria as outlined in the Teaching Criteria Rubric. Meeting these criteria will demonstrate a commitment to teaching, evidence of good interaction with students, satisfactory development of skill in presenting material and/or improvement and innovation in teaching methods and in curriculum development. In addition meeting the rubric criteria will demonstrate coherent and organized lectures as well as thoughtfully presented.

Scholarship/Research

The candidate is expected to meet the Meritorious research criteria as outlined in the Research Criteria Rubric. Meeting these criteria will demonstrate a well-designed research plan and the potential for continued development as a researcher and progress toward publication.

Our department emphasizes fundamental discovery, scholarly work which integrates existing knowledge, and applied research. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research.

Service

The candidate is expected to meet the Meritorious service criteria as outlined in the Service Criteria Table. Meeting these criteria will demonstrate that the candidate participated fully in the department, including attendance at faculty meetings, sharing in the departmental decision-making process, and participating in activities that contribute to the department's well-being.

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

The candidate's record in teaching, scholarship/research, and service will each be evaluated separately as: below expectations, meritorious, or excellent. The candidate must demonstrate sufficient progress toward tenure to justify reappointment. At this level, the candidates should have demonstrated merit as a teacher and researcher, and have established himself/herself as a contributor to the department and limitedly, to the college, community and profession.

Teaching

The candidate is expected to demonstrate effective teaching. The teaching portfolio should demonstrate evidence of improvement in teaching since the initial review. This evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and up-dating curriculum and course materials. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, intern/extern supervisor and similar activities will be considered. In evaluating teaching, course content, level and size will be considered interpreting student evaluation.

A rating of **Meritorious** will be demonstrated by meeting the criteria in the Teaching Criteria Rubric.

A rating of **Excellent** will be demonstrated by meeting the criteria in the Teaching Criteria Rubric.

Scholarship/Research

There should be clear evidence that a focused research program has been established that will produce rigorous, publishable research that makes a meaningful contribution to the discipline. The candidate must demonstrate reasonable progress toward tenure as demonstrated by the research portfolio and by the letters of evaluation of his/her work. Exceptional quality of scholarly work will be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where there is a lower quantity of work. Reappointment would not occur if there was little or no realistic prospect that publications will be forthcoming or that research funding proposals will be submitted within the next two years. The research portfolio should include examples of published work, with emphasis placed on refereed journal articles, book chapters, grant proposals, or books.

A rating of **Meritorious** will be demonstrated by meeting the criteria in the Scholarship/Research Criteria Rubric.

A rating of **Excellent** will be demonstrated by meeting the criteria in the Scholarship/Research Criteria Rubric.

Service

The candidate should demonstrate continuing departmental service and should show evidence of university, community, or national professional service. In evaluating service both the quality and quantity of service contributions will be considered.

A rating of **meritorious** will be demonstrated by meeting the criteria in the Service Criteria Table.

A rating of **excellent** will be demonstrated by meeting the criteria in the Service Criteria Table.

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND AWARDING OF TENURE

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and service will each be evaluated separately as below expectations, meritorious, or excellent. The candidate must receive a rating of excellent in either teaching or scholarship and be rated meritorious (or higher) in the remaining areas.

Teaching

The candidate will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching. This evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and up-dating curriculum and course materials. Maturation and improvement in teaching should be evident. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, intern supervisor and similar activities shall be considered here.

A rating of **Meritorious** will be demonstrated by meeting the criteria in the Teaching Criteria Rubric.

A rating of **Excellent** will be demonstrated meeting the criteria in the Teaching Criteria Rubric.

Scholarship/Research

The candidate must demonstrate a body of work which makes an original scholarly contribution. A variety of completed work may be submitted as evidence of a productive research program; however articles in published or accepted in final form in peer-reviewed journals are most important. Non-peer-reviewed works (e.g., article-length contributions to edited books, edited research works, published books, collaborative work, textbooks and other publications) will be considered on their scholarly merit. Other indicators of scholarly accomplishment include presentations at national meetings and external research funding. In all cases, the scholarly quality and contribution to the theoretical and applied fields of biology are of utmost importance, with quantity being necessary but not sufficient to demonstrate research merit. Although quality is of greater importance than quantity, the department expects evidence of continuous productivity over a period of years.

A rating of **Meritorious** will be demonstrated by meeting the criteria as outlined in the Scholarly/Research Criteria Rubric.

A rating of **Excellent** will be demonstrated by meeting the criteria as outlined in the Scholarly/Research Criteria Rubric.

Service

In addition to meeting his or her obligation to the department and university service, the candidate should also demonstrate service within the discipline and/or to the community. Service to the discipline may include reviewing for journals or granting agencies, participation at professional conferences, and leadership within professional associations. Service to the community may include pro bono consultation with community service agencies, membership on boards of organizations or agencies, responsible presentation of biological literature through the media, or provision of education to the lay public or professionals. In evaluating service both the quality and quantity of service contributions will be considered.

A rating of **Meritorious** will be demonstrated by meeting the criteria as outlined in the Service Criteria Table.

A rating of **Excellent** will be demonstrated by meeting the criteria as outlined in the Service Criteria Table.

PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

The candidate's record in teaching, scholarship/research, and service will be evaluated as a whole as either below expectations, meritorious, or excellent. Promotion requires a record that, taken as a whole, judged to be excellent; a record of significant contribution to both or either graduate or undergraduate education and a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial significant and continued growth, development and accomplishment in teaching, scholarship/research and service.

Teaching

The candidate will be expected to show contributions to the breadth and depth, and needs of the department and updating curriculum and course materials. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students within and outside the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director and similar activities shall be considered here. Substantial and significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a teacher since tenure must be **demonstrated by meeting Excellent in the criteria as outlined in the Teaching Criteria Rubric.**

Scholarship/Research

The candidate will be expected to demonstrate substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a researcher since tenure through refereed publications, peer-reviewed grants, books, book chapters and other areas of scholarly research. Exceptional quality of scholarly work may be considered to raise the evaluation in cases where the quantity is less. **The candidate will demonstrate Excellent by meeting the criteria as outlined in the Scholarship/Research Criteria Rubric.**

Service

The Biology Department recognizes service to the campus, community and to our profession. In evaluating service both the quality and quantity of service contributions will be considered. Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in service since tenure must be **demonstrated by meeting Excellent in the criteria as outlined in the Service Criteria Table.**

POST-TENURE REVIEW

The Biology Department defines “meeting expectations” for the purpose of post tenure review as consisting of three elements, each of which must be met:

1. Having achieved a rating of “meeting expectations” or higher on each of the annual merit reviews included in the time period under review.
2. Submission of an acceptable professional plan which indicates an ability to achieve “meeting expectations” or higher ratings in the future. (Tier 1 under Scholarship/Research)
3. Meeting or exceeding the criteria as outlined in the post tenure criteria rubric.

APPENDIX
BIOLOGY DEPARTMENT CRITERIA TIERS AND RUBRIC

Teaching Evidence

Tier 1

1. Student Evaluation:

Class size based on enrollment:

An average FCQ 4.5 or higher for 1-30 students for Instructor Rating

An average FCQ 4.3 or higher for 31-50 students for Instructor Rating

An average FCQ 4.0 or higher for 51 or above for Instructor Rating

- 2. Syllabi with stated course objectives**
- 3. Examples of detailed lecture notes for each course**
- 4. Examples of supplemental instructional materials**
- 5. Sample of homework and assignments**
- 6. Sample of exams**
- 7. Clearly defined student projects and/or presentations**
- 8. Develops and maintains a positive work relationship with peers, staff and administration**
- 9. Interaction with students (documented office hours, mentoring, and availability)**

Tier 2

1. Student Evaluation:

Class size based on enrollment:

An average FCQ 4.8 or higher for 1-30 students for Instructor Rating

An average FCQ 4.5 or higher for 31-50 students or above for Instructor Rating

An average FCQ 4.3 or higher for 51 or above for Instructor Rating

- 2. Obtains favorable peer (other faculty and/or teaching learning center faculty) evaluation of teaching and/or conducts a mid-semester evaluation to classes**
- 3. Participates as either a supervisor or member of student thesis projects**
- 4. New course development or redevelopment of an existing course to improve biology curriculum**
- 5. Participates in student advising activities and mentoring (including MOSIAC programs)**
- 6. Student supervision in professional experience activities, internships, and/or independent studies**
- 7. Application of different teaching strategies**
- 8. Implementation of technology in the classroom**
- 9. Participation in activities related to teaching improvement (e.g., workshops or conferences)**

Tier 3

1. Student Evaluation:

Class size based on enrollment:

An average FCQ 5.0 or higher for 1-30 students for Instructor Rating

An average FCQ 4.8 or higher for 30-50 students for Instructor Rating

An average FCQ 4.3 or higher for 50 or above for Instructor Rating

2. Recognition for outstanding teaching (e.g. nomination for LAS or University teaching award)
3. Demonstrates effectiveness of students in succeeding courses and/or in the pursuit of graduate education and/or in careers
4. Demonstrates innovation or creativity in teaching; including support of diverse students in the sciences
5. Plays a leadership role in teaching improvement activities (e.g., leading workshops or conferences, providing mentorship to junior faculty, participating in freshman seminar)
6. Invited guest lecturer in an educational setting outside UCCS i.e. class room instruction
7. Plays a significant role in classroom processes or student learning through ongoing assessment activities or program review
8. Demonstrates involvement in teaching challenging topics, which may include integration of materials in courses that deal with controversial or sensitive topics (including diversity)
9. Development of laboratory courses
10. Takes the lead in coordinating team taught courses or coordinates a bank of instructors teaching multiple sections of a course
11. Obtaining funding for teaching practices
12. Takes the lead roll in curriculum development and evaluation
13. Participation in teaching-related community outreach, such as involvement with K-12 science education
14. Demonstrates involvement with course development and teaching in courses that are not considered part of the candidate's teaching load
15. Demonstrates successful collaborative teaching or instructional activities with other departments

Teaching Criteria Rubric

| | Tiers | Initial Review | Comprehensive | Tenure |
|--------------------|--------------|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| Meritorious | 1 | 6/9 | 8/9 | 8/9 |
| | 2 | 0/9 | 5/9 | 7/9 |
| | 3 | 0/15 | 2/15 | 5/15 |
| Excellent | 1 | 7/9 | 9/9 | 9/9 |
| | 2 | 2/9 | 7/9 | 8/9 |
| | 3 | 0/15 | 4/15 | 7/15 |

| | Tiers | Post-Tenure** |
|------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| Meeting Expectations* | 1 | 8/9 |
| | 2 | 7/9 |
| | 3 | 5/15 |

* exceeding the number of criteria in each tier will result in a ranking of “exceeding expectations”

**in addition to the criteria tiers, the candidate must have achieved a rating of meeting expectations or higher on each of the annual merit reviews included in the time period under review.

| | Tiers | Full Professor |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| Excellent | 1 | 9/9 |
| | 2 | 8/9 |
| | 3 | 7/15 |

Scholarship/Research Evidence

Tier 1

1. Completion and approval by the Department Chair and the Evaluation Committee of a five-year professional plan
2. Submission of a budget for spending start up funds for research trajectory
3. Attend at least one local, regional, or national conference, workshop, or professional meeting
4. Evidence of scholarly research (e.g. data collection) that will ultimately result in a peer-reviewed publication
5. Draft of a proposal for either an internal or external research grant

Tier 2

1. Participation in peer-review of scholarly research in the candidate's field of expertise (e.g. journal reviewer, grant reviewer, national conference abstract reviewer)
2. Submission of at least one external research grant, contract or subcontract proposals
3. Attend at least 2 professional meetings, one of which must include a national research conference
4. Submission of at least one peer-reviewed abstract of scholarly research to a conference or meeting
5. Presentation (poster or speaker) of candidate's scholarly research at a conference or professional meeting
6. Contributing author (or investigator) of at least 1 peer-reviewed publication (published or in press) of scholarly research (e.g. journal articles, books, book chapters) written while the candidate was at UCCS
7. Establish collaborative research projects

Tier 3

1. Participation on an external grant review panel
2. Obtain research grant, contract or subcontract proposals.
3. Submission of at least two external research grant, contract or subcontract proposal.
4. Attend at least 4 professional meetings, two of which must include a national research conference
5. Submission of at least 3 peer-reviewed abstracts of scholarly research to a conference or professional meeting for the purpose of presenting the candidate's scholarly research .
6. At least 3 presentations (poster or speaker) of candidate's scholarly research at conferences or professional meetings
7. Contributing or lead author of at least 3, peer-reviewed publications (published or in press) of scholarly research (e.g. journal articles, books, book chapters)

8. Lead author or mentor author of 1 peer reviewed abstract
9. Patent submission
10. Invited speaker of scholarly research for a professional meeting or conference or seminar
11. Successful collaborations resulting in publications or research funding

Scholarship/Research Criteria Rubric

| | Tiers | Initial Review | Comprehensive | Tenure |
|--------------------|--------------|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| Meritorious | 1 | 2/5 | 3/5 | 5/5 |
| | 2 | 0/7 | 3/7 | 5/7* |
| | 3 | 0/11 | 3/11 | 5/11 |
| Excellent | 1 | 3/5 | 5/5 | 5/5 |
| | 2 | 1/7 | 4/7 | 6/7 |
| | 3 | 0/11 | 4/11 | 6/11** |

***must include 1 peer-reviewed publications**

**** must include 3 peer-reviewed publications**

| | Tiers | Post-Tenure** |
|------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| Meeting Expectations* | 1 | 5/5 |
| | 2 | 5/7 |
| | 3 | 5/11 |

*** exceeding the number of criteria in each tier will result in a ranking of “exceeding expectations”**

**** In addition to the criteria tiers, the candidate must have achieved a rating of meeting expectations or higher on each of the annual merit reviews included in the time period under review**

| | Tiers | Full Professor |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| Excellent | 1 | 5/5 |
| | 2 | 6/7 |
| | 3 | 6/11 |

Service Evidence

Tier 1

1. Active participant and regularly attends departmental meetings
2. Informal Student advising
3. Member on at least one Departmental Committee (e.g., new hire search, curriculum, scholarship selection, assessment)

Tier 2

1. Participated as a member on at least one College Committee (e.g., CAP, etc.)
2. Demonstrated involvement in community service
3. Demonstrated involvement in professional service (e.g. conference organizer, program planner, site visits, local planning committees etc)
4. Mentor students within the Department
5. Reviewing research proposals, grant proposals, referring manuscripts, reviewing books in Scholarly Journals

Tier 3

1. Participated as a member on at least two College Committees (e.g., CAP, C&R, Teaching Committee, Grievance Committee etc.)
2. Member of University or System Wide Committee
3. Mentor students outside of the Department
4. Professional consultant to community/professional organization
5. Hold an office in your professional area or member of an advisory board or committee
6. Participate in Faculty Governance
7. Serve as Department Chair

Service Criteria Rubric

| | Tiers | Initial Review | Comprehensive | Tenure |
|--------------------|----------|----------------|---------------|------------|
| Meritorious | 1 | 1/3 | 2/3 | 3/3 |
| | 2 | 0/5 | 2/5 | 4/5 |
| | 3 | 0/6 | 1/6 | 2/7 |

| | Tiers | Post-Tenure** |
|------------------------------|----------|---------------|
| Meeting Expectations* | 1 | 3/3 |
| | 2 | 4/5 |
| | 3 | 2/7 |

* exceeding the number of criteria in each tier will result in a ranking of “exceeding expectations”

**In addition to the criteria tiers, the candidate must have achieved a rating of meeting expectations or higher on each of the annual merit reviews included in the time period under review

| | Tiers | Full Professor |
|------------------|----------|----------------|
| Excellent | 1 | 3/3 |
| | 2 | 4/5 |
| | 3 | 3/7 |