

FACULTY EVALUATIONS
(modified October 6, 2006)

DEPARTMENT OF BIOCHEMISTRY, MICROBIOLOGY AND MOLECULAR BIOLOGY

PART A. GENERAL STATEMENT

Faculty evaluations serve to improve professional performance and to provide the basis for personnel recommendations by the Department. Evaluation of faculty members in the Department will be based on their activities in research, teaching and service to the Department, College, University community, scientific community and the public. Emphasis will be placed in proportion to assigned responsibilities. The evaluation process will be the same for all faculty members. The evaluation of the faculty member will be done by a Peer Committee of four (4), elected by the faculty of the Department. For the evaluation and promotion of Assistant and Associate Professors, the Peer Committee will consist of faculty members holding the rank of either Professor or Associate Professor, and having tenure. For the evaluation of full Professors, the Peer Committee composition will consist of four full Professors.

The evaluation criteria stated below shall be the sole criteria used in personnel recommendations by this department. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to assemble and present evidence to be included in their evaluation. All procedures for evaluation will be in accordance with the "Evaluation" Article of the current University of Maine Agreement with the Associated Faculties of the University of Maine (AFUM).

PART B. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY

- I. Instruction. Teaching includes both graduate and undergraduate instruction as well as both formal and individualized instruction. The difficulty and importance of teaching classes with large enrollments is recognized; also, the problem of teaching advanced courses where the subject matter is in a state of flux is appreciated. The development of new lecture and laboratory courses is recognized to require a special effort.
 - A. Quality of Teaching.
 1. Course content may be judged by the course syllabus, the examinations given, and the reading assignments. The faculty member may invite members of the Peer Committee to audit lectures. Other information may be submitted by the faculty member to support his or her evaluation.
 2. Opinions of students set forth in the formal rating process, opinions of peers, and opinions of successful graduates, number and caliber of graduate students (including evidence of a mature working relationship between students and the faculty member) and development of new and effective teaching techniques shall also be used as evidence of teaching effectiveness.
 - B. Course and Curriculum Development. Activities associated with these departmental functions are considered to be of value and are associated with the overall teaching responsibility of the Department. Cooperation and effort in these activities are essential from each faculty member.
 - C. Textbook and laboratory manual writing. These include published works of which the faculty member is the principal author.
 - D. Student advising. Unless a special arrangement exists, faculty are expected to serve as responsible student advisors.
 - E. Popular articles. Articles dealing with developments in microbiology, biochemistry, or molecular biology.
- II. Research, Publications, Scholarly Writing, and Creative Work in Discipline.

Evidence must be presented which will allow the committee to estimate the quality and extent of the faculty member's research activities.

The faculty member must demonstrate evidence of a creative and productive mind. The research area must be one of commonly accepted areas as designated in standard scientific journals appropriate to the areas of biochemistry, microbiology, and molecular biology. The quality of achievement will be determined by the

publication of research papers (abstracts, papers delivered at meetings, journal articles in refereed periodicals, chapters in books and/or books), of documented citations of the faculty member's published work by other scholars, and on the effort to seek financial support for such research projects. The Peer Committee recognizes that opportunities for funding are not uniformly distributed to all areas of research. Therefore, the level of external funding may not be directly correlated with the level of effort or competence.

The following types of evidence supporting the effectiveness of research activities are listed in approximate order of importance.

- A. Publications, particularly those in refereed professional journals are of prime importance. The number of publications, although significant, will not take precedence over quality.
 - B. Competitive awards from national granting agencies are of major importance since they represent national competition and evaluation by external peer reviewers.
 - C. Competitive awards from within the University of Maine and external contractual arrangements for the conduct of research will also be considered.
 - D. Review articles in publications such as Annual Review of Biochemistry, Microbiological Reviews, *etc.*, where they are critically reviewed as to content will be of importance in evaluation.
 - E. Invitations to speak at and to participate in symposia and workshops sponsored by professional societies will be recognized. Consideration is also given to invitations to present seminars at other universities and to present talks to lay groups concerning the meaning of research or research results. Such invitations represent external recognition of varying importance and must be considered individually.
 - F. Presentations of research results at professional meetings are useful evidence of research productivity.
 - G. Non-refereed publications for the Maine Agricultural Experiment Station and other groups.
 - H. Professional Activities. Attendance at local and national meetings of professional societies, participation in the activities of professional societies and participation in workshops and short courses will all be considered as pertinent.
- III. Public Service in Discipline. Professionally related activities which serve the public interest are of value to the Department. These activities can take the form of consulting and technical assistance, manuscript and grant reviewing, service on grant review panels, or the activities can be pertinent talks delivered to citizen and school groups.
- IV. Departmental, College, Campus and University Assignments and Service.
- A. Unless a special agreement exists, all faculty members are expected to participate to a comparable degree in tasks required to run the Department, College, and University. These include such tasks as service on University, College and Department Committees. Other kinds of contributions may become necessary and, by agreement of the faculty, will be expected.
 - B. Consideration will be given to major committee assignments which involve a substantial time commitment.

PART C. STANDARDS FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

I. Ratings.

- A. The Peer Committee will rate each faculty member primarily on categories I and II in Part B. This does not mean that good ratings in categories III and IV are not important but they are seen to be less important.

- B. The ratings in each category will be indicated as outstanding, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. These will be established by comparison with national standards wherever possible; the comparison will be made with faculty members in similar departments in other universities. The Peer Committee interprets “satisfactory” to mean that, during the defined interval, the faculty member fully met all requirements and standard expectations for continuation of the appointment at the present level. “Outstanding” is taken to mean the performance exceeds the standard expectations of the appointment, qualifying the faculty member for advancement in due course, where applicable, and a proportionate share of discretionary salary increases. A rating of “unsatisfactory” means that in at least some particular, the faculty member has not met expectations of faculty in the Department and that corrective measures should be taken. The basis for ratings of “outstanding”, “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory”, if any, will be given in the evaluation text, as will a discussion of any qualifications or uncertainties applying to this evaluation. In defining these criteria the viewpoint of the Committee is that, in order to advance in rank, faculty should achieve reasonably consistent ratings of “outstanding” in some part of the assignment and no ratings below “satisfactory”.
 - C. When evaluations for promotion in tenure or in rank are being made, the evaluation shall include all the evaluations that have been conducted during the qualification period.
- II. Reappointment, Promotions, and Merit Recommendations. In evaluating a faculty member, emphasis will be placed in proportion to the individual's assigned responsibilities in teaching and research.
- A. Reappointment
 - 1. Teaching rated at least satisfactory.
 - 2. Evidence of at least satisfactory research activity and interest.
 - 3. Evidence that overall progress is being made toward promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.
 - B. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure
 - 1. A consistent rating of outstanding in either teaching or research and at least satisfactory ratings in the other.
 - 2. Non-tenured faculty who are making satisfactory progress toward tenure can expect to be recommended in their sixth year of service. To be recommended earlier will require achievements beyond those normally considered sufficient for promotion.
 - 3. Associate Professors without tenure will be evaluated for tenure on the basis of the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor.
 - C. Promotion to Professor
 - 1. A faculty member will be recommended by the Department for promotion to the rank of Professor for demonstrating a high level of ability and scholarship. The faculty member must have shown sustained growth and development over time, with an outstanding level of achievement in the major assignment (teaching or research) and satisfactory achievement in the minor assignment, as evidenced by the periodic evaluation reports and other sources of evidence given in Part C - Section II.C.2. Research should be of a high enough caliber to have established an international reputation.
 - 2. Evidence for the level of scholarly activity might include such things as: a substantial record of publication in refereed journals; books or other comparable scholarly works; participation on editorial boards of journals; participation at national and/or international level in professional societies; invitations to participate in national and/or international meetings; and participation on grant peer review panels; success in obtaining external funding; letters of support from colleagues at other academic institutions; demonstrated excellence in teaching.
 - 3. Professors without tenure will be evaluated for tenure on the basis of the criteria for

promotion to Professor.

- III. Evaluations. Evaluations will be by letter written by the Peer Committee. The letters will be signed by all members of the Peer Committee. After the letter has been signed by the faculty member it will be returned to the faculty member's file.