

**Department of Biological Sciences Policies
and Procedures Handbook
2017**

Table of Contents

Foreword	4
Department Mission Statement	5
General Department Operating Procedures	5
Department Policy Amendment Procedure	5
General Faculty and Staff Hiring Procedures	6
1. General Hiring	6
2. Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments	6
3. Clinical/Research Faculty Appointments	6
4. Affiliate and Adjunct Faculty Appointments	7
Faculty Performance Review	7
1. Annual Review	7
2. Tenure Track Faculty Procedures	7
i. Third Year Review	7
ii. Tenure and Promotion Review	8
iii. Tenure Review	10
iv. Promotion Review	10
3. Non-Tenure Track Faculty Procedures	11
i. Research or Clinical Faculty Review	11
ii. Instructor Review	12
Faculty Mentoring	12

Position Description Policy	12
Annual Accomplishments Policy	13
Voting Privileges	13
Department Chair Policy	13
Equipment Policy	14
Tenure and Promotion Criteria	15

FOREWORD

This handbook contains the operating policies (i.e., bylaws) for faculty and staff in the Department of Biological Sciences at the University of Idaho (UI). These policies and procedures closely follow those of the College of Science (COS) and the UI Faculty-Staff Handbook. In the event of any discrepancies, the UI Faculty-Staff Handbook will take precedent. All policies were approved by a majority faculty vote on November 14, 2016, with the exception of the *Tenure and Promotion Criteria* which were approved by a majority faculty vote on May 1, 2017.

DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Department of Biological Sciences is to provide high quality teaching and research at the undergraduate, graduate and post-graduate levels in biological sciences. The goals of the department include:

- 1) preparing individuals through education and life-long learning to become leaders and contributing members of society
- 2) discovering, applying, and disseminating science-based knowledge

GENERAL DEPARTMENT OPERATING POLICIES

The day-to-day operational decisions for the Department of Biological Sciences shall be conducted through the main office, primarily directed by the Department Chair (i.e., unit administrator) and aided by the Department Coordinator. Faculty meetings will be held periodically throughout the academic year, as necessary. Faculty meetings can be attended by department staff and faculty, although only faculty participate in voting. Students may be invited to attend also. A quorum of two-thirds of the voting faculty must be present for a vote to take place. All voting (other than for promotion or tenure) will be conducted by a show of hands (for, against, or abstaining). A majority vote of the quorum present shall be necessary before a motion will be accepted. All department decisions specifically affecting curriculum, undergraduate and graduate student affairs, research and education infrastructure, research seminar programs, and strategic planning will first be discussed by specific committees appointed by the Department Chair. All committee recommendations will be brought to a faculty meeting, presented, discussed, and voted upon before implementation. Committee assignment is determined at the outset of each academic year by the Department Chair, based upon workload and expertise, and indicated on the Annual Position Description. Faculty, staff, and students (as necessary) are included on every committee.

DEPARTMENT POLICY AMENDMENT PROCEDURE

Amendments to department policy (bylaws) can be brought forth by any department staff person or faculty member. These will be presented as an agenda item at the next available faculty meeting by the Department Chair. All potential changes will be discussed and voted upon for approval, provided a quorum is present.

GENERAL FACULTY AND STAFF HIRING PROCEDURES

1. General Hiring

The hiring procedures used by the Department of Biological Sciences are set forth by Human Resources (HR). The Department Coordinator works with each faculty member, the Affirmative Action Coordinator, and HR to determine appropriate titles and procedures for each position. The department in general has positions for temporary lab assistants, classified staff lab assistants, postdoctoral fellows, and faculty. If an undergraduate student meets the guidelines for an approved search waiver, the Financial Technician will work with the faculty member to appoint the candidate. If permission of a search waiver is required, the Department Coordinator will initiate the request with the written justification provided by the faculty member and a CV from the applicant. If a search is required, the Department Coordinator will collect all required information for the search from the faculty member. The hiring consists of several parts and approval levels. There is no set time for how long a search takes, but the Department Coordinator will provide estimated timelines for each search.

2. Tenure-Track Faculty Appointment

The hiring of tenure-track faculty is initiated upon the consent of the COS Dean and Provost. The procedure begins with a position description that is developed by the faculty and a search committee appointed by the Department Chair. The position is advertised, nationally and internationally for a suitable time frame, and a review of all applicants is conducted by the search committee. A list of potential candidates is presented to the faculty and individuals are selected for an on-campus visit. Following all on-campus interviews a faculty meeting is held at which voting takes place to rank finalists for the position. The Department Chair and COS Dean then undertake negotiations, in rank order, to complete the hiring process.

3. Clinical/Research Faculty Appointments

The department hosts clinical and research faculty positions (e.g., Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor). Hiring for these positions is atypical, as a search is usually not conducted. Salary for these positions usually derives from temporary funding (e.g., research grants). These positions could also be wholly or partially volunteer (i.e., no salary). An application for a clinical/research faculty position will consist of a covering letter and CV provided by the applicant, which will be circulated to all faculty. The covering letter should describe how this position is an advantage to the applicant and the department. A research seminar by the applicant will be presented to the department in advance of a faculty meeting, at which time the Department Chair (or other faculty sponsor as appropriate) will present the case and entertain a discussion. After the discussion has concluded, all faculty will vote and a majority used to confirm the department's decision to request the position.

4. Affiliate and Adjunct Faculty Appointments

The department hosts both affiliate and adjunct faculty positions. Affiliate faculty are those employed by the University of Idaho, but not members of Biological Sciences. Adjunct faculty are individuals not employed by the University of Idaho. The procedure for appointing individuals to either of these faculty designations will be similar and begin with a current faculty member sponsoring an application. An application will consist of a covering letter and CV prepared by the applicant, which will be circulated to all faculty. The covering letter should describe how this position is an advantage to the applicant and the department. A research seminar by the applicant will be presented to the department in advance of a faculty meeting, at which the faculty sponsor will present the case and entertain a discussion. After the discussion has concluded, all faculty will vote and a majority used to confirm the department's decision to request the position. Affiliate and adjunct faculty can attend and participate in faculty meetings but have no voting privileges. Affiliate faculty can teach Biol 401 (Undergraduate Research). These positions will be evaluated annually by the Department Chair and can be terminated at any time by written notice to the faculty member.

FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW

1. ANNUAL REVIEW

All faculty in the department will undergo an annual review by the Department Chair in January of each year, based on their *Position Description* (see below) and *Accomplishments Form* (see below) from the previous year. Student evaluations from all courses taught the previous year will be considered in this review. This review will use the current *UI Annual Performance Evaluation Form* and include a narrative consisting of evaluative comments.

2. TENURE TRACK FACULTY PROCEDURES

i) Third year review

a) Timing and Purpose: All non-tenured faculty in the department, in tenure or research track positions, will undergo an in-depth review to begin 24 months after beginning UI employment. The purpose of this review shall be to inform the person of her/his progress toward attainment of promotion and tenure. The candidate is responsible for compiling the following information: current UI standard format curriculum vitae (CV), the most recent syllabus and a sample exam from all courses taught, a professional portfolio, and selected publications. The department will provide: all position descriptions, all annual performance evaluations, all mentoring reports, all student teaching evaluations, and peer evaluations of teaching. The combined materials provided by the candidate and department will form the review packet.

b) Peer Review of Teaching: A peer review of teaching will be conducted by a member of the mentoring committee by attending class lectures of the candidate. The Department Chair, in consultation with the candidate, will select one other evaluating faculty. The two evaluators attend two lectures, at the same time. The evaluating faculty will each submit a written assessment of the performance of the candidate to the Department Chair. These written assessments will become part of the candidate's review packet.

c) Third Year Review Committee Composition: The Third Year Review Committee will consist of three (3) tenured faculty. The Department Chair will determine a list of four (4) tenured faculty members, considering the following criteria:

- the majority of the committee must come from the department
- balance of research and teaching interests
- consideration of diversity
- consideration of WWAMI status, joint-appointments, and/or interdisciplinary involvement
- a mix of associate and full professors

In consultation with the Department Chair the candidate will select three faculty from this list. The three faculty will choose amongst themselves one member to serve as the committee chairperson.

d) Third Year Review Procedures: This committee must have all members in attendance to conduct a meeting. The Third Year Review Committee will study the information within the candidate's review file to determine compliance with the appropriate *Tenure and Promotion Criteria* (see Appendix below). At their discretion, the Committee can require the candidate to meet in person and address questions about their record. The candidate's review packet will be made available within the department's main office for a period sufficient for all members of the department to review it. All faculty are welcome to provide written comments to the Department Chair that will be provided to the Committee. After their review, the Committee will submit a written evaluation containing a recommendation (satisfactory/unsatisfactory progress) to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will forward the Committee's written review and her/his written evaluation to the college Dean (i.e., submit both written evaluations), with copies to the candidate. In the event of a joint-appointed person being reviewed (i.e., other academic program) the Committee's written review will be sent to the appropriate program administrator. This administrator will have the opportunity to submit a separate written review that will be conveyed by the Department Chair to the COS Dean (i.e., submit three written evaluations), with copies to the candidate.

ii) Tenure and promotion review

a) Timing and Purpose: All tenure-track assistant professors in the department will be reviewed after their fifth full year of UI employment. The "review period" is typically the first eight (8) weeks of the fall semester in the sixth year. Consideration for tenure and promotion can be postponed with Provost approval (see *FSH 3520 F9*). The purpose of

this review shall be to determine the awarding of tenure and consider promotion to the rank of associate professor. The candidate is responsible for compiling the following information: current UI standard format curriculum vitae (CV), the most recent syllabus and a sample exam from all courses taught, a professional portfolio, and selected publication reprints. The department will provide: all position descriptions, all annual performance evaluations, all mentoring reports, all student teaching evaluations, peer evaluations of teaching, external review letters, and third year review evaluation. The combined materials provided by the candidate and department will form the review packet.

All tenured associate professors will be reviewed six years after being promoted from assistant professor. Similar timing would apply to reconsideration of promotion if a faculty member is tenured without promotion to associate professor. With Provost approval, these tenure/promotion reviews may be postponed (see *FSH 3520 F9*). The purpose of this review shall be to determine the awarding of promotion to the rank of professor and/or awarding tenure. All other aspects of this review will be like those described above for non-tenured faculty.

A departmental research seminar is required of each candidate during the review period.

b) Peer Review of Teaching: The Department Chair, in consultation with the candidate, will select two faculty members to provide a peer-evaluation of teaching. The two evaluators attend two lectures, at the same time. The evaluating faculty each submit a written assessment of the teaching performance of the candidate to the department chair. These written assessments will become part of the candidate's review packet as described above.

c) External Reviewer Selection: The chair will select a minimum of three external reviewers, at least two of which will be selected from a list of six (6) external reviewers provided by the candidate. These reviewers must have an appointment at a Ph.D. degree-granting institution. The Department Chair will contact the external reviewers to request their participation in the tenure and promotion review, and determine that they have no conflict of interest with the candidate. They will be sent, at minimum, a current CV, position descriptions, and three recent papers provided by the candidate. Reviewers will be asked to provide a letter that evaluates the candidate's scholarship. The external review letters will become part of the candidate's review packet as described above.

d) Tenure and Promotion Review Committee Composition: The Tenure and Promotion Review Committee will consist of three (3) tenured faculty and one (1) untenured faculty selected as described above for the Third Year review. At least one of these faculty members will be from outside of the department. The Department Chair in consultation with the candidate will choose the three tenured individuals as described above for the Third Year review. The Department Chair will assign the untenured faculty member. In addition, a student (either undergraduate or graduate) may be included on the committee. The candidate will choose this student from a list provided by the department chair. If a

student is not included on the committee, student testimonials will be used to provide student input to the committee. The committee will choose amongst the tenured faculty from the department one member to serve as the committee chairperson.

e) Tenure and Promotion Review Committee Procedures: This committee must have all four (4) faculty members in attendance to conduct a meeting. The Tenure and Promotion Review Committee will study the information within the candidate's packet to determine compliance with the *Tenure and Promotion Criteria* described below. All procedures will be similar to those described above for the Third Year Review, the only difference being that the Committee's written evaluation will contain recommendations to award or deny tenure and/or promotion, and will be included in the candidate's packet for review by all faculty in advance of a vote.

f) Tenure and Promotion Vote: A faculty meeting will be held after the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee evaluation is complete at which time the candidate will be excused and all faculty invited to provide comments. After this discussion, a vote on tenure will be conducted by all tenured faculty via paper ballot. A separate vote for promotion will be conducted by all faculty at or above the proposed rank via paper ballot.

g) Departmental Reporting: The Department Chair will prepare her/his evaluation containing the vote results and submit this report along with the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee evaluation to the college Dean (i.e., submit two written evaluations), with copies to the candidate. In the event of a joint-appointed person being reviewed (i.e., other academic departments) the appropriate administrator will have the opportunity to submit a separate written review that will be conveyed by the Department Chair to the college Dean (i.e., submit three written evaluations), with copies to the candidate.

iii) Tenure review

For the purpose of a tenure (only) review, all aspects of the Tenure and Promotion Review will be followed with the exception that the only recommendation will be for/against awarding tenure. After the faculty meeting discussion, a vote will be conducted by all tenured faculty via paper ballot.

iv) Promotion review

For the purpose of a promotion (only) review, all aspects of the Tenure and Promotion Review will be followed with the exception that the only recommendation will be for/against promotion to the next higher rank. After the faculty meeting discussion, a vote will be conducted by all faculty at or above the proposed rank via paper ballot.

3) NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY PROCEDURES

i) Research or Clinical Faculty Review

a) Timing and Purpose: All department faculty in non-tenure track research or clinical faculty positions will be reviewed according to the timelines identified above for tenure-track assistant or associate professors. Consideration for promotion can be postponed with Provost approval (see *FSH 3520 F9*). The purpose of this review shall be to consider promotion to the next higher rank for that position. The candidate is responsible for compiling the following information: current UI standard format curriculum vitae (CV), a professional portfolio, and selected publication reprint(s). If teaching is a component of the position description the most recent syllabus, including a sample exam, from all courses taught will be provided by the candidate. The department will provide: all position descriptions, all mentoring reports, all annual performance evaluations, external review letters, and the Third Year review evaluation. If teaching is a component of the position description all student teaching evaluations will be provided by the department. Additionally, a peer review of teaching will be conducted as described above for the Third Year Review. The combined materials provided by the candidate and department will form the review packet. A departmental research seminar is required of each candidate during the review period. If a non-tenure track research or clinical faculty is reviewed and not awarded promotion they can continue with their current rank in position.

b) Promotion Review Committee Composition: The Promotion Review Committee will consist of three (3) tenured faculty selected as described above for the Third Year review. This committee will also contain one additional individual, a faculty member that holds a position like the candidate. The department chair, in consultation with the candidate will choose this person. The committee will choose amongst the three tenured faculty one member to serve as the committee chairperson.

c) Promotion Review Committee Procedures: This committee must have at least three (3) members in attendance to conduct a meeting. The Promotion Review Committee will study the information within the candidate's review packet to determine compliance with the *Tenure and Promotion Criteria* described below. All procedures will be similar to those described above for the Third Year Review, the only difference being that the Committee's written evaluation will contain a recommendation for/against promotion to the next higher rank and will be included in the candidate's packet for review by all faculty in advance of a vote.

d) Promotion Vote: A faculty meeting will be held after the Promotion Review Committee evaluation is complete at which time the candidate will be excused and all faculty invited to provide comments. After this discussion, a vote will be conducted by all faculty at or above the proposed rank via paper ballot.

d) Departmental Reporting: The Department Chair will prepare her/his evaluation containing the vote results and submit this report along with the Promotion Review Committee evaluation to the college Dean (i.e., submit two written evaluations), with copies to the candidate. In the event of a joint-appointed person being reviewed (i.e., other academic programs) the appropriate administrator will have the opportunity to submit a separate written review that will be conveyed by the Department Chair to the college Dean (i.e., submit three written evaluations), with copies to the candidate.

ii) Instructor review

All department faculty in an instructor position will be reviewed before the end of their third year of full-time UI employment. The purpose of this review shall be to consider promotion to rank of senior instructor. Consideration for promotion can be postponed with Provost approval (see *FSH 3520 F9*). The candidate is responsible for compiling the following information: current UI standard format curriculum vitae (CV), the most recent syllabus and a sample exam from all courses taught, and a professional teaching portfolio. The department will provide: all position descriptions, all annual performance evaluations, all mentoring reports, all student evaluations, and any prior review reports that are available. The department will arrange at least two (2) current peer evaluations of teaching conducted as described above. The combined materials provided by the candidate and department will form the review packet. All other aspects of this review will be like the Promotion Review for Research Professor and Clinical Faculty. For voting, all faculty and senior instructors are permitted to vote.

FACULTY MENTORING

All untenured faculty at the assistant professor rank (including research and clinical faculty) shall have a mentoring committee composed of a minimum of three faculty holding ranks that are more senior. The untenured faculty member in consultation with the department chair will select the committee members. It will be the faculty member's responsibility to meet with the committee and ensure that the Department Chair is provided with the committee's written mentoring report before the end of each academic year. Instructors will be assigned at least one mentor.

POSITION DESCRIPTION POLICY

During the fall semester of each year, every faculty member will be required to update their annual *Position Description* for the next year. The *Position Description* will reflect courses to be taught, students advised, scholarship activities planned, outreach, and university service and leadership commitments.

The Department Chair will review each faculty member's *Position Description* and, when required, in consultation with the faculty member revise this document as necessary to

meet the department's teaching, research and service obligations. To be valid, the *Position Description* must be signed by the faculty member, Department Chair, any joint appointment administrator (if applicable), and the COS Dean.

ANNUAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS POLICY

In December of each year, every faculty member will be required to complete their *Accomplishments Form* for that calendar year. The completed *Accomplishments Form* will be due by the end of that fall semester. This document is an important component used for the Annual Review.

VOTING PRIVILEGES

All faculty (tenured and tenure-track faculty, instructors, clinical faculty, research faculty) are eligible to vote on general department business, with the following exceptions: i) only graduate faculty (as approved by the College of Graduate Studies) are eligible to vote on graduate studies business, ii) only tenured faculty may vote on tenure and/or promotion of tenured or tenure-track faculty, iii) affiliate and adjunct faculty members are not eligible to vote. Faculty on sabbatical (or otherwise away from campus) may participate in promotion and/or tenure voting (in person or remotely via email) if they have, at a minimum, scrutinized the review packet.

DEPARTMENT CHAIR POLICY

The Department Chair will serve for a period of five (5) years. If the current individual wishes to continue in this position, s/he will undergo a review by a committee (of three faculty) elected by all department faculty (see COS By-laws). The committee review will determine whether each of the following criteria have been met (or not):

- Ensure academic excellence in the department and operate a system of academic advising.
- Lead, manage, and supervise the activities of department staff and faculty.
- Assign duties to the staff and faculty, define job responsibilities, provide annual performance evaluations, and mentor faculty and staff.
- Represent the faculty to the COS administration and represent this administration to the faculty.
- Develop, implement, and evaluate a strategic plan for the department.
- Manage department financial expenditures and approve faculty grant proposals.
- Develop recommendations concerning appointments, promotions, tenure, and salaries of department personnel.

- Allocate space assigned to the department and supervise its use, maintenance, and security.
- Organize activities to provide time for personal involvement in teaching, research, or equivalent professional endeavors.

The review will culminate in a written report by the committee that is shared with the faculty and forwarded to the COS Dean for consideration of re-appointment.

If a new chair is necessary, two courses of action are possible: 1) select an internal candidate or 2) conduct an external search. Selection of an internal candidate would require a majority vote from department faculty that is advisory to the COS Dean. Selection of an external candidate would follow the normal process for an external faculty search, ultimately requiring approval of the COS Dean.

EQUIPMENT POLICY

i) Research Equipment:

Faculty are responsible for all aspects of the equipment housed within their individual research laboratories. The department will maintain some common-use equipment, as available (e.g., departmental ultralow freezers, autoclaves, centrifuges, real-time PCR machines), in space accessible to everyone. However, access to some common-use equipment may be controlled to ensure safety, security, and/or proper operation of the equipment.

ii) Computer Replacement:

The department may contribute up to \$1,000 toward the purchase of an office computer for faculty. The department will reserve the right to contribute to a new computer purchase depending on the number of computers that need to be upgraded in each year. Once awarded, faculty must wait a minimum of three years before making another request.

TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA

I. Tenure-Track Faculty

The review considers performance in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service:

Teaching

There should be clear evidence that:

- The content and organization of each course are appropriate for the course title and number.
- Each course represents a comprehensive and up-to-date distillation of the subject area.
- Each course is rigorous and challenging.
- Lectures are effectively delivered.
- Laboratories are thoughtfully designed.

Evaluation of teaching shall be based on:

- i) Evidence from the course: including the syllabus, assignments, examinations, and textbook(s). Evaluating faculty will form an impression of the breadth and depth of course content, of the standards of performance called for by assignments and examinations, and of whether the required lecture and laboratory texts are appropriate.
- ii) Peer-evaluation of teaching: a written report(s) by the peer evaluators based upon attendance in two (or more) lectures.
- iii) Student evaluation of teaching: both written comments and numerical evaluation scores will be scrutinized.

Examples of teaching activities consistent with promotion (to either associate professor or professor):

The content of the courses is current, rigorous, and challenging (based on peer reviews, syllabi, and other course materials).

Student evaluations are consistent with department and college averages for similar courses (axes of comparison include: required vs. elective, majors vs. non-majors, upper division vs. lower division, enrollments).

Peer evaluations of teaching indicate no major concerns with teaching approaches and classroom interactions, but do suggest some improvements could be made.

Evidence that the faculty member is committed to the continued improvement of their courses from year to year (by revising material, introducing new topics, testing new pedagogical methods, etc.)

Student evaluations significantly exceed department and college averages for similar courses (axes of comparison include: required vs. elective, majors vs. non-majors, upper division vs. lower division, enrollments).

Recipient of teaching awards from the department, college, or university.

The amount of teaching (in terms of number of courses and their enrollment) is above average relative to the percent effort on the faculty position description.

Exceptionally positive peer reviews of teaching.

Evidence of professional development in teaching.

Research

There should be clear evidence that the candidate has established a strong, independent research program. The requirement for independence is not intended to exclude collaborative and/or interdisciplinary research. However, the candidate should describe his/her specific contribution to each multi-author product in enough detail to help define his/her area of expertise and individual contribution.

The first line of evidence is the record of peer-reviewed publications and other research products (e.g. other publications, software, data sets, biological resources, other citable products) based upon work performed at UI. The quality of the venue in which they are published will be a factor that is considered. External measures that **may** also be used to indicate the significance of the candidate's research include Journal Impact Factor and citation indices. The candidate is encouraged to highlight what they perceive to be their high impact and most significant research products.

The second line of evidence will be the candidate's record of extramural research funding. Faculty are expected to obtain funds to support lab research and personnel.

The third line of evidence will be the reports of the external reviewers. This evidence is to indicate whether the external academic community views the candidate's reputation as

solid and the candidate's research as significant. Evidence of prominence in one's research field includes highly cited publications or products, oral presentations at national or international meetings, invited seminars and/or invited reviews/book chapters or meeting reports.

There should also be clear evidence that the candidate has contributed effectively to the training and mentoring of undergraduate, graduate or post-doctoral fellows.

Examples of achievements consistent with promotion to Associate Professor:

Multiple publications as the corresponding author.

Corresponding authored publications with a trainee of the laboratory listed as first author.

Obtaining independent or collaborative extramural funding sufficient to support a graduate student and/or other lab personnel for multiple years.

Serving as co-investigator in larger program grant or training grant.

Serving as CoPI or key personnel on one or more grants that improve infrastructure.

Examples of achievements consistent with promotion to Professor:

A consistent record of publications/products as corresponding author.

One or more highly cited papers in high impact or top tier journals.

Evidence of success of undergraduate, graduate, and/or postdoctoral trainees, including publication success and/or placement into highly competitive positions.

A continuous or near-continuous record of extramural research funding for her/his research lab.

Serving as principal investigator on one or more major federal grants.

Serving as principal investigator on one or more grants that improve infrastructure (such as an instrumentation grant) or training (such as an REU grant).

Leadership roles at National/International Conferences or in academic societies.

Invited / Keynote Presentations at National/International Conferences.

A strong record of invited seminars.

Service and Citizenship

The department expects that the candidate will have regularly attended faculty meetings and departmental seminars, and honored reasonable requests to participate on graduate supervisory committees and committee service at all university levels. Service to the scientific community such as review of manuscripts or grant proposals, panel service for granting agencies, professional societies (e.g., executive committee service), and other outreach activities is expected.

Examples of achievements consistent with Promotion to Associate Professor:

Regularly attending faculty meetings and departmental seminars.

Serving as a member of a departmental committee.

Reviewing manuscripts for journals within their discipline.

Reviewing grant proposals from extramural agencies.

Panel service for granting agencies.

Chairing a departmental committee.

Serving on a University wide committee

Examples of achievements leading to Promotion to Professor:

Panel service for granting agencies.

Chairing a departmental committee.

Serving on a University wide committee.

Serving as Associate Editor of a journal

Mentoring junior faculty.

Chairing or co-Chairing a national or international scientific meeting

Serving as a program officer or in other capacities to granting agencies.

Serving as chair of University Committees, with evidence of effective leadership.

Election as an officer to a national or international society.

Serving as Editor in Chief of a scientific journal.

Leadership role in interdisciplinary groups.

II. Research Faculty

The review considers performance in Research and Service:

Research

There should be clear evidence that the candidate has established a strong, independent research program. The requirement for independence is not intended to exclude collaborative and/or interdisciplinary research. However, the candidate should describe his/her specific contribution to each multi-author product in enough detail to help define his/her area of expertise and individual contribution.

The first line of evidence is the record of peer-reviewed publications and other research products (e.g. other publications, software, data sets, biological resources, other citable products) based upon work performed at UI. The quality of the venue in which they are published will be a factor that is considered. be weighted by the percentage research effort indicated in the candidate's position description. External measures **may** also be used to indicate the significance of the candidate's research include Journal Impact Factor and citation indices. The candidate is encouraged to highlight what they perceive to be their high impact and most significant research products.

The second line of evidence will be the candidate's record of extramural research funding. Faculty are expected to obtain funds to support lab research and personnel.

The third line of evidence will be the reports of the external reviewers. This evidence is to indicate whether the external academic community views the candidate's reputation as solid and the candidate's research as significant. Evidence of prominence in one's research field includes highly cited publications or products, oral presentations at national or international meetings, invited seminars and/or invited reviews/book chapters or meeting reports.

There should also be clear evidence that the candidate has contributed effectively to the training and mentoring of undergraduate, graduate or post-doctoral fellows.

Examples of achievements consistent with promotion to Associate Professor:

Multiple publications as the corresponding author.

Corresponding authored publications with a trainee of the laboratory listed as first author.

Obtaining independent or collaborative extramural funding sufficient to support a graduate student and/or other lab personnel for multiple years.

Serving as co-investigator in larger program grant or training grant.

Serving as CoPI or key personnel on one or more grants that improve infrastructure.

Examples of achievements consistent with promotion to Professor:

A consistent record of publications/products as corresponding author.

One or more highly cited papers in high impact or top tier journals.

Evidence of success of undergraduate, graduate, and/or postdoctoral trainees, including publication success and/or placement into highly competitive positions.

A continuous or near-continuous record of extramural research funding for her/his research lab.

Serving as principal investigator on one or more major federal grants.

Serving as principal investigator on one or more grants that improve infrastructure (such as an instrumentation grant) or training (such as an REU grant).

Leadership roles at National/International Conferences or in academic societies.

Invited / Keynote Presentations at National/International Conferences.

A strong record of invited seminars.

Service and Citizenship

The department expects that the candidate will have regularly attended faculty meetings and departmental seminars, and honored reasonable requests to participate on graduate supervisory committees. Service opportunities consistent with their research enterprise are encouraged.

Examples of achievements consistent with Promotion to Associate Professor:

Regularly attending faculty meetings and departmental seminars.

Serving as a member of a departmental committee.

Reviewing manuscripts for journals within their discipline.

Reviewing grant proposals from extramural agencies.

Panel service for granting agencies.

Chairing a departmental committee.

Serving on a University wide committee.

Examples of achievements leading to Promotion to Professor:

Panel service for granting agencies.

Chairing a departmental committee.

Serving on a University wide committee.

Serving as Associate Editor of a journal

Mentoring junior faculty.

Chairing or co-Chairing a national or international scientific meeting

Serving as a program officer or in other capacities to granting agencies.

Serving as chair of University Committees, with evidence of effective leadership.

Election as an officer to a national or international society.

Serving as Editor in Chief of a scientific journal.

III. Clinical Faculty

The review considers performance in Research, Teaching and Service:

Teaching

There should be clear evidence that:

- The content and organization of each course are appropriate for the course title and number.
- Each course represents a comprehensive and up-to-date distillation of the subject area.
- Each course is rigorous and challenging.
- Lectures are effectively delivered.
- Laboratories are thoughtfully designed.

Evaluation of teaching shall be based on:

iv) Evidence from the course: including the syllabus, assignments, examinations, and textbook(s). Evaluating faculty will form an impression of the breadth and depth of course content, of the standards of performance called for by assignments and examinations, and of whether the required lecture and laboratory texts are appropriate.

v) Peer-evaluation of teaching: a written report(s) by the peer evaluators based upon attendance in two (or more) lectures.

vi) Student evaluation of teaching: both written comments and numerical evaluation scores will be scrutinized.

Examples of teaching activities consistent with promotion (to either associate professor or professor):

The content of the courses is current, rigorous, and challenging (based on peer reviews, syllabi, and other course materials).

Student evaluations are consistent with department and college averages for similar courses (axes of comparison include: required vs. elective, majors vs. non-majors, upper division vs. lower division, enrollments).

Peer evaluations of teaching indicate no major concerns with teaching approaches and classroom interactions, but do suggest some improvements could be made.

Evidence that the faculty member is committed to the continued improvement of their courses from year to year (by revising material, introducing new topics, testing new pedagogical methods, etc.)

Student evaluations significantly exceed department and college averages for similar courses (axes of comparison include: required vs. elective, majors vs. non-majors, upper division vs. lower division, enrollments).

Recipient of teaching awards from the department, college, or university.

The amount of teaching (in terms of number of courses and their enrollment) is above average relative to the percent effort on the faculty position description.

Exceptionally positive peer reviews of teaching.

Evidence of professional development in teaching.

Research

There should be clear evidence that the candidate has established a strong, independent research program. The requirement for independence is not intended to exclude collaborative and/or interdisciplinary research. However, the candidate should describe his/her specific contribution to each multi-author product in enough detail to help define his/her area of expertise and individual contribution.

The first line of evidence is the record of peer-reviewed publications and other research products (e.g. other publications, software, data sets, biological resources, other citable products) based upon work performed at UI. The quality of the venue in which they are published will be a factor that is considered. be weighted by the percentage research effort indicated in the candidate's position description. External measures **may** also be used to indicate the significance of the candidate's research include Journal Impact Factor and citation indices. The candidate is encouraged to highlight what they perceive to be their high impact and most significant research products.

The second line of evidence will be the candidate's record of extramural research funding. Faculty are expected to obtain funds to support lab research and personnel.

The third line of evidence will be the reports of the external reviewers. This evidence is to indicate whether the external academic community views the candidate's reputation as solid and the candidate's research as significant. Evidence of prominence in one's research field includes highly cited publications or products, oral presentations at national or international meetings, invited seminars and/or invited reviews/book chapters or meeting reports.

There should also be clear evidence that the candidate has contributed effectively to the training and mentoring of undergraduate, graduate or post-doctoral fellows.

Examples of achievements consistent with promotion to Associate Professor:

Multiple publications as the corresponding author.

Corresponding authored publications with a trainee of the laboratory listed as first author.

Obtaining independent or collaborative extramural funding sufficient to support a graduate student and/or other lab personnel for multiple years.

Serving as co-investigator in larger program grant or training grant.

Serving as CoPI or key personnel on one or more grants that improve infrastructure.

Examples of achievements consistent with promotion to Professor:

A consistent record of publications/products as corresponding author.

One or more highly cited papers in high impact or top tier journals.

Evidence of success of undergraduate, graduate, and/or postdoctoral trainees, including publication success and/or placement into highly competitive positions.

A continuous or near-continuous record of extramural research funding for her/his research lab.

Serving as principal investigator on one or more major federal grants.

Serving as principal investigator on one or more grants that improve infrastructure (such as an instrumentation grant) or training (such as an REU grant).

Leadership roles at National/International Conferences or in academic societies.

Invited / Keynote Presentations at National/International Conferences.

A strong record of invited seminars.

Service and Citizenship

The department expects that the candidate will have regularly attended faculty meetings and departmental seminars, and honored reasonable requests to participate on graduate supervisory committees. Service opportunities consistent with their research enterprise are encouraged.

Examples of achievements consistent with Promotion to Associate Professor:

Regularly attending faculty meetings and departmental seminars.

Serving as a member of a departmental committee.

Reviewing manuscripts for journals within their discipline.

Reviewing grant proposals from extramural agencies.

Panel service for granting agencies.

Chairing a departmental committee.

Serving on a University wide committee.

Examples of achievements leading to Promotion to Professor:

Panel service for granting agencies.

Chairing a departmental committee.

Serving on a University wide committee.

Serving as Associate Editor of a journal

Mentoring junior faculty.

Chairing or co-Chairing a national or international scientific meeting

Serving as a program officer or in other capacities to granting agencies.

Serving as chair of University Committees, with evidence of effective leadership.

Election as an officer to a national or international society.

Serving as Editor in Chief of a scientific journal.