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I. PREAMBLE

As faculty of the Oakland University Department of Biological Sciences, our responsibilities include research, teaching, and service. Below we describe the criteria and procedures for evaluating individual faculty for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in accordance with the university’s standards that are part of this review statement. Faculty are required to meet the criteria described below for scholarship/research, teaching, and service in order to be recommended for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

II. CRITERIA

A. SCHOLARSHIP/RESEARCH

Since its inception, the Department of Biological Sciences has had a strong research orientation. Faculty members are expected to establish a productive, independent research program. Scholarly potential has been and continues to be one of the major criteria for the recruiting of faculty members.

Scholarship/research is original scientific inquiry that enhances our understanding of the biological world and which is shared with the scientific community. Examples of activities that are to be considered when evaluating biological research include:

1. development of an independent research program in one’s area of expertise,

2. documentation of scholarly accomplishments through peer-reviewed publications in recognized scientific journals and/or authorship of scholarly texts,

3. presentation of research findings at professional meetings,

4. obtaining the means by which to pursue the studies; for example, securing appropriate funding, obtaining equipment, locating habitats, developing new techniques, seeking opportunity for collaborative research, and engaging in discussions with others in the field, and

5. mentoring of students in individual research projects, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Mentoring of graduate students that culminates in thesis completion and graduation is considered an important accomplishment in one’s research record. Candidates for reappointment, tenure or promotion can discuss research mentorship in their personal statement under either research or teaching.

Criteria for the various review levels:
c.1: The doctoral and postdoctoral research should be published or accepted for publication. The candidate should have identified research goals and have established a clear sense of direction as evidenced by research projects in progress. Applications for competitive external funding should be submitted. In order to meet these research expectations, it is important that sufficient time be devoted to research. The department and Review Committee must recognize this in setting their expectations for teaching and service.

c.2 or c.3: The candidate should be performing as an independent scholar through published works or articles accepted for publication. His/her research program should show a clear sense of direction that would lead one to expect continued contributions in the future. Competitive external funding should have been achieved, or the candidate’s progress in securing funding appropriate to his/her field should afford reasonable expectations of success.

c.4: In order for a candidate to be recommended for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the record should show high quality scholarship and significant research productivity as an independent research scholar. The candidate should have a substantial publication record (several peer-reviewed publications during the non-tenured years based on work performed at Oakland), presentations at professional meetings, and favorable letters of evaluation from outside reviewers who are experts in the field of the candidate. The candidate should have obtained the competitive external funding necessary to maintain his/her research or it should be clear how continued research productivity can be maintained in the absence of such support.

Promotion to Professor: The candidate should have a significant research record that clearly demonstrates that he/she is an established scholar in the chosen area of research. The candidate must have a continuous record of at least five (5) years of productive, post-tenure research immediately prior to being considered for promotion. Evidence for significant and productive research will be in the quantity and quality of the publications. It is expected that at least some of the publications are in leading journals in the candidate’s field of research. The candidate should have obtained the competitive external funding necessary to maintain his/her research.

DEFINITIONS:

Independent Research: Independent research involves sustained research activity as a lead investigator, in which the candidate makes substantial and original contributions to the research project. An independent investigator should have a lead role in the intellectual direction and supervision of his/her research project/s. The securing of funding and the publication of peer-reviewed articles are evidence of independent research.

Publications: Peer-reviewed publications in journals or books, whether original research reports or reviews, are the primary evidence of research productivity. Abstracts, meeting presentations and meeting proceedings enhance a candidate’s research record, but do not substitute for peer-reviewed research reports or reviews. For publications to qualify as evidence for independent research, the candidate should be the lead contributor to the study. In some areas of biological research, the lead contributor is designated as the “corresponding author” and is listed last in the authorship sequence. In other areas the lead contributor/corresponding author is listed as the first author. Manuscripts are evidence of research productivity only if they have been accepted for publication.
Collaboration:
The nature of competitive research often requires collaboration with other independent investigators within and outside the university. Collaborative research contributes to the research record of the candidate. However, collaborative work cannot be the sole evidence for independent research unless the candidate is the lead investigator of the collaborative project. Candidates must explain their particular role and contribution to collaborative research in their personal statement.

B. TEACHING

Departmental faculty are viewed as senior members of a community of scholars who share their experience with and provide guidance to students. This sharing of knowledge includes both the development of critical scientific thinking skills and problem solving ability, as well as the effective transmission of current information. The goal of teaching is to provide students a better biological understanding of the world and the vocational skills necessary for employment in a biological discipline.

Examples of teaching activities include:

1. effective communication of biological concepts and methodologies in lectures, discussions, and supervision of laboratory projects,
2. effective mentoring of graduate students (evidenced by student publications and presentations, thesis completion, graduation, etc.),
3. effective mentoring of undergraduate research students (evidenced by student publications, presentations, etc.),
4. training and guidance of graduate and undergraduate teaching assistants,
5. development of new courses and substantially improving ongoing courses,
6. authorship of textbooks or development of other teaching tools,
7. providing guest lectures in the academic community, and
8. seeking support (internal or external) for course development and for improvement and/or training grants.

The evaluation of teaching shall be based on (i) information from students in the form of end-of-semester evaluations as well as letters solicited by the Review Committee, (ii) colleagues’ review of teaching based on in-class visitations, and (iii) examination of course materials developed by the candidate (i.e., syllabi, exams, etc.).

Criteria for the various review levels:

c.1: The candidate will usually have been hired to fill a specified “teaching slot”. During this first year or two, it is expected that the candidate will have spent considerable preparation time
developing his/her own lecture notes, teaching methodologies, and laboratory experiments. The c.1 candidate will consider the constructive criticisms of students and colleagues to improve his/her teaching effectiveness.

**c.2 or c.3:** It is expected that any serious problems in his/her teaching performance at the c.1 review should have been corrected. Furthermore, in conjunction with developing a research program, he/she is expected to have sponsored students in individual research projects (BIO 490) or directed readings (BIO 405). Candidates at this stage are encouraged to mentor graduate students.

**c.4:** The candidate shall have developed courses in which he/she has become an effective teacher and has demonstrated high academic standards. The candidate must be an effective teacher (see definition below).

**Promotion to Professor:** The candidate must have offered a reasonable variety of courses and consistently demonstrated a high level of effective instruction. He/she should have made contributions in pedagogical areas such as defining the shape of the curriculum or helping junior members solve pedagogical problems.

**DEFINITIONS:**

**Effective Teaching/Instruction:**
Effective academic teaching includes developing and/or maintaining course curricula consistent with current knowledge, teaching and grading appropriate with the course level, and obtaining favorable reviews from student evaluations and peer visitations of classes. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness includes examining such factors as the fairness of grading and whether the grade distribution is comparable to that of other faculty teaching the same or similar level courses.

**C. SERVICE**

Service includes activities that are supportive of teaching and research functions. Examples of service include:

1. constructive participation in departmental, college, or university committees,
2. academic advising,
3. support of other department members, and other university faculty, in the process of carrying out their responsibilities; willingness to share ideas, competencies, and equipment,
4. maintenance and supervision of departmental equipment and facilities,
5. community outreach in a professional capacity and/or public relations role; professional contributions that are recognized beyond the university community,
6. seeking financial support for departmental equipment and programs,
7. providing professional services such as refereeing grants and publications, organizing conferences, serving on editorial boards, etc.
Criteria for the various review levels:

c.1: The only service required is that the candidate will have attended and participated in departmental faculty meetings. There is no requirement for service at the college or university level, nor will the department encourage such assignments.

c.2 or c.3: Service is expected in at least one standing department committee. Participation at the college or university level is highly valued and expected.

c.4: Service at the college and university level, in addition to departmental committees, is expected. Consideration will be given to leadership, productive participation, and workload.

Promotion to Professor: The candidate is expected to have consistently performed significant service and performed effectively in leadership roles at the departmental, college, and/or university levels. Evidence for leadership roles in service activities include chairing departmental, college, or university committees, serving on CAP or FRPC, serving as the departmental adviser, etc.

D. CRITERIA FOR SPECIAL INSTRUCTORS

Special instructors are reviewed for re-employment and job security on the basis of performance in the areas of teaching and service. Considering the emphasis on teaching for such faculty, these criteria include expectations of excellent teaching skills and professional leadership in curricular design and the use of instructional technology, as well as to demonstrate a solid service record. The criteria for the various review levels for special instructors are:

a. First re-employment

Teaching. The candidate must have a record of strong and dedicated teaching, as evidenced by student evaluations, student letters, teaching material (syllabi, test, handouts, etc.), and peer review.

Service. The candidate must show evidence of active participation in departmental meetings. Membership on one departmental committee is expected. Participation in college and/or university service will be viewed favorably.

b. Second re-employment

Teaching. The candidate must continue to show evidence of strong and dedicated teaching. Any problems identified at the first re-employment review should be addressed. Improvement of existing courses, creation of new courses, and involvement in writing and publishing instructional materials will be viewed favorably.

Service. Active participation in departmental service is expected, including membership on at least one standing department committee. Also, participation at the college or university level is highly valued and expected. The candidate should begin to assume a leadership role in service activities.

c. Re-employment with the granting of job security
**Teaching.** The candidate must have established him/herself as a strong and dedicated teacher. Initiative in course development and curricular improvement, including the use of instructional technology, is expected. Involvement in writing and publishing instructional materials, and in obtaining development grants for instructional purposes, will be viewed favorably.

**Service.** Service at the college and university level, in addition to departmental committees, is expected. The candidate will be expected to serve in a leadership capacity in one or more aspects of service.

### III. PROCEDURES

#### A. GUIDANCE FOR UNTENURED FACULTY

1. During the first semester of employment, the chairperson will provide a copy of this document and discuss this document with the new faculty member.

2. During their first semester of employment, each new faculty member will be assigned a Guidance Committee, consisting of the search committee for the candidate or other faculty designated by the chair. The purpose of this committee will be to counsel and assist the faculty member on working to meet departmental criteria for reappointment and promotion.

#### B. PROCEDURES FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION DECISIONS

1. The chairperson will appoint a Review Committee for each candidate by the beginning of the semester prior to Oakland’s review of the candidate (typically the beginning of the fall semester), except that the Committee shall be appointed before the end of the prior winter semester for candidates undergoing c.4 tenure review or by the middle of the winter semester for candidates for promotion to Professor. The membership of the Review Committee will consist of three tenured members of the academic unit, mutually agreed upon by the chairperson and the candidate. The responsibilities of the Review Committee will be both the gathering and evaluation of information.

2. Simultaneously, the candidate will prepare a complete dossier according to the guidelines of CAP and FRPC. An example for the most recent version is included in Appendix A. Below we detail some of the important items:

   a) A curriculum vitae in the format provided by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, which will also include all items required by CAP and FRPC.

   b) A concise personal statement of professional goals, educational and service objectives, and a discussion of how the candidate’s career at Oakland reflects these goals.

   c) A list of scientists who are competent to evaluate his/her research, compiled by the review committee in consultation with the candidate in the following manner: The candidate will provide a list of reviewers from which at least three will be selected; the
committee will select, independently, at least three additional reviewers. A statement of the reviewer’s relationship to the candidate will be provided in the dossier. As a rule, letters from reviewers with clearly visible connections to the candidate should be avoided. The letters soliciting reviews should be sent out by 1 October at the latest. For c.1 and c.2 reappointments, no outside letters are required.

d) A list of teaching assistants and research students under one’s supervision. All of the students engaged in one’s research program will be solicited for comments. The candidate will provide names of 20 students from classes taught since the last review to be solicited for written comments.

e) Presentation of a research seminar during the semester or term prior to the candidate’s review. This seminar will present the candidate’s recent progress in research and goals for future research. The seminar provides an opportunity to the departmental faculty to understand the candidate’s own view of his/her research program and to ask specific questions about the data presented and the candidate’s overall direction in research.

3. The candidate will provide an abbreviated c.v. along with copies of selected publications available for review by members of the department no later than 15 October before the review.

4. The Review Committee will review the dossier with the candidate, seeking more information from the candidate as necessary. It will also be responsible for obtaining further information from:

a) All full-time faculty of the department (tenured and non-tenured) in the form of written statements containing information from direct experience and any other relevant objective comments that will be helpful to the Review Committee in carrying out its evaluation role. All written statements will be anonymous.

b) Students’ perception of faculty teaching, as obtained through the departmental student questionnaire, and letters from students. The committee will solicit letters from 40 students, 20 specified by the candidate as in section 2(d) above and an unbiased sample of 20 selected by the review committee from recent class lists. The committee’s selection will include students whose grades range from 2.0 to 4.0.

c) Departmental colleagues who have conducted in-class visitations. At least three members of the biology faculty will attend the candidate’s class to evaluate teaching performance during the year prior to the candidate’s review.

d) Evaluation of the candidate’s course syllabi, examinations, and grade distributions.

e) Extra-departmental, university colleagues who have participated with the candidate in research programs, teaching, or committee work, or who have chaired committees on which the candidate has served.

f) External scientists who are qualified to evaluate his/her research as specified in section 2(c) above.
5. The Review Committee will organize and thoroughly review all of the material, and prepare a comprehensive, written evaluation and recommendation that will be provided to the candidate at least 21 days prior to submission of the dossier to the Dean of CAS.

6. The candidate will have the option of presenting a written response to the evaluation within three days, and this will become a part of the dossier.

7. The contents of the complete dossier will be available to the voting members and candidate 18 days before the Dean of CAS deadline. Voting members in the department are tenured, full-time faculty.

8. A meeting of the Review Committee and the voting members of the academic unit will be held to discuss the complete dossier at least 7 days prior to the Dean of the CAS deadline.

9. One ballot will be provided to each of the voting faculty immediately after the meeting, with a “yes” or “no” option and space for added comments. Every voting member of the academic unit, after thorough examination of the dossier, will submit to the chairperson in writing an anonymous “yes” or “no” vote as to the candidate’s reappointment/promotion with supporting arguments for the decision no later than the day following the meeting. Any abstention should be explained. The results of the voting and the supporting arguments become a part of the dossier.

10. The chairperson will write a summary that incorporates the opinions expressed by the Review Committee and the voting members. In the summary, the chairperson will discuss any disparities between the two, and evaluate the candidate within the total departmental program and goals. He/she will make certain that the departmental procedures in the review process have been correctly followed. A copy of the summary will be provided to the candidate at least three (3) days before of the Dean of CAS deadline. The candidate has three days to respond in writing to the chairperson’s summary (the candidate’s response is optional), and this would then be included in the dossier. The candidate will update the dossier according to the list in the appendix. The results of the vote and the chairperson’s summary will be accessible to the voting members three days before the submission deadline to the Dean.

11. If either the review committee’s recommendation or the departmental vote is negative, the candidate may appeal to the chairperson on the basis of invalid procedures or new information. The Chair will then call a meeting of the voting faculty as soon as possible to reconsider the case. Any changes in the subsequent vote will be incorporated into a new departmental report from the chairperson.

12. In the event that the department chairperson disagrees with the recommendation of the voting members, he or she may include a dissenting letter; however, such a letter is independent from the recommendation of the review committee and the voting members.
C. PROCEDURES FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND GRANTING OF TENURE TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The department’s c.4 criteria and procedures will be used in granting tenure to candidates at the associate professor level.

D. PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

The procedures are the same as for reappointment and tenure decisions, except as follows: tenured members in steps 1, 4, 6, 7, and 8 is replaced by professors and the following:

The chair can recommend an associate professor who has at least five years post-tenure service for candidacy to the rank of professor if the chair determines that a majority of the voting members (professors) support the candidacy. An associate professor can also initiate his/her candidacy for professor by submitting a written request to the chair.

In both situations, the chair will request from the candidate an abbreviated c.v., student teaching evaluations, and other relevant materials for review by the voting members. After these materials are reviewed by the voting members, the chair will inform the associate professor of the preliminary support for his/her promotion among the voting members as well as any deficiencies noted in the associate professor’s record.

The associate professor may request a meeting with the voting members to discuss his/her evaluation. The associate professor, after having received feedback from the voting members, can decide to continue or to withdraw his/her candidacy for promotion. If an associate professor decides to continue his/her candidacy after learning that the majority of the voting members do not support his/her promotion and is subsequently denied promotion, the associate professor must wait at least three years to resubmit his/her candidacy for professor.

E. PROCEDURES FOR EARLY PROMOTIONS:

Early promotion to associate professor with tenure will be recommended for any candidate showing precocious achievement in meeting or surpassing c.4 criteria.

F. PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF THESE PROCEDURES

Periodically, the chairperson will request the departmental Executive Committee to review these procedures and suggest modifications to be presented to the faculty for its approval. Changes to the criteria and procedures should be made in accordance with the faculty contract provisions.

IV. UNIVERSITY STANDARDS FOR RE-EMPLOYMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE
In all reviews for tenure and promotion Oakland will consider the candidate’s entire record, emphasizing efforts and accomplishments since attainment of current rank. The candidate’s record at Oakland University generally will be of particular importance. Oakland’s evaluation of the candidate will consider:

- the programmatic and institutional setting of the candidate’s work at Oakland and the nature of the candidate’s assignments and responsibilities;
- the quality of the candidate’s accomplishments;
- the relation of all these factors to the objectives of the area or department, the goals of the college or school or institute, and the mission and long range vision of the university.

Oakland’s evaluation focuses on the candidate’s efforts and accomplishments in three areas:

- teaching or performance as a university librarian, as appropriate to the appointment;
- intellectual contributions such as scholarship, research, and creative activities;
- service.

**Teaching and University Librarianship**

The term “teaching” refers to all instruction and advising activities that affect or support the academic progress of students. These activities include classroom, laboratory, studio, field, and clinical teaching and evaluation; the supervision of research, writing, independent study, practica, and performance; individual and group advising and mentoring; preparation of courses; development of curricular and instructional materials; instructional innovations; and application of new educational technologies.

The phrase “performance as a university librarian” refers to initiating, planning, organizing, and implementing library programs, including application of technology and effective communication with and service to library users.

A candidate for tenure must show substantial evidence of achievement in teaching and/or performance as a university librarian. Such evidence must be obtained through use of systematic procedures for student and peer review. Evidence may include, but is not limited to, assessments of the instructor’s preparation through peer review of syllabi, reading lists, class and library handouts, tests, examinations, and other course and library materials in all formats; student appraisals such as course evaluations and solicited and unsolicited letters; evidence of student achievement; and success in sharing teaching philosophies and methodologies and in obtaining grant support relating to teaching and/or university librarianship.
Intellectual Contributions – Scholarship, Research and Creative Endeavors

Because of the comprehensive and diverse nature of Oakland University’s mission, Oakland recognizes in its reviews a broad range of intellectual contributions. Such contributions improve theory and practice and support the present and future quality of instruction at Oakland University.

Scholarship and research include:

- basic, theoretical or applied research;
- scholarship that applies the research to the betterment of society, institutions, groups, and individuals;
- peer recognition of the above as reflected in publications in refereed journals, other peer-reviewed publications, and critical reviews as appropriate to the discipline;
- successful efforts in securing competitive or professionally significant external funding in disciplines where research is traditionally supported by grants;
- scholarship that interprets, draws together, and brings new insights to bear on original research, gives meaning to isolated facts and puts them in perspective, or creates connections across disciplinary lines;
- scholarship that involves not only transmitting knowledge but transforming and extending it as well through carefully planned and continuously examined pedagogical procedures that stimulate active learning and encourage students to be critical and creative thinkers with the capacity to go on learning after their college days are over.

“Creative activities” refers to works of artistic expression, production, or performance, and includes such activities as composing, writing, directing, performing, and conducting.

The most important evidence of scholarship, research, and creative activities is that authorities in the discipline(s) or field(s), including authorities outside the institution, have critically evaluated the work as meeting high standards (e.g., publications in refereed journals, grants and other funded research proposals). A candidate for tenure is expected to have made substantial progress toward maturity as a scholar or creative artist and to have established the presumption of continued growth in these areas.

Service

The term “service” refers to the following activities:

- public, institutional, and professional service through work that grows out of the university’s programs and mission and has the potential for substantial and positive effects on a community, profession, or external perceptions of the university, and that draws upon the candidate’s professional competence. Such service includes not only contributions to the organizational work of academic professional associations and societies at all levels but also activities that extend Oakland’s scholarly and instructional capabilities into various external agencies and communities.
university service through committee work or governance activities in the area, department, school, institute, college, or the university; for faculty, university service includes service as a role model and mentor for colleagues and students.

Documentation of the candidate’s service should recognize these distinctions and, particularly in the case of public, institutional, and professional service, should indicate the relationship of the candidate’s service activities to the programs and mission of the university and to the candidate’s instruction, intellectual contributions, and professional responsibilities. A candidate’s involvement in university service should reflect an appropriate sharing of general faculty obligations in university governance.

Evidence of service should speak to its magnitude, complexity, and duration and may be derived from the testimony of those served; from evaluations provided by others involved in service work; from reports, articles, instructional materials and other documents produced through service; and from grants and funded projects, honors, and awards received in recognition of service.

Oakland regards teaching or performance as a university librarian and intellectual contributions as the most crucial areas of development for candidates for non-tenured reemployment or for tenure. Oakland normally will expect the record of candidates for tenure to show some accomplishments in service.

Beyond their achievements at the time of tenure all candidates for professor are expected to have continued their development in teaching or performance as a university librarian and in intellectual contributions and service. In addition, candidates for professor are expected to have demonstrated excellence and creativity in teaching or performance as a university librarian including application of technology, or to have achieved wide recognition beyond the institution as authorities or leaders in intellectual contributions or wide recognition in public, institutional, and professional service. In disciplines where research is traditionally supported by grant support, external funding is desirable for consideration of promotion to professor. In addition, candidates for professor must demonstrate potential for sustained involvement in teaching, research, and service.
Appendix A:

Dossier Organization According to CAP and FRPC Guidelines
(Updated as of October 2005, check for new updates annually)

In main dossier:

Table of Contents
Curriculum vitae, (Dean’s format)
Candidate’s personal statement
Dept’s procedures and criteria
Chair’s certification of procedures (or within chair’s letter)
Chair’s letter
Candidate’s response (optional)
CAP C-2 recommendation (for C-4 reviews)
Review committee’s letter
Candidate’s response (optional)
Departmental colleagues’ letters
Departmental colleagues’ votes
List of contents of supplementary files
Scholarship: (in any order)
  Sample letter of solicitation
  List of external reviewers with brief identification and relationship
  Letters from external reviewers
  For each pub or presentation:
    Indication of contribution
    Indication of student co-authors
    Complete journal titles & pagination
Instruction: (in any order)
  Statements of faculty visitors (if not in committee report)
  Sample end-of-term student questionnaire
  Numerical results of student questionnaires
  Note on student questionnaires
  Sample solicitation letter to students
  Statement on how students solicited were selected
  Student letters
Service: (in any order)
  Sample solicitation letter for comments on external service
  Letters from chairs of committees
  Letters of appreciation for major service activities
  Any evidence of unusual professional service

Supporting files: Hard copies of everything noted and referred to in the main dossier.