

LINFIELD UNIVERSITY BIOLOGY DEPARTMENT
Guidelines for tenure and promotion

Succinctly, the Biology Department's expectations are as follows for the three major categories of evaluation:

Teaching Effectiveness: Intentional planning and thoughtful reflection on the items listed in IV.6.1.1 of the Linfield Faculty Handbook is necessary. The candidate should recognize that the process of teaching is one that requires a cycle of planning, execution, and adaptation based on thoughtful reflection.

Professional Achievement: Scholarly achievement in the profession is necessary. The candidate will have a plan with documented progress toward his or her goals.

Service: The service component of a candidate's file will exhibit a record of ongoing activities within the department and in the college and/or university. Participation in campus activities should not be done at the exclusion of departmental activities.

In the Biology Department, tenure and promotion to Associate are earned together, and therefore our guidelines are designed to set standards for achieving both tenure and promotion to Associate simultaneously. We do not anticipate any cases where decisions on tenure and promotion to Associate would differ from each other. In each category, we also define and provide examples of 'special merit' necessary for promotion to Full Professor. At both promotion steps, the Biology Department evaluates the cumulative record of achievement of the candidate either from the beginning of their time at Linfield, or from some other point as defined in the employment contract. Therefore, certain activities that rise to the level of 'special merit' may be accomplished during the probationary period at the rank of Assistant Professor, but this history of special merit may still contribute to a candidate's case for the final promotion to Full Professor.

Candidates for tenure and promotion bear the primary responsibility for demonstrating the merits of their accomplishments in the three categories for evaluation: teaching, professional achievement, and service. Frequently, this may necessitate explanations of certain activities and how they relate to the departmental guidelines developed here, as well as to the general guidelines in the faculty handbook. Where we include lists of example activities in these guidelines, the Biology Department does not intend to exclude all other possible activities. However, it is incumbent on the candidate to explain how any activity, whether listed as an exemplar or not, meets the Departments expectations for any category of evaluation.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Overarching Statement

We view effective teaching as that which maximizes student learning through careful planning and delivery followed by thoughtful assessment and reflection. Effective teaching is also characterized by continued growth and development as an educator. Promotion and tenure candidates should reflect on this cycle of planning, execution, and continuous adaptation in their teaching narrative.

Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

Biology Discipline-Specific Guidelines

47 Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated through a combination of student, colleague, and
48 department chair appraisals. Student appraisals will be primarily collected via formal course
49 evaluations. For non-tenured faculty members, student evaluations will be conducted for all
50 classes at the end of each semester through the Linfield course evaluation process. Colleague
51 appraisals will be enriched by observations of candidate teaching. Faculty in the Biology
52 Department visit each other's classes on a regular basis. Visits occur at least twice a semester,
53 with priority going to pre-tenure colleagues. The intent of these visits is to foster a
54 collaborative teaching environment among faculty at different levels of experience, from
55 different sub-disciplines, and teaching at different levels in the curriculum. These repeated
56 visits provide a longitudinal context for colleague appraisals regarding teaching
57 effectiveness as they encompass multiple class visits as well as collegial discussions about
58 teaching. Department Chair appraisals will include observations of each non-tenured
59 member's courses at least once annually.

60
61 Section IV.6.1.1 of the faculty handbook lists examples of teaching effectiveness. In addition
62 to these, the Biology Department also values evidence of continued pedagogical
63 development. The Biology Department also expects its members to contribute to the delivery
64 and revision of the biology curriculum and to advising our majors. Examples of how these
65 objectives might be fulfilled include:

- 66 - continued growth in teaching styles and approaches, responding to the evolving
67 needs of our students
- 68 - evidence of continued course revision in response to student and colleague feedback
69 or major updates in response to the evolving demands of the field, keeping the
70 conceptual material and scientific methodologies current
- 71 - engagement with colleagues – either at Linfield or elsewhere – for the purposes of
72 continuous pedagogical advancement
- 73 - interdisciplinary pedagogical activities (guest lectures, co-teaching with colleagues
74 outside of our discipline)
- 75 - participation in the continual assessment, revision and delivery of our introductory
76 Principles of Biology courses (BIOL 210 & 211)
- 77 - effective development and delivery of experiential learning through labs and field
78 trips.
- 79 - helping evaluate and revise course labs across our curriculum
- 80 - teaching one or more of the intermediate or advanced courses in our core
- 81 - developing new elective courses in the area of the faculty member's expertise
- 82 - advising student independent studies or internships

83 84 **Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

85 The Biology Department regards the following elements essential, but not sufficient, for
86 tenure and promotion to Associate. Candidates will exhibit effective teaching practices in all
87 areas described in Section IV.6.1.1. Faculty members should also contribute to our
88 introductory sequence (BIOL 210 and/or 211) and our major core. We also expect that a
89 candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate will have taken on student advising
90 responsibilities, either via participation in new student Colloquium, or by request from
91 Academic Advising, colleagues, or students. Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness

Biology Discipline-Specific Guidelines

92 (including but not limited to the items listed above) will complete the candidate's record of
93 accomplishment in the area of teaching effectiveness.

94
95 Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate effective and
96 reflective teaching as evidenced by their student evaluations, by their own reflective
97 narrative, and by colleague appraisals. Student evaluations must be mostly positive. Where
98 persistent challenges are identified by students, the faculty member must demonstrate a
99 thoughtful approach to the issue in their narrative. Comments seen as 'negative' by students
100 may, in fact, be part of an overall effective approach taken by the instructor. Colleagues and
101 candidates for promotion and tenure will provide context for such comments in their
102 appraisals.

103
104 Colleague appraisals must also be mostly positive and provide specific examples of how the
105 candidate's teaching meets the guidelines described above. As candidates receive formative
106 feedback on their teaching annually during the probationary period, there must be evidence
107 that such critiques are received and addressed in the candidate's pedagogical approach
108 through time.

109

110 **Promotion to Full Professor**

111 Candidates for promotion to Full Professor must continue to demonstrate effective and
112 reflective teaching as evidenced by student evaluations and colleague appraisals. In addition
113 to largely positive student evaluations and colleague appraisals, to achieve 'special merit' the
114 Biology Department expects candidates for promotion to Full Professor to show initiative
115 and leadership in pedagogy beyond that which would be expected for tenure and promotion
116 to Associate. Their activities should reverberate beyond their own classroom to the benefit
117 of the departmental curriculum, the University curriculum, and/or beyond. The Biology
118 Department recognizes numerous ways in which faculty may demonstrate 'special merit' in
119 the area of teaching effectiveness. These might include:

- 120
- 121 - significant leadership in curricular development or major revision
 - 122 - activities that lead to pedagogical innovation that contribute to the broader
123 community (within or beyond Linfield)
 - 124 - development of new courses that add breadth and diversity to the biology
125 department.
 - 126 - development of a new course for broader Linfield curricular goals, such as a
127 contribution to the Inquiry Seminar (INQS), an off-campus January Term offering, a
128 PLACE-themed course, a cross-listed interdisciplinary course, or a Linfield
129 Curriculum (LC) course for non-majors.
 - 130 - teaching awards

131
132 This list is not meant to be exhaustive; it is the responsibility of the candidate for promotion
133 to explain how items not included above rise to the level of 'special merit'. Furthermore,
134 demonstrations of 'special merit' may occur at any point during the candidate's Linfield
135 career.

136
137 **PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT**

Biology Discipline-Specific Guidelines

138

139 **Overarching Statement**

140 The faculty in the Biology Department strive for professional achievement on two broad
141 fronts: 1) A record of individual professional scholarship arising from the candidate's
142 scientific research agenda; this includes scholarship that results in peer-reviewed
143 publications, books and book chapters, grant proposals, and presentations at national and
144 regional meetings, and 2) Evidence that students are incorporated and benefiting from a
145 colleague's research program. Achievement must be demonstrated in both areas;
146 outstanding achievement in one category will not take the place of an absence of activity in
147 the other. We anticipate that these endeavors arise from the faculty member's scientific
148 research agenda. While scholarship relating to teaching and learning may augment a
149 candidate's scholarly record, they do not replace the expectation of productive work in their
150 scientific field.

151

152 *A note on peer-review:* Evaluation of one's research findings by other scientists with relevant
153 competencies prior to publication is the peer review system; this serves as verification that
154 the work meets the standards of the field with respect to methods, analysis, and
155 interpretation. This external validation is a significant hurdle and indicates that a piece of
156 work has been accepted into the body of scientific endeavor. For this reason, we value those
157 works that have gone through the peer-review process higher than those that have not.

158

159 **Evaluation of Professional Scholarship and Student Research Experiences**

160 Below are *types* of materials that would be accepted as evidence of an ongoing and successful
161 research program for the broad categories of Professional Scholarship and Student Research
162 Experiences. In Professional Scholarship, the *levels* of scholarship rank written works higher
163 than oral presentations, and are distinguished by whether or not a product has successfully
164 gone through peer review. In Student Research Experiences, the *levels* of accomplishment
165 are distinguished by whether the collaborative work has resulted in a finished product, or is
166 in an ongoing phase of development. The degree of interdisciplinarity in a faculty research
167 program is entirely at the discretion of the faculty member under review. These are not
168 meant to be comprehensive lists, nor are they mutually exclusive. A colleague wishing to
169 present other products as evidence for their research program would need to justify these
170 items in their narrative.

171

172 Evidence of Professional Scholarship

173 *Tier one – peer-reviewed written products*

174 - Peer-reviewed publications in scholarly journals

175 - Published books, book chapters

176 - Funded grants to external granting agencies

177

178 *Tier two – other evidence*

179 - Presentations at regional or national professional conferences (whether or not they are
180 peer-reviewed)

181 - Grants written but not funded

182

183 Evidence of Student Research Experiences

Biology Discipline-Specific Guidelines

184 *Tier One – finished products with students*

185 - Student co-authors on research manuscripts

186 - Student presentations at national or regional professional conferences

187

188 *Tier Two – evidence of ongoing collaborative research with students*

189 - Student-Faculty Collaborative Research Grants

190 - Student presentations at student research conferences (e.g. Murdock Conference)

191

192 It is not required for a colleague to demonstrate evidence for each of the activities listed
193 under these two broad categories, as each faculty member may concentrate on some aspects
194 of research within these categories. However, it is preferred that a colleague be able to
195 demonstrate evidence for more than a single item under each category, as this would include
196 a greater breadth of research experiences and exposure for the faculty member, for our
197 biology students, and for Linfield University.

198

199 Within the ‘Evidence of Professional Scholarship’ category we define two tiers of evidence,
200 with a greater weight being assigned to those items that are in the first tier. The first tier
201 indicates the product underwent external peer review. This includes journal articles, books,
202 and book chapters. The burden is on the faculty member seeking promotion and tenure to
203 provide evidence that any product considered as first tier evidence went through an external
204 review process. Note that scholarly work that is in press, i.e., accepted for publication, but
205 not yet published, can be considered evidence in this category. Our Department does not take
206 into account journal ranking or impact factor in weighing a colleague’s publication record.
207 We also do not take into account whether external grants are awarded from foundations or
208 from government sources. The second tier includes evidence of scholarship other than peer-
209 reviewed written products. Within each tier we have chosen to leave the products unranked
210 so that all first-tier items and all second-tier items represent equivalent lines of evidence.

211

212 Within the category of Evidence of Student Research Experiences our department needs to
213 see confirmation that students are being actively incorporated into the faculty member’s
214 research program. Additionally, these student research experiences should be benefitting
215 the student in terms of increasing their breadth and depth of knowledge in the field of
216 biology. Here we recognize two tiers of Student Research Experience, with greater weight
217 being given to items that have been brought to some form of completion, either as a paper
218 published with a student co-author or as a student presentation at a professional conference.
219 The second tier includes all other evidence of student-faculty collaborative research,
220 including student-faculty collaborative grants, student presentations at student research
221 conferences, etc. Again, this is not meant to be a comprehensive list, although a colleague
222 wishing to present other products as evidence for student research experience would need
223 to justify these items in their narrative.

224

225 **Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

226 In order to successfully earn tenure and gain promotion to the rank of Associate Professor,
227 colleagues in the Biology Department must demonstrate meritorious achievement in the two
228 broad categories of Professional Scholarship and Student Research Experiences.

229

Biology Discipline-Specific Guidelines

230 Our Department requires evidence for an ongoing and active research program. Typically,
231 we anticipate that a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate would have successfully
232 accomplished at least one first tier professional scholarship item during the probationary
233 period. In the event that the research has not yet yielded a tier one product, there must be
234 clear evidence of significant progress from professional scholarship tier two items, and a
235 defined plan for how the work will be brought to publication, and/or grant writing success.
236 Thus, it would be uncommon but possible for a member to acquire tenure without any
237 publications resulting from their work at Linfield University. However, the burden would be
238 on this individual to show, both within the narrative of their file and in their colleague
239 appraisal letters, that their research program is capable of generating this type of product
240 within the years leading to the promotion to Full Professor. Candidates should also
241 demonstrate consistent involvement of students in research as evidenced from both tiers of
242 student research experiences.

243
244 We recognize that newly hired faculty members will be bringing research to our Department
245 at various stages of completion from prior positions (graduate school, post-docs, other
246 faculty positions). To count these products as evidence for Professional Scholarship, some
247 considerable portion of the work needs to be completed at Linfield University or within the
248 time period stipulated by contract. This may include additional data collection, data analysis,
249 and writing. In these cases, the burden is on the faculty member to demonstrate what
250 portions of the product were completed while at Linfield.

251
252 **Promotion to Full Professor**
253 In reviewing materials for promotion to Full Professor our Department is looking for a
254 comprehensive body of work starting at the point of hire and continuing to the date of
255 review. As defined in the Faculty Handbook (Sec.VI), candidates for promotion to Full
256 Professor must demonstrate 'special merit' in professional achievement. The Biology
257 Department recognizes successful accomplishments on the candidate's scientific research
258 agenda as evidence of 'special merit'. These include tier one Professional Scholarship
259 elements such as peer-reviewed publications, books, book chapters, or funded external
260 grants. Furthermore, the candidate must have evidence of ongoing involvement of students
261 in their scientific research. It is incumbent upon the candidate for promotion to Full
262 Professor to explain why the totality of their scholarly record is worthy of the designation
263 'special merit.'

264
265 We recognize that a faculty member seeking promotion to Full Professor may have
266 continuing research at various stages of completion from prior to tenure and promotion to
267 Associate Professor. This represents the process of scientific inquiry as a continuous
268 enterprise without discrete boundaries that correspond to faculty ranks. However, the
269 Department expects the faculty member seeking promotion to describe what portions of the
270 product were completed since tenure and promotion to Associate were achieved, thus
271 demonstrating continuous advancement of a scientific agenda.

272
273 Faculty members seeking promotion to Full Professor should be actively engaged in research
274 that continues to lead towards publication. For promotion to Full Professor our department
275 has a minimum requirement of one peer-reviewed journal article on original research

Biology Discipline-Specific Guidelines

276 arising from the faculty member's scientific agenda. In practice, this generally means that
277 candidates for promotion to full professor will have published at least two peer-reviewed
278 journal articles from their research while on the tenure track, one during their time as an
279 assistant professor and one during their time as an associate professor. Exceptions to this
280 general guideline are possible, as other combinations of Tier 1 products across the assistant
281 and associate timeline will also be acceptable. It is incumbent on the candidate to
282 demonstrate that they have produced Tier 1 products during their time as an associate
283 professor.

284

285 **SERVICE**

286

287 **Overarching Statement**

288 Service includes activities supporting the life of the Department and University. The Biology
289 Department expects that our faculty members will contribute to the numerous tasks and
290 responsibilities that keep the department functioning well. We also anticipate that our
291 department members will contribute their strengths and interests to university-wide service
292 opportunities as their career progresses. Service to one's profession and/or broader
293 community, while laudable, does not constitute an essential component of our service
294 expectations, though it may be additional evidence of professional service. The view of the
295 Biology Department is that service begins in the department and extends outward from
296 there.

297

298 **Service Categories**

299 Below we define and give examples of activities in the two categories of service as they apply
300 to the Biology Department. The lists are neither exhaustive nor ranked, but rather provide
301 examples of the types of activities our department values in each service category. While it
302 is not necessary for any faculty member to participate in all of these activities, it is expected
303 that each member of the department will regularly engage in some meaningful combination
304 of these duties. In all cases, it is incumbent on the candidate to describe how their service
305 activities have met these expectations.

306

307 **Departmental Activities.** The Biology Department functions best when all faculty
308 members contribute to the workload. Therefore, we require a division of labor and
309 regular input from all faculty members. Evidence of service to the Biology Department
310 includes but is not limited to the following types of activities:

311

312 Department chair

313 Effective participation in departmental meetings and affairs

314 Department open house

315 Competitive scholarship day

316 Murdock Conference attendance coordinator

317 Murdock Research Scholars Steering Committee

318 Pre-professional advisor

319 Active participant in program review, accreditation and improvement

320

Biology Discipline-Specific Guidelines

321 **College-wide/University-wide Activities.** Promotion to Associate Professor does not
322 require significant engagement in college-wide or university-wide activities, though it is
323 looked on favorably by the Biology Department as evidence of future interest. Evidence
324 of service to the College or University includes but is not limited to the following
325 activities:

- 326
- 327 Division chair
- 328 Standing committee chair or divisional representative
- 329 Chair or a member of an ad hoc committee
- 330 Chair or a member of a Linfield Curriculum Working Group
- 331 Serving as Associate Dean of Faculty
- 332 Significant work on administrative initiatives
- 333 Leader of a Faculty Teaching and Learning Lunch
- 334 Organizing external speakers
- 335

336 **Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

337 During the probationary period, the Biology Department expects evidence of consistent and
338 valued contributions to the Biology Department. While college-wide and university-wide
339 activities are also valued, these cannot replace service to the Department. Therefore,
340 promotion to Associate Professor in the category of service requires the candidate to
341 demonstrate effective participation in Departmental activities.

342

343 **Promotion to Full Professor**

344 Promotion to Full Professor requires significant engagement in college-wide and/or
345 university-wide activities. Candidates should educate themselves about the issues that face
346 the faculty and the institution and determine their role given their interests and expertise. It
347 is expected that the candidate continues to demonstrate effective participation in
348 Departmental activities, and that their focus widens to encompass College-wide activities as
349 well. 'Special merit' requires evidence of *leadership* in either of these categories of service.
350 Examples include (but are not limited to) serving as chair of the Biology Department,
351 chairing a standing or *ad hoc* committee, or chairing a Linfield Curriculum Working Group.
352 As the number of such chair positions is limited, and are often occupied by full professors,
353 'special merit' may also be achieved by taking charge of a significant administrative initiative,
354 possibly as a member of one of the standing committees or working groups on campus.

355

356 **A Comment on External Service**

357 Biology is a large and diverse discipline, and though there are significant needs for service to
358 the profession, there are also many, many people willing and able to perform this service. It
359 can therefore be challenging to find any service opportunities external to Linfield. Therefore,
360 we do not have any requirement for this type of service in any promotion or tenure review.

361

Biology Discipline-Specific Guidelines

362 **External Reviews of Biology Discipline Specific Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion**

363
364 The biology department has been working on discipline-specific guidelines for several
365 years. In the Spring 2018 semester, we sent a complete draft of our guideline to three
366 people for reviews: David Scholnick, chair of Biology at Pacific University, Tim Parker, chair
367 of Biology at Whitman College, and David Craig, chair of Biology at Willamette University.
368 These three people were running departments similar to ours, and represented institutions
369 with resources that spanned a range of research funding. Those reviews are included
370 below. All three agreed that our criteria for tenure and promotion aligned well with those
371 criteria from their respective departments. In response to those reviews, we made some
372 minor changes to our guidelines to improve their clarity. The one area where there was
373 variation in opinions pertaining to a standard was whether one publication is absolutely
374 required for tenure or not. We strongly support the idea of publication as a standard for
375 demonstrating professional achievement. However, we are equally strong in our belief that
376 there are a number of factors outside the control of the candidate that could prevent an
377 otherwise excellent candidate from meeting this bar. The details of these exceptions were
378 described above under the Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor section of
379 Professional Achievement.

380

381

382

383

384 From: David Scholnick, Pacific University

385 Date: April 3, 2018

386 I commend the Biology Department's ability to produce a thoughtful document regarding
387 departmental guidelines for tenure and promotion. I know that nailing down guidelines
388 are often difficult discussions that can bring up uncomfortable and sensitive areas within a
389 department. Over the 10 plus years that I have been at Pacific we have unsuccessfully tried
390 several times to draft similar guidelines for tenure and promotion. I hope your
391 administration is supportive of your efforts and that your detailed and thoughtful
392 guidelines will be used to strengthen your evaluation process for promotion and tenure.
393 Since the biology department at Pacific University does not have a specific guideline
394 document for tenure and promotion, we rely instead on individualized memorandum of
395 understandings (MOU's) for each tenure candidate to specify departmental standards. Each
396 MOU is drafted according to a candidate's previous experience, startup package, general
397 departmental expectations at the time and the candidate's specific role in the department,
398 such as area of expertise. My personal opinion is that MOU's work well to clarify
399 expectations associated with individual contracts and background. Where they have fallen
400 short is in providing guidance for our Personnel Committee in terms of clearly laying out
401 Departmental expectations and providing context for a particular discipline.

402

403 Teaching Effectiveness:

404 In general, our MOU and departmental teaching expectations seem to be in line with your
405 guidelines for teaching. We typically specify in an MOU that teaching effectiveness should
406 include:

Biology Discipline-Specific Guidelines

- 407 • Actively participate in collaborative course design for multi-instructor courses in
408 the Biology curriculum, such as Introductory Biology and Advanced Research
409 Methods.
- 410 • Actively engage in efforts to maintain a vibrant, modern, and meaningful biology
411 curriculum, including participation in course and program assessment.
- 412 • Develop and offer upper division courses in the curriculum related to your expertise
413 (including _____)
- 414 • Contribute to developing and implementing effective pedagogical approaches in the
415 curriculum.

416

417 I should note that while we try to provide regular class observations and have set up
418 mentoring teams for all untenured faculty (typically 3 to 4 faculty including the current
419 dept. chair), in reality regular formative and summative observations have proven to be
420 much more difficult to implement than we envisioned. In all honesty, typically the chair is
421 the only person who regularly visits untenured faculty courses and other faculty rarely
422 have time to sit in on more than one lecture before the candidate's 3rd-year review and
423 possibly one other lecture before the tenure and promotion decision.

424

425 For promotion to full professor I particularly liked your statement that activities for Full
426 Professor should, "reverberate beyond their own classroom to the benefit of the
427 departmental curriculum, the College curriculum and/or beyond." I think that statement
428 clearly represents the intent of our teaching expectations for promotion to Full
429 Professor. Well put.

430

431 Scholarship:

432

433 Our expectations for scholarship don't seem to line up as neatly with your guidelines. The
434 two areas that seem most different are the expectation for peer-reviewed products prior to
435 tenure and external evaluation for both tenure and promotion. We require a minimum of
436 one peer-review product prior to a positive tenure decision with the expectation that the
437 work was primarily completed at Pacific, and additional peer-review products for
438 promotion to Full Professor. In addition, blind external review is required for both tenure
439 and promotion to Associate as well as promotion to Full Professor.

440

441 An MOU would typically include the following areas for scholarship:

- 442 • Participate in mentoring biology majors in their research and internship
443 experiences.

444 Scholarship

- 445 • Establish an active research program that involves Pacific University undergraduate
446 students. The scientific outcomes of this research will be of sufficient quality so as to
447 provide opportunities for students to attend and participate in regional and national
448 scientific meetings as funding allows. At least some of the research work will take
449 place on the Pacific University campus. Collaborations (with faculty at Pacific or
450 other institutions) are valued but not required.
- 451 • Pursue external funding for this research.

Biology Discipline-Specific Guidelines

- 452 • Produce materials that were evaluated positively by external reviewers. Examples
453 of acceptable materials include: peer reviewed papers and peer reviewed grant
454 proposals that were funded. The minimum requirement for tenure is one such peer-
455 reviewed product. Ideally, that product will arise from work primarily completed at
456 Pacific.

457 In addition, because the University will provide \$_____ in start-up funds for research,
458 supported in part by a Murdock Charitable Trust grant, there are expectations that you
459 will:

- 460 • Submit a budget plan for your start-up funding during your first semester at Pacific
461 • Use start-up funds to hire at least one Pacific undergraduate student for research
462 work in each of your first two summers at Pacific; you may draw a summer stipend
463 from those funds for up to \$____.
464 • Submit at least one grant proposal to outside agencies (major public or private
465 foundations) for further research funding no later than _____.
466 • Attend with students the Murdock Undergraduate Research Conference for at least
467 the first three years at Pacific University
468

469 One note is that while it is not a requirement for tenure, we consider peer-reviewed
470 publications with undergraduate co-authors as the highest standard for scholarship.
471

472

473 The language in our faculty handbook pretty much reflects the MOU for biology. The
474 handbook states that candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professors in the
475 department of biology must have a minimum of one externally reviewed publication or
476 grant. They must also have sustained scholarly professional work which may include
477 conference papers, posters, and abstracts, including those with student coauthors. The
478 college allows candidates to include work that they produced at previous institutions
479 within the probationary period to tenure. Candidates for promotion to professor must
480 demonstrate accomplishments that are at a higher level of achievement than the minimum
481 standards for promotion to associate professor as well as professional service outside of
482 Pacific University.
483

484 I should note that while the weight of external reviews waxes and wanes a bit over time
485 according to administration and membership on our Personnel Committee, in general
486 external reviews have steadily become a larger and more important part of the review
487 process. For example, candidates have traditionally provided a list of potential external
488 reviewers, but starting next year the expectation is that the Dean will select one additional
489 external reviewer that is not on the candidates approved list to help limit any bias in the
490 external review process.
491

492 It is my impression that most of our untenured faculty support the external review aspect
493 of the tenure decision. Given the many unknowns associated with the personnel committee,
494 having external authorities that are able to speak directly to national and international
495 expectations in a particular field can be reassuring.
496

Biology Discipline-Specific Guidelines

497 Service:

498 I think your expectations for service seem reasonable and are in line with expectations at
499 Pacific. Probationary faculty have no service obligations in their first year and we try to
500 limit service to one low-workload college-wide committee before tenure. Of course there is
501 always pull from administration to ask new faculty to do service but in the past
502 departmental chairs have been fairly unified in protecting untenured faculty time and
503 trying to keep the emphasis on contributions within the department.
504

505

506

507 From: Tim Parker, Whitman College

508 Date: April 3, 2018

509

510 I have read the Linfield College Biology Department draft tenure and promotion guidelines.
511 Overall I found the guidelines clear and reasonable. However, I do have some suggestions
512 for issues to consider before finalizing the guidelines.
513

513

514 Teaching:

515

516 I endorse the stated goals for teaching excellence and mostly endorse the methods to
517 assess those goals. My primary concern rests with student evaluations. Robust evidence
518 suggests that student evaluations mostly assess student satisfaction rather than student
519 learning, and these two things are often uncorrelated
520 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2016.08.007>). Given that you state that “We view
521 effective teaching as that which maximizes student learning”, it seems to me that you
522 should be cautious in your use of student evaluations. You show some recognition of this
523 concern when you state that “Comments seen as ‘negative’ by students may, in fact, be
524 part of an overall effective approach taken by the instructor.” However, the overall content
525 of your guidelines suggest placing more weight on student evaluations than seems merited
526 based on the evidence. Below are some of the quotes that concern me.
527

527

528 “Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated through a combination of student, colleague, and
529 department chair appraisals. Student appraisals will be primarily collected via formal
530 course evaluations.”
531

531

532 “Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate effective
533 and reflective teaching as evidenced by their student evaluations, by their own reflective
534 narrative, and by colleague appraisals. Student evaluations must be mostly positive. Where
535 persistent challenges are identified by students, the faculty member must demonstrate a
536 thoughtful approach to the issue in their narrative. Comments seen as ‘negative’ by students
537 may, in fact, be part of an overall effective approach taken by the instructor.”
538

538

539

540

541 Scholarship:

Biology Discipline-Specific Guidelines

542
543 The dual emphasis on both professor productivity and student participation is important.
544 The explicit requirement for a biological research program (and not just a pedagogical
545 research program) is important because active faculty research within the discipline
546 enhances student experience not only by (a) providing research opportunities, but also by
547 (b) promoting faculty member engagement with the broader intellectual community, which
548 should influence classroom teaching.

549
550 That said, I found aspects of the scholarship standards to be weak. For example, I think
551 requiring one (or better yet more than one) first tier scholarship items' would be
552 reasonable. As currently written, it appears that the department would like candidates to
553 meet this standard. However, there is an explicit pathway for exceptions. This is the
554 wording that concerns me:

555
556 "Typically, we anticipate that a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate would
557 have successfully accomplished at least one first tier professional scholarship item during
558 the probationary period. In the event that the research has not yet yielded a tier one
559 product, there must be clear evidence of significant progress from professional scholarship
560 tier two items, and a defined plan for how the work will be brought to publication, and/or
561 grant writing success. Thus, it would be uncommon but possible for a member to acquire
562 tenure without any publications resulting from their work at Linfield College."

563
564 I support the rejection of journal impact factor as criterion for evaluation of faculty
565 member publications: "Our Department does not take into account journal ranking or
566 impact factor in weighing a colleague's publication record". The journal impact factor is
567 problematic for a variety of reasons (see the DORA statement <https://sfdora.org/>). Thus it
568 seemed surprising that in the very same sentence, the guidelines state that "exceptional
569 publications (e.g., Nature, Science) may be evidence of special merit." I agree that
570 exceptional publications should be evidence of special merit.' I disagree that publishing in
571 Nature or Science should be identified as an example of meeting this goal. This is equivalent
572 to saying impact factor doesn't matter, except if impact factor is really, really high.' Instead,
573 to earn recognition for special merit, I recommend that the faculty member make a case for
574 the actual impact of their individual paper (for instance, how the paper has been received
575 in the research community or in society at large, or how it has influenced a discipline).

576
577 As currently written, the scholarship standards require (or almost require) peer-reviewed
578 publication, but there is no expectation about the quality of the scholarship. I would
579 suggest the addition of additional criteria linked to peer-reviewed publication. Most
580 important, you may wish to exclude predatory journals as acceptable outlets for
581 publication. This is not entirely straightforward since predatory journals attempt to appear
582 legitimate. However, given your small number of candidates for tenure and promotion, it
583 should be relatively easy to investigate journals to be sure that they are offering legitimate
584 peer review. Here are some suggestions for doing so:

585 <https://www.aje.com/en/arc/8-ways-identify-questionable-open-access-journal/>
586 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5493175/>

587

Biology Discipline-Specific Guidelines

588 Asking outside experts in the candidate's sub-discipline to review a candidate's scholarly
589 record could help call attention to papers in predatory journals, and could also help in the
590 process of identifying papers that might indicate special merit'. Asking outsiders is valuable
591 because it can be difficult for colleagues from different sub-disciplines in a relatively small
592 department to assess their colleague's scholarly work. If you were to choose this route, you
593 would need to develop a method for identifying and soliciting input from outside experts.
594 This could involve input from the candidate, but care would need to be taken to avoid
595 outside experts with close ties to the candidate. Once the outside expert (s) was/were
596 chosen, you would need to provide sufficient guidance for the expert to evaluate what you
597 wanted evaluated.

598
599 I want to return to discussion of your first tier evidence of scholarship. Funded grant
600 proposals are an excellent index of positive response from peer reviewers if the grant
601 program is intensely competitive, such as most NSF or NIH programs. However, there are
602 many smaller granting bodies that offer much less competitive grants, and so allowing any
603 external grant' to count as a first tier' appears problematic to me. For this reason, I would
604 not recommend allowing funded grants to substitute for peer reviewed papers. If a
605 proposal to a competitive funding body is funded early in the candidate's time at Linfield,
606 the candidate should have had plenty of time to get out at least one paper from the project.
607 If proposal to a competitive funding body is funded late in the pre-tenure period, the
608 candidate will almost certainly have had to publish papers to have been competitive for
609 funding. I also want to examine your inclusion of books and book chapters in tier one. Some
610 book chapters are rigorously reviewed, others are not. Some books are rigorously
611 reviewed, others are not. How do you plan to determine if sufficient peer review has taken
612 place? I suppose the outside experts could play a role here.

613
614 Service

615
616 I have no concerns regarding this section.

617
618
619

620
621

Biology Discipline-Specific Guidelines

622 From: David Craig, Willamette University

623 Date: April 18, 2018

624

625 The great news is you have a great set of guidelines and I commend you and your
626 colleagues for your professionalism. The students of Linfield are fortunate to be well served
627 by such clear and fair-minded language regarding the promotion and tenure of their
628 faculty.

629 Your expectations seem completely reasonable and very similar to Willamette. We might
630 ask a bit more in terms of scholarship and service but I think the sample sizes are really
631 rather small and therefore not really testable. We definitely have more explicit
632 expectations around some measure of commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion but
633 you may have those as well, just implicitly in your expectations of effective teaching and so
634 forth.

635 Here are a few specific points of compliment, curiosity and feedback.

636 TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

637 Really nice.

638 Page 2. Line 5. How often is often?

639 "Faculty in the Biology Department visit each others' classes on a regular basis. The
640 intent of these visits is to foster a collaborative teaching environment among faculty
641 at different levels of experience, from different sub-disciplines, and teaching at
642 different levels in the curriculum. These repeated visits provide a longitudinal
643 context for colleague appraisals as they encompass multiple class visits as well as
644 collegial discussions about teaching."

645 Page 3. Line 4. Really appreciate the explicit recognition of the work being more than a
646 'consumer driven' survey feedback loop.

647 "Comments seen as 'negative' by students may, in fact, be part of an overall effective
648 approach taken by the instructor."

649 Question: Any attention to overall load of teaching distribution? We try to have most
650 people teach the same number of students more or less, but some people and some topics
651 end in heavier loads. Recognizing this as part of the complexity of one person's challenges
652 seems important.

653 Question: How do you account for emotional work related to under-represented groups?

654 Question: Do you count academic advising in teaching or service? We see it as synergistic
655 between teaching and Department level service, but would bias it to service.

656

657 PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

658 Really nicely defined language and clarity of non-ranked value while at the same time
659 suggesting a bias to Tier 1 > Tier 2. In the last 10 years at years at Willamette no one who

Biology Discipline-Specific Guidelines

660 has gotten tenure has had less than at least two Tier 1 peer-reviewed professionally
661 written product to compliment many Tier 2 lines of evidence and a mix of Tiers for Student
662 Research Experience. Everyone has had at least external grants from Murdock and an
663 externally review publication. The paper for couple of people was on the edge and stressful
664 for them as they had papers submitted with positive early reviews when the put their
665 package in for evaluation in August, but did not have a paper yet. They busted ass to get
666 the reviews done so the publication was in fact *in press* by their review. I expect they
667 would have gotten tenure even if they had not made it over the line as the momentum was
668 there. In Chemistry there have been a couple people who were tenured without external
669 papers, but they had been very successful with external grants. The papers were key/are
670 key to them making full professor.

671 Promotion to Full Professor You need to have a new paper between getting tenure and
672 going up for full. A paper, even a great paper done at WU, before tenure would not be
673 enough for a promotion to full as the concern would be someone had lost their research
674 drive/momentum. This is not a written policy but has contributed to a number of people
675 stalling out at Associate. If someone had a pedagogical research paper or even some
676 letters to the editor at a journal this would usually be enough to clear the new publication
677 ongoing scholarly record, but there has to be something. It is tough because the new
678 Associates often end up with a lot of new heavy service work which makes the research
679 hard to maintain. We have very high service expectations of Associates (see below).

680 SERVICE

681 Willamette has an intense service culture and faculty heavily invested in governance. We
682 also put our evaluation of student advising in the service category. Our expectation for
683 tenure would fit into your language but for full professor we expect that someone has
684 chaired at couple of big assignments, typically Department Chair for 3 years AND serving
685 on one of three major governance bodies (Faculty Council tenure/promotion/HR
686 policy, Academic Council Curriculum, Academic policies, New/Replacement Positions,
687 or Budget Advisory Committee). Not everyone does chair Biology but they might instead
688 lead college wide accreditation or chair a program like Women and Gender Studies, or lead
689 a task force on Equity or Title IX - it needs to be big and high profile.

690 EQUITY?

691 In the last 10 years of Willamette in general and in Biology specifically we also have an
692 expectation that a person is doing professional development around equity, inclusiveness,
693 implicit bias, and or sustainability. We are still working on how to articulate our values and
694 policies here but the following position was created by a faculty task force

695 <http://willamette.edu/news/library/2017/06/edi-announcement.html>

696 and we have just added a new faculty committee on Equity to our current sweet of
697 University level faculty committees.

698 In the Biology Department all of the faculty in the last 10 years were hired based on job ads
699 that asked for the usual teaching and research statements AND a statement about diversity
700 and inclusion. We have developed a formal rubric for evaluating candidates on all three

Biology Discipline-Specific Guidelines

701 (teaching, research, and diversity) criteria at equal weight. Our own internal development
702 on what we mean by diversity has changed rapidly in this decade and I expect it will
703 continue to be an area of continued investment and attention.

704 Thanks for inviting me to learn more about your Department. I think you should be proud
705 of what you have done. With your permission I would love to share this with my
706 Departmental colleagues. We are working on a elaborating on our distributed model of
707 shared duties in the Department (See attachment) and also doing some more practice
708 around the use of 'Dynamic Governance' to conduct our Departmental business. I have
709 attached both of those documents for your consideration.

710 Best wishes

711 Dave

712

713

714

715

716