

Criteria for Performance Review

Biology Department (10-07)

Each faculty member must submit information supporting performance in teaching; research and scholarly activities; and service. Specific activities included in each of these areas shall be as described below. Merit evaluations should be consistent with current Department Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion and the Faculty Handbook.

Procedures for Annual Reviews

I. Period of Review

All tenured faculty members, probationary faculty members, and renewable instructors shall submit annual performance reports to the department head. Performance evaluations shall normally be carried out on an annual schedule, as determined by University and CNAS policy and shall cover a period of one calendar year (except for specific multi-year activities for research that are specified below).

II. Establishing Weightings

Each year, each faculty member will negotiate with the Department Head the percentage weightings he or she wishes to assign to each of the three areas of activity. Those weightings should be consistent with workloads and with guidelines provided by the University and the College. Faculty members may, after consultation with and permission from the Department Head, alter their percentage weightings prior to the evaluation process. However, no faculty member may alter the percent weightings once the evaluations have begun. Percent weightings will be available to the evaluation panel.

III. Merit Evaluation Committee

Only tenured faculty members are eligible to serve on the Merit Evaluation Panel. The Department of Biology will have three 3-member panels, with each panel evaluating one category (Teaching, Research, or Service). All eligible faculty members will be given the opportunity to serve on this panel before previous members are reappointed.

The charge of this panel will be to evaluate faculty members within the Biology Department and provide narrative evaluations and tentative performance rankings to the department head.

IV. Evaluations by Merit Evaluation Committee

The Biology Department's assessments are based on point scores, justifications, and, in some cases, qualitative indicators provided by faculty members. In cases where faculty members have the option of assigning a range of points, the committee should attempt to insure that points are assigned in a consistent manner; the committee can make changes in individual point assignments (within the ranges) if, in their views, inconsistencies exist between faculty members in the way that the points were assigned. Final assignment of points will be based on the judgment of the committee. Based on point totals, and, if available, other information (see below for teaching), the committees will rank order the faculty and assign values of 1—5 to each faculty member based on the Basic Expectations, natural breaks in the distributions, qualitative assessment (if applicable), and percentages mandated in the university guidelines. Final evaluations must be accompanied by a brief narrative assessment explaining the ratings assigned for each area, which will be given to the Department Head.

Note: First-year faculty often have had insufficient time to establish a reasonable record of meritorious activities in the three areas of review (teaching, research and service). According to policies established at the University level, any probationary faculty member in his or her first year will have the option of undergoing a *standard review* based on their activities since becoming a member of the faculty or can be assigned rankings *equivalent to the college average*.

V. Weighted Evaluations

The weightings for each area of activity will be used to weight the scores for the three areas to come up with a single composite value for each faculty member.

VI. Department Head Review

The department head will utilize narrative assessments and rankings from the Merit Evaluation panel, as well as consultation with panel members if necessary, as a component in assigning rankings. The department head will provide the evaluated faculty member with:

- a. copies of the committee's narrative reviews and the committee's ratings in the three performance areas;
- b. the department head's own narrative review and ratings if different from that of the committee;
- c. a written rationale for any differences between the committee evaluations and the department head evaluations.

The department head will forward his/her evaluations to the CNAS Dean.

VII. Appeals

Appeals of rankings will be carried out in accordance with guidelines set forth by the College and University.

Ratings

Each faculty member will be given one of the following ratings in each of the three areas, teaching, research and scholarly activities, and service in accordance with the following definitions:

5-Exceptional. Results consistently exceed basic expectations.*

4-Commendable. Results frequently exceed basic expectations.

3-Competent. Results consistently meets basic expectations

2-Needs Improvement. Results sometimes fail to meet expectations

1-Unsatisfactory. Results often fail to meet expectations; includes:

- a. Deficiency in at least two basic responsibilities.
- b. A serious deficiency in a fundamental responsibility such as meeting classes reliably.

*Basic expectations will be defined below for each category of Teaching, Research, and Service (below)

Teaching

I. Basic Expectations: In accordance with the Biology Department's Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion, primary teaching duties include:

1. Conscientious completion of classroom teaching assignments, including (if relevant) the coordination and supervision of assistants and colleagues. According to the Faculty Handbook (Section 4.5.1), this requirement includes, but is not limited to:
 - a. Preparation and distribution of syllabi and policy statements for all assigned courses in a timely manner.
 - b. Meeting all assigned classes regularly and reliably.

- c. Being available to students for required number of office hours per week.
 - d. Grading and returning assignments and tests to students in a timely manner.
 - e. Providing for student evaluations for all course sections taught.
2. Undergraduate student advising, as requested by Department Head.
 3. A conscientious effort to recruit and supervise graduate students in appropriate areas of research.
 4. Participation on (if asked) and conscientious contribution to graduate student committees.
 5. Adherence to all university policies as described in the Faculty Handbook

II. General Evaluation Procedures: The committee will examine the total point range (see below) for the entire faculty and decide where to make the cut-offs for the 3—5 range based upon natural breaks in the quantitative distribution of points, assessment of the data for “indicators of quality”, and the university guidelines. Note that there are two opportunities for assessments of “quality”:

1. When a point range exists for a given activity, the faculty member should suggest the appropriate point level and provide justification for this assessment. The committee can adjust the number of points to be given based on their assessment of the activity in relation to points given to similar activities by other faculty members.
2. Once point values are determined (see number III below), the committee can adjust ratings for a faculty member according to the indicators of quality listed in number IV below. Therefore, individuals with the same point totals could receive

different ratings (3—5) based on the committee's assessment of the indicators of quality.

III. Point Assessments

1. Student Teaching Evaluations
 - a. Weighted Averages (by contact hours):
 - i. Average scores of 1-1.99: 20 points
 - ii. Average scores of 2-2.99: 10 points
 - iii. Average scores of 3-5: 0 points
2. Overloads (noncompensated; >18 contact hours/year): 3 pts/overload contact hour
3. Graduate student supervision (major advisor): Thesis or Seminar option:
 - a. 1 pt each for a maximum of 4 semesters/2 summers (maximum = 6 pts per student)
 - b. Add 4 points when each student graduates
4. Graduate committee membership: 1 pt when student graduates.
5. Independent study courses: BIO 300, 390, 498, 499, 630: 1-4 pt per student, justify*
6. Undergraduate academic advisees: 1 pt per 10 students
7. Teaching awards (internal or external): 1-5 pts, justify
8. Author/co-author of textbook
 - a. 10-20 pts on publication; justify
 - b. 5-10 pts on revision, justify
9. Preparation of special classroom materials (lab manuals, etc.): 1—10 pts (justify)
10. Attending workshops designed for improvement of teaching: 1 pt each; maximum of 5 per year
11. Giving workshops and presentations about teaching
 - a. Internal = 1 pt each
 - b. External = 3 pts each
12. Grant proposals submitted:
 - a. Outside Funding Agencies: justify which category below
 - large or major grant—5 pts each
 - small grants or contracts—2 pts each

- b. MSU—1 pt each
13. Grants and contracts funded
- a. External ; 10 pts (+ 1 pt for every \$20,000; maximum = 5 pts) (+ 5 pts per additional year for a multi-year grant)
 - b. Internal grants (3 pts each)
14. Supervising non-credit students: 1—4 pts per student (justify)
15. Master Advisor training: 2 pts for original certification (one-time only)

*“Justify” means provide information concerning quality and/or effort

IV. Other Indicators of Effort or Quality

1. Development of a new course; *name course*
2. Substantial revision of a course; *name course*
3. Field trips outside of regular classroom hours; *name course*
4. Awards to students under my direction; *name student and award*
5. Student presentations not included in research; *list*
6. Student publications not included in research; *list*
7. Development of educational software or web-sites; *list and provide URL is applicable*
8. Teaching large sections (>80 students); *list course and section numbers*
9. Teach extra-large sections (> 150 students); *list course and section numbers*
10. Writing-intensive courses; *list course*
11. Multiple courses rather than multiple sections of same course; *list courses/sections*

For the following indicators, answer “yes” or “no”

12. Courses require students to read primary literature
13. Course stresses analytical skills
14. Courses integrate knowledge across courses
15. Lectures include real-world examples

16. Courses promote scientific exploration
17. Courses require students to engage in research
18. Courses require students to engage in discussions
19. Courses include a discussion of ethics
20. Courses connect science with social/political issues
21. Courses were taught during the summer or intersession

Research

- I. Basic Expectations: In accordance with the Biology Department's Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion, primary research duties include:
 1. Performance of scholarly activity during the period of review that has potential to lead to peer-reviewed publication based on current research carried out at MSU.

- II. General Evaluation Procedures: The committee will examine the total point range (see below) for the entire faculty and decide where to make the cut-offs for the 1—5 range based upon natural breaks in the distribution and the university guidelines for the percentage of individuals that should be included in each category. When a point range exists for a given activity, the faculty member should suggest the appropriate point level and provide justification for this assessment. The committee can adjust the number of points to be given based on their assessment of the activity in relation to points given to similar activities by other faculty members.

Because many research projects in Biology take multiple years from inception to completion, publications and grants will be included in evaluations for a period of 3-

years. The Personnel Committee must consider teaching loads in final ratings for research. Individuals with reduced teaching loads for research commitments are expected to exhibit higher research productivity.

III. Assignment of points

16. Peer-reviewed publications (5—50; justify*)
17. Publications in non-refereed journals or reports, or any other nonrefereed publication (generally, 3—5 pts each; justify; with strong justification, additional points may be awarded at the discretion of the committee—part of the justification must include whether the data are also included in a thesis or peer-reviewed published paper)
18. Submission of independent manuscripts (2 pts each)
19. Unpublishable contract work: 3-5, justify
20. Grant proposals submitted:
 - Outside Funding Agencies: justify which category below
 - a. large or major grant—5 pts each
 - b. small grants or contracts—2 pts each
 - c. MSU—1 pt each
21. Grants and contracts funded
 - d. External ; 10 pts (+ 1 pt for every \$20,000; maximum = 5 pts) (+ 5 pts per additional year for a multi-year grant)
 - e. Internal grants (3 pts each)
22. Papers or Posters presented (1—5 pts, justify)
23. Other (describe in detail with documentation and suggested points)

Service

- I. Basic Expectations: In accordance with the Biology Department's Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion, primary service duties include:

- a. Conscientious completion of assigned duties as a member of committees or councils of the department, college, or university.
- b. Conscientious completion of other non-classroom and non-committee departmental assignments.
3. General Evaluation Procedures: The committee will examine the total point range (see below) for the entire faculty and decide where to make the cut-offs for the 1—5 range based upon natural breaks in the distribution and the university guidelines for the percentage of individuals that should be included in each category. When a point range exists for a given activity, the faculty member should suggest the appropriate point level and provide justification for this assessment. The committee can adjust the number of points to be given based on their assessment of the activity in relation to points given to similar activities by other faculty members.

II. Assignment of Points:

1. Committees:
 - Chair of Senate or College Council (25 pts)
 - Chair of university or college committee (3-15 pts, justify)
 - Chair of Departmental Committee (3-10 pts each; justify)
 - Member of University, College, or Departmental Committees (1-10 pts each; justify)
2. Special assignments in the department such as curators and coordinators (2-20 pts each; justify (do not double count if this duty also counted as serving as the chair of a relevant committee))
3. Officer in Professional Society
 - National Society – 5 pts
 - Regional or State Society – 3 pts
4. External professional workshop attended (2 pts each, list)
5. University Promotional Activities (Fund Solicitation, Major's Fair, etc.) (1 pt each, list)

6. Non-paid consultation activity (1 pt each, maximum 3 pts per year, list)

7. Public Speaking Engagements on Biological Subjects (2 pts each, list)

8. Editor or service on editorial board of a professional journal; service on professional society committee (3—20; justify)

9. Review of manuscripts or grants (2 pts each)

10. Other significant service activities (list and justify, with suggested points)