

Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Department of Biology

Approved by the Regular Biology Faculty on March 29, 2018 (7-1-3)

Annual Review of Tenure-Track Faculty, and Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor: The development of a faculty member from his or her initial appointment to the granting of tenure and promotion is a continuous building process; thus, the successive reviews follow the same process. However, expectations regarding criteria increase with each successive review. This document provides suggested indicators in each of the three domains. However the candidate should not be limited to these or required to meet all of these to achieve a ranking of satisfactory. The primary guide for the evaluation of tenure track and tenured faculty is the *Indiana State University Handbook Section 305*¹.

Evaluations of tenure-track faculty are performed annually by the appropriate Biology committee following the University approved calendar. The College Personnel Committee also evaluates tenure-track faculty in the 3rd and 6th year. The appropriate committee chair, in consultation with the Biology Department Chair, will determine the departmental due dates of the e-portfolios and inform applicants of those dates at least 30 days prior to the due date.

The appropriate committee and the Department Chair will conduct independent evaluations.

The faculty member will submit materials for review to the Department Chair using the Faculty Activity Database (FAD). The Chairperson will confirm that all required items are included and transmit to the appropriate committee the electronic materials provided by the candidate as well as all other relevant evaluation information. The appropriate committee will meet in person to review and discuss the evaluation materials in executive session. The appropriate committee, using the forms provided by Academic Affairs, shall provide an evaluation of teaching, research and service as “Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory,” an individual-specific narrative of the evaluation outcome, the numerical vote and the committee’s overall recommendation regarding Reappointment, Conditional Reappointment, or Non-Reappointment. The Department Chair will make a separate evaluation and recommendation regarding Reappointment. At the end of each step in the evaluation process, the faculty member will receive a copy of the recommendations and the supporting documents. The faculty member may respond, within 5 working days, in writing to those evaluations if s/he so chooses. The resulting evaluation documents are then considered by the Dean of the College and then by the Provost, who will render the final decision on reappointment².

¹ <https://www.indstate.edu/handbook/300-academic-affairs/305>

² See 305.19.4 in <https://www.indstate.edu/handbook/300-academic-affairs/305/305-full#p19>

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

In the absence of any documented special conditions to the contrary, the candidate for tenure and/or promotion shall be evaluated for contributions in the broad areas of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service as established by the Department. Successful faculty members must demonstrate *satisfactory* performance in all three domains. Within and across the domains of teaching, research and service; Biology faculty are expected to contribute to the missions, visions and values of the Department, College and University.

Teaching:

The candidate's record since appointment must demonstrate substantial, effective, and sustained teaching contributions to the teaching mission of the department. A rating of *satisfactory* signifies that the faculty member's performance has met a high standard. A faculty member should not be evaluated solely on student evaluation; rather, a rating of *satisfactory* shall be evidenced by:

1. Thoroughly preparing for teaching
2. Effectively planning for teaching
3. Practicing effective teaching methods
4. Demonstrating commitment to students

Suggested indicators to measure satisfactory criteria are attached in Appendix 2

Scholarly Activity:

The candidate's record since appointment must show a level of substantial productivity in research and related scholarly activity commensurate with the mission of the Department. The department recognizes the diverse nature of faculty research areas in the field. Hence, research/scholarship and creative activity may include original work focused on discovery and integration or teaching focused on learning that applies methods and theories to address substantial problems; that integrates knowledge through interdisciplinary scholarship; or the engagement of the broader scientific community through rapid sharing of discovery.

A rating of *satisfactory* signifies that the faculty member has met a high standard. Unless indicated by an alternative agreement (eg MOU) this shall be evidenced by:

1. A sustained record of peer-reviewed/refereed publication of work primarily conducted at ISU (4 or more. 3 of which must be peer reviewed in respected national or international publication outlets). Because of differing disciplinary conventions author position is not a consideration.
2. Funding at a level to support a quality research program
3. Successful mentoring of students engaged in research

Suggested Indicators to measure satisfactory criteria are attached in Appendix 3

Service:

The candidate's record since appointment must demonstrate an *active* and *effective* commitment to serving their Department, College, University, professional discipline and/or community. The combination of activities will naturally vary by individual applicant. It is incumbent on the applicant to demonstrate that her/his level of service constitutes a "fair share". Service to the Department, College, and University may include participation on a broad range of committees, in faculty governance, and in other positions that provide support. Professional contributions include serving as a referee for manuscripts or grants, on editorial or organizational boards, and as a consultant to community partners or other organizations.

A rating of *satisfactory* signifies that the faculty member's performance has met a high standard. Achievement of a high standard shall be evidenced by:

1. Effective Undergraduate Academic Advising
2. Directing or coordinating specialized centers or programs (when such activities occur without released time; otherwise, documentation of this type of service should go into a separate section)
3. Service to the Department
4. Service to the College
5. Service to the University
6. Service to Professional Groups
7. Service to the Community

Suggested Indicators to measure satisfactory criteria are attached in Appendix 4

Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Department of Biology

Evaluation:

The candidate for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor is required to notify the Chair and the Chair of the appropriate committee at least 60 days before the documentation must be submitted to the College. Additionally, as part of the evaluation the candidate will have external (extramural) reviewers independently assess his or her scholarly achievements. The candidate must submit, to the department chair, the names of six individuals (excluding masters, doctoral, postdoctoral mentors, collaborators and Alumni of ISU) at least 60 days before the documentation must be submitted to the College.

The selected reviewers must be from other campuses, capable of evaluating the candidate's scholarly work, and willing to provide an evaluation. The majority of the selected reviewers must be faculty in a PhD- granting department. The appropriate committee in consultation with the Chair of the Department has the option of choosing three new reviewers (excluding masters, doctoral, postdoctoral mentors, collaborators and alumni of ISU) in lieu of three of the six suggested by the candidate. A rationale for the replacement of the candidate provided external reviewer(s) must be provided. The slate will be provided to the candidate by the chair. The candidate will have five days

to contest any of the external reviewers selected by the committee. The Chair will be responsible for contacting six external reviewers for their availability and willingness to conduct the review. Contact will be made within 10 business days of receiving notification of the candidate's application for tenure and promotion. The candidate will provide the chair with an updated CV (generated from the Faculty Activity Database, FAD), a personal statement (i.e. narrative from the FAD that includes summaries of scholarship, teaching and service), and representative PDFs of publications for assessment by external reviewers. The Chair will send the candidate's materials as well as the Department's promotion and tenure guidelines electronically to external reviewers. Each external reviewer will be requested to provide a critical examination of the candidate's record in the context of the quality of the publications listed, teaching efficacy, and service in terms of promotion in a PhD granting department relative to ISU's expectations.

The candidate shall provide complete documentation of his or her activities utilizing the University approved system (Faculty Activity Database, FAD) to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will confirm the presence of required materials and forward the candidate's documentation to the chair of the appropriate committee, who shall make the information available to the whole committee no later than twenty days before the first face-to-face meeting called to conduct the evaluation. Reviewer comments received after the appropriate committee has made its recommendation cannot be part of the evaluation. Candidates will not be penalized if external evaluations are not submitted.

To allow the appropriate committee and Department Chair to conduct a fair and accurate evaluation of the candidate for tenure and/or promotion, the supporting materials provided by the candidate should be as complete as possible. Supporting materials should be consistent with the expectations as described above.

Notifications and Responses: The appropriate committee shall provide the candidate with its evaluation and recommendation at the time they are forwarded to the Department Chair. The Department Chair shall provide the candidate with copies of his or her evaluation and recommendation at least 5 working days before they are sent to the College. The candidate may provide a written response to be forwarded with the application.

If a tenure-track faculty member receives negative evaluations at the department level (i.e. recommendation of conditional reappointment or non-reappointment) in years 1, 2, 4, or 5 of the probationary period, s/he has the right to request a review of their evaluation by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Committee has an obligation in such cases to undertake a review of the faculty member's performance using procedures and criteria similar to those employed in a standard third-year evaluation, while making appropriate allowances for the review calendar in the case of first- and second-year reviews. Such a request for review should be made in the form of a brief

memorandum to the Chairperson of the Promotion and Tenure Committee for the College of Arts and Sciences.

Promotion to Full Professor

Those aspiring to the rank of Full Professor must meet the same requirements to qualify for a Satisfactory rating in each of the three domains. The candidates must further demonstrate their maturity in teaching, national recognition in their discipline, a history of commitment to scholarship, and a documented pattern of engaged, significant service that is more substantial than the requirements for promotion to Associate Professor.

Handbook Language 305.12.4.5.1: Documented evidence of substantial and effective teaching or librarianship; a record of substantial accomplishment in research, scholarship or creativity which has led to recognition at the national level; and of active, substantial service to some combination of the University, the community, and the profession;

Or

Handbook Language 305.12.4.5.2: Documented evidence of excellence in one domain of faculty work, while also demonstrating substantial and/or sustained performance in other domains.

Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

Teaching: Maturity: significant and multi-faceted; must incorporate new developments in their field of instruction and establish their teaching on a high level

Excellence: To earn a rating of Excellence, in addition to the criteria for satisfactory must demonstrate

1. Regularly updates course content to reflect the latest developments in the field.
2. Demonstrates the ability to successfully teach courses in varying formats, levels and size.
3. Successfully and regularly incorporates practices that address the mission, vision, and values of the Department, College, and University to curriculum and coursework
4. Demonstrates the use of best practices and latest innovations in pedagogy
5. A pattern of successful mentorship of graduate and/or undergraduate students demonstrated through co-authorship, timely degree completion
6. Regularly and successfully participates in curriculum and course development
7. Teaching awards from National/International Organizations
8. International, Federal, State or Private funding to develop innovations in teaching

Substantial: To earn a rating of substantial, in addition to the criteria for Satisfactory, a successful candidate must demonstrate having met at least 5 criteria identified under Excellence.

Sustained: To earn a rating of sustained, in addition to the criteria for Satisfactory, a successful candidate must demonstrate having met at least 4 of the criteria identified

under Excellence.

Research: National recognition in their discipline and a history of commitment to scholarship

Excellence: To earn a rating of Excellence, in addition to the criteria for Satisfactory, a successful candidate must demonstrate

1. Receiving International, Federal, State or Private funding to support research innovation and or ongoing activities of benefit to colleagues, graduate students and/or undergraduate students
2. An average of 2 peer-reviewed publications per year in respected national or international journals since the last promotion.*
3. A pattern of successful mentoring of graduate students that includes chairing committees

Substantial: To earn a rating of substantial, in addition to the criteria for Satisfactory, a successful candidate must demonstrate

An average of 1.5 peer-reviewed publications per year in respected national or international journals since the last promotion.*

Plus at least one of the criteria identified under Excellence

Sustained: To earn a rating of sustained, in addition to the criteria for Satisfactory, a successful candidate must demonstrate

An average of 1 peer-reviewed publication per year in respected national or international journals since the last promotion.*

*Deviations from these numbers will be given consideration in extraordinary circumstances.

Service: a pattern of substantial engaged significant service, successfully assuming leadership responsibilities

Excellence: To earn a rating of Excellence, in addition to the criteria for Satisfactory, a successful candidate must demonstrate

1. Regular and successful service on Dissertations and Thesis committees
2. Assuming and successfully performing significant leadership roles in the Department, College and/or University
3. Assuming and successfully performing significant leadership roles requiring expertise to the community and/or profession.
4. Successful Direction or Coordination of Programs of Study or Centers

Substantial: To earn a rating of substantial, in addition to the criteria for Satisfactory, a successful candidate must demonstrate

Any combination of three of the criteria identified under Excellence

Sustained: To earn a rating of sustained, in addition to the criteria for Satisfactory, a successful candidate must demonstrate

Any combination of two of the criteria identified under Excellence

Special Points on Promotion to Professor

A number of features of promotion to Professor distinguish the review process from that applied for annual reappointment and tenure decisions.

- First, faculty members are not obliged to apply for this promotion. In contrast, annual reviews leading to a tenure decision and promotion to Associate Professor are required of all tenure-track faculty.
- Second, if a candidate for this promotion is not approved, he/she may apply in a subsequent year with no prejudice resulting from an earlier failed attempt.
- Third, while the domains of evaluation for this promotion are the same as for other reviews, a higher level of accomplishment is expected in each domain.
- Fourth, a minimal time of four years in the rank of Associate Professor is required before a faculty member is eligible to apply for promotion to Professor. No prejudice should be held against a candidate who applies with minimum time in rank. Likewise, no prejudice should be held against a candidate with many years in rank.
- Finally, portfolios submitted in support of an application for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor should provide evidence of accomplishments since the previous promotion.

At least 60 days before promotion documents must be submitted to the College, the candidate shall notify the Department Chair of his or her intent to apply for promotion to full Professor. Additionally, as part of the evaluation the candidate will have external (extramural) reviewers independently assess his or her achievements. The candidate must submit the names of six individuals (excluding masters, doctoral, postdoctoral mentors, and collaborators) at least 60 days before the documentation must be submitted to the College.

The selected reviewers must be from other campuses, capable of evaluating the candidate's scholarly work, and willing to provide an evaluation. The majority of the selected reviewers must be faculty in a PhD- granting department. The appropriate committee in consultation with the Chair of the Department has the option of choosing three new reviewers (excluding masters, doctoral, postdoctoral mentors, collaborators and alumni of ISU) in lieu of three of the six suggested by the candidate. A rationale for the replacement of the candidate provided external reviewer(s) must be provided. The slate will be provided to the candidate by the chair. The candidate will have five days to contest any of the external reviewers selected by the committee. The Chair will be responsible for contacting six external reviewers for their availability and willingness to conduct the review. Contact will be made within 10 business days of receiving notification of the candidate's application for tenure and promotion.

The candidate will provide the chair with an updated CV (generated from the Faculty Activity Database, FAD), a personal statement (i.e. narrative from the FAD that includes summaries of scholarship, teaching and service), and representative PDFs of publications

for assessment by external reviewers. The Chair will send the candidate's materials as well as the Department's promotion and tenure guidelines electronically to external reviewers. Each external reviewer will be requested to provide a critical examination of the candidate's record in the context quality of the publications listed, teaching efficacy, and service in terms of promotion to full professor in a PhD granting department.

The review will be conducted by the Professor-Level Promotion Committee, which consists of all regular faculty members holding the rank of Professor in the Department of Biology. The Committee is responsible for submitting its evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair in a timely fashion relative to the deadlines for the submission of these documents to the College. The Department Chair will then conduct an independent review of the candidate's achievements. The separate recommendations of the Professor-Level Promotion Committee and the Department Chair will then forward to the College.

Special Considerations

Exceptional Performance: University policy allows tenure-track faculty who have shown exceptional performance during their probationary period to apply for tenure and promotion in the fourth or fifth year of the period, rather than waiting until the sixth year as is customary. The Biology Department adopts this same provision for exceptional performance, which must be manifest in all three domains of faculty work. In accordance with University requirements, candidates for early tenure and promotion consideration must be nominated by their chairperson and achieve a positive recommendation at each level of review in order to be successful in such early applications. Due dates: the same as the dates for (6th year).

Promotion and/or Tenure at time of Appointment: The probationary period for the rank of Professor with tenure may be waived for a new appointee who has earned tenure and the rank of Professor at one or more accredited educational institutions. The Professor-Level Promotion Committee shall evaluate the candidate on the basis of documentation provided to the Department and/or presentations to the faculty. The Committee shall send its evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair within 5 working days after the decision by the Department Faculty to offer a position to the candidate. The Department Chair will then conduct an independent review of the candidate's achievements. The separate recommendations of the Professor-Level Promotion Committee and the Department Chair will then be forwarded to the College. A new appointee who has not earned the rank of Professor may be considered for the rank of Professor if he or she has served as an Associate Professor for 5 or more years at one or more accredited educational institutions. The evaluation process will follow that described earlier in this paragraph. If the candidate earns the rank of Professor, he or she may apply for tenure in the first probationary year.

Changes in Evaluation Criteria After Appointment to the Faculty:

Criteria for promotion and tenure at both the department/school and college level are subject to revision, and administrative restructuring may place a faculty member in a

department/school different from the one into which he/she was hired. Both of these contingencies imply that changes in the criteria for performance may occur during the probationary period or between promotion to Associate Professor and application for promotion to Professor. The question thus arises, whether faculty performance should be evaluated in relation to new standards or by standards in place at the time and department/school of initial appointment. The position of these *Guidelines* is to allow a degree of choice by the individual faculty member.

The default option is for faculty evaluation to be based on the criteria in place at the time and department/school of appointment. Alternatively, a faculty member may elect to be evaluated in relation to criteria adopted subsequent to her/his appointment or criteria.

Constructing the E Portfolio (Appendix 1)

The key to constructing an effective e-portfolio for annual evaluation, tenure, or promotion is to be concise and well organized. Professionalism and expertise are represented not only in the content of the portfolio but also in the care and efficiency with which materials are presented. Candidates should refrain from placing more into a portfolio than is necessary to properly communicate with those evaluating the candidate.

Candidates for tenure and promotion should build a self-contained case that presents major academic achievements and service contributions in a way that clearly demonstrates the quality, quantity, and importance of their work. The candidate must include a self-report/narrative that demonstrates *how* the candidate's activities have met the criteria for a rating of *satisfactory in all three domains (teaching, research, and service)*.

Electronic Portfolios for annual evaluations toward retention, while not expected to be as full, should be compiled in a fashion with the eventual tenure application in mind as a future goal. For the purpose of annual reviews during a candidate's probationary period, the *self-report/narrative statement* should focus on accomplishments since the previous review and how those accomplishments meet the criteria. The sixth-year review, however, is also the tenure review, so the supporting portfolio should present evidence of accomplishments across the entire probationary period. E-Portfolios submitted in support of an application for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor should provide evidence of accomplishments since the previous promotion, and the *self-report/narrative statement* should clearly demonstrate how the accomplishments meet the criteria for promotion to Full Professor. Results from Biennial Faculty Performance Evaluations may be included.

E-Portfolio Presentation Requirements: Preliminary Materials

1. A self-study/narrative indicating how the candidate's accomplishments meet the criteria for this evaluation. In the probationary period, the narrative should focus on accomplishments since the last review. In the tenure/promotion year, the narrative should be inclusive of selected previous accomplishments demonstrating how they meet the criteria. In the promotion to full-professor application, the narrative should demonstrate how the accomplishments since the last promotion meet the criteria as stated beyond satisfactory.
2. A current version of the candidate's curriculum vita.
3. A candidate must also include a copy of her/his letter of initial appointment and MOU that outlines performance expectations.
4. A copy of each of their annual reviews across the probationary period, i.e., the evaluation statements and recommendations from all levels (for tenure applicants).
5. Deviation from standard review circumstances, e.g., joint appointments, accelerated calendar toward tenure, or adoption of performance criteria revised from those in place at the time of the faculty member's appointment.
6. Clarification of role in collaborative efforts

E-Portfolio Presentation Requirements: Evidence of Teaching Performance

1. A brief statement on teaching philosophy.
2. A short summary of the teaching work in which the candidate has been engaged (e.g. Are the courses basic undergraduate classes, upper-division undergraduate, graduate courses, research guidance, etc.?).
3. A list of all courses taught at ISU, include course number and title, credit hours and number of students enrolled.
4. A list of all students writing theses, dissertations, or significant undergraduate research papers under the guidance of the faculty member. (This should distinguish membership on a thesis or dissertation committee from a role as chairperson of the committee).
5. Course syllabi – three or four that represent the range of courses taught. Some collection of syllabi is *required* in the portfolio.
6. Copies of all reports from peer evaluation of teaching.
7. A summary of all student course evaluations.
8. Brief descriptions of teaching awards received (if any).
9. Brief descriptions of participation in instructor training and development programs (if any).
10. Brief descriptions of new course development, significant course revision and notable innovations in pedagogy and course materials.
11. Brief descriptions, including date, dollar amount and status of application, of any grant or contract applications related to instructional activities.

E-Portfolio Presentation Requirements: Evidence of Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity

1. A brief statement of efforts and accomplishments that indicates the context of the candidate's activity and characterizes a research or scholarly or creative agenda.
2. List of individual works with brief annotations to provide a very brief explanation for each entry (including bibliographic information of co-authors).
3. Published works: books, journal articles, articles in conference proceedings, review articles, book chapters, translations, research reports, software, and collected volumes for which the candidate served as editor.
4. Minor publications such as book reviews and brief encyclopedia entries.
5. Artistic performances, exhibitions, and productions. (Include details of the venue.)
6. Forthcoming works: include evidence of acceptance.
7. Conference presentations: include details on the title, co-authors, and conference venue (sponsoring organization, city, and date).
8. Works under review: include date of submission, publisher/journal or other relevant submission information.
9. Works in progress: include any relevant details on contracts or invitations and any plans for submission for publication.
10. Research grant and contract applications: include details on status (funded/unfunded/pending), source, date, and dollar amount.
11. List of donations secured in support of research.

E-Portfolio Presentation Requirements: Evidence of Service Contributions

1. Summary of the service work.
2. List of key positions or contributions to service, with brief annotations to provide context.
3. Faculty members who claim academic advising as a service contribution must provide a brief description of their advising practice, academic programs for which they advise, information on the number and type of students advised, and any available assessments of advising performance by students or colleagues.
4. Faculty members who claim administration of programs of study as a service contribution must include the following in their portfolio: a brief description of the program, data on the number of students served, a short summary of their managerial duties in relation to the program, and the time frame for this special service.
5. The same degree of evidence and detail is not necessary for every circumstance. For example, routine service work that is understood and recognized by colleagues across disciplines and units may be presented in minimal form. ; For work that is in some way unique or more significant than typical service contributions, faculty should provide a greater degree of clarification, which can be presented in bullet lists or brief narrative summaries of up to five or six sentences.
6. When additional clarity is necessary and appropriate, faculty should include the following kinds of information:

Role. – Describe one’s role in the service work (e.g., director or coordinator of a program, member of a review board, editor of a journal, officer of an organization, member of a committee, chairperson of a committee, advisor of a group, and so on).

Affiliation. – Identify the organization, group, or unit for which the work was done. Use full titles, not acronyms.

Nature of the Work. – Briefly explain the service work and one’s specific contribution.

Length of Service. – Provide inclusive dates to indicate the length of one’s service.

Approximate Time Commitment. – Give some sense of the scope of the work (e.g., provide the approximate number of hours devoted to the activity or the number and frequency of meetings).

Results. – Summarize the results of the service work (e.g., a journal was published, a conference or festival took place, a report was prepared, a program was assessed, a website was created, scholarships were awarded, and so on).

Other information. – Provide any other information that can help reviewers assess the quality of one’s work. Letters that describe a faculty member’s unique contribution may be included, but letters that merely acknowledge membership or participation should not be included.

Appendix 2

Suggested Indicators to Measure Satisfactory in Teaching

1. Prepares for teaching
 - a. Seeks the latest information in the subject area(s) taught by reading, attending professional conferences, and/or by communicating with colleagues
 - b. Participates creatively in the subject area through development of teaching materials
 - c. Regularly evaluates his/her own teaching methods, procedures, and course content
 - d. Demonstrates the ability to teach Biology courses of varying levels, sizes and delivery modes

2. Plans effectively for teaching
 - a. Understands how his/her course(s) contributes to the department, the university and/or the community, and its role for preparing students for careers.
 - b. Establishes long-term learning objectives for course(s) and the day-to-day classroom activities
 - c. Has a clear and relevant plan to accomplish both short and long term learning objectives
 - d. Evaluates the efficacy of his/her plan by measuring how well students attain established learning objectives
 - e. Demonstrate a willingness to organize, or reorganize, a course with new or innovative teaching techniques in an effort to increase student learning.

3. Practices effective teaching methods
 - a. Clearly informs students of the purposes and learning objectives of the course(s) and of units of study in the course(s)
 - b. Helps students develop methods of study and skills in self-direction
 - c. Provides students with necessary and timely information on specific course assignments
 - d. Endeavors to establish and maintain good communication with students
 - e. Promotes a classroom environment that encourages learning and inclusiveness
 - f. Regularly seeks information from students regarding their achievements and informs them of his/her estimation of their performance
 - g. Develops and institutes curricular and/or extra-curricular activities requiring experiential learning and/or community engagement

4. Commitment to students
 - a. Adheres to office hours
 - b. Answers emails related to student issues in timely manner
 - c. Maintains an updated grade book, accessible to students
 - d. Reports 3-week attendance and interim grades to ISU
 - e. Effectively trains graduate students in lab/classroom instruction
 - f. Demonstrates effective undergraduate advising practices and regularly seeks to improve those practices

Appendix 3

Suggested Indicators to Measure Satisfactory in Research

1. Substantial and sustained record of publication (4 or more. 3 of which must be peer reviewed publications in national or international journals)
 - a. Peer reviewed publications in respected national or international journals
 - b. Publication of works edited or authored by a nationally recognized publishing house: laboratory manuals, disciplinary related books, textbooks, book chapters, research reports, software, data repositories and collected volumes. It is incumbent on the applicant to demonstrate that the item is searchable and citable using accepted disciplinary techniques.

2. Funding at a level to support a quality research program
 - a. Successfully securing external grants and contracts
 - b. Successfully securing internal grants
 - c. Collaborative research efforts with community partners that do not involve dollars per se but provide value to the community

3. Successful mentoring of students engaged in research
 - a. Directing graduate students to timely degree completion
 - b. Demonstrated commitment to graduate student development through publications, presentations, professional development and research opportunities.
 - c. Significant supervision of undergraduate research resulting in presentation or publication in regional, national or international conferences.

Appendix 4

Suggested Indicators to Measure Satisfactory in Service

1. Effective Academic Advising
 - a. effectively communicates curriculum, employment opportunities and internships to advisees.
 - b. plans coursework with advisees over multiple semesters
 - c. monitors student progress and communicates with Biology dept and CAS Dean's office on issues with advisees
 - d. makes time available to meet with advisees during the semester and, particularly, at the time preceding registration
2. Service to the Department of Biology
 - a. Regularly contributes to standing committee decision-making, report writing and special initiatives
 - b. Regularly contributes to departmental decision-making, report writing and special initiatives
 - c. Plans/organizes and/or contributes to department special events, conferences and visits from outside speakers (this may also be at the college/university/professional/community levels)
 - d. Serves on and actively contributes to Faculty Search committee activities
 - e. Regularly responds, in a timely fashion, to requests for information related to departmental initiatives, reports etc.
3. Service to the College
 - a. Serving on college standing, ad hoc committees and/or task forces
 - b. Is available to host prospective and/or transfer students
 - c. Regularly contributes to Centers, Programs, or Advisory Boards, etc. outside department but within the college
4. Service to the University
 - a. Serving on University standing, ad hoc committees and/or task forces
 - b. Serving on search committees
 - c. Planning, organizing or otherwise contributing to special events, conferences or visits of outside speakers that enrich the intellectual environment of the University
5. Service to the Profession
 - a. Editing/Reviewing manuscripts
 - b. leadership in an organization
6. Service to the Community
 - a. provides discipline-related expertise to an external agency, company, or non-profit organization at the local, state, national or international level.