

Virginia Tech

Department of Biological Sciences

Policy and Governance Manual

Approved October 19, 2006; Revised October 23, 2006, December 11, 2007, May 2, 2012, November 16, 2017, and December 27, 2019

SECTIONS:

- 1) INTRODUCTION and RATIONALE
- 2) STRUCTURE OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES
- 3) EXECUTIVE AND PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
- 4) EVALUATION OF FACULTY AND SETTING LEARNING, DISCOVERY AND ENGAGEMENT EXPECTATIONS
- 5) POST-TENURE REVIEW
- 6) BUYING OUT TEACHING
- 7) BRIDGE FUNDING
- 8) SUPPORT OF GRADUATE STUDENTS
- 9) ADJUNCT AND AFFILIATED FACULTY APPOINTMENTS
- 10) ASSIGNMENT OF SPACE FOR RESEARCH OPERATIONS
- 11) OBLIGATIONS CONCERNING EQUIPMENT, MATERIALS, AND FACILITIES UPON RETIREMENT OR DEPARTURE FROM THE DEPARTMENT

1) INTRODUCTION and RATIONALE

The Department

Biological Sciences is one of nine units (eight departments and a school) within the College of Science at Virginia Tech. Encompassing a broad array of life science disciplines, the Department provides programs to meet the following mission:

- (1) *DISCOVERY: The use of innovative research to generate new knowledge in the biological sciences.* Our faculty are engaged in a broad array of basic and applied research.
- (2) *LEARNING: Comprehensive education in biological sciences to foster learning for life at the undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral levels.* Department programs encompass learning, training, and experience in all levels of biological hierarchy from molecular to global.
- (3) *ENGAGEMENT: Partnerships with the public and industry to facilitate understanding of the natural world and enhance the quality of life.* Biological Science faculty members, students, and staff are involved in a number of outreach projects and service with public agencies, schools, industry, the public, and professional societies.

Leadership and Representation

Leadership is provided by:

- A Department Head appointed by the dean in consultation with the faculty and staff, and Assistant or Associate Head(s) appointed by the Department Head in consultation with faculty and staff
- The faculty as a whole, who have the rights and ultimate responsibility for defining departmental policy
- Various combinations of elected and appointed faculty, staff, students, alumni, and friends serving on standing committees
- Volunteer and appointed faculty, staff, and students serving on various ad hoc committees

It is a goal of the Department to have open and frequent communication between leadership (including committee chairs and members and the various faculty committees and Department Head) and department constituents (including faculty, staff, students, alumni, and citizens of Virginia).

Policies included in this document

Many department policies and procedures (e.g., the tenure and promotion process, accounting, and personnel management) are defined by the president, provost, dean, university council, controller and state and federal law. This document includes only those policies and procedures that: 1) are set and controlled by the Department, and 2) are of sufficient impact and importance to require written documentation.

Procedures for changing policies in this document

- 1) A faculty member submits proposed changes in writing to the Department Head or the Faculty Executive and Personnel Committee (EPC); or the EPC or Department Head suggest a change
- 2) The EPC examines the proposal, and if approved by the EPC, proposes the wording to modify existing policy, and brings the proposed changes for discussion and approval at a regular faculty meeting. Or, if the EPC feels that the changes are non-controversial (e.g., if a prior discussion indicates very strong support), a vote by email for approval of changes is acceptable
- 3) Relevant University or College policies supersede departmental policies, resulting in automatic changes to policies in this document

2) STRUCTURE OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

Standing committees, boards, mentors, and centers formed for specific tasks are listed below. Except for the Alumni Advisory Board, Curriculum Committee, and EPC (all of which have established charters or meet university requirements), standing committees can be restructured, renamed, combined with others, or deleted with approval from a majority of the EPC.

Alumni Advisory Board

- Composed of alumni and friends of the Department who are appointed according to a charter established by the board
- Provides advice, reviews of programs, and assistance in meeting department missions and goals

Curriculum Committee

- Has representation from across the major sub-disciplines in the Department
- Considers course and undergraduate and graduate curricular proposals forwarded by faculty members in the Department and from other academic units that may affect teaching programs in the Department
- Examines and evaluates the structure and effectiveness of curricula and makes recommendations for improvements and changes when warranted

Diversity Committee

- Has representation from staff, graduate students, and faculty
- Conducts activities aimed at improving the work environment and increasing representation of underrepresented groups in department programs and staffing

Executive and Personnel Committee (see next section)

Faculty and Student Recognition Committees

- Has representation that includes individuals familiar with discovery, learning, and engagement programs (student committee includes at least one individual from the undergraduate advising center)
- Identifies candidates for various scholarships, honors, and awards, and assists in preparing nominations (or in the case of scholarships, makes the final decision on award winners)
- Uses information from a variety of sources, including annual faculty evaluations by the EPC, self-nominations, and student records, to identify nominees

Graduate Student Evaluation Committee

- Has representation from across the major sub-disciplines in the Department
- Reviews graduate student files to evaluate if adequate progress toward the degree is occurring
- Informs Department Head of exceptional and sub-par performance

Graduate Student Selection Committee

- Consists of at least one representative from each major sub-discipline in the Department
- Evaluates graduate applications for acceptable credentials and recommends acceptance or declines to the Department Head
- Makes certain that an appropriate group of faculty members is polled for evaluating applications and determining if there is a potential major advisor for each student
- Participates in active recruitment activities to improve the quality and quantity of applicants

Undergraduate Academic Advising Center

- Includes staff and faculty
- Handles most of the day to day academic advising for undergraduate Biological Sciences majors and minors, and other students who are considering a Biological Sciences major or minor

- Assists in career advising by assigning students to faculty members with appropriate expertise, and encouraging students to meet with faculty
- Is responsible for conducting summer orientation and organizing commencement ceremonies

Faculty Mentors

- Consist of tenured faculty members assigned to each untenured faculty member on tenure track
- Provide advice for achieving tenure and promotion
- Follow guidelines outlined in a departmental mentoring document that is maintained by and shared with mentors and new faculty

3) EXECUTIVE AND PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (EPC)

The EPC forms the heart of the departmental governance system. It is responsible for promotion and tenure recommendations as defined by university policy (see faculty handbook), annual faculty evaluations (see section on evaluation below), providing a conduit for frequent communication between the faculty and the Department Head, and providing advice on the operations of the Department and its programs. The following description of the committee is adapted from a Memo dated April 4, 1983, composed by Dr. Ernest Stout, Department Head, and modified in the 2005-6 and 2019-20 academic years to align with practices that were in place at those times.

Composition

Three Professors, two Associate Professors, at least one Assistant Professor, and at least one non-TT faculty member are elected by the faculty members within each of the respective ranks. In addition, the Department Head appoints one T/TT faculty member whose primary appointment is at the Fralin Biomedical Research Institute and up to three additional faculty members to provide desirable disciplinary, gender or other types of balance, with the provision that the number of Professors on the committee exceeds that of any other rank.

Terms

Elected Full and Associate Professor serve two-year terms; elected Assistant Professors and non-TT faculty members serve a one-year term. Terms are staggered in time to ensure that the committee always has experienced individuals. All appointed members serve for one year.

Eligibility

Faculty members are not eligible in a year in which they are being considered for tenure or promotion. Vacancies occurring before the completion of a term are filled by another election or appointment as appropriate. In elections, eligible faculty members are listed on the ballot, but voting is within ranks. In practice, faculty members who have just served a term, or who are scheduled for a sabbatical during the term of service, are not listed on the ballot.

Voting Responsibility

All members vote on all matters before the Committee, except promotion and tenure decisions for T/TT faculty, where only tenured faculty are eligible to vote. In addition, the Department Head does not vote as part of the committee on promotion and tenure decisions. Rather, the committee discusses the merits of the candidates and frame their recommendations without the department head in attendance. Votes for sensitive matters, including tenure and promotion decision, will be conducted by secret ballot with each member given the option of voting yes or no, or abstaining. If sensitive matters involve a conflict of interest (COI, see below), the person with a conflict should leave the room during the discussion.

Conflict of Interest (COI)

Conflicts of interest occur when sensitive matters (e.g., promotion and tenure, annual performance based on FARs) are being discussed and a member of the EPC is a spouse or partner, or has very substantial collaborations with the faculty member being discussed. In case of doubt, the EPC member should discuss potential COI with the Department Head before sensitive discussions take place. Any faculty member who believes that an EPC member has a potential COI, may alert the Department Head of this potential.

4) EVALUATION OF FACULTY AND SETTING LEARNING, DISCOVERY, AND ENGAGEMENT

Prepared by the Department Head and Executive and Personnel Committee
December 16, 2003; updated February 11-22, 2004; April 14, 2004; September 28, 2006

Departmental Goals - Faculty are expected to contribute to the following three major categories (shown below with examples listed for each):

- (1) Discovery (Research)
 - a. Generate high quality, high impact research/scholarship as judged by peers at other institutions
 - b. Generate funding to support research/scholarship and graduate/postdoc training

- (2) Learning (Teaching)
 - a. Provide post-baccalaureate research training with emphasis on Ph.D. students and postdocs
 - b. Provide undergraduate research training
 - c. Provide high-quality classroom and laboratory instruction
 - d. Provide international dimensions to learning at Virginia Tech
 - e. Generate funding to support educational initiatives

- (3) Engagement (Outreach and Service)
 - a. Provide support to governance of the department/college/university
 - b. Provide support to relevant professional organizations
 - c. Provide continuing or public education

Evaluating Faculty Contributions to the Goals and Mission of the Department

The Department recognizes that individuals have different talents and interests, and supports the idea that maximum progress toward departmental goals will be made if individuals are allowed to vary in the time allocated to discovery, learning, and engagement. It is clear that excellence in discovery is always highly regarded and rewarded, and is necessary for tenure and promotion. To encourage and reward excellent contributions in learning and engagement, the Department has developed a procedure that will divide the total departmental work load and allocate it to individual faculty members in an objective and fair manner, and will reward those who carry large learning and engagement responsibilities and also perform well in those areas. The evaluation procedure is a two-step process beginning with the assignment of percentage of faculty time allocated to learning (i.e., specific teaching loads), discovery, and engagement, and ending with evaluation of performance by the EPC, Department Head, and Dean.

Procedure for Setting Variable Learning, Discovery and Engagement Assignments:

- (1) Guidelines for teaching responsibilities are outlined in Table 1.

- (2) Each spring, faculty members must use Table 1 to submit a proposed 3-year outline of teaching responsibilities along with the Faculty Activity Report (FAR). The outline will be evaluated by the Department Head and EPC. By summer, each faculty member will be notified if the plan is accepted or in need of modification to meet specific departmental needs. This is meant to be a fluid, flexible process, with room for making changes if mutually agreeable to faculty members and Department Head, and to meet changing needs of the faculty and Department.

Procedure for Evaluating Faculty Performance:

- (1) FARs will be evaluated by the EPC, Department Head, and Dean each year.
- (2) Using the general performance criteria listed in Table 2, the EPC and Department Head will assign a score of 0-10 (5 = meeting expectations, 10 = outstanding) to the research, teaching and service components of each faculty member's contributions. In determining these scores, the EPC and Department Head must weigh many nuances; there is no specific numerical procedure that can adequately capture the quality and amount of scholarship that each faculty member contributes.
- (3) To provide a fair assessment of how faculty members are performing based on the individualized expectations that each faculty member has, a weighted overall score will be calculated using the procedure outlined in Table 3. Both the individual categorical scores (discover, learning and engagement) and overall weighted score will be used by the Department Head and Dean to evaluate relative performance of faculty. The weighted score will be particularly useful to reward faculty members who have large learning and engagement expectations and perform well in these areas.
- (4) The weighted overall scores, and the relative standing of individual faculty members within the department, are to remain confidential. This information will not be made known to anyone outside of the EPC with the exception of the Dean, including the faculty members themselves.

5) POST-TENURE REVIEW

This policy was constructed and approved by faculty during 2003-2004, with current wording set in March 2004. In fall 2006, the name of the Department was changed from Biology to Biological Sciences, and other minor changes were instituted to make this document consistent with wording in the other faculty policies included in this manual.

1. General

This document provides details and procedures on evaluation policy and criteria specific to the Department of Biological Sciences and is intended to be in compliance with the University Policies and Procedures related to Unsatisfactory Performance and Post-Tenure Review contained in Section 2.9 of the Faculty Handbook. Nothing in this document should be interpreted as abridging those policies. Faculty members shall adhere to standards of conduct and ethical behavior as stated in the Faculty Handbook and/or promulgated through other official channels. These standards should in no way be interpreted as an attempt to restrict academic freedom, expression of minority opinions, or honest and civil disagreement with administrative actions.

2. Policy

The Department of Biological Sciences has a history of thorough annual assessments of the performance of tenured and tenure-track faculty members for decisions regarding tenure, promotion and merit-increase in salary. Thorough peer evaluations continue to be completed by elected and appointed members of the EPC. The annual assessment can lead to an unsatisfactory evaluation that without satisfactory remediation will invoke a Post-Tenure Review. The evaluation process will take into account extenuating circumstances that may have adversely affected faculty performance or productivity in any given year. For example, starting new projects or training new graduate students may delay published papers, or grant and contract funding, and may vary from year to year. Therefore, an Unsatisfactory rating is based on more than a short-term drop in any one aspect of the faculty member's performance. The Department Head and EPC will take into account both the nature of the faculty member's assignment and any such extenuating circumstances as part of the evaluation process.

In those cases where the overall performance is substantially below that expected for the rank, the Department Head in consultation with the EPC may designate an individual's performance to be Unsatisfactory (U). When a first U rating has been assigned the Department Head and EPC will work with the affected faculty member to develop a plan for improved performance. The intent is that successful implementation of the plan will prevent a second U designation and avoid the initiation of the formal Post-Tenure Review process. A second consecutive U designation initiates the Post-Tenure Review procedures described in the Faculty Handbook.

3. Review Criteria

A list of qualitative and quantitative criteria used to evaluate faculty learning, discovery and engagement activities is shown in Table 2. These criteria form the primary basis for post-tenure review.

A. Learning (teaching)

Contributions of a faculty member to the learning mission of the Department are judged on the basis of a number of teaching, mentoring, and related activities, such as number of classes and students taught per year, course development, and advising effectiveness. Student and peer evaluations are important parameters to assess the quality of teaching effectiveness.

The goals of successful teaching and learning programs are numerous. They include conveyance of materials to ensure that students learn an appropriate portion of the knowledge of a field, the sense of standards and culture of the field, and methods for continuous learning applicable to the field. A faculty member is expected to demonstrate success with students in achieving these goals.

The assessment of a faculty member's teaching performance is multifaceted. Unsatisfactory performance would be assessed as poor performance in a majority of the learning activities (see Table 2 for examples) that the faculty member is expected to do.

B. Discovery (research)

Contributions of a faculty member to the research mission of the Department are judged principally on the basis of maintaining a productive research program, including supportive funding, scholarly publications, and communication of current research at appropriate meetings. The evaluation should include a discussion of research quality. Interdisciplinary and educational contributions are to be included where present.

The assessment of a faculty member's success in achieving a satisfactory performance in discovery is multifaceted. While a faculty member is expected to have activity in the majority of the areas in Table 2, significant achievement in these areas or outstanding performance in one or two areas would surely be considered satisfactory.

Unsatisfactory performance is defined as little or no activity in most of the areas listed in Table 2, with no off-setting strong performance in one or more areas for more than a year.

C. Engagement (outreach and service)

Engagement contributions, including outreach and service, of a faculty member are principally judged on contributions to the local and broader university community, to one's profession and scholarly societies, and to society broadly defined, including agencies, industry, and the public.

Faculty members are expected to exhibit a level of outreach and service activity commensurate with their academic rank and with their assigned duties. Faculty members whose engagement contributions are at or near the average of comparable members in the Department would clearly be successful. Little or no activity in most of the above categories (defined in detail in Table 2) would constitute unsatisfactory performance.

4. Overall Unsatisfactory Performance

The designation of Unsatisfactory Performance cannot be used if the faculty member has satisfactory performance in two of the three areas of responsibilities (learning, discovery, and engagement). In particular, this designation is not intended to indicate activity that is simply below average. Procedures for academic advancement, personal satisfaction, and merit increases are normally sufficient inducements for faculty members to perform at satisfactory levels. However, in those cases wherein performance is judged by the EPC to be unsatisfactory in two or three areas of responsibilities (learning, discovery, and engagement) or in 60% or more of a faculty member's assignment, the U designation may be appropriate. The reasons for the U must be conveyed to the faculty member, in writing, at the time of the annual evaluation letters to the faculty.

5. Selection of Post-Tenure Review Committee

Should it become necessary to assemble a Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC), as outlined in Section 2.9 of the Faculty Handbook, the Department will follow one of two procedures at the choice of the faculty member under review (FMUR). Actions taken by the PTRC require a majority vote of the committee.

If the FMUR wishes to keep the review as confidential as possible, the 5-member PTRC will be selected as follows. The FMUR and the EPC will each nominate five faculty members. Members of the current and previous year EPC cannot serve on the PTRC unless they are nominated by the FMUR. Two names will be removed from each list; two from the EPC list by the FMUR and two from the FMUR list by the EPC. If all six faculty members on the final list can serve, the Department Head and FMUR will work together to reduce the list to 5 members. If an agreement cannot be reached on the final reduction to five members, the Dean will be asked to make the final decision. The PTRC may not have more than one member from the EPC nor more than two members from outside the Department. Only tenured faculty members may serve on the PTRC.

If the FMUR is willing for the post-tenure review to be more broadly known among the faculty, selection of the PTRC will be by the Biological Sciences faculty at a called meeting. A slate of ten tenured faculty members (5 selected by the FMUR and 5 by the EPC) will be presented to the faculty in an open meeting. If the FMUR wishes to ensure that a Virginia Tech faculty member from outside the Department is on the PTRC, he/she must nominate at least three faculty members from outside the Department on his/her slate. In such case, the Department must elect at least one outside member for the PTRC. The faculty will then elect five members by secret ballot counted by the Department Head and the FMUR or their representatives. The PTRC may not have more than one member from the EPC nor more than two faculty members from outside the Department. Only tenured faculty members can serve on the PTRC.

If an EPC member is not selected for the PTRC in either process, it is recommended that someone from the EPC serve as a resource person to the PTRC.

6) BUYING OUT TEACHING (adopted by faculty vote, October 2007)

Introduction

This policy provides a mechanism for faculty to request time off from teaching provided that they meet specified criteria and the department has the flexibility to support the request.

Rationale

- Our teaching load exceeds that for top tier programs at peer institutions (in non-agricultural and non-medical departments). Specifically, our average is close to 2 courses per year while the averages for cell and molecular biology are closer to 1 and those for organismal biology are closer to 1.5.
- It is vitally important for research faculty to contribute to teaching; most everyone agrees that a minimum of one course per academic year is needed to have a healthy and balanced set of research and teaching programs that provide synergies (i.e., both teaching and research benefit)

- Teaching time buyout is a permissible practice at Virginia Tech.

Procedures

- Request for buyout must be made to, and approved by the executive and personnel committee (EPC). In making its decision, the EPC will consider the impacts of the request on the department's teaching program, the potential for growth or continuation of successful research programs, and research training and mentoring.
- Those making a request are responsible for certifying that their grants provide the opportunity to compensate the department for the buyout. It is advised to have a discussion with the department head well ahead of time to make certain that the finances will work as planned.
- It is encouraged to use strategies that reduce teaching but also avoid fragmentation of courses that may diminish teaching quality.
- If approved, the details of administering the buyout will be handled by the department head.
- Maximum allowable buyout rate is one course per two years.
- Faculty with approved buyouts are expected to maintain a full-time commitment to the department and university. Most faculty will devote the released time from teaching to research activities, although they might also choose to commit some or all of this time to increased service or outreach. However, a buyout is not intended to relieve faculty members of their normal departmental service and citizenship responsibilities.
- Use of this policy cannot result in a faculty member teaching no classes within any one academic year.
- The cost of one course buyout will be 1/5 of the beginning salary of the last three assistant professor hires. For the 2019-2000 academic year this would translate into a cost of \$16,200.
- The buyout can be concatenated with other mechanisms used for teaching load reductions, resulting in extended periods in which only one course is taught per year. Here is an example: over a four-year grant, two courses could be bought out for ~\$32,400, and these could be applied at ½ course per year over four years, resulting in a teaching load of just one course per year over the entire four year period. In the year before this grant, it may be possible that the faculty member was taking a course reduction according to our variable teaching plan. Thus, the individual would have 5 years in a row of one course taught per year.
- Buyout funds will be used by the department for teaching only. If several faculty elect to take this (and over time, if we always have ~ three faculty on this plan) we can hire an additional instructor who will be able to teach four courses per year. To the extent possible, this instructor will help in the areas where the department is running short due to the buyouts.

7) BRIDGE FUNDING (adopted by faculty vote, September 2007)

Introduction

This policy provides guidance on how bridge funding can be requested by faculty to keep research momentum going after a grant funding expires. The goal is to keep research programs competitive for obtaining new funding.

Rationale

- Funding to support research programs is very difficult to obtain, and even with excellent grant proposals, it is very common for faculty to have a gap between grants.
- Loss of funding, even for a short time, can reduce the momentum of a research program, and jeopardize the capacity to get a grant renewal or new grant.
- Bridge funding can enhance the chances for success for the investments that individual faculty and the department have made in research programs.

Procedures

- In anticipation of a need for bridge funding in the future, the department head will establish an overhead account. To build long-term capacity to supply bridge funding, the account will receive annual deposits as needed, and to the extent that department budgets allow. The department head, however, can use other non-overhead funds, if available, to provide needed bridge funding.
- Request for bridge funding proposal must be made to the executive committee in writing, using no more than two pages of text. The proposals should include a budget, and an explicit plan for positioning the research program to obtain additional external funding.
- For faculty between grants, all existing graduate students in their lab will automatically go on GTA support. Therefore, bridge fund proposals should focus on materials, supplies, travel funds, and if strongly justified, student or technical labor funding. It is not encouraged to use bridge funding to support or continue postdoc appointments.
- The maximum duration of an individual bridge fund will be two years.
- The executive committee simultaneously provides the department head and the faculty member making the proposal its recommendation for funding at high, medium or low priority, or a recommendation not to fund.
- The department head will use all means available to honor requests recommended for funding. Limits on available funds and multiple requests made within a year may lead to approved budgets that are smaller than requested.

8) SUPPORT OF GRADUATE STUDENTS (adopted by faculty vote, March 2012)

Graduate students are guaranteed 12 months of support as long as they continue to make satisfactory progress toward their degree requirements, as determined by the department's Graduate Review Committee. The department may provide GTA support in the fall and spring semesters as resources allow, up to the limits outlined in the department's Graduate Program Policies and Procedures document. Summer support in the form of a GRA must be provided by the advisor; the only exceptions are for students who are on fellowships (e.g. Cunningham, ICTAS) where the department has committed matching funds or where the advisor has made special arrangements with the department, for example, for temporary bridge funding as outlined in section 7 above.

9) ADJUNCT AND AFFILIATED FACULTY APPOINTMENTS (adopted by faculty vote, March 2012)

Individuals requesting adjunct or affiliated status in the Department must submit a letter describing the rationale for the request and a full academic c.v., as well as a letter of support from at least one faculty member in the department. If the appointment is considered to be advantageous to both the candidate and the department by the Executive and Personnel Committee, a formal seminar may be arranged and feedback will be solicited from the full faculty. Approval of the request will require a minimum 2/3 majority vote in favor from the Executive and Personnel Committee. All appointments will be for three-year terms, at which point they may be renewed by the Executive and Personnel Committee upon written request by the adjunct faculty member.

It is department policy that adjunct and affiliated faculty may serve as co-chairs of graduate student advisory committees together with a tenured or tenure-track faculty member in Biological Sciences.

10) ASSIGNMENT OF SPACE FOR RESEARCH OPERATIONS (adopted by faculty vote, November 2017)

The department is committed to supporting faculty research programs by providing space and equipment appropriate for a faculty member's scholarship, research funding, and student training. Acknowledging that programs may experience cycles of growth and shrinkage, faculty should be prepared to be flexible with regard to space assignments. Opportunities may arise for faculty to expand or move to other facilities. Conversely, it may be necessary to share space or have space reassigned to accommodate department needs. Decisions concerning reassignments will be made by the Department Head in consultation with the Executive and Personnel Committee.

11) OBLIGATIONS REGARDING EQUIPMENT, MATERIALS, AND FACILITIES UPON RETIREMENT OR DEPARTURE FROM THE DEPARTMENT (adopted by faculty vote, March 2012)

Upon retirement or departure from the department, faculty members may retain their original office and research space, or may be assigned alternative space, only through special agreement with the department. These agreements will typically be made with the understanding that the faculty member will maintain an active teaching and/or research program consistent with the missions of the department. The agreements will be reviewed annually and are contingent on submission of a two year plan, as well as an annual Faculty Activities Report documenting the professional activities carried out within these facilities.

Prior to the faculty member's final day of employment at Virginia Tech or the termination of a space occupancy agreement, it is expected that all personal property be removed and that arrangements be made to donate, surplus, recycle, properly dispose of, or transfer all documents, books, chemicals, and other research materials, including electronic data. In doing so, faculty members should keep in mind that all materials, furniture, and equipment purchased with university or grant funds are the property of the university and that all arrangements for disposal or redistribution of these items must therefore be made in cooperation with the department.

Table 1. Discovery/learning assignment guide.

Categories	Teaching Responsibility	How Determined
(A) New faculty	3 semesters off/4 years	Automatic; semesters off chosen by faculty
(B) Research scholarship exceptionally good as determined by presence of national competitive grant support; high quality, quantity, or potential impact of publications; funds generated to support postdocs or GRAs, and evidence for excellent advising of graduate and undergraduate research; etc.	1 semester off/2 years ¹	Automatic in case of a new or renewed nationally competitive grant (Faculty and Department Head together determine semester(s) with no teaching); If no nationally funded grant in hand, can be determined by Department Head in consultation with faculty EPC
(C) Research scholarship meets expectations for average teaching & research faculty member in Department; e.g., one or more of the following: publication record about 2 pubs/yr, applications made for competitive extramural grants, some extramural funding in hand, some graduate and/or undergraduate research training in lab, etc.	1 course each semester	Automatic
(D) Research program somewhat below expectations for average teaching and research faculty; e.g., at least one scholarly publication/year but without nationally funded grants for more than three years, no postdocs, and few or no graduate student and undergraduate research trainees	3 courses/year	Faculty can volunteer or be directed to choose by EPC and Department Head in accordance with results of FAR reviews
(E) Instructors and tenured faculty with no or minimal research; e.g., little or no involvement in graduate or undergraduate research education, no publications for last two or more years, etc.	4 courses/year	Faculty can volunteer or be directed to choose by EPC and Department Head in accordance with results of FAR reviews
(F) Dedicated Teaching Faculty; teaching scholarship must be exceptional as determined by teaching awards, innovations in teaching, grants, and publications in pedagogy, learning, etc.	3-4 courses/ year	Faculty identifies interest and applies to EPC; EPC and Head must approve request; Evaluations consider teaching scholarship
(G) New research or special initiatives	1 semester off	Application submitted to EPC at time of FAR
(H) Special administrative assignment	Possible reduced teaching	Negotiations with Department Head

¹Teaching release resulting from a 6-month Research Assignment, but not from a 12-month Study Research Leave, counts as the 1 semester off/2 years; this is because the department receives resources to compensate for the lost contribution to teaching only for the latter. (Adopted by faculty vote, March 2012.)

Table 2. Criteria Used to Assess Quality and Quantity of Faculty Contributions

NOTES: 1) Items in lists are not presented in order of importance, and 2) The totality of all quantitative and qualitative indicators must be used to evaluate performance.

Preamble	As the Department assesses teaching loads, it affirms its commitment to encourage, recognize, and reward quality in discovery, learning, and engagement.
Discovery	<p>Indicators of the quality of discovery activities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The significance of peer-reviewed publications, as judged by the reputation of the journal in which they appear and the impact of the research on the field of biology • The significance and impact of other scholarly publications • The degree to which an individual contributes, leads, or inspires collaborative projects • Peer recognition (e.g., awards, editorships) • The initiation of new and imaginative research efforts • Whether grants received are from competitive, peer-evaluated programs • Obtaining outside financial support for graduate students and postdocs
	<p>Measures of the quantity of discovery activities include the numbers of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Books and monographs • Book chapters • Refereed journal articles • Invited review papers and/or presentations • Grant proposals submitted and funded • Notes, review articles, and shorter communications in technical journals. Published book reviews, letters to the editor, instructional videos, manuals, articles in trade journals and society magazines, etc. • Talks and posters presented at professional meetings • Patents
Learning	<p>Indicators of the quality of learning activities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The quality of an individual's teaching, as judged by student and peer evaluations and by teaching awards • Involvement in teaching as judged by new teaching initiatives and participation in teaching related activities such as workshops • The successful mentoring of undergraduate, M.S., and Ph.D. students and postdoctorals as judged by the successful completion of degrees, student publications, student-obtained research grants, and professional success of former postdoctorals and students • The quality of academic advising as determined by student demand for advising services, activities of clubs that are being advised, and solicited and unsolicited feedback obtained by the Biology Academic Advising Center
	<p>Measures of the quantity of learning activities include the numbers of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students, classes, and laboratories taught per year • Textbooks published • Guest lectures • Undergraduate students advised • New classes and laboratories developed • New teaching methods and materials developed and used • Graduate and independent study students taught or advised • Postdoctorals, graduate, and undergraduate students advised in research • Students or groups advised in special advising programs • Student evaluations of courses taught and classroom performance • Learning grant proposals submitted and funded

<p>Engage- ment</p>	<p>Indicators of the quality of engagement activities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact of service activities in governance and operations of the department, college, and university as judged by time commitment to these activities, leadership provided, and outcomes of efforts such as the establishment of new policies, an increase in the quality of work life or cultural and ethnic diversity within the university, or the achievement of other university, college, or departmental goals • The impact of service activities to the profession, as judged by time commitment to these activities, leadership, and positive outcomes of the efforts • The impact, time committed, and leadership in public service (in the biological field) and special biology programs such as continuing education • The impact and quality of the outreach publications • The obtaining of funds to support engagement, and whether the funds come from competitive grant programs
	<p>Measures of the quantity of engagement activities include:</p> <p><i>Outreach and continuing education:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Editorship(s) of outreach or continuing education journals • Number of peer-reviewed outreach works published • Number of grants submitted and funded • Number of conferences and workshops organized or conducted and numbers of people attending <p><i>Service to Profession:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offices held or number of committee assignments • Number of papers, proposals, and textbook manuscripts reviewed • Number of conference proceedings edited • Service on grant or program review panels • Number of sessions chaired at professional conferences <p><i>Service to department, college, or university:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of committees and committee activities • Number of student activities or organizations advised or sponsored • Special service appointments such as administrative appointments • Hosting of seminar speakers • Number of events or activities conducted or people recruited to build a more culturally rich and welcoming work/study environment <p><i>Service to community, state, and beyond:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of public lectures • Number of consulting ventures • Number of local, regional, state, national, or international boards served • Number of popular articles published

Table 3. Guidelines for determining percent discovery/learning/engagement appointment and weighted faculty evaluation scores. Note: These are approximate guidelines.

Step 1: Determine appointment assuming service ~10% (service can be modified on a case-by case basis, to be negotiated with head prior to year of evaluation)

Assignment Category (From Table 1)	Number of courses* taught per year	Learning (teaching) appointment (%)	Discovery (research) appointment (%)	Engagement (service) appointment (%)
A	1.5	30	60	10
B	1.5	30	60	10
C	2	40	50	10
D	3	60	30	10
E	4	80	10	10
F	3-4	70	20	10
G	variable	variable	variable	>10

* a single course is ~ 3 credit lecture class with 25 or more students. The evaluation of quality of effort can be used to provide more weight for larger classes, more credit hours of teaching, or special work loads such as writing intensive or study abroad.

Step 2: Weight evaluation scores by appointment. For example:

Appointment (% teaching: research: service)	Learning			Discovery			Engagement			Weighted Total Score
	Score	Weight	SXW	Score	Weight	SXW	Score	Weight	SXW	
30 - 60 - 10	7	0.30	2.1	3	0.60	1.80	6	0.10	0.60	4.50
80 - 10 - 10	7	0.80	5.60	3	0.10	0.30	6	0.10	0.60	6.50