

Department of Integrative Biology

University of Colorado Denver

Denver Campus

BYLAWS

Approved 22 May 2008 by electronic vote (13-0-0)

Amended June 2015

Approved by Dean and Provost 7-30-15

I. Preamble

II. Faculty

III. Department Administration

IV. Department Decision Making

V. Hiring and Appointment to the Faculty

VI. Annual Evaluation

VII. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

VIII. Other Policies

IX. Approval of Bylaws

X. Appendices

I. PREAMBLE

- A. The Department of Integrative Biology, hereafter referred to as the Department, is organized and its affairs conducted in accordance with the Laws and Policies of the Board of Regents of the University of Colorado, and the policies of the University of Colorado system, of the University of Colorado Denver (CU Denver), of the downtown Denver Campus, and of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.
- B. The Bylaws presented herein cover the policies and procedures of the Department, specifically.
- C. Policies and procedures not covered by these Bylaws may be initiated or modified by a majority vote of the voting Faculty of the Department.

II. THE FACULTY

A. Membership

- 1. Members of the Faculty, hereafter referred to as the Faculty, shall be those individuals within the Department who hold the title of assistant, associate, or Professor; clinical teaching track (C/T) assistant, associate, or professor; instructor or senior instructor; lecturer and any other such title identified as a faculty title under applicable policies of the Board of Regents.
- 2. The designation “visiting” before an academic title indicates that the faculty member has a temporary appointment for a defined period such as an academic year, semester, or summer term. The visiting title should indicate the faculty member’s rank at his/her home institution or planned for at this university.
- 3. The Chair of the Department, hereafter referred to as the Chair, must be a tenured member of the Faculty.
- 4. Emeritus membership shall include those faculty members in the Department who have received the title of emeritus.
- 5. Graduate Faculty.
 - a) All graduate appointments will be administered following the policies of the Graduate School.
 - b) All members of the Faculty within the Department who hold the title of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor will be given a graduate appointment.
 - c) All members of the Faculty within the Department who have the title of clinical teaching track assistant, associate, or professor; instructor or senior instructor; or lecturer and hold the terminal degree in biology or another discipline pertinent to the mission of the Department may be considered for a graduate appointment.
 - d) All individuals who teach graduate courses or serve on graduate committees must have a graduate appointment.

B. Powers

1. The Faculty is concerned with:
 - a) Teaching.
 - b) Research scholarship.
 - c) Leadership & Service to the Department; College, University, and System; profession; and community.
2. The Faculty shall make and approve recommendations pertaining to:
 - a) Requirements for each degree or certificate program offered within the Department.
 - b) Curriculum, academic, and ethical standards leading to all degrees and majors offered within the Department.
 - c) Content of the biology curriculum.
3. The Faculty is responsible for maintaining the high standards of the Faculty following the policies and procedures of the Department, including:
 - a) recommendations and approval of appointments to the Faculty.
 - b) recommendations for promotion and tenure.
 - c) annual evaluations of teaching, research, and/or leadership & service.
4. The Faculty is responsible for other matters of academic and administrative importance as specified in the bylaws including, but not restricted to, approval of the annual budget, academic planning, self-study, graduate admissions and graduate degree programs.
5. The Faculty is responsible for developing and approving all departmental policies following standard parliamentary procedures.

C. VOTING MEMBERS

1. The following persons may be voting members of the Department:
 - a) Chair, associate chair(s), and director(s).
 - b) Faculty holding the title of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor; C/T assistant professor, associate professor, or professor; instructor or senior instructor and teaching at least one course in the Department at the time of voting.
 - c) Faculty having appointments of 50% or more are voting members in the Department, assuming that they are not voting members in another academic unit.
 - d) Faculty who are on leave and who taught at least one course in the Department the previous year.

- e) Lecturers, emeritus faculty, adjunct faculty, adjoint faculty, and affiliated Faculty are not voting members of the Department.
2. A vote is required on all matters pertaining, but not restricted to the:
 - a) policies governing undergraduate and graduate: curriculum, degree requirements, and administration.
 - b) appointment, reappointment, and promotion of faculty holding the title of: assistant professor, associate professor, and professor; C/T track assistant professor, associate professor, and professor; director, associate chair, and chair.
 - c) policies governing the administration of Department, including the budget.
 - d) bylaws.
 3. For the purpose of voting to amend the undergraduate curriculum, degree requirements, and administrative policies and procedures, the voting members of the Faculty include all those holding the title of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor; C/T assistant professor, associate professor, or professor; instructor or senior instructor and teaching at least one course in the Department at the time of voting.
 4. For the purpose of voting to amend the graduate curriculum, degree requirements, and administrative policies and procedures, the voting members of the Faculty include all members of the Graduate Faculty holding the title of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor; C/T assistant professor, associate professor, or professor; instructor or senior instructor and teaching at least one course in the Department at the time of voting.
 5. For the purpose of ranking and recommending applicants for appointment as assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, all voting members of the Faculty will be consulted.
 6. For the purpose of voting to support or reject the recommendation regarding the granting of reappointment, tenure, or promotion, the voting members of the Faculty shall include all tenured members of the Faculty and shall exclude the member seeking reappointment, tenure, or promotion.
 - a) Only tenured Faculty may vote for reappointment and promotion with tenure.
 - b) Only professors can vote for promotion to professor.
 7. Members of the Faculty who are eligible to vote on the personnel action and who may be on leave at the time a personnel action is being considered retain their vote. Their vote shall be accepted by the Chair by mail or e-mail prior to the faculty meeting set to consider the personnel action and added anonymously to the final vote tally by the Chair.

8. Voting members of the Faculty are expected to actively and fully participate in the process. Those who have not actively participated should recuse themselves from the vote.
9. A private vote will take place at the request of any voting member.

D. Other faculty titles.

1. Adjunct, adjoint, and affiliated membership shall include those faculty members or senior personnel in other departments, institutions, or organizations who hold the terminal degree in their discipline and have received the title of adjunct, adjoint, or affiliated Faculty in Integrative Biology. These faculty are expected to make regular and significant contribution to the teaching (e.g., instructor of record), research (e.g., co-PI on a grant), and/or leadership & service activities (e.g., graduate committee membership) of the Department. However, adjunct, adjoint, and affiliated faculty are non-voting members of the Faculty.

a) Adjunct/Adjoint research faculty

- (i) Adjunct Research Associate. This title is reserved for individuals who are or have been employed by an academic institution and who are actively participating in research associated with the Denver Campus, (e.g., research scientist at CU Denver who is actively conducting research with a faculty member in the Department).
- (ii) Adjoint Research Associate. This title is reserved for individuals who are or have been employed by a non-academic institution (e.g., a federal agency, Denver Zoo) and who are actively participating in research associated with the Denver Campus (e.g., NREL research scientist collaborating with a faculty member in the Department).
- (iii) These individuals do not oversee student research and do not teach in the Department.
- (iv) The title Adjunct/Adjoint Senior Research Associate will be applied to individuals advanced in their careers.

b) Graduate research and instructional faculty

- (i) Adjunct Research Professor. This title is reserved for individuals with a doctoral degree or the terminal degree in their field, who are or have been employed by an academic institution, and who are actively overseeing student research and are participating in student instruction (e.g., University of Denver faculty member overseeing graduate student thesis research).
- (ii) Adjoint Research Professor. This title is reserved for individuals with a doctoral degree or the terminal degree in their field, who are or have been employed by a non-academic institution (e.g., federal agency) and who are actively overseeing student research and are participating in student

instruction (e.g., EPA research scientist overseeing graduate student thesis research).

- (iii) Instruction is defined as any combination of student mentoring, traditional classroom instruction, thesis/research scholars committee participation, and student academic/programmatic advising.
- (iv) The title Adjunct/Adjoint Senior Research Professor will be applied to individuals advanced in their careers.
- (v) Research faculty must have a graduate appointment on the Denver Campus in the Department of Integrative Biology for which they are required to meet specific criteria as described in the Graduate School Rules and Policies for CU Denver.
- (vi) Expectations follow:
 - (a) Oversee graduate student thesis research
 - (b) Regular communication with the director of graduate studies in Biology regarding student issues, graduate program policies, research expectations, etc.
 - (c) Graduate faculty will be encouraged to teach in our graduate program, if possible.
- c) Affiliated faculty is a “working title” for those individuals appointed in another unit at CU Denver who may be involved in day-to-day operations of the Department.
 - (i) This title is reserved for individuals with a doctoral degree or the terminal degree in their field and who are actively overseeing student research and are participating in student instruction (e.g., Psychology faculty member overseeing graduate student thesis research).
 - (ii) Instruction is defined as any combination of student mentoring, traditional classroom instruction, thesis/research scholars committee participation, and student academic/programmatic advising.
 - (iii) All graduate faculty must have a graduate appointment on the Denver Campus in the Department of Integrative Biology for which they are required to meet specific criteria as described in the Graduate School Rules and Policies for CU Denver.
 - (iv) Expectations follow:
 - (a) Oversee graduate student thesis research
 - (b) Regular communication with the director of graduate studies in Biology regarding student issues, graduate program policies, research expectations, etc.

- (c) Graduate faculty will be encouraged to teach in our graduate program, if possible.
- d) Appointment
 - (i) Adjunct/Adjoint/Affiliated Faculty will be appointed for a period of up to five years as determined by their contribution to the Department. Membership will be re-evaluated for renewal. Either the Faculty or the Chair may recommend termination of an appointment at any time prior to the expiration of a term of appointment.
 - (ii) Adjunct/Adjoint/Affiliated Faculty may be nominated by any member of the Faculty.
 - (iii) The nominee will provide relevant supporting materials (e.g., CV, publications, teaching evaluations) to accompany the nomination, which should include a letter of support from the chair of the home department or institution.
 - (iv) Following a review of the nomination and supporting materials, there will be a discussion and vote of the Faculty following standard parliamentary procedures.
 - (v) Adjunct/Adjoint appointments are recommended to the Dean upon approval by the Faculty.

III. DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATION

A. CHAIR

1. Leader of the Department

- a) The Chair has the responsibility for providing leadership toward the achievement of the highest possible level of excellence in the teaching, research, and leadership & service activities of the Department.
- b) The Chair is expected to articulate the goals of the Department, both within and without the Department, to articulate the Department's actions or requests in pursuit of these aims, and to maintain a climate that is hospitable to innovation and productivity.
 - (i) The Chair has the responsibility to inform the Department of the stances and actions of the Dean and other administrators that might affect the Department.
 - (ii) The Faculty is responsible to inform the Chair of their stances and actions that might affect the Department.
- c) In the larger framework of the college, the Chair, as a Faculty member, has a special responsibility in representing the Department in areas of formulation of educational policy and academic ethics, as provided in article 4, Laws of the Regents, 1990.

- d) The Chair is ultimately responsible for the recruitment, selection, and evaluation of both the academic and the Staff personnel of the Department.
 - (i) In consultation with colleagues, and in consonance with the appropriate departmental procedures, the Chair recommends appointments, promotion, merit increases, and terminations.
 - (ii) The Chair has the explicit responsibility to ensure that Faculty members are aware of the Department, College, and University criteria prescribed for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure, and to make appraisals and recommendations in accordance with the procedures and principles stated in the Laws of the Regents.
 - (iii) In the course of recruitment of new appointees or in relation to salary increases or advancement of incumbents, the Chair shall make no formal commitment as to rank and salary until such action has received final approval of the appropriate administrative office.
 - (iv) The Chair has the responsibility to be familiar with the state personnel system, and to ensure that Faculty and Staff are aware of departmental expectations and of state personnel system criteria for appointment, reappointment, job classification, and promotion.
 - e) The Chair should be receptive to questions, complaints, grievances, and suggestions from members of the Department, both academic and staff personnel, and from students. The Chair has the responsibility to take appropriate action as required.
2. Administrator of the Department
- a) As administrator of the Department, the Chair has responsibilities that include the following:
 - (i) Assignment of appropriate teaching and leadership & service responsibilities within the Department with the concept that teaching, research or creative scholarship, and leadership & service may differ from person to person, and from time to time in the career of an individual.
 - (ii) Preparation of the budget and administration of the financial affairs of the Department, mindful of annual allocations and in strict accordance with University policies and procedures.
 - (iii) General stewardship of all Department resources including, but not restricted to, instructional and staff personnel, budget, capital equipment, and access to and use of space.
 - (iv) Custody and authorization of use of University property charged to the Department, and assignment of departmental space and facilities to authorized activities in accordance with University policy and campus rules and regulations.

- (v) Preparation of the schedule of courses, and coordination of times and places for class meetings or the arrangement and assignment of these duties.
 - (vi) Arrangement and assignment of duties for student advising.
 - (vii) Arrangement for training and supervision of teaching assistants in consultation with the director of graduate studies and instructors of record.
 - (viii) Recommendation of sabbatical assignments and other leaves of absence to the Dean, and for ensuring that the scheduling of sabbaticals is consistent with Departmental needs.
 - (ix) Promptly reporting the resignation or death of any member of the Department, as well as circumstance that may lead to academic leave.
 - (x) Departmental observance of proper health and safety regulations, in coordination with laboratory coordinators and campus Environmental Health and Safety officer.
 - (xi) Preparation and maintenance of records, personnel files, and other reports, cooperating with the appropriate staff member(s) and following University and College procedures.
 - (xii) Enforcing the "one-sixth" rule regarding additional remuneration for consultative services in accordance with the Laws of the Regents.
 - (xiii) Reporting to the Dean, or appropriate administrators — whenever a problem cannot be expeditiously resolved at the departmental level — any failure of an academic or staff member of the Department to carry out responsibilities, and recommendation of appropriate remedial and/or disciplinary action.
- b) Although duties can be delegated to others, the Chair is ultimately responsible for the aforementioned, although special assignments and additional duties may be added from time to time.
- c) In the performance of the duties listed above, the Chair is expected to seek the advice of members of the Faculty in a systematic way, to provide for the conduct of Department affairs in an orderly manner through Department meetings and the appointment of appropriate committees, and to keep Department members informed of his/her actions in a timely manner.
- (i) The Chair is also expected to seek student advice on matters of concern to students enrolled in Department programs.
 - (ii) The Chair is expected to seek advice from the Associate Chair(s), Committee Chairs, Staff, or other colleagues in carrying out his/her responsibilities.
 - (iii) An executive committee chosen in an appropriate manner may advise the Chair.

3. Appointment

- a) The appointment of a Chair should be based on the following criteria:
 - (i) Ability to provide administrative leadership in the effective functioning of the Department.
 - (ii) Possession of personal skills to deal effectively with faculty, administrators, staff, and students within the college and campus structure.
 - (iii) Possession of organizational skills.
 - (iv) Ability to provide intellectual leadership in the development of departmental faculty and programs.
- b) Procedures
 - (i) Prior to initiating search and nomination procedures for a Chair, the Faculty should meet with the Dean to discuss the needs and expectations of the Department as they relate to the appointment of a new Chair, the role of the Chair, and the type of search (i.e., internal or external) that will most likely assure that an appropriate candidate is recommended, and to discuss any budgetary considerations related to the search and appointment of a new Chair.
 - (ii) The Faculty of the Department in accordance with Department procedures will carry out a search and nominating process. The Faculty will subsequently submit its recommendation to the Dean.
 - (iii) If the Dean does not concur with the Faculty's recommendation, the Dean will meet with the Faculty to discuss his/her reasons for disagreement.
 - (iv) The Chancellor of the University of Colorado Denver, hereafter referred to as the Chancellor, will approve appointments of the Chair.
 - (v) It will be the responsibility of the Dean and the Chancellor to assure that recruitment and appointment procedures for the Chair reflect the University's commitment to equal opportunity and affirmative action. In order to achieve this objective, efforts should be made to provide experience for all faculty, including females and underrepresented minorities that will prepare them for these positions.
- c) Term of Appointment
 - (i) The Chair is expected to be tenured in the Department.
 - (ii) Consistent with article 4, Laws of the Regents, 1990, the Chair will normally serve for four-year terms.
 - (a) Appointments may be made occasionally for shorter or longer periods for specific reasons (e.g., acting or interim appointments).

- (b) Under the circumstances when a sabbatical falls within the four-year term of a Chair, an acting chair will be appointed following the procedures outlined above for selecting and appointing a Chair.
 - (c) When a sabbatical leave interrupts the tenure of Chair, the Department can decide whether or not that year should count against the duration of the planned tenure on a case-by-case basis.
 - (iii) Reappointment of a Chair to an additional term will be dependent on the outcome of a performance evaluation and the positive recommendation of the Department and Dean.
 - (iv) The Chair will be appointed on the basis of a 12-month fiscal year.
- 4. Evaluation
 - a) All Chairs will be subject to a comprehensive performance evaluation at least once every four years. The evaluation will be conducted by the Dean of the college/school and the Department Faculty in accordance with procedures developed by the Department in consultation with the Dean.
 - b) Formal input from other Department constituencies (i.e., staff) will be obtained as part of the evaluation process.
 - c) Prior to recommending the reappointment of a Chair to another term, a comprehensive performance evaluation will be conducted.
- 5. Compensation of the Chair is determined by the policies and procedures of the College and University.

B. ASSOCIATE CHAIR AND DIRECTOR

- 1. Although the Chair is ultimately responsible for the administration of the Department, s/he may be aided by one or more associate chairs, directors, or other appointees.
- 2. Associate Chair.
 - a) Associate Chair(s) will be a tenured member of the Department.
 - b) Tasks appointed to the associate chair(s) will be determined based on the changing needs of the Department.
 - c) Associate Chair(s) will be nominated by the Chair or a member of the Faculty and approved by majority vote of the voting members of the Faculty following standard parliamentary procedures.
 - d) Associate Chair(s) will receive compensation commensurate with the expectations of the position as determined by the Dean of the college.
- 3. Director.
 - a) Director(s) will be an untenured (e.g., instructor or tenure-track) or tenured member of the Department.

- b) Tasks appointed to the director(s) will be determined based on the changing needs of the Department.
- c) Directors(s) will be nominated by the Chair or a member of the Faculty and approved by majority vote of the voting members of the Faculty following standard parliamentary procedures.
- d) Director(s) will receive compensation commensurate with the expectations of the position as determined by the Dean of the college.

IV. DEPARTMENT DECISION MAKING

A. PROCESS

1. The Department shall meet when called by the Chair, any individual faculty member of the Department, the Dean, or the Provost.
2. All items to be considered at a meeting shall be placed on an agenda, including the date, time, and location of the meeting, which shall be distributed to the Faculty at least one day prior to the meeting.
3. When known ahead of time, all items requiring a vote will be so noted on the agenda.
4. If urgent business should come before the Department during times other than the regular nine month academic year, the Chair shall be authorized to act for the Department with the following provisions:
 - a) All actions taken by the Chair shall be presented to the Department at its next meeting.
 - b) The Chair shall inform all concerned parties via e-mail within one week of such actions.

B. FACULTY MEETINGS

1. Faculty meetings are scheduled by the Chair, as needed and keeping in mind the schedules of the voting members of the Faculty. Minimally, they should be held monthly throughout the nine-month academic year.
2. Meetings are preceded by an agenda prepared by the Chair, who also presides at the meetings.
3. As a rule, the following items of business shall be covered, and should questions of procedure arise, they shall be taken up in the order presented here:
 - a) Approval of minutes of the preceding meeting.
 - b) Announcement of informational items or administrative actions taken by the Chair since the previous meeting and report of items of specific interest to the Department as a whole.
 - c) Committee reports.

- d) Old business.
 - e) New business.
 - f) Communications by members.
 - g) Adjournment.
4. Faculty attendance at meetings is expected of the voting Faculty.
 5. Normally, only Faculty present at a meeting will vote. Absentee ballots may be recorded when a member of the Faculty is unable to attend a meeting, provided the faculty member notifies the Chair in advance of the meeting.
 6. A simple majority of voting Faculty constitutes a quorum.
 7. A simple majority vote of the quorum is required for making a recommendation.
 8. Any faculty member having a clear conflict of interest is obligated to abstain from voting.
 9. The minutes, as amended and approved, constitute the official record of the meeting.
 10. The Chairperson shall designate the departmental secretary or someone else to serve as secretary to all departmental meetings.
 11. E-mail ballots, motions, and voting.
 - a) E-mail voting will normally be conducted for business that takes place between faculty meetings.
 - b) Ballots and motions can be made and voted on via e-mail, an official communication method approved by the University.
 - c) E-mail motions and seconds should be addressed to all voting members in the same e-mail.
 - d) Discussion should take place by responding to all in the address heading of the e-mail.
 - e) The Chair will then e-mail all voting members with the final wording of the motion and call for a vote.
 - f) Voting should also be done by responding to all.
 - g) A simple majority vote of the eligible Faculty is required for making a recommendation.
 - h) The outcome of an e-mail ballot will also be reported and recorded at the following faculty meeting, where it will be recorded in the minutes.
 12. Recall
 - a) A request for recall may be initiated against any elected officer.

- b) Recall action must be initiated by a petition signed by two members of the Department and will require a 2/3 majority vote of the entire voting membership.

C. COMMITTEES

1. Standing committees will include, but not be limited to:
 - a) Curriculum Committee.
 - b) Graduate Committee.
 - c) Merit Review Committee.
 - d) TT and C/T Advisory Panel.
 - e) Space Committee
 - f) Fiscal Oversight committee.
 - g) Outcomes Assessment Committee
 - h) Awards and Scholarship Committee.
 - i) Teaching Effectiveness Committee.
2. Membership.
 - a) Each committee will comprise a minimum number of members (specified below), with additional *ex officio* members appointed to committees on an as needed basis.
 - b) Faculty members may volunteer, be nominated, or appointed to a standing or *ad hoc* committee.
 - c) Instructors may serve on committees at-will.
 - d) Members will serve at the discretion of the Chair.
3. Standing committees roles and guidelines.
 - a) Curriculum Committee:
 - (i) Responsibilities will include, but not be limited to: reviewing relevant departmental literature (e.g., catalog); reviewing course offerings and recommending changes; and reviewing the curriculum and recommending curricular changes (e.g., degree requirements).
 - (ii) The committee will be comprised of a minimum of three faculty (including the person responsible for scheduling, one undergraduate advisor, and one graduate advisor) who will have 3-yr terms and will report to the Chair or her/his appointee overseeing undergraduate and/or graduate curriculum.
 - (iii) Meetings will be held on an as-needed basis.
 - b) Graduate Committee:

- (i) Responsibilities will include, but not be limited to: graduate student advising and assignment of graduate faculty advisors; reviewing relevant program literature; working with the administrative assistant to receive, organize, and screen graduate applications; addressing student and faculty concerns regarding graduate program and policies; department liaison regarding Graduate Program; assigning financial aid packages in consultation with the Chair and instructors of record; advising the director of graduate studies.
 - (ii) The committee will be comprised of a minimum of three graduate faculty members (including the director of graduate studies) who will have 3-yr terms.
 - (iii) Meetings will be held once each Spring Semester and on an as-needed basis.
- c) Merit Review Committee:
 - (i) Responsibilities will include, but not be limited to:
 - (a) reviewing policies, guidelines, forms, and other supporting documents for annual merit review;
 - (b) collaborating with the program assistant to solicit and collect supporting materials for annual merit review;
 - (c) ensuring that the dossier is both up to date and complete.
 - (ii) The Merit Review committee will:
 - (a) review forms (e.g., spreadsheets) and supporting documents for accuracy, as well as alignment with current professional plan
 - (b) submit reports recommending a rating for each faculty member to the Chair.
 - (iii) The committee will be comprised of a minimum of four faculty members, including at least one Professor and one instructor, who will have 3-yr terms.
 - (iv) Meetings will occur once each Spring Semester and on an as-needed basis.
- d) TT and C/T Advisory Panel will be responsible for the formal mentoring of Tenure-track (TT) and Clinical Teaching Track (C/T) faculty.
 - (i) Responsibilities will include, but not be limited to:
 - (a) reviewing departmental policies, guidelines, and supporting documents for retention and reappointment, promotion, and, in the case of TT faculty, tenure;
 - (b) performing classroom visits;
 - (c) meeting with TT and C/T professors to discuss activities; maintaining a log of these discussions; preparing a document summarizing the activities of

the TT and C/T faculty over the preceding academic year; and advising the Chair of the Department.

- (d) The Panel will be expected to craft formal mentoring letters addressing research, teaching, and leadership & service for reappointment and promotion.
- (ii) The Panel will be comprised of a minimum of three faculty members who will be appointed by the Chair and approved by the Faculty. Terms will be three years and staggered.
 - (a) The panel will include at least one Professor, and a mix of other tenured faculty members (e.g., recently tenured).
 - (b) In addition to the Panel, each faculty member is encouraged to identify an “informal” mentor who could be from outside the Department selected based on her/his ability to provide expert mentoring in the area of research of the TT and C/T faculty member.
 - (c) The Chair may not serve on the Panel.
- (iii) Meetings and expectations
 - (a) The Panel will meet with the TT and C/T faculty at least three times annually.
 - (i) The first meeting held early in the Fall Semester will address, but not be restricted to retention and promotion criteria, and provide an opportunity for Q&A.
 - (ii) The second meeting held late in the Spring Semester will provide a platform for summarizing and evaluating each faculty member’s progress.
 - (iii) The third and final meeting held shortly after the end of the Spring Semester will provide an opportunity for open and informal discourse on issues related to retention and promotion.

- (b) The Panel will coordinate classroom visits to ensure that every TT and C/T faculty member has at least one peer review of teaching each year from which feedback will be provided to the TT and C/T faculty member (see documentation below).
- e) Space Committee:
 - (i) Responsibilities will include, but not be limited to: developing and reviewing guiding principles for the allocation and utilization of departmental space; overseeing the allocation and efficient utilization of departmental classroom and laboratory space; maintaining a record of departmental space allocations; and overseeing the efficient utilization of common space in the Department (e.g., animal care facility, greenhouse, core facilities).
 - (ii) The committee will be comprised of a minimum of three faculty members who will have 3-yr terms.
 - (iii) Meetings will be held on an as-needed basis.
- f) Fiscal Oversight Committee:
 - (i) Responsibilities will include, but not be limited to: developing and reviewing guiding principles for departmental budgetary allocation; reviewing and amending departmental budgets, including but not limited to the office expense budget, the laboratory course budget, ICR, Computer Replacement budget, and the Gift account; and approving and reviewing budgets set by the Chair and her/his staff.
 - (ii) The committee will be comprised of four members (including the Chair, Program Assistant, Teaching Lab Coordinator, and one T/TT faculty) who will have 3-yr terms.
 - (iii) Meetings will be held on an as-needed basis.
- g) Outcomes Assessment Committee:
 - (i) Responsibilities will include, but not be limited to: reviewing policies, guidelines, and supporting documentation related to undergraduate and graduate outcomes assessment in Biology, to include writing across the curriculum; consulting with institutional representatives on outcomes assessment on an as needed basis; collecting materials once each semester from relevant faculty; preparing annual outcomes reports for the undergraduate and graduate programs, to include informed recommendations; preparing outcomes reports for program review and accreditation; advising the Chair, director of undergraduate studies, and director of graduate studies.
 - (ii) The committee will be comprised of three members of the Faculty, to include the director of undergraduate studies or an undergraduate advisor and the director of graduate studies or a graduate advisor.

(iii) Meetings will be held on an as-needed basis.

h) Awards and Scholarship Committee:

(i) Responsibilities will include, but not be limited to: developing undergraduate and graduate student awards that recognize outstanding achievements in the traditional and non-traditional classroom; promoting awards and soliciting nominations each Spring Semester; receiving, organizing, and screening nomination materials; submitting a list of ranked candidates to the Faculty; and identifying funds to establish awards and scholarships.

(ii) The committee will be comprised of a minimum of two faculty members who will have 3-yr terms.

(iii) The committee will meet at least once during the Spring Semester.

i) Teaching Effectiveness Committee:

(i) Responsibilities will include, but not be limited to: creating and/or reviewing supporting documents for teaching effectiveness; reviewing and disseminating relevant literature; aligning and scaffolding the curriculum; identifying gaps and/or needs within the faculty to increase teaching effectiveness; holding workshops at least once each semester during the academic year (e.g. scientific teaching, active learning, assessment, diversity, and institutional transformation) to address gaps or needs; creating and maintaining standard observation protocols for classroom visits.

(ii) The committee will be comprised of a minimum of four faculty members who will have 3-yr terms, including one faculty member with pedagogical expertise who is external to the Department.

(iii) The committee will meet at least once each semester during the academic year.

4. Standing committees may be established by the Faculty to aid in the execution of its academic and related responsibilities.

5. The Chair may appoint ad hoc and functional committees as the need arises. The responsibilities, membership, and duration of these committees shall be established at the time of the announcement of their creation.

6. The responsibilities, guiding principles, procedures, and membership will be specified in policies attached as appendices.

D. FISCAL MATTERS

1. The Chair is the fiscal authority for the Department, although the Chair may delegate responsibilities (e.g., budget preparation, expense report approval) as appropriate.

2. Fiscal policies and decisions shall involve the Chair and the governing Faculty, Staff, and other relevant constituents, as outlined herein.
3. The Chair will draft annual budgets early in the fiscal year.
 - a) In so doing, the Chair will consult the appropriate Faculty and Staff.
 - b) The draft budget will be presented to the Faculty for recommendations and approval following standard parliamentary procedures early in the academic year.
 - c) Budget updates will be prepared by the program assistant and presented to the Faculty on a monthly basis.
 - d) Adjustments to the budget should involve consultation by the Chair with the appropriate Faculty and Staff.
4. Many Departmental policies governing fiscal matters are dynamic and can be expected to change over time. These include, but are not restricted to, policies governing: student fees covering laboratory expenses; travel to meetings, both student and faculty; computer replacement; fund-raising; and ICR. With that in mind, current and dated copies of all Department policies will be maintained as appendices to the bylaws.

E. Student Grievance Policy

1. This procedure applies to grievances not covered by other departmental, college, or university policies (e.g., plagiarism). Likewise, criminal grievances follow applicable legal procedures. Examples of grievance covered by this policy include alleged rude or non-professional behavior, significant deviations from course syllabus, or uneven treatment of students.
2. At any level of appeal, the student should write a letter that summarizes the grievance, including course number, instructor of record, nature of concern, and impact on student, as well as the desired outcome.
3. For those grievances covered by this policy:
 - a) The student must meet in person with the instructor to discuss the grievance. If either the student or the instructor feels strongly that they cannot have an open, respectful dialogue with the other party, a written statement of explanation must be submitted to the Chair. The student may also meet with the CU Denver Ombudsperson.
 - b) If the aforementioned does not result in a resolution, the student may meet with the Chair to discuss her/his concerns. The Chair may choose to mediate between the student and instructor of record, or may make a determination to resolve the grievance.
 - c) If the aforementioned does not result in a resolution, the student or instructor of record may appeal to the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Curriculum and

Student Affairs in CLAS Administration. The Associate Dean may resolve the grievance or refer the student to an appropriate office or committee (e.g., CLAS Academic Standards Committee). The decision of CLAS Administration is final.

4. CLAS Policy addressing student grievances or an abbreviated version must be placed in every syllabus to inform students about their rights, as well as those of the instructor of record, and the procedures for exercising a grievance.

V. HIRING AND APPOINTMENT TO THE FACULTY

- A. It is the Department's policy to ensure that every employee enjoys a non-hostile work environment free of discrimination or harassment of any kind.
 1. All employment decisions, such as appointing, promoting, training, and rewarding, will be made exclusively on the basis of job-related criteria, that is, employees' performance, knowledge, skills, and abilities as they pertain to the expectations of the position.
 2. Disciplinary actions will be taken solely on the bases of employees' behavior and performance abilities relative to the expectations of the position.
 3. Discrimination of any kind based on race, color, national origin, sex, age, disability, creed, religion, sexual orientation, political affiliation veteran status, or marital or parental status is forbidden and subject to appropriate disciplinary action.
- B. For the purpose of hiring an assistant professor, associate professor, or professor,
 1. The Chair will form a search committee comprising no fewer than four members to include, at least one member of the Faculty who holds a title at or above the rank at which the hire will be made.
 - a) Although not required, it is desired that the committee will include one member who is under-represented in the sciences or higher education.
 - b) One search committee member may be from another unit within the College or University, if it is in the best interests of the Department.
 2. The search committee will select a chair from among the faculty members who will typically hold a title in the Department above the rank at which the hire will be made.
 3. The Chair will charge the search committee to:
 - a) Adhere to all University, College, and Department hiring policies and procedures, including the Department's Diversity Plan.
 - b) Develop a job announcement for:
 - (i) Approval by the Department, College, and University, including Human Resources.
 - (ii) Publication nationally and internationally in print and on-line media following guidelines in the Department's Diversity Plan.

- c) Solicit applications to ensure a qualified and representative pool of applicants following guidelines described in the Department's Diversity Plan.
 - d) Review applications and develop a long list of qualified applicants following guidelines in the Department's Diversity Plan.
 - e) Develop a short list of 3-4 applicants for approval by the Chair and Dean.
 - f) Organize and coordinate on campus interviews for those applicants on the short list following guidelines in the Department's Diversity Plan.
 - 4. Selection, ranking, and recommendation of candidates for appointment will be informed by a straw vote to include:
 - a) Each member of the search committee.
 - b) The voting members of the Faculty.
 - c) Individuals not fully participating in the interview process should consider recusing themselves from this vote.
 - 5. The Search Committee will make a recommendation or recommendations to the Chair, based upon the actions and recommendations of the search committee with input from the Faculty.
- C. For the purpose of hiring an instructor or senior instructor:
- 1. The Chair will form a search committee comprising no fewer than three faculty members, of which at least one should be tenured in the Department.
 - 2. The search committee will select a chair from among the faculty members.
 - 3. The Chair will charge the search committee to:
 - a) Adhere to all University, College, and Department hiring policies and procedures, including the Department's Diversity Plan.
 - b) Develop a job announcement for:
 - (i) Approval by the Department, College, and University, including Human Resources.
 - (ii) Publication nationally in print and on-line media following guidelines in the Department's Diversity Plan.
 - c) Review applications and develop a long list of qualified candidates following guidelines described in the Department's Diversity Plan.
 - d) Develop a short list of interviewees for approval by the Chair.
 - e) Organize and coordinate phone and on campus interviews.
 - f) Make recommendations to the Chair after soliciting and considering input from departmental faculty, staff, and students, as appropriate.

4. Selection, ranking, and recommendation of candidates for appointment will be made by simple majority vote, for which the voting members will include the members of the search committee.
 5. The search committee will make a recommendation to the Chair.
- D. Application and appointment to Clinical Teaching (C/T) track
1. General:
 - a) The general criteria for the appointment of faculty to the Clinical Teaching (C/T) track are given in “The Laws and Policies of the Regents of the University of Colorado” and the University of Colorado Faculty Handbook. Additional criteria are specified in the CLAS policy on C/T Track Appointment and Promotion (http://www.ucdenver.edu/academics/colleges/CLAS/faculty-staff/Documents/policies/CLAS_CTT_policies.pdf).
 - b) All C/T track appointments are, by law, at-will three-year appointments and expire after no more than three years. At the discretion of the Department, appointments may be renewed.
 - c) Typically, the primary responsibility of a faculty member in the C/T track will be teaching, with 80% effort teaching or eight courses per academic year. The remaining 20% effort will typically be apportioned equally between leadership & service and research.
 - d) While research should advance departmental goals, teaching and leadership & service must directly benefit the Department.
 - e) C/T track faculty members are expected to demonstrate continued professional growth as part of their teaching, research, and leadership & service efforts.
 2. Applicants requesting appointment to the C/T track must hold the terminal degree in biology or a related field, e.g., medicine. Applicants to the C/T track must also be able to provide documentation that s/he is able to assume high-quality independent teaching and research.
 3. With written notice to the Dean from the Chair, qualified senior instructors in the Department have the following options regarding application for appointment to the C/T track. This applies to new senior instructor hires, as well.
 - a) Any senior instructor may apply to be appointed assistant professor, C/T track.
 - b) Senior instructors who have six or more years of full time relevant experience in higher education, with a record of teaching, research, and leadership & service that is commensurate with expectations for associate professor, C/T track may apply to be appointed at that rank.
 - c) Senior instructors who have 12 or more years of full time relevant experience in higher education, with a record of teaching, research, and leadership & service

that is commensurate with expectations for Professor, C/T track may apply to be appointed at that rank.

4. Applicants for the C/T track must provide an application packet to the Chair of the Department that includes the following materials: personal statement that addresses eligibility and provides the following: three-year professional plan that addresses teaching, research, and leadership & service; current curriculum vitae (UCD format); supporting documentation, including teaching materials, FCQ summaries and student comments, peer reviews of teaching, mentoring letters, publications and grant proposals, and evidence of leadership & service.
5. The Chair will solicit letters of recommendation following consultation with the applicant. For application to the rank of assistant professor C/T track, three letters of recommendation are required, including one from outside the Department addressing the applicant's research. For application or promotion to the rank of associate or Professor C/T track, five letters of recommendation are required, including two from outside the Department addressing the applicant's research.
6. All tenured/tenure (TT) track faculty and C/T track faculty, who are senior to the applicant, will be eligible to vote on appointment and promotion of C/T track faculty. Following review of the application materials appended by the letters of recommendation, appointment to the C/T track must be approved by a simple majority of the eligible voting members at a faculty meeting.
7. Following an affirming vote, the Chair will review the application materials and submit a written recommendation supporting or rejecting the nomination to the DAC-C/T, who will then make a recommendation to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, with the Chancellor making the final decision regarding appointment. At any point in this process, the applicant can request withdrawal from nomination.
8. If the faculty member's review is not positive, the faculty member will remain at her/his current rank.

VI. FACULTY EVALUATION

A. Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty

1. Professional Plan

- a) The Professional Plan is designed to provide a clear statement of a faculty member's goals and the nature of effort to be made in the areas of teaching, research, and leadership & service.
- b) The Plan should be developed in consultation with the Chair so that the faculty member's planned activities, when combined with those of other faculty in the Department, result in the primary unit meeting its responsibilities to students and the university.

- (i) Tenure track faculty member should complete a Professional Plan in the second year of their appointment. A signed copy of the Plan should be filed with the Chair and with CLAS Administration.
 - (ii) The Plan should be revised in accordance with the following schedule.
 - (a) after each personnel decision (e.g., promotion with tenure)
 - (b) every five years following promotion with tenure or promotion to Professor as part of post-tenure review.
 - (iii) At the time of annual merit review and also during post-tenure review, the Merit Review Committee will review the Professional Plan (and any revisions or updates to the Plan), compare its goals to the actual achievements of the faculty member to date, and report their findings to the Chair.
 - (iv) Professional Plans must be kept current. Significant changes should be incorporated into a revision of the Plan as soon as possible. The updated Plan must be provided to the Chair and commented upon and signed as needed.
- c) The achievement of professional plan goals does not ensure reappointment, the award of tenure, or promotion.
 - d) The full text of the University's implementation policy on Professional Plans may be found at <https://www.cu.edu/policies/>.
2. Annual merit review, ratings, and salary recommendations.
- a) At the beginning of the Spring Semester, each faculty member updates their dossier as follows:
 - (i) Faculty complete and submit the signed FRPA (Faculty Report of Professional Activities) to the Chair for inclusion in her/his dossier. Subsequently, the Chair submits signed copies of the reports to CLAS Administration.
 - (ii) Faculty updates her/his dossier to include relevant supporting documentation (e.g., manuscripts, grants awarded, FCQs).
 - (iii) Faculty complete internal evaluation worksheets upon receipt of the FCQ Summaries for inclusion in her/his dossier.
 - b) The Merit Review Committee, a standing committee within the department, reviews the dossier, professional plan, and forms for accuracy, as well as alignment with the Professional Plan. Within the context of the Annual Merit Review Criteria, the Merit Review Committee submits reports to the Chair, recommending a rating for each faculty member (i.e., outstanding, exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, below expectations, or fails to meet expectations), along with a statement supporting their recommendation.

- c) The Chair evaluates each member of the faculty (Appendix A); rates their performance as outstanding, exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, below expectations, or fails to meet expectations; and meets with each faculty member individually to discuss their performance evaluation.
 - d) Appeals. If a faculty member does not agree with the outcome of an annual merit review, s/he may request that the Merit Review Committee re-evaluate her/his dossier by submitting, in writing, a well-justified appeal. The Merit Committee will review the appeal and submit a recommendation to the Chair, who will re-evaluate the faculty member. If the faculty member does not agree with the outcome of the appeal, s/he may appeal to CLAS Administration.
 - e) The Chair conveys evaluations to the Dean following College and University policies and procedures.
3. Post-tenure review (PTR)
- a) Completion of PTR is mandated every five years for tenured faculty, both at the Associate and Professor levels, following a schedule maintained by CLAS Administration.
 - b) PTR evaluates accomplishment during the five previous years, and is informed by the five previous Annual Merit Reviews.
 - c) All tenured faculty are expected to:
 - (i) maintain productive research programs leading to publication, obtaining external funding, and presenting research at professional societies
 - (ii) continue to teach with effectiveness and competence in the classroom while mentoring graduate and undergraduate students in research
 - (iii) engage in service to the Department, University, community, and profession.
 - d) The Department of Integrative Biology has opted to have the Post-tenure Review Committee of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences perform the evaluation. For more information about Post-tenure Review, including appeals, contact the Associate Dean for Research and Creative Activities. See also <http://www.ucdenver.edu/academics/colleges/CLAS/faculty-staff/faculty-resources/tenure-resources/Pages/Post-TenureReview.aspx>.
4. Differentiated Workload
- a) The policy on differentiated workloads:
 - (i) recognizes that individual faculty members may have different professional interests, abilities, and preferences, which are dynamic
 - (ii) recognizes that unit and college needs, priorities, and requirements may vary, as well

- (iii) provides an opportunity for individual faculty members and their units to renegotiate goals and expectations in the areas of teaching, research, and leadership & service as part of annual merit review.
- b) This flexible model of workload allocation enables scholars to pursue a course of professional development that matches their needs and abilities, while not conflicting with the needs and goals of the Department, College, and University.
- c) The objectives and general criteria for implementing differentiated workloads for tenured/tenure-track faculty are specified in the recommendation of the ad hoc CLAS Differentiated Workload Task Force, with some relevant text provided in “The Laws and Policies of the Regents of the University of Colorado” and the University of Colorado Faculty Handbook. A detailed departmental policy accompanies these bylaws (Appendix B).
- d) Guidelines for Implementation
 - (i) Faculty with records of scholarly excellence in research or teaching, as revealed by ratings of “exceeding expectations” or “outstanding” in that area reported during annual merit reviews, may request a reduction in teaching or research, respectively, to maintain and enhance that excellence. Similarly, faculty asked to perform exceptionally demanding leadership, service or administrative obligations may request to alter the proportions of teaching or research.
 - (ii) Although the DW policy is designed for those faculty members who are exceeding expectations in research, teaching, or leadership & service, in rare cases, exceptions to this requirement may be made with the agreement of the Chair and CLAS Dean.
 - (iii) Recognizing that personnel decisions regarding retention, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review follow CU rules and regulations, the Chair will take special care in crafting workload agreements.
 - (a) DW agreements will be used sparingly in the case of junior faculty, in particular. Pre-tenure faculty should not enter into DW agreements that increase teaching or leadership & service at the expense of research effort, nor should they enter into prolonged DW agreements that substantially reduce teaching effort.
 - (b) It is expected that a DW agreement for any tenured or tenure-track faculty member will include at least 10% effort in each area.
 - (c) Recognizing the distinction between tenured/tenure-track faculty and rostered non-tenure-track faculty, teaching will not exceed 60% of a tenured/tenure-track faculty member’s workload.
 - (iv) To implement the negotiated workload model, the Chair must be able to assure that differentiated workloads do not impair the ability of the Department and College to meet instructional needs. The burden of

balancing workloads and instructional potential — the ability to serve a certain number of students and generate a consistent number of SCH — will be shared between the Department and CLAS Administration.

- (v) The time limit of the DW agreement will be 1-3 academic years. However, differentiated workload agreements are subject to annual evaluation and, if need be, renegotiation.
- e) Process for Requesting, Designing, and Approving a Differentiated Workload
 - (i) All differential workload agreements will be the result of negotiations between a faculty member, her/his Chair, and CLAS Administration, who are expected to:
 - (a) engage in annual conversations regarding the parameters of specific workload agreements, and
 - (b) ensure that annual methods of evaluation match the workload agreement.
 - (ii) A differentiated workload must be requested by a faculty member early in the academic year preceding implementation. A differentiated workload may also be requested for a faculty member by the Department Chair or CLAS Dean.
 - (iii) The Chair will evaluate the faculty member's research, teaching, and leadership & service record within the context of the area of proposed workload increase. The Chair will also advise the faculty member about any implications for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review, as well as additional compensation for teaching, which may be disallowed.
 - (iv) If the faculty member is deemed eligible, s/he and the Chair will prepare a draft differentiated workload agreement for submission to CLAS Administration that specifies:
 - (a) workload adjustment(s),
 - (b) expected outcomes as defined by a set of benchmarks that must be achieved within a mutually-agreed upon timeframe,
 - (c) formal process for documenting and reporting the benefits of the DW each academic year, and
 - (d) time limit of the agreement (1-3 academic years).
 - (v) Implementation of this policy presupposes the maintenance of enrollment and budget neutrality — there should be few, if any implications for the College and University.
 - (vi) Following discussion between the faculty member, Chair, and CLAS Administration, the Dean will notify the faculty member and Chair of her/his decision, including any revisions to the proposed DW plan.

- (vii) Upon approval, the faculty member will submit a revised Professional Plan to the Dean's office by 31 July.
- (viii) The new workload proportions will be applied to the merit scores if a faculty member works under the differentiated workload agreement. In the initial year and final year of a differentiated workload agreement, the workload proportions for the calendar year will be an average of the DW proportions and 40/40/20.
- (ix) Differentiated workload agreements will be evaluated annually during merit review. In order to continue a DW, the faculty member must have satisfactorily met the requirements of her/his DW contract.
- (x) At the end of the specified length of the DW agreement, faculty workload will revert to the original 40/40/20 split, although the faculty may submit another DW request. Alternatively, the faculty member may request to return to a standard 40/40/20 workload at the end of an academic year prior to the end of the DW agreement.

B. Instructors and senior instructors.

1. Annual merit review, ratings, and salary recommendations.

- a) Annual Evaluations will be conducted each year during the Spring Semester.
- b) At the beginning of the Spring Semester, each faculty member updates their dossier as follows:
 - (i) Faculty complete the modified FRPA (Faculty Report of Professional Activities, which is signed and submitted to the Chair for inclusion in her/his dossier. Subsequently, the Chair submits signed copies of the reports to CLAS Administration.
 - (ii) Faculty update her/his dossier to include relevant supporting documentation (e.g., teaching materials, FCQs, reflection, peer-observation(s), outcomes of required surveys).
 - (iii) Faculty complete internal evaluation worksheets upon receipt of the FCQ Summaries for inclusion in her/his dossier.
- c) The Merit Review Committee, a standing committee within the department, reviews the dossier, forms, and worksheets for accuracy, as well as alignment with the Professional Plan. Within the context of the Annual Merit Review Criteria, the Merit Review Committee submits reports to the Chair, recommending a rating for each faculty member (i.e., outstanding, exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, or below expectations), along with a statement supporting their recommendation.
- d) The Chair evaluates each member of the faculty (Appendix A); rates their performance as outstanding, exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, below expectations, or failing to meet expectations; and meets with each faculty

member individually to discuss their performance evaluation. At this meeting, the Chair will review the Annual Evaluation Criteria for the upcoming academic year.

e) Appeals.

- (i) If a faculty member does not agree with the outcome of an annual merit review, s/he may request that the Merit Review Committee re-evaluate her/his dossier by submitting, in writing, a well-justified appeal. The Merit Committee will review the appeal and submit a recommendation to the Chair, who will re-evaluate the faculty member. If the faculty member does not agree with the outcome of the appeal, s/he may appeal to CLAS Administration.
- (ii) In the case where the recommendation of the Merit Review Committee disagrees with that of the Chair, the faculty member may appeal to CLAS Administration.

f) The Chair conveys evaluations to the Dean following College and University policies and procedures.

VII. RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

A. Tenure-track faculty.

1. The tenure and promotion criteria described below apply to all new tenure-track Assistant Professors hired in the Department of Integrative Biology beginning AY 2012-13. Current untenured faculty may opt to select these new criteria rather than those that applied when they began their academic appointments at CU Denver.
2. Principles
 - a) The Laws of the Regents of the University of Colorado have delineated both the procedures for tenure evaluation and the standards for tenure and promotion in APS 1022 "Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review and Promotion" (Appendix C).
 - b) Primary Unit Evaluation Committee
 - (i) The Primary Unit Evaluation Committee, hereafter referred to as the TT and C/T Advisory Panel, is a standing committee within the Department (see Standing Committees).
 - (ii) The Panel is responsible for reviewing the qualifications of candidates for comprehensive review, tenure, and/or promotion and distilling this for the voting members of the Faculty and the Chair.
 - (iii) The Panel's review will include:
 - (a) A description and evaluation of the candidate's research, teaching, and leadership & service, as required by primary unit criteria.

- (b) Salient points of the external reviewers' analyses, with care taken to maintain confidentiality
 - c) Selection of external reviewers will follow University and Campus administrative policy statements governing Retention, Tenure, and Promotion, highlighted below
 - (i) Selection of external evaluators will be undertaken by the Chair of the Department.
 - (ii) The candidate will provide the Chair with external reviewers from which one or two reviewers may be chosen.
 - (a) At least three external reviewers are required for the comprehensive review, with at most one selected from the candidate's list, and at least two selected outside the candidate's list.
 - (b) At least six external letters of evaluation are required for review for tenure with promotion, with at most two selected from the candidate's list, and at least four selected from outside the candidate's list.
 - (c) The candidate may also indicate specific scholars to exclude from consideration because their evaluations might be prejudiced against the candidate.
 - (iii) The Chair, not the candidate, must solicit external letters of evaluation.
 - (a) External reviewers may not be relatives or close personal friends.
 - (b) Individuals who may be biased (for or against) the candidate, or not able to give a fair, honest assessment of the candidate's accomplishments, should not be asked to serve as external reviewers.
 - (c) External reviewers should be faculty members at institutions outside the University of Colorado system, preferably "peer" institutions.
 - d) The process leading to award of tenure is a summary evaluation of a faculty member's cumulative performance that is separate and distinct from the annual merit performance evaluation. The standards, policies, and procedures are described in the policy on "Retention, Tenure, Promotion in the Department of Integrative Biology (Appendix D) and summarized herein.
 - e) The faculty of the Department subscribes to the belief that past performance is a valid predictor of future performance.
3. Research
- a) The academic discipline of biology is comprised of a highly diverse array of subdisciplines. Therefore, the criteria discussed below rely heavily on the evaluation of outside reviewers within a subdiscipline.
 - b) The principal accomplishments expected for tenure and promotion are, in order of importance:

- (i) established and active research program with a record of publication in peer-reviewed, ISI listed and ranked journals;
 - (ii) significant contribution to the advancement of a subdiscipline of biology through publication
 - (iii) submission of one or more proposals for federal funding and attainment of funding from federal or other sources.
- c) Active research program with a record of publication in peer-reviewed journals.
 - (i) For the normal seven-year pre-tenure period, at least one publication is expected by the fourth year comprehensive review for which the majority of the work was accomplished since being appointed at CU Denver.
 - (ii) At least three additional publications beyond those required for the comprehensive review and for which the majority of the work was accomplished at CU Denver are required of all faculty for her/his tenure and promotion dossier.
 - (iii) All research for the minimum three papers beyond the comprehensive review must be completed while at CU Denver.
 - (iv) Collaborative research is both advocated and encouraged, as are multi-authored papers, but in such cases contributions of the faculty member must be documented. Collaboration with graduate students is expected.
 - (v) Simply publishing some minimum number of publications will be considered inadequate — it is ultimately the obligation of the candidate to demonstrate the importance of any papers.
- d) Receiving federal funding will be considered an important accomplishment towards tenure. During the pre-tenure period, Assistant Professors are expected to develop and submit major proposals for federal funding.
- e) Faculty members are urged to attend a minimum of one professional meeting a year on average, and present research in oral or poster format.
- f) A truly excellent record in research may be distinguished from an otherwise meritorious record by either the quality or quantity of the scholarly contributions exceeding the minimum expectations. Faculty seeking excellence in research should be recognized for important or innovative contributions to their subdiscipline (see Appendix D for details).

4. Teaching

- a) All tenure-track faculty are expected to become dedicated and competent teachers at both the undergraduate and graduate levels
- b) The principal teaching accomplishments required for tenure and promotion are as follows:
 - (i) quality course design
 - (ii) competent and clear course instruction and materials;
 - (iii) satisfactory student evaluations (Faculty Course Questionnaires or FCQs) and peer reviews;
 - (iv) serving as primary thesis advisor and committee member for graduate students in biology and other programs
 - (v) serving as research mentor for undergraduate students.
- c) There are many approaches to good teaching, and no particular formula is recommended. However, there are general skills and qualities that are shared by effective teachers. Expectations include: designing courses that provide thorough, accurate, and balanced overviews of subject areas; developing and including clearly stated course objectives that link course content to course objectives; assembling a clear syllabus with course policies that provide clear expectations; providing helpful and well-designed supporting materials; developing good organization, communication, and presentation skills; employing available technology; using current and well-regarded texts; routinely updating course materials with new and relevant findings; testing with rigor and fairness; and being accessible to students.
- d) The effectiveness and quality of classroom teaching are expected to be reflected in good FCQ scores, as measured for those items that reflect quality of instruction.
- e) Truly excellent teaching may be distinguished from otherwise effective and competent classroom approaches by the implementation of innovative teaching techniques, by high levels of classroom interaction and faculty rapport with students, and by demonstrated leadership in course curriculum development. We also value publishing papers in science education journals that describe and validate new teaching techniques, as well as submitting grant applications to implement new teaching methods, if appropriate.
- f) Pedagogical research that is hypothesis driven, statistically rigorous, and published in highly reputable journals will be considered as evidence of meritorious or excellent research in science education.
- g) Mentoring research students is another form of evidence for effective teaching. Faculty members are expected to collaborate with graduate and undergraduate students as they conduct their research.

- h) As mandated by the Laws of the Regents, and emphasized herein, the assessment of teaching must involve multiple means of evaluation. These include Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQ), unannounced classroom visits, peer review of course materials, and outcomes assessment, in addition to other lines of evidence. In some cases, there may be evidence of pedagogical innovation. Evaluation should also assess the extent and quality of mentoring students in research. These diverse forms of evidence should be used collectively to describe the total teaching contribution by a faculty member.
- i) Excellence in teaching is indicated by very good to superior FCQ scores; supported by peer review of class organization, course content, supporting materials, and communication skills; and, further distinguished by innovative teaching techniques, highly interactive teaching styles, and leadership in curriculum development. Excellence in teaching should be supported by other evidence, as well, including but not restricted to pedagogical publications, grant funding related to teaching, and teaching awards.

5. Leadership & Service

- a) Leadership & Service by faculty is both an obligation and a privilege.
- b) Although faculty members are expected to engage in leadership & service at multiple levels — Department, College, University, and CU System, profession, and society — untenured faculty are discouraged from investing large amounts of time in leadership & service activities.
- c) All proposed service responsibilities require consultation with the Department Chair and should be approved by the TT and C/T Faculty Advisory Panel.
- d) Departmental level service and some professional service are both strongly recommended at this early career stage. In addition, all faculty members should be engaged in reviewing papers for scientific journals and grant proposals.
- e) Beyond the comprehensive review, untenured faculty should increase their service commitments judiciously, participating on committees both within and outside the department and university.
- f) Evaluation criteria.
 - (i) For the comprehensive review, the faculty member should, at minimum, provide service to the Department as an involved and conscientious faculty member, including attendance at faculty meetings, serving on standing committees, and executing competently, and within the designated timeframe, all assigned responsibilities.
 - (ii) Additional leadership & service at multiple levels beyond the department level as described in the previous paragraphs will be expected for tenure and promotion.

6. Process. For comprehensive review, tenure, and promotion, the Department will follow those policies described in other CLAS, University, and System policies addressing this process, including but not restricted to those outlined in Strategies for Success and various web pages on this topic (e.g., <http://www.ucdenver.edu/academics/colleges/CLAS/faculty-staff/faculty-resources/tenure-resources/Pages/ComprehensiveReview.aspx>). For details, contact the CLAS Associate Dean for Planning and Initiatives.
- B. Promotion to Professor
1. The promotion criteria described below apply to all new professors hired in the Department of Integrative Biology beginning AY 2012-13. Current tenured faculty may opt to select these new criteria rather than those that applied when they began their academic appointments at CU Denver.
 2. Here, the Faculty of the Department of Integrative Biology specify and describe the criteria for promotion to rank of Professor from Associate Professor. The criteria are in a state of transition and take into consideration the challenges to doing competitive state-of-field research, as discussed above. Nonetheless, a strong record of accomplishment is required for promotion to Professor.
 3. Principles
 - a) The Laws of the University of Colorado Regents have delineated the criteria for attainment of rank of Professor under “Standards Processes and Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure, Post Tenure Reviews and Promotion” (revised July 1, 2007 <https://www.cusys.edu/policies/policies>).
 - b) “Professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, and
 - (i) a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent;
 - (ii) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other;
 - (iii) and a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, scholarship or creative work, and service.”
 - c) This, however, is not meant to imply that candidates must be rated as excellent in each of the endeavors of research, teaching, and service, but rather must show substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in all academic endeavors..
 - (i) Expectations for candidates for Professor *surpass* those required of tenure-seeking faculty, given that research productivity, teaching skills, and service workload and effectiveness should increase over time.

- (ii) Candidates, by virtue of their accomplishments and experiences, are expected to be important mentors for untenured faculty, to lead the Department of Integrative Biology towards Carnegie Classification Research University/Very High Research Activity (RU/VH) performance levels, and to strengthen the undergraduate and graduate teaching program.

- d) Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (see section VII A 2 B above).
- e) The process leading to award of tenure is a summary evaluation of a faculty member's cumulative performance and is a process that is separate and distinct from the annual merit performance evaluation.

4. Research.

- a) Candidates for promotion to Professor must have earned recognition as a contributor to the advancement of a particular subdiscipline or area of inquiry in biology, as validated by internal evaluation and by external review.
- b) It is expected that a candidate faculty member will have a strong record of accomplishment in publication, external funding, and other forms of scholarship that together reveal an active, innovative, and sustainable research program.
- c) The latter may be manifested in many ways that demonstrate leadership in advancing a subfield of study, such as by invitations to collaborate; write review papers; participate in symposia; participate on editorial boards; conceive and lead workshops; present plenary lectures; and serve on proposal review panels.

5. Teaching.

- a) Candidates are expected to have achieved a high level of effectiveness and competence in the classroom at both the undergraduate and graduate level based on multiple means of evaluation.
- b) Faculty members are also expected to have a strong record of mentoring students in research.
- c) Publication in collaboration with undergraduate and graduate students as well as postdoctoral students is assumed.

6. Service.

- a) The successful candidate is expected to have achieved and maintained a strong record of service to the Department, in particular, and at all campus levels, including the University.
- b) The importance of this cannot be understated, as most high-level service should fall to tenured faculty members holding the rank of full professor, thereby protecting assistant and associate professors seeking promotion.
- c) The candidate is also expected to have served his/her professional field in a variety of capacities.

C. C/T track.

1. Reappointment to the C/T track:

- a) Reappointment beginning in the fourth year is contingent upon a comprehensive merit review conducted at the end of the three-year appointment. The applicant will be expected to have achieved a standard of “meeting expectations” or better according to the current merit review criteria, modified for the C/T track.
- b) Reappointment to the C/T track requires submission of all materials required for appointment to the track, excepting letters of recommendation. Additionally, the applicant must submit a copy of the most recent employment contract, annual performance evaluation reports, a summary of teaching activities for the previous appointment, a summary of research activities for the previous appointment, and a summary of service activities for the previous appointment, including supporting documentation for each of the aforementioned.
- c) The Merit Review Committee consisting of no less than three T/TT faculty members, as well as one C/T track faculty member, who may or may not be a member of the Department, will review the reappointment materials. The Committee will submit to the Chair a recommendation supporting or rejecting reappointment. The Chair will review the recommendation and the materials and submit a written recommendation to the Dean supporting or rejecting the reappointment of the applicant. The Dean will review the material from the department and convey this material as well as his/her recommendation to the Provost, who will have the final authority to reappoint or not to reappoint.
- d) An assistant professor, C/T track may request a senior instructor appointment instead of undergoing a comprehensive review in the fourth year of university service and in so doing, will no longer have access to the professor ranking system in the C/T track title series.

2. Promotion within the C/T track:

- a) Promotion within the C/T track presupposes excellence in teaching, as well as significant contributions in the remaining two areas of responsibility.
- b) An assistant professor, C/T track is eligible to apply for promotion to associate professor, C/T track following completion of her/his second three-year appointment. Following a minimum of five years at the rank of associate professor, C/T track or the equivalent higher education experience, a faculty member is eligible to apply for promotion to professor, C/T track. Although an associate professor, C/T track may remain at that rank indefinitely, it is assumed that s/he will strive for overall excellence in teaching, research, and service leading to promotion to professor, C/T track.
- c) For promotion to the rank of associate professor or professor, C/T track, applicants must supply all the materials for the initial appointment and reappointment, as well as those materials required for appointment at the rank to which promotion is aspired.

- d) The Chair will solicit letters of recommendation following consultation with the applicant. For application to the rank of associate or Professor, C/T track, five letters of recommendation are required, including two from outside the Department.
- e) All tenure track faculty and C/T track faculty, who are senior to the applicant, will be eligible to vote on promotion of C/T track faculty. Following review of the application materials appended by the letters of recommendation, appointment to the C/T track must be approved by a simple majority of the eligible voting members at a faculty meeting.
- f) Following an affirming vote, the Chair will review the application materials and submit a written recommendation supporting or rejecting promotion to the DAC-C/T, who will then make a recommendation to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, with the Provost making the final decision regarding promotion.
- g) If the faculty member's review is not positive, the faculty member will remain at her/his current rank the faculty member but may reapply for promotion.

VIII. OTHER POLICIES

- A. The Department abides by the policies of the College, University, CU System, and Regents of the University of Colorado, with which faculty, staff, and other departmental employees should be aware (e.g., Academic Dishonesty; Academic Standards, including grade appeals grade appeals, Student Petitions for Exceptions to Policy. Notable among these are the following:
 - 1. Policy on Misconduct in Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities (see Administrative Policy Statement 1007, which complies with Regent Law, Article 5.E.5).
 - a) The Department is committed to excellence in research and other forms of scholarship and is committed to conducting these activities according to the highest ethical standards of honesty and integrity. As such, we maintain an environment that fosters adherence to these ethical standards.
 - b) We also provide avenues by which the faculty can respond to any deviation from these standard in keeping with APS 1007, which provides the fundamental framework to respond to allegations of misconduct thereby ensuring consistency.
- B. Many Departmental policies are dynamic and can be expected to change over time. These include, but are not restricted to, policies governing: reappointment, tenure, and promotion; merit evaluation and standards; service expectations; curriculum and degree requirements; assessment; awards; access; grievances; syllabus; academic dishonesty.
- C. With that in mind, current and dated copies of all Department policies will be maintained as appendices to the bylaws.

IX. APPROVAL OF BYLAWS

- A. The Department Bylaws may be amended at a Department meeting.
- B. Amendments must take the form of a notice of action.
- C. Amendments to the Bylaws may be initiated by any regular member.
 - 1. A 2/3 majority of the voting membership of the Department will be required to amend.
 - 2. Mail or e-mail ballots will be supplied to all absent regular voting members.
 - 3. Voting members that have not participated in discussion should recuse themselves from voting.
- D. Where provisions of the Bylaws are in conflict with previously adopted rules, the provisions of these Bylaws shall prevail.

X. APPENDICES will include policies and procedures that change frequently, do not require inclusion in the Bylaws, or are not currently developed enough to include in the Bylaws.



University of Colorado
Denver

College of Liberal
Arts and Sciences

Department of Integrative Biology
1151 Arapahoe, Suite 2071
Campus Box 171
P.O. Box 173364
Denver, CO 80217-3364
Office: 303-556-8440
Office Fax: 303-556-4352

**POLICY: Annual Merit Review for Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty,
Department of Integrative Biology**

FROM: Merit Review Committee (2011-12): Brad Stith (Chair), Michael Greene, Michael Wunder, Cheri Jones; (2012-13): Diana Tomback (Chair), Brad Stith, Mike Wunder, Cheri Jones; (2013-14) Diana Tomback (Chair), Amanda Charlesworth, Brad Stith, Cheri Jones

ADOPTED IN INTENT: May 14, 2012

APPROVED BY PROVOST: September 27, 2013;

REVISED: February 18, 2013; February 4, 2014; April 1 to June 3, 2014; minor revision July 7, 2015

REVISION APPROVED BY FACULTY: June 2, 2014

APPROVED BY PROVOST: November 18, 2014

The Annual Merit Review process is used by the Faculty to inform the Chair of the Department of Integrative Biology, who is responsible for making recommendations to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Although Annual Merit Reviews are not considered in the evaluation process for retention, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review, the expectations established below for annual reviews are based on evidence from the fundamental responsibilities of faculty: effective teaching, research productivity, and service contributions.

The Annual Merit Review process tracks performance using calendar year intervals to assess faculty accomplishment. However, in Spring 2010, the CLAS Council unanimously resolved "...that the College adopt a policy that permits recognizing merit over multiple years." A recently invoked Regent Policy 11.B.1.6 allows Annual Merit Reviews to "reflect ongoing achievements in teaching, research, and service that may not yield measurable results in any given year. This principle of a rolling measure of merit recognizes that some projects require years to come to fruition and also that strongly productive years may coincide with years in which there are low salary pools." The Department of Integrative Biology supports the College resolution and Regental policy by considering the performance of individual faculty members over three-year intervals during the annual merit review process. The quantitative measures used to evaluate performance also support this resolution and policy by rewarding ongoing sustained research effort in addition to new and/or recently completed work in each year. Faculty members are therefore encouraged to report all accomplishments for each calendar year as part of this process and to maintain an up-to-date Merit Review Dossier.

The criteria for Annual Merit Review should be re-evaluated periodically so that this policy reflects the mission, vision, and strategic goals of the Department, as well as those for the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

Process and Guidelines

Faculty members are encouraged to compile supporting documentation over the course of each academic year, and should aim to have this completed by the end of January each year. Tenured/tenure track faculty should use the following guidelines to update Annual Merit Review dossiers, which are located in the Chair's office in the Department of Integrative Biology.

The merit review process provides a mechanism to ensure that each faculty member is meeting expectations commensurate with his/her rank. The Merit Review Committee will review all materials for completeness, consistency and accuracy. The committee will use these materials to evaluate each faculty member as described on the CLAS Annual Performance Rating Form. The ratings are provided for each of the three major areas of effort (research, teaching, service) and are defined as follows:

- **Failing to meet expectations (1 point):** Fails to meet performance expectations, with insufficient effort towards improvement.
- **Below expectations (2 points):** Falls short of performance expectations, and improvement is needed in these areas.
- **Meeting expectations (3 points):** Consistently fulfills performance expectations and may exceed them periodically. Work is of high quality in all significant areas of responsibility.
- **Exceeding expectations (4 points):** Frequently exceeds all performance expectations. Demonstrates performance of a very high level of quality in all areas of responsibility.
- **Outstanding (5 points):** Exceeds all performance expectations on a consistent and uniform basis. Work is of exceptional quality in all essential areas of responsibility. In addition, makes an exceptional or unique contribution to achievement of Department, College, and University objectives

Specific actions required by all faculty members for Annual Merit Review are as follows:

- All faculty must complete the online Faculty Report of Professional Activities (FRPA) by the CLAS deadline. A hard copy of the FRPA is submitted to the CLAS Dean's Office by the Chair. The FRPA system is published on the OIRE website http://www.ucdenver.edu/about/departments/InstitutionalResearch/Pages/UserLogin_MixedAuth.aspx through the OIRE "User Login / User Portal" link. All faculty who are responsible for completing a FRPA automatically have been given access to the OIRE website and to the FRPA system. A short User's Guide is available through a link at the top of the FRPA web page.

- Provide an updated Curriculum Vitae (CV) following CU-Denver format as described in “Strategies for Success.” A template is available on the “Resources for Faculty” web page.
- All tenured and tenure track faculty members are also required to maintain a current Professional Plan, each of which covers five academic years. Update the Professional Plan following any personnel action, including comprehensive review, tenure review, post-tenure review, and review for promotion to professor. A template is available on the “Resources for Faculty” web page.
- Complete brief but thoughtful teaching, research, and service self-evaluations that clearly summarize accomplishments and set-backs in the previous year and goals for the upcoming calendar year.
- Provide required documentation of research, teaching, and service activities, as directed below in the Checklist.
- Submit completed folder to Merit Review Committee Chair.

Clarification of “Below expectations”: A faculty member who is rated as “Below expectations” will be expected to respond by improving her or his performance during the next review cycle. This rating may follow unforeseen circumstances, poor decision-making, or unwise allocation of time. The problems are solvable and the faculty member is motivated to help solve them.

Clarification of “Failing to meet expectations”: A faculty member who is rated as “Failing to meet expectations” in one or more areas of effort has demonstrated little or no effort towards improvement in the work performance that led to these low merit review scores. This individual also may not be meeting contractual obligations by not conforming to university, college or departmental policies. This rating essentially indicates that the faculty member is not performing a significant proportion of his or her job, and has not worked constructively with the Chair to correct the performance.

Note: The process for appealing a merit evaluation rating is described in the by-laws for the Department of Integrative Biology.

Checklist of Materials

- _____ 1) Faculty Report of Professional Activity (FRPA) for current year
- _____ 2) CV following CU-Denver format (current year)
- _____ 3) Current Professional Plan
- _____ 4) Differentiated Workload Agreement (if one is in place for the faculty member)
- _____ 5) Faculty Performance Rating Forms (previous 2 years)
- _____ 6) Research materials (calendar year under review):
 - Evidence, including first page of publications, and first page of new grant proposals.
 - When multiple authors or P.I.s share a publication, grant, or grant proposal, you should describe your contribution and level of effort.

- Provide a ≤ 1-page statement summarizing accomplishments, challenges, and short-term goals.

7) Teaching materials (calendar year under review):

- ≤ 1-page statement that provides an insightful but brief evaluation of each class taught, addressing accomplishments, failings, challenges, and short-term goals.
- When multiple authors or P.I.s are involved in an innovative teaching activity, pedagogical grant, or grant proposal, faculty members should describe their contribution and level of work.
- Syllabi and Classroom visit statements for courses taught during year under review should also be included.
- FCQ summary sheets for courses taught during the calendar year under review

8) Service materials (calendar year under review):

- ≤ 1-page statement summarizing activity, challenges, and short-term goals.
- Provide a description of your contribution for each service activity, where this is unclear. Ongoing compilation of these materials will facilitate preparation for retention, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure reviews.

Timeline for Completing Annual Merit Review

January	Compile materials for Annual Merit Review year.
Mid February	Submit FRPA to Merit Review Committee Chair.
Late February	Submit all materials to Committee Chair by deadline established by Department Chair. Departmental Annual Merit Review should begin in early March, and individual faculty meetings with the Departmental Chair will be scheduled for mid-March.

Annual Merit Review Ranking Criteria

The following criteria are used to determine the initial rankings for each faculty member in each of the three areas of faculty effort. They serve as evaluative guidelines for the merit review committee in order to provide a recommendation to the chair. Individual effort rankings are on a 1 to 5 scale, where 1 = "Failing to meet expectations", 2 = "Below expectations", 3 = "Meeting expectations", 4 = "Exceeding expectations", and 5 = "Outstanding." The overall ranking for the calendar year under review is initially computed as a weighted mean of the three duty specific ranking values. For example, if a faculty member is on a 40%-40%-20% research-teaching-service contract and scores "Exceeding expectations" for research, and "Meeting expectations" for teaching and service, the overall rank is computed as $0.4*4+0.4*3+0.2*3 = 3.4$ which is between "Meeting expectations" and "Exceeding expectations." That score is then averaged with the score from each of the previous two years and then rounded to the nearest integer for a final ranking that is recommended to the Departmental Chair for the calendar year under review. Significant improvement will be taken under consideration by the Chair.

RESEARCH Criteria

In the Department of Integrative Biology, “research” is defined as including original discovery, review, synthesis, application, and integration related to biology or pedagogy in biology. The main criterion for research credit is peer-reviewed publication in ISI (Institute for Scientific Information) Web of Science¹ recognized journals, in mainstream pedagogy journals, or in scholarly books published by recognized publishers.²

Note: Faculty members will be given credit for only one additional year of a no-cost extension on any grant or contract.

Meeting expectations:

- 1 original peer-reviewed research-based (as defined above) publication in an ISI-ranked journal in the current or previous year.

¹Defined as peer-reviewed journals for which citation rates are tracked.

²Peer-reviewed book chapters and other special publications of scholarly weight and merit may substitute for an ISI-ranked publication, but these need to be justified. In addition, authorship of scholarly books can substitute for two ISI publications. A paper that is *In Press* during the year under review can be claimed in the year under review even if it will be published in the following year. It cannot be claimed again after publication.

Exceeding expectations:

- Fulfill the requirements for Meeting expectations.

And either

- PI/Co-PI on external grant or grants of more than \$25,000 in total.

Or

- ≥ 2 original peer-reviewed research-based publications in ISI-ranked journals within previous 3 years.

Outstanding:

- Fulfill the requirements for Exceeding expectations.

And either

- Receive a research award (University or Professional Society).

Or

- Accomplish both of the following:
 - a) PI/Co-PI on external grant.
 - b) Exceptional*** publication record within previous two years.

*** Exceptional is defined as both high quality and high quantity. High quality is determined by having one or more publications in a multi-disciplinary outlet with a high Impact Factor (around 4-5). Definition of high quantity will vary by subdiscipline, but cannot be fewer than 2 original research-based manuscripts in ISI-ranked journal in the year under review.

TEACHING Criteria

Note: Faculty at CU Denver are expected to maintain an appropriate mix of traditional classroom teaching combined with mentoring in the research laboratory or field, which is

reflected in the evaluation criteria, and to update their course materials and syllabus periodically to reflect changes within a discipline.

Meeting expectations:

Note: The impact of average FCQ scores as low as 3.8 may be offset by a) evidence revealing innovation in the classroom (e.g., inquiry-based learning), b) evidence revealing demonstrated learning gains or learning outcomes achieved, c) evidence documenting professional development leading to classroom innovation (e.g., active learning), or d) large class sizes and student antipathy towards subject area. We will refer to FCQ questions below by factor or quality addressed, given that these questions may change in wording over time.

- Teaching statement includes reflective evaluation of faculty member's performance and effectiveness in each course, as well as critical evaluation of new pedagogical approaches or other classroom innovations.
- Average FCQ scores of 4.0 or higher across all courses taught in the academic year for the following items: (1) overall course rating; (2) overall instructor rating; (3) course challenged student to improve critical thinking skills (for example, with evidence-based reasoning, analysis, or application); (4) course as a learning experience; and either (5) course challenged student to improve writing skills, 6) course challenged student to improve quantitative skills (for example, with equations, statistics, calculations, or graphing); or (7) course challenged student to relate concepts from different topics.

And one of the following:

- Evidence of classroom innovation to enhance learning in at least one course.
- Curriculum development that enhances learning in at least one course—for example, incorporate new or improved exercises in critical thinking, quantitative knowledge, or effective written communication, (e.g., addresses Essential Learning Outcomes).
- Attended a professional workshop or 3 or more seminars in teaching innovation and effectiveness.
- Peer assessment from colleague within or outside the department of one or more courses during academic year under evaluation.
- Use of student focus groups in one or more courses to provide feedback on teaching effectiveness.

And:

- 1 graduate thesis/dissertation student or equivalent effort (e.g., a post-doctoral scientist; more than one undergraduate research student, such as an undergraduate Biology Research Scholar and a productive undergraduate independent study student). For “equivalent” category, describe how effort equals thesis student. (This requirement may be waived with exceptional FCQs and under negotiated workloads where research expectation is minimal.)

Exceeding expectations:

- Teaching statement includes reflective evaluation of faculty member's performance and effectiveness in each course, as well as critical evaluation of new pedagogical approaches or other classroom innovations.
- Average FCQ scores of 5.0 or higher across all courses taught in the academic year under review for the following questions: (1) overall course rating; (2) overall instructor rating; (3) course challenged student to improve critical thinking skills (for example, with evidence-based reasoning, analysis, or application); (4) course as a learning experience; and either (5) course challenged student to improve writing skills, 6) course challenged student to improve quantitative skills (for example, with equations, statistics, calculations, or graphing); or (7) course challenged student to relate concepts from different topics.

And two of the following:

- Evidence of classroom innovation to enhance learning in at least one course.
- Curriculum development that enhances learning in at least one course—for example, incorporate new or improved exercises in critical thinking, quantitative knowledge, or effective written communication, (e.g., addresses Essential Learning Outcomes).
- Attended a professional workshop or 3 or more seminars in teaching innovation and effectiveness; or helped organize and/or presented information at professional workshop or a seminar.
- Peer assessment of one or more courses during academic year under evaluation by colleague within or outside the department.
- Use of student focus groups in one or more courses to provide feedback on teaching effectiveness.

And:

- 2 graduate (thesis/dissertation) students or equivalent effort (e.g., post-doctoral scientists and/ or a mix of several Biology Research Scholars and productive undergraduate independent study students). For “equivalent” category, describe how the effort equals two thesis students. (This requirement may be waived with exceptional FCQs and under negotiated workloads where research expectation is minimal.)

Outstanding:

- Average FCQ scores of 5.5 or higher across all courses taught in the academic year under review for the following questions: (1) overall course rating; (2) overall instructor rating; (3) course challenged student to improve critical thinking skills (for example, with evidence-based reasoning, analysis, or application); (4) course as a learning experience; and either (5) course challenged student to improve writing skills, 6) course challenged student to

improve quantitative skills (for example, with equations, statistics, calculations, or graphing); or (7) course challenged student to relate concepts from different topics.

- Meet all other criteria for Exceeding Expectations.

Or:

- Meet criteria for Exceeding Expectations.
- And one of the following:
 - PI or Co-PI on internal or external grant related to the improvement of teaching pedagogy .
 - Recipient of a teaching award (College or University).
 - Other high impact accomplishment in teaching, such as invited talk on pedagogy at regional or national meeting or organization of a major educational-related event. The importance and impact of the event must be documented and explained.
 - PI or Co-PI on department, college, or university-wide training grant or grant to support undergraduate-focused research mentoring (e.g., NIH IMSD, BRAIN, etc.)
 - Project with pedagogical or undergraduate-focused research effort relating to “broader impacts” for NSF grant.

LEADERSHIP & SERVICE Criteria

These service criteria emphasize the importance of effective departmental service as well as service at different institutional levels, to professions, and to the community in a professional capacity. Faculty should undertake all service tasks with sincere commitment to a useful or productive outcome.

Serving as faculty sponsor for a student group may substitute for UCD committee service but not departmental service unless the student group is based in Integrative Biology. External service in a professional capacity can substitute for University, Departmental or College activities noted below--for example, serving as an officer or on a committee of a professional society or education-related group. Professional service, which includes professional community-related activities, is defined as non-University service requiring academic qualifications. Examples of professional service activities include (but are not limited to): reviewing manuscripts and grant proposals, serving on an advisory committee, serving as president of a society, editorship, award nominating committee, and conference or workshop, organization, etc. Winning a CLAS service award will result in an Outstanding rating in that calendar year.

As faculty progress in rank from Assistant to full Professor, there are qualitative changes in service expectations. With rank advancement, faculty members are expected to assume more leadership roles in service, invest more time, and to provide contributions leading to measurable progress. Major service projects at any level in the university or associated with professional contribution may be weighted more heavily and can be used to substitute for

other UCD or departmental service. However, both the significance of the work and workload must be explained in sufficient detail to justify the exchange.

All faculty must regularly attend department meetings and functions, and should participate in graduation ceremonies at least once a year. The only valid reasons for not attending department meetings include illness, conflicting responsibilities in teaching and service obligations, and attending professional meetings or important research-related events. If a faculty member consistently does not participate for reasons other than the above, the Chair has the option of lowering the annual service score.

Meeting expectations:

Professor:

- Serve as departmental Chair, Associate Chair, or Graduate Advisor, and
- Perform one professional service task, and
- Undertake a department, college, or campus service assignment.

Or

- Chair one departmental standing committee or search committee, and
- Serve on one additional departmental standing or search committee, and
- Serve on a UCD committee at any level, or university committee, and
- Perform one professional service task or undertake one assignment.

Or

- Chair one departmental standing committee or search committee, and
- Chair a work-intensive UCD or university committee or task force, or work on an important, time-intensive service task or project, whether departmental, UCD-based, or related to professional service, which may be sufficient to take the place of two of the three service requirements above.

Associate Professor:

- Serve as departmental Chair, Associate Chair, or Graduate Advisor, and
- Perform one professional service task or assignment.

Or

- Chair one departmental standing committee or search committee, or serve on two departmental committees, either standing committee or search committee, and
- Serve on a UCD committee at any level, or university committee, and
- Perform one professional service task or undertake one assignment.

Or

- Chair one departmental standing committee or search committee, or serve on two departmental committees, either standing committee or search committee, and
- Chair a work-intensive UCD or university committee or task force, or work on an important, time-intensive service task or project, whether departmental, UCD-based, or related to professional service, which may be sufficient to take the place of two service requirements above.

Assistant Professor:

- Serve on one Department standing committee or search committee, and
- Complete one professional service task or assignment, and
- Perform departmental *ad hoc* service.

Exceeding expectations**Professor**

- Fulfill requirements for meeting expectations, and
- Chair an additional department committee or lead an *ad hoc* department project, which involves a significant effort.

Or

- Fulfill requirements for meeting expectations, and
- Serve on one additional CLAS, campus, or system committee, and
- Perform an additional professional service task or undertake one assignment.

Or

- Fulfill requirements for meeting expectations, and
- Chair a work-intensive UCD or university committee or task force, or work on an important, time-intensive service task or project, whether departmental, UCD-based, or related to professional service, which may be sufficient to take the place of two of the service requirements above.

Associate Professor:

- Fulfill requirements for meeting expectations, and
- Perform additional department service, either as a member of a standing committee or search committee, or by chairing a search committee, or participate in an *ad hoc* department task.

Or

- Fulfill requirements for meeting expectations, and
- Serve on one additional CLAS, campus, or system committee, and
- Perform an additional professional service task or undertake one assignment.

Or

- Fulfill requirements for meeting expectations, and
- Chair a work-intensive UCD or university committee or task force, or work on an important, time-intensive service task or project, whether departmental, UCD-based, or related to professional service, which may be sufficient to take the place of two of the service requirements above.

Assistant Professor

- Fulfill requirements for meeting expectations, and
- Serve on an additional department standing committee or search committee or perform departmental *ad hoc* service, and

- Serve on one CLAS, campus, or system committee, and
- Perform an additional professional service task or undertake one additional department or campus service assignment.

Outstanding:

Professor:

- Fulfill requirements for exceeding expectations.

And two of the following:

- One professional service obligation of significance (e.g., editor of journal, officer of a society, or effort that involves a high work load and/or high impact; provide evidence).
- Provide leadership for a significant service project for the Department, CLAS, or UCD, or university (e.g., role in UCD accreditation process, write a doctoral proposal, write a training grant, etc.).
- Chair a work-intensive UCD or university committee or task force, or work on an important, time-intensive service task or project, whether departmental, UCD-based, or related to professional service.

Associate Professor:

- Fulfill requirements for exceeding expectations.

And one of the following:

- One professional service obligation of significance (e.g., editor of journal, officer of a society, or effort that involves a high work load and/or high impact; describe).
- Provide leadership for a significant service project for the Department, CLAS, or UCD, or university (e.g., role in UCD accreditation process, write a doctoral proposal, write a training grant, etc.).
- Chair a work-intensive UCD or university committee or task force, or work on an important, time-intensive service task or project, whether departmental, UCD-based, or related to professional service.

Assistant professor:

- Fulfill requirements for exceeding expectations.

And either:

- Serve on a UCD committee at any level, or university committee, and
- Chair one Departmental committee, or head an *ad hoc* departmental service effort.

Or

- Fulfill requirements for exceeding expectations, and
- Participate on a work-intensive UCD or university committee or task force, or work on an important, time-intensive service task or project, whether departmental, UCD-based, or related to professional service.

University of Colorado Denver
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Department of Integrative Biology
 1200 Larimer St., Suite 3016
 Campus Box 171
 P.O. Box 173364
 Office: 303-556-3419
 Office Fax: 303-556-4352
www.ucdenver.edu/clas/biology

POLICY: Departmental Implementation of the Differentiated Workload Policy
FROM: Leo P. Bruederle, outgoing Chair
 Diana F. Tomback, Acting Chair
ADOPTED: 20 August 2010
VOTE: Motion to approve, Charlie Ferguson; second, Timberley Roane; approved
 (11:0:0)

The document defines policies and procedures for developing and implementing differentiated workload (DW) agreements for tenured and tenure-track (T/TT) faculty in the Department of Integrative Biology within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS). It is adapted directly from the recommendation of the *ad hoc* Differentiated Workload Task Force and, as such, draws from that document, utilizing much of its language without modification.

This policy: recognizes that individual faculty members may have different professional interests, abilities, and preferences, which are dynamic; recognizes that unit and college needs, priorities, and requirements may vary; and provides an opportunity for individual faculty members and their units to renegotiate goals and expectations in the areas of teaching, research, and service as part of annual merit review.

This flexible model of workload allocation enables scholars with different strengths, interests, and career goals to pursue a course of professional development that matches their needs and abilities, while not conflicting with the needs and goals of their Department or the College.

Guidelines for Implementation

Faculty with records of research excellence, as revealed by ratings of “exceeding expectations” or “outstanding” reported during annual merit review, may request a reduction in teaching so as to facilitate and enhance research excellence. Similarly, faculty with records of teaching excellence may request a reduction in research obligations by adding one or more courses to their teaching load or by undertaking substantial and measurable duties in the areas of program and curriculum development. Alternatively, faculty asked to perform exceptionally demanding service may request to alter the proportions of teaching or research.

Although the DW policy is designed for those faculty members who are exceeding expectations in research, teaching, or service, in rare cases, exceptions to this requirement may be made with the agreement of the Chair and CLAS Dean. For example, faculty who receive funding for sponsored research that includes course buyouts during the academic year may request a differentiated workload reflecting a decrease in teaching and an increase in research activity. Similarly, faculty with unusual service obligations, who receive funding for course reductions,

may request a DW agreement. For example, the opportunity to request a DW agreement would exist for faculty who chair important campus committees and who traditionally receive course reductions or journal editors who receive externally-funded course releases.

Regardless, implementation of a differentiated workload must:

- enable research-focused faculty to continue to produce exceptional scholarship by lowering their teaching obligations;
- enable teaching-focused faculty to continue to provide outstanding pedagogical experiences, including the development of new curricula and programs, without facing annual penalties for not publishing more;
- enable faculty providing exceptional levels of service to be recognized and rewarded for these activities during annual merit review.

Recognizing that personnel decisions regarding retention, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review follow CU rules and regulations, the Chair will take special care in crafting workload agreements for assistant and associate professors to enhance their progress toward achieving tenure and/or promotion. DW agreements should be used sparingly in the case of junior faculty, in particular. In exceptional cases (e.g. an externally funded award that presupposes reduced teaching in favor of research), pre-tenure faculty might benefit from a DW agreement formalizing increased research effort. Pre-tenure faculty should not enter into DW agreements that increase teaching or service at the expense of research effort, nor should they enter into prolonged DW agreements that substantially reduce teaching effort. In fact, it is expected that a DW agreement for any tenured or tenure-track faculty member will include at least 10% effort in each area. Finally, recognizing the distinction between tenured/tenure-track faculty and rostered non-tenure-track faculty, teaching should not exceed 60% of a tenured/tenure-track faculty member's workload.

To implement the negotiated workload model, the Chair must be able to assure that differentiated workloads do not impair the ability of the Department or College to meet instructional needs. The burden of balancing workloads and instructional potential — the ability to serve a certain number of students and generate a consistent number of SCH — will be shared between the Department and CLAS Administration, and will involve internal redistribution of SCH generation across the Department, as well as altering the frequency and pattern of course offerings.

The time limit of the DW agreement will be 1-3 academic years. However, differentiated workload agreements are subject to annual evaluation and, if need be, renegotiation.

Process for Requesting, Designing, and Approving a Differentiated Workload

1. All differential workload agreements will be the result of voluntary negotiations between a faculty member, her/his Chair, and CLAS Administration. Furthermore, to achieve the goals of this policy, the Chair and faculty will need to maintain clear channels of communication throughout the academic year, to engage in annual conversations regarding the parameters

of specific workload agreements, and to make sure that annual methods of evaluation match the workload agreement.

2. A differentiated workload should be requested by a faculty member early in the academic year preceding implementation. A differentiated workload may also be requested for a faculty member by the Chair or Dean.
3. The Chair will evaluate the faculty member's research, teaching, and service record within the context of the area of proposed workload increase. As part of this discussion, the Chair will also advise the faculty member about any implications for personnel decisions (e.g., retention, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review), as well as additional compensation, which may be disallowed as part of a differentiated workload de-emphasizing teaching.
4. If the faculty member is deemed eligible, s/he and the Chair will prepare a draft differentiated workload agreement (attached) for submission to CLAS Administration that specifies the following: workload adjustment(s); expected outcomes as defined by a set of benchmarks that must be achieved within a mutually-agreed upon timeframe; formal process for documenting and reporting the benefits of the DW each academic year; and time limit of the agreement (1-3 academic years).
5. Implementation of this policy presupposes the maintenance of enrollment and budget neutrality — there should be few, if any budgetary implications for the College. As such, the Chair will develop a plan due to CLAS Administration by 30 May that addresses instructional needs. This will necessitate conducting an analysis of major and minor requirements, historical patterns of student enrollment and course demand, and the frequency with which courses, especially electives, are offered.
6. Following discussion between the faculty member, Chair, and CLAS Administration, the Dean will notify the faculty member and Chair of her/his decision, including any revisions to the proposed DW plan.
7. Upon approval, the faculty member will submit a revised Professional Plan to the Dean's office by 31 July. The new workload and evaluation proportions will be applied to the merit scores if a faculty member works under the differentiated workload agreement. In the initial year and final year of a differentiated workload agreement, the proportions for the calendar year will be an average of the DW proportions and 40/40/20.
8. Differentiated workload agreements will be evaluated annually during merit review. In order to continue a DW, the faculty member must have satisfactorily met the requirements of her/his DW contract.
9. At the end of the specified length of the DW agreement, faculty workload will revert to the original 40/40/20 split, although the faculty may submit another DW request. Alternatively,

the faculty member may request to return to a standard 40/40/20 workload at the end of an academic year prior to the end of the DW agreement.

UC Denver Integrative Biology: Differentiated Workload Agreement

Faculty member:

Rank:

Chair:

Dean:

Terms: ☐ research ☐ teaching ☐ service expectations

Time limit for agreement: ☐ one year ☐ two years ☐ three years

Academic year for initial appointment with differentiated workload:

Most recent personnel decision: ☐ new hire ☐ comprehensive review

☐ promotion with tenure ☐ post-tenure review ☐ promotion to full

Date (AY) for most recent personnel decision: **AY for next personnel decision:**

Next personnel decision: ☐ comprehensive review ☐ promotion with tenure

☐ post-tenure review ☐ promotion to full ☐ NA

Workload adjustment(s), including schedule of courses (completed by Chair):

Implications for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review (completed by Chair):

Implications for additional compensation (completed by Chair):

Implications for enrollment (completed by Chair):

Implications for instructional budget (completed by Chair):

Expected outcome(s), including benchmarks and timeframe (completed by faculty member):

Outcome:

Outcome:

Outcome:

Outcome:

Process for documenting and reporting the benefits of the DW each academic year (completed by faculty member):

Attach the following documents (completed by faculty member):

1. current Professional Plan and proposed Professional Plan with differentiated workload,
2. current CV (following UCD format),
3. Faculty Record of Professional Activities (FRPA) from two preceding academic years
4. Faculty rating forms from two preceding years.

Faculty member

Date

Chair

Date

Dean

Date

Department of Integrative Biology

1200 Larimer St., Suite 3016

Campus Box 171

P.O. Box 173364

Office: 303-556-3419

Office Fax: 303-556-4352

www.ucdenver.edu/clas/biology

POLICY: Retention, Tenure, Promotion for Faculty in the Department of Integrative Biology

FROM: D. F. Tomback, Acting Chair

APPROVED: September 29, 2010

VOTE: Motion to approve revisions from Associate Professor Charles Ferguson, second of motion from Associate Professor Leo Bruederle. Vote: 7 tenured faculty eligible to vote; 6 in favor, 1 opposed.

This policy specifies and describes the criteria for 1) tenure and promotion for Assistant Professors, 2) promotion for Associate Professors, and 3) post-tenure review of tenured faculty members in the Department of Integrative Biology at the University of Colorado Denver (UC Denver) Downtown Campus.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Here, the criteria for tenure and promotion for Assistant Professors with a standard distribution of work effort (40% research, 40% teaching, and 20% service) are specified and described. These criteria are regarded as transitional. The recently consolidated University of Colorado at Denver and University of Colorado Health Sciences Center, renamed the University of Colorado Denver (UC Denver), has received a Carnegie Foundation classification of Research University, Very High Research Activity (RU/VH). Although in the near future, requirements for tenure and promotion will become commensurate with this high-level research designation, immediate obstacles to performance include comparatively high teaching loads, no doctoral program, no tuition support for graduate students, insufficient staff support, and a comparatively small tenure-track faculty with limited opportunities for collaboration. As these challenges are gradually mitigated and connections with the Anschutz Medical Campus (AMC) are forged, the RTP criteria will be revised, potentially every three to five years.

The tenure and promotion criteria described below apply to all new tenure-track Assistant Professors hired in the Department of Integrative Biology beginning AY 2010-11. Current untenured faculty may opt to select these new criteria rather than those that applied when they began their academic appointments at UC Denver. The guidelines described here concerning promotion to Full Professor and Post-tenure Review, however, will apply to current tenured faculty, because no departmental policy existed previously.

Principles

The Laws of the Regents of the University of Colorado have delineated both the procedures for tenure evaluation and the criteria for tenure and promotion under Appendix A, "Standards Processes and Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion" (most recently revised July 1, 2007 <https://www.cusys.edu/policies/policies>). The standards of

performance for tenure are as follows: “Tenure may be awarded only to faculty members with demonstrated meritorious performance in each of the three areas of teaching, research or creative work, and service, and demonstrated excellence in either teaching, or research or creative work...” The process leading to award of tenure is a summary evaluation of a faculty member’s cumulative performance and is a process that is separate and distinct from the annual merit performance evaluation.” The faculty of the Department of Integrative Biology subscribes to the belief that past performance is a valid predictor of future performance; that is, strong accomplishment in research, teaching, and service during the pre-tenure period is a good indicator of continued productivity after tenure is awarded. Therefore, it is imperative for faculty to show continuing accomplishment prior to tenure evaluation. A burst of activity at the end of the pre-tenure period is not sufficient to demonstrate the potential for on-going accomplishment and the attainment of excellence.

Research

The academic discipline of biology is comprised of a highly diverse array of subdisciplines, each differing in methodology and recognized avenues for investigation, and each approaching the study of biology at a different level of organization, from cellular and molecular through ecological and evolutionary to integrative and systems-wide. These subdisciplines also vary in the nature of the questions asked, federal and state funding opportunities, competition for funding, rate at which research data may be amassed, volume of data required to publish a single paper, and difficulty of publishing in top-tier journals. Thus, it is difficult for a researcher in one subdiscipline to effectively evaluate the research progress and accomplishments of faculty in other subdisciplines. Furthermore, the size and competitiveness of start-up packages have varied over the last few years in the Department of Integrative Biology. Considering all factors, expectations for publication and external funding will differ according to field and for each junior faculty member. Therefore, the criteria discussed below will rely heavily on the evaluation of outside reviewers within a subdiscipline, in addition to the opinion of tenured faculty in the Department of Integrative Biology.

Criteria and standards. The principal accomplishments expected for tenure and promotion are, in order of importance: 1) an established and active research program with a record of publication in relevant peer-reviewed journals, based primarily on data gathered during the Assistant Professor’s pre-tenure period at UC Denver; 2) significant contribution to the advancement of a subdiscipline of biology through publication, as acknowledged by external reviewers within the subdiscipline; and 3) submission of one or more proposals for federal funding (>\$100,000), and attainment of funding, or, given a publication record exceeding expectation in both quality and quantity, good reviews and high ranking of a proposal by granting agencies, thus validating the ideas and methodologies set forth.

Record of publication or accomplishment. The most important demonstration of research progress and accomplishment is publication in peer-reviewed journals. Invited book chapters and invited symposium contributions are further demonstrations of peer recognition, but are supplementary and not primary evidence of research, even if peer-reviewed. As stated above,

the rate of publication, competition for space in first-tier journals, and the length and depth of published papers vary greatly among the subdisciplines of biology. The Department will rely on both the judgment of external reviewers and tenured faculty as to the sufficiency of the publication record.

For the normal seven year pre-tenure period, at least one publication (or in press paper) is expected by the fourth year comprehensive review. In all cases, the majority of the work for the publication should be accomplished during the faculty member's tenure at UC Denver. Papers published prior to the comprehensive review based in part on work conducted while the candidate was at another institution will strengthen the case for the candidate if some steps in completing the paper (e.g., additional research, data analysis, and/or writing) were accomplished at UC Denver. However, these papers will not substitute for the requirement of one or more published or in press papers based primarily on work accomplished while the faculty member is at UC Denver.

At least three additional publications beyond those required for the comprehensive review are required of all faculty for her/his tenure and promotion dossier. These three publications must include the UC Denver Department of Integrative Biology affiliation as the main institutional address and not just the "current address." Furthermore, this minimum number should not be viewed as sufficient, unless these publications are important contributions and published in top tier journals within a discipline. Again, the decision as to how many publications are ultimately sufficient for tenure will vary greatly by research subdiscipline.

Papers based on data gathered at a previous institution, but some measure of analysis and writing occurred at UC Denver, will help build the case that the candidate is productive in research. Often, these papers represent obligations to prior mentors, and timely completion demonstrates a good work ethic. However, all research for the minimum three papers beyond the comprehensive review must be completed during the faculty member's tenure at UC Denver, and not contributed from previous work. Collaborative research is both advocated and encouraged, as are multi-authored papers, but in such cases contributions of the faculty member must be documented. If an important data contribution to a paper was principally produced with the aid of graduate students or postdoctoral fellows within the faculty member's research lab, the resulting publication will also be favorably regarded. In fact, collaboration with graduate students signifies an active research program and is expected of all tenured and untenured faculty.

Quality of research program and contribution to the subdiscipline. Simply publishing some minimum number of publications will be considered inadequate — publications need to meet two important criteria. First, do the questions asked or hypotheses tested demonstrate innovative thinking? And second, are the data generated of high quality, providing some elucidation of questions or hypotheses? In some cases, review and synthesis papers meet these criteria, especially if published in high impact, peer-reviewed journals. Research papers based on original data, however, are the preferred indicators of a state-of-the-field, productive research program. Regardless, an essential question for the tenure and promotion evaluation

process is whether the published papers have had an impact on the faculty member's subdiscipline — in other words, has the research advanced a particular field. Although the external reviewers, who are chosen for their accomplishments within a particular subdiscipline, are best able to address this question, it is ultimately the obligation of the candidate to demonstrate the importance of any papers, e.g., using journal acceptance rates, impact factors, Eigen factors, or science citation indices.

Research program at UCD. A newly hired Assistant Professor should begin to organize and equip her/his laboratory immediately upon arrival at UC Denver and begin research as soon as possible during the first academic year. It is important to begin generating research data early, using start-up funds strategically. The faculty member is encouraged to hire technical support, if needed, recruit competent and motivated graduate and undergraduate students to help with research, and establish collaborations with other faculty members at the Downtown Campus, Anschutz Medical Campus (AMC), or at other universities or governmental agencies. Evidence of an active research program based in the Department of Integrative Biology at UC Denver is very important.

Proposals for federal funding. During the pre-tenure period, Assistant Professors are expected to develop and submit major proposals for federal funding, either as sole principal investigator (PI) or in collaboration with other investigators. First of all, funding ensures continued support for an investigator's research program, which UC Denver alone cannot provide. Second, the process of writing a proposal entails innovation, organization, and clarity of purpose, and often can lead to new avenues of investigation and inspiration, regardless of funding outcome. Furthermore, proposal reviews provide constructive suggestions for new researchers, and can head off potential problems.

We recommend, however, that pre-tenure faculty make strategic decisions about when and how many large grant proposals to submit prior to the comprehensive review process. Often, start-up support, small federal grants, and non-federal sources of funding suffice to enable a faculty member to collect publishable data. Major grant proposals are unlikely to be successful without convincing pilot data and a sufficient publication record in the area of research; grant writing can take time from writing manuscripts for publication. It is expected that faculty will make use of start-up funds to generate these data and establish the publication track record. Mentoring committees for junior faculty can help provide input as to these decisions.

Receiving federal funding will be considered an important accomplishment towards tenure; an award represents peer validation of a faculty member's research plans and methods, as well as providing financial support for an active research program. Smaller competitive grants are also useful for supporting research in some subdisciplines. However, federal funding and other grants will not substitute for a record of peer reviewed publications. Although tenure and promotion are possible without federal funding, if the research contribution is of considerable quality and impact, it is expected that funding to sustain the research program will be obtained.

Other evidence of research progress. Faculty members are urged to attend a minimum of one professional meeting a year on average, and present research in oral or poster format. Invited seminars or symposium contributions at meetings are also taken as peer validation of contribution. Although these presentations by themselves count minimally towards tenure, together they present a picture of a faculty member who is professionally engaged, and recognized for her/his work within a field.

In summary, an assistant professor seeking promotion with tenure is expected to have a record of publication including at least four papers in peer-reviewed journals, funding of one federal grant proposal or good reviews for an unfunded proposal, and participation in professional meetings, which together indicate a research program that has advanced the profession while being sustainable at UC Denver. Faculty seeking excellence in research, however, should be recognized for important or innovative contributions to their subdiscipline. In addition, they must have a strong record of publication in highly reputable journals, with publication numbers exceeding the aforementioned minimum. They should also receive significant external funding. Their contributions should be validated by invitations to present seminars or symposium papers, or awards. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to make the case for excellence in research.

Teaching

All Integrative Biology tenure-track faculty are expected to become dedicated and competent teachers at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. In addition, tenure-track faculty are expected to act as primary advisors and committee members for graduate students in Integrative Biology, but may mentor students from the M.S. program in Environmental Sciences and other inter-disciplinary programs. Tenure-track faculty are also encouraged to participate on graduate committees from the AMC and other campuses of the CU system, as well as those at other colleges and universities. Mentoring of undergraduate students in research is also considered an important teaching activity.

Criteria and standards. The principal teaching accomplishments required for tenure and promotion are as follows: 1) quality course design; 2) competent and clear course instruction and materials; 3) satisfactory student evaluations (Faculty Course Questionnaires or FCQs) and peer reviews; 4) serving as primary thesis advisor and committee member for graduate students in biology and other programs; and 5) serving as research mentor for undergraduate students.

Well designed courses; competent and clear course instruction and supporting materials; and strong evaluations. There are many approaches to good teaching, and no particular formula is recommended. However, there are general skills and qualities that are shared by effective teachers. Expectations include: designing courses that provide reasonably thorough, accurate, and balanced overviews of subject areas at appropriate levels of rigor with sufficient challenge, even for the best students; assembling a clear syllabus with course policies that provide clear expectations for students; providing helpful and well-designed supporting materials; developing

good organization, communication, and presentation skills; preparing and planning sufficiently prior to each lecture; employing available technology, if appropriate, as course enhancements; using current and well-regarded texts; routinely updating course materials with new and relevant findings; testing with rigor and fairness; and, being accessible and helpful to students. The effectiveness and quality of classroom teaching are expected to be reflected in good FCQ scores, as measured for those items that reflect quality of instruction, and not necessarily popularity of courses or instructors (see teaching policy on annual merit review).

Truly excellent teaching may be distinguished from otherwise effective and competent classroom approaches by the implementation of innovative teaching techniques, by high levels of classroom interaction and faculty rapport with students, and by demonstrated leadership in course curriculum development which includes both a state of field and synthetic disciplinary perspective. The value of novel classroom activities or teaching styles must be clearly demonstrated — they must result in improved critical thinking and learning skills by students, as demonstrated by planned assessments or favorable peer reviews either from within or outside the department. We also value publishing papers in science education journals that describe and validate new teaching techniques, as well as submitting grant applications to implement new teaching methods, if appropriate. NOTE: Pedagogical research that is hypothesis driven, statistically rigorous, and published in highly reputable journals will be considered as evidence of meritorious or excellent research in science education.

Graduate and undergraduate student research mentoring. Mentoring research students is another form of evidence for effective teaching. Faculty members are expected to collaborate with graduate students as they conduct their research, with most also involving undergraduates. Whereas graduate students are often completing a research project in partial fulfillment of a graduate degree, undergraduate students may vary in how much responsibility they assume by virtue of level of intellectual maturity or time restrictions; that said, some undergraduates are capable of contributing at a very high level. Regardless, the faculty mentor should provide a nurturing learning environment, allowing students to acquire the knowledge and protocols standard to a field or specific line of investigation, yet encouraging independent thought and ideas while also reinforcing student understanding of the scientific method. Furthermore, faculty members are always obligated to convey to all students involved in research the high ethical standards of science.

Excellent mentors of undergraduate and graduate students should be role models who instill passion for and dedication to scientific research in biology; they should inspire student interest in their subdiscipline, in particular. We expect that research students will attend professional meetings with their mentors and co-author posters and oral papers as well as publications. Excellent mentors should inspire their undergraduate students to continue their education after graduation by entering graduate or professional schools. Similarly, graduate students of excellent mentors are expected to complete their degrees and either go on to graduate or professional schools to obtain more advanced degrees or enter careers related to their training.

Evaluation criteria. As mandated by the Laws of the Regents, and emphasized herein, the assessment of teaching must involve multiple means of evaluation. These include Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQ), unannounced classroom visits, peer review of course materials, including laboratory and recitation exercises, and outcomes assessment, in addition to other lines of evidence (e.g., awards) in order to construct a full picture of a faculty member's performance in the classroom. In some cases, there may be evidence of pedagogical innovation. Evaluation should also assess the extent and quality of mentoring undergraduate students in research, extent and quality of mentoring and advising graduate students, and contribution to graduate thesis and dissertation committees. An additional measure is whether students who have been mentored continue on for advanced degrees in graduate or professional schools, or whether students obtain professional jobs in their field after completing their degree. These diverse forms of evidence should be used collectively to describe the total teaching contribution by a faculty member. Faculty members who teach large courses, departmental core courses, or lab-based courses should also be recognized for the extra work involved therein.

Summarizing, meritorious classroom teaching by an assistant professor seeking promotion with tenure should be validated by good FCQ scores in areas that relate to quality of instruction rather than popularity. Peer review should substantiate that courses are well-organized and sufficiently challenge students with state-of-the-field content, well-designed course materials, and that faculty have strong communication skills. In addition, tenure-track faculty are expected to mentor 2-3 graduate students at any given time, while also serving on graduate committees, with mentoring of undergraduate students counting for some of this activity.

Excellence in teaching is indicated by very good to superior FCQ scores; supported by peer review of class organization, course content, supporting materials, and communication skills; and, further distinguished by innovative teaching techniques, highly interactive teaching styles, and leadership in curriculum development. Students of excellent mentors will disseminate their research findings at professional meetings and in peer-reviewed journals, and be successful in pursuing careers in their chosen field or gaining admittance into graduate school. Excellence in teaching should be supported by other evidence, as well, including but not restricted to pedagogical publications, grant funding related to teaching, and teaching awards.

Service

Service by faculty is both an obligation and a privilege, because many aspects of the university are governed by faculty or require faculty input, as determined by bylaws or policy. Although faculty members are expected to engage in service at multiple levels — Department, College, University, and CU System, profession, and society — untenured faculty are discouraged from investing large amounts of time in service activities. That said, tenure-track faculty members should begin developing some record of service shortly after coming to UC Denver.

Recommended service activities. Reiterating, tenure-track faculty should assume limited service responsibilities prior to the comprehensive review. All proposed service responsibilities

require consultation with the Department Chair and should be approved by the faculty member's mentoring committee. Departmental level service and some professional service are both strongly recommended at this early career stage. Involvement in professional service includes serving on governing boards of scientific societies, editorial boards, organizing symposia at meetings, and serving on society committees, providing that time demands are limited. In addition, all faculty members should be engaged in reviewing papers for scientific journals and grant proposals, but with discretion as to time commitment. Professional service is regarded favorably, as it enables an untenured faculty member to network and achieve name recognition with others in the same general field. Other professional service includes serving in an advisory capacity to federal agencies and non-governmental organizations, and on grant review panels.

Beyond the comprehensive review, untenured faculty should increase their service commitments judiciously, participating on committees both within and outside the university. The mentoring committee and department chair may make recommendations, based on the individual interests of the faculty member.

Evaluation criteria. For the comprehensive review, the faculty member should, at minimum, provide service to the Department as an involved and conscientious faculty member, including attendance at faculty meetings, serving on standing committees, and executing competently, and within the designated timeframe, all assigned responsibilities. Additional service at multiple levels beyond the department level as described in the previous paragraphs will be expected for tenure and promotion.

Promotion to Professor

Here, the Faculty of the Department of Integrative Biology specify and describe the criteria for promotion to rank of Professor from Associate Professor. The criteria are in a state of transition and take into consideration the challenges to doing competitive state-of-field research, as discussed above. Nonetheless, a strong record of accomplishment is required for promotion to Professor.

Principles

The Laws of the University of Colorado Regents have delineated the criteria for attainment of rank of Professor under Appendix A, "Standards Processes and Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion" (revised July 1, 2007 <https://www.cusys.edu/policies/policies>). "Professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, and (A) a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; (B) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; and (C) a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, scholarship or creative work, and service."

Thus, candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must show strong accomplishment in their record of achievement since promotion. This, however, is not meant to imply that candidates must be rated as excellent in each of the endeavors of research, teaching, and service, but rather must show significant and continuing contribution in all areas overall. It is acknowledged that relative emphasis on different areas may change over time, since some faculty may choose differentiated workloads or assume administrative positions. In these situations, accomplishment will be judged relative to these factors. Furthermore, these candidates, by virtue of their accomplishments and experiences, are expected to be important mentors for untenured faculty, to lead the Department of Integrative Biology towards RU/VH performance levels, and to strengthen the undergraduate and graduate teaching program, either through classroom or individual instruction.

Criteria and standards. Expectations for accomplishments and workloads for candidates for full professor *surpass* those required of tenure-seeking faculty, given that research productivity, teaching skills, and service workload and effectiveness should increase over time. The candidate's record should demonstrate a significant contribution to undergraduate and graduate education and indicate substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in all academic endeavors.

Research. Candidates for promotion to Professor must have earned recognition as a contributor to the advancement of a particular subdiscipline or area of inquiry in biology, as validated by internal evaluation and by external review. It is expected that a candidate faculty member will have a strong record of accomplishment in publication, external funding, and other forms of scholarship that together reveal an active, innovative, and sustainable research program. The latter may be manifested in many ways that demonstrate leadership in advancing a subfield of study, such as by invitations to collaborate on new research projects; write review papers or commentaries for first tier journals; present research seminars or participate in symposia; participate on editorial boards; conceive and lead workshops within a subfield; present plenary lectures; and, serve on proposal review panels for NSF, NIH, or other federal funding agencies.

Teaching. Candidates are expected to have achieved a high level of effectiveness and competence in the classroom at both the undergraduate and graduate level based on multiple means of evaluation, as discussed elsewhere. Faculty members are also expected to have a strong record of mentoring students, and especially graduate students, in research, with frequent participation on graduate committees. Publication in collaboration with undergraduate and graduate students as well as postdoctoral students is assumed. Furthermore, it is expected that many of the research students mentored by a faculty member will be inspired to continue their professional education or be successful pursuing careers in biology.

Service. The successful candidate is expected to have achieved and maintained a strong record of service to the Department, in particular, and at all campus levels, including the University.

The importance of this cannot be understated, as most high-level service should fall to tenured faculty members holding the rank of full professor, thereby protecting assistant and associate professors seeking promotion. The candidate is also expected to have served his/her professional field in a variety of capacities.

Post-tenure Review

Post-tenure review is mandated every five years for tenured faculty, both at the Associate and Full Professor levels. All tenured faculty are expected to maintain productive research programs leading to publication, obtaining external funding, and presenting research at professional societies. They are expected to continue to teach with effectiveness and competence in the classroom while mentoring graduate and undergraduate students in research, as well as engage in service to the Department, University, and profession.

The post-tenure review evaluates accomplishment during the five previous years, and is informed by the five previous Annual Merit Reviews. Based on a review of these materials, faculty undergoing post-tenure review are rated Outstanding, Exceeding Expectations, Meeting Expectations, or Below Expectations. The Department of Integrative Biology has opted to have the Post-tenure Review Committee of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences perform the evaluation.

I have read the tenure and promotion policy of the Department of Integrative Biology.

Assistant Professor of Integrative Biology

Date

Chair of Integrative Biology

Date