

## **DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY AND EVOLUTIONARY BIOLOGY PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION FOR PROMOTION FROM ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO PROFESSOR**

The College has established a set of principles and best practices involved in evaluating faculty for promotion. The Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (EEB) has used these to develop the specific procedures described below that will be followed in our department. For faculty with joint appointments with other units, the specific procedures for evaluation for promotion for each case will be specified in a joint letter to the faculty member from the Chairs or Directors of all units involved.

Promotion to Professor in EEB is based on evidence that the candidate has fulfilled the promise for continued excellence in research, teaching, and academic leadership evident at the tenure review. EEB, along with LSA more broadly, recognizes that, during their time in rank, Associate Professors are engaged in a wider variety of activities than Assistant Professors and carry significantly more administrative and service responsibilities, along with the expectation of continued excellence in research. Therefore the evaluation process is intended to take into account the totality of Associate Professors' contributions to the unit, the College, the university, and the profession. Excellent research should have a demonstrable impact on the area of study to which it is meant to contribute and should provide evidence of a continued trajectory of research distinction. Excellence in teaching is demonstrated by evidence of a strong motivation to engage students in the learning process, by the rigor and scope of the courses taught, by student and (if available) peer evaluations of the course and instructor, and by leadership in programmatic and curricular development. A strong record of undergraduate teaching is essential. Excellent academic leadership is demonstrated by engagement in departmental, College, University and professional activities that further the intellectual and pedagogical profile of the institution.

Candidates will be notified of all requests for information described below **at least two months before the relevant deadline.**

### **I. TIMING OF PROMOTION**

Candidates should come up for promotion at the appropriate time as determined by the criteria described above. However, we expect that many, if not most, faculty will be promoted to the Professor rank sometime between their third and sixth year in the associate professor rank. To achieve this, associate professors will have the opportunity to meet with the Promotion and Merit Committee each year to discuss progress towards promotion, including areas of strength and areas for improvement in teaching, research, service, and, as appropriate, curation. The PMC will then send a brief report to the Chair that includes concrete recommendations for future actions by the associate professor and by the department to support progress towards promotion. The Chair will then meet with the associate professor to discuss the report and progress towards promotion; this could

be accomplished in the context of annual meetings between the Chair and each faculty member if such meetings regularly occur. In the third year in rank, this meeting will also include development of a specific plan for promotion. This plan will be documented in a letter, signed by the candidate and the Chair, that lays out a reasonable set of expectations for what needs to be accomplished in terms of research, teaching, service, and, if appropriate, curation, and a timetable for promotion. This is an internal document, which will not be forwarded to the College, unless the candidate chooses to do so as part of his or her promotion package. This plan will be reviewed during a meeting between the chair and any Associate Professor who remains in rank past year 6, at least every two years to ensure that the expectations and timetable laid out in that document are reasonable and up to date.

## **II. SELECTION OF EXTERNAL ASSESSORS**

1. **By April 1** in the academic year preceding the Department's recommendation to the College regarding promotion, candidates are to provide the Chair with a list of 8 scientists and scholars whom they consider appropriate to assess their work. With each name, the candidate should provide complete contact information and a brief biography indicating the research area and professional stature of the potential reviewer.
  - i) Candidates may include their dissertation and/or post-doctoral fellowship supervisors in this list; otherwise, the names should not include scientific collaborators or co-authors from within the last ten years.
  - ii) Candidates should indicate to the Chair the names of persons they consider inappropriate to assess their work by reason of conflict of interest or by kinship or domestic relationship, and should indicate why they consider these persons inappropriate. In such cases, the Chair should not ask these persons to provide external assessments. Intellectual disagreements do not constitute conflict of interest and are not grounds for exclusion as a potential assessor.
2. The Chair will consult with the Promotion Review Panel for additional names of potential reviewers for a total list of at least 16 reviewers. For candidates with curatorial appointments, this list should include some reviewers appropriate for assessing curatorial contributions. From this list, the Chair will choose 10 names from whom to request letters of evaluation, assuring that at least three external assessments are from persons suggested by the candidate. When at least three such external assessments are not provided because the persons suggested by the candidate declined to write or did not respond to requests, these exceptions shall be documented at the end of the list of assessors in the file that goes to the decision-making body and the College.

### **III. CANDIDATE SUBMISSION OF MATERIALS FOR CONSIDERATION BY EXTERNAL ASSESSORS, THE PROMOTION PANEL, THE DEPARTMENTAL DECISION-MAKING BODY, AND THE COLLEGE**

**By June 1** of the academic year preceding the review, the candidate should provide copies of:

- i) a current curriculum vitae;
- ii) a teaching statement (five page maximum);
- iii) a research statement (five page maximum);
- iv) a leadership, governance, and service statement (five-page maximum);
- v) copies of his or her written work, including studies that have been accepted and are in press, but not yet published, and
- vi) for candidates with a curatorial appointment, a curatorial statement (five-page maximum).

The research and teaching statements should address a general intellectual audience and the candidate is encouraged to ask colleagues, especially former members of a Divisional Evaluation Committee or the College Executive Committee, to review drafts of the statements. Potentially relevant topics for the teaching statement include: main objectives at each level of instruction (including mentorships), genesis of the candidate's pedagogical and curricular innovations, evolution of teaching style, explanation of especially good or bad performance in particular classes or terms taught, plans for future teaching and Inclusive Teaching and Mentoring. Potentially relevant topics for the research statement include: the conceptual areas addressed, how components of the research program fit together, specific contributions made during the period since the last promotion, false starts in procurement of funding or execution of the research program, exact role(s) in collaborative work, and plans for future research. Potentially relevant topics for the leadership, governance, and service statement include: service roles and activities to the department, college, professional community, and the University, accomplishments and outcomes that have come from those activities, goals and rationales, leadership and/or service plans going forward, if known. Potentially relevant topics for the curatorial statement include: goals for the candidate's curatorial work, genesis of innovations and major contributions, how curatorial research feeds into the candidates research and vice versa, and plan for future curatorial activities.

### **IV. DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR PREPARING AND REVIEWING THE COMPLETED PROMOTION FILE**

1. **By April 1**, the Department Chair, with the advice of the Promotions and Merit Committee, will appoint a committee of three faculty at the rank of full professor to serve as the Promotion Review Panel for each associate professor undergoing evaluation for promotion. At least one of the committee members will be a member of the PMC and one member should be designated as closely associated with the

candidate's research specialty. For candidates with a curatorial appointment, at least one member of the Promotion Review Panel should also have a curatorial appointment.

The Department Chair will notify the candidate of the composition of the Promotion Review Panel **no later than April 10**. The candidate shall have the opportunity to review the membership of the Promotion Review Panel to ensure that the candidate's field and methodology are represented on the group and to challenge the faculty person designated as being most closely associated with the candidate's research specialty. Any conflicts over the composition of the promotion review panel may be brought to the Associate Dean for Natural Sciences in consultation with the Chair. Any challenges must be brought to the Chair within one week of notification to the candidate of composition of the promotion review panel.

2. The Chair will be responsible for requesting external letters of assessment by **July 1** and no later than August 1 of the academic year preceding consideration for promotion. Once the Promotion Review Panel has completed a draft preliminary promotion report, it will be made available to the Chair for review before it is forwarded to the promotion candidate. Because of the procedural importance of the Preliminary Report in the process, it is within the overall procedural responsibility of the Chair to ensure that any negative issues from the letters are addressed in the PRP report and that this report is balanced before it goes to the candidate. This includes consideration of whether the report contains implicit gender, racial, or other bias. If needed, the Chair should suggest revisions to the draft to achieve balance, and if the changes are substantive, the Chair will call a meeting of the Promotion Review Panel to discuss the changes in detail.
3. The candidate has a right to respond to the preliminary report before the Promotion Review Panel forwards the report to the decision making body. Toward that end, the Chair should give the candidate a copy of the preliminary promotion report prepared by the Promotion Review Panel. The Chair will invite the candidate to respond to any inaccuracies, misunderstandings of the candidate's work, or failures to contextualize the candidate's work appropriately. Candidates are encouraged to discuss the promotion report with non-PRP colleagues prior to writing an official response to the Chair. If these colleagues have questions about the preliminary PRP report, they may consult with the Chair.
  - i) Maintaining confidentiality in the preliminary promotion report to the candidate is critical; this summary must protect absolutely the identity of the external assessors. While the strengths and weaknesses this summary enumerates will be consistent with those described in the report that the Promotion Review Panel sends to the decision-making body and prepares for discussion by the College, the summary for the candidate must not quote directly from letters of assessment, and it must not include any markers that would enable the candidate to identify who wrote the letters of assessment.
  - ii) The candidate will have a minimum of two weeks to respond to the preliminary promotion report. If the candidate chooses not to respond,

she/he should submit a written statement to that effect.

- iii) After reviewing the preliminary promotion report, and consulting with the Chair [and Director], the candidate may choose to discontinue the review.
  - iv) The candidate may choose to modify the teaching, research, and, as appropriate, curatorial statements in response to this preliminary report; if done, the modified statements shall be the ones included in the file that is forwarded to the College.
  - v) The Promotion Review Panel will prepare a final promotion review report taking into account the candidate's response. The preliminary report, candidate's response, and final report will all be forwarded to the College as part of the tenure dossier.
4. Evaluation of the promotion file and report prepared by the Promotion Review Panel and voting on a recommendation to the College will be done **by early December** in the year in which the candidate will be considered for tenure.
- i) The decision making body will consist of all tenured full professors holding appointments of 50% or greater in EEB or whose tenure resides in EEB and who have reviewed the promotion file. Quorum for the decision making body is half of all on-duty faculty at rank. Immediate members of the candidate's family should be recused from the decision making body. If the candidate believes a member of the decision making body has a conflict of interest that will prevent them from assessing the candidate fairly, the candidate should discuss this with the Chair and can request the faculty member be recused from the decision making body. Intellectual disagreements do not constitute conflict of interest and are not grounds for recusal as a potential assessor. Candidates are encouraged to talk with the Chair about their concerns and the basis of the conflict during their initial meeting regarding the promotion review process that occurs prior to April 1. If the candidate decides to proceed with a request for recusal, the Chair will consult with the LSA Associate Dean. The request will be confidential unless approved. Any challenges to the decision making body composition must be brought to the Chair at least a month before the decision making body meets.
  - ii) The decision making body will receive from the Promotion Review Panel the promotion file concerning the achievements and external evaluations of the candidate being considered for promotion. Members of the decision making body are expected to fully participate in the evaluation of each candidate for promotion, including the examination of all relevant documents. After thorough discussion, the group will vote on whether or not to recommend to the College of LSA that the candidate be recommended for promotion. A positive vote by written secret ballot of at least 2/3 of those who are a) eligible to vote and b) who have participated in the discussion in person or

by teleconference is required for a positive recommendation to the College for promotion. Abstentions, which are written, are treated as negative votes.

- iii) For both positive and negative cases - In the event that wholly new, substantive negative elements that did not appear in the Preliminary Report emerge in the course of the discussion of the decision making body the candidate must be informed of those new elements in a letter from the chair and be given one week to respond in writing. The chair should consult with the relevant Associate Dean when drafting the communication. This letter from the chair, along with the candidate's response (if any), must be forwarded to the College as part of the promotion dossier.

## **V. MAKING A RECOMMENDATION ON PROMOTION TO THE COLLEGE OF LS&A**

1. The Promotion Review Panel will prepare a final report to the College, based on the promotion report, taking into account the candidate's response and the decision-making body's discussion and recommendation.
2. The numerical vote of the decision-making body shall be reported by the Chair to the College, along with the final report by the Promotion Review Panel.
3. A positive vote by at least 2/3 of the decision-making body members will constitute a positive recommendation. Abstentions will be counted as negative votes.
4. The Chair will provide a cover letter for the promotion packet to be provided to the College.

<i>Approved by the Executive Committee:</i>	<i>November 1, 2004</i>
<i>Revisions approved by the Executive Committee:</i>	<i>September 9, 2008</i>
<i>Revisions approved by the EEB Faculty:</i>	<i>September 22, 2008</i>
<i>Revisions approved by the Executive Committee:</i>	<i>March 7, 2011</i>
<i>Revisions approved by the EEB Faculty:</i>	<i>March 28, 2011</i>
<i>Revisions approved by the EEB Faculty:</i>	<i>January 19, 2015</i>
<b><i>Revision approved by the EEB Faculty:</i></b>	<b><i>April 23, 2018</i></b>