



The University of Akron
Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences

Date: October 25, 2018

TO: Rex Ramsier
Executive VP & Chief Admin Officer

FROM: Linda Subich

SUBJECT: Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Guideline and Criteria

The attached guidelines have been approved by the faculty of the Department of Biology on April 25, 2018.

I have approved all attached guidelines and criteria.

If you concur, we ask that you also approve the guidelines and criteria.



Department Chair

10-28-18

Date



Dean Buchtel College of Arts & Sciences

10-30-18

Date



Exec VP & Chief Admin Officer

11-1-18

Date

Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion of Tenure Track Bargaining Unit Members in the Department of Biology, Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences

Introduction

The UA-Akron AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) contains processes, timelines and procedures for the Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) of Bargaining Unit members, and should be referred to for such matters. This document serves to enumerate the minimum criteria for tenure/promotion relevant to the discipline(s) represented in the academic unit listed above. These criteria may include quantitative and/or qualitative measures, and meeting these minimum criteria does not guarantee a positive recommendation. Nothing contained in this document can conflict with the CBA or University rules.

1. Materials for the RTP file

Expectations for the narrative statements provided for tenure/promotion decisions:

A four to six page narrative statement shall provide the candidate with an opportunity to present an overview of how he/she is meeting the professorial role expectations of a faculty member in the Biology Department, including both the broad expectations and the specific standards for teaching, research and service. The narrative statement should not be a summary of one's curriculum vita, but rather a broad overview and integration of one's professional vision and accomplishments. It should describe his/her professional philosophy, the interrelationships and relative priorities among teaching, research and service in his/her activities, the accomplishments in teaching, research and service, and the goals that he/she would like to achieve during the next three to five years as a faculty member in the Department.

2. Annual Reappointment

A. Non-tenured tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated mainly in terms of teaching and research, and to a lesser extent in terms of service. The Department Reappointment Committee shall conduct its review of the candidate with an emphasis on the candidate's progress toward Tenure (see requirements below). If a candidate's teaching evaluations fail to meet guidelines noted in 3.A. below for 2 consecutive semesters, then the candidate is required to present a yearly teaching portfolio for the course with each year's RTP package. In those portfolios, the candidate will detail the interventions he/she is taking to improve teaching effectiveness, and the results of any other (non-student evaluation) instruments utilized to measure teaching effectiveness. Candidates shall be examined with greater scrutiny in each successive year of the Reappointment deliberations. The Reappointment Committee Chairperson is expected to present all the information provided by the candidate in an objective and unbiased manner at the evaluation meeting. At the initiation of the meeting, the Chairperson shall summarize the candidate's role in the Department over the years in service. During this discussion if any concerns are raised about the candidate's performance, any unresolved concerns must be communicated when the candidate is invited to the meeting.

B. Following a discussion of the material submitted by the candidate and how it supports his/her role in the Department, the candidate will join the meeting. The candidate and members of the committee will exchange views on this member's role in the work of the Department, how it could be strengthened, and how the Department could better aid the candidate's work. The committee

will tell the candidate which of their scholarly products they deem legitimate toward eventual consideration of tenure or promotion. Then the candidate will be given time to address any concerns raised by the committee.

C. The Reappointment Committee's recommendation letters to the candidate and the Department Chair shall contain an explicit assessment of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, if any. In the event of a perceived weakness, the Committee shall recommend a plan to give the candidate an opportunity to correct any deficiencies before the time of application for Tenure.

D. It is the responsibility of a tenure-track candidate for Reappointment to provide evidence that he or she shall be able to meet the criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor (if applicable) at the end of the probationary period.

3. Promotion to Associate Professor

The faculty member will be evaluated on his/her total contribution to the work of the department, the university, and the community. Candidates for promotion must be evaluated in the areas of teaching, research, professional service, discipline-related public service, and professional conduct (as defined in the CBA). All materials considered will have been generated since the time of hire.

A. Accomplishments in Teaching. Effectiveness of classroom teaching will be documented by the candidate's teaching portfolios (along with comments and student evaluation scores). Additional information may also be included such as updates to the portfolios; specific course improvements; supervision of teaching assistants; self-improvement through teaching related seminars, continuing education courses, grants/workshops/symposia to increase teaching effectiveness; presentation of papers at educational meetings; and guest lectures or seminars presented at other institutions. A full list of evidence that can be considered is detailed in the CBA. Acceptable teaching competency must be displayed by student evaluation scores consistent with national and departmental norms for classes in the subject area.

In addition, the Chair will assign 3 faculty members to review the teaching portfolio, one of whom will attend a lecture at random and provide the candidate a written critique for that course. These reviews shall be included in the candidate's RTP package. All of these materials are considered during RTP to assess whether the candidate has met an acceptable level of teaching effectiveness.

B. Accomplishments in Research and Publications. Five peer-reviewed publications in research and/or the scholarship of teaching shall be a minimum criterion for consideration for promotion to Associate Professor. Also, two international, national, state, or other peer reviewed extramural grant proposals submitted as Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator are necessary to be considered for tenure (one funded, multiple year external award as PI or Co-PI also satisfies this requirement). The expectation is that at least one extramural grant will be funded except in rare or exceptional circumstances. There must be evidence of an ongoing, basic or applied research program and/or program in the scholarship of teaching. The research/scholarship must also demonstrate that it will continue following promotion (e.g. submitted grant proposals, submitted papers, ongoing collaborations, current training of graduate students, etc.). In addition, positive external reviews of the candidate's performance in research are required. Contract testing is to be

considered under discipline-related public service. Additional evidence which may also be presented for consideration include: patents, intellectual property, evidence of direction of graduate students; publication of textbooks, scholarly books, scholarly book chapters, or monographs; personal involvement in research procedures; self-improvement through research seminars, workshops, symposia, summer fellowships, faculty improvement leaves, etc.; presentation of papers at scientific meetings; and seminars presented at other institutions.

C. Professional Service and Recognition. The candidate will be evaluated on the basis of service to the professional scientific community including, but not restricted to, reviews of manuscripts for professional journals and books, book reviews for professional journals, grant proposal reviews, service on thesis or dissertation defense committees, memberships and officerships in professional societies, and chairing sessions at professional meetings. Service to the department and university includes serving adequately on committees, chairing committees, and/or effectively carrying out duties assigned by the Department Chair. Professional recognition by awards, grants, and prizes will also be considered, along with any criteria listed in the CBA.

D. Personal Characteristics and Collegiality. Personal characteristics will be evaluated on the basis of (a) cooperation with colleagues and students and (b) demonstration of professional conduct as defined in the CBA.

4. Indefinite Tenure

Recommendation for tenure will follow the CBA. All of the minimum criteria included in consideration for promotion to Associate Professor also apply.

The minimum criteria for consideration of tenure recommendation shall include: a) positive external reviews of the candidate's performance in research; b) five refereed contributions in scientific publications: two must contain data obtained while holding a tenure-track position at The University of Akron and the candidate must be first author on at least one of the five*; c) two international, national, state, or other peer reviewed extramural grant proposals submitted as Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator (one funded, multiple year extramural award also satisfies this requirement). The expectation is that at least one external grant will be funded except in rare or exceptional circumstances; d) effective teaching to be documented by the candidate's teaching portfolios (along with the comments and scores); and e) appropriate contributions to departmental, university, and discipline related public service. Personal characteristics will be evaluated on the basis of cooperation with colleagues and students, and demonstration of professional conduct as defined in the CBA.

*A research publication is eligible for RTP considerations if it became available to the general public after the date of initial appointment (date as determined by the Board of Trustees), and before the date of a candidate's RTP meeting. This date may differ from the publication date (e.g. some journal publication dates run behind the calendar date); nonetheless, the calendar date when it becomes available to the general public in any format (paper or first date of availability on-line) is the date that determines its validity for RTP purposes. The burden of proof as to demonstrating the correct publication date is on the candidate.

5. Promotion to Professor

The faculty member will be evaluated on his/her total contribution to the work of the department, the university, and the community. Candidates for promotion will be evaluated in the areas of teaching, research, professional service, discipline-related public service, evidence of leadership, and personality-character-attitudes. All materials considered will have been generated since the time of the tenure meeting and decision by the department.

A. **Accomplishments in Teaching.** Effectiveness of classroom teaching will be documented by the candidate's teaching portfolios (along with comments and student evaluation scores). Additional information may also be included such as updates to the portfolios; specific course improvements; supervision of teaching assistants; self-improvement through teaching related seminars, continuing education courses, grants/workshops/symposia to increase teaching effectiveness; presentation of papers at educational meetings; guest lectures or seminars presented at other institutions. A full list of evidence that can be considered is detailed in the CBA. Acceptable teaching competency must be displayed by student evaluation scores consistent with national and departmental norms for classes in the subject area. A candidate with low teaching evaluations can request the Chair to assign a faculty member to attend a lecture at random and provide the candidate a written critique for that course. The candidate should include in their promotion package details of the interventions/steps he/she has taken to improve their teaching effectiveness including the result of any instruments utilized to measure teaching effectiveness.

In addition to teaching effectiveness, candidates should also demonstrate leadership in teaching. This may be demonstrated by the supervision of student research, curricular development or other appropriate activities.

B. **Accomplishments in Research and Publications.** Seven peer-reviewed publications in research and/or the scholarship of teaching produced since tenure shall be the minimum criteria for consideration for promotion to Professor. Also, one international, national, state, or other peer reviewed extramural grant submitted as Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator must have been funded since the previous successful promotion or receipt of tenure if promotion to Associate Professor preceded tenure. There must be evidence of an ongoing, basic or applied research program and/or program in the scholarship of teaching. The research/scholarship must also demonstrate that it will continue following promotion (e.g., submitted grant proposals, submitted papers, ongoing collaborations, current training of graduate students, etc.). Contract testing is to be considered under discipline-related public service. Additional criteria which may also be presented for consideration include: patents, intellectual property, evidence of direction of graduate students; publication of textbooks, scholarly books, scholarly book chapters, or monographs; personal involvement in research procedures; self-improvement through research seminars, workshops, symposia, summer fellowships, faculty improvement leaves, etc.; presentation of papers at scientific meetings; seminars presented at other institutions.

C. **Professional Service and Recognition.** The candidate will be evaluated on the basis of service to the professional scientific community including, but not restricted to, reviews of manuscripts for professional journals and books, book reviews for professional journals, grant proposal reviews, service on thesis or dissertation defense committees, memberships and officerships in professional societies, and chairing sessions at professional meetings. Service to the department and university

includes serving adequately on committees, chairing committees, and/or effectively carrying out duties assigned by the Department Chair. Professional recognition by awards, grants, and prizes will also be considered, along with any criteria listed in the CBA.

Candidates should also demonstrate leadership in service. This may be demonstrated by professional activities within the department, college, university and/or professional societies.

D. **Personal Characteristics and Collegiality.** Personal characteristics will be evaluated on the basis of (a) cooperation with colleagues and students, and (b) demonstration of professional conduct as defined in the CBA.

6. Materials for External Review

A. Scientists eligible as external reviewers should not have conflicts of interest with the candidate. These conflicts of interest include:

- (1) known family relationships (i.e., spouse, child, sibling or parent),
- (2) economic relationships (i.e., business partnerships),
- (3) past thesis advisors,
- (4) past students,
- (5) current or recent (within 36 months) collaborators on professional publications or grants,
- (6) a close personal relationship or friendship that might tend to affect the judgment of the reviewer or be seen as so by a reasonable person familiar with the relationship.

B. The tenure committee chair will mail instructions to external reviewers regarding what materials are to be reviewed including the candidate's curriculum vitae, publications selected in consultation with the candidate, research narrative and the manner in which they should be considered. This letter will state that the committee is requesting an independent review of the candidate's research, and the conditions under which it was conducted (e.g. the candidate's teaching load during the period of review).

The text of the letter for Promotion is below (it will be modified appropriately for candidates seeking both tenure and promotion):

Dear Professor Z:

Dr. Y has requested promotion to the rank of zzz in the Department of Biology at The University of Akron. In response, the Promotion Committee of the Department of Biology has initiated a review of Dr. Y's credentials. Having identified you as a leader in the candidate's field, I am writing on behalf of the Committee to ask you for a letter which evaluates the quality of Dr. Y's research and scholarly contributions. I have enclosed the candidate's curriculum vitae, selected publications and research narrative.

Among other factors, the committee is charged with evaluating the candidate's performance in research. We therefore are most interested in your assessment of the quality and impact of his/her scholarly achievements. Put another way, what has been the significance of Dr. Y's work, beyond the publication of material contained in his/her dissertation and postdoctoral studies? Is it original and innovative, or relatively commonplace and inconsequential? What is its potential for advancing theory, research, or practice? Has Dr. Y attained a position of academic distinction as evidenced by publication in highly regarded, refereed journals and by presentation at major conferences? We are requesting an appraisal that focuses on the candidate's record of performance as a scholar, rather than on his/her teaching or service contributions. Moreover, we prefer that you not comment on Dr. Y's eligibility for tenure and promotion at The University of Akron or at any other university.

Your letter will become part of the documentation that will be examined by those responsible for making recommendations regarding the candidate's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor/Professor. Please note that your review may be subject to disclosure under such circumstances including but not limited to subpoena, validly issued court order, or public records request.

The Promotion Committee would greatly appreciate receiving your comments, as they are important in the proper evaluation of Dr. Y's application for promotion/tenure. In order that we may meet University deadlines governing our internal review process, we ask that your letter reach us by zzz. If you are unable to participate in this review, please let me know at your earliest convenience. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

signature

Professor of Biology

Chair, Promotion/Tenure Committee