

Standards and Criteria for Retention, Tenure and Promotion
Humboldt State University
Department of Biological Sciences
12 March 2008

The tenured and tenure-track members of the Department of Biological Sciences approved the following teaching, scholarly/creative, and service activities as applicable to the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) process pursuant to Appendix J of the Faculty Handbook (Effective AY 2008-2009).

1. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Retention, Tenure, and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

In the evaluation of the teaching effectiveness of faculty members with the rank of Assistant Professor in the RTP process

Appendix J

IX. Areas of Performance for RTP

B. Assessment of the Areas of Performance for RTP

1. Effectiveness

a) *Teaching effectiveness*

shall be followed.

Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor

In the evaluation of the teaching effectiveness of faculty members with the rank of Associate Professor in the promotion process

Appendix J

IX. Areas of Performance for RTP

B. Assessment of the Areas of Performance for RTP

1. Effectiveness

a) *Teaching effectiveness*

shall be followed (with the exception that in subsection (a)(1), the phrase "throughout the probationary period" is eliminated as these faculty members are no longer in their probationary period).

2. RESEARCH AND OTHER SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

a. CONTRIBUTIONS ASSESSED

Retention, Tenure, and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

For the granting of tenure, the Department expects a faculty member to provide evidence of an on-campus research program that encourages and provides for student involvement. Each faculty member is required to demonstrate contributions to knowledge in his or her area of specialization. At least some of the contributions from HSU-based activities should provide evidence of graduate or undergraduate student involvement. It is expected that a faculty member will provide evidence of his or her efforts towards the dissemination of original research in peer-reviewed publications, as well as evidence of efforts towards the submission of extramural research grant proposals. Contributions made during any service credit years granted to a faculty member will have equal standing to HSU-based contributions. The timing of contributions is not critical, but evidence of on-campus scholarly activity must be presented.

These and other contributions shall be in accordance with areas specifically indicated below. They are organized in two categories. No relative importance or weighting is implied by the order within each category.

Category I Contributions:

Peer-Reviewed Publications: Academic journal papers or similar publications that represent original research contributions to knowledge in biology. Peer-reviewed books, book chapters, textbooks, review articles, symposium proceedings and the like that primarily compile, organize and analyze material from the field. *For any co-authored publications, the specific role of the faculty member in generating the final product should be indicated. The greater the involvement of the faculty member, the more important the contribution.*

Extramural Research Grants: Funded extramural grants in support of original research (whether for instrumentation, personnel, student research stipends, educational opportunities, or operating expenses). Unfunded extramural grant proposals in support of original research, when such proposals were submitted to established funding agencies for competitive evaluation by peers. *Funded proposals shall be weighted more heavily than unfunded proposals. Co-PIs should specifically indicate the contributions they made to the proposal. Exceptional size and longevity of funded grants may carry additional weight towards fulfilling the requirements for tenure.*

Completed Graduate Theses: Masters theses on which the faculty served as the thesis advisor or co-advisor. *Unless the Masters Degree has already been awarded to the student in question, the completeness of theses must be documented (e.g., with letters of support from colleagues).*

Category II Contributions:

Funded Intramural Grants: Seed grants for research, graduate student support, etc., awarded by on-campus selection committees.

Technical Reports: Non-peer-reviewed technical reports presented in completion of contracts that have a substantial scholarly value (and are not simply a bureaucratic exercise).

Software and Instructional Materials: Non-peer-reviewed 'courseware', tutorials, or software developed for innovative instruction or specialized research uses. These contributions shall be evaluated based on evidence of value to the discipline.

Other Non-Peer-Reviewed Publications: Professional letters, professional book reviews, and other publications in the discipline.

Extramural Meeting Presentations: Published or unpublished abstracts from papers or posters presented at regional, national or international meetings, conferences, or symposia (including such meetings when they are held on campus).

Academic Seminars: e.g. Departmental Seminars at HSU or elsewhere.

Unfunded Intramural Grants Submitted

Other Unpublished Materials: Manuscripts in preparation, grant proposals in preparation, student theses in progress, research data sets, and the like. *Such unpublished contributions must be documented and evaluated (e.g., with letters of support from colleagues).*

Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor

For promotion to full professor, the Department expects a faculty member to provide evidence of an on-campus research program that encourages and provides for student involvement. Each faculty member is required to demonstrate contributions to knowledge in his or her area of specialization. At

least some of the contributions from HSU-based activities should provide evidence of graduate or undergraduate student involvement. It is expected that a faculty member will provide evidence of his or her efforts towards the dissemination of original research in peer-reviewed publications, as well as evidence of efforts towards the submission of extramural research grant proposals. The timing of contributions is not critical, but evidence of on-campus scholarly activity must be presented.

These and other contributions shall be in accordance with areas specifically indicated below. They are organized in two categories. No relative importance or weighting is implied by the order within each category.

Category I Contributions:

Peer-Reviewed Publications: Academic journal papers or similar publications that represent original research contributions to knowledge in biology. Peer-reviewed books, book chapters, textbooks, review articles, symposium proceedings and the like that primarily compile, organize and analyze material from the field. *For any co-authored publications, the specific role of the faculty member in generating the final product should be indicated. The greater the involvement of the faculty member, the more important the contribution.*

Extramural Research Grants: Funded extramural grants in support of original research (whether for instrumentation, personnel, student research stipends, educational opportunities, or operating expenses). Unfunded extramural grant proposals in support of original research, when such proposals were submitted to established funding agencies for competitive evaluation by peers. *Funded proposals shall be weighted more heavily than unfunded proposals. Co-PIs should specifically indicate the contributions they made to the proposal. Exceptional size and longevity of funded grants may carry additional weight towards fulfilling the requirements for promotion.*

Completed Graduate Theses: Masters theses on which the faculty served as the thesis advisor or co-advisor. *Unless the Masters Degree has already been awarded to the student in question, the completeness of theses must be documented (e.g., with letters of support from colleagues).*

Category II Contributions:

Funded Intramural Grants: Seed grants for research, graduate student support, etc., awarded by on-campus selection committees.

Technical Reports: Non-peer reviewed technical reports presented in completion of contracts that have a substantial scholarly value (and are not simply a bureaucratic exercise).

Software and Instructional Materials: Non peer-reviewed 'courseware', tutorials, or software developed for innovative instruction or specialized research uses. These contributions shall be evaluated based on evidence of value to the discipline.

Other Non Peer-Reviewed Publications: Professional letters, professional book reviews, and other publications in the discipline.

Extramural Meeting Presentations: Published or unpublished abstracts from papers or posters presented at regional, national or international meetings, conferences, or symposia (including such meetings when they are held on campus).

Academic Seminars: e.g. Departmental Seminars at HSU or elsewhere.

Unfunded Intramural Grants Submitted

Other Unpublished Materials: Manuscripts in preparation, grant proposals in preparation, student theses in progress, research data sets, and the like. *Such unpublished contributions must be documented and evaluated (e.g., with letters of support from colleagues).*

2. b. EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

Retention, Tenure, and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

Each member of the IUPC shall evaluate the *Research and Other Scholarly or Creative Activities* of faculty being considered for tenure according to four categories of performance: Excellent, Good, Minimum Essential, and Unacceptable (from new Appendix J). The Department defines these categories as follows:

'Excellent' – At least three distinct contributions are expected from Category I (peer-reviewed publications, extramural grants, completed graduate theses). An unfunded grant proposal may be used as one of the two contributions required from Category I, if the proposal was submitted to an established funding agency and was subjected to competitive evaluation by peers. Intramural funding should have been awarded if no extramural grant was awarded. An average of

one contribution per year (including service credit years) from Category II is expected.

'Good' – At least one distinct contribution from Category I. An unfunded grant proposal may be used as the contribution required from Category I, if the proposal was submitted to an established funding agency and was subjected to competitive evaluation by peers. Intramural funding should have been sought if no extramural grant was awarded. An average of one contribution per year (including service credit years) from Category II is expected.

'Minimum Essential' - Approximately one contribution per year (including service credit years) from Category II.

'Unacceptable' - Contributions that do not meet the criteria for 'Minimum Essential' shall be rated 'Unacceptable'.

For the purpose of placing faculty under consideration for tenure into these performance groupings, additional contributions in Category I can be used to take the place of requirements from Category II. However, the reverse will not be true; additional contributions from Category II cannot be used to offset deficiencies in contributions from Category I.

Exceptional Situations

The Department acknowledges that exceptional situations may arise in which the specific criteria and rankings delineated above for ancillary activities may not provide an appropriate rubric for the awarding of tenure. For example, such situations may arise when faculty are specifically hired to conduct activities in addition to instruction, such as program development.

Accordingly, the specific requirements for scholarly activities may be modified on a case-by-case basis, in consultation with the CNRS Dean, so long as faculty have met the primary requirement of demonstrating excellence and effectiveness in their teaching assignments. Any requested modifications of tenure criteria should be specifically itemized and presented to the IUPC by the faculty member at least one year prior to the submission of personnel files for the tenure decision.

Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor

Each member of the IUPC shall evaluate the *Research and Other Scholarly or Creative Activities* of faculty being considered for promotion to full professor according to four categories of performance: Excellent, Good, Minimum

Essential, and Unacceptable (from new Appendix J). The Department defines these categories as follows:

'Excellent' – At least three distinct contributions are expected from Category I (peer-reviewed publications, extramural grants, completed graduate theses). An unfunded grant proposal may be used as one of the two contributions required from Category I, if the proposal was submitted to an established funding agency and was subjected to competitive evaluation by peers. Intramural funding should have been awarded if no extramural grant was awarded. An average of one contribution per year (including service credit years) from Category II is expected.

'Good' – At least one distinct contribution from Category I. An unfunded grant proposal may be used as the contribution required from Category I, if the proposal was submitted to an established funding agency and was subjected to competitive evaluation by peers. Intramural funding should have been sought if no extramural grant was awarded. An average of one contribution per year (including service credit years) from Category II is expected.

'Minimum Essential' - Approximately one contribution per year (including service credit years) from Category II.

'Unacceptable' - Contributions that do not meet the criteria for 'Minimum Essential' shall be rated 'Unacceptable'.

For the purpose of placing faculty under consideration for promotion to full professor into these performance groupings, additional contributions in Category I can be used to take the place of requirements from Category II. However, the reverse will not be true; additional contributions from Category II cannot be used to offset deficiencies in contributions from Category I.

Exceptional Situations

The Department acknowledges that exceptional situations may arise in which the specific criteria and rankings delineated above for ancillary activities may not provide an appropriate rubric for promotion to full professor. For example, such situations may arise when faculty are specifically tasked with conducting activities in addition to instruction, such as program development.

Accordingly, the specific requirements for scholarly activities may be modified on a case-by-case basis, in consultation with the CNRS Dean, so long as faculty have met the primary requirement of demonstrating excellence and effectiveness

in their teaching assignments. Any requested modifications of promotion criteria should be specifically itemized and presented to the IUPC by the faculty member at least one year prior to the submission of personnel files for the promotion decision.

3. SERVICE TO THE PROFESSION, UNIVERSITY OR COMMUNITY

a. CONTRIBUTIONS ASSESSED

Retention, Tenure, and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

Faculty service activities are important, but the Department encourages faculty to emphasize *Research and Other Scholarly or Creative Activities* in the years prior to the granting of tenure. Evidence of modest, but high-quality, on-going service activity is expected of faculty under consideration for tenure. Documentation of service requires that faculty provide a measure of their efforts (e.g., hours worked) on each activity.

The Department considers service in the three categories to be of equal value, so long as the documented level of effort is equivalent. However, faculty will be expected to provide some evidence of service to the Department or University. The following is a list of possible activities, which may not be comprehensive and does not denote any order of importance.

I. Evidence of Service to the Profession

Service at meetings of professional organizations, including organizing or chairing meetings, symposia or contributed paper sessions.

Service in an official capacity for professional societies or organizations, including activity as an officer, committee chair, committee member, or the like.

Service awards and honors from professional societies or organizations.

Service as an editor or member of an editorial board for a professional journal.

Service as a reviewer for professional publications, especially peer-review of manuscripts of journal articles, books, textbooks, and the like.

Service as a reviewer for grant applications submitted to professional granting agencies such as the National Science Foundation.

Service as a scientific consultant for public or private agencies.

II. Evidence of Service to the University

Service in governance, including membership on standing or ad hoc committees or offices involved in the governance.

Service in organizing or conducting University functions and activities.

Service on graduate student thesis committees at HSU or elsewhere.

Mentoring activities sponsored by the University that are not directly related to instruction.

Service as a faculty sponsor or advisor for on-campus student clubs or organizations.

III. Evidence of Service to the Community

Service in community groups, including membership on local boards or other evidence of activity in community governance.

Participation in mentoring, fund-raising, and charitable efforts in the community.

Service in organizing or conducting community functions and events.

Presentations of lectures or other instruction delivered to community groups or organizations.

Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor

Evidence of significant, high-quality, on-going service activity is expected of faculty under consideration for promotion to full professor. Documentation of service requires that faculty provide a measure of their efforts (e.g., hours worked) on each activity.

The Department considers service in the three categories to be of equal value, so long as the documented level of effort is equivalent. However, faculty will be

expected to provide some evidence of service to the Department or University. The following is a list of possible activities, which may not be comprehensive and does not denote any order of importance.

I. Evidence of Service to the Profession

Service at meetings of professional organizations, including organizing or chairing meetings, symposia or contributed paper sessions.

Service in an official capacity for professional societies or organizations, including activity as an officer, committee chair, committee member, or the like.

Service awards and honors from professional societies or organizations.

Service as an editor or member of an editorial board for a professional journal. Service as a reviewer for professional publications, especially peer-review of manuscripts of journal articles, books, textbooks, and the like.

Service as a reviewer for grant applications submitted to professional granting agencies such as the National Science Foundation.

Service as a scientific consultant for public or private agencies.

II. Evidence of Service to the University

Service in governance, including membership on standing or ad hoc committees or offices involved in the governance.

Service in organizing or conducting University functions and activities.

Service on graduate student thesis committees at HSU or elsewhere.

Mentoring activities sponsored by the University that are not directly related to instruction.

Service as a faculty sponsor or advisor for on-campus student clubs or organizations.

III. Evidence of Service to the Community

Service in community groups, including membership on local boards or other evidence of activity in community governance.

Participation in mentoring, fund-raising, and charitable efforts in the community.

Service in organizing or conducting community functions and events.

Presentations of lectures or other instruction delivered to community groups or organizations.

3. b. EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

Retention, Tenure, and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

Self-evaluation of *Service to the Profession, University, or Community* should be provided by the faculty member in his or her PDS. Faculty should describe all service contributions along with a measure of the effort devoted to each contribution. Effort of more than a few hours on a specific service activity should be documented with a letter of support from an appropriate person. For granting of tenure, faculty will be expected to show some evidence of service to the Department or University.

The IUPC shall review the material submitted by faculty as evidence of service, and evaluate these contributions as 'Excellent', 'Good', 'Minimum Essential', or 'Unacceptable' (from new Appendix J). The Department defines these categories as follows:

'Excellent' – An average of 75 or more service hours per year (2.5 hours per week per 2 semesters), at least half of which were devoted to ongoing committees or other activities that require regular, periodic effort.

'Good' – An average of 45 or more service hours per year (1.5 hours per week per 2 semesters), at least half of which were devoted to ongoing committees or other activities that require regular, periodic effort.

'Minimum Essential' – An average of 15 or more hours of service per year (1/2 hour per week per 2 semesters), at least half of which can be defined as 'Service to the University'.

'Unacceptable' - Contributions that do not meet the criteria for 'Minimum Essential' shall be rated 'Unacceptable'.

Exceptional Situations

The Department acknowledges that exceptional situations may arise in which the specific criteria and rankings delineated above for ancillary activities may not provide an appropriate rubric for the awarding of tenure. For example, such situations may arise when faculty are specifically hired to conduct activities in addition to instruction, such as program development.

Accordingly, the specific requirements for service activities may be modified on a case-by-case basis, in consultation with the CNRS Dean, so long as faculty have met the primary requirement of demonstrating excellence and effectiveness in their teaching assignments. Any requested modifications of tenure criteria should be specifically itemized and presented to the IUPC by the faculty member at least one year prior to the submission of personnel files for the tenure decision.

Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor

Self-evaluation of *Service to the Profession, University, or Community* should be provided by the faculty member in his or her PDS. Faculty should describe all service contributions along with a measure of the effort devoted to each contribution. Effort of more than a few hours on a specific service activity should be documented with a letter of support from an appropriate person. For promotion to full professor, faculty will be expected to show some evidence of service to the Department or University.

The IUPC shall review the material submitted by faculty as evidence of service, and evaluate these contributions as 'Excellent', 'Good', 'Minimum Essential', or 'Unacceptable' (from new Appendix J). The Department defines these categories as follows:

'Excellent' – An average of 75 or more service hours per year (2.5 hours per week per 2 semesters), at least half of which were devoted to ongoing committees or other activities that require regular, periodic effort.

'Good' – An average of 45 or more service hours per year (1.5 hours per week per 2 semesters), at least half of which were devoted to ongoing committees or other activities that require regular, periodic effort.

'Minimum Essential' – An average of 15 or more hours of service per year (1/2 hour per week per 2 semesters), at least half of which can be defined as 'Service to the University'.

'Unacceptable' - Contributions that do not meet the criteria for 'Minimum Essential' shall be rated 'Unacceptable'.

Exceptional Situations

The Department acknowledges that exceptional situations may arise in which the specific criteria and rankings delineated above for ancillary activities may not provide an appropriate rubric for promotion to full professor. For example, such situations may arise when faculty are specifically tasked with conducting activities in addition to instruction, such as program development.

Accordingly, the specific requirements for service activities may be modified on a case-by-case basis, in consultation with the CNRS Dean, so long as faculty have met the primary requirement of demonstrating excellence and effectiveness in their teaching assignments. Any requested modifications of promotion criteria should be specifically itemized and presented to the IUPC by the faculty member at least one year prior to the submission of personnel files for the promotion decision.

Attached: Memorandum signed by department faculty



HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY

Department of Biological Sciences

Memorandum

To: University Ad-Hoc Committee for RTP Criteria
From: Department of Biological Sciences Probationary/Tenured Faculty
Date: 28 March 2008
Subject: Faculty Approval of Submitted RTP Criteria

The Department of Biological Sciences has submitted guidelines for teaching, scholarly/creative, and service activities as applicable to the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) process pursuant to Appendix J of the Faculty Handbook (effective AY 2008-2009). These guidelines were approved by vote of the Biological Sciences faculty at the end of fall 2007 semester, and have been submitted to the University Ad-Hoc Committee on RTP for approval. The undersigned probationary/tenured members of the Department of Biological Sciences approve the use of these guidelines for RTP in our Department.

Signature

Printed Name

Date

Mark S. Wilson

3.28.08

Patricia C. Siering

3/28/08

Jianmin Zhong

3/28/08

ALEXANDRU M.F. TOMESCU

3/28/2008

Brian S. Arbogast

3/28/08

Bruce O'bars

3/28/08

John O. REISS

3/28/08

Sharyn Marks

3/28/08

Michael Gorman

28 March 08

P. Dawn Goley

28 March 08

Edward Metz

28 March 08

Bryan Jennings

28 March 08

Signature

Printed Name

Date

Jacob Varney

JACOB VARNEY

4/3/08

Sean Coats

Sean Coats

4/4/08

Casey R. Lu

Casey R. Lu

4/4/08