

Roles, Scope, Criteria, Standards and Procedures  
of the  
Microbiology and Immunology  
Colleges of Agriculture and Letters and Sciences  
(Name of Department/School/College)

Effective Date: 4/23/2019

APPROVALS

SIGNATURE

DATE

Mark T. Quinn  
Department Faculty

Mark T. Quinn  
Chair, Primary Review Committee

4/23/19

Mark Jutila  
Primary Administrative Reviewer

Mark Jutila  
Department Head/Director

4/24/19

N/A

Intermediate Review Committee

Chair, Intermediate Review Committee

MCSL C. RAE  
Sneekala Bajwa  
Intermediate Administrative Reviewer

[Signature]  
College Dean

5/2/19  
4/30/19

David Ertle  
Robert K. A. Peterson  
College Review Committee

[Signature]  
Chair, College Review Committee

5/3/19  
4/25/19

DAVID T. SINGEL  
University Retention, Tenure and Promotion

[Signature]  
Chair, University Retention, Tenure and Promotion

Robert L. Mokwa  
Provost

[Signature]  
5.7.19

# Role and Scope Document for Microbiology and Immunology

## Article I. Role and Scope of Unit

Microbiology and Immunology are exciting fields that are crucial to understanding everything from natural and human-made ecosystems, human and animal health, infectious disease, microbial ecology, molecular evolution, clean water, alternative energy, the potential for life beyond earth, and climate change. The Department of Microbiology & Immunology (MBI) at Montana State University (MSU) consists of a unique combination of expertise in cell and developmental biology, pathogen biology, host/pathogen interactions, immunology/immunopathology, immunotoxicology, disease ecology, epidemiology, microbial ecology, biofilm biology, bioremediation, biofuels, astrobiology, and geomicrobiology. With this diverse expertise, the department strives to provide a broad and thorough curriculum to both undergraduate and graduate students that are encouraged to cross boundaries and push their studies/research via interactions across departments and colleges. MBI currently is in both the College of Agriculture (COA) and the College of Letters and Science (CLS) and strives to meet the missions of both colleges. MBI dossiers for retention, tenure, and promotion are reviewed by both colleges. The departmental instructional prospectus strives to incorporate American Society for Microbiology (ASM) guidelines for a broad curriculum that includes molecular evolution, microbial and disease ecology, cell structure/function, metabolism, information flow, bioinformatics, hematology, immunology, and pathogenesis of different microbial systems. It is also crucial that microbiology students become competent in general microbiological techniques and acquire critical scientific thinking skills. For undergraduates, the department has seven main tracks within the Microbiology major: 1) Microbiology, 2) Environmental Microbiology, 3) Pre-Med, 4) Environmental Health, 5) Biotechnology, 6) Pre-Vet, and 7) Medical Laboratory Science. A Microbiology minor is also available to enrich other majors. Additionally, the department provides advising for all Pre-veterinary students at MSU and offers a Certificate in Pre-Veterinary Medicine. At the graduate level, the Department offers Masters of Science and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degrees in microbiology and immunology.

MBI is housed in the newly renovated Cooley Labs, renovated laboratory space in Leon Johnson Hall, the Health Sciences Building in the Advanced Technology Park, and the Engineering and Physical Sciences (now called Barnard Hall) building. The department houses the Center for Zoonotic and Emerging Infectious Diseases and the Center for Wildlife Health, including large animal ABSL-2 and small animal BSL-3 facilities, and contributes significantly to the Center for Biofilm Engineering, the Thermal Biology Institute, and the Montana Institute on Ecosystems at MSU. The department also supports the Montana Medical Laboratory Science Professional Program, and MBI faculty direct and teach in the new WIMU Cooperative Veterinary Medicine program and are also involved in the WWAMI Medical Education program. WIMU is an important part of the mission of the department and tenure-track faculty in this program hold their tenure rights in MBI.

In research, the goal of the department is to develop and maintain independent research programs in multiple areas of basic and applied microbiology, virology, bacteriology, parasitology, mycology, immunology, host/pathogen interactions, epidemiology, genomics/bioinformatics, toxicology, microbial/disease ecology and molecular and cell biology. The term “biological sciences” is used as a common reference to the diversity of the research efforts in MBI. MBI faculty members: 1) support their research as principal investigators with funds from external and internal sources; 2) supervise

graduate thesis and dissertation research; 3) publish original research observations in rigorously reviewed professional journals; 4) publish scholarly review articles and books; and 5) present the results of their research at national and international meetings. Faculty members in the department are also engaged in cooperative and collaborative research efforts with other scientists on and off campus. MBI faculty are funded by multiple agencies, such as NIH, USDA, Gates, DoD, NSF, DoE, NASA, USGS, NPS, and MAES.

*Montana Agricultural Experiment Station Mission.* A major component of the MBI research program is its mission to address research needs of Montana through the Montana Agricultural Experiment Station (MAES). State support through MAES provides funding for a significant portion of MBI faculty FTE, which is roughly 50% of the state support of the department. To receive MAES funding, MBI faculty must have a competitive grant program focused on research relevant to animal health, including livestock and/or wildlife. Most MAES projects in MBI focus on zoonotic infectious diseases, though some are uniquely focused on animal health, including studies of disease transmission between livestock and wildlife.

In instruction, faculty strive to: 1) maintain rigorous, updated, and appropriate curricula for undergraduate and/or graduate students majoring in microbiology, immunology and biotechnology; 2) offer undergraduate and graduate courses in general, medical (pre-med and pre-vet), and environmental microbiology, medical laboratory sciences, genomics and bioinformatics, biotechnology, and support the curricula in related fields; 3) provide undergraduate students with guidance in independent labs; 4) offer appropriate courses for students majoring in other fields, such as nursing, environmental sciences, ecology, animal and range sciences, cell biology, health sciences, biomedical science, and engineering; 5) provide faculty to teach courses to medical students in the WWAMI and WIMU Programs; 6) offer courses that fulfill university core curriculum requirements; and 7) maintain M.S. and Ph.D. programs of national stature.

Faculty members perform departmental, university, local, and national and international service. Service activities that are encouraged include: 1) participation on appropriate departmental, university and state committees; 2) membership on editorial boards of high quality professional journals; 3) service on study sections or evaluation panels that review grant applications; 4) service to professional societies; 5) any activities, including writing, lecturing and consulting, that promote a better public understanding of science, education or scholarship; and 6) multiple service activities to engage and/or educate the public in general.

## **Article II. Appointment and Advancement of Research Faculty**

Research faculty members in MBI normally have a 100% research assignment, supported completely by research (grants and contracts) funding. However, a research faculty member may serve as an “adjunct” instructor for a class or in a service role for the university, but this requires non-research funding sources for these efforts. Below are procedures/descriptions for types of appointments, mechanism of hiring into an appointment, and criteria/standards for each research appointment.

## **Types of Research Appointments**

- **Postdoctoral Research Associate/Postdoctoral Scholar:** An individual who is engaged in advanced scholarship or research, frequently as part of a research team. Postdoctoral positions require a terminal degree; appointment is renewable annually for up to four years. Individuals cannot be reappointed to this title after four years of service (per Faculty Handbook). Postdoctoral appointees are not research faculty and are not expected to participate in the instructional program of the university. MSU policy does not allow Postdoctoral Fellows to serve as PI or co-PI on grant proposals except for fellowship applications.
- **Research Scientist/Senior Research Scientist:** Experienced researchers (Ph.D., D.V.M., M.D.) engaged in on-going research projects and experiments, and who have minimal or no academic or instructional responsibilities. Research Scientists may be PI or co-PI on grant proposals, though they are not research faculty. Research Scientists typically are neither responsible for their own support nor have research space assigned to them, but are supported (space and at least partial salary support) by their supervisor or collaborators. If a Research Scientist acquires independent grant support, they have the opportunity to potentially move into a Research Track Faculty position providing that they accept the additional responsibilities and they submit an application that is reviewed by the Microbiology and Immunology faculty (see section B below).
- **Research Faculty:** Research Faculty appointments are potentially long term. Research Faculty members have some instructional expectations. The instructional expectation can be met in a variety of ways, but will mainly focus on teaching efforts related to research (leading journal clubs for example) and inclusion of students in their research programs. These efforts must meet the expectations of the department and will be reviewed for effectiveness in Annual Reviews. Any formal teaching duties, such as adjunct instructor, will be paid for by institutional funds. Research Faculty members are expected to be PIs on grants that provide their support (for those just appointed at the Assistant Professor level, there must be demonstrated potential). Continuation of these positions is contingent on independent research funding held by the Research Faculty member. If an Associate or Full Research Professor loses funding, a reasonable period of time (no less than a year and normally not to exceed two years) will usually be granted to re-new funding, based on an acceptable plan for the submission of new grants, adequate support to maintain employment, and meeting the requirements of the Office of Sponsored Programs for Principle Investigators at MSU.

### **Levels of Research Faculty**

- a. Assistant Research Professor
- b. Associate Research Professor
- c. Research Professor

### **Role/Expectations of Research Faculty**

1. All MBI Research Faculty must meet the guidelines of the Office of Sponsored Programs concerning who can serve as a Principal Investigator at Montana State University.

2. All MBI Research Faculty are expected to perform research consistent with the mission of Microbiology and Immunology and involve students in their research program.
3. All MBI Research Faculty are expected to seek funding for their research programs and maintain an independently funded research program.
4. Associate Research Professors and above are eligible to serve as co-advisors for graduate students working on M.S. and/or Ph.D. theses/dissertations.
5. All MBI Research Faculty are eligible to serve on committees for M.S. and Ph.D. students.
6. All MBI Research Faculty are eligible to serve on departmental committees, except those restricted to Tenure Track Faculty, such as the Promotion and Tenure Review Committee. Associate and Full Research Professors can serve as Chairs of some Departmental Committees, except, again, those restricted to Tenure Track Faculty. Appointments are made by the Department Head.
7. Since Associate and Full Research Professors have independent programs (see above) they are eligible to attend and contribute to "all-hands" MBI faculty meetings. However, they cannot participate in faculty meetings and/or decisions that focus on Promotion and Tenure decisions/issues.

### **Guidelines for Hiring and Appointing Research Faculty**

Selection/hiring of Research Faculty must be documented in their file. Note that appointment to a research track position does not necessarily imply commitment of laboratory space to the appointee.

### **Assistant Research Professor**

A Postdoctoral Research Associate (Fellow) or Research Scientist currently in MBI can be promoted to Assistant Research Professor. For promotion of a recent Postdoctoral Fellow, the individual must have been a member of MBI for at least 2 years (Postdoc level), sponsored by an MBI faculty member, have presented a departmental seminar and whose application the majority of the faculty supports. Exceptions to this requirement can be made for those that have MBI appointments beyond a postdoctoral fellow, such as Research Scientist or have held similar appointments at another institution, however the candidate will normally still have a faculty sponsor (the faculty sponsor could be a newly hired professor who is bringing an Assistant Research Professor(s) from another institution as part of their overall research program). In the rare situation that a new Assistant Research Professor is hired into MBI through a search or other process, but without a faculty sponsor, the candidate will provide letters of reference and a departmental seminar. In all cases, departmental faculty members will review the candidate's application and appointment will only be granted if there is majority support for the candidate.

### **Requirements**

Teaching and service expectations are minimal for Assistant Research Professors, consistent with their salary coming from research grant sources. As such, there is a greater emphasis on research expectations for a Research Track Faculty member. Additional departmental requirements for the Assistant Research Professor are:

- The individual has demonstrated the potential to be self-supporting, which implies future acquisition of independent grant funding.
- The individual is pursuing research that is relevant to the mission of the department.
- The candidate or faculty sponsor provides an application letter, supported by a Curriculum vitae (CV), which is reviewed by the MBI faculty.

### **Associate Research Professor**

Promotion of a current Assistant Research Professor to the Associate level is the most common mechanism for these appointments. For Promotion to Associate Research Professor, the Candidate will submit a letter of application, which outlines their current and future independent research focus and evidence of substantial, independent research funding, and a current CV to the Department Head. They will also present a departmental seminar. In rare instances, hiring of a new Associate Research Professor into MBI will normally follow departmental guidelines for hiring Tenure Track faculty. External candidates identified through a search or other departmental contact, for example, will submit a letter of application, which will include letters of reference. The candidate will present a departmental seminar and undergo a formal interview by the department.

#### Requirements

The general requirements for appointment to Associate Research Professor are similar to those listed for appointment to the rank of Associate Professor described below. However, teaching and service expectations will be lower for the Research Track, consistent with their salary coming from research grant sources. As such, there is a greater emphasis on research expectations for a Research Track Faculty member. Additional departmental requirements for appointment to Associate Research Professor are:

- The individual must be self-supporting and has a track record of success in obtaining major externally funded grants as P.I.
- The individual should be recognized for his/her work at a national level.
- The individual should have shown a willingness and capacity (funding) to co-mentor graduate students (University Policy currently prohibits Research Track Faculty serving as sole mentors) and/or serving on graduate student Thesis and Dissertation Committees.
- The individual may participate in formal MBI teaching efforts, but this normally will require funding from instructional dollars (separate adjunct teaching appointment) and cannot violate conditions of any funding source/agency that provides salary support for the Research Track appointment.
- The university-wide general requirements indicate that it would normally take six years at the Assistant Professor rank to demonstrate the requirements for Associate Professor. The same guideline will be followed for Research Track Professors, except that exceptions can be made for

meritorious candidates who have demonstrated substantial independence and ability to acquire competitive grant funding.

### **Research Professor**

In rare cases a new Research Professor could be hired by the department. The hiring process will follow MBI guidelines for hiring Tenure Track faculty. External candidates identified through a search, for example, will submit a letter of application, which will include letters of reference. The candidate will also present a departmental seminar and participate in a formal interview by the department. For appointment to Research Professor, the Candidate will submit a letter of application, which outlines their current and future independent research focus and evidence of substantial, independent research funding, and a current CV to the Department Head and Department.

#### **Requirements**

The general requirements for appointment to Research Professor are the same as those listed for appointment to the rank of Professor in the department role and scope document. However, teaching and service expectations will be lower for the Research Track, consistent with their salary coming from research grant sources. As such, there is a greater emphasis on research expectations for a Research Track Faculty member. Additional departmental requirements for Research Professor Track are:

- The individual must have an established track record of productivity involving high quality peer-reviewed publications, high impact reviews, and substantial external grant support. Usually, their research operation will be large enough to employ postdoctoral fellows.
- The individual must be an outstanding scientist with an international reputation.
- The individual is a regular member of appropriate national grant review committees and/or serves on editorial boards for appropriate journals.
- The individual should have a track record of successful mentoring of undergraduate students, co-mentoring of graduate students and/or mentoring of postdoctoral fellows.
- The individual regularly participates in departmental teaching efforts (e.g., providing lectures or team-teaching courses).

### **Guidelines for Annual Review of Research Faculty in Microbiology & Immunology**

Research Faculty will be evaluated on an annual basis, and review will be based on the faculty member's appointment.

1. Review of Assistant Research Professors will be performed by the faculty sponsor and will be based on the individual's assignment. The Faculty mentor then submits their Annual Review of the Assistant Professor to the Department Head. The Department Head will provide the Annual Review of any Assistant Research Professor that does not have a faculty sponsor.
2. Review of Associate Research Professors and Research Professors will be conducted by the Department Head following standard Tenure Track Faculty review procedures.

### **Research Criteria – Accomplishment at the Associate Research Professor level**

The department uses the Colleges of Agriculture and Letters and Science criteria for Accomplishment in Research. In addition, the following criteria are considered in promotion and/or assignment to Associate Research Professor:

- The individual must be self-supporting and has a track record of success in obtaining major (sizable in terms of dollars) external grants as Principle Investigator (P.I.)
- The individual should be recognized for his/her work at a national level.
- The individual should have shown a willingness and capacity (funding) to co-mentor graduate students (University Policy currently prohibits Research Track Faculty serving as sole mentors) and/or serving on graduate student Thesis and Dissertation Committees.
- The individual may participate in formal MBI teaching efforts, but this normally will require funding from instructional dollars (separate adjunct teaching appointment) and cannot violate conditions of any funding source/agency that provides salary support for the Research Track appointment.
- While the university-wide general requirements indicate that it would normally take six years at the Assistant Professor rank to demonstrate the requirements for Associate Professor, exceptions can be made for meritorious candidates who have demonstrated substantial independence and ability to acquire competitive grant funding.

### **Evidence of accomplishment**

The following items are commonly used to demonstrate accomplishment. The lists are not intended to be exhaustive and candidates are not required to include every item on each list.

Items required by all candidates:

- Research Statement
- List of proposals submitted with results
- List of research funding
- List of research results: reports, conference presentations, refereed journal articles, conference articles, monographs, texts

Additional items that could be included to demonstrate performance:

- List of graduate and undergraduate students mentored
- Invited papers and presentations
- Professional assignments with technical committees, technical editing
- Awards or honors for research or similar recognition
- The Candidate will submit a letter of application, which outlines their current and future independent research focus and evidence of substantial, independent research funding, and a current CV to the Department Head.
- The Candidate will present a departmental seminar.



### **Research criteria- Accomplishment at the Research Professor level**

The criteria and standards for promotion to Research Professor are the same as those used for a TT faculty member, except the only area of responsibility is research. Reviews for promotion to Research Professor are typically at least five years after the faculty member's promotion to Associate Professor. An in-depth assessment of performance of the candidate's research is required. External reviews are required as part of the in-depth assessment. The departmental Promotion and Tenure Review Committee will review and provide a recommendation to the Department Head on all applications for promotion to Research Professor.

- Sustained ability to define and develop research ideas, create successful grant proposals
- Ability to generate research products (papers and presentations) that impact the discipline
- International recognition as evidenced through invited book chapters, reviews, and international presentations
- Department Review Criteria: Promotion to Research Professor – Excellence
- The individual must have an established track record of productivity involving high quality peer-reviewed publications, high impact reviews, and substantial external grant support. Usually, their research operation will be large enough to employ postdoctoral fellows.
- The individual must be an outstanding scientist with an international reputation.
- The individual is a regular member of appropriate national grant review committees and/or serves on editorial boards for appropriate journals.
- The individual should have a track record of successful mentoring of undergraduate students, co-mentoring of graduate students and/or mentoring of postdoctoral fellows.
- The individual regularly participates in Microbiology teaching effort (e.g., providing lectures or team-teaching courses or formal teaching supported by instructional funds).

### **Evidence: Promotion to Research Professor**

- Research Statement
- List of proposals submitted with results
- List of research funding
- List of research results: reports, conference presentations, refereed journal articles, conference articles, monographs, texts

Additional items that could be included to demonstrate performance:

- List of graduate and undergraduate students and postdoctoral fellows mentored and their current employment status
- Invited papers and presentations
- Professional assignments with technical committees, technical editing
- Awards or honors for research or similar recognition

- The Candidate will submit a letter of application, which outlines their current and future independent research focus and evidence of substantial, independent research funding, and a current CV to the Department Head.
- A review of the application by at least three outside reviewers of the impact of the applicant's research is required.
- The Candidate will present a departmental seminar

### **Article III. Annual Review Process**

All TT faculty members will be reviewed annually. Annual review assesses the faculty member's performance over the preceding calendar year with the major aim of improvement ("formative") and is based upon the faculty member's letter of hire, assigned percentages of effort, annual assignments, annual productivity report, and evaluation of teaching. Any NTT faculty member at less than 0.5 FTE (not members of the NTT collective bargaining unit) will be reviewed by the Department Head based on the expectations of their specific appointment.

Annual review procedures may vary by college and department, but must include the following elements:

- All faculty members will provide data on their activities over the preceding year. These data must be submitted no later than the end of January. Individual colleges or departments may specify an earlier date
- Annual reviews will cover the faculty member's activities and accomplishments in the preceding calendar year
- All areas of the faculty member's responsibility must be reviewed
- Annual reviews must be completed by the end of March
- Annual review documents must be communicated to the college deans by March 31
- Annual review documents are retained as part of the faculty member's personnel file

#### **Annual Reviews: Department Requirements**

MBI follows the Colleges of Agriculture and Letters and Science procedures for annual review. In addition, the following procedures are used in conducting annual reviews in MBI:

- The faculty member and Department Head annually review the faculty member's performance relative to the faculty member's assigned percentages of effort, annual assignments, and annual productivity report. Evaluations are expected to recognize the requirements and expectations of the position and the proportionate time and resources officially allocated to particular activities. Faculty members with 20% or more effort assigned to another unit will have letters submitted by the Heads/Directors of those units to be included in the annual review done by the Department Head.
- Activity Insight (or any future on-line data base) is used for data entry by faculty. In addition, faculty can provide a summary of the research, teaching and service

activities, particularly those items not captured well by Activity Insight, directly to the Department Head.

- The Department Head rates the performance of each faculty member and submits an Annual Review form approved by the Provost to the college Dean using the rating system prescribed by the university. By consensus of the TT faculty, the Faculty Affairs Committee or a specific committee elected by the TT faculty can also participate in the review process, providing input on performance to be included in the Department Head's review. Per the latter, if a faculty committee participates in the review process, it should be done for all faculty to ensure that the Department Head is provided equivalent input/information on all faculty to inform his or her performance review assignment. Only tenured faculty are to participate in providing input on performance of TT faculty.
- The faculty member must sign the card on which the rating is communicated to the Dean of the College of Letters and Sciences or the Dean of the College of Agriculture. The signature of a faculty member does not indicate concurrence with the rating; rather it signifies that they have seen the rating. If the faculty member refuses to sign the card, the card shall be forwarded with the notation that the faculty member refused to sign it. In such a case the faculty member can request a review by a subcommittee of tenured faculty members.
- Copies of all annual reviews and the performance ratings of each faculty member shall be maintained in the faculty member's file in the department. These files shall be kept confidential and maintained in conformity with University requirements.

#### **Article IV. Primary Review Committee and Administrator**

##### **Section 4.01 Primary Review Committee-Composition and Appointment**

Each year the Department Head will propose candidates and the method of faculty participation in the selection of candidates for the Department's Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Committee to evaluate all cases of retention, tenure, and promotion occurring within a given academic year. Only members of the committee may be present when the committee reviews, deliberates, and votes. Review administrators may not attend committee meetings. Only tenured faculty members are eligible to serve on the review committee. Normally, at least one-half of the members will have attained the rank of professor. The RTP Committee selection process will prioritize representation of the diverse research programs in the department. The RTP Committee membership selection process will promote inclusion of protected categories identified by MSU whenever possible, attending to the dual goals of valuing diverse perspectives and promoting access to decision-making committees for individuals from protected categories. The Department Head will appoint the Chairperson of the committee. No faculty member may serve on any review committee during the year their Dossier is reviewed.

If committee composition is restricted due to limitations within the Department, the Head will request approval from the University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee to make an alternate tenured faculty appointment; however, emeritus faculty members are not eligible to serve. If members from other departments are required to serve on the department's RTP Review Committee, the majority of members must still be from MBI.

Before beginning their work, all RTP members will complete required orientation and training sessions as described in the Faculty Handbook, including bias-literacy training.

The RTP committee shall review all submitted materials, provide any required materials, and solicit and obtain additional materials it deems necessary to make a fair, objective, independent, thorough, and substantive review of the candidate's qualifications commensurate with the candidate's appointment. The committee shall prepare its written evaluation letter concerning the retention, tenure, and/or promotion of each candidate. This letter shall include a rationale explaining the reasons for the decision, vote tally, and will be forwarded to the primary administrative reviewer with a copy sent to the candidate. The recommendation becomes a permanent part of the faculty member's personnel files maintained in the department, division, and college offices.

#### **Section 4.02 Primary Review Administrator**

The Primary Review Administrator will be the MBI Department Head. Should the Primary Review Administrator have a conflict of interest with a candidate under review, the COA and CLS Deans will identify an individual to serve as Primary Review Administrator for the case under review.

#### **Section 4.03 Identification of responsible entities**

- Establish the Primary Review Committee by facilitating the appointment and confirmation of the members as described.

##### **Primary Review Administrator**

- Select external reviewers and solicit review letters.  
**RTP Review Committee Chair in consultation with Primary Review Administrator**
- If internal reviews are part of the unit's review process, selecting and soliciting Internal reviews.  
**This is not applicable for MBI.**
- Assuring the following materials are included in the Dossier:
  - External reviewer letters of solicitation, letters from the reviewers, a short bio-sketch of the reviewer. Referees will be asked to state either knowledge of or relationship to the candidate, if any  
**Primary Review Administrator and/or RTP Review Committee Chair**
  - Applicable Role and Scope Document.  
**Primary Review Administrator and/or RTP Review Committee Chair**
  - Letter of hire, any percentages of effort changes, all annual reviews, and all evaluation letters from prior retention, tenure, and promotion reviews at MSU.  
**Primary Review Administrator and/or RTP Review Committee Chair**

- Candidate's teaching evaluations and classroom observations from the review period. If the evaluations are not in electronic format, the unit will provide evaluation summaries. Upon request by review committees and review administrators, the unit will provide access to the original evaluations to review committees and administrators during the review.

**Primary Review Administrator**

- Maintaining copies of all review committee evaluation letters and internal (if applicable) and external review letters after the review.

**Primary Review Administrator**

#### **Section 4.04 Next Review Level**

The next review level after the reviews by the Primary Review Committee and the Primary Review Administrator includes both the College of Agriculture and the College of Letters and Science RTP Committees.

#### **Article V. Intermediate Review Committee and Administrator**

The intermediate review committees are the College of Letters and Science and College of Agriculture RTP Committees, which conduct independent reviews of the dossier in accordance with the responsibilities delineated in Sections 2 through 6 of the University Faculty Handbook Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Rights and Responsibilities.

#### **Section 5.01 Intermediate Review Committee - Composition and Appointment**

The Intermediate Review Committee are the the College Agriculture and College of Letters and Science RTP Committees, with composition and appointment as described in the College Agriculture and College of Letters and Science Role and Scope documents.

#### **Section 5.02 Intermediate Review Administrator**

The Intermediate Review Administrators are the Vice-President and Dean of the College of Agriculture and the Dean of the College of Letters & Science.

#### **Section 5.03 Level of Review following Intermediate Review Administrator**

The next level of review after the Intermediate Review Administrators is by the University RTP Review Committee.

#### **Article VI. Review Materials**

Review materials submitted by the candidate shall comply with the University Faculty Handbook document entitled "Annual Review, Retention, Tenure and Promotion," subsection "RTP: Rights and Responsibilities," and the College Agriculture and College of Letters and Science Role and Scope documents. Additionally, candidates in MBI must follow the requirements below.

#### **Section 6. 01 Materials submitted by Candidate**

##### **Materials for external review must include:**

- a. A comprehensive Curriculum Vitae (CV) with teaching, scholarship and service activities of the candidate.

- b. A brief statement that identifies the candidate's area of scholarship, which should also summarize other expectations of their position (e.g., teaching and service).
- c. Selected articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence from the review period that, in the candidate's judgement, best represents their scholarship.

**Materials for the Dossier must include:**

- a. Cover sheet obtained from the Provost's office.
- b. A comprehensive Curriculum Vitae (CV) documenting teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the candidate. The candidate's CV should separately indicate:
  - refereed books or book chapters,
  - refereed journal articles,
  - invited book chapters or articles,
  - invited conference presentations,
  - contributed conference presentations,
  - seminars and/or colloquia,
  - grant proposals submitted and grants funded, including % contribution by the candidate for multi-investigator grants
  - unrefereed publications
- d. A Personal Statement that includes a description of the candidate's area of scholarship, including progress relevant to any MAES appointment.
- e. Separate self-evaluations for teaching, scholarship, service, and integration summarizing the evidence demonstrating that the candidate meets the standards for the attainment of retention, tenure, or promotion, as applicable. Each self-evaluation shall include a summary of activities, selected products or accomplishments, and evidence of recognition itemized by year over the relevant review period.

**Section 6.02 Documentation of Collaborative Scholarly Contributions**

Candidates are expected to establish independent lines of scholarship. For that reason, the autonomous role played by the candidate in collaborative publications, creative works, and grant proposals must be clear. Candidates must define their role and contribution as co-author on all papers and grants. As examples:

- Role: corresponding author, conceived the idea, directed the work, wrote the paper; or
- Role: contributed to writing of the manuscript and interpretation of the data; or
- Role: directed the work of network analysis, contributed to statistical analysis, helped write the manuscript and interpreted data.

**Section 6.03 Peer Review Solicitation Procedure**

The process and requirements for soliciting peer review materials are described in the University Faculty Handbook document entitled "Annual Review, Retention, Tenure and Promotion," subsection "RTP: Rights and Responsibilities," Section 6.

The process and requirements for soliciting peer review materials are described in the University Faculty Handbook document entitled "Annual Review, Retention, Tenure and Promotion," subsection "RTP: Rights and Responsibilities," Section 6.

External reviewers should be specialists in the candidate's field and familiar with the usual expectations for faculty performance. At least half of the external reviewers must be selected by the Department RTP Committee Chair in consultation with the Primary Review Administrator, the

remainder may come from a list of names submitted by the candidate. The Primary Review Administrator and/or Department RTP Committee will solicit reviews from among those on the list provided by the candidate, but if those contacted are unable to serve then they will be replaced by other reviewers, not necessarily from the candidate's list. Candidates shall not be informed of the identity of outside evaluators to protect the confidentiality of the review process.

The five or more external review letters must be requested by the Primary Review Administrator and/or Department RTP Committee Chair, and must not be solicited by the candidate. The Department report should state clearly how external reviewers were chosen and should include a brief statement of their status in the field. External reviewers should state knowledge of or relationship to the candidate, if either applies.

External reviewers will be sent the Department Role and Scope document, a copy of the candidate's CV, a brief statement that identifies the candidate's area of scholarship, and a selection of relevant publications and/or unpublished manuscripts, along with other materials, as appropriate and selected by the candidate. Reviewers will be asked to comment specifically on the quality of the candidate's written scholarship and productivity, as well as the candidate's recognition in the field.

The Primary Review Administrator will ensure that each candidate has at least two peer observations of teaching and will select the peer observers in consultation with the tenured faculty whose teaching is most closely related with the candidate's area of teaching expertise.

## **Article VII. Applicable Role and Scope Documents**

### **Section 7.01 Retention Review**

Candidates for retention are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position.

### **Section 7.02 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Review**

Candidates for tenure are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position. Candidates may select a more recent, approved Role and Scope Document by notifying the primary review committee.

### **Section 7.03 Promotion to Professor Review**

The faculty member will be reviewed using standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect two (2) years prior to the deadline for notification of intent to apply for promotion.

## **Article VIII. Retention Reviews**

### **Section 8.01 Timing of Retention Review.**

Faculty are reviewed for retention in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

### **Section 8.02 University Standard.**

The standards for the retention of probationary faculty members are:

- Effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service during the review period, and
- Integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- Satisfactory progress towards meeting the standards for tenure by the candidate's tenure review year.

### **Section 8.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting**

Performance indicators and weighting are defined in Section 9.03. The same indicators and weights that are used in tenure review are used in retention review.

### **Section 8.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations**

The Department values intellectual discovery and the generation of new knowledge above all other measures of scholarship.

*Effectiveness in scholarship* is judged primarily by the quality of published scholarly works, with refereed articles being the most commonly used performance indicator. *Effectiveness* includes, but is not limited to, establishing a research specialty that is in the candidate's discipline, as evidenced by the creation of scholarly products (see Section 9.03) throughout the review period.

It is expected that scholarship be of high quality, be ongoing throughout the review period, be commensurate with the associated discipline, and result in a record of scholarly products at the time of retention. These products shall represent both Group I and Group II indicators, as defined in section 9.03. Publications may be submitted, accepted, in press, or published at the time of review. The record must be substantive enough that it is reasonable to expect the candidate to achieve the standards for tenure at the time of tenure review.

Collaborative work is highly valued in the biological sciences, and there is no expectation that single-authored publications are required to demonstrate effectiveness in scholarship. Standards for determining author order vary within and across groups, so no inferences about level of contribution should be made based on author order. The candidate is expected to identify the level of individual contribution to scholarly works (see Section 6.02).

*Effectiveness in Teaching* is as described in Section 9.04.

*Effectiveness in Service* is as described in Section 9.04. Although it is beneficial for faculty development, there is no requirement that service include assignment to a Department, College, or University committee at MSU at the time of retention review.

### **Section 8.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators**

Evidence of performance indicators are listed in Section 9.05. The same performance indicators and evidence that are used in tenure review are used in retention review, with the addition that *submitted* products are to be documented with a copy of the submitted work along with verification of submission.

### **Section 8.06 Status of Scholarly Products**

For retention review, scholarly products that are submitted, accepted, in press, or published at the time of review will be considered if they are included in the dossier and are appropriately documented according to Section 8.05.



## **Article IX. Tenure Review**

### **Section 9.01 Timing of Tenure Review**

Faculty are normally reviewed for tenure in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the University's Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

### **Section 9.02 University Standard**

The University standards for the award of tenure are:

- Sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period.
- Integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service.
- Accomplishment in scholarship.

### **Section 9.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting**

The following performance indicators are considered in the review to determine if the standards in the previous section are satisfied. The faculty in MBI is comprised of environmental and biomedical microbiologists, and these performance indicators apply to all MBI faculty. However, the *weighting* of each indicator may vary across and within the groups. Additional indicators will be considered if deemed appropriate and consistent with the definition of indicators stated in the Faculty Handbook.

#### ***Performance indicators in scholarship***

The following is a list of performance indicators applicable to scholarship. The indicators listed in Group I are considered the primary activities by which performance in scholarship is evaluated. Those from Group II also contribute to performance but carry less weight. All items from Groups I and II are referred to as "scholarly products."

#### **Group I**

- Refereed journal articles, monographs, book chapters, and textbooks in the biological sciences
- Refereed journal articles, monographs, book chapters and textbooks in disciplines outside of the biological sciences that result from multidisciplinary research
- External grants funded
- Program leadership (e.g., director of program a project type grant, research center, or institute)
- Invited major talks (e.g., plenary or keynote)
- Research Awards
- Professional recognition (e.g., appointment to editorial boards, editorial positions, grant review panels, and/or grant panel leadership positions)
- Invited high-profile seminars or colloquia (e.g., at prestigious venues)\*
- Refereed proceedings published in connection with professional meetings\*
- Invited and referred reviews
- Editorship of or primary author of a book
- Technology transfer activities
- Quantity and quality of trainees (postdoctoral, graduate, undergraduate) and career advancement (placement) of graduate and postdoctoral trainees

#### **Group II**

- Refereed proceedings published in connection with professional meetings\*

- Invited papers or presentations given at professional meetings
- Contributed papers or presentations given at professional meetings
- Grant proposals submitted (external and internal)
- Internal grants funded
- Invited seminars and/or colloquia\*
- Non-refereed publications (e.g., non-refereed proceedings and technical reports)
- Development and publication of scholarly products (e.g., software or curriculum materials)

This list is representative, but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in scholarship, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The Department RTP Committee will determine the weight of such indicators and will describe this determination in their evaluation letter. In addition, the weight of indicators marked (\*) will be determined and described by the RTP Committee, based on varying disciplinary norms for research publications and presentations. For example, an invited talk at a high-profile seminar at a prestigious venue would normally be weighted as a Group I indicator, while an invited talk at a seminar in another department on campus would normally be weighted as a Group II indicator. An invited talk at a conference where most talks are organized by different individuals who issue invitations would normally be weighted as a Group II indicator, while an invited plenary talk at the same conference would normally be weighted as a Group I indicator.

### ***Performance indicators in teaching***

The following is a list of performance indicators applicable to teaching. All indicators listed are considered the primary activities by which performance in teaching is evaluated.

- Delivering quality instruction in support of the Department's teaching mission (primarily documented by faculty peer review of teaching)
- Development and implementation of new pedagogical methods and/or curriculum materials (note that publications resulting from such activities are performance indicators of scholarship)
- Design and facilitation of instructional programs, e.g., graduate teaching assistant training (note that publications resulting from such activities are performance indicators of scholarship)
- Mentorship of graduate students (e.g., supervising or substantially contributing to graduate student research)
- Mentorship of undergraduate students (e.g., supervising undergraduate research or independent study projects)
- Awards for teaching excellence
- Advising graduate or undergraduate students
- Quantity and quality of trainees (postdoctoral, graduate, undergraduate) and career advancement (placement) of graduate and postdoctoral trainees
- Student evaluations of instruction via University-approved instruments

Student evaluations are vulnerable to various forms of bias (e.g., evaluations may be based on criteria other than quality of instruction). Therefore, evaluation scores and averages should be applied with caution as a measure of teaching effectiveness and supplemented by other evidence.

This list is representative but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in teaching, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The

Department RTP Committee will determine the weight of such indicators and will describe this determination in their evaluation letter.

### ***Performance indicators in service***

The following is a list of performance indicators applicable to service. All indicators listed are considered the primary activities by which performance in service is evaluated.

- Membership and leadership positions held on Department, College, and University committees
- Professional service in local, state, national, or international organizations in the biological sciences
- Outreach in the biological sciences to local, state, national, or international communities
- Active supervision of multi-section courses
- Service as a reviewer or editor for a professional journal, monograph, or book
- Professional consultations that may or may not result in a co-authored publication

This list is representative but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in service, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The Department RTP Committee will determine the weight of such indicators.

### ***Performance Indicators in Integration***

As indicated in Section 9.02, candidates are expected to demonstrate integration across at least two of the categories of scholarship, teaching, and service. The nature and extent of integrated activities will vary depending on the candidate's discipline and areas of specialization. The following list offers examples of potential indicators of integration, with the understanding that integration can take many forms. The candidate must clearly define and describe how integration is achieved in the dossier.

- Integration of scholarship and teaching: implementing a research activity within a course.
- Integration of scholarship and teaching: offering seminars to introduce students to the process of conducting research.
- Integration of scholarship and teaching: mentoring and collaborating in research and/or publication with a student.
- Integrating of scholarship and service: lending research expertise through consulting.
- Integration of scholarship and service: implementing research results in a community setting.

## **Section 9.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations**

### ***Scholarship Expectations***

The Department values intellectual discovery and the generation of new knowledge above all other measures of scholarship.

*Accomplishment in scholarship* is judged primarily by the quality of published scholarly works, with refereed articles being the most commonly used performance indicator. With respect to publication quality, the Department RTP Committee will assess accomplishment, considering evidence provided by External Reviewers. *Accomplishment* includes, but is not limited to, an ongoing record of independent research that has led to a regular record of publication in refereed journals. It is expected that the results of these publications will be presented at conferences and professional meetings. A record of seeking and acquiring extramural funds to support research activities is also expected.

It is expected that scholarship be of high quality, be ongoing throughout the tenure review period, be commensurate with the associated discipline, and result in a substantive record of peer-reviewed products at the time of tenure. The minimal Departmental expectation for scholarly productivity is that tenure candidates average between 1 and 3 scholarly products per year during the review period, dependent on expectations of the faculty member's appointment. These products may represent both Group I and Group II indicators, and publications may be accepted, in press, or published at the time of review. At the time of tenure it is expected that multiple items from Group I will appear in the candidate's body of work.

Regardless of quantity of products, the quality of the candidate's scholarly body of work as documented by External Reviewers is of primary importance. In particular, the quality and reputation of journals and other scholarly venues, as documented by External Reviewers and disciplinary norms, is considered extremely important in the review process. Impact ratings for journals, such as Science Citation Index, and h-indices based upon publications (Google Scholar) may be used as measures of prestige or scholarly accomplishment in the biological sciences.

In some cases, a relatively small number of products with high impact may be acceptable for satisfying scholarship expectations, while in other cases a large number of products may not be sufficient. If the number of products is near the average of 1-3 scholarly products per year, and one or more of the products are documented by the External Reviewers as having little to no impact in the discipline, then scholarship expectations may not be satisfied. Also, if the candidate's contribution to one or more products is documented as minimal, then it is expected that the number of scholarly products would need to sufficiently exceed the average to offset the candidate's limited contributions.

A record of seeking extramural funds to support research activities is also expected. As recognition of the intellectual work invested in the early phases of a grant, a candidate who is active as a PI or co-PI on an awarded external grant during the review period may not be expected to produce as many peer-reviewed papers. The scope of the grant work and the reputation of the granting agency are qualitative factors that will influence the quantitative expectation for number of peer-reviewed papers and other Group I products.

Collaborative work is highly valued in the biological sciences, and there is no expectation that single-authored publications are required to demonstrate effectiveness in scholarship. Standards for determining author order vary within and across groups, so no inferences about level of contribution should be made based on author order. The candidate is expected to identify the level of individual contribution to scholarly works [see Section 6.02].

### ***Teaching Expectations***

*Effectiveness in teaching* is achieved through the candidate's positive contributions to the design, delivery, and instruction of courses and labs, both in the Department and in other venues.

*Effectiveness* is judged primarily from multiple peer reviews conducted by Departmental faculty who observe the candidate in the classroom or lab during the review period. Written reports from peer reviewers are important in documenting the candidate's teaching performance and serve as evidence to evaluate effectiveness.

Graduate advising is integral to the Department, and all faculty are expected to contribute to graduate education in the Department. At the time of the tenure review, a candidate is expected to demonstrate evidence of ability to mentor graduate students. Evidence may include chairing or

serving on graduate committees, but can also be exhibited through other types of graduate student interactions.

Course evaluations serve to provide a measure of student satisfaction. The Department expectation is that normally, for each course taught, the overall mean score from the student evaluation instrument is not less than the indicator for “Average.” As an example, 3.0 is the “average” evaluation score for “Overall Effectiveness” on an instrument with 5 categories (1=Poor, 2=Below Average, 3=Average, 4=Above Average, and 5 = Excellent). It is expected that any overall mean score below “Average” will be addressed by the candidate. Similarly, any issues related to teaching noted in the retention review should be addressed prior to tenure review.

***Service Expectations***

*Effectiveness in service* will be achieved if the candidate demonstrates active participation and competent execution of tasks in any of the areas of service described by the performance indicators. Service is expected to include at least one assignment to a Department, College, or University committee at MSU. Participation in other activities that contribute to the candidate’s discipline or profession (e.g., task forces or special programs) is also valued, especially when such participation raises the stature and reputation of the Department or the University in the state, the nation, or internationally.

**Section 9.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators**

Applicable performance indicators, and evidence supporting the candidate’s performance for each indicator, will be assessed using the contents of the candidate’s dossier.

In addition to the listed evidence of performance indicators, properly documented nominations for and receptions of competitive awards for scholarship, teaching, or service will be considered as evidence of peer recognition.

***Evidence of performance indicators in scholarship***

The list of evidence presented in Tables 1 and 2 is not exhaustive. Other evidence supplied by the candidate that is related to the performance indicators for scholarship will be considered in the review. The weight category (Group I or Group II) of indicators marked (\*) will be determined based on varying disciplinary norms for research publications and presentations.

Only scholarly products that have been accepted for publication, performance, or exhibition within the tenure review period will be considered. For works published in a journal not readily available through University databases, the candidate must include a digital copy of the accepted work in the dossier. For works accepted for publication but not yet published, the candidate must include a digital copy of the accepted work accompanied by an official letter or email indicating acceptance.

<b>Group I: Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Typical Evidence</b>
Refereed journal articles, monographs, book chapters, and textbooks in the biological sciences:	Full citation for the scholarly work, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.

Refereed journal articles, monographs, book chapters and textbooks in disciplines outside of the biological sciences that result from multidisciplinary research:	Full citation for the scholarly work, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
External grants funded:	Grant number or code with URL or other contact where more information can be found. Brief description (title, funding agency and level, primary goals, length, collaborators if any).
Program leadership (e.g., director of program project type grant, or research center or institute)	Summary of leadership efforts.
Invited major talks (e.g., plenary or keynote):	Letter of invitation, copy of program, or full citation.
Research Awards/Honors	Brief summary of award or honor.
Professional recognition (e.g., appointment to editorial boards, editorial positions, grant review panels, and/or grant panel leadership positions)	Brief summary of appointment, which may include letter of invitation or other evidence of recognition.
Invited high-profile seminars or colloquia (e.g., at prestigious venues):*	Full citation, including the title, venue, date, and level (Department, University, community, etc.).
Refereed proceedings published in connection with professional meetings:*	Full citation for the proceedings, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
Invited and refereed reviews:	Full citation for the scholarly work, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
Editorship of and/or primary author of a book:	Full citation for the scholarly work, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
Technology transfer activities	Summary of efforts such as patent applications, awarded patents, licensing agreements, consulting efforts, new business development
Quantity and quality of trainees (postdoctoral, graduate, undergraduate) and career advancement (placement) of graduate and postdoctoral trainees	Summary of the quantity and quality of trainees and placement results.

Table 1. Group I Performance Indicators in Scholarship and Typical Evidence

Group II: Performance Indicator	Typical Evidence
---------------------------------	------------------

Refereed proceedings published in connection with professional meetings:*	Full citation for the proceedings, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
Invited papers or presentations given at professional meetings:	Full citation including the title, co-presenters, organization, location, and date.
Contributed papers or presentations given at professional meetings:	Full citation including the title, co-presenters, organization, location, and date.
Grant proposals submitted and funded (external and internal):	Grant number or code with URL or other contact where more information can be found. Brief description (title, funding agency and level, primary goals, length, collaborators if any).
Internal grants funded:	Brief description (title, source of funding, primary goals, length, collaborators if any).
Invited seminars and/or colloquia:*	Full citation, including the title, venue, date, and level (Department, University, community, etc.).
Non-refereed publications (e.g., non-refereed proceedings and technical reports):	Full citation for the publication or report, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
Development and publication of scholarly products (e.g., software or curriculum materials):	Brief description of the product including an overview of content and format, intended use, potential audience, and location where it is publicly available.

Table 2. Group II Performance Indicators in Scholarship and Typical Evidence

### ***Evidence of performance indicators in teaching***

The list of evidence presented in Table 3 is not exhaustive. Other evidence supplied by the candidate that is related to performance indicators for teaching will be considered in the review.

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Typical Evidence</b>
Delivering quality instruction in support of the Department's teaching mission (primarily documented by faculty peer review of teaching):	Written report or letter from peer observer, submitted directly by the observer to the Department Head and maintained in Department files. The Department Head may serve as a peer observer.
Development and implementation of new pedagogical methods and/or curriculum materials:	Syllabus or other documentation of new methods or materials with

	evidence supporting innovation. Brief description of the implementation process, audience, and outcomes.
Design and facilitation of instructional programs (e.g., graduate teaching assistant training):	Agenda or other documentation of instructional program's goals and major components. Brief description of audience and outcomes.
Mentorship of graduate students (e.g., supervising or substantially contributing to graduate student research):	Brief description including graduate student name, research question/focus, funding (if any), and progress to date.
Mentorship of undergraduate students (e.g., supervising undergraduate research or projects):	Brief description including undergraduate student name, research question/focus, funding (if any), and progress to date.
Awards for teaching excellence	Brief description of the award, including whether local or national.
Graduate or undergraduate student advising	Brief description including number of students advised and progress to date.
Quantity and quality of trainees (postdoctoral, graduate, undergraduate) and career advancement (placement) of graduate and postdoctoral trainees:	Summary of the quantity and quality of trainees and placement results.
Student evaluations of instruction via University-approved instruments:	Student evaluation scores for all courses taught during the review period. Brief, overarching analysis of student comments (summary, selected quotes, or full list of comments). If appropriate, include a broad description of changes made in response to student feedback.

Table 3. Performance Indicators in Teaching and Typical Evidence

### ***Evidence of performance indicators in service***

The list of evidence in Table 4 is not exhaustive. Other evidence supplied by the candidate that is related to performance indicators for service will be considered in the review.

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Typical Evidence</b>
Membership and leadership positions held on Department, College, and University committees:	Name and level of each committee and dates of service.
Professional service in local, state, national, or international organizations in the biological sciences:	Name of each organization (with description as needed), offices or roles held, dates of service, and notable accomplishments.
Outreach in the biological sciences to local, state, national, or international communities:	Brief description of outreach activities, audience, and outcomes.
Active supervision of multi-section courses:	Course title, number of instructors, dates of supervision, and notable accomplishments.
Service as a reviewer or editor for a professional journal, monograph, or book:	Citations including name of journal, editorial role, dates of service, and workload.



Professional consultations that may or may not result in a co-authored publication:	Brief description of consulting activities, audience, and outcomes.
---	---

Table 4. Performance Indicators in Service and Typical Evidence

**Article X. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor**

**Section 10.01 University Standards**

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are the standards for the award of tenure. Appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor does not demonstrate, in and of itself, that standards for tenure have been met.

**Article XI. Promotion to Rank of Professor**

**Section 11.01 Timing of Review.**

Normally, faculty are reviewed for promotion after the completion of five (5) years of service in the current rank; however, faculty may seek promotion earlier if they can establish that they meet the same standards of effectiveness and accomplishment or excellence used in evaluating candidates after five (5) years in rank.

**Section 11.02 University Standard**

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Professor are:

- a) Sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period, and
- b) Sustained integration of no less than two of the following areas during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- c) Excellence in scholarship.

**Section 11.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting**

The performance indicators and weighting used for this review are the same as those defined in Section 9.03 of this document, with the following exceptions

**Teaching**

In addition to the performance indicators for Tenure, it is expected that the candidate for professor will have mentored multiple graduate students and postdoctoral fellows or equivalent mentoring, as determined by the MBI RTP review committee.

**Scholarship**

In addition to the performance indicators for Tenure, it is expected that the candidate for Professor will demonstrate that they have contributed in a significant manner to his or her discipline, including sustained ability to define and develop research ideas, create successful grant proposals, and generate research products (papers and presentations) that impact the discipline and recognition of the candidate by their profession.

**Service**

In addition to the performance indicators for Tenure, it is expected that the candidate for Professor will document repeated service on grant review panels, journal editorial board service, and service to the Department.

## **Section 11.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations**

### ***Scholarship expectations***

The Department values intellectual discovery and the generation of new knowledge above all other measures of scholarship.

*Excellence in scholarship* is judged primarily by the quality of published scholarly works, with refereed articles being the most commonly used performance indicator. With respect to publication quality, the Department RTP Committee will assess excellence based on the evidence provided by External Reviewers. *Excellence* includes, but is not limited to, receiving national or international recognition from peers and colleagues as having made important scholarly contributions to the candidate's discipline. The Department expects that scholarly results will be disseminated through both publications and presentations.

It is expected that scholarship be of high quality, be ongoing throughout the review period, be commensurate with the associated discipline, and result in a substantive record of peer-reviewed scholarly products that impact the field. Impact ratings for journals and h-indices based upon publications may be used as measures of prestige or scholarly accomplishment in the biological sciences. These products may represent both Group I and Group II indicators, and publications may be accepted, in press, or published at the time of review. At the time of promotion review it is expected that a substantial portion of the candidate's body of work will be comprised of Group I items. Although the candidate's complete body of work since the tenure review is important, the candidate's scholarship performance will be reviewed primarily on the most recent 5 years of appointment, regardless of the amount of time that has elapsed since the candidate's tenure review.

Regardless of quantity of products, the quality of the candidate's scholarly body of work as documented by External Reviewers is of primary importance. In particular, the quality and reputation of journals and other scholarly venues, as documented by External Reviewers and disciplinary norms, is considered extremely important in the review process. In some cases, a relatively small number of products with high impact may be acceptable for satisfying scholarship expectations, while in other cases a large number of products may not be sufficient.

A record of seeking and acquiring extramural funds to support research activities is also expected. As recognition of the intellectual work invested in the early phases of a grant, a candidate who is active as a PI or co-PI on an awarded external grant during the review period may not be expected to produce as many peer-reviewed papers. The scope of the grant work and the reputation of the granting agency are qualitative factors that will influence the quantitative expectation for number of peer-reviewed papers and other Group I products.

Collaborative work is highly valued in the biological sciences, and there is no expectation that single-authored publications are required to demonstrate accomplishment in scholarship. Standards for determining author order vary within and across groups, so no inferences about level of contribution should be made based on author order. The candidate is expected to identify the level of individual contribution to scholarly works [see Section 6.02].

### ***Teaching Expectations***

The expectation for this review is effectiveness in teaching, and the standard is defined in Section 9.04, with the exception that at the time of promotion review an additional weight is placed on mentorship of graduate students.

### ***Service Expectations***

The expectation for this review is effectiveness in service, and the standard is defined in Section 9.04, with the exception that at the time of promotion review an additional weight is placed on active contributions to Department committees and programs.

### **Section 11.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators**

Applicable performance indicators, and evidence supporting the candidate's performance for each indicator, will be assessed using the contents of the candidate's dossier. The description of evidence of performance indicators is found in Section 9.05 of this document.

## **Article XII. Procedures for Update and Revision of the Unit Role and Scope Document**

Faculty members are entitled to propose changes to Role and Scope Documents of their academic unit. Review committee members or administrators who identify a need for improvement, clarification, or other revision to the Department's Role and Scope may submit the request for changes to the chair of the University Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee (URPTC). The URPTC Chair will forward the recommendations to MBI. Submission to the URPTC chair should occur after the review committee or administrator completes all reviews for the year. Units will act on any proposed changes received from the URPTC Chair on an annual basis and will undertake a full review of their Document no less than every three years.

## **Article XIII. Approval Process**

### **Section 13.01 Primary Academic Unit Role and Scope Document**

- Tenurable faculty and administrator of the primary academic unit
- Promotion and tenure review committee and administrator of all associated intermediate units (usually colleges)
- University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee
- Provost

### **Section 13.02 Intermediate Academic Unit Role and Scope Document**

- Promotion and tenure review committee and administrator of the intermediate unit
- University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URPTC)
- Provost

### **Section 13.03 University Role and Scope Document**

- University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URPTC)
- Faculty Senate
- Deans' Council
- Provost