

DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY BYLAWS AND STANDING RULES

1. Name of Department

The Department of Biology, hereafter referred to as the Department, is a unit of the Hal Marcus College of Science and Engineering at The University of West Florida.

2. Mission

In keeping with the University mission, the Department is dedicated to creation, transmission, application, and preservation of knowledge at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Within this framework, the primary mission of the Department is to develop, support, and conduct high quality educational and research programs in the life sciences with emphasis on marine biology, biology, and biomedical programs.

The Department encourages the performance of original work in the production of research by faculty in collaboration with colleagues, students, and staff. The Department promotes the bridging of ideas in integrating research with teaching. The Department will assist in seeking support (facilities, equipment, financial, release time) for faculty, while promoting open discussion among peers. The Department ascribes to the notion that faculty have the professional obligation to inform the scientific community of noteworthy results through refereed publications.

The Department encourages faculty to engage in service activities for the university, profession, and community.

3. Structure of the Department

Section 1. Members of the Department

The Department shall be composed of a chair, faculty members, adjuncts, visiting instructors/professors, and support staff.

Section 2. Eligibility in Governance

Faculty holding the rank of instructor, lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor are eligible to participate in departmental governance activities, and to vote on non-personnel matters. The eligibility to vote on faculty personnel matters is restricted to full-time tenured/tenure earning faculty in a manner consistent with University guidelines. The faculty may, by majority vote, extend voting rights to other individuals associated with the Department.

Section 3. Role of the Chair

The Chair will perform all responsibilities in the best interests of the Department by taking into account the wisdom and advice of faculty colleagues. The Chair is responsible for scheduling of courses, management of departmental financial resources, assignment of duties to faculty and staff, annual evaluation of faculty and staff, initial adjudication of grievances filed by faculty and students, coordination of departmental committees, scheduling of departmental meetings, and other administrative activities necessary for departmental function.

4. Departmental Meetings

There should be at least one faculty meeting per month during the fall and spring semesters. A majority of eligible faculty must be present to carry out official departmental business. Parliamentary procedures, order of business, and voting procedures, etc. will be carried out according to Robert's Rules. At least one week notice shall be given, excepting emergency situations for scheduling, or cancelling a faculty meeting. Faculty may place items on the agenda by contacting the Chair prior to the notice of the meeting. Minutes will be taken by the office manager and distributed to the faculty no later than one week following a meeting.

5. Committee Structure

Section 1. Ad Hoc Committees/Working Groups

Ad Hoc committees/working groups are formed by the Chair as needed to carry out specific duties (examples: personnel committee; space and equipment working groups). Ad Hoc committees/working groups are disbanded following completion of assigned duties.

Section 2. Standing Committees

Each standing committee will consist of at least three faculty members, including a chair. Standing committees of the Department shall be: Graduate Admissions Committee, and Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Graduate Admissions Committee: The Graduate Admissions Committee will review applications and make recommendations for admittance of prospective students into the graduate program. The committee will make recommendations on awarding scholarships to students and maintain a general interest in the educational development of all graduate students. The committee will consist of 5 faculty members, two of whom will be in the molecular/microbiology specialty area.

Promotion and Tenure Committee: The P&T Committee will consist of all tenured faculty in Biology. The P&T committee will meet at two points in the tenure and promotion timeline of a faculty member seeking tenure and promotion.

- 1). A mid-tenure review will take place at the end of the spring semester in the third year of a faculty member seeking tenure and promotion. The candidate will supply the Chair of the Department with a dossier documenting accomplishments (CV, student evaluations, publications, etc.). The Chair of the Department will circulate the dossier to the P&T committee for review. The P&T committee members will individually provide the Chair of the Department with comments on the dossier.
- 2). During the fall term in which the final P&T packets are due, the Committee will meet to examine the completed tenure/promotion dossier of a faculty member seeking tenure and/or promotion. The Committee will provide a formal, anonymous vote in favor of or against tenure/promotion for the candidate. The Committee will produce a single memo, signed by all members, describing how the candidate appears to meet, or fails to meet, the tenure and promotion criteria set forth by the departmental by-laws.

The Committee will meet at least every 3 years in order to assess and make recommendations on altering tenure and promotion criteria as needed.

6. Academic Policies

Section 1. Advising

Advising will be carried out by departmental advisors, who will also participate in student recruitment and retention efforts. Career advising will be conducted by faculty.

Section 2. Changes in Policies

All changes to academic and curricular policies must be approved via the Curriculum Change Review process (CCR). The process starts by a majority vote of eligible faculty, and forwarded by the Chair through the Dean to appropriate review committees.

Section 3. Course Related Policies

Grading and examination policies are made at the discretion of the instructor. The policies are to be published in class syllabi. Controversy over grading practices should begin with the concerned parties and follow the grievance process outlined by the University.

Attendance policies for financial aid verification and mandatory attendance are to be published in class syllabi.

Drop policies concerning 3:1 lab:lecture courses are to be published in class syllabi for both lecture and lab.

Protocol for canceling classes is to be published in class syllabi for both lecture and lab.

Section 4. Role of Adjunct Faculty

Beyond teaching duties, adjunct faculty can only serve as members or Co-Chairs for thesis committees, and only on a case-by-case basis with approval by tenure-earning faculty. Adjuncts may offer directed studies for graduate and undergraduate students with approval by the Department Chair.

7. Personnel Policies/Procedures

Section 1. Recruitment/Selection of New Faculty

Advertising, recruiting, and selection of new faculty follow the established university procedures.

Section 2. Annual Work Assignments

The Chair, in consultation with the faculty member, will establish the faculty member's assignments in teaching, research, and service for the upcoming academic year. These assignments are based upon the needs of the department, and the professional development of the faculty member. The Chair prepares and signs the letter of assignment, and refers to the Dean for further processing.

Section 3. Faculty Mentoring

Mentoring of untenured, tenure-track faculty is a critical part of moving the faculty member toward a successful tenure decision. The Chair, in consultation with the faculty member, will identify at least two tenured faculty from within the department and one from outside the department to serve on their mentoring committee. While the usual committee consists of three tenured faculty, the committee may consist of up to five members. The five year development period passes quickly, so it is recommended that meetings be held at the end of each semester to assess progress in teaching, research and service. Mentored faculty are expected to provide a statement on their accomplishments in the three areas during the previous semester, as well as a summary of their accomplishments for the period during which they have been in the tenure track at UWF. The Chair will confer with the candidate's mentoring committee in preparing the annual Progress Toward Tenure letter that must accompany the Annual Evaluation of non-tenured, tenure-earning faculty each spring.

Section 4. Annual Evaluation Procedures (see Appendix II for criteria)

Annual evaluations are made by the Chair. The evaluation is based on the annual assignment letter written by the Chair, and acknowledged by the faculty member. The assignment letter addresses teaching, research, and service.

The faculty member will document accomplishments for the year under consideration based on the annual evaluation criteria. The Chair and faculty member review and discuss the submitted material and the results of the evaluation form. The chair writes a the letter of evaluation with a rating of poor, fair, good, excellent, or distinguished in each area being evaluated based on the results from the evaluation form. An overall evaluation is also provided based on the results from the evaluation form. The letter of evaluation is submitted electronically and forwarded to the Dean for further evaluation.

Section 5. Tenure (see Appendix I for criteria)

Excellence in teaching, significant demonstration of scholarship, and tangible evidence of service to the university, community and profession justify the decision to grant tenure.

During the tenure earning years the faculty member, in pursuing activities listed on the *Criteria for Annual Evaluation*, should seek critiques and guidance from the assigned mentors, as well as other colleagues within the university.

Mid-Tenure review will take place at the end of the third year. The faculty member will put together a dossier consisting of a list of contributions to teaching, research, and service, current CV, summary of teaching evaluations, and documentation (reprints) of accomplishments. Letters of evaluation from outside the department are not necessary for the mid-tenure review process. The candidate will supply the Chair of the Department with the dossier. The Chair of the Department will circulate the dossier to the P&T committee for review. The P&T committee members will individually provide the Chair of the Department with comments on the dossier, and the Chair will add comments and a summary. The comments from the Department will be sent to the faculty member, and to the Dean for consideration.

The Department will follow the University guidelines for tenure and promotion. Members of the Biology Promotion and Tenure Committee will sign a single memo resulting from their evaluation of the candidate for promotion.

Section 6. Promotion (see Appendix I for criteria)

Excellence in teaching, demonstration of scholarship, and tangible evidence of service to the university, community and profession justify the yearly reappointment of an assistant professor.

The associate professor must show continued excellent-distinguished performances in teaching. The associate professor must establish significant and tangible scholarship in the area of expertise. Leadership in service to the department, college, and university should be shown.

Substantial and tangible contributions in scholarship, as recognized by peers external to the university, in the area of expertise justify promotion to the rank of professor. The professor must show continued performances of distinguished teaching, and carry out major responsibilities in service within and/or beyond the university.

The Department will follow the University guidelines for tenure and promotion:

1. University Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

This section describes the university criteria for promotion and tenure for regular, full-time, tenure earning faculty. Reflecting the mission of UWF as a regional comprehensive university, the university criteria emphasize teaching relative to scholarship/creative projects and service. A minimum of excellent teaching performance is required in all promotion and all tenure and promotion decisions. Favorable promotion decisions also require excellent performance in scholarship/creative projects and service for promotion decisions. However, faculty need not achieve excellent ratings in all three areas to achieve tenure. As shown in Table 1, good ratings in either service or scholarship/creative projects, combined with an excellent or distinguished rating in the other area and excellent or distinguished rating in teaching, should result in a favorable tenure decision. Except in unusual circumstances (e.g., egregious ethical violation), if faculty members meet the criteria described above, they should receive favorable decisions, but the meeting of such criteria cannot be construed as a guarantee of either tenure or promotion.

TABLE 1 University Criteria for Tenure and Promotion Decisions

	<i>For a favorable personnel decision the weight of evidence must show sustained performance at these levels</i>		
Personnel Decision	Teaching	Scholarship and Creative Projects	Service
<i>Tenure</i>	Excellent	At least Excellent in one category and at least Good in the other category	
<i>Promotion to associate</i>	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
<i>Promotion to professor</i>	Distinguished in at least one category and at least excellent in the other two categories		

Members of the Biology Promotion and Tenure Committee will sign a single memo resulting from their evaluation of the candidate for promotion.

Section 7. Sustained Performance Evaluation

All full-time faculty beyond the rank of assistant professor are evaluated for sustained performance every six years. Evaluation is based on criteria set for tenure status. Faculty receiving an unsatisfactory sustained performance evaluation must construct a performance enhancement plan outlining measures to correct deficiencies.

Section 8. Summer Supplemental Contract Opportunities

All full-time faculty are given the opportunity to teach during the summer term contingent upon large enough class enrollment, and programmatic needs. Visiting instructors/professors and adjuncts will be given consideration for summer employment on a second priority basis.

Section 9. Office Hours

All faculty teaching a face-to-face lecture section are required to meet a posted schedule of six office hours per week distributed over at least two days and several time blocks.

Section 10: Allocation of Paid Overload Appointments

Paid overload appointments will be granted by the Dean as needed to fulfill the teaching obligations of the department, and contingent upon rotation through a list showing faculty expertise in the area of need.

Section 11: Faculty Development

The Department is committed to assisting faculty development. To facilitate planning, faculty requesting sabbaticals will notify the Chair. Faculty requesting release time for curriculum and/or research development should present the plan to the Chair for review. Release time can only be granted by the Provost, or Dean.

Seed Account: When available, these funds can be used to give partial financial support to full-time faculty for the purpose of carrying out new research projects. Requests (\$500-\$1500) are made by submitting a brief research proposal to the chair. Funding is to be used for the purchase of reagents and supplies and excludes salary compensation for faculty.

Support for student assistance, particularly at the graduate level will be considered.

8. Departmental Resources

Section 1. Budgeting

Laboratory Fee Accounts: Funds in the laboratory fee accounts are in the form of supply fees, and equipment fees, which are earned through charges to students for those expenses. Funds will be disbursed for the purchase of expendable supplies, and for equipment from the appropriate pool of funds earned through enrollment in the respective courses to operate the teaching laboratory sections.

Section 2. Equipment

Operating Capital Outlay (OCO): The Department will maintain an OCO list, which will be periodically updated and prioritized through input of the faculty.

Request for Use of Departmental Resources: Any request to use equipment and other departmental resources for purposes external to the academic/scholarly mission of the department must be submitted in written form to the Chair for review and decision.

9. Amendments to Bylaws

Any amendment to the Department of Biology Bylaws and Standing Rules must come through petition of a faculty member and subsequent discussion and approval by the department as a whole.

10. Revision History

October 3, 2005

January 27, 2007

April 27, 2007

November 6, 2008

June 20, 2017

APPENDIX I
DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY
PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA
(Revised Fall 2005, Revised Summer 2017)

The Department of Biology supports the University assertion that a candidate for tenure and promotion must demonstrate expertise in the areas of teaching, research, and service. However, the Department declares the privilege to define where a specific activity resides. The Department of Biology declares that the candidates for promotion and tenure within the Department must demonstrate expertise in areas under the aegis of the Department.

The criteria that must be met for teaching, research and service contributions will reflect the relative distribution of assigned duties stated on the candidate's contracts over the period of evaluation. The candidate must provide a summary of how the relative distribution of duties was estimated, and copies of all contract assignments for the period of evaluation must be available in the tenure/promotion packet. The department Chair must approve the summary allocation of duties (teaching, research, service) in writing in the form of the letter of assignment. The standard UWF 9-month contract is 18 contact hours of teaching (0.75 FTE); those faculty assigned fewer teaching contact hours by the Chair will be expected to demonstrate higher productivity in service, research, or non-credit generating teaching activities. Given the diversity of specializations and areas of expertise among biology faculty (e.g. field ecology, biochemistry, physiology, etc.), and the differences in contact hour allocation, tenure and promotion assessment may require individual considerations distinct from other faculty within the department.

A. TEACHING

The faculty member must demonstrate competence in teaching while contributing to the instructional needs of departmental programs. The faculty member will develop and instruct lecture/laboratory course(s) in area(s) of expertise and assist at all levels of instruction in a collegial atmosphere.

Tenure requires that the faculty member demonstrate a continuous record of excellent teaching for the three years leading up to tenure. A continuous excellent-distinguished record in teaching is required for promotion to associate professor. Distinguished teaching and a positive reputation within the University is required for promotion to professor.

B. RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

Candidates to be considered for tenure and promotion must carry out the following activities:

- Chair master's thesis committees.

- Conduct original research and contribute to the discovery, application, integration, and teaching of knowledge.
- Involve undergraduate and graduate students in the exploration of research, and the discovery, application, integration and teaching of knowledge.
- Communicate results at professional meetings
- Publish results in peer-reviewed journals, books or monographs.
- Contribute to the University goals on issues of regional, statewide, national, and international concerns.

The candidate for tenure must establish an area of research specialty in the discipline. The research laboratory must be functional and active, involving undergraduate and/or graduate student participation. The candidate's scholarly activity must be recognized by peers external to the University

The candidate for promotion to associate professor must establish significant and tangible scholarship in the area of expertise. The candidate's scholarly activity must be recognized by peers external to the University.

Substantial and highly tangible contributions in scholarship, as recognized by peers external to the university, in the area of expertise justify promotion to the rank of professor.

Specific scholarly outcomes related to publications and procuring grants are outlined in separate sections below.

C. **PUBLICATIONS**

In order for a candidate to be considered for both tenure and promotion to associate professor, the candidate must have at least 4 publications and graduate a thesis student, or have 5 publications without graduating a thesis student. Two of the publications must be peer-reviewed research articles with the candidate as 1st or corresponding author. The remaining publications may be peer-reviewed or edited research, review or education-based journal articles, book chapters, or technical reports, where the candidate is a co-author.

In order for a candidate to be considered for promotion to the rank of professor the candidate must publish a total of 10 publications, including publications the candidate counted toward promotion to associate professor with all additional publications (5 or 6 publications, depending on whether 4 publications plus thesis student or 5 publications where completed for promotion to associate) since being promoted to associate professor. Five of the 10 total must be peer-reviewed research articles with the candidate as 1st or corresponding author. The remaining publications may be peer-reviewed or edited research, review or education-based journal articles, book chapters, or technical reports, where the candidate is a co-author.

Given the diversity of specializations and areas of expertise among biology faculty (e.g. field ecology, biochemistry, physiology, etc.), and the differences in contact hour allocation, tenure and promotion assessment may require individual considerations distinct from other faculty within the department.

D. EXTRAMURAL SUPPORT

In order to be considered for tenure and promotion to associate professor, the candidate must be awarded at least one externally-funded research grant, contract, or other source of support including but not limited to equipment grants from non-vendor sources, a training grant, education- or research-related ship time, or funds from an organization outside of UWF that supports education and/or research.

Consideration for promotion to the rank of professor requires the following after being promoted to associate professor: the candidate must be awarded at least one externally-funded research grant, contract, or other source of support including but not limited to equipment grants from non-vendor sources, a training grant, education- or research-related ship time, or funds from an organization outside of UWF that supports education and/or research.

E. SERVICE

The candidate for tenure must show tangible evidence of service to the University, community and profession. Leadership in service to the department, college, and University must be shown by the candidate for promotion to associate professor. The candidate for professor must demonstrate the ability to shoulder major responsibilities in service within and/or beyond the University including leadership roles.

APPENDIX II
DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY
ANNUAL EVALUATION CRITERIA
(Revised Fall 2009, Revised Spring 2017)

Faculty members are required to submit a statement and documentation of accomplishments on a yearly basis at the end of spring semester for annual review and evaluation by the Chair of the Department of Biology. The evaluation is then sent to the Dean of the College of Science, Engineering and Health. Faculty members are evaluated and receive rankings (poor, fair, good, excellent, distinguished) in three areas: service, research, and teaching. They also receive an overall combined ranking.

The following document lists activity categories for each of the three areas and describes the indicators of the each of the rank levels. The rank level of “Excellent” is defined specifically under the statement “Departmental Standard” and all other ranking levels are based on a relative comparison to the departmental standard expectations. The list of activity categories is not meant to be all inclusive, but a set of common activities most faculty members are involved with. Other activities may be included by a faculty member in their annual evaluation portfolio.

The overall combined ranking is made by the Chair of the Department of Biology based on all three areas. The assessment includes considering the degree of accomplishment in each area as it relates to the others to weight each area in arriving at the overall ranking. The Chair will assess the faculty member based on their performance according to the annual letter of assignment and will include the faculty member’s contributions to the department above and beyond those guidelines as observed by the Chair.

In all areas of scholarly activity (Service, Research, Teaching) the Chair has the prerogative to include qualitative factors in arriving at a ranking for an individual faculty member. Faculty should be aware that Promotion and Tenure is based on criteria related to total effort in service and teaching while at UWF, and to research prior to and during one’s tenure at UWF at the time a dossier is submitted for the Promotion and Tenure process. Promotion and Tenure is not based on simply adding annual evaluation rankings across the time of employment.

Criteria for Annual Evaluation for Service

Service: Activity (areas of effort) Categories

1. Institution (department, college, university)
 - Committee/council/task force as member
 - Committee/council/task force as chair
 - Institution sponsored activities: open house, orientations, recruitment.
 - Sponsorships for student organizations
2. Profession
 - Associations/Societies: officer, committees, invited seminars
 - Journals: editorships, reviewer
 - Agencies: board memberships, reviewer
 - Meeting/conference: hosting, chairing sessions
 - Publishing houses: textbook reviews
3. Community
 - Invited seminars
 - Juror/Judge
 - Sponsor/participant outreach activities
4. Awards related to service

Service: Departmental Standard

Individuals in the Department of Biology are expected to participate in service related areas including activities from at least two of the first three categories listed above with at least four activities total. Two activities may be single events (such as review of a manuscript); two activities must be recurring events (such serving on a standing committee), one of the two recurring events must be from category 1 institutional activities.

Service: Evaluation Ranking & Indicators

Poor

This performance level demonstrates serious problems in fulfilling appropriate service role for faculty as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is absent.

Indicators:

- * Service activity nonexistent or very poor in quality, producing a potentially adverse impact on the goals of the relevant organization
- * Significance of the obligation of service in the faculty role in a regional comprehensive university not apparent (e.g., faculty seems resistant or oblivious to service needs)
- * Community service, if any, does not in any way provide synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions

Fair

This performance level demonstrates only minor tangible progress in service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is moderately below the departmental standard.

Indicators:

- * Appropriate arenas for service identified and explored
- * Minimal contributions made in service role (e.g., "sits" on committees as compared to active participation)
- * Recognition of service obligation in faculty role shapes consideration
- * Over-commitment to service spreads faculty time too thinly to facilitate effectiveness
- * Community service, if applicable, provides limited, tangential synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and service functions

Good

This performance level demonstrates major tangible progress in relevant service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is somewhat below the departmental standard.

Indicators:

- * Emerging service agenda reflects reasonable expectation for rank
- * Selection of service activity expresses understanding of faculty service role in regional comprehensive university
- * Usually participates actively and constructively in service activity
- * Usually effective in service as citizen of department
- * Balance across service obligations may be a struggle
- * Community service, if applicable, provides reasonable synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions

Excellent

This performance level demonstrates satisfactory execution of service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service contributions meet the departmental standard.

Indicators:

- * Scope and effort level meet department standards
- * Service agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university mission
- * Service contributions represent strategic decisions that balance demands from the discipline, department, campus, and community
- * Potential shown for wide recognition inside and outside of the university
- * Community service, if applicable, provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions

Distinguished

This performance level demonstrates high degree of skill in service contributions as shown by the indicators below that build upon indicators for excellence. In general, service contributions exceed the standards of excellence of the department.

Indicators:

- * Leadership demonstrated in targeted arenas of service (e.g., holds elected office; collaborates skillfully and innovatively)
- * Problems solved proactively through vigorous contributions
- * Wide external recognition (local, national or international audiences) or awards achieved for

quality of service contributions

* Community service, if applicable, provided significant and measurable impact; service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions

Criteria for Annual Evaluation for Research & Scholarly Activity

Research & Scholarly Activity (areas of effort) Categories

1. Publications (Refereed)
 - Journals: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
 - Technical reports: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
 - Proceedings full paper: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
 - Books as author: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
 - Books as editor: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
 - Chapters in books: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
2. Publications (Non-refereed)
 - Technical reports: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
 - Proceedings full paper: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
 - Books as author: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
 - Books as editor: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
 - Chapters in books: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
3. Meeting/Conference: international, national, regional, local
 - Presentations
 - Invited speaker
4. External grants/contracts (Reviewed)
 - Federal: submitted, new awards, continuing
 - State: submitted, new awards, continuing
 - Local: submitted, new awards, continuing
 - Private: submitted, new awards, continuing
5. External grants/contracts (Non-reviewed)
 - Federal: submitted, new awards, continuing
 - State: submitted, new awards, continuing
 - Local: submitted, new awards, continuing
 - Private: submitted, new awards, continuing
6. Internal grants/contracts: submitted, new awards, continuing
7. Student Research
 - Graduate student: chair of committee, activities in support of faculty research
 - Undergraduate student: thesis, activities in support of faculty research
8. Other Activities
 - Abstracts: submitted, published (in press, on-line, in print)
 - Patents on products related to field of study: filed, awarded
 - Workshops attended related to field of study
9. Awards related to field of study

Research: Departmental Standard

Individuals in tenured/tenure earning positions in the Department of Biology are expected to participate in research related activities (not applicable to instructor or lecturer positions). The following standard is based on a 3:3 fall:spring teaching load, which should be adjusted in proportion to assigned contracts. Individuals are expected to perform at least 5 total activities comprised from at least 3 categories. The activities listed are not exhaustive and actual ranking is the discretion of the chair based on the quality and scope of the activities. For annual evaluations, faculty members are responsible for justifying their proposed ranking including addition of activities not listed above. An executive committee may be established as needed to discuss activities not included on the lists above. Executive committee would be comprised of 2 tenured faculty and 1 junior faculty with expertise in the appropriate discipline.

Research: Evaluation Ranking & Indicators

Poor

This performance level demonstrates serious problems in developing scholarship and creative projects as reflected by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative production is well below the departmental standard.

Indicators:

- * Scholarly agenda or creative plan has not been identified (e.g., central focus of career interest has not materialized)
- * Minimal pursuit of scholarly and creative projects
- * Avoidance of professional organization involvement that could help disseminate or display faculty work
- * Failure to pursue expected professional enhancement activities (e.g., licensure, continuing education, technology training)
- * Avoidance of grant exploration or pursuit
- * Ethical regulations violated regarding scholarly or artistic production
- * Poor time management strategies handicap work output

Fair

This performance level demonstrates only minor tangible progress toward executing a scholarly and creative agenda as shown by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative projects are moderately below the departmental standard.

Indicators:

- * General focus of interest identified
- * Evidence of some completion of beginning stages of scholarly or artistic process (e.g., data collection, manuscript outline, artistic plan)
- * Exploration of possible scholarly collaboration or resource network to help with specific plan
- * Professional organizations identified that will support scholarly and creative goals
- * Appropriate professional educational opportunities (e.g., licensure, technology training, special educational opportunities) identified
- * Sources of external support for scholarship or creative activities agenda identified and

explored

- * Judgment about ethical standards for scholarly and artistic production may be problematic at times
- * Questionable time management strategies limit production

Good

This performance level demonstrates moderate tangible progress in scholarship or creative activity agenda as shown by the indicators below, but work falls mildly below the departmental standard.

Indicators:

- * Specific scholarly agenda or creative plan identified, including appropriate timelines and preferred dissemination or display venues
- * Scholarly and creative projects completed but falls short of rate of department standards related to the rate of completion or quality of dissemination venue
- * Completed projects suggest the potential for significant, high quality scholarship over the candidate's career.
- * Appropriate professional educational opportunities pursued
- * Involvement with professional organizations that will support scholarly or creative goals
- * Grants developed and submitted to capture support
- * Adheres to relevant ethics conventions for scholarly and creative projects
- * Reasonably effective time management strategies contribute to success

Excellent

This performance level demonstrates satisfactory execution of scholarship or creative activity agenda as shown by the indicators below. Excellence meets the departmental standard.

Indicators:

- * Refined scholarly agenda or creative plan well suited to regional comprehensive university context
- * Meets department production targets for both quantity and quality of scholarship
- * Potential for wide recognition of quality outside of the University
- * Completes appropriate schedule of professional educational opportunities (e.g., licensure, technology training, etc.) in a timely fashion
- * Support captured to facilitate scholarship or creative activities agenda
- * Highly skilled application of ethical conventions in discipline
- * Skilled time management facilitates success of scholarly agenda or creative plan

Distinguished

This performance level demonstrates unusually high degree of skill in design and execution of scholarly and creativity projects as shown by the indicators below that build upon the indicators for excellence. In general, scholarly and creativity projects exceed the standards of excellence of the department.

Indicators:

- * Both quantity and quality measures clearly exceed department expectations

- * National or international audience
- * National or international recognition earned for quality
- * Awards received for scholarly or creative projects
- * Achievements in continuing professional training show unusual merit
- * Strong record of grant pursuit, grant awards, successful completion, and dissemination of results
- * Campus and/or disciplinary leadership in promoting scholarly and creative projects

Criteria for Annual Evaluation for Teaching

Teaching: Activity (areas of effort) Categories

1. Course and Curriculum Planning/Organization
 - Teaching Philosophy
 - Syllabi development
 - Assessment Practices
 - Planned class activities
 - Course development
 - Program Curriculum/Program Assessment
 - Special teaching assignments
2. Course Execution
 - Pedagogical strategies
 - Classroom management
 - Assessment implementation
 - Student Assessment of Instruction
3. Continuous improvement plan
 - Course revision
 - Professional development
 - Awards related to teaching
 - Grants related to teaching
4. Professional Responsibility and Academic Integrity
 - Accessibility to Students
 - Feedback to Students
 - Promotion of Academic Integrity
5. Unscheduled Teaching
 - Directed Studies (undergraduate and/or graduate)
 - Graduate non-thesis advisor
 - Undergraduate honor's thesis
 - Graduate thesis committees

Suggested supporting evidences of performance

Narrative Statements support evaluation rankings

Teaching Philosophy

Sample syllabi

Sample activities documenting high impact practices

Sample assessments of learning outcomes

Narrative statements may refer to other SAI elements other than Overall assessment of instructor

or overall rating of course organization
 Letters or emails from students
 Letters, emails, or documents from other stakeholders.
 Evidence of professional development courses
 Evidence of participation in peer evaluation of instruction
 Other documents that may support evaluation rating

Teaching: Departmental Standard

Individuals in the Department of Biology are expected to participate in teaching related activities. Category 1, 2, 3, and 4 activities are performed based on assigned contact hours per individual contract. Tenure-track individuals should participate in at least one of the Category 5 activities over the course of a 3 year interval. Category 5 activities are not required for individuals on instructor/lecturer contracts, but may be used to support a distinguished evaluation. Annual evaluations should document consistently positive impact on learning, assessment, syllabi, curriculum development, etc. and should be in compliance with departmental policies. Annual evaluations will be based on all required components of teaching.

Teaching: Evaluation Ranking & Indicators

Poor

This performance level demonstrates serious problems in attaining success in teaching role as reflected either by (1) a combination of many of the negative indicators; or (2) fewer, but more extreme behaviors that produce substantial negative outcomes on students and their learning. In general, teaching performance is well below the departmental standard.

Fair

This performance level demonstrates some positive teaching outcomes, but produces major areas for concern that have a moderately negative impact on students and their learning typically as reflected by a generally meeting the indicator standards contained within the evaluation rubric. In general, teaching performance is moderately below the departmental standard.

Good

This performance level demonstrates overall teaching effectiveness but some minor areas for concern, typically reflected by generally meeting the indicator standards within the evaluation rubric. In general, teaching performance is mildly below the departmental standard.

Excellent

This performance level demonstrates consistent high quality teaching with positive outcomes for student as reflected by generally meeting the indicator standards within the evaluation rubric. Excellence meets the departmental standard.

Distinguished

This performance level demonstrates unusually high degree of quality in teaching as shown by the following indicators that build upon indicators for excellence within the evaluation rubric. In general, teaching contributions exceed the standards of excellence of the department.

Teaching	Poor Performance	Fair Performance	Good Performance	Excellent Performance	Distinguished Performance
Teaching Philosophy	Teaching Philosophy: Teaching philosophy absent	Teaching Philosophy: Teaching philosophy included in portfolio but may not be clearly expressed in course planning and activities (syllabi, handouts, assessments, etc.)	Teaching Philosophy: Teaching philosophy included in portfolio and is generally expressed in evidence of course planning and activities (syllabi, handouts, assessments, etc.)	Teaching Philosophy: Teaching philosophy included in portfolio and is clearly expressed in evidence of course planning and activities (syllabi, handouts, assessments, etc.)	Teaching Philosophy: Teaching philosophy included in portfolio and is clearly expressed in evidence of course planning and activities (syllabi, handouts, assessments, etc.)
Course and Curriculum Planning / Organization	Course Plan and Organization: Syllabi do not include all required components. Syllabi do not provide adequate expectations and course specific SLOs Assessment practices inadequate to support student learning and are unrelated to the course specific SLOs (e.g., learning outcomes are inadequate, inappropriate, or missing) Class activities inadequate in supporting student learning and are related to the course specific SLOs Course content is clearly outdated	Course Plan and Organization: Syllabi includes required components with prompting Syllabi may not provide reasonable expectations and course specific SLOs Assessment practices do not clearly support student learning. Class activities inadequate in supporting student learning Course content is slightly outdated with reference to the discipline	Course Plan and Organization: Syllabi includes required components Syllabi provide reasonable expectations and course specific SLOs Assessment practices support student learning. Class activities support student learning Course content is current to the discipline	Course Plan and Organization: Syllabi includes required components Syllabi provide clear and appropriate expectations and course specific SLOs Assessment practices support student learning and are related to the course specific SLOs Class activities support student learning and are related to the course specific SLOs Course content is current to the discipline. Special teaching assignments (e.g. honors, seminar, bioskills, general education) demonstrate SLOs appropriate to the student population	Course Plan and Organization: Syllabi includes required components Syllabi provide clear and appropriate expectations and course specific SLOs Syllabi describe assessment practices and provide criteria for performance expectations (grading rubrics) Assessment practices support student learning and are related to the course specific SLOs and utilize multiple assessment formats Class activities support student learning and are related to the course specific SLOs. Specific examples of these activities are provided Course content is current to the discipline

Teaching	Poor Performance	Fair Performance	Good Performance	Excellent Performance	Distinguished Performance
<p>Course Execution</p>	<p>Pedagogical practices are unsound (e.g., disorganization; late, missing, unhelpful feedback; standards too lax or too challenging; routinely poor preparation; disengaging, chaotic, or hostile classroom environment) Is not available to help students or provide feedback Classroom poorly organized and not well-managed (often late or absent from class) Guidance to students is inadequate Assessment standards are inappropriate for the course (assessment strategies are not effective or fair) Student evaluations document substantial negative outcomes related to learning (substantially below departmental average) as evidenced by SAI Overall evaluation of Instructor below 50% combined very good and excellent Student evaluations</p>	<p>Pedagogical strategies are often not appropriate for the course Rarely available to help students/provides feedback Classroom is inadequately organized Guidance to students needs improvement Assessment standards are often not appropriate for the course Assessments within special teaching assignments (e.g. honors, seminar, bioskills, general education) are often not appropriate for the individual student population and often do not relate to the course SLOs Student evaluations document areas of moderate concern regarding impact on learning (moderately below departmental average) as evidenced by SAI Overall evaluation of Instructor</p>	<p>Majority of pedagogical strategies are appropriate for the course Generally available to help students/provides feedback Classroom is organized and well-managed Provides adequate guidance to students Assessment standards are appropriate for the course Assessments within special teaching assignments (e.g. honors, seminar, bioskills, general education) are appropriate for the individual student population and mostly relate to the course SLOs Student evaluations document adequate impact on learning (mildly below departmental average) as evidenced by SAI Overall evaluation of Instructor 60% - 70% combined very good and excellent Student evaluations document adequate course organization (mildly below departmental average) as evidenced by SAI Overall evaluation of course organization 60% - 70% combined very good and</p>	<p>Most pedagogical strategies are appropriate for the course Routinely available to help students/provides feedback Classroom is organized and well-managed Provides clear and adequate guidance to students Assessment standards are appropriate for the course Assessments within special teaching assignments (e.g. honors, seminar, bioskills, general education) are appropriate for the individual student population and relate to the course SLOs Student evaluations document consistently positive impact on learning (at departmental average) as evidenced by SAI Overall evaluation of Instructor 70% - 80% combined very good and excellent Student evaluations document that consistently positive course organization (at departmental average) as evidenced by SAI Overall evaluation of course organization 70% - 80% combined very good and excellent</p>	<p>Pedagogical strategies are appropriate for the course Routinely available to help students/provides feedback Classroom is organized and well-managed Provides clear and adequate guidance to students Assessment standards are appropriate for the course Assessments within special teaching assignments (e.g. honors, seminar, bioskills, general education) are appropriate for the individual student population and relate to the course SLOs Student evaluations document consistently positive impact on learning (above departmental average) as evidenced by SAI Overall evaluation of Instructor above 80% combined very good and excellent Student evaluations document that consistently positive course organization (above departmental average) as evidenced by SAI Overall evaluation of course organization above 80% combined very good and excellent At least one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrative statements emphasize powerful impact </p>

	<p>document substantial negative outcomes related to course organization (substantially below departmental average) as evidenced by SAI Overall evaluation of course organization below 50% combined very good and excellent</p>	<p>50% - 60% combined very good and excellent Student evaluations document areas of moderate concern regarding course organization (moderately below departmental average) as evidenced by SAI Overall evaluation of course organization 50% - 60% combined very good and excellent</p>	<p>excellent</p>		<p>on learner or transformative learning experiences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching awards honoring high caliber of performance. • Grants related to teaching or student mentorship
--	--	--	------------------	--	--

Teaching	Poor Performance	Fair Performance	Good Performance	Excellent Performance	Distinguished Performance
Continuous improvement efforts	Narrative does not include plan to address SAI deficiencies or comments Actively refuses or avoids teaching developmental experiences	Narrative does not include plan to address SAI deficiencies or comments Has not developed a plan or taken action to improve course/curriculum planning, organization and execution even when prompted by the Department Chair.	Narrative includes plan to address SAI deficiencies or comments Has developed a plan or taken action to improve course/curriculum planning, organization and execution when prompted by the Department Chair.	Narrative includes plan to address SAI deficiencies or comments Has developed a plan to improve course/curriculum planning, organization and execution. This plan may include 1 or more of the following or their equivalent with evidences provided by narrative statement and/or certification of activity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested/performed peer evaluation of teaching • Participated in University workshops that promote best pedagogical practices • Shows clear personal research of best pedagogical practices • Participates in departmental, college, or university curriculum decisions • Participate in continuing education course(s) outside the University but within the biological sciences 	Narrative includes plan to address SAI deficiencies or comments Has taken action to improve course/curriculum planning, organization and execution. This may include 2 of the following or their equivalent: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested/performed peer evaluation of teaching • Participated in University workshops that promote best pedagogical practices • Shows clear personal research of best pedagogical practices • Participates in departmental, college, or university curriculum decisions • Participate in continuing education course(s) outside the University but within the biological sciences

Teaching	Poor Performance	Fair Performance	Good Performance	Excellent Performance	Distinguished Performance
Professional Responsibilities and Academic integrity	Chronic pattern of disrespect for students and their rights. Many students complaints often with evidence of disrespect Chronically inaccessible to students (fails to keep office hours or respond to emails, shows favoritism) Chronic pattern of inappropriate student feedback	Occasionally shows clear disrespect for students and their rights. Student complaints common with supporting evidence Often inaccessible to students (office hours) Student feedback poor with many occurrences of inappropriate feedback to students.	Shows a pattern of respect for students but with a few serious classroom incidents Above average number of student complaints Irregular pattern of accessibility to students (office hours) Pattern of adequate and appropriate student feedback with several occurrences of inappropriate feedback to students.	Shows a pattern of respect for students with no serious incidents Consistent pattern of accessibility to students (office hours) Appropriate standards of academic integrity are promoted Consistent pattern of adequate and appropriate student feedback with only isolated occurrences of inappropriate feedback to students.	Shows a pattern of respect for students with no serious incidents student complaints rare Specific class activities to promote appropriate standards of academic integrity are included within course curricula. Consistent pattern of accessibility to students (office hours) Consistent pattern of adequate and appropriate student feedback.
Unscheduled Teaching (tenure track faculty)	Does not participate in unscheduled teaching activities (DIS, etc.) Does not participate in thesis, thesis equivalent, or internship committee Fails to guide students to degree completion Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices receive consistent and very negative reviews	Does not engage in unscheduled teaching activities Does not participate in thesis, thesis equivalent, or internship committees Fails to guide most students to degree completion Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices receive inadequate review	Does not engage in unscheduled teaching activities Member of at least one thesis, thesis equivalent, or internship committee Successfully guides approximately half of all students to degree completion Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices receive adequate review	Engages occasionally in unscheduled teaching activities (Directed Independent Study) Chairs at least one thesis, thesis equivalent, or internship committee Successfully guides most students to degree completion Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices receive consistent favorable review	Engages often in unscheduled teaching activities (Directed Independent Study) Chairs at least multiple thesis, thesis equivalent, or internship committee Successfully guides most students to degree completion Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices receive consistent favorable review and document exceptional student impact.