

Guidelines for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

Department of Biology

Adopted September 30, 1993; Revised March 2010, October 2012, January 2014

The criteria listed below are intended to provide general guidelines to faculty, and to reflect what is expected *under typical circumstances*. However, Departmental evaluations may consider additional criteria if warranted by exceptional circumstances or mitigating factors. Ultimately, each candidate must be evaluated on an individual basis and in a holistic manner.

The Department of Biology recognizes that to gain promotion to associate professor and especially to full professor, faculty must achieve distinction in one of three traditional areas of academic endeavor: teaching, research, or service. Distinction is defined as having established and maintained a reputation at the national or international level, and must be substantiated by appropriate external reviewers.

I. Reappointment:

A. Research:

- Independent research program likely to ultimately enhance the university's reputation at the national/international level established and functioning.
- At least one presentation at a national or international meeting.
- External funding is not required for reappointment, but submission of at least two major external grant proposals is expected. Receiving internal grants will be viewed positively only if there is demonstrated systematic effort to pursue external funds.
- Publications resulting from the candidate's current or previous post are anticipated and will be viewed positively for reappointment. Emphasis will be placed on publications for which the candidate is senior or lead author, and/or report data generated since joining the faculty of UNC Charlotte.
- The criteria listed above are typical expectations for research performance for reappointment. However, the Department recognizes that the level of research productivity may vary with research area, co-authorship arrangements, the funding environment, and opportunities for collaboration. It is the candidate's responsibility to explain and justify non-typical levels of performance.

B. Teaching: The department values effective teaching at both the graduate and undergraduate (non-majors as well as majors) levels.

- Development of new and modification of existing courses. Attempts to introduce innovative teaching methods will be viewed positively.
- Effective direction of graduate and undergraduate student research.
- Student evaluation scores on the two questions for "Quality of the Instructor" and "Quality of the Course" that indicate appropriate teaching performance. The Department recognizes that student scores may vary with course status (i.e.

required vs. elective), course level (i.e. lower division undergraduate vs. upper division undergraduate and graduate), enrollment, etc., and such factors will be taken into account as appropriate. It is the candidate's responsibility to explain and justify non-standard levels of performance.

- Peer evaluations of teaching
- Appropriate actions to improve identified teaching problems, if necessary.
- Funding from teaching-related grants will be viewed positively.
- Annual merit evaluations near or above the Department's norm for Teaching for research track faculty.

C. Service: Service should be as connected as possible to the research and teaching mission of the university. In general the Department does not expect a large service commitment from new faculty. However, for the service expected the following will be considered:

- Performance on Departmental committees.
- Involvement in College and University level committees viewed positively unless it adversely affects teaching and research.
- Community service will be viewed positively if related to a person's field or university position.

II. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

A. Research: A candidate for promotion and tenure will be expected to have begun to establish a national reputation in the candidate's area of research. Evidence for such a reputation will be based on publications, external funding, invited presentations and letters from external reviewers.

- Publications: A candidate is typically expected to generate a minimum of six papers in peer-reviewed journals during the five-year period considered for tenure. Papers should be published in journals with at least an average impact factor for the field of study. Publications should reflect that the candidate has established an independent line of investigation, normally indicated by senior or lead authorship on a majority of publications generated since joining the faculty at UNC-Charlotte. Candidates should explain their relative contributions to publications for which they are not senior or lead author, but which substantiate the independence of their research program. Emphasis will be placed on publications of significant or potentially significant original research. Significance will be evaluated by external reviewers, citation rates, and reputation of the journal of publication (as indicated by impact factor, etc.). In evaluating the publication record, consideration will be made for impact factors in the various sub-disciplines of Biology. Candidates should provide a list of journal titles and impact factors appropriate for their field of specialization, as well as citation rates for their individual articles, to facilitate assessment of the significance of the published work.

- **Funding:** Tenure and promotion will require generation of external funds in amounts appropriate for maintaining recognition at a national or international level. Typically this will entail funding as PI on grants from federal or state agencies such as NIH, NSF, EPA, USDA, NOAA, DOD, or appropriate private agencies. Particular emphasis will be placed on evidence for the ability to maintain consistent funding adequate to support the faculty member's research program, including the support of graduate students working in the lab. Consideration will also be given for significant contributions as co-investigator as part of funded collaborations with other faculty. When possible, the candidate should report the level of funding for the agency or program to which proposals were submitted.
- **Letters from external reviewers:** Letters should be obtained from external reviewers knowledgeable in the candidate's research area that demonstrate that the candidate has established an independent line of investigations and has the potential to achieve research distinction. Particular emphasis will be placed on objective evaluations from external reviewers who have not collaborated with the candidate.
- **At least one presentation per year at a national or international meeting.**
- **Invited presentations:** Invited presentations such as symposium speaker or session chair at major meetings or invited seminars at major universities or institutes will be regarded particularly highly.
- **A departmental presentation open to the University showcasing the highlights and broader impacts of the candidate's scholarly activities.**
- **Annual merit evaluations near or above the Department's norm for research for research track faculty.**
- **The criteria listed above are typical expectations for research performance. However, the Department recognizes that the level of research productivity may vary with research area, co-authorship arrangements, the funding environment, and opportunities for collaboration. It is the candidate's responsibility to explain and justify non-standard levels of performance.**

B. Teaching: The department values effective teaching at both the graduate and undergraduate (non-majors as well as majors) levels. Candidates for promotion and tenure in Biology should demonstrate excellence in teaching and engagement in the teaching activities of the department and university. Measures of excellence and engagement include:

- Effective direction of graduate and undergraduate student research.
- New courses developed, and modification of existing courses.
- Awards.
- Student evaluation scores on the two questions for "Quality of the Instructor" and "Quality of the Course" that indicate appropriate teaching performance. The Department recognizes that student scores may vary with course status (i.e. required vs. elective), course level (i.e. lower division undergraduate vs. upper division undergraduate and graduate), enrollment, etc., and such factors will be taken into account as appropriate. It is the candidate's responsibility to explain

and justify non-standard levels of performance.

- Positive peer evaluations of teaching
- Demonstrated improvement in any identified teaching problems.
- Funding.
- Annual merit evaluations near or above the Department's norm for Teaching for research track faculty.

C. Service: Faculty members will not be favorably considered for promotion and tenure if their main area of emphasis is service. However, service is expected of all tenure/track faculty. Departmental consideration will include:

- Professional service that indicates the candidate's reputation will be particularly highly regarded. This includes positions on editorial boards, ad hoc review of manuscripts, and service on grant review panels.
- Membership on Departmental, College and University committees.
- Performance on committees.
- Community involvement if related to the person's university appointment.
- Annual merit evaluations near or above 1, the Department's norm for service.

III. Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion to full professor requires that the candidate has achieved at least national and preferably international distinction in scholarship. Consistent publication is important, but the determining factor in evaluating this activity is the significance of those publications in an individual's field, as reflected in external letters of recommendation and quality of publications. Leadership within and outside the Department is also expected.

A. Scholarship

- **Publications:** Consistent output of high quality, peer-reviewed publications (typically greater than or equal to 3 per year) as senior or lead author. In cases where the candidate's contribution is not evident from authorship, the level of contribution should be explained. In addition to the impact factor of the journal of publication, for Professorial promotion emphasis will also be placed on the citation record of individual articles to determine impact on the field. Emphasis will also be placed on invited reviews in top journals, as well as books and book chapters in the candidate's field. Candidates should provide a list of journal titles and impact factors appropriate for their field of specialization, as well as citation rates for their individual articles, to facilitate assessment of the significance of the published work. It is the candidate's responsibility to explain and justify non-standard levels of performance.
- Consistent generation of external funds in amounts appropriate for maintaining recognition at the national or international level.
- A record of awards and serving as an invited speaker for National and International conferences.

- A departmental presentation open to the University showcasing the highlights and broader impacts of the candidate's scholarly activities.
- Positive external evaluations. Particular emphasis will be placed on objective evaluations from external reviewers who have not collaborated with the candidate.
- Annual merit evaluations above the Department's norm for research for research track faculty.

B. Teaching: The department values effective teaching at both the graduate and undergraduate (non-majors as well as majors) levels. Although promotion to Professor will not typically be made based primarily on achievement in teaching, excellence in teaching is expected. Evidence of excellence will be indicated by:

- Development of new courses.
- Demonstrated commitment to continued improvement and innovation in teaching (e.g., external grants, CID grants, education-oriented publications, seminars, awards).
- Student evaluation scores on the two questions for "Quality of the Instructor" and "Quality of the Course" that indicate appropriate teaching performance. The Department recognizes that student scores may vary with course status (i.e. required vs. elective), course level (i.e. lower division undergraduate vs. upper division undergraduate and graduate), enrollment, etc., and such factors will be taken into account as appropriate. It is the candidate's responsibility to explain and justify non-standard levels of performance.
- Appropriate actions to improve identified teaching problems, if necessary.
- Effective direction of graduate, post-graduate and undergraduate students.
- Annual merit evaluations near or above the Department's norm for Teaching for research track faculty.

C. Service: Promotion to Professor will not be made based primarily on service; however, a strong record of service indicating leadership and dedication to the Department and University is expected. Professional service indicating a leadership role in the candidate's sub-discipline will be emphasized.

- High level professional service, e.g. Editorial Boards, serving as officer or committee member in national or international professional societies, etc.
- Chairing important committees (e.g., a review committee).
- Community involvement related to the individual's area of expertise and university position.
- Performance on committees.
- Annual merit evaluations near or above, the Department's norm for service.

IV. Lecturer Reappointment and Evaluation

Candidates for reappointment and evaluation should demonstrate excellence in teaching

and engagement in the teaching activities of the department and university. Measures of excellence and engagement include:

- Development of existing and new courses. The incorporation of innovative teaching methods will be viewed positively.
- Effective direction of undergraduate and graduate teaching assistants.
- Student evaluation scores on the two questions for “Quality of the Instructor” and “Quality of the Course” that indicate appropriate teaching performance. The Department recognizes that student scores may vary with course status (i.e. required vs. elective), course level (i.e. lower division undergraduate vs. upper division undergraduate and graduate), enrollment, etc., and such factors will be taken into account as appropriate. It is the candidate’s responsibility to explain and justify non-standard levels of performance.
- Peer teaching evaluations
- Appropriate actions to address any problems in teaching identified through student evaluations and/or annual merit evaluations. Such actions should be discussed in the Personal Statement and their effectiveness should be reflected in improving student evaluations and annual merit evaluations.
- Continued professional development as demonstrated through course work, participation in workshops, and attendance at professional meetings
- Engaging in the scholarship of teaching (through publications, professional presentations, reviewing, etc.) will be viewed positively.
- Funding from teaching-related grants will be viewed positively.
- Annual merit evaluations near or above the Department's norm for Lecturers.

Appendix I

1. Tenure-Line Faculty Portfolio for Tenure and Promotion

1. Current CV.
2. External letters.
3. Reprints of all published papers and preprints of all papers in press. For published articles, report citation rates.
4. A list of titles and impact factors for journals appropriate for the field of study.
5. Published abstracts or program listings for all papers presented at professional meetings.
6. Copies of grant proposal pages that indicate your relative contribution to the proposals.
7. Copies of reviews of all funded and unfunded grant proposals.
8. All teaching evaluations (student and peer).
9. All past merit pay forms.
10. Copies of merit evaluation letters.
11. Copies of reappointment/promotion letters.
12. Self assessment.
13. Any other information the candidate wishes the Review Committee to consider.

For student numerical evaluations please include the following summary table in your portfolio **and email a copy to the Chair of the Review Committee** (add rows as necessary):

Course	Semester taught	Instructor score (lect Q7; lab Q4)	Departmental Mean	Course score (lect Q6; lab Q5)	Departmental Mean

2. Lecturers Portfolio for Reappointment and Evaluation

1. A current CV
2. A copy of the job description
3. Personal statement (self assessment)
4. All student evaluations and written student comments.
5. Copies of Peer teaching evaluations
6. Copies of course syllabi
7. Samples of class assignments and/or activities
8. Copies of annual evaluation letters
9. Any other information the candidate wishes the Review Committee to consider (publications; funding efforts; professional presentations; reviewing; departmental and University service; etc.)

For student numerical evaluations please include the following summary table in your portfolio **and email a copy to the Chair of the Review Committee** (add rows as necessary):

Course	Semester taught	Instructor score (lect Q7; lab Q4)	Departmental Mean	Course score (lect Q6; lab Q5)	Departmental Mean

Appendix II: Personal Statement

The Department of Biology recommends that candidates incorporate the following format when preparing their personal statements to assist the Review Committee and Departmental Chair in evaluating performance. **Please Note:** this recommendation does not replace or supersede any components of the Personal Statement required by the College or University.

From the Departmental perspective, the purpose of the personal statement is for the candidate to provide a critical, objective self assessment of his/her performance relative to departmental expectations and plans for continued growth and development. As such, for each of the areas of teaching, research and service, candidates should:

- State their general philosophy or approach
- Summarize their accomplishments and indicate the degree to which they meet departmental requirements
- Identify the main strengths and weakness of the performance

- Discuss plans for continued development and improvement, especially for any identified weaknesses

Approximate Timeline for the TT RPT Process:

(Department Review Committee = DRC; eRPT = electronic RPT web application)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Candidate provides list with names of external reviewers to Chair (if required) | 6 months & 1 week before due date |
| 2. External review package to Chair (if required) | 6 months before due date |
| 3. Chair solicits external letters (if required) | 6 months before due date |
| 4. Candidate submits material to Chair (and eRPT if required) | 8 weeks before due date |
| 5. eRPT/RPT package including external letters to DRC | 5 weeks before due date |
| 6. DRC recommendation presented to and discussed by eligible Faculty in a scheduled faculty meeting | 3 weeks before due date |
| 7. Vote by ballot by the eligible Faculty, results to Chair | 2 weeks before due date |
| 8. DRC recommendation to Chair | 2 weeks before due date |
| 9. Chair & DRC recommendations to Dean | Due date in CLAS calendar |

Typical dates for TT promotions

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| 6 months & 1 week before due date | April 1 |
| 6 months before due date | April 10 |
| 6 months before due date | April 10 |
| 8 weeks before due date | August 1 |
| 5 weeks before due date | August 31 |
| 3 weeks before due date | September 7 |
| 2 weeks before due date | September 14 |
| 2 weeks before due date | September 15 |
| Due date in CLAS calendar | September 28 |