

**GUIDELINES FOR RETENTION, TENURE, PROMOTION,
AND POST-TENURE REVIEW
MAY, 2014
CWU DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES**

Approved by the department on May 9, 2014

Department Personnel Committee:

Daniel Beck (Chair), Lucinda Carnell, Wayne Quirk, Gabrielle Stryker, and Steven Wagner

- 1. Overview** – This document outlines the CWU Biology Department criteria and standards for Retention, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review. These standards are framed by the CWU Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) Articles 13 and 22, with University Faculty Criteria Guidelines, and with the College of the Sciences (COTS) criteria for faculty performance. The discipline-specific standards outlined herein are designed to align with COTS and University criteria as explained in article 22 of the CBA.

1.1 Personnel Committee – The Personnel Committee will consist of at least 3 tenured members of the Department of Biological Sciences as proscribed by the rules of the CBA (22.5.1). Phased retirees and the Department Chair are not eligible to serve. Voting committee members must be at or above the rank under consideration. The Department Chair and Dean have the discretion of providing additional voting members to the Personnel Committee when warranted. The department personnel committee is responsible for evaluating the professional record and providing written recommendations to the dean according to the schedules outlined in the CBA. Candidates up for review will be notified in advance by the dean of COTS.

2. CRITERIA FOR TENURE, PROMOTION, AND POST-TENURE REVIEW

2.1 General Comments – During their initial probationary period (tenure and promotion to associate professor), faculty will be evaluated based on criteria in place during the academic year in which they were appointed, or the most recent criteria if they choose. Probationary faculty can expect reviews every two years during their probationary period as described in the CBA at dates set by Provost and published in the Academic Calendar (see **3.1, Reappointment**, below). The probationary period review will decide whether tenure is recommended. By the middle of the probationary period it is expected that faculty members will have demonstrated their progress in becoming effective teachers and scholars. Service to the department, college, or university is also expected.

During each review period the personnel committee will provide a recommendation to the dean centered on the three required performance areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. The personnel committee and chair will meet with each tenure-track faculty member each probationary period to address any concerns the committee or the

candidate may have about their job performance. At all levels (reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review) the department expects faculty to adhere to guidelines for collegiality and professional conduct (Section 6 below) in meeting the criteria for teaching, scholarship and service.

The department chair will conduct an independent evaluation and make an independent recommendation to the dean.

2.2 Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching – Performance as a teacher is an essential factor in evaluating faculty. The department particularly values teaching that is characterized by rigor, clarity, effectiveness, and organization. The department also values collaborative efforts in teaching.

Evaluation of faculty teaching will be expressed in terms of the following parameters (based on guidelines prepared in March 2014 by the Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment Committee and Arreola, R. 2007, *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System*, 3rd ed. Anker Publishing): **Content Expertise** (e.g., evidence of faculty currency in the field, accuracy and appropriate level of information presented to students), **Instructional Design** (e.g., course syllabi, learner objectives, handouts, media used, content organization, grading standards and tools), **Instructional Delivery** (i.e., ability to motivate, generate enthusiasm, and communicate effectively using various forms of transmittal—thus contributing to a conducive learning environment), **Instructional Assessment** (e.g., effective grading practices, valid and reliable exams, meaningful feedback) and **Course Management** (respectful treatment of students, handling student/course paperwork, ensuring working, useable technology, making appropriate materials available, providing timely feedback, ensuring a proper physical environment, arranging field trips, coordinating guest speakers, etc., appropriate to course content/objectives).

The criteria outlined below summarize the many ways faculty contribute to teaching, and are recognized for their efforts. Because teaching is not limited to classroom activities, the Biology Department expects its members to be active in multiple aspects of teaching. Individuals vary considerably in their particular teaching strengths (e.g. some may excel at mentoring undergraduate research while others are inspiring lecturers). Excellence in teaching, therefore, is the sum of performance in all areas. Faculty deemed excellent teachers must be proficient in all areas of teaching, and demonstrate excellence in several areas under consideration. Teaching effectiveness will be assessed by the Personnel Committee on the basis of:

- **Peer evaluations of teaching.** Peers are considered to be in the best positions to evaluate Content Expertise, Instructional Design, and Assessment Skills, with some added perspectives on Delivery and Course Management. Faculty will submit Peer Evaluation Summaries **at least once every other year**. These formative reviews will be prepared by a member of the department or peer evaluation team and will include direct observations of teaching in the classroom, lab, and/or field. Peer Evaluation Summaries should also address teaching parameters outlined above, as evidenced by course syllabi, assessment materials, handouts, use of technology, etc. Each candidate is responsible for submittal of her/his own peer evaluations. Faculty are encouraged to include peer evaluations that are based on more

than single classroom visits. See “**Guidelines for peer evaluations (in progress, Summer 2014; to be completed fall 2014)**” for details.

- **Improvement and innovation of courses taught.** This includes developing and implementing innovative teaching methods and approaches that reflect current advances in education. Examples include, but are not limited to: updated labs or field activities that teach or use new techniques; new or updated case studies in the classroom; new software, computer programs or web-based tools that enhance learning, etc.
- **Critical Self-Evaluation** of teaching. Candidates should use self-evaluation to reflect on SEOIs, peer evaluations, and other forms of assessment. Self-evaluation may also present evidence of development activities related to teaching, to explain goals and objectives of courses, grade distributions, and to present evidence of success in teaching (student achievement, content expertise; instructional design, delivery, assessment, and organization etc.).
- **Contributions to curriculum and/or program needs.** This includes playing a role in teaching key courses in our curriculum, along with developing and implementing updated curriculum in our department.
- **Efforts to improve performance**, such as attending teaching workshops and symposia, that are subsequently implemented in courses taught.
- **Successful mentoring of students in research** (e.g. BIOL 295, 490, 495, 496, 595, 596, 700) as evidence by dissemination through attendance at meetings (including SOURCE) or publications.
- **Mentoring of student service learning activities,**
- **Standard student evaluations (SEOI’s)** and student written feedback. The Biology department recognizes that the SEOI has utility limited primarily to judging effectiveness of instructor delivery skills. When evaluating SEOI’s, the department recognizes certain categories as valuable such as:
 - those that identify level of student involvement, and student perception of respect/discrimination, and
 - written comments by students that identify positive aspects of the course and cite specific areas for improvement (organization, communication, etc.).
 - Candidates should average above 3.0 in most categories of the SEOI. Scores below 3.0 **may** indicate an area for improvement and should be addressed by the candidate and evaluators in the reappointment files.

2.3 Scholarship Criteria – The department expects to recommend tenure, promotion and continuation for post-tenure review only to those faculty members who show evidence of scholarship. The department also values collaborative efforts in scholarly activities. A diversity of activities may constitute scholarship, and the department encourages diverse pursuits “in order to tap the full range of faculty talent ... [and afford] flexible career paths that avoid narrow definitions of scholarship” (*Scholarship Assessed*, Glassick, et. al., 1997). The department requires faculty to pursue those activities that involve an external (off-campus) peer review and dissemination process. In accordance with the University Faculty Criteria and the COTS policy manual, scholarly products and activities are divided into two categories:

Category A – are discipline-recognized products, for which the faculty member is a major contributor, and that are formally peer-reviewed and disseminated outside the university. Products resulting from collaborative work for which the faculty member has made a substantive contribution to the authorship and intellectual merit and/or design also fall into Category A. It is the responsibility of the candidate being reviewed to provide clear evidence of the formal peer-review process, and their level of contribution, for each category A product. As per section 7.1 of the COTS policy manual, publications in “predatory” journals (i.e online journals without rigorous peer-review) will not be considered as Category A products. Category A products must be of significant scholarly content, as evaluated and reviewed by the Personnel Committee. These include:

- Journal articles
- Published, peer reviewed Case Studies
- Research monographs and peer-reviewed technical reports
- Scholarly books, textbooks, and chapters
- Principal or co-PI of funded peer-reviewed external grants or contracts devoted to scholarship in the biological sciences, biology education, or area related to candidate’s expertise (lead PI or substantive co-PI).
- Contributions to conference proceedings that are full-length manuscripts subjected to traditional peer-review before acceptance
- Patents

Category B – include other formal activities that support a faculty member's program of scholarly effort. They include, but are not limited to:

- Grant proposal submitted for external peer-review (lead PI or substantive co-PI)
- Contracts that are not subject to external peer review
- Serving in a contributing role on a funded, external peer-reviewed grant, but not as a substantive co-PI (as above)
- Presentation in conferences, scientific meetings and workshops in area of expertise
- Collaboration with students in scholarly activities leading to external recognition
- Authoring publicly available research and technical papers
- Grant reports and technical reports that are not peer-reviewed
- Study guides published by a recognized publisher or professional society
- Book reviews published in professional societies, etc.
- Other activities may meet the criteria for Category B provided the candidate provides clear evidence of the scholarly value of the activity

2.4 Service Criteria – Service to the department, college, university and/or profession is valued and expected. Service to the community is also valued and encouraged. Faculty members are responsible for providing documentation of service activities.

Examples of service that are particularly encouraged by the Biology Department include, but are not limited to:

- Serving on departmental, college, or university committees
- Involvement with SOURCE (chairing sessions, judging, etc)
- Applying for grants that benefit the department or university

- Serving on the department advising team
- Projects leading to improved assessment of teaching and learning
- Projects that develop bridges between the Biology department and groups external to the department and university
- Interdisciplinary projects
- Organizing and advising clubs associated with the Biology department
- Professional service, including but not limited to:
 - organizing meetings or sessions at meetings
 - grant review panels
 - peer review of manuscripts for professional journals
 - editorial boards of professional journals
- Community Service, including but not limited to:
 - Conservancies
 - Natural History Organizations
 - Educational groups (KEEN, for example)
 - Serving as the “local expert” in your area of expertise
 - Working with local schools

**The advising team refers to the people specifically overseeing the advising of majors, minors, and those students in pre-professional programs. The advising of students within a specific course for course-related issues falls within the “teaching” area of evaluation.*

3. STANDARDS FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, PROMOTION, AND POST-TENURE REVIEW

3.1 Reappointment – Probationary tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated during the second (2nd), fourth (4th), and sixth (6th) years of their probationary period. Evaluation for reappointment shall occur during fall quarter as established in the Academic Calendar and as specified in 22.2.1 of the CBA. A third (3rd) or fifth (5th) year evaluation may be requested by the department personnel committee, the department chair, the college personnel committee, or the dean if a faculty member’s performance is judged to be substandard or deficient in the second (2nd) or fourth (4th) year review cycle. Any time an evaluation is judged to be substandard or deficient, the faculty member shall meet with their faculty mentor, chair and department personnel committee and develop a plan for rectifying any noted issues.

During years 1 and 2 minimum expectations focus on teaching and starting up a research program. The candidate’s responsibilities include the development of effective instruction, initiation of a research program that involves students, and minor departmental or college-level service.

During years 3 and 4 the candidate should demonstrate maturity and accomplishment as a teacher, as evidenced by peer review, SEOI and other assessment criteria (outlined in sec 2.2 above). Curricula for courses taught repeatedly should be fairly well established. Challenges from previous years should be addressed. Scholarship expectations are that the candidate’s research program should be maturing; students are

involved in faculty member's research and presenting their research at SOURCE, as well as regional and national meetings when appropriate. Results of scholarship (e.g., grants, papers, research presentations) should begin to emerge. Service should include, but extend beyond, the department, and may include college-level, university-level, professional, or community service.

During years 5 and 6 expectations are that the candidate will have demonstrated rigor and effectiveness in teaching as evidenced by peer review, student SOURCE presentations, self-reflection, SEOI scores, and other means of assessment (see Sec. 2.2, above). The candidate will have mentored students (graduate and/or undergraduate) in research projects, with evidence in the form of presentation at SOURCE or meetings, or inclusion on publications. By the end of the probationary period at CWU (typically year 6), the candidate will have produced 2 or more category A products, with at least one category A product based on work performed at CWU. Service will include contributions to the department, the college or university, and the community or profession (Sec 2.4, above).

3.2 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor – For non-tenured Associate Professors, the probationary period before promotion to Professor typically coincides with the probationary period before tenure. Refer to the Article 22 of the CBA for details. The probationary period before promotion to Associate Professor typically coincides with the probationary period before tenure. The procedures for evaluating a candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service coincide with those procedures related to tenure.

- A. Teaching:** To receive tenure and promotion to associate professor, the candidate will show clear evidence of teaching that is characterized by rigor, clarity, effectiveness, organization, and concern for student learning. These will be evidenced by peer review, SEOI scores, critical self-evaluation, mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students, and other means of assessment as outlined in departmental criteria above. Successful candidates will have mentored students (graduate and/or undergraduate) in research projects, with evidence in the form of presentation at SOURCE or meetings, or inclusion on publications.
- B. Scholarship:** To receive tenure and promotion to associate professor, the candidate is expected to produce a minimum of 2 "Category A" products and establish a pattern of scholarship that indicates the promise of ongoing activity. At least one of the 2 "Category A" products must be a peer-reviewed publication where the majority of the data was generated at CWU. The strength and sustainability of the candidate's research program will also be evidenced by Category B products (or additional Category A products), and by works in progress.
- C. Service:** To receive tenure and promotion to associate professor, a candidate will have shown sustained service to the department, college, university, and profession. In addition to being consistent

and sustained, at least some service activities should include a leadership role, such as chairing committees, etc. At the time of tenure evaluation, service should focus more on quality, rather than quantity, and contribute well-considered ideas in an articulate and professional manner.

3.3 Post Tenure-Review – In the fifth year following the granting of tenure, faculty, including those in phased retirement, will submit their Professional Records for Post-Tenure Review (Post-TR) during the fall quarter, and every fifth year thereafter, as established in the Academic Calendar. Promotion in rank shall be considered the equivalent of Post-TR, and a subsequent Post-TR will occur five (5) years following the promotion in accordance with the CBA (22.2.3)

Post-TR is an evaluation of tenured faculty in the three performance areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. With the understanding that faculty contributions to the university change and mature over time, expectations for each faculty member's Post-TR evaluation will be based on their workload plans accumulated over the review period as defined by the CBA 15.5. Due to these less frequent evaluations, more responsibility is placed on tenured faculty members to ensure that reasonable and expected levels of teaching, scholarship, and service are being maintained.

Post-TR will result in one of the following actions: a) Continued with recognition of excellence, b) Continued, or c) Continued with reservations. At the conclusion of their Post-TR, those who receive a "continued with reservations" recommendation shall construct a Professional Development Plan in accordance with section 22.2.3 of the CBA. Full professors who receive "Continued with recognition of excellence" recommendations will be eligible to receive merit salary increases as described in Section 16.6 of the CBA. Those who are judged to be excellent teachers or to have excelled in scholarship will receive a three percent (3.0%) increase in their base salary. Those who are judged to be excellent teachers AND to have excelled in either their scholarship or service responsibilities will receive a five percent (5.0%) increase in their base salary.

Faculty who meet the minimum criteria in teaching, research, and service (outlined in Section 2) will be deemed "proficient" and will receive a "Continued" recommendation for Post T-R. Those who are clearly underperforming in teaching will receive a "continued with reservations" recommendation.

For purposes of Post-TR, excellent performance by faculty will be demonstrated by clearly exceeding departmental performance standards in teaching, scholarship or service. To be considered excellent in any of these three performance areas, faculty are expected to show leadership, maturity, and effectiveness, where quality of work is emphasized over quantity of output.

Each faculty member brings their own unique strengths to our department within their particular area of expertise. Faculty who are judged excellent in our department should thus fill a crucial need and provide a unique talent, skill set or knowledge set from which they draw to contribute to our curriculum, research programs, and service. In judging excellence, we also value innovation and creativity in the performance areas, which can be demonstrated in many ways including, but not be limited to, applying new teaching methods to the classroom, laboratory, or field; developing new research approaches; integrating one's own teaching, research and service into community service, or academic service learning; promoting diversity and/or integrating interdisciplinary and/or international elements into courses and our curriculum.

- A. Teaching:** For purposes of Post-TR, to be considered “excellent” in teaching, the candidate will show clear evidence of teaching that is characterized by rigor, clarity, effectiveness, organization, and concern for student learning. They will have in their record bi-annual peer evaluations of teaching that demonstrate maturity, leadership, and competence in the teaching parameters outlined above in section 2.2. Their course syllabi, assessment materials and other course documents will show a commitment to updating and improving courses taught. They will have thoughtful self-evaluations that reflect on and improve their teaching practice. Evidence of excellence in teaching may also include a consistent record, beyond the last Post-TR, of mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students in biological research culminating in presentations at SOURCE and/or other professional meetings, theses (Masters, Honors, etc.), and/or publications with CWU students.
- B. Scholarship:** For purposes of Post-TR, to be considered “excellent” in scholarship, the candidate is expected to produce a minimum of 2 “Category A” products, based on work done at CWU since their last review and continue a pattern of scholarship that indicates the promise of ongoing activity. The strength and sustainability of the candidate’s research program will also be evidenced by substantial Category B products (or additional Category A products), and by works in progress.
- C. Service:** For purposes of Post-TR, to be considered “excellent” in service, a candidate should show sustained service to the department and beyond (college, university, or profession). In addition to being consistent and sustained, service activities should include leadership roles (chairing committees, initiating programs, mentoring junior faculty, etc.). Excellence in service will be judged by evidence of significant effort (e.g. results and leadership on committees, not merely a presence) impact (high quality of work), and scope (broader impact is generally better).

3.4 Promotion to Full Professor – Promotion in rank to Full Professor shall be considered the equivalent of Post-TR, and a subsequent Post-TR will

occur five (5) years following the promotion in accordance with the CBA (22.2.3). The Department of Biological Sciences builds on the University Faculty Criteria Guidelines identifying a full professor as a faculty member whose excellent teaching commands the respect of other faculty and students; who has accumulated a record of excellent peer-reviewed scholarship since the previous promotion, sustained contributions to university life, and increasing service to professional organizations and/or the community. The rank of professor assumes depth, maturity, and leadership in teaching, scholarly activity, and service to the department, university and community.

To be promoted to full professor, a candidate should fulfill the same standards as outlined above in section 3.3 (A, B, and C). In addition, the candidate should

- have a minimum of ten years of professional academic experience
- coauthor at least one of their 2 Category A products with one or more CWU students.

4. REVIEW OF FULL-TIME NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY (FTNTT)

4.1 Procedure – Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty will be reviewed on a regular basis (annual, biannual, or every third year, depending on the contract). Teaching effectiveness of FTNTT faculty is to be assessed by the Personnel Committee and the Departmental Chair based on a file containing:

- complete results of student evaluations (SEOI's) for all classes taught in the period under review,
- syllabi from all classes taught in the period under review and sample classroom materials,
- an optional statement on the faculty member's philosophy of education as it pertains to instruction in the biology courses taught
- classroom observations from tenured or tenure-track faculty members during the period under review.
- other teaching material submitted by the FTNTT Faculty member

The personnel committee together with the Chair will evaluate each file and send a report to the Dean. The results of the process will be used for the purposes of rehiring and as a vehicle for improving the quality of the candidate's classroom instruction.

5. Supplemental Materials

5.1. Timelines

5.2. Timeline to Tenure – This timeline is largely summarized in section 3.c. (above) and is provided here as a useful guideline for the pathway to Tenure.

Years 1 and 2. Minimum expectations for years 1 and 2 focus on teaching and starting up a research program. The candidate's responsibilities include the development of effective instruction, initiation of a research program that involves students, and minor departmental or college-level service. During this time, it is the responsibility of the department and college to provide appropriate mentorship, and provide the facilities and resources agreed upon at the time of hire for the establishment of a productive research program in the candidate's area of expertise.

Years 3 and 4: Teaching: the candidate should demonstrate maturity and accomplishment as a teacher, as evidenced by peer review, SEOI and other avenues of assessment. Curricula for courses should be well established. Challenges from previous years should be addressed. Scholarship: The candidate's research program should be maturing; students are involved in faculty member's research and presenting their research at SOURCE, as well as regional and national meetings when appropriate. Results of scholarship (e.g., grants, papers, research presentations) should begin to emerge. Service should include, but extend beyond, the department, and may include college-level, university-level, professional, or community service.

Years 5 and 6: Teaching: Candidate will have demonstrated rigor and effectiveness in teaching as evidenced by peer review, student SOURCE presentations, SEOI scores, and any other means of assessment available. Candidate will have mentored students (graduate and/or undergraduate) in research projects, with evidence in the form of presentation at SOURCE or meetings, or inclusion on publications. By the end of the probationary period at CWU (typically year 6), the candidate will have produced 2 or more category A products, with at least one category A product based on work performed at CWU. Service will include contributions to the department, the college or university, and the community or profession.

5.3 Mentorship and Annual Meeting

In an effort to enhance communication regarding expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and service, all probationary, tenure-track faculty are encouraged to communicate an *Academic Plan* for teaching, scholarship, and service to the personnel committee at their annual meeting. The candidate should provide brief descriptions of ongoing and planned work in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service together with anticipated dates of completion and expected avenues of dissemination.

The Biology Department has a formal mentorship program for probationary faculty. All probationary faculty are encouraged to participate and should contact the department chair and personnel committee chair for details.

5.4. Faculty Hired with Tenure – Administrators may occasionally be granted tenure as a departmental faculty member at the time of original appointment. Such appointments shall ordinarily be upon recommendation of the dean and the Provost. Faculty recommended in this manner must meet department standards for tenure upon hire. Faculty will be subject to Post Tenure-Review evaluations and will be held to department standards for continuation of tenure if their appointment becomes a faculty appointment rather than an administrative appointment.

6. Biological Sciences Guidelines for Professional Conduct

As outlined in CBA (13.5), all members of the department are responsible for adhering to University policies found in the CWU Policies Manual (<http://www.cwu.edu/resources-reports>), including Professional and Research Ethics (CWUP 1-50 and 2-40-165), the Policy on Sexual Harassment (CWUP 2-35-050), the Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy (CWUP 2-40-030), and Conflict of Interest in Relationships (CWUP 2-40-070).

Professional conduct permeates all levels of faculty performance. It influences how effectively we teach, conduct our research, and serve our community. Professional conduct dictates how well we interact with students and colleagues, how we evaluate our peers, and how our peers and community view us. In the Department of Biological Sciences, specific expectations for professional conduct include the following:

- Contributing to departmental activities:
 - Assuming and carrying out a reasonable and appropriate share of departmental business
 - Reliably following through on departmental assignments
 - Taking part in departmental governance and decision-making
 - Providing a safe and supportive learning environment for students
 - Maintaining adequate accessibility to students, staff, and colleagues
 - Respecting and complying with departmental decisions
 - Assuming primary responsibility for in-class research and independent study activities of students

- Fostering a supportive and cooperative climate in the department:
 - Advancing a collective ethic rather than a competitive, parochial, or self-promoting environment
 - Balancing the good of the department with personal preferences
 - Demonstrating a reasonable willingness to compromise
 - Fostering a positive, constructive attitude
 - Showing flexibility and adaptability
 - Treating colleagues, Chair, staff and students with civility and respect
 - Assuming responsibility for one's own actions
 - Respecting confidentiality of faculty, staff, and students
 - Avoiding perception to students of disrespect for faculty colleagues
 - Respecting appropriate faculty-student boundaries

7. Personnel Committee Evaluation Guidelines

Guidelines Regarding Content: Every tenure-track faculty member deserves a reappointment letter that contains:

- Specific examples that illustrate the quality of his or her performance.
- Constructive criticism outlining any potential areas for improvement.
- Practical guidance for future efforts to meet the requirements

Guidelines Regarding Format: In order to create reappointment letters that are consistent across candidates and years, all reappointment letters will follow the same standard format described below:

Dear Dean _____,

The Department of Biological Sciences Personnel Committee <sentence of the recommendation>. This recommendation is based on Dr. <candidate's> professional record and the observations of the personnel committee on the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Performance as a teacher is an essential factor in evaluating Biology faculty for tenure. The most important factors in the evaluations of teaching are clarity, effectiveness, organization, rigor, improvement, and innovation. (Followed by statements regarding candidate's teaching.)

The Biology Department has established standards for scholarship, and advocates a broad definition of scholarly activity. (Followed by statements regarding the scholarship activities of the candidate.)

The Biology Department expects consistent and strong service of all faculty members. (Followed by statements regarding the service activities)

In summary, <reiteration statements>

Sincerely,

member A, Chair
title

member B
title

member C
title

member D
title

C: Dr. xxxx, Department Chair

C: Dr. <candidate>

The following items are not to be included in the letter:

- Confidential comments to committee, references to undocumented or unsubstantiated material.
- Issues outside the stated criteria for productive teaching, scholarship and service.

Current Peer Evaluation: Summary of Classroom Observation

Faculty Member _____

Course observed _____ **Time** _____

Observed by _____ **Date** _____

Describe the classroom format and structure. That is, what did you see take place (e.g., 50 minutes of lecture, 20 minutes of group work followed by 30 minutes of lecture and discussion)?

Did the students appear engaged and/or participating in the class (how many asked questions? took notes? came in late? how many students who are enrolled in the course were in attendance)?

Was the delivery of course material organized?

Does the instructor/course syllabus provide clear objectives for the students?

Did the instructor ask insightful questions that increased student engagement and stimulated higher-level thinking?

Did the instructor provide clear explanations of the subject matter appropriate for the level of students?

What aspects of this class were well done?

What could be done to improve the class?

Additional comments and summary.

**(DRAFT) Peer Evaluation Summary, Department of Biological Sciences
(Being developed for use in AY 2014/2015)**

Faculty Member _____

Course/s observed/evaluated:

Materials evaluated (lectures, labs, field trips, course materials (syllabi, labs, exams, etc):

Period of Evaluation:

Observed by _____ **Date of Submittal** _____

Issues to address in Peer Evaluation...

Whether the course reflects the current state of the discipline.

The faculty member's mastery of the course content.

The course objectives, including whether the course meets the objectives of the curriculum of which it is a part.

The course organization.

The methods used to foster and measure learning.

The materials in the teaching portfolio (syllabi, textbooks, handouts, multimedia materials, assignments, learning exercises, examinations, and other course materials).

The faculty member's general concern for and interest in teaching.

The overall quality of teaching.

... to be further developed at Biology faculty retreat in September 2014