

Annual Review Policies
Department of Biology
College of Science

The Department of Biology performs an annual performance evaluation of each faculty member's teaching, research, and professional service. This annual review is performed by the departmental Annual Review Committee (ARC) in the spring semester of each calendar year. The ARC is composed of the Head (chair), Associate Head (ex officio and voting member), and six members elected by the faculty. To ensure broad faculty representation and participation in the review process, elected members will serve a three-year term, but cannot serve two consecutive terms. Two members will rotate out every year, and two new members will be elected to take their place. The first ARC will be formed by an election in which two members will be elected to a one-year term, two members will be elected to a two-year term, and two members will be elected to a three-year term. Members of the ARC independently evaluate annual reports, up-to-date curriculum vitae, teaching evaluations, and any additional materials provided by the faculty member for the committee's consideration. On completion of their individual evaluations the ARC meets with the Head to present and discuss their findings. Subsequently the Head prepares a written summary for, and meets with, each faculty member to discuss his or her performance during the previous calendar year.

For un-tenured, non-tenure-track and temporary faculty, the ARC will evaluate the quality of the faculty members' performance, usually primarily teaching, using the Annual Report, teaching evaluations and additional materials (e.g. teaching portfolios) the faculty member wishes to provide. Details of evaluation of these faculty are described in POLICIES ON TEMPORARY AND NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY.

For tenure-track faculty, the ARC will evaluate progress toward tenure and promotion using the Annual Report, curriculum vitae, teaching evaluations and any additional materials provided by the faculty member. Success in research, teaching and service will be recognized, and areas of concern will be identified at this time. Based upon these deliberations, the ARC will recommend to the Head that the candidate is making 1) excellent progress, meaning the candidate is excelling in all aspects of his/her position and that early promotion and tenure should be considered; 2) very good progress, meaning the candidate is ahead of schedule toward tenure and promotion; 3) satisfactory progress, meaning the candidate is on track toward tenure and promotion; 4) marginal progress, meaning the candidate is very close to an unsatisfactory mark and will need to make improvements in one or more categories; 5) unsatisfactory progress, meaning significant deficiencies in one or more categories must be addressed in order to be considered for tenure and promotion. For tenure-track faculty, a separate designation of "marginal" should be considered if the ARC considers faculty member is in danger of an unsatisfactory progress but is at this stage still within the "satisfactory range".

For tenured faculty, the departmental annual review is a means for recognizing meritorious performance for Post Tenure Faculty Review. Meritorious performance in one or more areas is highlighted in the ARC's report to the Head. Receipt of an unsatisfactory rating in one or more areas is deemed sufficient cause to designate a faculty member's performance as

unsatisfactory. The final rating, whether it be excellent, very good, satisfactory, marginal, or unsatisfactory, will take into account the sum of individual faculty activities. It is generally recognized that the role of a faculty member may change over his/her career resulting in a shift in emphasis toward or away from one of the areas described above. In such cases the Head will define and clearly communicate the expectations to the faculty member and the ARC.

Below are the criteria for satisfactory performance in each of the three areas. Exceeding these performance standards is deemed meritorious while failing to meet these standards is classified as unsatisfactory. Examples of meritorious and unsatisfactory performance are also indicated.

Teaching. Teaching excellence is a desired goal of the Department of Biology, whereas unsatisfactory teaching is contrary to our mission and a serious violation of the public trust. Satisfactory teaching performance is defined as: (1) the presentation of accurate, up-to-date, well organized information and concepts; (2) demonstrating interest in the course subject and the process of teaching; (3) receiving acceptable or better teaching evaluations; (4) satisfactory resolution of student complaints. Examples of meritorious performance in teaching include: (1) design and successful institution of new courses; (2) extensive implementation of new laboratory exercises; (3) obtaining extramural funding for laboratory improvements; (4) leadership in non-traditional teaching, such as sponsoring special summer programs for undergraduates, high school students or teachers; (5) student recognition of teaching excellence; (6) authoring of textbooks or other instructional materials. Reasons for judging teaching performance as unsatisfactory include: (1) significantly negative student evaluations; (2) regular and unresolved student complaints; (3) indifference to teaching; (4) presentation of out-of-date or incorrect information; (5) disorganized presentation of course materials and poor communication of course requirements; (6) and inability or unwillingness to address 1-5. Unsatisfactory student evaluations or occurrence of unresolved complaints will necessitate a comprehensive review of teaching. A teaching review committee of three faculty members will be appointed by the Head, in consultation with the faculty member. The committee will review the faculty member's syllabus, exams, course notes, and other materials provided by the faculty member and will perform classroom visitations. The ARC will use the report of the teaching review committee, together with student evaluations, to determine whether the faculty member's teaching is satisfactory.

Research. The generation of new knowledge through research is the hallmark of a world-class university and an integral part of our departmental culture. Criteria for judging research performance as satisfactory include: (1) regular publication in peer reviewed journals, (2) involvement in graduate-student training, (3) successful pursuit of extramural research support, and (4) the performance of other scholarly activities such as attendance at scientific meetings, authorship of review articles, or electronic publications. In addition to the above, meritorious research performance may include: (1) publication of ground-breaking research in high-impact journals, (2) leadership in obtaining funding for large scale or multiple-investigator projects. By contrast, unsatisfactory research performance may include: (1) lack of publications in peer reviewed journals, (2)

failure to participate in training of graduate students, (3) inability and/or unwillingness to obtain extramural research support; (4) the absence of other scholarly activity.

Service. Service to the department, college, university, and the community at large is recognized an essential component of good academic citizenship. Criteria for judging service performance as satisfactory include: (1) regular attendance at faculty meetings and participation in other faculty activities such as recruiting, (2) service on departmental, college, or university committees when asked, (3) performance of requested service to the larger scientific community in the form of journal and grant reviewing, and active participation in scientific societies. Meritorious service activity may include (1) shouldering a large or pivotal service role without reduction in other responsibilities; (2) performance of service to the larger scientific community through leadership in scientific societies, editing of scientific publications, or membership on advisory boards or grant review panels. Conversely, an unsatisfactory service performance would include (1) failure to attend faculty meetings regularly, and (2) refusal to serve on departmental, college, or university committees.