September 4, 2002

Statement of Expectations of General
Criteria on Faculty Tenure, Promotion and Merit Evaluations

The Department of Biology utilizes the general and specific criteria given in the Faculty/University Staff Handbook to evaluate faculty for tenure, promotion, and merit evaluations.

Five broad areas of academic and professional activity are considered as follows:

A. Teaching

B. Scholarship-Research

C. Professional Development

D. Service to the University, Profession and Community

E. Academic Advisement

A. TEACHING

Effective teaching is expected of all faculty members. Faculty are expected to be competent in their specific discipline and in the subject area in which they teach. Competence is exemplified by the possession of knowledge of one's subject area and the ability to convey this knowledge to students. Though methods of knowledge and information transmission vary according to specific circumstances, the idealistic goals of this process are to train students to think for themselves; to make necessary value judgments; to understand and appreciate the world
in which they live; and to apply successfully what they have learned in the classroom to new circumstances as well as to their role in society.

An effective instructor is expected to organize significant and current subject matter; to present this information with great expertise and coherence, to establish a rapport with students that enhances and nurtures the educational process; to test students fairly, impartially, and accumulatively so that adequate information is obtained in order to evaluate and monitor each student's coursework.

Students, colleagues and the departmental chair must evaluate the quality of teaching excellence and instructor competence. Colleagues are appointed to an evaluation committee (tenured faculty) which reviews a non-tenured instructor's formal student evaluations, and they personally interview a broad range of students who have taken an instructor's course. The tenured faculty committee submits its evaluation to the departmental chair. If promotion and tenure are involved, the faculty advisory committee is charged to make its evaluation and recommendations to the departmental chair according to university policies and procedures.

**B. SCHOLARSHIP-RESEARCH**

Faculty members are expected to maintain a high level of competence in their research specializations. Active involvement in research is considered in the same context as scholarship. Research activity must be in addition to regular teaching assignments, and it must be subjected to thorough, critical peer review.

The primary evidence of scholarship-research is publication in refereed forums. Examples of acceptable publication forums include journal articles, monographs, books, and book chapters.
This list is neither all-inclusive nor limiting. An individual is expected to publish a substantial portion of their research in prestigious and significant forums within their discipline.

While publication in a non-cognate discipline is acceptable, primary consideration is given to publication within the discipline. Secondary evidence of scholarship or research activities include papers presented at scientific meetings; participation in invited seminars, symposia, and workshops; grant-seeking activity; and other germane activities.

Evaluation of scholarly endeavors is based first upon quality and secondly upon quantity. Factors which delineate quality are rank-ordered as follows: (1) the degree or rigor employed by the peer review process of the specific publication forum; and (2) the level of the publication forum, i.e., international-national, regional, state or local in descending rank order; but the number and sequence of authors do not always reflect contributions and efforts to the final product of a scholarly publication. Quantity of publications is considered less important than quality because in some biological sub-disciplines, research may be limited by seasonal factors and other variables. Also, quantity of publications is evaluated inversely proportional to teaching loads in some cases e.g., faculty with heavy teaching loads are not expected to publish the same quantities as those who have light teaching loads and who therefore, have more time allotted for research.

Similar quality standards are applied to secondary evidence of scholarship-research endeavors. Research reports or research papers presented at scientific meeting or symposia workshops are held in higher regard if they have been refereed prior to acceptance and publication, whereas non-refereed publications which fit into this sub-category are not given as much weight. The nature of the forum is also important. International/national presentations are
deemed more significant than regional, state, or local presentations in that order. The number and sequence of authors of secondary papers, reports, etc. are considered in the same light as those for publications mentioned above. Invited presentations at meetings, symposia, and workshops are considered of higher value than are general presentations to the membership-at-large of a society. If a faculty member engages in electronic publishing and submits such information for evaluation, then the individual should present accompanying information in the form of an explanation to validate that such activity is peer-reviewed. With appropriate validation this form of publication will be considered equivalent to traditional avenues of publishing within the discipline.

Grant seeking is considered a scholarly activity. Attempts to seek extramural and intramural funding of research projects are expected. Receipt of a grant connotes both scholarly accomplishments and the expectation of contributions to the discipline. Receipt of an extramural grant from a national agency, e.g., National Science Foundation or National Institutes of Health, weighs favorably in departmental evaluation of the faculty member. Receipt of grants from lower level agencies (regional, state or local groups) are also viewed favorably though such grants are less competitive and therefore less prestigious than are grants from national agencies and foundations.

If the faculty member submits additional information to be considered as scholarship or research activity, the burden of proof is on the faculty member to justify the significance of the contribution(s).

Scholarly productivity should occur at a reasonably regular rate and should be commensurate with the purpose of the evaluation: i.e., evaluation for recommendation on tenure, promotion, and
merit evaluation.

Multiple authorship is common in many disciplines. The order of authors' names does not necessarily reflect relative contributions. When evaluating an individual faculty member, a chairperson should determine the faculty member's relative contribution to multiple-authored publications and include that information in the evaluation.

C. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Though an important means by which faculty may remain current and updated in their field, professional development is considered secondary to scholarship-research. Professional development endeavors may be applied to teaching or research activities. These are activities, which the faculty member undertakes to maintain knowledge of one's teaching and research discipline(s) and to keep abreast of new and pertinent developments within one's areas of expertise.

Evaluation of these activities includes but are not limited to:

(1) Receipt of faculty development grants

(2) Receipt of post-doctoral fellowships

(3) Attendance at professional meetings, symposia, and workshops

D. SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY, PROFESSION AND COMMUNITY

Other functions which are considered an integral part of academic life but not classified specifically as teaching, scholarship-research, and professional development are service to the
university, profession and community. It is expected that faculty take part in various service functions to the maximum extent possible. It is also recognized that individual faculty members have varying interests so that services rendered to the university, profession and community necessarily vary from person to person.

Evaluation of service should include consideration:

1) Departmental, college and university committees
   a) Committee memberships
   b) Committees chaired
   c) Time devoted to committee assignment
2) Contributions to professional societies
3) Contributions to community activities
4) Participation in discipline-oriented, lay-related workshops or clinics
5) Consulting or editorial services
6) Community lecture or speaking invitations
7) Participation on boards of directors
8) Other responsibilities considered to be of a service nature within the university, profession or community

E. ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT

Academic advisement, is important in meeting the needs of individual students both in their academic programs and in their career planning. Faculty advisers are expected to advise and counsel students with great expertise. Because the advising system within the Biology
Department is specialized, only selected faculty members serve as departmental advisers. Those faculty who serve as advisers are given special evaluative consideration for this activity.

F. PROMOTION FROM ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO PROFESSOR

Receipt of tenure denotes that an individual has met or exceeded the criteria which designated significant academic achievement and professional development. Tenure also connotes that an individual has the ability to maintain, continue and improve upon these levels of achievement for future promotion to the rank of professor.

The criteria employed for consideration of promotion from associate professor to professor are the same as listed above (Teaching, Scholarship-Research, Professional Development, Service to the University, Profession and Community and Academic Advisement), however, they vary in degree rather than in kind. It is expected that teaching and service functions of the individual would at the very least continue along the same lines of achievement when tenure was granted or even improve. After tenure has been attained the individual has greater flexibility to extend and expand research endeavors. For this reason research accomplishments are given greater evaluation weight than teaching or service.

G. EXPECTATIONS FOR TENURED FACULTY

Three-year evaluations of tenured faculty will use the same criteria as expressed in Section F above. Because each individual makes unique contributions to the department, each person will be evaluated on an individualized basis. Such contributions as teaching load, teaching
effectiveness, research accomplishments, advising, service to the department as chair, and other
service functions to the profession and the university will be used and taken into appropriate
correct context when evaluating each tenured faculty member.

H. PROCEDURE

1. Non-Tenured Faculty - Annual Evaluation of Progress Toward Tenure

The department chair appoints subcommittees composed of tenured faculty and chairs for the
subcommittees. These subcommittees carry out the evaluation of a faculty member under
review. The subcommittees evaluate the following areas: 1) Teaching, 2) Research-Scholarship
and 3) Service, Advising and Professional Development. In the case of an annual review of a
non-tenured faculty, the teaching subcommittee will review student teaching evaluations,
interview students and interview the individual; the research and service subcommittees will
examine the vita, and any submitted documents and interview the individual as necessary. Each
subcommittee will submit a written report to the department chair who, in turn, will compose a
letter of evaluation. This letter will be distributed to the tenured faculty one week in advance of a
tenured faculty meeting. The departmental chair then meets with the tenured faculty to discuss
the draft of the evaluation letter and to make any modifications or revisions as necessary for a
final draft. The departmental chair forwards the progress-toward-tenure letter to the faculty
member under review with copies to the Dean of AddRan and Vice Chancellor for Academic
Affairs.
2. Extension of Probationary Period

In the case of an extraordinary experience or event beyond the individual's control that affects a non-tenured faculty member's professional performance, the faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period. Such request should be timely, but no longer than one year after the event of consequence. In making a request for extension of the probationary period, the faculty member relinquishes any and all claims to *de facto* tenure. A faculty member may address such a request directly to the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs or to the Dean or to the Departmental Chair who will forward such request to the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs for decision. Prior to rendering a decision, the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs will consult with the academic Dean.

3. Promotion/Tenure

In a promotion/tenure decision, the tenured faculty conduct a review. They use the same broad areas of criteria and subcommittee system outlined in section H.1. After completion of their evaluation, they submit a recommendation in writing to the departmental chair. Upon receiving the tenured faculty's recommendation, the departmental chair submits a written recommendation along with supporting evidence to the departmental advisory committee. The recommendation is based upon the above-mentioned criteria. The advisory committee meets and discusses the chair's recommendation, and submits its recommendation in writing to the departmental chair. One week after receiving the advisory committee's recommendation, the departmental chair forwards a letter of recommendation on promotion/tenure along with
supporting evidence to the dean of the college.

If a faculty member is seeking promotion from associate professor to professor, the individual makes the request to the departmental chair. The departmental chair then institutes the review process and procedures as indicated above in this section.

*ETHICAL CONDUCT.* Faculty members are expected to adhere to the ethical conduct code adopted by the TCU Faculty Senate as well as the professional ethics codes of their disciplines.