



## PROCEDURES

The decisions to recommend for or against promotion and tenure rests with both the Department Personnel Committee and the Chair. The Personnel Committee consists of tenured faculty members who are members of bargaining unit 07, represent each rank (to the extent that it is feasible, given the small size of the Department) and are selected in an open lottery. Ordinarily, the Committee will consist of five people. The members will serve for a period of one year. The Department Chair is excluded from this Committee, as are all candidates for promotion or tenure during the year of service.

### 1. Preliminary Conference

As soon as a faculty member applies for a promotion or tenure, or is automatically up for consideration by virtue of being at the end of their probationary period, being at top of rank, etc., the individual concerned should meet with the Department Personnel Committee for a preliminary conference. The purpose of this conference is to discuss: (a) The timeliness of the application; whether or not there is any reason why it should be deferred and a request for extension of probation, or continuance in present rank, submitted. (b) The assembly of the dossier and the kinds of information and supporting data the committee would like to have supplied by the candidate. As specified in the Agreement, (pp. 10 and 12) The Department Chair will assist the candidate to prepare the application if the latter so desires.

### 2. Examination of the Dossier

After the candidates have submitted their dossiers, the Committee will evaluate them. In addition, the Committee will solicit opinions of the candidate's qualifications for promotion and/or tenure from all faculty members of the Department who are not themselves being considered in that year. The letters of solicitation will be included in the dossier along with the replies received, which will not be regarded as confidential communications. The Committee will also solicit evaluations of the published research of each candidate from reputable scientists outside the Department. The letters of solicitation will be included in the dossier, but the replies will be held in confidence to the extent legally possible. After the dossier has been evaluated, the Committee will hold a second meeting with the candidate if (a) there seems to be a possibility that the Committee will recommend against promotion or tenure, or (b) if the committee expects to make a favorable recommendation but feels that the candidates could strengthen their case in certain particulars. In either case, the candidates will be invited to submit additional material to improve their case for promotion or tenure.

If the recommendation is unfavorable, the candidate will be allowed to examine the case against them, as prepared by the Committee, and submit a rebuttal. In all cases, the candidate will be given a copy of the dossier. The decision of the Committee is arrived at by a working consensus with no firm rules as to voting. Effort is made to reach agreement, but if this is not possible, the dissenting member has the prerogative of adding a minority opinion to the report. The document produced by the Committee is signed by all of its members.

### 3. Vote of the Faculty

The Committee report is presented to the faculty of the Department of Microbiology. Only tenured faculty members who are not themselves being considered for promotion in that year and are members of bargaining unit 07

may deliberate over the recommendations of the Committee. Committee members vote for or against tenure or promotion. This vote is by secret ballot and is added to the dossier.

The dossier with the Committee's recommendation is then forwarded to the Chair, who will then write the Chair's recommendation. Both documents are then forwarded to the Dean and the Office of Assistant Vice-President for Academic Affairs for consideration by the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee.

## CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

The activities on which evaluations will be carried out fall primarily into three categories: Teaching, Research, and Service. Ideally, every professor should perform brilliantly in each of these 3 areas. In practice, most of us find some areas more congenial to our talents than others, and, while trying to do a competent job in each, make major contributions primarily in one or two. Let us consider each of these categories in turn.

### Teaching

1. Amount: The Department of Microbiology attempts to distribute the joys and burdens of teaching as equally as possible among all staff members. Everyone on the Department faculty is expected to take part in teaching the large general courses and to teach advanced courses in fields of particular interest to them at both 400 and 600 levels. Everyone is also expected to play a role in the training of graduate students. Since our students are free to choose a research director, some professors will have more M.S. and Ph.D. candidates under their supervision than others, but it is expected that each professor will maintain a research program of sufficient interest and significance that at least a few students will be attracted to it. The Department is also committed to teaching in the Biology Program and may undertake to teach other courses as a service to other departments, programs, or groups in the future. People participating extensively in such teaching will have their teaching loads within the Department adjusted to maintain a reasonable equality of effort among the staff members. Ordinarily, such assignments will be for a limited time and will be rotated among different faculty members of the Department. Teaching in the Biology Program will normally be balanced by a reduction in the amount of teaching in the basic departmental courses without affecting the professor's commitment to offer their usual advanced (400 and 600 level) courses. In general, no matter what specific assignment a professor may have in a given year or series of years, he or she is expected to be able to participate in teaching the basic courses offered in the Department and to do so as needed, to offer advanced level courses periodically (normally once a year for 300 and 400 level courses, at least once every second year for 600 level courses), and to supervise the training of graduate students conducting thesis and dissertation research projects in their laboratory.

Beyond these essential teaching assignments, the amount of additional teaching done by any staff member may vary substantially. A person with a strong research orientation may not do any further teaching. Another may wish to give a course in an area of interest that is sponsored by another department, perhaps in collaboration with another professor from that department, or to do work in an experimental program testing alternative modes of education. In general, the Department will probably regard such work as constituting a worthwhile service to the University and contributing to the development of the individual's teaching skills. In some cases, the activity may be regarded as having dubious

value, however, and it would probably be wise for any professor desiring to become involved in such programs to clear their participation with the Department before undertaking such duties. The Department provides opportunities for additional teaching. Professors receive extra pay for such work, but, as anyone who has taught them can testify, the pay is scant recompense for the effort involved, and much of the work must be regarded as a voluntary service to the students of the University.

The preparation of textbooks, laboratory manuals, study guides, honors notes, and such materials, above and beyond those needed as an integral part of teaching the assigned departmental courses will also be considered to be additional contributions to teaching in microbiology.

The amount of teaching done by a professor will be carefully weighed in considering an application for promotion and/or tenure. It must be emphasized, however, that quality is important also and that doing the best possible job in teaching the courses normally scheduled by the Department must take priority over voluntary efforts outside of our usual programs.

2. Quality: Measurement of the quality of a person's teaching is a difficult and thankless task. Any evidence that the candidate can supply to support their claim to excellence in this art should be gathered with diligence. For this reason, it is now departmental policy that all professors will collect course evaluation forms from each of the classes that they teach. These should be carefully identified by date and course number, number of students in the course and number responding, and filed where they can be found when needed. The Department has designed its own evaluation forms which is recommended for use in all departmental courses. These forms provide a degree of uniformity in the evaluation of different candidates and contain questions the Department PC would most like to have answered to assist them in evaluating a candidate's teaching performance.

Peer evaluations will also be used when possible. Opinions will be solicited from all members of the department who are not themselves currently being considered for promotion regarding all aspects of a candidate's professional performance. Particular weight in evaluating their teaching will be given to the opinions of other professors who have sat in on one of the candidate's courses or have taught a course as part of a team that included the candidate.

Informal feedback from students may also provide useful information about a professor's teaching. Often this comes in the form of casual conversation of bull sessions with or among graduate students or undergraduate workers in the laboratory, or from students who are upset about something sufficiently to come and complain to another professor. Such feedback must be viewed with caution, of course, consisting as it does of a small, possible unrepresentative sample of student opinion, which may signify no more than the disenchantment of a student who has discovered that the professor has a less inflated view of their talents than they do of themselves. Sometimes, however, such feedback may be quite specific and factual in its criticism or commendation, and help to illuminate particular defects or strengths in the teaching performance of the candidate. The Microbiology Graduate Students Association will be notified of impending promotion or tenure decisions and invited collectively or as individuals, to submit evaluations of the candidates.

Finally, the teaching performance of a candidate may be attested to by the success of their graduates. This is particularly true when the ability of the professor to train graduate students is in question, since the demand for their

students for postdoctoral and professional positions is compounded from their perceived ability as a teacher of scientific skills, their own research reputation, and the current interest in, and activity of, the field in which he is working. The success of former students on admissions exams for graduate and professional schools and on professional board exams may also testify to the quality of a professor's teaching, although in most cases it will probably reflect the excellence (or otherwise) of an entire department's program. Where such success can reasonably be attributed to one or more courses taught by the candidate, evidence of it should be presented to the Personnel Committee.

Testimony of graduates may also be useful. As in the case of other student feedback, it must be used with caution in the absence of any measure of how representative it may be, but certainly graduates who have been employed for a while and had an opportunity to compare their own training with that of their peers from other schools, can provide us with very useful insights into the strengths and weakness of our training programs and sometimes with helpful information about the past teaching effectiveness of various professors.

In general, in evaluating teaching the Department Personnel Committee expect to find answers to the following questions: Does the faculty member

- have an adequate command of their subject?
- provide evidence of continued growth and of an ability and willingness to keep up with current developments in the field?
- present materials in a clear, logical, and well organized way?
- teach in an interesting and effective manner so that the enthusiasm of the students for the subject is aroused.
- stimulate, advise, and direct students at both graduate and undergraduate levels?
- seem willing to innovate and experiment with techniques which may improve teaching effectiveness, where appropriate?
- receive and respond positively to assessments by students and colleagues?

#### Research:

Faculty members of the Department of Microbiology are expected to engage in research. Performance as a research scientist will be evaluated as part of the candidate's total performance for promotion and tenure. Because of the diversity, technicality, and specialization of the many fields of scientific activity in microbiology, it is impossible for any one group or committee to be able to fully comprehend the value of every research program. Therefore, the following guidelines are suggested to indicate the kinds of appraisal that will be made.

1. Quantity of Research. The initial estimation of research productivity will be based on a compilation of all of the candidate's publications, with a view to determining the number and length of their research reports. It is generally assumed that a published report represents a conclusion of some phase of the project, and consequently the greater the number of publications, the greater the total research output. It is necessary to recognize, of course, that such a

measure may misrepresent the value of a research contribution and even the actual volume of work accomplished. Therefore, in evaluating research output, the Committee will also consider the following questions:

- a. Has the same piece of work been published in more than one outlet?
  - b. In the case of a group project, how extensive was the candidate's contribution?
  - c. Is the work original, or is it a rehash or review of their own past work or of the work of others?
2. Kinds of Research Output: Ultimately, most research accomplishments will be recorded in one of the following forms:
- a. Books. A single-author volume for any use except as a text is rare in modern microbiology. Most scholarly efforts that are equivalent to the old-time monograph appear as chapters in symposia collections, "annual review", and "advances", series. Publication of articles of this kind usually signifies that the author is considered an authority in the field and has a distinguished record of research accomplishment in it. Occasionally, junior scientists are invited to contribute such articles also, however.
  - b. Journal articles. Most original research in microbiology is published in this form. Most articles will be full length, consisting of a full and well-rounded consideration of some research problem. Journals vary a great deal in reputation. The best have the papers submitted to them distributed to several experts on the topic covered by the paper and critically examined to eliminate dubious or shoddy work. Articles published in such refereed journals are more consistently of high quality than those published in journals which do not insist on a critical review of their papers. In general, a candidate's work will be more highly regarded if a substantial proportion of their publications have appeared in reputable, refereed journals, than if much of it has appeared in those with lower standards of review. Many journals also publish Notes, which are usually much shorter and are limited to reporting a single interesting result or procedure. The latter are not usually regarded as being as significant as full-length articles as research contributions. Letters to the Editors, Abstracts of oral reports to be presented to national scientific meetings, etc., are similar to short notes, but generally even less significant. It is assumed that any pertinent materials contained in them will be published again later when the research is complete.
  - c. Manuals, laboratory procedures, technical bulletins, and the like. These are seldom used to report original research in microbiology but may be important in reducing it to a form suitable for practical application. They will be considered and weighed in context with the candidate's overall program and other contributions.
  - d. Incomplete work. Not all research efforts result in publication and when they do there is often a considerable length of time between completion of the work and its publication. Therefore, the candidate is encouraged to submit evidence of any such work, which might include:
    - (1) Preprints or manuscripts of articles submitted or to be submitted for publication.

- (2) Annual reports or project reports regarding research conducted but not published.
  - (3) Evidence of active participation in published work in which he or she was not listed as an author.
3. Quality of Research. At best, the evaluation of the quality of a research program is difficult and subjective. The Committee will try to obtain the following data to aid in this evaluation.
- a. The candidate's evaluation. It is the responsibility of the candidate to point out to the Committee the particular merits and impact of their work, and its effect on science in general as well as on the reputation of the Department and the University.
  - b. Direct peer assessment. Since the candidate's peers in their area of specialization are in the best position to evaluate the candidate's research efforts, evaluation of the candidate's work by intramural and extramural peers should be obtained. These evaluations should be obtained by the Committee although the candidate may suggest suitable referees for this evaluation.
  - c. Indirect peer assessment. Indirect evidence for peer group acceptance of candidate's stature in their field of research may be obtained by considering:
    - (1) The frequency with which their work is cited by others as indicated in the Science Citation Index.
    - (2) The frequency with which other scientists request their collaboration or recommend them as a mentor to prospective graduate students or postdoctoral fellows.
    - (3) The attractiveness of their graduates and postdoctoral fellows to scientists, industry, and universities.
    - (4) Any invitations to edit and referee papers for a journal, which indicate that the scientist is regarded with respect by their colleagues.
  - d. Ability to obtain research funds. Although the total amount of funding of a research program is not always directly proportional to the value of the work, extensive support is an asset to the reputation of the Department and the University and usually reflects the significance of the project. The candidate should submit any available evidence pertaining to this or her ability to obtain intra- or extramural grants, and traineeships or fellowships for graduate students or postdoctoral fellows who wish to work in their research program, as principal or co-principal investigator.
  - e. Formal recognition. Really marked excellence in research is often rewarded by prizes or awards by an official organization, public or private. Such awards are useful testimonials to the quality of a candidate's work and the esteem with which their peers regard them and should be mentioned in the candidate's dossier.

- f. Direction of the research program. Although it is desirable for a scientist to have a certain breadth of view, and many outstanding researchers have changed their major interests one or more times, it is also imperative that the candidate be able to demonstrate a major focus or direction in at least one of their fields of special interest. It is only through concentration on one or a few areas that the individual can develop the expertise to make significant contributions to science and to establish a reputation as an acknowledged specialist in a given field. This criterion will be applied more strictly in evaluating more senior professors, such as those applying for promotion to full professorship, since they have had the time and experience necessary to develop and focus their major interests.

Service:

The third category in which the candidate for promotion or tenure will be evaluated is that of service to the Department, the University, and the community at large. As noted earlier, the nature and extent of the services performed by an individual will vary according to that person's capabilities, interests, academic experience, and involvement in teaching and research. Therefore, an individual's service contribution must be judged in company with a consideration of these other activities.

Although in the science departments service is given less emphasis than teaching and research, it is nonetheless necessary and important. It is an academic tradition that much of the decision making process within a true university must remain in the hands of the faculty in order to preserve a large degree of academic freedom and responsibility. From this premise, it follows logically that faculty members are obligated to participate in the operations necessary for the routine functioning of the Department and the University. The duties involved include, among others, service on Departmental committees dealing with graduate student admissions, curriculum reviews, promotion and tenure, graduate student theses, procurement of necessary equipment, and etc. Similarly, there are numerous University service functions, such as the University Faculty Senate, the College of Arts and Sciences Senate, program review committees and subcommittees, etc.

Although different in nature, service to the community and State is also important. As employees of a State supported institution which is subject to the scrutiny of both a community and a legislature which take an active interest in the functioning of the University, it is both an obligation, and in the self-interest of the faculty to maintain a visible profile within the community. The nature and extent of service to the community is more variable may range from occasional off-campus lectures to some or technical problem, to helping with the Science Fair, or service as a consultant to a hospital or an industry with problems that have a component within the professional competence of the faculty member.

The evaluation of a particular person's service effort is often rather difficult. In general, only such contributions should be included that are a consequence of their membership in the University community or clearly depend on the candidate's professional training and experience. General service to the community that is not related to the candidate's professional expertise is regarded as part of the duty of a citizen in general and not as an element to be weighed in considering promotion and tenure.

To aid in evaluating their service contributions, the candidate should also define quite clearly the nature and extent of such endeavor. Merely listing membership on



a particular committee, for example, may not provide sufficient information for evaluating the time or expertise devoted to the activities of this group. The time spent may also fail to reflect the value of the candidate's contribution. If, for example, he or she had some particularly vital role to play in illuminating and resolving an issue, this should also be pointed out.

#### Priorities and Balance:

Although every professor is expected to do an adequate job in each of the 3 major areas of endeavor, they are not all of equal priority. The Department of Microbiology takes its duties to the students of the University very seriously, and expects each professor to do the best possible job in teaching the basic and advanced courses which are regularly assigned. The teaching load is not onerous and ample time remains after these duties have been discharged to carry out research or other scholarly activities, additional teaching, or service to the Department, University, or community. In general, professors are expected to be able to schedule these latter activities so that they will not interfere with their normal teaching assignments, and should take care not to accept so many other duties that teaching performance might be impaired.

After teaching, research and scholarly activities will probably engross most of a professor's time and energy. This will be particularly true for the junior staff members who may have little or no involvement in university committees above the departmental level and may not be in a specialty that is in much demand for consultation, etc., by outside State agencies or task forces or by private business or public groups, so that most of their service activities will be restricted to such relatively light duties as participating in the Science Fair or giving occasional lectures or seminars to other departments. More experienced professors tend to become more involved in university committee work and may therefore have less time for scholarly pursuits. Junior professors will not be penalized for undertaking relatively little service work as long as they carry out the necessary duties requested by the Department, nor will more senior staff members be penalized for doing more such work, assuming, of course, in both cases, that the activities that are undertaken are important, carried out well, and are in the interest of the University.

While it would be very gratifying if every professor could do an outstanding job in every field of endeavor, in practice, most are better at one or two of the three major activities than in the remainder. In general, the Department Personnel Committee will take this into account and try to balance strengths in one area against weaknesses in another. A hopelessly inadequate teacher or completely unproductive scientist cannot expect to be promoted or to receive tenure; reasonable competence in every field is expected of each candidate. However, excellence in teaching or the ability to perform particularly valuable service may compensate for some weakness in research, and vice versa. Ordinarily, strength in one area may offset weakness in a second, but the third should be at least average; weakness in two areas would raise serious questions about the professional suitability of a candidate.

#### PROMOTION FROM DIFFERENT RANKS

Criteria for promotion from associate professor to professor are very similar to those for promotion from assistant to associate professor. This should not be taken to mean, however, that promotion to professor simply requires time and endurance, with the candidate continuing to perform the same duties with the same skill that earned them promotion to associate professor. The Committee expects that a candidate for promotion to professor will be able to demonstrate continued

growth and development. If the candidate has reached a plateau and is no longer open to innovation or improvement, he or she is a poor prospect for further academic advancement.

In consideration promotion applications at any level, the Committee will ordinarily evaluate the candidate's performance since their last promotion. Materials pertaining to earlier periods should not be submitted.

(Revised February 28, 1997)