

Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion for the Department of Biology

All departmental guidelines are secondary to the regulations given in the Faculty Handbook of Case Western Reserve University. The three basic areas for consideration in the tenure and promotion process are (a) scholarship, (b) teaching, and (c) university and community service. While not understating the importance of service, the first two areas are considered the key areas for tenure consideration.

Requirements for tenure.

1. **Scholarship.** A primary requirement for tenure is for the candidate to establish a research expertise of the highest quality that results in recognition nationally by the scientific community. The criteria for this achievement are creativity, innovation and productivity. The main paths for establishing such a reputation for innovation and quality are:
 - (1) to publish original contributions in prestigious peer-reviewed journals available in the discipline - in this way the quality of the contribution is usually assured;
 - (2) to secure external funding for the candidate's research area from national and/or international funding agencies.
 - (3) to present new and ongoing work at national and international meetings annually.

Since, while possible, it is unlikely that a single manuscript or book would be sufficient to establish such a reputation, a consistent publication record (commensurate with the time for data accumulation and analysis for the particular discipline) in excellent peer-reviewed journals in the candidate's field is essential. The main criterion for establishing scholarship is not a simple publication count *per se* but the impact that the published work has on the field.

The ability to secure external funding for the candidate's research, especially through national and international competition, as occurs with grants from NIH and NSF, will be considered as supplemental evidence of national recognition but not as a substitute for published scholarly work. In the case of pre-tenured faculty, the award of a grant is evidence that the reviewers found the proposed research to be significant to fund with the anticipation that published manuscripts in peer-reviewed journals shall result from the project.

Presentation of new and ongoing work at national and international meetings is essential for the candidate since it provides both a necessary vehicle to get exposure of his or her research to peers, and also to get informal critiques and suggestions from them.

Appointments to NIH or NSF study sections or advisory boards, to editorial boards of respected peer-reviewed journals, and invitations to present seminars and papers at national and international scientific meetings, or to contribute articles to books, will be considered as evidence of national and international recognition of the candidate's scholarship. Such appointments and invitations are generally a consequence of having already established a high quality research program.

As indicated above, the evaluation of scholarship shall be through peer-review mechanisms. At the time of tenure consideration, letters shall be solicited (as required by the College guidelines) from outstanding scholars in the candidate's field to judge the candidate's scholarship. These letters should address in detail the effect that the published output has made on the field and these opinions will have a major impact on the tenure award decision.

2. Teaching. Teaching comprises both lecture and laboratory courses and may encompass the entire range from undergraduate to post-graduate training. The need to be an effective teacher is paramount to the mission of the department. Just as the expectation that a candidate's scholarship will grow, his or her effectiveness as a teacher will also be expected to grow. It is anticipated that every faculty member (pre-tenured and tenured) will revise his or her teaching, as circumstances warrant, to ensure that our students get the best possible instruction without compromising standards. The material must be well prepared, current, articulate and motivational and appropriate for the experience of the students. Each faculty member will maintain a "teaching portfolio" containing course syllabi, copies of examinations and an explanation of the rationale for course content including the goals for each course that the faculty member teaches.

Evaluation of teaching is based upon three sources of information: (1) Student evaluation, (2) Self-evaluation by the faculty teaching particular courses and (3) Peer review. All aspects of this evaluation process should revolve around the faculty member's ability to achieve the intended goals of a particular course. Because the goals vary from course to course, the faculty teaching a course will devise a statement that indicates the goals that they hope to achieve for the students taking the course. They will then devise a student evaluation form to determine whether, in the students' opinions those goals were achieved. Questions will be taken from a department database and supplemented by additional questions devised by the faculty who will teach the course. Both the stated goals and evaluation form for each course will be reviewed and approved by the department curriculum committee. In addition to the student evaluations, the faculty will prepare a self-evaluation expressing whether in their view the course succeeded in achieving the stated goals. The third source of information, Peer Review, will be implemented regularly for junior faculty in order to give them feedback as they begin to acquire teaching skills. The reviews will be conducted by faculty mentors and the chairperson and/or a designee of the chairperson. Time does not permit regular peer evaluation of all courses. Thus, peer review for senior faculty and experienced instructors will be done on a prescribed basis, relying upon the first two sources of information to determine where such a process is appropriate. Where the student evaluations and self-evaluation agree that the goals of the course are being met, no peer review is required. However, if the two evaluations contradict each other or where they agree that the goals of the course are not being met, a group of 2-3 faculty will observe the course and attempt to establish whether the problem lies in student perception, preparation or effort, faculty presentation or both. They will then meet with the faculty and make recommendations to alleviate the situation.

In addition to undergraduate teaching, each faculty member has the responsibility of mentoring their graduate students in an effective and collegial manner to ensure that these students obtain the highest level of professional training possible.

3. Service. While secondary to the other areas for tenure consideration, service to the department and to the university is considered a duty that shall be shared by all faculty members and as such will also be considered for tenure evaluation. Service obligations must be balanced with scholarship and teaching duties, and junior faculty are encouraged to pursue service duties in consultation with the Chair and Mentor. The candidate shall serve on departmental committees as soon as realistically possible so that he or she will be able to participate actively in issues affecting the department. Moreover, appointment to university-wide committees can give the candidate additional visibility to the broader university community, thereby establishing his or her service to the university. Recognition for participation in outreach programs to the community and for service to the scientific community would also be used as a measure of the candidate's service.

Monitoring of Pre-tenured Faculty Progress.

In order to satisfy these criteria, the candidate for tenure is encouraged to seek advice and guidance from senior faculty in an informal manner. The Chair shall appoint a senior faculty member to act as a mentor to the candidate during the pre-tenure period. During this period each junior faculty will be evaluated annually by the Chair and senior faculty as part of the College review of untenured faculty members, in addition to the formal annual review for all faculty members. The Chair will discuss with the candidate the overall assessment of his or her progress in attaining the requirements for tenure articulated above, and the candidate will be provided with a written summary of this progress report. A formal review of progress will be taken in the third year of the pre-tenure period by the entire tenured faculty of the department and this shall serve as the departmental view as to the progress of the untenured faculty in reaching the tenure requirements. This review will be subject to further oversight by the College Appointments Committee. This Committee shall provide a written summary of their recommendations, concerning progress in meeting tenure requirements, and this summary shall be provided to the faculty member by the Chair.

Consideration for tenure and promotion of junior faculty normally takes place during the sixth year after the initial appointment. This review shall follow the established guidelines of the Department and of the College of Arts and Sciences for such reviews.

Promotion of Tenured Faculty.

Promotion to the rank of full professor is the single opportunity for the University to recognize excellence in scholarship after tenure. The requirement, therefore, is that in addition to meeting the aforesaid criteria for tenure, the candidate must have established a clear international leadership role in his or her area of expertise. The candidate is also expected to have demonstrated a sustained commitment to teaching effectiveness and to have provided service to the University Community by actively participating in departmental and university issues by serving on committees by election or at the request of either the Chair or the Dean.

Approved by vote of Biology Faculty, 2/13/02