

Department of Biology
New Mexico State University
Functions and Criteria
2019-20



Michele K. Nishiguchi

18 January, 2020

Michele K. Nishiguchi, Academic Department Head, Biology

02/05/2020

Enrico Pontelli, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Table of Contents

<i>1. Introduction</i>	2
<i>2. Purpose and Mission of the Department of Biology</i>	2
<i>3. Role of Faculty in the Department of Biology</i>	2
<i>4. Documenting and Evaluating Excellence in Research, Teaching, Service and Outreach</i>	4
<i>5. The Faculty Evaluation Process</i>	5
<i>6. Documentation Required at the Time of Evaluation for Promotion and/or Tenure</i>	7
<i>7. The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee Composition</i>	8
<i>8. Policies for Non-departmental Graduate Faculty Members</i>	9
<i>9. Changes in Policy</i>	9
<i>10. Flexibility in Tenure-Track</i>	10

Appendices

- **Appendix A: Documenting and Evaluating Scholarship and Creative Activity**
- **Appendix B: Documenting and Evaluating Effective Teaching, Advising and Mentoring**
- **Appendix C: Documenting and Evaluating Service**
- **Appendix D: Documenting and Evaluating Outreach**
- **Appendix E: Documenting and Evaluating Leadership**
- **Appendix F: Candidate’s Executive Summary and Promotion &/or Tenure Review Process**
- **Appendix G: Current A&S Promotion &/or Tenure Portfolio Checklist**

1. Introduction

This document is intended to address the functions of the faculty of the Department of Biology. The primary focus is on faculty roles and the criteria for documenting and evaluating faculty for the purposes of promotion and/or tenure. Details of all relevant NMSU and College of Arts and Sciences (A&S) policies can be found in the respective policy manuals, and this document is superseded by both the A&S and NMSU Administrative Rules and Procedures (ARP). Furthermore, this document is subject to revision and approval by the entire Department every three years.

2. Purpose and Mission of the Department of Biology

Purpose

Faculty and staff of the Department of Biology at New Mexico State University advance current knowledge of biology through world-class research and teaching.

Mission Statement

The New Mexico State University System is the state's land-grant university, serving the educational needs of New Mexico's diverse population through comprehensive programs of education, research, extension education, and public service.

The purposes of the NMSU Department of Biology are coincident with those of the University, in that our responsibilities fall into the general areas of teaching, research, and professional service. The first two are considered to be synergistic and of equal importance; graduate and undergraduate instruction is enriched by faculty and student involvement in research. The third area, professional service, enhances the function of the department, the university and the discipline. In addition to these primary responsibilities, we see leadership as an important element of our activities and, when applicable, extension and outreach as contributing positively to our mission.

3. Role of Faculty in the Department of Biology

Consistent with our mission statement, faculty primarily focus on research (scholarship), teaching, and service, as well as outreach when appropriate. Tenure-track faculty are those who generally have effort allocated to scholarship and creative activities, teaching and service. Tenure-track faculty are eligible for both promotion and tenure. As defined by the College of Arts and Sciences, college-track faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure, and are expected to strive for excellence in teaching and teaching-related service. As defined by the College of Arts and Sciences, research faculty have qualifications similar to those of tenure-track faculty but hold a primarily research appointment typically funded through external funding sources. The extent to which each faculty member participates in research (scholarship), teaching, service and outreach is determined by the allocation of effort agreed upon annually with the department head and dean. All evaluations will take into consideration each faculty member's individual allocation of effort to each of research (scholarship), teaching, service and outreach. As per the Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual, evaluations should also consider a candidate's strengths and weaknesses regarding collegiality, which is defined as the ability of a faculty member to positively interact and collaborate with all constituents within the academic environment, including colleagues, students, staff, administrators, and members of the community. As the successful execution of research, teaching, service and outreach all depend on

interacting and collaborating with others, collegiality can be evaluated using the specific criteria for accomplishment in each of these areas given below. Additionally, as faculty members are promoted, expectations for leadership increase. Each of these activities is described below.

The Department's framework for identifying and interpreting **scholarship and creative activity** is grounded in Boyer's concepts of the four scholarships:

Discovery- the processes and outcomes associated with disciplined inquiry and exploration intended to expand the realm of legitimate discourse within the discipline.

Teaching- the dynamic, reciprocal, and critically reflective processes among teaching and learning at the university level and in the community in which their activity and interaction enriches and transforms knowledge and skills, taught and learned. As with all scholarship, there is an expectation for the creation of new knowledge recognized and accepted by a community of users, practitioners, and/or researchers and educators.

Engagement- the myriad ways to proactively offer and employ knowledge and skills to matters of consequence to the Department, University and community.

Integration- the processes of assessing, interpreting, and applying knowledge and skills in new and creative ways to produce new, richer, and more comprehensive insights, understanding, and outcomes.

Teaching responsibilities include all forms of NMSU instructional activity, on and off campus, and may include: preparation for and teaching courses, seminars and other academic learning experiences; non-credit workshops and informal instructional activities, course and program development; team or collaborative teaching; web-based instruction; supervision of student research; service on graduate student committees; supervision of internship experiences; production of course materials, textbooks, web pages and electronic aids to learning; and other activities in consultation with the Department Head and Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Faculty advising may take the form of assisting undergraduate or graduate students in the selection of courses, course registration, career consultation, assisting learners in educational programs on and off campus, serving as a faculty mentor to student groups, as well as providing other forms of advice. Advising also includes evaluating course equivalencies.

Mentoring generally takes the form of working with undergraduate or graduate students or postdoctoral fellows on a research program or project that enhances the education and training of mentees in the area of expertise.

Service involves contributing time, effort and professional expertise to the development and organization of the University and its units, and to local, state, national, and international agencies, institutions and organizations.

Outreach activities are collaborative ventures that leverage the specialized knowledge available within the university into programs that identify and address specific needs in the general community. These programs may include collaborations both within and outside the university. As per NMSU policy, outreach activities should provide evidence that they are a "creative and intellectual undertaking; disseminated to stakeholders; and have a beneficial effect on stakeholders and the region" Given the programmatic nature of outreach activities, it is common for most Biology faculty to have no allocation of effort to this category.

The development and execution of **leadership** skills as a faculty member progresses in his or her academic career is essential to the Department, College and University mission and to the scholar's professional affiliations. The importance of leadership increases with academic rank, and is specifically evaluated for promotion to full professor. The allocation of effort to leadership can be combined with service, or if the effort is substantial (i.e., department head, associate department head, program director) can be listed separately in the allocation of effort and goals statement.

4. Documenting and Evaluating Excellence in Research, Teaching, Service and Outreach

Faculty members are expected to document their accomplishments in each of the areas for which they have effort allocated.

Scholarship and Creative Activity

Excellence in scholarship is an expectation of the department. Faculty members are expected to develop research programs (commensurate with their allocation of effort) that contribute to the field of study, provide opportunities for student training, and establish the faculty member as a well-regarded and widely-recognized independent investigator. The department recognizes that collaboration in science is often the norm, and encourages the participation of faculty members in productive collaborations. At the same time, we expect each faculty member to establish independence as a researcher.

Faculty are expected to present their work at local, regional and national conferences, publish their work in peer-reviewed venues, and actively seek the funding necessary to maintain their research program. It is important to document not only the final outcomes of these activities (e.g., published papers and funded grants), but also the progress towards these outcomes (e.g., manuscripts in preparation, grants submitted).

Please see Appendix A for a more comprehensive description of documenting and evaluating scholarship in the Department of Biology.

Teaching

Teaching is a complex and multifaceted activity, ultimately aiming to improve student learning (broadly defined). To document effectiveness in teaching, several forms of evidence should be provided. Materials appropriate for documenting and evaluating teaching include: (a) evidence from the instructor, (b) evidence from other professionals, (c) evidence from students, and (d) evidence of student learning.

Evidence from students is required, minimally in the form of a summary of end-of-semester student evaluations. For each college-track faculty and untenured tenure-track faculty, a minimum of **two additional** forms of evidence are required. For each tenured faculty member, a minimum of **one additional** form of evidence is required. All documentation must be appropriately annotated and/or discussed.

Evaluation of Advising and Mentoring

Faculty are encouraged to be available to students for career advice and/or questions about their major. For research mentoring, faculty are expected to maintain a research program or project that enhances the education and training of students in his/her area of expertise or related field and ensure the completion and success of students (graduate and postdoctoral) in their thesis/dissertation research while under his/her guidance and supervision.

Please see Appendix B on Teaching Effectiveness for more specific information regarding documenting and evaluating teaching, advising and mentoring.

Service

Service can take many forms, including service to the department, institution, profession, and communities. An expectation of service is that it relates to the faculty member's professional expertise, and makes a meaningful contribution to the relevant organization. So that service can be evaluated, faculty should describe their service activities (including the time invested) and provide an indication of the impact of these activities. These descriptions will be used in evaluating each faculty member's service contributions, in accordance with their allocation of effort.

Please see Appendix C for a more detailed description of documenting and evaluating service.

Outreach

Outreach activities are ventures that leverage the specialized knowledge available within the university into programs that identify and address specific needs in the general community. These programs may include collaborations both within and outside the university. As per NMSU policy, outreach activities should provide evidence that they are a "creative and intellectual undertaking; disseminated to stakeholders; and have a beneficial effect on stakeholders and the region"

Please see Appendix D for a more detailed description of documenting and evaluating of outreach.

Leadership

Leadership can be in many areas, including leadership in research, teaching, service, outreach and governance.

The general recognition of leadership is based on moving beyond participation to direct, coordinate, or guide some aspect of the applicable activities. The activities may be internal or external to NMSU (e.g., within a professional society). However, as faculty members proceed through their careers, increasing leadership in national and international activities is expected.

Please see Appendix E for a more detailed description of documenting and evaluating leadership.

5. The Faculty Evaluation Process

The evaluation of progress towards promotion and/or tenure involves two independent annual evaluations:

- An annual performance report, evaluated by the Department Head and Dean/Associate Dean (to be submitted each Fall for the prior academic year; feedback will be provided in the following Spring).

- An annual review by the Departmental Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee (to be carried out each Spring); the Department Head also provides an independent review of progress towards promotion and/or tenure.

Candidates may also request an optional and formal mid-probationary review. This is a substantive review including feedback from external reviewers and from the Faculty Affairs committee, following the same procedure as the final review for promotion and tenure. It will occur in addition to the annual review required of all probationary candidates.

For tenured faculty, the annual performance reviews by the Department Head continue post-tenure. For tenured assistant professors, departmental P&T review also continues to occur annually. For tenured associate professors, departmental P&T review only occurs in conjunction with the next promotion (the Spring prior to submitting the promotion packet), at the request of the individual faculty member.

For college-track and research faculty at the associate level, the annual performance reviews by the Department Head continue; however, the departmental P&T review only occurs in conjunction with the next promotion (the Spring prior to submitting the promotion packet), at the request of the individual faculty member.

If necessary, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will review post-tenure faculty as required by ARP 9.36.

The annual performance report (APR) is submitted in the Fall, and reports on the prior academic year and summer. The College provides specific guidelines and clarifications as necessary. The Department Head writes an evaluation in the Fall of the faculty member's performance based on the APR, which is shared with the faculty member in the following Spring. Faculty members may submit a written response to the Department Head's evaluation that is then transmitted to the Dean.

The annual review by the departmental P&T committee occurs in February/March. The chair of the P&T committee will request that all faculty to be reviewed have their materials up-to-date. This includes:

- A copy of the most recent APR, including accessible (hard copies) of all attachments
- An updated (current) "parsed" CV
 - Note that the CV is to be parsed into sections, based on experience and rank at NMSU
 - pre-NMSU activities
 - NMSU activities prior to promotion
 - as applicable, NMSU activities since the last promotion
- For the final spring review prior to formal evaluation for tenure and/or promotion, a draft of the Executive Summary for the Tenure and/or Promotion binder (see next section)

The P&T committee will evaluate each faculty member in accordance with the individual allocation of effort for the year under review. The P&T committee will provide their review in the form of a written letter. The letter is forwarded to the Department Head and Dean. The Department Head is responsible for providing the P&T letter to the faculty member.

6. Documentation Required at the Time of Evaluation for Promotion and/or Tenure

The Department Head will solicit **external evaluation letters** (from letter writers who are external to NMSU) for tenure-track candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion. The Department Head will consult with the candidate regarding possible letter-writers and is ultimately responsible for soliciting the external letters. The Department Head will ensure that at least three substantive external reviews are available, including at least one letter from someone not identified by the candidate. The external letter writers will be provided with a packet that includes such items as the candidate's CV and Executive Summary. (*See Appendix F for a more detailed description of this process*). The department head will adhere to the College guidelines for the external letters, including avoiding potential or perceived conflicts of interest, and the minimum number of letters required. Unsolicited letters are not accepted. College-track and research faculty do not require external evaluation for promotion (per A&S policy).

The candidate will prepare a **core portfolio (hereafter "portfolio")**. The department will provide assistance by helping candidates ensure that all APRs and annual Department Head and P&T letters are included, and that the binder is organized according to College guidelines. In addition, sample portfolios are available at the Teaching Academy for consultation. However, each candidate should review the binder to ensure that it is complete and correct, and each candidate is ultimately responsible for their binder contents. Once the portfolio is presented to the P&T Committee for review its contents may not be changed by the candidate; if necessary, the Committee may request additional information in writing.

In addition to the binder (and its required contents), candidates should prepare and maintain a **supplemental documentation file** with original documentation for any summarized information (e.g., student evaluations, external letters acknowledging service activities, letters and other forms of evidence documenting recognition and awards), in case of requests for additional information or clarification. The supplemental file is to be kept in the Department Head's office to be made available upon request.

The portfolio will include an Executive Summary (prepared by the candidate), describing the accomplishments in research, teaching, service and leadership in these areas (as appropriate according to the allocation of effort and rank being sought).

Please see Appendix G for a checklist of portfolio contents (subject to updates by A&S).

The entire portfolio will undergo several levels of independent review. At each level, a written recommendation is made.

- Departmental P&T
- Department Head
- A&S Faculty Affairs (there is a separate A&S committee for the review of College Track and Research candidates for promotion),
- A&S Dean
- Provost, who makes final decision

The candidate will receive copies of the Departmental P&T, Department Head, A&S Faculty Affairs (or College Track Promotion Committee), A&S Dean and Provost letters, and is permitted to submit a

rebuttal to correct any factual errors in the Departmental P&T letter, the Department Head letter, the A&S Faculty Affairs letter and the Dean's letter within five working days. These appeals processes are outlined in ARP 3.25 and ARP 10.60.

7. The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee Composition

Faculty who are promoted (e.g., who are at the rank of Associate or higher) are eligible and expected to sit on the departmental P&T committee.

Within a track (tenure-track, college-track or research track), all reviewers of a candidate must be of a rank greater than the candidate being reviewed. Here is some important information about the P&T committee:

Composition

- All promoted faculty are eligible to participate.
- The Department Head or other administrators do not participate in deliberations, but may request to meet with the P&T committee to discuss procedural matters.
- The committee must include a college track faculty member for review of college track or research faculty (if there is not a college-track faculty member at the rank above the candidate being reviewed, the Dean will appoint a college track member from another department).
- The committee must include a member from another department (external member); this member is appointed by the Dean.
- If there are fewer than the required minimum of three eligible committee members, additional ones will be appointed by the Dean.

Confidentiality

All materials pertaining to faculty performance evaluation and a candidate's promotion and/or tenure progress should remain confidential. All members of the departmental P&T committee will guarantee the confidentiality of records, deliberations, and recommendations.

Conflicts of interest

The Department Head and Chair of the departmental P&T committee will verify that there are no actual or perceived conflicts of interest during the review process. This includes members of the P&T committee, as well as external letter writers. In addition to conflicts of interest identified in NMSU and A&S policy, the department will consider potential conflicts of interest using standards of the discipline (e.g., federal agency guidelines for grant review or journal guidelines for peer review). Because of the importance of ongoing collaborations and interactions within the department, conflict of interest guidelines must be interpreted somewhat more loosely for members of the P&T committee than for outside reviewers. However, to minimize conflicts, the policy will be reviewed regularly by the Committee as part of the procedures.

Voting

The deliberations and voting of the committee meeting regarding promotion and/or tenure recommendations should be conducted in a closed session. Committee member's individual recommendations should be obtained via secret written ballot. Absentia and proxy ballots are not permitted. Faculty members must participate in the substantive discussion of a candidate in order to vote. If physical attendance is not possible, then confidential electronic means of participation and/or

voting may be arranged with permission of the Committee Chair. All vote counts must be recorded and are kept in the Departmental office.

Feedback to the Candidate

The P&T committee develops written evaluations of faculty candidate's evaluation packet. The evaluation will include the numeric vote count, reflect the majority view, and justify the recommendation according to the departmental and university policy. Dissenting and minority views will also be reflected in the same written evaluation. All reports will reflect what was discussed during all committee meetings. The evaluation(s) and numeric vote count are submitted to the Department Head and the Dean by the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Department Head is responsible for providing the P&T letter to the faculty member.

8. Policies for Non-departmental Graduate Faculty Members

Individuals from outside the Biology department with NMSU Graduate Faculty status can apply for permission to serve as a co-advisor for Biology Ph.D. candidates. The purpose of this section is to document the process used to evaluate their suitability to serve as a co-advisor for Biology doctoral students. The application should include a CV, a statement indicating the type of resources that their students will require to complete a successful degree program, and an explanation of what programs or departments will provide these resources. If the Department Head of Biology determines that the CV indicates the applicant has a strong active research program in the biological sciences, and that they have resources available for potential graduate students, the applicant will be requested to present a research seminar in the Biology Seminar series. The Biology faculty will be invited to assess the CV, and attend the seminar. The Biology faculty will also be provided with opportunities to individually meet with the candidate. The Biology faculty will then anonymously vote on the application. The application can be approved by a simple majority.

The approved inter-departmental graduate faculty will serve as a co-advisor for Biology Ph.D. students. Each student's Ph.D. Committee must include a co-advisor from the Department of Biology, who will share in the mentoring and monitoring of the student's progress and will provide advice concerning the Department of Biology's graduate student policies and procedures. This sharing of duties will be formalized in an agreement, signed by the co-advisors and their respective Department chairs.

The successful candidate's permission to accept new Ph.D. students to co-advise will be evaluated on the same cycle as the graduate school's renewal of their graduate faculty status. The Department Head of Biology will make this determination based on a written summary of graduate student progress provided by the inter-departmental graduate faculty.

9. Changes in Policy

In the case of a change in policy (e.g., a revision of the Department Functions and Criteria Statement) that occurs during the pre-promotion and/or pre-tenure period of a faculty member, the faculty member will be given the choice of selecting which policy document should be applicable for all future evaluations. This applies to all:

- Untenured faculty members during their tenure-track period
- Faculty members who are Assistant Professors
- Faculty members who are Associate Professors

By default, the *most recent policy* will be used to perform evaluation of faculty members for promotion and/or tenure. Faculty members have the option to continue being evaluated according to an older policy if such policy meets the following requirements:

1. It has been in effect at any time during the period the faculty member has been in service at NMSU;
2. The faculty member has not elected at any time to use a more recent policy.

If the faculty member wishes to be evaluated according to an older policy, this request should be made in writing after the new policy is enacted and before their next annual evaluation. The memo specifying the choice of policy should be submitted to the Department Head (for changes in Departmental policies) or to the Department Head and the Dean (for changes in College or University policies). In case of lack of communication about a policy choice by the proposed deadline, the most recent policy will be applied by default in all future evaluations. Requests to revert to an older policy after this period will be considered when extenuating circumstances exist, and will require a written request to and approval by the Dean.

10. Flexibility in Tenure-Track

The Biology Department follows NMSU policy regarding the pre-tenure probationary period, and circumstances under which the probationary period may be extended or shortened (see ARP 9.35 Part 2 and Part 3 for full details).

The usual probationary period is 6 years, with the application for promotion and tenure being made during the 6th year. If successful, a continuous contract will begin at the end of the 6th year. If not successful, a one year terminal contract will be awarded for the 7th and final year of employment at NMSU.

Section 9.35 Part 2 of the ARP considers extension of the probationary period:

“When requested in writing within one year of the qualifying event by the faculty member, leaves of absence can lead to postponement of the tenure decision date; however, modifications in that date require the recommendation of the department head and dean and the approval of the executive vice-president and provost. Faculty responsibilities may be negotiated when the extension is requested. An extension may be granted up to two times, so long as the total pre-tenure probationary period does not exceed eight years. Exceptions to this limit can be made under extraordinary circumstances if approved by the executive vice-president and provost. Candidates must be held to the same standards of performance when the probationary period has been extended as candidates whose probationary period was not extended.”

Examples of extenuating circumstances include medical leave of absence, family leave of absence, and catastrophic events. Please see the ARP for full details (<https://arp.nmsu.edu/9-35/>).

Appendix A: Evaluation of Scholarship and Creative Activity

Appendix A: Evaluation of Scholarship and Creative Activity

No one form of scholarship is predominant. Each form is vital to the Department's ability to achieve its mission. The relative focus of a faculty member on one scholarship form or another varies and it is fundamentally unfair to expect the same focus from each faculty member. Consequently, evaluation of the performance of a candidate for tenure and promotion to any rank will focus on an indication of sustained scholarship and creative activity leading to a particular tenure or promotion decision, and its linkage to the Department, College, and University mission. The following criteria are central to the evaluation of **Scholarship and Creative Activity**.

The Allocation of Effort Form guides assessment of achievement related to scholarship and creative activity. Consequently, there is no expectation that a faculty member meet each and every criterion below for the Scholarship.

Evaluation of the scholarship of discovery

1. Characteristics of activities that are recognized include, but are not limited to the following.

- a. The activity supports the land grant mission of the Department, College, and University,
- b. The activity's purposes, goals, and objectives are clear. The objectives are realistic and achievable. It addresses important questions in the scholar's field, broadly defined.
- c. The activity reveals a high level of discipline-related expertise. The scholar brings to the activity a high level of relevant knowledge, skills, artistry, and reflective understanding.
- d. Appropriate and ethical methods are used for the activity, including principles of honesty, integrity, and objectivity. The methods are chosen wisely, and applied effectively. It allows for replication or elaboration.
- e. The activity achieves its goals and has outcomes of significant impact. It adds consequentially to the field. It breaks new ground or is innovative. It leads to further exploration or new avenues for exploration for the scholar and for others.
- f. The activity and outcomes have been presented appropriately, ethically, and effectively to its constituent audience(s).

- g.** One's peers and/or constituent audience(s) judge the activity and outcomes meritorious and significant. The scholar has critically evaluated the activity and outcomes and has assessed the impact and implications on the greater community, the community of scholars, and on one's own work. The scholar uses this assessment to improve, extend, revise, and integrate subsequent work.

2. Evidence of achievement includes, but is not limited to the following. Note that in general peer-reviewed evidence ranks of higher importance, points a-c rank higher than others, and the remainder are not necessarily in order of importance.

- a.** Traditional research articles (in order of importance), such as peer-reviewed primary research or review articles, book chapters, (co)edited or (co)authored books and monographs accepted for publication;
- b.** Grant proposals funded;
- c.** Grant proposals submitted;
- d.** A critical book review essay published in an academic or professional journal;
- e.** An essay published in a major newspaper or popular journal;
- f.** Dissemination of scholarship in web pages, accompanied by evidence of external evaluation of the relative contribution of the scholarship in terms of its creative and intellectual content and potential impact for the discipline, or agencies and organizations that may be the intended constituents;
- g.** Production of multi-media or other presentation or performance, accompanied by evidence of external evaluation of the relative contribution of the scholarship in terms of its creative and intellectual content and potential impact for the discipline, or agencies and organizations that may be the intended constituents;
- h.** written reviews attesting to the relative contribution of the scholarship represented, and its creative and intellectual impact for the discipline or intended constituents;
- i.** Creating general or popular definitions of concepts in the scholar's field for public consumption;
- j.** Textbook and textbook related published contributions;
- k.** Honorary awards;
- l.** Invited and contributed talks/papers/posters at conferences of international or national repute in their field;

- m. Any patents submitted from research produced while at NMSU.
- n. Contributions to curated computer code or data repositories (e.g., GenBank, MG-Rast, dryad, figshare).

Evaluation of the scholarship of teaching

1. Types of activity that advance the scholarship of teaching:

- a. Develop new and innovative curriculum/methodology/ teaching and learning activities with clear purpose, goals, and objectives that are realistically achievable and address important questions in the field, broadly defined.
- b. Authoring of textbooks and monographs in topics related to the teaching of biology.
- c. The activity reveals a high level of discipline-related expertise and relevant pedagogical knowledge. The scholar brings to the activity a high level of relevant knowledge, skills, artistry, and reflective understanding.
- d. Appropriate and ethical methods are used for the activity, including principles of honesty, integrity, and objectivity. The methods are chosen wisely and applied effectively. It allows for replication or elaboration.
- e. The activity achieves its goals and has outcomes of significant impact. It adds consequentially to the field. It breaks new ground or is innovative. It leads to further exploration or new avenues for exploration for the scholar and for others.
- f. The activity and outcomes have been presented appropriately, ethically, and effectively to its constituent audience(s).
- g. One's peers and/or constituent audience(s) judge the activity and outcomes meritorious and significant.
- h. The scholar has critically evaluated the activity and outcomes and has assessed the impact and implications on the greater community, the community of scholars, and on one's own work. The scholar uses this assessment to improve, extend, revise, and integrate subsequent work. The activity integrates or applies scholarship in the provision of professional expertise in the scholar's field, broadly defined

2. Evidence of achievement include, but are not limited to:

- a. International or nationally recognized treatises or monographs on the teaching of biology or related field;

- b. Invited or refereed publications of curriculum materials, or papers or articles, in journals or edited volumes of international or national repute, on the teaching of biology or related field;
- c. Invited or contributed talks/papers/posters on the teaching of biology or related field materials including textbooks and related material; at conferences of international or national repute in biology education;
- d. Funded grants;
- e. Grant proposals submitted;
- f. Citations of papers in professional publications in biology education;
- g. Evidence of adoption of teaching materials developed (that include, but not limited to, curriculum, textbook, and educational web site) by other biology departments or institutes;
- h. Honorary awards.

Evaluation of the scholarship of integration

1. *Types of activity that advance the scholarship of integration:*
 - a. Scholarly activities by which knowledge and skills in biology are assessed, interpreted, and applied in new and creative ways as often demonstrated in interdisciplinary research, to produce new, richer, and more comprehensive, insights, understanding, and outcomes;
 - b. Efforts to synthesize knowledge into new and useful forms.
2. *Evidence of achievement include, but are not limited to:*
 - a. Awards, support letters or other documentations in recognition of the significance of the scholarly activities recognized;
 - b. Books and peer-reviewed articles providing integration of knowledge developed by other researchers (e.g., original surveys);
 - c. Invited or contributed talks/posters at conferences of international or national repute integrating knowledge developed by other researchers.

Evaluation of the scholarship of engagement

1. *Types of activity that advance the scholarship of engagement:*

- a.** Collaboration between faculty at institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global);
- b.** A mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources;
- c.** Partnership and reciprocity.

2. *Evidence of achievement includes, but is not limited to:*

- a.** Organizing or attending workshops that promote interdisciplinary or cross-system engagement;
- b.** Development of databases or software products that engage multiple audiences or disciplines.

Appendix B: Documenting and Evaluating Effective Teaching, Advising and Mentoring

A. Definitions (from the Biology core F&C document):

i. Teaching responsibilities include all forms of NMSU instructional activity, on and off campus, and may include: preparation for and teaching courses, seminars and other academic learning experiences; non-credit workshops and informal instructional activities, course and program development; team or collaborative teaching; web-based instruction; supervision of student research; service on graduate student committees; supervision of internship experiences; production of course materials, textbooks, web pages and electronic aids to learning; and other activities in consultation with the Department Head and Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. In addition to carrying out their teaching activities, faculty are expected to interact with students in a productive manner, monitor student learning and critically reflect on their teaching and student learning.

ii. Faculty advising may take the form of assisting undergraduate or graduate students in the selection of courses, course registration, career consultation, assisting learners in educational programs on and off campus, serving as a faculty mentor to student groups, as well as providing other forms of advice. Advising also includes evaluating course equivalencies.

iii. Mentoring generally takes the form of working with undergraduate or graduate students or postdoctoral fellows on a research program or project that enhances the education and training of mentees in the area of expertise.

B. Documentation and Evaluation

i. Teaching

The NMSU Administrative Rules and Procedures Section 9.31 Part 3 outlines expectations regarding the **evidence used to evaluate teaching**. The Biology core F&C document is consistent with this policy, and notes that the four forms of evidence of teaching effectiveness recognized by NMSU are (a) evidence from the instructor, (b) evidence from other professionals, (c) evidence from students, and (d) evidence of student learning. Each of these is described in more detail below.

All evidence is to be presented as part of a discussion or reflection, with appropriate annotation.

The institutional requirements state that:

- Summaries of student evaluations are mandatory for each course;
- For each college-track faculty and untenured tenure-track faculty: a minimum of two additional forms of evidence are required;
- For each tenured faculty member: a minimum of one additional form of evidence is required.

The following sections provide expanded descriptions of the four forms of evidence.

Effective Teaching: Evidence from the Instructor may include:

- self-critique of course instruction;
- syllabi, student learning objectives, activities and assignments; only if these are used to document a particular aspect of teaching and student learning, and are accompanied by discussion/reflection;
- descriptions of new pedagogical approaches for existing courses.

Effective Teaching: Evidence from other professionals may include

- peer review assessments;
- nomination for or receipt of teaching honors and awards.

Effective Teaching: Evidence from Students

- Summaries of End-of-Semester Student Evaluations; to include a numerical summary, as well as information regarding written comments (as requested by the College each year); obtained by following the departmental policy in administering student evaluations at the end of each semester; the instructor must not be present while the evaluation forms are written, and must not see or handle the forms until after grades are reported.
- Optional evidence may include evidence from mid-semester student evaluations.

Effective Teaching: Evidence of student learning includes

- results of *direct assessments* of student learning (note: final course grades are not direct measures of student learning, and should not be used to document e.g. learning of a specific topic).
- direct assessments of student learning include, for example, analyses of responses to test questions on a particular topic; analysis of pre-post test data on a specific topic. Note that such analyses should be accompanied by a discussion of the instructional strategies used in the teaching of the assessed topic(s).

Documentation of the selected categories of evidence demonstrating teaching effectiveness should be included for each year. Student evaluation forms, summaries of assessments or learning (e.g. specific exam questions, student papers or other work product evaluated for evidence of student learning), and letters from peer evaluations should be archived in case there is a need for further evaluation (e.g. at the time of the next promotion).

ii. Evaluation of Advising

a. For faculty who do not have a formal advising responsibility, informal advising is encouraged, and may take the form of:

- assisting students in the selection of courses;
- providing career advice to students;
- providing assistance to students in finding and participating in educational programs on and off campus (e.g. assist students seeking summer internships);
- serving as a faculty mentor to student organizations (e.g. undergraduate clubs, the BGSO).

Faculty should document such informal advising activities in their annual reports, including the time spent working with students in an advising capacity, and the outcome (when appropriate or known) (e.g. the student ended up applying for an internship, the student decided to apply to graduate school, the student organization held a successful fund-raiser, raising \$XX to fund a field trip).

b. For faculty who have a formal advising responsibility (e.g. as a departmental advisor or advising liaison), the documentation should include

- the time spent in various formal advising activities;

- the number of students advised;
- the number of course equivalency requests completed;
- the number of course registrations facilitated;
- other activities as appropriate.

iii. Evaluation of Mentoring

Faculty who mentor students are expected to maintain a research program/project that enhances the education and training of students in his/her area of expertise or related field and make every effort to ensure the completion and success of students (graduate and postdoctoral) in their thesis/dissertation research while under his/her guidance and supervision.

Evidence of effective mentoring includes documentation of

- research products from students/postdoctoral associates mentored/conducting research under faculty member's guidance, including publications, conference participation, research presentations;
- students' progress towards their degree; progress can be measured by grades achieved in thesis/projects, the milestones achieved in a Ph.D. program such as passing the qualifying exam, comprehensive exam, thesis proposal, and oral defense;
- other evidence of impact on professional and academic development of graduate and undergraduate students (e.g., advising of undergraduate theses, success in securing fellowships and scholarships);
- documentation of the number of graduate committees chaired, and membership on graduate committees within and outside the Department;
- when applicable, documentation of graduate student advising in cross- disciplinary programs with which the faculty member is affiliated (e.g. Molecular Biology);
- documentation of graduate mentoring in programs outside of NMSU (e.g. serving as an external member of graduate student committees at other universities/institutions);
- documentation of involvement of students in activities, e.g., museum curation, that do not necessarily generate a tangible product.

Appendix C: Department of Biology, Evaluation of Service

Achievement in service includes, but is not limited to:

Professional service:

- serving on editorial boards of scholarly journals;
- serving as officials in a leadership role for professional and scientific societies or organizations;
- chairing of conferences and workshops;
- serving as program chair or conferences and workshops;
- serving as officials for professional and scientific societies or organizations;
- serving as program committee member of conferences and workshops;
- refereeing/reviewing activities for journals, conferences, and funding agencies;
- reviewing activities for textbooks;
- efforts to educate the public, educational institutions, various industries, and different levels of government as to the technological aspects and social implications of biology;
- the application of professional expertise to serve the public, educational institutions, various industries and different levels of government;
- integral collaboration with public service agencies and organizations to identify programmatic needs, design programs, implement programs or evaluate programs. A written document attesting to the significance of the scholarly contribution by peers and/or stakeholders along with research/technical reports, video documentary, or web pages created to post relevant information is evidence of the contribution;
- curation of formal collections of specimens or data resources.

Service to the Community, University, College, and Department:

- Chairing of departmental committees (or significant service within), such as facilities, curriculum, faculty position searches, tenure and promotion, graduate and undergraduate education, graduate assistantship, graduate and undergraduate awards, teaching evaluation, Biology Symposium, and any other departmental committee not listed here;
- Other departmental related services (include but are not necessarily limited to):
 - mentoring of junior faculty;
 - recruiting faculty and students;
 - performing services that advance the profession, and departmental teaching and research efforts;
 - actively participating in non-committee departmental policy making efforts, in faculty meetings and otherwise;
 - actively participating in departmental committee work.
- University and College related services
 - Membership in College and University committees and Faculty Senate, particularly in leadership roles such as chairing such committees;
 - initiating and developing, and acting as liaison for, service and general education courses.

Appendix D: Definition of Outreach for Main Functions and Criteria Document

Outreach

Outreach activities are collaborative ventures that leverage the specialized knowledge available within the university into programs that identify and address specific needs in the general community. These programs may include collaborations both within and outside the university. As per the NMSU Administrative Rules and Procedures, outreach activities should provide evidence that they are a "creative and intellectual undertaking; disseminated to stakeholders; and have a beneficial effect on stakeholders and the region".

Evaluation of outreach

Achievement in outreach includes, but is not limited to:

- Evidence demonstrating the building of collaborations within and outside the university to create programs that address needs in the general community;
- Documents demonstrating effort to identify the programmatic concerns, issues and needs of specific constituent groups;
- Documents demonstrating use of best practices relative to identified concerns, issues and needs of specific constituent groups;
- Technical reports prepared and presentations made to and on behalf of specific constituent groups as a result of programmatic activity;
- Documents demonstrating positive impact on specific constituent groups consequent to programmatic activity;
- Evidence from peers and stakeholders attesting to the contribution of programmatic activity.

2. Evaluation Criteria for Extension and Outreach:

Faculty must provide evidence of the collaborative and other efforts to receive recognition in this Area of Faculty Effort.

- a. **The documentation should provide evidence that the work is:**
 - i. creative and intellectual;
 - ii. communicated to stakeholders;
 - iii. have a beneficial effect on stakeholders and the region.
- b. **Components of extension include:**
 - i. developing programs based on locally identified needs, concerns, and/or issues; targeting specific audiences;
 - ii. setting goals and objectives for the program;
 - iii. reviewing current literature and/or research for the program;
 - iv. planning appropriate program delivery;
 - v. documenting changes in clientele knowledge, behaviors, attitudes, and/or skills;
 - vi. conducting a reflective critique and/or evaluation of the program;
 - vii. validation of the program by peers and/or stakeholders; and
 - viii. communicating results to stakeholders and decision makers.

Appendix E: Documenting and Evaluating Leadership

A. Tenured and Tenure-Track

The following considerations are relevant to the evaluation and evidence of Leadership throughout the promotion process, with the expectation that leadership will be an increasingly important component as one's career progresses. Specifically, strong evidence of at least one form of leadership, including demonstrated leadership that is recognizable at the national or international level, is a central criterion for consideration of promotion to the rank of Full Professor.

1. Evidence of leadership includes, but is not limited to:
 - a. documented leadership role (i.e., committee chair) in initiatives, activities or services that advance the mission of the Department, College, and/or University;
 - b. service in a leadership/administrative capacity within the Department, College, or University, in ways contributing to their respective missions (e.g., Faculty Senate, college committees, museums and formal collections or repositories, etc.);
 - c. formal mentorship role that empowers colleagues in the pursuit of their professional goals;
 - d. service in external professional organizations that contributes to their respective missions, such as committee participation or leadership in national organizations (e.g., ASM, SACNAS, ESA);
 - e. organizing and running a workshop or conference within the scholar's discipline at the local, regional, national or international level;
 - f. organizing and running a professional development workshop or conference at the local, regional, national or international level;
 - g. serving as an editor/editorial board member for a nationally/internationally recognized journal;
 - h. serving as PI or associate director of an established research or training program for undergraduate or graduate students (e.g., RISE, HHMI, INBRE, U54), or initiating a new one;
 - i. directing community outreach (e.g., Science Fair), formal direction or advancement of non-University educational institution (e.g., Board Member of Las Cruces public school, LC Natural History Museum), leader of organization that involves the public in University programs;
 - j. engaging in fund-raising to advance the mission of the Department, College, and/or University above and beyond personal research (e.g., acquiring outside funding for Biology Department Awards)'
 - k. developing or adopting novel teaching formats, tools, or curricula at the local or national levels, and assisting others in implementing these tools in their own classrooms;
 - l. leading or coordinating interdepartmental or intercollegiate research/education degree-granting programs (e.g., Molecular Biology, Conservation Biology);
 - m. leading efforts to improve infrastructure or collections to provide novel resources and advance University function (e.g., NIH or NSF equipment or infrastructure grants) above and beyond personal research use;
 - n. advancing the larger reputation of NMSU (ie above and beyond personal accomplishments) at local, national or international professional fora or media;

o. contributing to internationalization by leading international research or educational projects above and beyond personal research or teaching (i.e. establishing new field courses that involve multiple institutions in the US and abroad).

2. Evaluation of Leadership

- a. initiates, directs, coordinates, or guides activities that advance the Department, College, and University mission;
- b. initiates, directs, coordinates, or guides activities of professional organizations in field of scholarship;
- c. provides formalized peer mentorship for colleagues regarding professional development and effective approaches to faculty governance;
- d. initiates, directs, coordinates, or guides, progress within field of scholarship;
- e. builds or fosters interdisciplinary, interdepartmental, or inter-institutional research, teaching, or policy initiatives or programs;
- f. consults or advises in decisions about government or funding agency policies;
- g. engenders breakthroughs, paradigm shifts, or landmark contributions with clear and enduring impact on his/her/their field;
- h. acquires funds that advance the mission of the Department, College or University;
- j. directs education, particularly biology education, of members of the community outside of the University.

B. College-Track

The following considerations are relevant to the evaluation and evidence of Leadership across the College Track promotion period, but evidence of one or more form of leadership are central criteria in consideration of promotion to the rank of Full College Professor:

- 1. Evidence of leadership includes, but is not limited to:
 - a. developing new courses reflecting emerging research and current issues and sharing these with colleagues within and outside the department;
 - b. revising existing courses to reflect emerging research, new technologies, current issues and successful pedagogies and sharing these with colleagues within and outside the department;
 - c. contributing in exceptional ways to the mission of the Department, College, University, or the profession;
 - d. serving in a leadership/administrative capacity within the Department, College, University, external organizations and agencies;
 - e. organizing and running a professional development workshop or conference at the local, regional, national or international level;
 - f. serving as an editor/editorial board member for a nationally/internationally recognized journal;
 - g. advancing the larger reputation of NMSU (ie above and beyond personal accomplishments) at local, national or international professional fora or media;

- h. contributing to efforts to obtain funding for research, training or education programs through external grants or donations;
- i. service or other activities not described above resulting in significant benefit to the educational mission of the department.

2. Evaluation of Leadership

- a. initiates, directs, coordinates, or guides activities that advance the Department, College, and University mission;
- b. initiates, directs, coordinates, or guides activities of professional organizations in field of scholarship;
- c. provides formalized peer mentorship for colleagues regarding professional development and effective approaches to faculty governance;
- d. initiates, directs, coordinates, or guides, progress within field of scholarship;
- e. builds or fosters interdisciplinary, interdepartmental, or inter-institutional research, teaching, or policy initiatives or programs;
- f. consults or advises in decisions about government or funding agency policies;
- g. engenders breakthroughs, paradigm shifts, or landmark contributions with clear and enduring impact on his/her/their field;
- h. acquires funds that advance the mission of the Department, College or University;
- i. directs education, particularly biology education, of members of the community outside of the University.

C. Research Track

The following considerations are relevant to the evaluation and evidence of Leadership across the Research Track promotion period, but evidence of one or more form of leadership are central criteria in consideration of promotion to the rank of Full Research Professor:

- 1. Evidence of leadership includes, but is not limited to:
 - a. organizing and running a workshop or conference within the scholar's discipline at the local, regional, national or international level;
 - b. organizing and running a professional development workshop or conference at the local, regional, national or international level;
 - c. serving as an editor/editorial board member for a nationally/internationally recognized journal;
 - d. serving as PI or associate director of an established research or training program for undergraduate or graduate students (e.g., RISE, HHMI, INBRE, U54), or initiating a new one;
 - e. directing community outreach (e.g., Science Fair), formal direction or advancement of non-University educational institution (e.g., Board Member of Las Cruces public school, LC Natural History Museum), leader of organization that involves the public in University programs;
 - f. leading efforts to improve infrastructure or collections to provide novel resources and advance University function (e.g., NIH or NSF equipment or infrastructure grants) above and beyond

personal research use;

g. advancing the larger reputation of NMSU (ie above and beyond personal accomplishments) at local, national or international professional fora or media;

h. contributing to internationalization by leading international research or educational projects above and beyond personal research or teaching (i.e. establishing new field courses that involve multiple institutions in the US and abroad).

2. Evaluation of Leadership

a. initiates, directs, coordinates, or guides activities of professional organizations in field of scholarship;

b. provides formalized peer mentorship for colleagues regarding professional development and effective approaches to faculty governance;

c. initiates, directs, coordinates, or guides, progress within field of scholarship;

d. builds or fosters interdisciplinary, interdepartmental, or inter-institutional research, teaching, or policy initiatives or programs;

e. consults or advises in decisions about government or funding agency policies;

f. engenders breakthroughs, paradigm shifts, or landmark contributions with clear and enduring impact on his/her/their field;

g. acquires funds that advance the mission of the Department, College or University.

**Appendix F: Candidate's Executive
Summary and Promotion and/or Tenure
Review Process**

See also Appendix G: College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and/or Tenure portfolio checklist, applicable for tenure-track, college-track and research faculty

Executive Summary (maximum of 3,000 words)

- The document should provide separate sections dedicated to teaching and advising, scholarly and creative activities, service and outreach.
- The document should demonstrate the candidate's philosophy in the various areas of effort, along with a reflection of the work performed in each area.
- Achievements and contributions in the different areas should be discussed and placed in the context of the overall philosophy and goals of the candidate. It is recommended that the summary provides a framework for interpreting and contextualizing the content of the candidate's curriculum vitae.
- If appropriate, the summary should provide evidence of leadership achieved in the various areas of effort.
- Discussion of scholarship and creative activities should be formulated with reference to the model articulated by NMSU policy.
- Discussion of teaching and advising should include a reflection of teaching effectiveness, professional development and impact on students' learning.
- Discussion of service should formulate the vision of impact within the unit, the College, the institution and the broader community.
- Discussion of outreach should formulate the vision of impact within the unit, the College, the institution and the broader community.

General process for promotion and tenure

This outlines the general process undertaken for promotion or promotion and tenure to provide background regarding steps and timing. Details vary from year to year so candidates should be sure to consult relevant sections of the NMSU and College of Arts and Sciences Administrative Rules and Procedures. The ARP Section 9.35 (<https://arp.nmsu.edu/9-35/>) contains information on the process, including extending the probationary period or withdrawing at any time prior to the final signature of the executive vice-president and provost, or in the fifth year of service (see Part 7).

March- Candidates generally declare their intention to apply for tenure and/or promotion the following fall semester. In the case of faculty without a continuous contract, both the P&T committee and the DH provide the standard annual review. In the case of faculty with a continuous contract, the candidate may request a review by the P&T Committee, which will be provided in the form of a letter to the candidate; this review, however, is optional as faculty can seek promotion without the prior recommendation of the P&T committee. In all cases, however, the DH must work with the faculty member to determine a timeline and guidelines for their portfolio and assist the candidate with creation of the portfolio according to the set timeline. The

Department Head will define a deadline, often July 31st, for the candidate having their materials ready for external and internal review. For external review, the Department head will request the executive summary, the scholarship that occurred between arrival to NMSU and present (assistant professors), or the scholarship that occurred between tenure/promotion and the present (associate professors). Note that external review is not required for college-track or research faculty seeking promotion (per A&S Policy).

May/June: Submit at least 6-10 names to the Department Head of colleagues who you consider experts in your area of scholarship/creative activity who can provide diverse and objective assessments of your scholarship. The people on this list must be at the level above you (e.g., associate or full professors or equivalent professional ranks for assistant professors, full professors or equivalent professional ranks for associate professors). In addition, submit the names of your PhD and postdoctoral advisors, and any other expert, not suggested as reviewers, in your current field of scholarship; these individuals will help guide the Department Head with identifying additional reviewers. When suggesting external reviewers, avoid any conflicts of interest, real or perceived.

The Department Head will also oversee the process of securing and communicating with the external reviewers (including submission of appropriate material for review, creation of letter to reviewers that explains NMSU, College, and Departmental context, and refers reviewers to the Departmental, College, and University policies. Reviewers generally will receive your entire portfolio as submitted to the Department Head, as well as the criteria regarding promotion and tenure. A typical letter of instruction is included in Appendix H for reference.

July/August- External reviews are conducted under the oversight of the Department Head. Candidates may review the external letters any time after they are received by the Department Head.

August/September- APR and annual DH appraisal are conducted early for the candidate. A complete portfolio and supporting documents are made available to the P & T committee. See Appendix G for the A&S Portfolio checklist.

September/October-P & T committee reviews portfolio and makes recommendation regarding tenure &/or promotion to DH.

October- DH receives P & T committee recommendation and conducts an independent assessment towards promotion and/or tenure. DH shares both recommendations in writing with the candidate and places both in the portfolio that will be forwarded to the Dean's office. The candidate is given a time window to provide a written rebuttal (to be inserted in the portfolio).

Mid-October- Two copies of the core document of the promotion and/or tenure portfolio (checklist) are submitted to the Dean's office with required forms.

Nov/Dec/Jan- College Faculty Affairs committee reviews all applications for tenure and/or promotion and makes an independent recommendation to the Dean.

Jan- The Dean notifies the candidate in writing the outcome of the Faculty affairs committee.

Feb/March- The Dean reviews and makes an independent recommendation to the Executive Vice President/Provost (EVPP). The candidate is notified in writing of the Dean's recommendation.

March- The Dean meets with the EVPP to discuss recommendations for each candidate from their college.

April- EVPP makes final decision and informs the candidate.

All forms can be found on the NMSU website for Promotion and Tenure materials
<https://provost.nmsu.edu/promotion-and-tenure/>

**Appendix G- College of Arts and Sciences
Promotion and/or Tenure Portfolio Checklist**

College of Arts and Sciences
Promotion and/or Tenure Portfolio Checklist

The College of Arts and Sciences updates its Promotion and/or Tenure Portfolio checklist each year. Please check the following website for the most current checklist to attach to the P and/or T folder:

<https://artsci.nmsu.edu/as-policies-and-procedures/>

**Appendix H- Sample Department Head letter to
External Reviewers**

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Department of Biology, MSC 3AF
New Mexico State University
P.O. Box 30001
Las Cruces, NM 88003-8001

Telephone: (575) 646-3611
Fax: (575) 646-5665



Date

Professor Y
Department of X
University of X

Dear Professor Y:

Thank you very much for agreeing to serve as an external reviewer for Dr. XX as he/she applies for promotion to associate/full professor. Dr. XX will begin his/her XX year as an Assistant/Associate Professor who specializes in XX, and regularly teaches our required courses in (list courses). To assist you in your review, I will be creating a drop box with the following materials:

1. A copy of Dr. XX's vitae.
2. A copy of the executive summary that Dr. XX prepared.
3. A copy of our department's statement on tenure and promotion.
4. A copy of the university procedures for promotion and tenure.

On behalf of the department I ask that you review these materials and then prepare a letter addressing the contributions Dr. XX makes to the profession through his/her research and scholarship. Our university documentation does not provide specific criteria for achieving promotion to associate/full professor. Our department documentation specifies that candidates for promotion to associate/full professor should demonstrate leadership capabilities (if going up for full), along with scholarship, teaching, and service. Faculty in our department regularly teach a 2/1 load (45%), scholarship (45%), and have a high service commitment (10%).

If you wish, you may address Dr. XX's work as a whole, focusing on its overall reputation and quality, or you may address individual pieces of the work as you see fit. Most helpful for Dr. XX and those who review his/her application will be an overview statement concerning his/her scholarly contribution to the profession. It would also be very helpful if you could provide me with a vitae, so I can use it to write a paragraph speaking to your qualifications to review Dr. XX's work for the college review committee.

Your letter will become part of Dr. XX's final application and will be reviewed first by a department tenure and promotion committee and the department head (me), then by a college faculty review committee (comprised of representative faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences), our college's dean, and finally approved by the Provost. Because we have an open file system at the university, Dr. XX will be entitled to review your letter, although many choose not to (as stated in their executive summary).

In order to ensure a smooth process, I ask that you review the enclosed materials and send me your letter by the 1st of September. You may send me a PDF of the letter, but if you prefer you can send a hard copy sent to me via regular mail. If you have any questions, please get in touch with me at the email below. And let me thank you again for taking the time to complete this review during the summer. I truly appreciate your generosity, expertise and service in this important process.

With best wishes,

XXX
Academic Department Head, Biology