

Roles, Scope, Criteria, Standards and Procedures

of the

Ecology Department

(Name of Department/School/College)

Effective Date: 4/15/19

APPROVALS

SIGNATURE

DATE

Department Faculty

Chair, Primary Review Committee

Diane Debiniski
Primary Administrative Reviewer

Lucy Schreiber 4/15/19
Department Head/Director

N/A

Intermediate Review Committee

Chair, Intermediate Review Committee

MICOL C. RAE
Intermediate Administrative Reviewer

Meane 4/17/19
College Dean

David Ertle
College Review Committee

DEA 4/17/19
Chair, College Review Committee

DAVID J SINGEL
University Retention, Tenure and Promotion

DJ Singel
Chair, University Retention, Tenure and Promotion

Robert L. Mokwa
Provost

RL Mokwa 5-7-19

Role and Scope Document

for the MSU Department of Ecology

5/8/19

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
ARTICLE I. ROLE AND SCOPE OF THE UNIT	2
ARTICLE II. APPOINTMENT OF RESEARCH FACULTY	3
ARTICLE III. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCESS FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY	4
ARTICLE IV. PRIMARY REVIEW COMMITTEE AND ADMINISTRATOR ROLES - PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEWS	6
ARTICLE V. INTERMEDIATE REVIEW COMMITTEE AND ADMINISTRATOR	8
ARTICLE VI. REVIEW MATERIALS	9
ARTICLE VII. APPLICABLE ROLE AND SCOPE DOCUMENTS	12
ARTICLE VIII. RETENTION REVIEWS	12
ARTICLE IX. TENURE REVIEW	14
ARTICLE X. PROMOTION TO RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	25
ARTICLE XI. PROMOTION TO RANK OF PROFESSOR	26
ARTICLE XII. PROCEDURES FOR UPDATE AND REVISION OF THE DEPARTMENTAL ROLE AND SCOPE DOCUMENT	28
ARTICLE XIII. APPROVAL PROCESS	28

Article I. Role and Scope of the Unit

Montana State University, the State's land-grant institution, educates students, creates knowledge and art, and serves communities by integrating learning, discovery, and engagement.

The Ecology Department at Montana State University actively supports the university's mission in teaching, scholarship, and service. We balance excellence in undergraduate education, graduate education, student mentoring, scientific research, and engagement with public and private organizations involved in conservation, management, and research of ecological resources. We provide education and research that advances ecological knowledge, scientific evaluation, and the management of populations and communities of fish, wildlife, invertebrates, and plants, and the ecosystems and landscapes that support them. We produce graduates with fundamental scientific and critical-thinking skills that are employed by public natural resource agencies, non-governmental conservation organizations, private businesses, and academic institutions. We provide an integrated program in terrestrial and aquatic ecology and management.

Faculty in the Ecology Department are expected to support the mission of the university through teaching, scholarship, and service. We are a primary source of education in the biology of organisms, populations, communities, and ecosystems at the University, and the largest major in the College of Letters and Science. At the upper division and graduate level, we provide a broad education in plant and animal ecology, conservation, and fish and wildlife management. Ecology faculty are expected to develop and present well-designed and structured courses reflecting both best practices in pedagogy and up-to-date concepts and content.

Faculty in the Ecology Department are expected to engage actively in research and scholarship by developing and supporting effective research programs that produce scholarly publications in scientific and management-oriented journals and by mentoring graduate students through their development to independent researchers or ecological management specialists.

Ecology Department faculty recognize our role in the land grant mission of Montana State University. We value teaching, scholarship, and service activities that advance and support the success of under-represented groups in science. We collaborate actively with public and private natural resource and ecological management agencies to ensure that management of state and regional resources benefits from the contemporary and comprehensive understanding that active scholarship and research can contribute. In addition, faculty embrace our role in furthering the science of ecology by participating in professional ecological or natural resource societies and scientific or natural resource funding agencies as reviewers of proposal and manuscripts, serving as editors, officers, and program chairs, and participating in policy and scientific review committees and panels.

Faculty members are expected to engage in service activities. Service can occur at global, national, state or local levels. Faculty also have responsibilities to serve on Department, College, and University committees.

In summary, faculty in the Department of Ecology fulfill three interrelated and complementary roles: undergraduate and graduate education, scholarship, and service to the people of Montana and beyond. The integration among these roles is fundamental to our mission as a land grant university.

Academic Degrees of the Department

B.S. Biological Sciences with 4 options:

Biology Teaching

Conservation Biology and Ecology

Fish and Wildlife Ecology and Management

Organismal Biology

M.S. in Biological Sciences

M.S. in Fish and Wildlife Management

Ph.D. in Biological Sciences

Ph.D. in Ecology and Environmental Sciences (intercollege)

Ph.D. in Fish and Wildlife Biology

Article II. Appointment of Research Faculty

Research faculty members have a primary research assignment and are appointed on grant funds using the processes and procedures of the Office of Sponsored Programs and the policies of the Ecology Department. Initial appointment is generally as an Assistant Research Professor unless the candidate's research record warrants appointment at a higher rank. Research faculty may have educational and service responsibilities that include, but are not limited to, supervising graduate students, co-chairing graduate committees, serving on graduate student committees, undergraduate advising and mentorship, teaching seminars and courses, and serving on departmental or college curriculum committees.

Research faculty will be appointed for a one-year term after the review and approval of the Ecology Executive Committee. Reappointment will be contingent upon funding and appropriate contributions to the departmental mission. After being appointed, faculty

will be evaluated by the Department Head annually. Research faculty requesting consideration for promotion will prepare a dossier summarizing their research productivity and other contributions to the department mission which will be evaluated by the PRC with respect to the equivalent standards for promotion of tenure-track faculty enumerated in this document. No external review will be required. When the research faculty member has a significant commitment in a second department, or a research center or institute, the department head or director of the non-home department should provide a written evaluation of the candidate's scholarship for inclusion in the candidate's dossier.

Article III. Annual Review Process for Tenure Track Faculty

All Tenure Track (TT) and non-tenure track (NTT) faculty not subject to the Collective Bargaining Agreement are reviewed annually using the Annual Review Form. An annual review assesses the faculty member's performance over the preceding calendar year with the major aim of improvement ("formative") and is based upon the faculty member's letter of hire, assigned percentages of effort, annual assignments, annual productivity report, and evaluation of teaching.

Section 3.01 Annual Reviews: University Requirements

Annual review procedures may vary by college and department, but must include the following elements:

- a. All faculty members will provide data on their activities over the preceding year. These data must be submitted no later than the end of January.
- b. Annual reviews will cover the faculty member's activities and accomplishments in the preceding calendar year.
- c. All areas of the faculty member's responsibility must be reviewed.
- d. Annual reviews must be completed by the end of March.
- e. Annual review documents must be communicated to the college dean.
- f. Annual review documents are retained as part of the faculty member's personnel file.

Section 3.02 Annual Reviews: College Requirements

The department head will assign a proposed annual review score to each faculty member. These proposed scores are reported to the Dean by the required deadline. The Dean will review the scores for inter-departmental consistency. If inconsistencies are identified, the Dean will meet with the department heads to resolve the issue.

Department heads will provide each faculty member with their final score by late March.

Section 3.03 Annual Reviews: Department Requirements

The Department of Ecology follows the College of Letters and Science procedures for annual review. In addition, the following procedures are used in conducting annual reviews in Ecology:

- a. The faculty member and Department Head annually review the faculty member's performance relative to the assigned percentages of effort, annual assignments, and annual performance report. Evaluations are expected to recognize the requirements and expectations of the position and the proportionate time and resources officially allocated to particular activities. Faculty members with 20% or more effort assigned to another unit will have letters submitted by the Heads/Directors of those units to be included in the annual review done by the Department Head.
- b. Activity Insight (or any future MSU on-line database) is used for data entry by faculty. In addition, faculty can provide a summary of the research, teaching and service activities, particularly those items not captured well by Activity Insight, directly to the Department Head.
- c. The Department Head rates the performance of each faculty member and submits an Annual Review form approved by the Provost to the College Dean using the performance rating system prescribed by the University.
- d. The faculty member must sign the document on which the rating is communicated to the Dean of the College of Letters and Sciences. The signature of a faculty member does not indicate concurrence with the rating; rather it signifies that he or she has seen the rating. If the faculty member disagrees with the review, they have the prerogative to appeal to the dean (see Faculty Handbook Section 3 of Annual Review).
- e. Copies of all annual reviews and the performance ratings of each faculty member shall be maintained in the faculty member's file in the department. These files shall be kept confidential and maintained in conformity with University requirements.

Article IV. Primary Review Committee and Administrator Roles - Promotion and Tenure Reviews

Section 4.01 Ecology Department Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee Composition, Election, and Appointment

The Primary Review Committee (PRC) is the Department of Ecology Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee which conducts an independent review of the candidate's dossier in accordance with the responsibilities delineated in Sections 2 through 6 of the University Faculty Handbook Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Rights and Responsibilities.

The Department of Ecology Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee consists of at least four tenured faculty members, half of whom have to be full professors. One member is appointed by the Department Head and the remaining members are elected by the voting faculty (Tenure Track Faculty, Co-op Faculty, and Non-Tenure Track Faculty who have been approved to be voting members). Members serve one-year terms. For the review of faculty coming up for ranking as Full Professor, we will aim to compose the Primary Review Committee (PRC) of only tenured full professors. If there are not enough tenured full professors in Ecology to constitute a review committee, tenured Associate Professors from Ecology will be asked to serve on the Primary Review Committee. Votes of the Primary Review Committee will be reported to the candidate by number rather than name, thereby protecting the anonymity of the PRC members. No faculty member shall serve on the committee during the review of her or his own dossier. In making these nominations or appointments, the Department Head should adopt selection procedures for committee members that will promote membership which is inclusive of the categories protected by the University's Non-Discrimination Policy. An individual may only serve on one review committee: the department, college, or university.

Section 4.01.1 Responsibilities and Actions of the Department Review Committee

The Departmental Primary Review Committee (PRC) is responsible for:

- a. Conducting a fair, objective, independent, and substantive review of the candidate's dossier based on department, college, and university criteria and standards.
- b. Preparing a written recommendation, with vote tally, concerning the retention, tenure, and/or promotion of each candidate for review.

The PRC prepares a written recommendation, with vote tally, concerning the retention, tenure, and/or promotion of each candidate. The recommendation becomes a permanent part of the faculty member's personnel files maintained in the Department Head's office.

- a. For formal review of a candidate, the PRC first reviews the Standards, Indicators, Weights, Qualitative and Quantitative Expectations, and Evidence listed in this document and the appropriate Role and Scope, "Procedures, Standards and Criteria" documents.
- b. Each committee member independently reviews the candidate's dossier materials.
- c. Following detailed discussion of the merits of each case, each committee member indicates her/his vote.
- d. All recommendations are summarized by the PRC in an Evaluation Letter to the Department Head, which is placed in the dossier and provided to each candidate under review. For those cases in which the department committee is divided, the committee will provide a written rationale for the dissenting vote(s). Copies of these letters are kept in the faculty personnel file in the Departmental office.

Section 4.02 Primary Review Administrator

The Primary Review Administrator is the Department Head. Should the Primary Review Administrator have a conflict of interest with a candidate under review, the College of Letters and Science (CLS) Dean will identify an individual to serve as Primary Review Administrator for the case under review.

Section 4.03 Identification of Responsible Entities

- a. The Department Head, consistent with the University Faculty Handbook, shall establish the Primary Review Committee by appointment of the members (see Section 4.01).
- b. The PRC shall obtain at least five external review letters. Regardless of the number of letters requested, all letters received shall be included in the dossier. The majority of the letters must come from sources other than the candidate's list (See Section 6.03). This work may go into the summer, so it is important that committee members know this when they agree to serve on the PRC.
- c. The Department Head, with the assistance of the PRC, will ensure the following materials are included in the dossier:

- i. Letters of solicitation for internal and/or external letters, letters from the reviewers, and in the case of external reviewers, a short bio-sketch of the reviewer.
 - ii. Applicable Role and Scope document.
 - iii. Letter of hire, any percentages of effort changes, all annual reviews, and all evaluation letters from prior retention, tenure, and promotion reviews at MSU.
 - iv. Candidate's teaching evaluations from the review period. Upon request by review committees and review administrators, the department will provide access to the original evaluations to review committees and administrators during the review. A minimum of one peer-evaluation is required per course taught during the period prior to retention review. Candidate should request peer evaluations from DH and Department Head is responsible for organizing faculty to conduct the reviews.
- d. The Department Head will maintain copies of all review committee evaluation letters including internal letters after the review.

Section 4.04 Next review level

The next review level after the reviews by the Primary Review Committee and the Primary Review Administrator is the College of Letters & Science Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (CLSRTPC).

Article V. Intermediate Review Committee and Administrator

The intermediate review committee is the College of Letters and Science Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee which conducts an independent review of the dossier in accordance with the responsibilities delineated in Sections 2 through 6 of the University Faculty Handbook Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Rights and Responsibilities and the CLS Role and Scope

<http://www.montana.edu/lettersandscience/rs/index.html>

Article VI. Review Materials

Review materials submitted by the candidate shall comply with the University Faculty Handbook document "Annual Review, Retention, Tenure and Promotion," subsection "RTP: Rights and Responsibilities," sections 1 and 7. Additionally, candidates in the College of Letters and Science must follow the requirements below.

Section 6.01 Materials submitted by Candidate

Materials for external review must include:

- a. A comprehensive Curriculum Vitae (CV) documenting teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the candidate.
- b. A brief research statement describing the candidate's scholarship.
- c. Articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence from the review period, selected by the candidate, that best represents the candidate's scholarship.

Materials for all dossiers must include:

- a. Cover sheet obtained from the Provost's office.
- b. A comprehensive CV documenting teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the candidate.
- c. A Personal Statement that includes a description of the candidate's area of scholarship.

Separate self-evaluations for teaching, scholarship, service, and integration summarizing the evidence demonstrating that the candidate meets the standards for the attainment of retention, tenure, or promotion, as applicable. Each self-evaluation shall include a summary of activities, selected products or accomplishments, and evidence of recognition, itemized by year over the relevant review period.

If included in the CV, the candidate should separate the following categories:

- a. Refereed books or book chapters
- b. Refereed journal articles
- c. Invited book chapters or articles
- d. Invited conference presentations
- e. Contributed conference presentations
- f. Seminars and/or colloquia
- g. Grant proposals submitted and grants funded

h. Non-refereed publications

The candidate may choose to include other categories as appropriate to the discipline and the candidate's record. For papers, grants funded, and other scholarly products, full author lists must match the publication or grant award. This list is a general requirement for all dossiers. For further details including evidence of teaching, scholarship, service, and integration activity, see Articles VIII-XI of this document.

Section 6.02 Documentation of Collaborative Scholarly Contributions

In complying with the University Faculty Handbook requirement to detail scholarly collaboration, candidates in the College of Letters and Science will include this information. For Ecology, candidates must define their role and contribution as co-author on papers and grants: As examples: 1) corresponding author, conceived the idea, directed the work, wrote the paper, 2) contributed to writing of the manuscript and interpretation of the data, or 3) directed the work of network analysis, contributed to statistical analysis, helped write manuscript and interpreted data.

Section 6.03 Peer Review Solicitation Procedure

The process and requirements for soliciting peer review materials are described in the University Faculty Handbook, "Annual Review, Retention, Tenure and Promotion," subsection "RTP: Rights and Responsibilities," section 7.

Evaluators should be specialists in the candidate's field and familiar with the usual expectations for faculty performance. The majority of the outside evaluators must be selected by the department head and/or PRC; the remainder may come from a list of names submitted by the candidate. Candidates shall not be informed of the identity of outside evaluators to protect the confidentiality of the review process.

Guidelines regarding who may and may not serve as referees are elaborated in the Faculty Handbook on "Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Rights and Responsibilities as follows:

3.c. No person may participate in the review of any person with whom they have a personal, business, or professional relationship that could be perceived to preclude objective application of professional judgment. A conflict of interest occurs when the evaluating party could realize personal, financial, professional, or other gain or loss as a result of the outcome of the review process, or when the objectivity of the evaluating party could be impaired by virtue of the relationship. Examples of persons who may be excluded by professional relationship include undergraduate and/or graduate mentors, postdoctoral mentors, collaborators who are co-investigators on grants and/or co-authors on a significant portion of

scholarly products completed during the review period, colleagues who depend on instrumentation controlled or operated by the candidate, and/or co-inventor of a patent.

The external review letters must be requested by the PRC as specified in Section 4.03, and must not be solicited by the candidate. The department report should state clearly how external referees were chosen and should include a biosketch summarizing their status in the field. Referees will be asked to state either knowledge of or relationship to the candidate, if any.

The Ecology Department will use the following specific rules for soliciting reviews:

External referees are selected by the Primary Review Committee from a list supplied by the candidate, appropriate bibliographies, membership listings of professional societies, or by consultations with active investigators in the discipline. At least five external letters of evaluation are to be solicited, a majority of which must come from sources other than the candidate's list. Referees are contacted by the PRC first by email to determine their willingness to serve. Those who agree are sent a formal letter of request with explicit timelines and expectations. Such external referees must be experts in the specific discipline, from other universities or appropriate institutions, and familiar with expectations of faculty performance. Selection of mentors, former colleagues, collaborators or close friends as referees is not permitted. To protect the confidentiality of the review process, candidates must not be informed of the identity of outside evaluations. These requirements are further developed in the FH Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Rights & Responsibilities Section 3.

The external review letters must not be solicited by the candidate. The Primary Review Committee report will state clearly how external referees were chosen and should include a brief statement of their status in the field. A copy of the letter soliciting outside reviewers must be included in the candidate's file; referees should state either knowledge of or relationship to the candidate, if any.

The Primary Review Committee will send the external evaluators a copy of the candidate's vita, as well as a selection of relevant publications and/or unpublished manuscripts, and the Personal Statement, Teaching Performance, Research/Creative Activity, and Service statements (e.g. items 6-10 in dossier components required by Provost's office). They should be asked to comment specifically on the quality of the candidate's written scholarship and his or her productivity, as well as the candidate's recognition in the field.

Article VII. Applicable Role and Scope Documents

Section 7.01 Retention Review

Candidates for retention are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope documents in effect on the first date of employment in a tenurable position.

Section 7.02 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Review

Candidates for tenure are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope documents in effect on the first date of employment in a tenurable position. Candidates may choose any Role and Scope from the time of their hire forward. For reference, they need to include the applicable Role and Scope in their dossier.

Section 7.03 Promotion to Professor Review

A candidate for promotion to Full Professor will be reviewed using standards and indicators in the Role and Scope documents in effect two (2) years prior to the deadline for notification of intent to apply for promotion.

Article VIII. Retention Reviews

Section 8.01 Timing of Retention Review

Faculty are reviewed for retention in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

Section 8.02 University Standard

The standards for the retention of probationary faculty members are:

- a. Effectiveness in teaching, scholarship and service during the review period; and
- b. Integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service; and
- c. Satisfactory progress towards meeting the standards for tenure by the candidate's tenure review year.

Section 8.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

Section 9.03 of this document lists and describes performance indicators for scholarship, teaching, and service. Unless otherwise noted, the same performance indicators and weights that are used in tenure review are used in retention review.

Section 8.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

The Department values intellectual discovery and the generation of new knowledge above all other measures of scholarship.

Effectiveness in scholarship It is expected that candidates establish a research specialty in their discipline and create scholarly products (see Section 9.03) during the review period. It is expected that scholarship be of high quality, be ongoing throughout the review period, be commensurate with the associated discipline, and result in a record of scholarly products at the time of retention. These products may represent both Group I and Group II indicators, and publications may be submitted, in revision, accepted, in press, or published and grants may be in review, unfunded, or funded at the time of review. The record must be substantive enough that it is reasonable to expect the candidate to achieve the standards for tenure at the time of tenure review.

Effectiveness in Teaching Candidates must provide evidence that it reasonable to expect the candidate to achieve the standards for tenure at the time of tenure review as described in Section 9.04.

Effectiveness in Service Expectations for service are described in Section 9.04, except that there is no requirement that service include assignment to a Department, College, or University committee at MSU at the time of retention review.

Section 8.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

Evidence of performance indicators are listed in Section 9.05. The same performance indicators and evidence that are used in tenure review are used in retention review, with the addition that *submitted* products are to be documented with a copy of the submitted work along with verification of submission.

Section 8.06 Status of Scholarly Products

For retention review, scholarly products that are submitted, accepted, in press, or published at the time of review will be considered if they are included in the dossier and are appropriately documented according to Section 8.05.

Article IX. Tenure Review

Section 9.01 Timing of Tenure Review

Faculty are normally reviewed for tenure in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the University's Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

Section 9.02 University Standard

The University standards for the award of tenure are:

- Sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period.
- Integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service.
- Accomplishment in scholarship.

Section 9.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

Candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion to full professor must submit evidence documenting effectiveness, accomplishment, or excellence of their scholarship, teaching, and service. This Role and Scope Document calls the types of evidence candidates may use "performance indicators." For example, peer-reviewed publications are a performance indicator for scholarship, and student-evaluations are performance indicators for teaching.

The following performance indicators are considered in the review to determine if the standards in the previous section are satisfied. These performance indicators apply to all Department faculty. The review committee will determine the appropriate weights for different performance indicators within a group. Additional indicators will be considered by the review committee if deemed appropriate and consistent with the definition of indicators stated in the Faculty Handbook.

Performance indicators in scholarship

The following is a list of performance indicators applicable to scholarship. The indicators listed in Group I are considered examples of primary activities by which performance in scholarship is evaluated. Those from Group II also contribute to performance but carry less weight. All items from Groups I and II are referred to as “scholarly products.”

Group I

- Refereed journal articles, monographs, book chapters, and textbooks in the biological sciences and related disciplines
- External grants funded
- Invited major talks (e.g., plenary or keynote) or invited high-profile seminars or colloquia (e.g., at prestigious venues)*

Group II

- Refereed proceedings published in connection with professional meetings*
- Papers or presentations given at professional meetings
- Grant proposals submitted (external and internal)
- Internal grants funded
- Seminars and/or colloquia*
- Non-refereed publications (e.g., non-refereed proceedings and technical reports)
- Development and publication of scholarly products (e.g., software or curriculum materials)

This list is representative but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in scholarship, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The PRC will determine the weight of such indicators and will describe this determination in their evaluation letter. In addition, the weight of indicators marked (*) will be determined and described by the PRC Committee, based on varying disciplinary norms for research publications and presentations. For example, an invited talk at a high-profile seminar at a prestigious venue would normally be weighted as a Group I indicator, while an invited talk at a seminar in another department on campus would normally be weighted as a Group II indicator. An invited talk at a conference where most talks are organized by different individuals who issue invitations would normally be weighted as a Group II indicator, while an invited plenary talk at the same conference would normally be weighted as a Group I indicator.

Performance indicators in teaching

The following is a list of performance indicators applicable to teaching. All indicators listed are considered the primary activities by which performance in teaching is evaluated.

- Faculty peer reviews of teaching
- Development and implementation of new pedagogical methods and/or curriculum materials beyond what is normally expected for teaching a course. Note: publications resulting from such activities are performance indicators of scholarship.
- Design and facilitation of instructional programs, e.g., graduate teaching assistant training (note that publications resulting from such activities are performance indicators of scholarship)
- Mentorship of graduate students (e.g., supervising or substantially contributing to graduate student research)
- Mentorship of undergraduate students (e.g., supervising undergraduate research or independent study projects, advising of undergraduate students)
- Student evaluations of instruction via University-approved instruments
- Assessment data documenting learning gains in a course or post-instruction student performance using validated instruments
- Awards received for teaching
- Attendance in training programs designed to promote improved teaching

This list is representative but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in teaching, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The PRC will determine the weight of such indicators and will describe this determination in their evaluation letter.

Performance indicators in service

The following is a list of performance indicators applicable to service. All indicators listed are considered the primary activities by which performance in service is evaluated.

- Membership and offices held on Department, College, and University committees
- Professional service in local, state, national, or international organizations in the biological sciences
- Outreach in the biological sciences to local, state, national, or international communities
- Service as a reviewer or editor for a professional journal, monograph, or book
- Professional consultations that may or may not result in a co-authored publication

This list is representative but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in service, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The PRC will determine the weight of such indicators.

Performance Indicators in Integration

As indicated in Section 9.02, candidates are expected to demonstrate integration across at least two of the categories of scholarship, teaching, and service. The nature and extent of integrated activities will vary depending on the candidate's discipline and areas of specialization. The following list offers examples of potential indicators of integration, with the understanding that integration can take many forms. The candidate must clearly define and describe how integration is achieved in the dossier.

- Integration of scholarship and teaching: implementing a research activity within a course, incorporating research findings into a course, helping students understand methods for conducting research, collaborating with undergraduates in research.
- Integration of scholarship and service: lending research expertise through consulting or disseminating research to the public.
- Integration of teaching and service: designing and/or delivering professional development for K-12 teachers or special programs for K-12 students.

Section 9.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Scholarship Expectations

The Ecology Department values intellectual discovery and the generation of new knowledge above all other measures of scholarship.

Accomplishment in scholarship is judged primarily by the quality of published scholarly works, with refereed articles being the most commonly used performance indicator. With respect to publication quality, the PRC will assess accomplishment based on their own expertise as well as the evidence provided by External Reviewers. *Accomplishment* includes, but is not limited to, an ongoing record of independent research that has led to a regular record of publication in refereed journals. It is expected that the results of these publications will be presented at conferences and professional meetings. A record of seeking extramural funds to support research activities is also expected.

It is expected that scholarship be of high quality, be ongoing throughout the tenure review period, be commensurate with the associated discipline, and result in a substantive record of peer-reviewed products at the time of tenure. The usual Departmental expectation for scholarly productivity is that tenure candidates average between 1 and 2 scholarly products per year during the review period. These products may represent both Group I and Group II indicators, and publications may be accepted, in press, or published at the time of review. At the time of tenure it is expected that multiple items from Group I will appear in the candidate's body of work. Due to the diverse nature of scholarship within the Department, expectations will vary across disciplines.

Regardless of quantity of products, the quality of the candidate's scholarly body of work as documented by External Reviewers is of primary importance. In particular, the quality and reputation of journals and other scholarly venues, as documented by External Reviewers and disciplinary norms, is considered extremely important in the review process. Citation data and publication impact factors may be used as a performance indicator for scholarship, but are not always an important measure of prestige or scholarly accomplishment in the biological sciences.

In some cases, a relatively small number of products with high impact may be acceptable for satisfying scholarship expectations, while in other cases a large number of products may not be sufficient. If the number of products is near the average of 1-2 scholarly products per year, then these products should be documented by the External Reviewers and/or PRC committee as having made a significant contribution to the discipline. Also, if the candidate's contribution to one or more products is documented as minimal, then it is expected that the number of scholarly products would need to sufficiently exceed the average to offset the candidate's limited contributions.

A record of seeking extramural funds to support research activities is also expected. As recognition of the intellectual work invested in the early phases of a grant, a candidate who is active as a PI or co-PI on an unusually large awarded external grant during the review period may not be expected to produce as many peer-reviewed papers. The scope of the grant work and the reputation of the granting agency are qualitative factors that will influence the quantitative expectation for number of peer-reviewed papers and other Group I products.

Collaborative work is highly valued in the biological sciences, and there is no expectation that single-authored publications are required to demonstrate effectiveness in scholarship. Standards for determining author order vary within and across groups, so no inferences about level of contribution should be made based on author order. The candidate is expected to identify the level of individual contribution to grants and scholarly works [see Section 6.02].

Teaching Expectations

The Department of Ecology expects faculty to have the ability to 1) organize, deliver, and manage courses with clarity, logic, and command of the subject, 2) contribute positively to the curriculum of the Ecology Department, and 3) mentor undergraduate and graduate students.

In addition to student evaluations, *effectiveness* in classroom teaching is judged from multiple peer reviews conducted by Departmental faculty who observe the candidate in the classroom or lab during the review period. Written reports from peer reviewers

document the candidate's teaching performance and serve as evidence to evaluate effectiveness.

The Department expectation is that normally, for each course taught, the overall mean score from the student evaluation instrument is not less than the indicator for "Average." For example, 3.0 is the "average" evaluation score for "Overall Effectiveness" on an instrument with 5 categories (1=Poor, 2=Below Average, 3=Average, 4=Above Average, and 5 = Excellent). Scores will be interpreted in the context of average scores across departmental faculty relative to class size and course level. It is expected that any overall mean score below "Average" will be addressed by the candidate. Similarly, any issues related to teaching noted in the retention review should be addressed prior to tenure review.

All faculty are expected to contribute to undergraduate and graduate education and advising in the Department. At the time of the tenure review, a candidate is expected to demonstrate evidence of the ability to mentor graduate students. Evidence may include chairing or serving on graduate committees, or graduating a student for whom the faculty member served as major advisor, but can also be exhibited through other types of graduate student mentoring.

Service Expectations

Effectiveness in service will be achieved if the candidate demonstrates active participation and competent execution of tasks in any of the areas of service described by the performance indicators (See 9.03). Service is expected to include at least one assignment to a Department, College, or University committee at MSU. Participation in other activities that contribute to the candidate's discipline or profession (e.g., task forces or special programs) is also valued, especially when such participation raises the stature and reputation of the Department or the University in the state, the nation, or internationally.

Section 9.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

Applicable performance indicators, and evidence supporting the candidate's performance for each indicator, will be assessed using the contents of the candidate's dossier.

In addition to the listed evidence of performance indicators, properly documented nominations for and receptions of competitive awards for scholarship, teaching, or service will be considered as evidence of peer recognition.

Evidence of performance indicators in scholarship

The list of evidence presented in Tables 1 and 2 is not exhaustive. Other evidence supplied by the candidate that is related to the performance indicators for scholarship will be considered in the review. The weight category (Group I or Group II) of indicators marked (*) will be determined based on varying disciplinary norms for research publications and presentations.

Only scholarly products that have been accepted for publication, performance, or exhibition within the tenure review period will be considered. For works published in a journal not readily available through University databases, the candidate must include a digital copy of the accepted work in the dossier. For works accepted for publication but not yet published, the candidate must include a digital copy of the accepted work accompanied by an official letter or email indicating acceptance.

Table 1. Group I Performance Indicators in Scholarship and Typical Evidence

Group I: Performance Indicator	Typical Evidence
Refereed journal articles, monographs, book chapters, and textbooks in the biological sciences:	Full citation for the scholarly work, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
Refereed journal articles, monographs, book chapters and textbooks in disciplines outside of the biological sciences that result from multidisciplinary research:	Full citation for the scholarly work, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
External grants funded:	Grant number or code with URL or other contact where more information can be found. Brief description (title, funding agency, years of support, collaborators if any).
Invited major talks (e.g., plenary or keynote):	Letter of invitation, copy of program, or full citation.
Invited high-profile seminars or colloquia (e.g., at prestigious venues):*	Full citation, including the title, venue, date, and level (Department, University, community, etc.).
Refereed proceedings published in connection with professional meetings:*	Full citation for the proceedings, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
Citation data for publications	Number of citations per paper as noted by Google Scholar, Web of Science; H index

Table 2. Group II Performance Indicators in Scholarship and Typical Evidence

Group II: Performance Indicator	Typical Evidence
Refereed proceedings published in connection with professional meetings:*	Full citation for the proceedings, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
Invited papers or presentations given at professional meetings:	Full citation including the title, co-presenters, organization, location, and date.
Contributed papers or presentations given at professional meetings:	Full citation including the title, co-presenters, organization, location, and date.
Grant proposals submitted (external and internal):	Grant number or code with URL or other contact where more information can be found. Brief description (title, funding agency, years of funding, collaborators if any).
Internal grants funded:	Brief description (title, source of funding, years of funding, collaborators if any).
Invited seminars and/or colloquia:*	Full citation, including the title, venue, date, and level (Department, University, community, etc.).
Non-refereed publications (e.g., non-refereed proceedings and technical reports):	Full citation for the publication or report, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
Development and publication of scholarly products (e.g., software or curriculum materials):	Brief description of the product including an overview of content and format, intended use, potential audience, and location where it is publicly available.

Evidence of performance indicators in teaching

The list of evidence presented in Table 3 is not exhaustive. Other evidence supplied by the candidate that is related to performance indicators for teaching will be considered in the review.

Table 3. Performance Indicators in Teaching and Typical Evidence

Performance Indicator	Typical Evidence
Faculty peer reviews of teaching:	A copy of the review. Faculty may use a form or letter for their review. Reviews must be submitted by the observer directly to the Department head and maintained in Department files. The Department Head may serve as a peer observer.
Development and implementation of new pedagogical methods and/or curriculum materials beyond what is normally expected for teaching a course:	Syllabus or other documentation (including publications) of new methods or materials with evidence supporting innovation. Brief description of the implementation process, audience, and outcomes.
Design and facilitation of instructional programs (e.g., graduate teaching assistant training):	Agenda or other documentation of instructional program’s goals and major components. Brief description of audience and outcomes.
Mentorship of graduate students (e.g., supervising or substantially contributing to graduate student research):	Brief description including graduate student name, research question/focus, funding (if any), and progress to date.
Mentorship of undergraduate students (e.g., supervising undergraduate research or projects):	Brief description including undergraduate student name, research question/focus, funding (if any), and progress to date.
Mentorship of undergraduate students (e.g., undergraduate advising):	List of undergraduate students advised during the evaluation period and faculty self-evaluation of accomplishments relative to advising.
Student evaluations of instruction via University-approved instruments:	Student evaluation scores for all courses taught during the review period.

	Brief, overarching analysis of student comments (summary, selected quotes, or full list of comments). If appropriate, include a broad description of changes made in response to student feedback.
Assessment data documenting learning gains in a course or post-instruction student performance using validated instruments:	A description of the instrument used, evidence for the validity of the instrument, a description of when and how the instrument was administered, and a summary of the results.
Awards received for teaching:	Name, date, and type of award (University, College, Department, External Organization, etc.).
Attendance in training programs designed to promote improved teaching:	Title, place, and date of training program.

Evidence of performance indicators in service

The list of evidence in Table 4 is not exhaustive. Other evidence supplied by the candidate that is related to performance indicators for service will be considered in the review.

Table 4. Performance Indicators in Service and Typical Evidence

Performance Indicator	Typical Evidence
Membership and offices held on Department, College, and University committees:	Name and level of each committee and dates of service.
Professional service in local, state, national, or international organizations in the biological sciences:	Name of each organization (with description as needed), offices or roles held, dates of service, and notable accomplishments.
Outreach in the biological sciences to local, state, national, or international communities:	Brief description of outreach activities, audience, and outcomes.
Service as a reviewer or editor for a professional journal, monograph, or book:	Citations including name of journal, editorial role, dates of service, and workload.
Professional consultations that may or may not result in a co-authored publication:	Brief description of consulting activities, audience, and outcomes.

Article X. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor

Section 10.01 University Standards

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are the standards for the award of tenure. Appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor does not demonstrate, in and of itself, that standards for tenure have been met.

Article XI. Promotion to Rank of Professor

Section 11.01 Timing of Review

Normally, faculty are reviewed for promotion after the completion of five (5) years of service at the rank of Associate Professor, however, faculty may seek promotion earlier if they can establish that they meet the same standards of effectiveness and accomplishment or excellence used in evaluating candidates after five (5) years in rank.

Section 11.02 University Standard

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Professor are:

- Sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period
- Sustained integration of no less than two of the following areas during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service
- Excellence in scholarship

Section 11.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

The performance indicators and weighting used for this review are the same as those defined in Section 9.03 of this document, with the following two exceptions. In teaching expectations, an additional weight is placed on mentorship of graduate students. In service expectations, an additional weight is placed on active contributions to University, College, and Department committees and professional committees and programs.

Section 11.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Scholarship expectations

The Department values intellectual discovery and the generation of new knowledge above all other measures of scholarship.

Excellence in scholarship is judged primarily by the quality of published scholarly works, with refereed articles being the most commonly used performance indicator. With respect to publication quality, the PRC will assess excellence based on the evidence provided by External Reviewers. *Excellence* includes, but is not limited to, receiving national or international recognition from peers and colleagues as having made important scholarly contributions to the candidate's discipline. The Department expects that scholarly results will be disseminated through both publications and presentations.

It is expected that scholarship be of high quality, be ongoing throughout the review period, be commensurate with the associated discipline, and result in a substantive record of peer-reviewed scholarly products that impact the field. These products may represent both Group I and Group II indicators, and publications may be accepted, in press, or published at the time of review. At the time of promotion review it is expected that a substantial portion of the candidate's body of work will be comprised of Group I items. Due to the diverse nature of scholarship within the Department, expectations will vary across disciplines.

Regardless of the quantity of products, the quality of the candidate's scholarly body of work as documented by External Reviewers and the PRC is of primary importance. In particular, the quality and reputation of journals and other scholarly venues, as documented by External Reviewers and disciplinary norms, is considered extremely important in the review process. It should be noted that publication impact factors or h-indices are not always an important measure of prestige or scholarly productivity in the biological sciences at early stages of a faculty member's career. However, for promotion to Professor, it is generally expected that citations will be much more extensive than for a candidate coming up for tenure.

Collaborative work is highly valued in the biological sciences, and there is no expectation that single-authored publications are required to demonstrate accomplishment in scholarship. Standards for determining author order vary within and across groups, so no inferences about level of contribution should be made based on author order. The candidate is expected to identify the level of individual contribution to scholarly works [see Section 6.02].

Teaching Expectations

The expectation for this review is effectiveness in teaching, and the standard is defined in Section 9.04, with the exception that at the time of promotion review an additional weight is placed on mentorship of graduate students. Classroom teaching expectations are the same as for tenure and promotion.

Service Expectations

The expectation for this review is effectiveness in service, and the standard is defined in Section 9.04, with the exception that at the time of promotion review the candidate should have contributed at a higher caliber of service to Department, College, University and professional committees and programs.

Section 11.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

Applicable performance indicators, and evidence supporting the candidate's performance for each indicator, will be assessed using the contents of the candidate's dossier. The description of evidence of performance indicators is found in Section 9.05 of this document.

Article XII. Procedures for Update and Revision of the Departmental Role and Scope Document

The Ecology Department Role and Scope may be amended by a two-thirds majority vote of the tenure-track faculty. Before a vote to amend is taken, at least one open meeting must be held at which the proposed amendment(s) shall be explained and discussed. A formal vote shall be by written or secure electronic ballot. After the departmental approval, revisions must also be approved by the college promotion and tenure review committee and Dean, University Retention Tenure and Promotion and Committee (URTPC); and Provost. A current version of this Role and Scope document shall be maintained in the Department office and posted on the Department web site and Departmental digital document storage (Box).

Article XIII. Approval Process

Section 13.01 Primary Academic Unit Role and Scope Document

- a. Tenurable faculty and administrator of the primary academic unit
- b. Promotion and tenure review committee and administrator of all associated intermediate units (usually colleges)
- c. University Retention Tenure and Promotion Committee (URTPC)
- d. Provost

Section 13.02 Intermediate Academic Unit Role and Scope Document

- a. Promotion and tenure review committee and administrator of the intermediate unit
- b. University Retention Tenure and Promotion Committee (URTPC)
- c. Provost

Section 13.03 University Role and Scope Document

- a. University Retention Tenure and Promotion Committee (URTPC)
- b. Faculty Senate
- c. Deans' Council
- d. Provost