

Annual Review Policies
Department of Biology
College of Science

Purpose of the Annual Review: The Department of Biology performs an annual evaluation of each faculty member's teaching, research/scholarship, and professional service. The purpose of the evaluation is to recognize a level of performance and productivity that is appropriate and desirable for the department, and provide guidance when performance and productivity is less than satisfactory. The review process provides an opportunity for effective communication between each faculty member and his or her department leadership. The annual reviews also form the basis of Post-Tenure Review as described in the Department of Biology Post-Tenure Review Policy.

Period of Evaluation: The period of evaluation is a calendar year. The annual review will be performed the spring semester following the year to be evaluated.

Mechanism of the Annual Review: The department head performs an annual evaluation of faculty. The Annual Review Committee (ARC) serves in an advisory capacity to the department head and provides a written report of yearly performance and productivity, and a recommended rating in each category of research, teaching, and service. A copy of the ARC report is provided to the faculty member, along with an evaluation report from the Department Head. Pre-tenure faculty members will meet with the department head to discuss their annual review and any issues arising from it. Tenured faculty members may request to meet with the department head to discuss their review.

Composition of the Annual Review Committee: The Annual Review Committee is composed of the associate head of operations (ex officio and voting member) and 6 tenured faculty elected by the department, with no fewer than 3 Full Professors. Members will serve a three-year term.

Performance to be Evaluated: Members of the ARC summarize and evaluate annual reports provided by the faculty on their research/scholarship, teaching, and service activities in accordance with a standard weighting of 60% research/scholarship (e.g. grant proposal preparation, manuscript preparation, conference attendance, invited talks, compliance), 30% teaching (e.g. formal courses, graduate and undergraduate research training), and 10% service (e.g. major departmental, college, or university committees, grant and manuscript reviews and other service to the field). Modified loads are discussed with the head and approved by the dean. Any approved changes to the standard load for an individual faculty member will be communicated to the

Approved by Biology Faculty 11/13/18

ARC by the department head. Each faculty member also provides an up-to-date curriculum vitae, and any additional materials they deem relevant for the committee's consideration. The department provides student evaluations of teaching to the committee.

Report: The ARC provides an advisory rating to the department head for each faculty member on their research/scholarship, teaching, and service over the previous year as *Meritorious*, *Satisfactory*, *Needs Improvement*, or *Unsatisfactory* based on established evaluation criteria (examples listed below) and in accord with departmental standards. In addition, the ARC provides an advisory overall rating to the department head that is based on the individual criteria ratings. The department head will consider the advice of the ARC and determine the final criteria and overall ratings. The department head ratings will be provided in an evaluation report to the faculty member. This report will include a statement on expectations for the next year in research, teaching, and service. The faculty member indicates receipt of the evaluation report by signing a copy of the document, and is given the opportunity to provide written comments for their personnel file if they so choose. If a faculty member declines to acknowledge receipt of the report, that will be noted in the file. All faculty members will have an opportunity, if desired, to meet with the department head to discuss the written review and expectations. For faculty members who receive a *Needs Improvement* or *Unsatisfactory* rating in any single category, or an overall *Needs Improvement* or *Unsatisfactory* rating, the department head will consult with the faculty member to formulate a timely improvement plan with milestones. An overall *Unsatisfactory* rating is reported to the Dean of the College of Science, along with a written plan, developed by the faculty member and Department Head for near-term improvement.

Complaint Procedures: A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the stated guidelines, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the College of Science, and with a copy to the dean of faculties. The dean of the College of Science will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the College of Science may be appealed to the dean of faculties.

Timeline:

In January of each calendar year, the department head will request the following from each faculty member:

1. A completed annual report form
2. A current curriculum vitae
3. Course syllabi and exams
4. Rationale for any changes to the standard research/scholarship, teaching, and service load that were not granted prior approval
5. Copies of any supplemental research, teaching and/or service reports the faculty member chooses to submit

Approved by Biology Faculty 11/13/18

The reports are due on February 1 of each year. The ARC will evaluate the annual reports in February and March, and then provide their recommendations to the department head in April. The department head will review the recommendations of the ARC, determine the ratings in each criteria area and the overall rating, and provide a written report of the evaluation to the faculty member by July 1.

Other responsibilities of the ARC: The ARC provides input to the department head on promotions for biology faculty based on research, teaching, and service excellence. In addition, the ARC makes recommendations for faculty award nominations to the department Awards Committee.

Assistant Professors

Each year, in addition to evaluating the previous year's performance, the ARC will provide an evaluation and a written summary of overall progress toward tenure and promotion, with particular emphasis on mid-term reviews. The guidelines for promotion and tenure are provided in the Department of Biology Policies for Tenure and Promotion document. Success in research/scholarship, teaching and service will be recognized, and any areas of concern will be identified. The ARC will advise the department head that the candidate is making 1) excellent progress (meritorious), meaning the candidate is excelling in all aspects of his/her position; 2) satisfactory progress, meaning the candidate is on track toward tenure and promotion; 3) needs improvement, meaning the candidate is very close to an unsatisfactory mark and will need to make improvements in one or more categories to stay on track toward tenure and promotion; 4) unsatisfactory progress, meaning significant deficiencies in one or more categories must be addressed in order to be considered for tenure and promotion. The department head will consider the advice of the ARC and determine the rating for progress towards tenure and promotion. This information will be included in the evaluation report.

Associate Professors

For tenured faculty, the annual review takes a broad perspective of progress in research/scholarship, teaching, and service, using standard evaluation criteria (examples listed below). It is expected that the faculty member will provide evidence of having a scholarly impact on their field (e.g. publications, invited seminars, grant and manuscript reviews, editorial positions, education enhancement). The ARC evaluates and provides recommendations to the department head for potential promotion of associate professors to professor according to the guidelines in the Department of Biology Policies for Tenure and Promotion document. The department head provides a written report of progress towards promotion.

Approved by Biology Faculty 11/13/18

Professors

For tenured faculty, the annual review takes a broad perspective of progress in research/scholarship, teaching, and service, using standard evaluation criteria (examples listed below). It is expected that the faculty member will provide evidence of having a sustained and significant scholarly impact on their field (e.g. publications, invited seminars, grant and manuscript reviews, editorial positions, education enhancement).

Academic Professional track and temporary faculty

The ARC annually evaluates the quality of the faculty member's performance, which is primarily based on teaching and related activities, and provides a recommendation to the department head, who will determine the overall performance rating. Satisfactory performance criteria are detailed in the Department of Biology Academic Professional Track policy. Additional performance recognition is given for research/scholarship participation, publications, and service.

Evaluation criteria

The criteria below are common, established measures of faculty effectiveness, and while it is expected that faculty will meet some of the metrics for a given performance ranking, the metrics should not be treated as a checklist. Furthermore, taking into account differing paths of career development, it is expected that flexibility of performance criteria should accrue with seniority. Taking such flexibility in consideration, the ARC and department head will evaluate the strengths of a faculty member's research/scholarship, teaching, and service activities in their totality, and take into account the contribution of a faculty member toward accomplishing the university's overall mission, when evaluating performance.

1. Research/scholarship. The generation of new knowledge through research is the hallmark of a world-class university and an integral part of the Department of Biology.

Indicators of satisfactory performance in research/scholarship include, but are not limited to:

1. Regular publication (≥ 1 /year) of research as corresponding author in peer reviewed journals
2. Successful pursuit of extramural research support as PI/coPI
3. Presentation of research at national and/or international meetings
4. Publication of a scholarly book, or a chapter in a scholarly book
5. Publication in proceedings of conferences and professional meetings
6. Significant self-development activities, such as faculty development leave
7. Applying for, receiving, and/or licensing patents

Indicators of meritorious performance in research include, but are not limited to:

1. Publication in top tier journals in your field (≥ 2 /year)
2. Leadership in obtaining funding for large scale or multiple-investigator projects
3. Editor or member of editorial board of a major journal
4. Member of review panel for national research organization
5. Invited plenary speaker at national and international meetings
6. Receiving a major fellowship or research award
7. Publication and funding resulting from collaborations in other fields
8. Licensing patents

Indicators of needs improvement in research/scholarship include, but are not limited to:

1. Lack of publication in peer reviewed journals
2. Continued inability to obtain extramural research support, and/or unwillingness to submit applications
3. The absence of other scholarly activity

Indicators of unsatisfactory performance in research/scholarship, include, but are not limited to:

1. Inability or unwillingness to resolve any problems that led to a *Needs Improvement* rating in research/scholarship in the previous Annual Review
2. 0% research/scholarship activity over an academic year

2. Teaching. Teaching excellence is a goal of the Department of Biology. According to the College of Science guidelines, the ARC will review teaching performance indicators from the table provided on the annual report Form. This table includes semester, course number, number of students in the course, mean course GPA, mean overall student evaluation rating, and the percentages of D, F, Q grades. Unsatisfactory teaching is contrary to our mission and a serious violation of the public trust. An unsatisfactory rating in teaching will necessitate a comprehensive review of teaching. The head, in consultation with the faculty member, will appoint a teaching review committee consisting of three faculty members. This committee will review the faculty member's syllabi, exams, course notes, student evaluations, mean course GPA, the percentages of D, F, and Q grades, and classroom performance, as well as any additional materials provided by the faculty member. The faculty member and the teaching review committee will develop a written plan for near-term improvement.

Indicators of satisfactory performance in teaching include, but are not limited to:

1. The presentation of accurate, up-to-date, well-organized information and concepts

Approved by Biology Faculty 11/13/18

2. Receiving acceptable (>2.5 based on a 1-5 point scale) teaching evaluations from students, while maintaining rigor
3. Percentages of D, F, Q rates that are standard for the level of course (e.g. <20% for 100 and 200 level courses, and <10% for 300 and 400 level courses).
4. Satisfactory resolution of student complaints
5. Direction of graduate student thesis or dissertation research
6. Satisfactory progress to degree of graduate students
7. Service as a member of graduate student advisory committees
8. Coordination of multisection courses
9. Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness

Indicators of meritorious performance in teaching include, but are not limited to:

1. Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses
2. Development of innovative pedagogical methods and materials
3. Obtaining extramural funding for curricular enhancement
4. Selection for a university, college, or professional society outstanding teacher award
5. Authoring of textbooks or other instructional materials
6. Outstanding teaching evaluations (> 4.0 based on a 1-5 point scale) from students, while maintaining rigor.
4. Significant improvements in the percentages of D, F, Q rates that are standard for the level of course (e.g. <20% for 100 and 200 level courses, and <10% for 300 and 400 level courses)

Indicators of needs improvement in teaching include, but are not limited to:

1. Significantly negative teaching evaluations (<2.5 based on a 1-5 point scale) from students
2. Percentages of D, F, Q rates that are significantly higher than the standard for the level of course (e.g. >20% for 100 and 200 level courses, and >10% for 300 and 400 level courses)
3. Regular and unresolved student complaints
4. Presentation of out-of-date or incorrect information
5. Not meeting deadlines for graduate student committee meetings and preliminary exams

Indicators of unsatisfactory performance in teaching include, but are not limited to:

1. Inability or unwillingness to resolve any problems that led to a *Needs Improvement* rating in teaching in the previous Annual Review
2. Less than 30% teaching load over a calendar year

Approved by Biology Faculty 11/13/18

3. Neglecting to meet formal teaching responsibilities

3. Service. Service to the department, college, university, and the scientific community at large is recognized an essential component of good academic citizenship.

Indicators of satisfactory performance in service include, but are not limited to:

1. Regular attendance and participation in faculty meetings, departmental seminars, and faculty chalk talks.
2. Service on departmental, college, or university committees
3. Officer in regional, state, and/or national professional organization
4. Program or committee chair for regional or state meeting
5. Reviewer for refereed journals, and/or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations
6. Service as a consultant to business or governmental agencies
7. Advisor to student organizations
8. Directing consulting, continuing education, and/or outreach activities
9. Contributions to diversity and/or internationalization/globalization

Indicators of meritorious performance in service include, but are not limited to:

1. Officer in a national professional organization
2. Service on a major governmental commission, task force or board
3. Editor or member of editorial board of a major journal
4. Member of review panel for a national research organization
5. Program chair, or similar chair, for a national or international meeting
6. Officer in Faculty Senate, CPI, or other elected university committee.
7. Committee chair of national professional organization
8. Chair of major standing or ad hoc TAMU committee

Indicators of needs improvement in service include but are not limited to:

1. Failure to regularly participate in faculty meetings, departmental seminars, and faculty chalk talks
2. Refusal to serve, or to be nominated to serve, on departmental, college, or university committees
3. Unwillingness or inability to contribute to the mission of committees the faculty member serves on

Indicators of unsatisfactory performance in service include but are not limited to:

Approved by Biology Faculty 11/13/18

1. Inability or unwillingness to resolve any problems that led to a *Needs Improvement* rating in service in the previous Annual Review
2. Less than 10% service load over a calendar year