

DBS Guidelines for Promotion & Tenure Process

1 June 2011

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Biological Sciences (hereafter “DBS”) follows the Faculty Handbook for Auburn University and the guidelines outlined below. The DBS faculty and the Auburn University Faculty Handbook (hereafter “Handbook”) recognize that different ranks of Professor and Tenure carry different expectations. As such, they are awarded differentially as merit, or collegiality, respectively as guidelines dictate. Below, are general guidelines for what is expected for tenure or a given professional rank. As a faculty, we acknowledge that these are only guidelines and that professional development of individuals varies. Thus, candidates considered for promotion and/or tenure should be assessed in a holistic fashion.

Portions of the Handbook appear below in italics, but faculty members are urged to consult the full-length version by following the link that appears on the Provost’s homepage <http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/handbook/>

Individual Roles:

The **DBS Faculty**: Before voting on the hire of a new faculty member, the DBS faculty should seriously consider the capabilities of that person to meet the requirements of tenure at Auburn and on the DBS. Once the hire is made, the faculty should promote a positive yet constructive atmosphere for the new member to meet the requirements, and be helpful. The success of the Candidate represents the success of the DBS.

The **Candidate** is responsible for initiating the P&T process, making sure their dossier is turned-in in a timely manner, and that it conforms to stated guidelines.

The **DBS Chair** serves to oversee the professional development of the candidate and the general P&T process.

The **Promotion and Tenure Committee** is responsible for advising the candidate on preparation of the dossier, undertaking aspects of the dossier preparation (including solicitation of letters), and preparing an objective summary of deliberations. Procedural questions about P&T should be addressed to the P&T Chair. The P&T Chair and Committee serve advisory and procedural roles and do not pass judgments on the actions of the Candidate except in their capacity as an individual voting faculty members.

The **Mentor** serves as a representative and advisor for the Candidate.

CONTENTS

- I. Assignment of Mentor
 - II. Preparation of Dossier
 - A) Material for DBS Faculty
 - B) Peer Review of Teaching
 - III. Annual Review & Vote by Faculty
 - IV. 3rd Year Review
 - V. Tenure Review
 - VI. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor
 - VII. Promotion to Rank of Full Professor
 - VIII. Consideration for Tenure
 - IX. Procedure for Solicitation of External Letters
 - X. Agenda for Meeting of Tenured Faculty
 - XI. Voting Procedure
 - XII. Post-meeting Conference & Actions
 - XIII. Time Table
- Appendix 1 – Form for “Peer Review of Teaching”

I. Assignment of Mentor

The Department Chair will assign each new faculty member a faculty Mentor within 2 months of employment. The assignment will be agreeable to both Mentor and Mentee. The Mentor/Mentee relationship will vary, but new faculty should strive to meet frequently with their Mentor. The Mentor provides 3 important functions: 1) the Mentor serves as a source of information and advice for the Mentee in areas of teaching, research, and service, 2) the Mentor provides detailed insight into the Mentee's professional development by presenting summaries of progress at all P&T meetings, and 3) the Mentor attends all P&T progress and promotion meetings with the candidate, the DBS Chair, and the P&T Chair.

II. Preparation of Dossier

Within 2 months of employment, all new faculty members will be provided a properly formatted sample dossier by the P&T Chair. The purpose of the dossier is to document, as completely as possible, the Candidate's accomplishments over their career, particularly those contributions at Auburn University. All untenured faculty will submit the dossier each year for review. Clear differentiation between "activities at Auburn" from "activities outside of or before Auburn" is important. Associate Professors may submit a dossier for evaluation of progress toward the rank of Professor when they see fit.

A) Materials for review by faculty

The P&T packet is prepared as 2 documents: (1) dossier and (2) supplemental information.

The Candidate will be expected to provide, in the proper format and order, the following:

- 1a. Standard Biographical Data Form for Auburn University (1 page; complete online & print)
- 1b. One-page summary of accomplishments (teaching; research-projects, publications, proposals; Service-national, international, Auburn, departmental)
2. Percent Breakdown of Duties- Includes % allocation of time in teaching, research, service, advising, administration
3. Honors & Awards
4. Scholarly Contributions (must distinguish Auburn from non-Auburn work)
 - A. Teaching
 1. Courses taught (in table form – semester, course #, title, % taught, contact hr, enrollment).
 2. Graduate students completed (tabular form, with name, institution, degree, completion date, current position). Students for which Candidate was the primary advisor should be listed

separately from those in which Candidate was a committee member.

3. Present graduate students (in table form: name, institution, degree, start date, expected completion date, awards). Students for which Candidate was the primary advisor should be listed separately from those as a committee member. Awards to graduate students under Candidate's supervision – list as "Others Supervised" – any that do not fit above categories.
4. Courses & curricula developed.
5. Grants related to teaching.
6. Publications pertaining to teaching.
7. Other contributions to teaching.
8. Teaching philosophy. Paragraph narrative. Ideally limited to 1 page.

B. Research/Creative Work (distinguish Auburn from non-Auburn work)-
For all creative works, list % of work conducted under Auburn's auspices and % contribution by the Candidate. Work from graduate or undergraduate students in the Candidate's lab, or citation metrics can be noted if desired. The Candidate should refer to the sample dossier for how to represent this information.

1. Books
2. Article-length Publications.
 - a. Book chapters (distinguish peer reviewed from non-peer reviewed)
 - b. Articles on original research published in refereed journals
 - c. Other communications
3. Presented Papers & Lectures
 - a. Invited lectures
 - b. Presentations at professional meetings (distinguish those presented by candidate from those presented by others).
4. Exhibitions
5. Performances
6. Patents & Inventions
List all Invention Disclosures that have been submitted to the Office of Technology Transfer. For each disclosure, list the following: inventors and their percent contribution to the development of the intellectual property, student inventors, status of the disclosure (provisional or full patent application, or full patent issued), and whether there has been a license for commercialization.
7. Other Research/Creative Contributions
8. Grants & Contracts (table form-title, co-PIs, agency, dates/duration, amount, Candidates' role in development). List in three sections: funded, pending, and not funded.
9. Description of Scholarly program (narrative). Ideally 1 page or less.

C. Outreach (Note: most DBS faculty do not have outreach appointments as defined by the Faculty Handbook. Therefore this section is usually denoted using “N/A”, but see below.)

1. Commentary
2. Activities & Products

It is the understanding of the DBS faculty that, based on directives from the Office of the Provost, outreach activities performed by COSAM faculty should be reported as service. This mandate is purportedly related to a desire to distinguish among appointment categories and position funding sources. However, it is the position of the DBS faculty that outreach activities and scholarship are distinct from general service activities expected of all department members. Numerous examples can be forwarded to support this position. One example commonly seen is the development and dissemination of public information materials through programs, websites, popular format books, circulars, and informational posters. Such materials are typically produced by faculty holding curatorial appointments, with expertise in medical diseases, working in conservation biology, etc. Restrictions preventing the proper identification of such activities as formal Outreach fail to acknowledge the unique nature of these contributions to the departmental mission. DBS faculty desire that, where appropriate, description of activities clearly fitting the Outreach mission be listed under this category.

D. Service

1. University service
 - University-level activity
 - College-level activity
 - Departmental-level activity
 2. Professional Service
5. Grade distributions for courses taught (provided by candidate)
 6. Evaluations from students – data on numerical electronic forms (provided by DBS Chair)
 7. Peer review of teaching – forms/reports (provided by DBS Chair; see sample form below)
 8. Letters from External Evaluators, selected following guidelines at <http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/policies.html> –SUBMITTED ONLY WHEN BEING CONSIDERED FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

B) Peer Review of Teaching

Purpose and General Background

The Peer Review of Teaching (PRT) process is intended to provide information on faculty teaching as a complement to other sources of information such as student evaluations and midterm evaluations (e.g., Small Groups Instructional Feedbacks [SGIFs] administered by the Biggio Center).

Ideally, all faculty will receive PRT on a regular basis (e.g., annually); however, implementation of this level of evaluation with the process outlined below is difficult given the large size of our teaching faculty and the associated high need for reviewers and the difficulty of coordinating evaluation schedules for both reviewers and reviewees. Thus, efforts are focused on evaluating 1) tenure-eligible faculty at least once each academic year, 2) tenured faculty anticipating promotion from Associate to Full Professor, and 3) all faculty who request peer evaluation irrespective of their rank. Initiating peer review of teaching early in a faculty member's appointment to Auburn University reflects the Department's commitment to fostering teaching excellence and general faculty development. Completed evaluations of tenure-eligible faculty in their third, fourth and fifth years of service will be included in that faculty member's tenure packet as evidence of their teaching performance.

The Peer Review Process (see also Appendix 1 for evaluation forms)

- Notification of reviewee and request for a packet of course materials.
- Selection of a review team by Chair of the Curriculum Committee with approval of the DBS Chair.
- Review of course materials and at least two in-class visits by the review team.
- Post-review meeting of the review team and preparation of a written report.
- The report is sent to the instructor, and the reviewers meet with the instructor prior to the submission of the report to the Department Chair.
- Submission of the report to the Undergraduate Program Officer (UPO), who will send the report to the Department Chair.

Selection of Review Team:

The review team consists of two members, one being a current member of the Curriculum Committee and the other a non-Committee member. One member of the review team will have expertise in the reviewee's teaching area whereas the other will not.

Review of the course materials packet:

The course materials packet should be prepared by the reviewee and made available to the reviewers before classroom visits. The course packet should include:

- Current course syllabus and lecture schedule
- Representative exams
- Representative handouts of materials given to students or the review team should be given access to the materials available on Blackboard

The review team should thoroughly review the course materials prior to the classroom observation.

Classroom observation:

The reviewee should inform the class of the reviewers visit before the review team's visit; it is appropriate for the reviewee to explain the purpose of the visit. Each member of the review team will visit the classroom twice during the semester (preferably together, to facilitate discussion of that day's materials and approach used). Reviewers should arrive early, and should stay for the entire class.

The **supplemental information (type A)** for the dossier should be organized as follows:

- A. Reprints of 3 representative papers published while at Auburn
- B. Any other pertinent information that the candidate wishes to include
- C. Letters not solicited by the P&T committee – these are not required and should not be received by the Candidate; rather, the Candidate should direct evaluators to submit letters directly to the P&T committee for inclusion.

Supplemental information (type B) – reviewed only by DBS

- A. Written comments from students
- B. Course syllabi

III. Annual Review & Vote by Faculty

The “tenure clock” typically begins on August 16. All untenured assistant professors will submit their dossier and supplemental information each year (usually early to mid-October) to the P&T Committee who will check it for formatting issues and accuracy. Inclusion of materials documenting prior service (i.e., time in rank prior to Auburn University) as part of the tenure packet may be included if approved by the Provost at the outset of hire. After revisions have been made, the packet will be sent to the tenured faculty for review. The tenured faculty will discuss the progress of each dossier at an annual meeting and an advisory vote will be taken (see sections X and XI). Eligible faculty also will submit written comments. The untenured faculty member will meet with the DBS Chair, Mentor, and P&T Chair to learn the outcome of the vote and meeting, usually within 1 week after the meeting. If consistent substandard performance dictates, the Candidate may receive a letter of non-continuation from the Dean after the 3rd year review.

IV. Third-Year Review

The 3rd-year review will occur no later than 32 months after initial appointment, normally before April 30 of the faculty member's 3rd year of appointment. The untenured faculty member will submit the packet and supplemental information for review by the tenured faculty who will then meet and vote. The P&T committee will write a report summarizing the meeting, and the DBS Chair will write a separate evaluation describing the Candidate's progress towards P&T. The untenured faculty member will then meet with the DBS Chair, Mentor, and P&T Chair to discuss the outcome of the vote and meeting and to receive an oral summary of the P&T report of the faculty meeting. The DBS Chair's letter is considered confidential.

AU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.7 Performance Evaluation:

Each department shall conduct a third year review of all its probationary faculty members. This shall take place no later than 32 months after initial appointment, normally before April 30 of the faculty member's third year. The head shall request a current vita and any supporting material the head or the faculty member deems appropriate prior to the review. The particular focus of this review is the faculty member's progress toward achieving tenure. The review therefore must address the criteria for tenure set forth in this document. To be maximally useful to the candidate and the department, the review shall involve the entire tenured faculty. In order for it to accurately reveal the judgment of tenured faculty, it shall conclude with a vote on whether or not, in the judgment of the tenured faculty, the candidate is making appropriate progress toward tenure. The result of the vote shall be announced at the meeting. Faculty should understand that this vote is not a commitment to grant or deny tenure in the future.

The Head (or Chair) shall prepare a written report covering the findings of the review, and characterizing the nature of the vote. The procedure described above for the report on the yearly conference shall be followed, with the difference that this report may be consulted by the tenured faculty when the faculty member is a candidate for tenure; otherwise, the report is to remain confidential.

V. Tenure Review

According to the Handbook, there is no set schedule for Tenure, but usually 4 years of complete service are required to demonstrate competency for tenure. A bid for tenure prior to the 4th complete year of service is considered "early" and dossier must attest to the exceptional nature of the Candidate. Under normal conditions, the Candidate is considered for Tenure during 2 of the following 3 periods:

- After 4 years – i.e., during 5th year of service; this is the “optional” year to go forward.
- After 5 years – i.e., during 6th year of service; this is the “usual” year to go forward.
- After 6 years – i.e., during 7th year of service; this is last chance to go forward. Candidates going forward after 6 years will receive letter of non-continuation by the Dean; if tenure is granted, then the letter of non-continuation will be rendered void.

NOTE: A Candidate only has 2 opportunities to be considered for tenure, whereas there is no limit to the number times the Candidate may be considered for promotion.

Assistant Professors can go forward for consideration for promotion and tenure at the end of their 4th year or end of 5th year (typical), but it is their responsibility to declare their intentions to the DBS Chair and P&T Chair. For a 6th-year candidate the process will be automatically started by the DBS Chair and the P&T Chair. All P&T bid will use the following procedure:

1. During the spring semester of the year of consideration, the Candidate contacts the DBS Chair and P&T Chair to initiate the process of consideration.
2. The Candidate submits the dossier and supplemental information to the P&T committee, who will edit the information for formatting and accuracy, and for which the Candidate revises the packet.
3. The packet is sent to external evaluators (see Section IX).
4. The DBS Chair requests updated dossiers & supplemental information from the Candidate (usually in September), which will be distributed, along with the external evaluations, to the tenured faculty for review.
5. The tenured faculty submit confidential written comments to the P&T Chair, if desired, and then meet and discuss the candidate’s readiness for promotion and tenure.
6. The Candidate’s packet is discussed and a vote taken at the annual meeting of the tenured faculty.
7. Within 1 week of the tenure meeting, the Candidate meets with the DBS Chair, Mentor, and P&T Chair to discuss the outcome of the meeting. The Candidate is provided the vote and an oral summary of the meeting prepared by the P&T Committee. Regardless of the vote, if the candidate decides to proceed, they will have one final chance to update the dossier before it is forwarded, along with letters from the tenured faculty and the DBS Chair, to the Dean and eventually to the University P&T Committee. Alternatively, if the Candidate withdraws their packet prior to submission to the Dean, it will not count as one of the two tenure bids.

VI. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor

6a. Relevant section from Faculty Handbook

*Associate Professor is a rank of distinction which is attained **through successful performance of assigned duties**. A candidate should hold the appropriate terminal degree (usually a doctorate) or the equivalent. Normally, a candidate must serve at least four complete years on full-time appointment at the assistant professor level before he or she may be nominated for promotion to associate professor. Prior faculty service at other colleges or universities or prior service in appropriate professional activities may qualify for consideration in meeting the requirement for years in rank for promotion. A candidate who is especially meritorious may be recommended for early promotion by the department head with majority support of the faculty who hold rank superior to that of the candidate.*

*A candidate for Associate Professor should have **demonstrated mastery of the subject matter** of his or her field **and the ability to apply it well in the primary area(s)** to which he or she is assigned whether in teaching, research/creative work, or outreach. Additionally, the candidate should have contributed, typically through **significant scholarly or creative work**, to his or her area of specialization; participated in professional life; and served on departmental, college or school, and/or University committees. Through his or her scholarly and professional activity, the candidate should **demonstrate an emerging stature as a regional or national authority**.” (Emphasis added as boldface)*

6b. Departmental Position on Promotion to Associate Professor

As indicated in the Handbook, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires that the Candidate demonstrate a high degree of overall academic achievement. The DBS Mission places high emphasis on Teaching, Research and Service; therefore, all tenure-track faculty members are expected to make significant contributions to each of these areas throughout their careers. A successful candidate for promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate they have met this expectation in a meritorious manner.

The faculty of DBS expect the following meritorious activities as components of any promotion consideration: 1) development of an academically rigorous instructional program at both the graduate and undergraduate level; 2) development of an independent research program, defined primarily by dissemination of ideas through peer-reviewed scholarly outlets; 3) training of graduate students; 4) acquisition of extramural funding; and 5) dedication to service. Multiple scholarly publications reflecting independent research conducted and/or directed by the Candidate while at Auburn are considered a paramount requirement for promotion. In addition, acquisition of extramural funding is usually essential for development of a research program at a level expected for DBS faculty. Successful acquisition of such funding from peer-

reviewed sources provides strong evidence that the Candidate's ideas and research are meritorious and important beyond Auburn.

Assigned appointment levels and associated workloads vary among faculty members in the Department, so the Candidate's contributions to the above areas need to be considered in context. Thus, both quality and quantity of contributions are to be considered by eligible faculty with regard to duties assigned or opportunities presented to the Candidate.

The procedure for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is normally joined to the process of consideration for Tenure. For most candidates and as specified by the Handbook, a minimum of four (4) years is needed to demonstrate and document sufficient time in rank to support a Promotion bid. Thus, most candidates are initially considered after 5 years in rank. To begin the process of promotion consideration, the Candidate should confer with the DBS Chair and the P&T Chair. The P&T Committee will provide the Candidate with guidance on the preparation and submission of the dossier (described in the Tenure section of this document) and associated materials. All communication with the P&T Committee should be directed to the P&T Chair or a committee member designated by the DBS Chair as the Candidate's liaison.

6c. Departmental Expectations for Promotion to Associate Professor

Within DBS, promotion from the rank of Assistant to Associate Professor is based on meritorious performance and scholarly activity in the areas of teaching, research and service. Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor are expected to develop a body of work that demonstrates consistent progress towards achievement of distinction in scholarship related to the core (i.e., predominant) elements of the Candidate's appointment, which traditionally is teaching and research. The Candidate also must demonstrate evidence of an emerging national/international reputation in their discipline and the potential to ultimately advance to rank of Full Professor. This level of accomplishment must be substantiated through internal and external peer review and recognition. Of particular importance is a consistent level of programmatic growth over a substantial portion of the promotion review period (i.e., over multiple years).

The DBS Faculty recognizes that the department is home to a broad spectrum of disciplines, each with a unique set of research characteristics and scholarly outlets. The Faculty values the differences among the disciplines and makes every effort to ensure that promotion materials are considered within the appropriate framework. However, the Candidate must understand that promotion is not a discipline-specific achievement, but rather one that ultimately represents a department-wide recognition of meritorious performance at Auburn.

Publication is the primary indicator of effort and success in research such that the strength of a faculty member's research record is measured by the number and quality of publications produced. There is an expected rate of 1 to 3 scholarly products per year with preference given to individuals who exhibit a steady progression of productivity. Grants provide the funds to conduct research and produce publications. Extramural grants are vital to successful research, but they are not ends unto themselves.

Expectations for each of the major areas of contribution (teaching, research, service) are outlined below. Importantly, the Candidate should understand that these are not minimum requirements, but are consensus guidelines for initiating promotion considerations as agreed upon by the DBS Faculty.

6c.1 Teaching and Instructional Scholarship Expectations

DBS has a strong tradition of excellent teaching, and thus places a high value on teaching performance. Candidates for promotion are expected to demonstrate strength in this area. Through its diverse course offerings, DBS is a leading department in providing science education to a broad spectrum of majors and non-majors. Because of the importance of its Instructional Mission to the broader university community, exemplary teaching and instructional scholarship is expected of all DBS faculty members. Successful candidates with an appropriate workload (i.e., with at least 35% teaching appointment) are expected to demonstrate a commitment to the Instructional Mission by regular participation in both graduate and undergraduate education in both formal (classroom) and informal settings (i.e., directed study, undergraduate and graduate research). Education of graduate students is a fundamental aspect of DBS teaching. As such, the Candidate's ability to contribute to the overall graduate program is weighted heavily in promotion considerations; effective direction of graduate students as major advisor is expected. Meritorious teaching alone will not qualify a candidate for promotion, although evidence of a strong commitment to effective teaching is required. Conversely, ineffective teaching can be strong contributing factor to denial of promotion.

Teaching scholarship is different from general teaching activity. Daily teaching activities, curriculum development, and course management are all standard elements of a Candidate's instructional load. These activities may contribute to teaching scholarship if there is related meritorious performance as evidenced by some form of peer review or other measurable impacts, such as awards. Instructional scholarship extends beyond these general activities to include creation of published instructional manuals, acceptance of peer-reviewed journal articles, local / national teaching awards, and successful acquisition of instructional grants. Evidence that the Candidate has advanced, and will continue to advance, the educational program of the Department through scholarly contributions and pedagogical improvements is a minimum requirement for promotion to Associate Professor.

When evaluating teaching performance, especially in undergraduate classes, tenured faculty members should consider the Candidate's assigned teaching load by the DBS Chair.

General teaching ability and scholarly productivity is assessed during each annual P&T review. Assessments may include a) student evaluations, b) peer reviews, c) student letters, d) comments from other instructors of courses in which the Candidate's teaches, e) review of scholarly products such as examples of innovative course changes provided by the Candidate, and f) input from the DBS Chair. All DBS faculty participate in classroom instruction, so teaching effectiveness is measured as a judicious but not necessarily uniform combination of classroom and research instruction. Student evaluations of classroom

performance play a key role in the process and are used to assist/guide a junior faculty member's progress. The Department recognizes that student evaluations are useful in helping judge an individual's method of presentation, course organization, sense of fairness, and ability to cultivate productive student-teacher interactions. In addition, judgment of colleagues who have attended the Candidate's class(es) and have consulted with them may provide a more informed assessment of the level, quality, and value of course content. Both types of assessment play key roles in promotion considerations, and should be given serious consideration by the Candidate.

6c.2 Research Program Development and Scholarship Expectations

A vibrant research environment is essential for the success of any modern academic unit within the Sciences. In this context, a culture of strong research activity and scholarship, foundations of discovery, and acquisition of new knowledge, are essential to the DBS Research Mission. Productivity in research and scholarly output are important because they demonstrate faculty significance to external audiences, enhance educational opportunities for DBS students, increase the national and international profile of the faculty and advance the disciplines represented within DBS. Invention Disclosures or patents that have been submitted to the Office of Technology Transfer also may be included as part of the research productivity. To meet these goals, every DBS faculty member seeking promotion or tenure is expected to develop and maintain a strong, externally funded research program.

Research accomplishments for promotion to Associate Professor can be demonstrated through significant articles published in refereed journals, authorship of books or book chapters, invitations to participate in national and international symposia, invitations to present outside lectures, invitations to serve on editorial boards of professional organizations, participation on grant review panels, invitations to review for journals, written opinions of distinguished scientists external the University, and success in securing competitive grant support for research. Faculty should understand that publication formats and rates vary among research areas, but evidence of a strong commitment to the continued production of scholarly products is required of all successful candidates.

DBS seeks evidence of sustained growth and maturation of a Candidate's research program. A steady increase in publication productivity showing clear indication of independent research scholarship provides unequivocal evidence of program development. Understandably, an initial lag period may occur for new faculty both in terms of the time required to generate publishable data and for publication time lines. DBS traditionally provides additional release time and funding support for new faculty to assist in program initiation. The Candidate is strongly advised to be aware of these lags and to incorporate them into research program planning. Failure of the Candidate to overcome these limitations can be viewed as an inability to function effectively within the existing DBS infrastructure. Starting in their first year, new faculty members are expected to aggressively seek extramural funding to support their research program. Extramural funding often correlates with research productivity. As such, inability to acquire competitive extramural funding may be viewed as potential liability in maintaining

a productive research program. Thus, lack of extramural funding most often reflects unfavorably on promotion requests.

As with teaching, evaluation of a Candidate's scholarly research activity and program growth is assessed annually in DBS. Particular attention is given to program development at the time of the third-year review. For promotion consideration, only accomplishments of the Candidate while in residence at Auburn will be considered. Successful dossiers are expected to illustrate a balanced and consistent pattern of research effort.

6c.3 Service Expectations

Service to the department, university and broader academic community is an integral component of a tenure-track appointment. All DBS faculty members are expected to be active departmental citizens. Within DBS, service is embedded in the standard appointment and candidates participate in the administration of the department through assigned committee tasks and other duties. Traditionally, DBS limits the service responsibilities requested of new faculty, with the expectation that service activity will increase during and beyond the promotion review period. As members of a major academic unit, DBS faculty have the opportunity to significantly enhance their disciplines and establish a national reputation through meritorious performance in community and professional service. All DBS faculty are expected to strive for the good of the department, college, and university in their degree of interaction with students, colleagues, and the community. As with teaching, evaluation of service within the confines of the university should take into consideration the assignments and opportunities of the Candidate.

The service requirement for promotion is assessed by review of the service section of the Candidate's dossier. This section should describe the type and extent of the Candidate's service on departmental, college, university, and professional committees. Strong dossiers typically show evidence of service activity as, for example, peer-reviewers, curators of biological collections, panel members, invited speakers and extramural committee members, with activity levels increasing over time. In this regard, comments from faculty members sharing committee work along with input for external reviewers evaluating service can carry significant weight during promotion deliberations.

6c.4 General Recommendations for New Assistant Professors

- **Teaching is an art** that requires practice to perfect. Starting with concepts that you know well, and then progressively increasing the complexity of the material presented as you learn to effectively interrelate concepts, is acceptable. The Candidate should periodically request input from students on how to improve classroom instruction (e.g., Small Groups Instructional Feedback (SGIF) input from the Biggio Center). One should take time to know the audience and optimize their pedagogical approach. The Candidate should not overreact to student evaluations but, in consultation with their Mentor, integrate student comments as they work to improve their courses.

- **Begin your research immediately.** Startup of any independent research program requires substantial time and effort.
- **Plan to do much of the initial work yourself.** Do not depend solely on graduate or undergraduate students for early publishable results; students will need time and your availability to become effective researchers. You may want to consider hiring part- or full-time technical help, including post-doctoral researchers, once your program is functioning.
- **Seek out quality graduate students** to integrate into your program. Once trained, these individuals can be a key component of any research. However, mentoring graduate students requires significant time, thus taking on marginal or poor students may be more detrimental than not having students right away. Avoid becoming overloaded with non-thesis (MST-NT) students as they often are in residence awaiting professional school, imposing on your time and rarely producing scholarly products. Also carefully **consider how undergraduates are best incorporated** into your program. Training of undergraduates is important, but may be most productive within well-established research programs.
- **Publish early.** Early publication attracts attention and lets others in your field know that you are an active investigator. It also is a primary means of attracting good graduate students. Be sure that this **work is readily distinguishable from that of your former mentors.**
- Consider publishing a **single-author review article** in your area. Development of such articles may help you understand a new area and can place your name at the forefront of discussion in a discipline.
- Make all necessary efforts to **publish regularly.** Success in promotion depends heavily on favorable recognition of your work by external reviewers; often, they will know and evaluate you primarily by your published work. Be sensitive to the issues of both quantity and quality. Questions will arise about a promotion dossier showing few publications in refereed journals and/or with a paucity of papers in major outlets in your field. Your external evaluators should recognize 1 or 2 of your papers as a major contribution in the discipline.
- **Attend and present at meetings** / invited seminars. You should plan to participate in at least in at least 1 major and 1 smaller meeting per year. Give at least 1 presentation in such forums each year. Meetings provide excellent opportunities to network and build your reputation.
- Seek out service on a regional or national **grant review panel.** These are excellent opportunities to learn about the funding process as well as being demonstrations of your value to the discipline.
- Volunteer to **serve on committees within a major professional society** in your discipline.

- **Get grant funding early.** Submit proposals for “starter” grants early, preferably before you arrive on campus. In your first year, plan to submit a major proposal to funding agencies that use a critical review system. Understand that under current highly competitive conditions, multiple submissions will likely be required. If your proposal is not funded, consider carefully the comments, adjust the proposal appropriately and resubmit at the very next opportunity. Seek advice from your Mentor or other senior colleagues and/or the COSAM Associate Dean for Research on improving your proposal. Also, discuss reviews with the appropriate program officer/director.
- Consider carefully your **use of “startup” funds**. Funds provided by the department are not a research grant; they are intended to provide you with the means to acquire the necessary data to successfully compete for extramural funding, in time period designed in your offer letter. How you use these funds can play multiple roles in promotion decisions. Your startup funds come at a considerable cost to others. By accepting this limited departmental resource, you are accepting a responsibility to advance both your and the Department’s research programs.
- **Listen** to your Mentor and other senior faculty members. They understand the system and have a vested interest in helping you succeed.
- Consider carefully how you approach **collaborative research**. The latter is important and may be beneficial to you and DBS. If you participate in a joint research venture, make sure your participation is clearly distinguishable so there are no doubts about the extent of your separate and meritorious contributions. Participation in interdisciplinary research is encouraged as long as your identity on the work is clear and significant.
- Be willing to **assist others with your expertise, but be judicious** with your time. New faculty are valued because they bring new techniques, ideas, and skills to a department. Sharing of expertise with your colleagues, especially graduate students, is strongly encouraged. However, be careful of your time. Tactfully request co-authorship if you make significant or unique contributions to any research. Avoid the perception of becoming a departmental “technician” just because you have special skills.
- **Participate in departmental governance and service** activities. As a new faculty member you should have few service duties, but serve conscientiously on any duties to which you are assigned. You have an important stake in the successful operation of DBS; thus, you should endeavor to understand how and why departmental decisions are made and welcome opportunities to participate in this important decision-making.

- Take time to learn the system and **be flexible**. No two academic institutions operate in exactly the same way. You must demonstrate that you can function effectively within the existing infrastructure. Pontificating about “how things worked” at University X is rarely fruitful. However, do not be afraid to pick up the phone and query individuals about the “system”.
- **Don’t be afraid to say “No”** when appropriate. Although you need to consider the above activities, new faculty often find themselves overcommitted. In particular, saying “no” to senior faculty or the DBS Chair can be difficult, but you must keep your workload manageable while simultaneously meeting the expectations for P&T. The DBS Chair and Mentor will strive to help you to achieve a balance between too few and too many commitments.
- Miscommunications or tense situations sometimes develop in the workplace. In such cases, **consult with your Mentor**. S/he often can provide an indirect communication channel to resolve issues.

VII. Promotion to Rank of Full Professor

An Associate Professor is considered for promotion to the rank of Full Professor (hereafter “Professor”) after consultation with the DBS Chair. Ideally, the dossier should be sent to the Professors in the fall, and a “straw vote” on readiness will be taken. In the spring, the dossier and supplemental information are then submitted to the DBS P&T Committee for comment on formatting and editorial review. Revisions are made then by the Candidate, and distributed to external evaluators by the P&T Committee (see section IX). The Candidate’s dossier, external letters, and supplemental information are discussed at a meeting of the Professors (usually in September), who discuss the dossier and then vote (see section XI). The Candidate is encouraged to choose an “Advocate” to present their dossier in meetings, similar to the role of the Mentor for untenured faculty.

7a. Relevant section from Faculty Handbook (section 6):

Professor is a rank requiring professional peer-recognition of the individual as an authority in his or her field of specialization. A candidate must be recognized by associates as a capable teacher, scholar or artist, or outreach specialist. It is therefore expected that peers within and outside the University will attest to the candidate’s high professional standing. A candidate should hold the appropriate terminal degree (usually a doctorate) or the equivalent. Normally, a candidate must serve at least four complete years on full-time appointment at the associate professor level before he or she may be nominated for promotion to professor. Only in exceptional and well-documented cases, in which a faculty member has substantially exceeded requirements for promotion to Professor in a shorter time, should he or she be recommended for early promotion by the

department head, with majority support of the faculty members who hold rank superior to that of the candidate.

A candidate for Professor should have demonstrated significant involvement in the teaching, research/creative work, or the outreach functions of the University. He or she should also have participated in professional life and have been actively involved in departmental, college or school, and University affairs. For this rank, it is essential that the candidate should have demonstrated a marked degree of scholarship appropriate to his or her assignment through work, typically publication or creative endeavor, subjected to peer review. By means of such activity, a candidate for the University's highest academic rank should have a respected national reputation.

Promotion is based on merit. A candidate for promotion should have acceptable achievements in the areas of 1) teaching and/or outreach and 2) research/creative work. He or she is further expected to demonstrate over a sustained period distinctive achievement in one of these areas or achievement in both areas comparable to that of successful candidates in the discipline in the past five years. In addition, he or she is expected to have contributed some service to the University. The criteria for teaching, research/creative work, and outreach described below shall be considered by the faculty in the evaluation of a candidate's performance and achievement. The candidate's employment conditions and academic assignments shall determine which criteria are most emphasized. Credit shall also be given for contributions above and beyond specifically assigned duties.

7b. Departmental Position on Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion to Professor is based on merit, and should reflect excellence in teaching, research and/or service. A viable candidate for Professor will be able to document a sustained and high-quality commitment to all 3 areas for a minimum of 4 years. In addition, they must demonstrate a strong national and international reputation in at least 1 of these areas. Within DBS, documenting excellence and a strong reputation in research is the most typical route of promotion to Professor. Involvement in the 3 core areas, and high achievement in the primary area, should clearly be above the expectations needed to reach Associate Professor. Assessment of productivity and contributions should focus on recent efforts at the rank of Associate Professor, and thus older contributions made at the Assistant rank should be down weighted in consideration for Professor. Thus, promotion to Professor is primarily a function of specific scholarly contributions and general productivity, and not an entitlement after time in rank.

Significant participation in the undergraduate and graduate programs is a requirement for promotion to Professor. The role of the Candidate in undergraduate and graduate programs is similar to that of the Assistant Professor (section 6c); however, in most cases, a candidate's efforts will have had time to mature (except those faculty hired at Associate level). Therefore, the level of accomplishment and interaction is expected to be greater than at lower ranks. The Candidate must be an active participant in the graduate program, which typically involves successful mentoring of graduate students as an advisor, committee member, or both.

Professors are expected to act as leaders in DBS and should actively participate in departmental, college, and university service to a greater degree than faculty in lower ranks. They are expected to promote collegiality and foster the development of the junior faculty. Additionally, they should promote a dynamic atmosphere to an ever-improving department rather than allowing or perpetuating stagnation of DBS programs or initiatives.

As stated above for Associate Professor, DBS is home to a broad spectrum of disciplines. This high diversity should be recognized and discussed in the promotion process; however, promotion represents a department-wide recognition of meritorious performance by all candidates, subject to rigor. The successful Candidate will have maintained an extramurally funded research program of international stature, and produced a minimum of 1 to 3 high-quality scholarly products per year. In the atypical case where international reputation has been built more on teaching or service contributions than research, the dossier should document high levels of sustained productivity and scholarship in these areas. Furthermore, the Candidate's reputation and impact are more easily assessed if their contributions are recognized by a broad community rather than a narrow and specialized group.

Expectations for each of the major areas of contribution (teaching, research, service) are outlined below. These represent consensus guidelines for initiating promotion considerations as agreed upon by DBS Faculty, rather than absolute minimum requirements.

7c. Departmental Expectations for Full Professor

Expectations for promotion to the rank of Professor follow on to the expectations for teaching, research and service/outreach detailed above for Associate Professor; however, levels of expectations should be higher as evidence that the Candidate's program has matured.

Candidates for Professor are expected to be leaders in their discipline with several significant contributions to that field. A viable candidate will have a sustained program in all 3 areas. As their international reputation grows in research (or, less typically, teaching or service), their dossier will usually include an increased non-Auburn service component (e.g., review of manuscripts or proposal, proposal panels, major or multiple offices held in scientific societies, invited presentations, public comments on policy, etc). As a result, viable candidates usually will have a very strong dossier in research and teaching/service.

Whether in research or teaching, a candidate for promotion to Professor will most likely have accumulated multiple extramurally funded grants and high-quality peer-reviewed publications during the review period. However, increased emphasis is placed on publication quality and quantity rather than the number, kind, or dollar amount of grants received. Other contributions, such as synthesis-based books or book chapters, may profoundly change a research field, and thus should be weighed appropriately in a promotion bid. Promotion at this level usually favors a strong research program; but, as with promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, a strong teaching program alone likely will not justify promotion, and a weak teaching program will reflect negatively on the Candidate. Nonetheless, a strong teaching program is expected. In addition, significant contributions to graduate student development are required, such as advising a

PhD student to completion, serving on graduate advisory committees, and teaching graduate courses.

Criteria used to judge suitability for promotion to Professor are generally the same as for promotion to Associate Professor, although the level of rigor is significantly higher. Another major difference is the weight given to external letters used to assess a Candidate's national and international reputation. Such external evaluations provide a critical source of information pertaining to the Candidate's scholarly contributions to the discipline. Likewise, a Candidate's service activity outside of Auburn reflects the degree to which the Candidate's opinions, insights, and contributions are valued by the community at large. Thus, external letters and service contributions are typically weighted much heavier for promotion to Professor because they provide a useful evaluation of one's academic reputation.

VIII. Consideration for Tenure

8a. Relevant sections from Faculty Handbook (section 9)

Tenure

*Decisions on tenure **are different in kind from those on promotion. Tenure, in fact, is more exacting. In addition to demonstrating quality in the areas of 1) teaching, 2) research/creative work, 3) outreach and 4) service as described above under Promotion Criteria, the candidate for tenure **must also demonstrate professional collegiality.***** (Emphasis added as boldface)

Collegiality

*.....Concerns relevant to collegiality include the following: Are the candidate's professional abilities and relationships with colleagues **compatible with the departmental mission and with its long-term goals?** Has the candidate exhibited an **ability and willingness to engage in shared academic and administrative tasks** that a departmental group must often perform and to participate with some measure of reason and knowledge in discussions germane to departmental policies and programs? Does the candidate maintain high standards of professional integrity?*

Collegiality can best be evaluated at the departmental level. Concerns respecting collegiality should be shared with the candidate **as soon as they arise;* they should certainly be addressed in the yearly review and the third year review."* (Emphasis added as boldface)

8b. Departmental Position on Tenure

The DBS Faculty view Tenure as a critical element in the overall success of both the individual faculty member and the department. The sufferance to pursue scholarly activities unencumbered by internal or external pressures, a right provided by Tenure, is one of the most highly valued of academic freedoms. In decisions regarding granting of Tenure, DBS gives great consideration to both the freedoms and the long-term responsibilities associated with this decision. As

stated in the Handbook, Tenure is separate and distinct from promotion, requiring consideration of additional issues. It is recognized that academic, research and service achievements form the basis for Tenure decisions, but it is the additional concept of Collegiality that makes this decision unique. DBS faculty strongly support the position presented in the Handbook that Collegiality is not equated to whether a candidate is “liked” or “disliked”. Rather, collegiality is directly related to how successfully a candidate functions as a departmental citizen. It is the responsibility of those considering a candidate for Tenure to consider how well the individual fulfills this role and what the likelihood is that such commitment will continue in the long-term. Tenure is granted on a permanent basis, so voting faculty must, by necessity, predict how well the department, college, and university will meet the long-term needs of the Candidate and, in turn, how the Candidate will meet the goals and needs of the department.

- Tenure decisions are based on 2 primary considerations:
1. The degree to which the Candidate contributes significantly to the department’s academic community, now and in the future, in terms of continued advancement of the department’s programs, students, and Mission through either direct or indirect means, and
 2. The degree to which the Candidate demonstrates they can function effectively as a valuable departmental participant over a 25-to 30-year career given the limitations imposed by the department and university infrastructure.

8c. Departmental Expectations for Tenure

Granting of Tenure in DBS is based on the following criteria and minimum expectations. The Department realizes that fulfillment of criteria is sometimes limited by the level of a faculty member’s professional obligations.

Examples of Good Citizenship Attributes in the Department

- Willingness to help others’ graduate students or undergraduate advisees when feasible
- Attendance and active participation at faculty meetings and seminars
- Willingness to participate enthusiastically in departmental service activities
- General availability to students and faculty
- Promptness in carrying out assigned committee tasks
- Ability to present positive solutions to problems rather than simply criticizing proposals put forth by others
- Participation in the maintenance of shared laboratory equipment.
- High diligence and responsibility in the workplace

Examples of Good Collegiality

- Willingness to interact in a positive manner with DBS faculty
- Willingness to collaborate on research projects where appropriate
- Open-mindedness to others’ interests and opinions
- Non-hostile nature
- A good team-player in DBS service and administrative tasks

- Showing high ethical standards and abiding by them
- Showing high integrity and high professional standards

In addition to the above examples, a candidate must demonstrate an ability to carry out their departmental expectations in teaching, research and service. Failure to fulfill their minimum obligations to the Department will create an undo burden on other DBS faculty, thus putting the department and fellow faculty in a negative situation.

8d. Procedure for Tenure Consideration

The procedure for Tenure consideration is normally joined to the consideration of promotion to Associate Professor. In rare cases, Tenure may be considered separately. Such cases would include recruitment to the department of a senior faculty member with existing Rank and Tenure elsewhere. Materials required for consideration for Promotion or Tenure are generally identical. The Candidate should prepare and submit a standard dossier as described elsewhere in this document. Discussion and vote for Tenure is conducted following the procedures outlined in Sections X and XI below.

IX. Procedure for Solicitation of External Letters

9a. Relevant section from Faculty Handbook

*The department head (or the dean) shall solicit information from outside referees in the case of candidates nominated for **full professor** or librarian IV or archivist IV; **he or she may do so in other cases**. In consultation with the candidate and the faculty voting on the candidate the head (or dean) shall compile a list of potential evaluators. He or she shall then **seek responses from at least three** of the potential evaluators. These **evaluators shall be people outside of Auburn University who are nationally acknowledged experts** in the candidate's field and can comment on the quality and reputation of the candidate's work. If the evaluator is from an academic institution, he or she **shall be of higher academic rank than the candidate**. Letters from the candidate's major professor for a graduate degree, from former graduate students, and from ongoing research partners are unacceptable. Evaluators may be associated with industry, government agencies, foundations, etc. If these letters arrive in time, they shall be made available to the voting faculty; otherwise, they shall be sent on to the Promotion and Tenure Committee.*
(Emphasis added as boldface)

9b. Departmental Position on External Letters

External letters are only required by the Handbook for candidates seeking promotion to the rank of Professor, but DBS and COSAM have a long history of requiring letters for those individuals seeking Tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor. The Department views positive external peer recognition of a candidate's scholarly efforts as a fundamentally important indicator of academic achievement. Inclusion of comments by external evaluators provides evidence of such achievement and has historically been a key factor in the department's success at positive P&T outcomes at the university level. External reviews by individuals directly involved in the candidate's research area provide essential context relative to specific issues, limitations and expectations in the various sub-disciplines represented in the department. Based on these considerations, DBS views inclusion of external letters as a **departmental requirement** in all cases. All solicited letters received **must** be included in the dossier; no form of selective pre-review is appropriate. The guidelines for the external letter process may be found at <http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/policies.html>

9c. Procedure for External Letter Solicitation

The procedure for solicitation of external letters is similar for both Associate and Professor promotion bids, with the exception of the **minimum number** of letters required. For Associate Professor, the department's minimum number of external letters is **four (4)**; for Professor, the minimum is **eight (8)**. In both cases, letters in excess of these minimums are welcome and indeed may be essential if they address unique aspects of the Candidate's scholarly effort and/or if there is a history of issues with earlier considerations of the Candidate.

Procedural Steps for Consideration of Tenure and the Associated Calendar:

1. Once the initial packet review is completed, a list of potential evaluators is compiled by the DBS P&T committee – (**early May**)
 - a. Names are obtained from:
 - i. Candidate's Mentor
 - ii. Senior faculty in candidate's research area
 - iii. Voting DBS faculty
 - iv. P&T Committee
 - b. Process continues until 15+ names have been identified
 - c. P&T Committee verifies names on evaluator list
 - i. Rank must be at or above rank sought
 - ii. Professional status – current position / availability
 - iii. Evidence of existing / pass association with candidate with exclusions including:
 1. Previous mentor relationship (Major Professor, etc.)
 2. Fellow graduate students / post-doctoral
 3. Co-authorship / research collaborations
 4. Other professional associations
 - d. Candidate (through faculty mentor) is asked to provide names of individuals **to be considered for exclusion** from evaluator list (Active research competitors for example)

- e. P&T committee in consultation with faculty mentor and others identifies 8+ of the most appropriate evaluators for contact. Priorities for selection include:
 - i. National / International prominence in candidate's area
 - ii. Direct knowledge of candidate's research area
 - iii. Editorship or similar position that provides broad perspective
 - iv. Regional knowledge if appropriate for candidate's area
 - v. Active research program at institution of equal or higher standing than AU
 - vi. Experience with P&T process – holds rank at academic institution or has experience with process if in industry / non-academic position
- f. One member of P&T committee is assigned duties for soliciting letters
 - i. Contacts each evaluator (email, phone, postal) to determine if they are willing / available to provide review (**late May**). Contacts are made by starting at the top of the list (order by committee) and contacting individuals until a minimum of **4 (8 for Professor)** respond affirmatively. Committee will revisit evaluator list if responses are not received.
 - 1. Initial contact includes:
 - a. Brief overview of candidate's area and achievements
 - b. General information of requirements for rank being sought
 - ii. Provides dossier and letter outlining AU P&T process to those evaluators that respond affirming willingness to participate. Letters are requested for return by **30 June**
 - iii. Member sends follow-up correspondence one (1) week before letters are due.
 - iv. Member continues process until at least four (4) letters have been obtained.
 - v. Letters prepared for dossier
 - 1. Electronic versions are generated (scans - PDF)
 - 2. Position, Institution and Biographical summaries are generated for each evaluator and included in dossier. Originals of all letters received are provided to the DBS Chair for inclusion in the candidate's personnel file.

X. Agenda for Meeting of Tenured Faculty

The following agenda is used for meetings of the tenured faculty for annual review, 3rd-year review, and tenure-year review of untenured faculty and for promotion.

The P&T Committee will serve in the following capacities:

- Chairs & moderates meeting
- Reads written comments
- Records the votes events of the meeting
- Writes summary of the meeting

Order of Meeting:

- Call to order; attendance taken (meeting proceeds if quorum present, i.e., 50% + 1).
- Explanation of any changes in procedure
- Candidates are discussed in alphabetical order

The following are provided on behalf of each Candidate:

- Mentor gives a 3-5 minute summary of the Candidate's program and a summary of previous votes
- Confidential written comments from faculty are read
- Discussion of Candidate's teaching efforts
- Discussion of Candidate's research program
- Discussion of Candidate's efforts in service activities
- Discussion of Candidate's characteristics that merit tenure
- Discussion of the external letters
- Other discussion
- Vote by secret paper ballot for promotion and for tenure
- Tally of ballots and oral summary

XI. Voting Procedure

There are 2 types of votes, a vote for tenure and vote for promotion.

Candidate's status	Consideration of	Those eligible to vote
Untenured Assistant Professor	Tenure	Tenured faculty
Untenured Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Associate & Full Professors (tenured & untenured)
Untenured Associate Professor	Tenure	Tenured faculty
Untenured Associate Professor	Professor	Full professors
Tenured Associate Professor	Professor	Tenured Full Professors
Untenured Full Professor	Tenure	Tenured faculty

Faculty who are eligible to vote may cast votes in the following ways:

- Attend the faculty meeting and vote by secret paper ballot
- Be absent from meeting and vote by secret paper ballot or by an “emailed vote” to the P&T Chair and the DBS Chair.

The ballot will appear as follows:

	Candidate's Name	
	Promotion	Tenure
YES	_____	_____
NO	_____	_____
ABSTAIN	_____	_____

Numerical results will be recorded as:

	Number
# Faculty eligible to vote	
# Present & Voting Yes	
# Present & Voting No	
# Present & Abstaining	
# Absent & Voting Yes	
# Absent & Voting No	
# Absent & Abstaining	
# Faculty not voting	

XII. Post-meeting Conference & Actions

The Candidate will confer with the DBS Chair after each annual meeting of the tenured faculty. After the faculty meetings for the 3rd-year review and for tenure and promotion, the Mentor and P&T Chair will also attend the conference, which will be held no more than 1 week after the faculty meeting. The Candidate will be provided with the (a) vote and (b) an oral summary of the faculty meeting, the written version of which will be included in the dossier as information for the Dean and Provost, and as a separate evaluation from that of the DBS Chair. The summary is intended to be an objective accounting of major points in the meeting and is prepared *collectively* by the P&T Committee. The summary report will be reviewed by a tenured associate or full professor who has attended the P&T meeting and is not a member of the P&T Committee to ensure the summary report is complete, fair, and objective. In cases of formal consideration of P&T, the Candidate will have the option to withdraw the packet from consideration.

XIII. Time Table

Below is a sample of a general timetable; the dates give a rough idea of plausible dates.

For Tenure and/or Promotion:

April 27: Dossiers/supplemental info due to P&T Committee for editorial/formatting check

May 15: Corrected dossiers/supplemental sent to external evaluators

July 1: External letters due

September 15: Dossiers/supplemental info/letters sent to faculty for review

October 1-15: Faculty meeting to discuss and vote on Candidate

November 1: Dossiers/supplemental info/letters submitted to Dean with departmental recommendation. NO INFORMATION MAY BE ADDED TO DOSSIER AFTER NOV 1.

December 1: Dossiers/supplemental info/letters due to office of Provost

March 15: Promotion & Tenure deliberations completed

April 1: Appeals received by University Committee

May 3: Promotion & Tenure process completed

Appendix 1
Department of Biological Sciences Peer Review Report Form

General Information

Instructor	
Reviewers	
Course Title and Number	
Semester and Year	
Enrollment (provided by instructor)	

Brief description of student demographics (e.g., approximate distribution of student majors, class level, whether course an elective or required for most of the students or major):

Other comments:

Evaluation of Course Materials

Course syllabus	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Grading standards and policies are clearly described and consistent with AU policies						
Topics and exam dates are clearly described						
Exams	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Format is appropriate for course objectives and class size						
Exam is appropriately rigorous for class level						
Course materials	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Materials are well organized and consistently presented						
Assignments, if given, are clearly described and provide appropriate feedback to students						
Course Content	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Content includes important knowledge and concepts in the field						
Content is up to date						
Content appropriate for prerequisites and student background						

Classroom Evaluation

Lecture Organization and Presentation	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Topics are logically presented						
Topics are summarized and important points occasionally restated						
Linkages are made to prior knowledge and/or course themes when appropriate						
Material is presented at an appropriate pace						
Presentations (such as board work, power point, overheads, etc.) are legible and organized						
Media are used appropriately and support learning						
Instructional Strategies	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The instructor's choice of teaching techniques is appropriate for the goals						
The instructor provides clear explanations						
The instructor provides alternative explanations when needed						
The instructor responds to student involvement (such as questions, discussion) clearly and appropriately						
The instructor encourages critical thinking (i.e. through questioning or other techniques)						
Presentation style and rapport	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The instructor speaks clearly and makes eye contact						
The instructor is enthusiastic						
Students are encouraged to ask questions						
The instructor holds the class's attention						

Summary

Overall teaching effectiveness:

Exceeds Expectations (> 4+)

Meets Expectations (2.5-4)

Below Expectations (< 2.5)

Comments

End of Peer Review Form