

Number: 1.02

Issued By: Tenured Faculty of the Department of  
Biological Sciences

Date: April 15, 2015

**This policy replaces that adopted on 1 January 1985, as amended 1 October 1990 & November 1992 & 15 February 1996 & 19 September 2001 & 23 October 2002**

*UCTP Approved – April 15, 2015*

## **ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

**SUBJECT:** *Departmental Policy and Procedures for Faculty Tenure and Promotion*

In matters of tenure and promotion, the Department of Biological Sciences will follow the procedures of the University Faculty Manual (12/17/2013).

The tenured faculty of the Department of Biological Sciences shall serve as the unit's tenure and promotions committee. The tenured faculty of equal or higher rank will evaluate for tenure and/or promotion. The unit tenure and promotions committee may create subcommittees to assist the full committee in the performance of its work. Where possible, on matters other than consideration of a full professor for tenure or consideration of an associate professor for promotion to full professor, a subcommittee shall include both professors and associate professors. Faculty with administrative positions as associate deans, and any otherwise eligible faculty member who has a conflict of interest or a family or other close personal relationship with the candidate that could affect his or her objectivity shall not vote or otherwise participate in the process. By April 15 of each year, each unit tenure and promotions committee shall elect a chair for the upcoming year and report the chair's name to the provost and Faculty Senate office. The department chair can not serve as the unit's tenure and promotions committee chair.

All tenure-track faculty who have completed the minimum years of service (see page 4) are considered for tenure, and all faculty members below the rank of professor are considered for promotion each year, unless the faculty member requests, in writing, that consideration be deferred. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion shall be advised in writing of their eligibility for tenure or promotion by the department chair by the date stated on the university calendar posted on the provost's Web site. Since two tenure and promotion cycles occur annually, two dates will be given. A faculty member who intends to apply for tenure or promotion in the next cycle must so inform the department chair no later than 15 calendar days after the first notification. At least one month prior to any tenure or promotion consideration, eligible faculty will be requested to add any pertinent documents to their file. A candidate and the academic unit should follow UCTP guidelines for compiling files. The record of research, teaching, and service shall be thoroughly documented. Each file should contain the following items:

- Updated curriculum vitae, prepared by candidate;
- Summary of teaching performance and load (provided by the unit);
- Evaluations of teaching performance;
- A list of publications, papers presented, grant proposals, and the like; reprints of publications;
- A list of activities such as work on unit, college and university committees, student advisement, participation in professional societies, and relevant public service;
- Other pertinent letters or documents, including special awards, citations for community service, etc.
- All memoranda of understanding (MOU) pertaining to the appointment of the candidate.
- The tenure and promotion criteria in effect at the time of appointment of the candidate.
- All external evaluations of a candidate's scholarly or creative achievements and other professional activities received by the units.
- At least five evaluations of the candidate's research and scholarship from outside the University of South Carolina (provided by the unit).

The unit is responsible for providing a synthesis of evaluations of the candidate's teaching performance (including a comparison of student teaching evaluations of candidate to those of comparable courses within the unit) and obtaining at least five evaluations of the candidate's research and scholarship from outside the University of South Carolina. The candidate may not provide the names of potential referees.

In consultation with senior faculty members of the Department, the department chair will obtain letters from referees familiar with the candidate's field of research. At least five external evaluations from professional peers must accompany the file. None of the referees may be the candidate's dissertation or postdoctoral advisor(s), coauthors, or colleagues with whom the candidate has served at other institutions. The department chair will include a concise biographical sketch of each external reviewer. Confidentiality of the peer review letters will be respected, to the extent allowed by law.

Where a candidate holds a secondary appointment in another academic unit, the chair of the Department of Biological Sciences and the head of the secondary unit(s) will consult and determine jointly the selection of external reviewers. The chair of the Department of Biological Sciences and the head of the secondary unit(s) will also consult with the appropriate members of their respective units that have expertise in the candidate's area of research to derive a list of qualified potential external reviewers. If there is disagreement between the chair of Biological Sciences and the head of the secondary unit(s) regarding the list of potential reviewers, at least three of the external letters will come from the reviewers selected by the chair of Biological Sciences and at least two will come from the reviewers selected by the head of the secondary unit(s).

The chair of Biological Sciences will also solicit a review of the candidate from the head of each secondary unit in accordance with the specifications of the memoranda of understanding (MOU) between the Department of Biological Sciences and the secondary unit(s). For purposes of making the review and transmitting it to the primary unit, the candidate's complete file will be made available to the secondary unit at least two weeks prior to consideration by the Department of Biological Sciences. Unless otherwise specified in the memoranda of understanding the head of the

secondary unit will solicit a review of the candidate by the appropriate faculty in the secondary unit and provide a letter to the chair of Biological Sciences summarizing the review. "Appropriate" faculty in the secondary unit shall include those tenure track faculty of higher rank than the candidate. The review letter from the head of the secondary unit will be included in the candidate's file at least five working days prior to the unit's vote on the application. The head of the secondary unit will also provide to the chair of Biological Sciences a written statement of the procedures by which the views of all faculty in the secondary unit, eligible to participate in the evaluation, will be solicited and provided for inclusion in the candidate's file. A copy of these procedures will be included in the candidate's file. Memoranda of understanding specifying the responsibilities of the candidate to the Department of Biological Sciences and the secondary unit(s), as described in the Faculty Manual (12/17/2013), will be included in the file. If there is a conflict between the specifications of the MOU and the Faculty Manual, the Faculty Manual will have priority.

Upon receipt of the letters of the external evaluators the unit tenure and promotions committee members shall examine all relevant documents. The unit tenure and promotions committee in assembly shall then discuss the candidates individually and thereafter vote by secret ballot whether "to recommend" for tenure and/or promotion. At the meeting at which tenure and promotion of a candidate is discussed, attendance by 2/3 of the faculty eligible to participate is required. Faculty on leave are not required to participate in this discussion and will not be counted towards the quorum. At any time during the meeting that this requirement is not met, the meeting will cease until the mandatory attendance is regained. It is the duty of the committee chair to monitor this requirement. In the case of a faculty member holding a joint appointment, notice shall also be given to the appropriate administrator of the secondary unit, who shall have the right to attend the meeting and participate in discussion of the candidate, but not the right to vote. At the end of the unit tenure and promotions committee meeting, the committee chair shall distribute ballots to all faculty eligible to vote. Written justification of all votes at the unit level shall be mandatory and shall state specifically how the candidate meets or does not meet the unit's criteria. Completed ballots will be returned to the committee chair within three days of the meeting. Sealed proxy votes will be accepted by the chair and counted with the total. A record of the voting will be maintained by the department chair.

In all votes by the unit tenure and promotions committees a majority of the votes, excluding abstentions, constitutes a recommendation. Faculty with a conflict of interest as explained on page one shall not vote or otherwise participate in the process. The file containing the recommendations of the unit tenure and promotions committee together with a record of the vote (positive, negative, and abstentions) and all pertinent letters and documents then will be transmitted to the department chair. The department chair shall vote "yes" or "no" or "abstain" and shall forward his or her vote with written justification, along with all other recommendations, statements, and endorsements to the dean. The department chair or other administrators who choose to vote on tenure and promotion cases as members of their respective tenure and promotion committees may not then make further recommendations on cases at other points in the process. In other words, individuals are allowed to influence outcomes at only one point in the process. The candidate and the unit tenure and promotions committee shall be informed, in writing, of the vote by the chair of the unit tenure and promotions committee. The candidate will also be notified of the right to appeal and of the fact that

an unfavorable decision will not jeopardize any future consideration. The department chair shall also transmit to the dean a list of all faculty who were considered but not recommended and those who requested that they not be considered. The department chair will be available to confer with all candidates and discuss their attributes and deficiencies as judged by the unit tenure and promotions committees.

Notice of Meeting. The dean and the department chair shall be notified by the unit tenure and promotions committee chair of the pending meeting of the committee. However, if the department chair will make an administrative recommendation in a tenure or promotion case the chair shall not attend the meeting or participate in the discussion at which the case is considered by the unit tenure and promotion committee unless invited by the committee chair.

Candidates for new faculty appointments may be recommended for tenure by the eligible members of the departmental faculty on appointment. The eligible faculty may also approve the use of time and accomplishments at another education institution for consideration for tenure and promotion. According to the Faculty Manual (12/17/2013), faculty members appointed at the rank of assistant professor who have not previously held tenure-track positions at another institution of higher learning normally will not be recommended for tenure until they are in at least their fourth year at the University of South Carolina. Faculty members appointed at the rank of associate professor or professor who have not previously held tenure-track positions at another institution of higher learning normally will not be recommended for tenure until they are in at least their third year at the University of South Carolina. There is no difference between the standards applied to faculty who apply for tenure in the penultimate year of the probationary period and those who apply for tenure prior to the penultimate year.

## **CRITERIA IN CONSIDERATIONS FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION**

The Department of Biological Sciences has established the following guidelines, which will be used in evaluation of a faculty member for promotion and/or tenure. In accordance with the Faculty Manual (12/17/2013) faculty hired on or after January 1, 1995 are responsible for meeting the tenure and promotion criteria in effect at the time of their hiring unless the faculty member elects to be considered under the unit criteria in effect at the time of the application for tenure. For all subsequent promotions the faculty member shall be responsible for meeting the criteria in effect at the time of their application for that promotion. Faculty members hired before January 1, 1995, may choose either the unit criteria in effect at the time of their hiring or the criteria in effect at the time of their application for promotion.

### **I. Tenure at Associate Professor and/or Promotion to Associate Professor**

General. The Department of Biological Sciences is striving to continue to develop a national reputation in research. Therefore, it is essential that research excellence in junior faculty be stressed. In consideration for tenure and promotion to associate professor, greater weight must be assigned to the research ability of the faculty member relative to teaching or service. The candidate for tenure and promotion must demonstrate (1) excellent or outstanding accomplishment in research and productive scholarship, (2) at least good proficiency as a teacher, and (3) at least good performance in the necessary service functions of the department, college and/or university as assigned.

Research and Productive Scholarship. Knowledge is generated through original research and productive scholarship. Original research is defined as expanding the understanding of nature through observation and experimentation. Productive scholarship is defined as the systemization of knowledge and the construction of theory. Tenure-track Biological Sciences faculty are expected to be skilled as researchers and productive scholars. Competence in research and productive scholarship is ultimately measured by the contribution made to the body of scientific knowledge.

#### **Required criteria:**

1. The candidate must present a record of original research or scholarship in recognized, peer-reviewed publications of national or international scope. Articles should reflect work accomplished principally at the University of South Carolina. Whereas the research publication record should be judged by quality, and not necessarily on the number of articles, a publication rate exceeding one per year on average is expected for junior faculty. For publication with multiple authors the candidate's contribution(s) should be clearly explained. Additional, but not requisite, evidence of research and productive scholarship include:
  - a. Publications in books
  - b. Presentations at scientific or professional meetings
  - c. Presentation of research seminars, particularly at other institutions or by invitations

- d. Research-related activities such as reviewing grants, refereeing papers, organizing symposia, etc.
2. There must be an independent assessment of the significance and quality of the published research. This is attested to by external peer review letters. The overall external review must be construed as primarily positive. Other relevant information may supplement this assessment.
3. The candidate must demonstrate the ability to sustain a high quality research program. Research programs require effective management, appropriate personnel and material resources. While these factors may vary depending upon the nature of the research, generation of funding by the candidate through external grants or contracts, sufficient to accomplish the research objectives, is ordinarily expected. In cases where the candidate has a collaborative grant support, a letter from the senior co-principal investigator describing the candidate's contribution to the project and portion of funding is required.

In accordance with the Faculty Manual (12/17/2013) the performance of candidates for tenure and promotion must be rated as "outstanding, excellent, good, fair, or unacceptable". In the area of Research and Productive Scholarship the candidate will be assessed as follows:

**Outstanding:** The candidate has significantly exceeded the expectations of the three required criteria for Research and Productive Scholarship. To be rated as "outstanding" a candidate must have research productivity that exceeds that required as described above. Once again, the quality of the resulting research publications holds greater significance than the number of the publications. The national or international reputation of the candidate's record of research must be evident. An "outstanding" candidate must also demonstrate the capacity to build and maintain external funding in support of his or her research program.

**Excellent:** The candidate meets the required criteria as described above for Research and Productive Scholarship.

**Good:** The candidate meets two of the three required criteria described above for Research and Productive Scholarship.

**Fair:** The candidate meets only one of the three required criteria described above for Research and Productive Scholarship.

**Unacceptable:** The candidate has failed to meet any of the three required criteria for Research and Productive Scholarship.

To be eligible for tenure and promotion a candidate must be rated as excellent or outstanding in Research and Productive Scholarship.

Teaching and Educational Activity. The transmission of knowledge in a university is accomplished through formal teaching and other means of communication. Tenure track faculty are expected to become effective teachers as judged by the learning imparted, regardless of means. Evidence of effective teaching may be direct or indirect.

Required criteria:

1. The candidate must demonstrate proficient formal classroom teaching. A positive reputation for teaching among students, former students and colleagues is evidence for effective teaching. A candidate's teaching effectiveness will be judged based on her or his performance on student and peer evaluations of teaching. Student evaluation of teaching effectiveness should be considered in perspective relative to other factors, including class level, course enrollment and total teaching load. Continued efforts to improve teaching effectiveness are essential. Additional, but not requisite, evidence of instruction-related activity include:
  - a. Participation in course organization
  - b. Authorship or development of instructional books, manuals, audio/visual aids, etc.
  
2. Candidates must be effectively involved in the training of the next generation of scientists. Indicators of these activities may include
  - a. mentoring undergraduate students in research activities,
  - b. successful supervision of graduate students,
  - c. successful supervision of post-doctoral associates, and
  - d. active participation in graduate education.

Additional, but not requisite, evidence of effective contribution to research education includes membership on thesis and dissertation committees.

In accordance with the Faculty Manual (12/17/2013) the performance of candidates for tenure and promotion must be rated as "outstanding, excellent, good, fair, or unacceptable". In the area of Teaching and Educational Activity the candidate will be assessed as follows:

**Outstanding:** The candidate significantly exceeds the required criteria for Teaching and Educational Activity, in both formal undergraduate teaching and in training the next generation of scientists.

**Excellent:** The candidate exceeds the required criteria for Teaching and Educational Activity in both undergraduate teaching and in training the next generation of scientists.

Good: The candidate meets the required criteria for Teaching and Educational Activity as described above.

Fair: The candidate meets the required criteria for Teaching and Educational Activity in one of the areas described above but is deficient in the second area. Candidates ranked as “fair” will also have demonstrated little performance in the areas listed above as “Additional, but not requisite, evidence of instruction-related activity”.

Unacceptable: The candidate fails to meet the required criteria for Teaching and Educational Activity.

To be eligible for tenure and promotion the candidate must demonstrate at least a “good” level of performance in Teaching and Educational Activity.

Service. Certain administrative and community service functions are essential in any academic setting. Faculty are expected to cooperate fully in these activities as necessary and as requested. Among these activities are service on departmental, college and university committees, participation in student advisement, presentation of professional talks, service within the local community and service to the professional community. While these activities are of secondary importance in the overall performance of junior faculty, willing service contributes to a positive recommendation for tenure and promotion.

In accordance with the Faculty Manual (12/17/2013) the performance of candidates for tenure and promotion must be rated as “outstanding, excellent, good, fair, or unacceptable”. In the area of Service the candidate will be assessed as follows:

Outstanding: The candidate significantly exceeds the required criteria of providing effective service as assigned. The candidate provides leadership in service activities within the university, the state and local community, and the scientific community at large. To be rated as “outstanding” the candidate must provide effective service at each of these levels.

Excellent: The candidate exceeds the required criteria of providing effective service as assigned. The candidate provides service at more than one level, including the university, the state and local community, and the scientific community at large. To be rated as “excellent” in Service the candidate is not expected to contribute service at all levels.

Good: The candidate meets the criteria for Service as described above.

Fair: The candidate provides minimal or ineffective service to the university as described above.

Unacceptable: The candidate fails to provide service to the university as described above.

To be eligible for tenure and promotion the candidate must demonstrate a at least “good” level of performance in Service.

## **II. Promotion to Full Professor or Tenure at the Professorial Rank**

General. The rank of Professor in the Department of Biological Sciences is awarded to those faculty who have achieved a significant level of academic stature and accomplishment worthy of general acknowledgement among professional peers at the national level. Candidates for promotion to Full Professor will be evaluated on the basis of his or her combined record in the areas of research, teaching and service. The candidate must be ranked as “Excellent” or “Outstanding” in Research and Productive Scholarship and in Teaching. In the third area of Service the candidate must be ranked at least as “Good”. Evaluation of the candidate will be on the entire professional record, but will emphasize performance since promotion to (or appointment at) Associate Professor.

Research and Productive Scholarship. The candidate for promotion to, or tenure at, Full Professor is expected to meet the following criteria:

1. The candidate must present a substantial record of original research or scholarship in recognized, peer-reviewed, specialty or general publications of national or international scope. The research publication record of the candidate should be judged by its quality. What is considered substantial may vary with the area of inquiry and thus the judgment of the faculty and of the external reviewers will prevail in determining whether the candidate’s contributions to his or her subdiscipline are substantial.
2. There must be an independent assessment of the significance and quality of the published research. This is attested to by external peer review letters. The overall external review must be construed as primarily positive. Other relevant information may supplement this assessment.
3. The candidate must demonstrate the ability to sustain a high quality research program. Research programs require effective management, appropriate personnel and material resources. While these factors may vary depending upon the nature of the research, generation of funding by the candidate through external grants or contracts, sufficient to accomplish the research objectives, is ordinarily expected. In cases where the candidate has collaborative grant support, a letter from the senior co-principal investigator, describing the candidate’s contribution to the project and portion of funding, is required

Additionally, the candidate is expected to have attained national recognition and a favorable reputation among peers within a special area of research and scholarship. The department acknowledges that each candidate has his/her own special talents and strengths which may contribute to a national reputation. It is incumbent upon the candidate to provide sufficient evidence that he/she has attained national recognition. Examples of such supporting evidence are given below:

1. Invitations to present special seminars, lectures or addresses.
2. Invitations to contribute to symposia.
3. Authorship of review articles.
4. Authorship and/or editorship of any academic or scholarly book or monograph.
5. Invitations to referee or review professional literature or grant proposals.
6. Awards or special recognition for research accomplishments.
7. Receipt of career development awards, senior faculty fellowships or grants.
8. Invitations to serve on grant review panels as either a regular or ad hoc member.

In accordance with the Faculty Manual (12/17/2013) the performance of candidates for promotion to full professor must be rated as “outstanding, excellent, good, fair, or unacceptable”. In the area of Research and Productive Scholarship the candidate for full professor will be assessed as follows:

**Outstanding:** The candidate has significantly exceeded the expectations of the three required criteria for Research and Productive Scholarship. To be rated as “outstanding” a candidate must have research productivity that exceeds that required as described above. Once again, the quality of the resulting research publications holds greater significance than the number of the publications. The candidate’s record of research is expected to attract a high level of external recognition. An “outstanding” candidate must also demonstrate the capacity to build and maintain external funding in support of his or her research program.

**Excellent:** The candidate meets the required criteria as described above for Research and Productive Scholarship.

**Good:** The candidate meets two of the three required criteria described above for Research and Productive Scholarship.

**Fair:** The candidate meets only one of the three required criteria described above for Research and Productive Scholarship.

Unacceptable: The candidate has failed to meet any of the three required criteria for Research and Productive Scholarship.

To be eligible for promotion to full professor a candidate must be rated as “excellent” or “outstanding” in Research and Productive Scholarship.

Teaching. Promotion to, or tenure at the rank of Full Professor assumes ability to teach effectively at the university level. The candidate for promotion to, or tenure at, Full Professor is expected to meet the following criteria:

Required criteria:

1. The candidate must demonstrate proficient formal classroom teaching. A positive reputation for teaching among students, former students and colleagues is evidence for effective teaching. A candidate’s teaching effectiveness will be judged based on her or his performance on student and peer evaluations of teaching. Student evaluation of teaching effectiveness should be considered in perspective relative to other factors, including class level, course enrollment and total teaching load. The candidate is expected to have achieved a continuing level of effective teaching. Additional, but not requisite, evidence of instruction-related activity include:
  - a. Creation or revisions of courses
  - b. Participation in revision of Department or university curricula
  - c. Authorship or development of instruction books, manuals, audio/visual aids, etc.
  - d. Receipt of awards or recognition for teaching excellence
2. Candidates must be effectively involved in the training of the next generation of scientists. Indicators of these activities may include 1) mentoring undergraduate students in research activities, 2) a consistent record of successful supervision of graduate students through the completion of their degree, 3) successful supervision of post-doctoral associates, and 4) active participation in graduate education. Additional, but not requisite, evidence of effective participation in research training include chairing thesis and dissertation committees.

In accordance with the Faculty Manual (12/17/2013) the performance of candidates for tenure and promotion must be rated as “outstanding, excellent, good, fair, or unacceptable”. In the area of Teaching and Educational Activity the candidate will be assessed as follows:

Outstanding: The candidate significantly exceeds the required criteria for Teaching and Educational Activity in both undergraduate and graduate training. Candidates ranked as “outstanding” must demonstrate a high level of proficiency in teaching at all levels, including the training of graduate students and/or postdoctoral associates and the supervision of undergraduate student research projects. In addition the candidate must also take an active role in the development of new curricular materials or significant revision of existing courses.

Excellent: The candidate meets the required criteria for Teaching and Educational Activity in both undergraduate and graduate training as described above.

Good: The candidate meets the required criteria for Teaching and Educational Activity in one of the required areas but is only partially successful in the second area.

Fair: The candidate meets the required criteria for Teaching and Educational Activity in one of the required areas but is ineffective in the second area or is partially successful in both of the required areas.

Unacceptable: The candidate fails to meet the criteria in either of the required areas for Teaching and Educational Activity.

To be eligible for promotion to professor a candidate must be rated as “excellent” or “outstanding” in Teaching.

*Service.* Professors are expected to provide leadership through service within the university, the state and local community, and the scientific community at large. The candidate for promotion to, or tenure at the rank of Full Professor should present a record of noteworthy service, which demonstrates a willingness and ability to contribute expertise in the university, community and scientific realms. Appropriate examples of service commensurate with Full Professor rank are:

Within the University ...

1. Appointments or elections to chair or other offices of university-wide committees or service in the Faculty Senate.
2. Active leadership within the department, such as heading search committees, engaging in special projects, undertaking administrative functions, organizing professional meetings, and conducting in-depth studies.
3. Appointment to and effective performance in compensated administrative posts within the department, college or university. However,

in no instance will promotion to full professorship be based primarily upon administrative service or position.

Within the community ...

1. Service on public advisory panels, boards or workshops.
2. Election to office or other special recognition by civic organizations.
3. Consulting service, whether compensated or not.
4. Professional service to the media as a scientific consultant, or broadcast or telecast participant.
5. Public educational activities, including educational (K-12) outreach activities.

Within the scientific community ...

1. Editor of a journal.
2. Officer in a professional organization.
3. Service on grant panels or editorial review boards.
4. Organization of symposia, conferences, etc.
5. Consultation.

In accordance with the Faculty Manual (12/17/2013) the performance of candidates for promotion to full professor must be rated as “outstanding, excellent, good, fair, or unacceptable”. In the area of Service the candidate will be assessed as follows:

**Outstanding:** The candidate significantly exceeds the required criteria of providing effective service as assigned. The candidate provides leadership in service activities within the university, the state and local community, and the scientific community at large. To be rated as “outstanding” the candidate must provide effective leadership and service at each of these levels.

**Excellent:** The candidate meets the required criteria of providing effective service as describe above for Full Professors.

**Good:** The candidate has provided effective service at some but not all of the levels expected for a full professor.

**Fair:** The candidate provides minimal or ineffective service as described above.

Unacceptable: The candidate fails to provide service as described above.

To be eligible for promotion to professor a candidate must be rated as at least good in Service.”

**III. The general qualifications for each rank are described in the Faculty Manual (12/17/2013, page 17) under "Appointments".**

Notice particularly:

Professor

"The faculty member normally is expected to hold the earned doctor's degree and have at least nine years of effective, relevant experience."

Associate Professor

"The faculty member normally is expected to hold the earned doctor's degree and must possess strong potential for further development as a teacher and scholar.."

**Formulated by the Advisory Committee of the Biology Department (W.D. Dawson, B.E. Ely, J.M. Herr, R.H. Sawyer, E.A. Thompson, F.J. Vernberg, L.T. Wimer). Adopted by the Tenured Faculty of the Department without dissenting votes 1 October 1984.**

**Formulated by the Ad Hoc Committee to review the Tenure and Promotion policy of the Biological Sciences Department (F.F. Bolander, M.R. Felder, J.M. Quattro, D.C. Yoch).**

**Adopted by the Tenured Faculty of the Department without dissenting votes 15 February 1996.**

**Formulated by the Ad Hoc Committee to review the Tenure and Promotion policy of the Biological Sciences Department (T.J. Hilbish, S.A. Woodin, D. Reisman, R.M. Showman, and E.L. Connolly). Adopted by the Tenure-Track Faculty September 2001.**

**Formulated by the Ad Hoc Committee to review the Tenure and Promotion policy of the Department of Biological Sciences (T.J. Hilbish, L.H. Bowman, J.W. Stratmann, R.C. Patel, and D.S. Wethey). Adopted by the Tenured Faculty, 22 September 2011, and, after changes requested by the UCTP were addressed, 8 September 2014.**