

BYLAWS FOR ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE  
DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE  
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Revised by the Departmental Advisory Committee on November 2020  
Approved by the Faculty on November 9, 2020

## Table of Contents

Cover page .....	1
Table of contents.....	2
Department Mission, Vision, and Values .....	3
Preamble .....	4
Article 1. The Faculty .....	5
1.1 Composition of the Faculty	
1.2 Composition of the Voting Faculty	
1.3 Non-Voting Members of the Department	
1.4 Modes of Participation	
1.5 Faculty Meetings	
1.6 Terms and Conditions for Voting Faculty Appointments	
1.7 Mentoring Process for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure	
1.8 Annual Performance Reviews	
1.9 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure	
Article 2. Students.....	10
Article 3. Department Organization.....	11
3.1 Department Chairperson	
3.2 Department Associate Chairperson	
3.3 Committees	
Article 4. Grievance and Hearing Procedures.....	20
4.1 Constituency	
4.2 Initiation of Grievances and Hearing Procedures	
4.3 Formal Hearing Procedures	
4.4 Student Grievances	
Article 5. Establishment of Bylaws .....	23
5.1 Interpretation	
5.2 Amendments	
5.3 Review of the Bylaws	
Appendices	
(1) Guidelines for Voting on Tenure, Reappointment, and Promotion	
(2) Guidelines for Annual Evaluation of Faculty	
(3) Guidelines for Evaluation of Faculty in Teaching, Research, and Outreach	
(4) Developing Performance Expectations for Fisheries and Wildlife Faculty	
(5) Elements of a Strong P&T Package	
(6) Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure	
(7) Faculty Mentoring in the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife	
(8) Selection Procedure for the Department Chair Search Committee	

## **The Department of Fisheries and Wildlife**

The Department of Fisheries and Wildlife was established in 1950 with faculty drawn from several different units. Since that time, both the faculty and the issues of importance in fisheries and wildlife have changed significantly. Our Mission, Vision, and Values build on our core strengths and prepare us for continuing change in societal needs, scientific understanding, and educational priorities.

### **Department Mission**

To build local, national, and international capacities to conserve ecosystems that support fish, wildlife, and society through integrated programs in research, education, and engagement.

### **Department Vision**

To be a world-class, inclusive, and innovative research, education, and engagement community that promotes leadership in conservation of fisheries and wildlife resources.

### **Department Values**

Diversity and Inclusion: We believe a diverse, inclusive working and learning environment enriches the department and fosters innovation in teaching, research, and engagement with partners and the public.

Integrity and Professionalism: We expect all members of the department to uphold the highest ethical standards in our work and personal conduct, with shared responsibility and accountability. We act in keeping with our values, mission, and vision.

Collaboration: We engage with partners and pursue collegial, interdisciplinary efforts within diverse teams to support our individual and collective professional and educational goals.

Leadership: We seek to empower students, faculty, and staff to lead on campus and beyond, and to empower others through partnership and shared experiences.

Adaptability: In a rapidly changing world, we rigorously adapt our approaches and practices to (a) student populations, (b) scientific innovations, and (c) emerging means of communication and engagement.

Transparency: We are committed to honest and open communication about the actions we take.

Innovation: We seek to advance the frontiers of science, learning and engagement, to improve management outcomes for our shared natural and social environment.

Balance: We are committed to creating and maintaining a supportive environment that respects the diverse life challenges and personal commitments of all employees and students

## **Preamble**

The purposes of the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife Bylaws are to: 1) meet the requirement of the Bylaws of the Michigan State University faculty with reference to Department structure and procedures; 2) provide a Department structure and outline procedures which result in effective and transparent operation of the Department; and 3) create an environment in which all members of the Department community may contribute to the function of the Department.

Nothing in these Bylaws shall be construed as limiting or discouraging the rights of 1) groups or individuals from initiating actions or resolving problems through direct consultation with the Department Chairperson, and 2) the Chairperson to discuss and formulate programs of action with individuals or groups as he/she chooses, acting within the general framework of these Bylaws.

## 1. The Faculty

### 1.1 Composition of the Faculty

- 1.1.1 The faculty of the Department being diverse in their appointments are self-governing and hence vote on numerous issues which help guide or determine the business of the Department, thus, this section describes the composition and voting members of the Faculty. This does not change the voting rules associated with reappointment, tenure or promotion (which is described in Section 1.6).
- 1.1.2 The Department chairperson will keep an up-to-date list of the Faculty and their appointments.
- 1.1.3 The Department chairperson and associate chairperson shall be considered members of the Voting faculty.
- 1.1.4 Faculty members of other MSU departments, faculty members of other universities, or other fisheries and wildlife professionals may become adjunct members of the departmental faculty.

### 1.2 Composition of the Voting Faculty

- 1.2.1 The individuals making up the faculty in the Department include tenure stream faculty, fixed term faculty, academic specialists within the continuing appointment system, and academic specialists which are fixed term or a qualifying fixed term academic staff, for the purposes of these bylaws with at least 12 month appointments.

### 1.3 Non-Voting Members of the Department

- 1.3.1 Faculty members of other MSU departments, faculty members of other universities, or other fisheries and wildlife professionals that may become adjunct members of the departmental faculty are non-voting.
- 1.3.2 Persons designated as Research Associates, Lecturers, Distinguished Lecturers (with less than a 1 year appointment), Visiting Professors, Adjunct Faculty, Emeritus Faculty or other honorary rank in the Department shall have courtesy faculty status (and are non-voting).

### 1.4 Modes of Participation

- 1.4.1 Consultation – A body of faculty and/or students that discusses with and informs the administrator with authority and responsibility for decision. Such a body is not a deliberative body; there is no vote. Rather, the members express their views to inform an administrator's decision.

- 1.4.2 Advisory – A deliberative body of faculty and/or students recommends policies to an administrator who is authorized to make decisions. The administrator is not bound by the recommendation and accepts responsibility for the decision.
- 1.4.3 Shared Responsibility – A deliberative body of faculty and/or students makes recommendations to an administrator authorized to make decisions. If the administrator and deliberative body cannot agree and action must be taken, the recommendations of the administrator and the deliberative body will be submitted in writing to the next higher administrative level for resolution.
- 1.4.4 Delegated Authority – A deliberative body of faculty and/or students is authorized to make decisions on specified matters. Such decisions are subject to administrative review but will be altered only in exceptional circumstances.

## 1.5 Faculty Meetings

- 1.5.1 Regular meetings of the faculty shall be held a minimum of three times each term, excluding summer term.
- 1.5.2 Other meetings of the faculty may be called by the Department chairperson or by the group of at least three members of the voting faculty.
- 1.5.3 The chairperson shall preside at faculty meetings, or in that person's absence, the associate chairperson, or the chairperson of the Department advisory committee in the absence of both the chairperson and the associate chairperson.
- 1.5.4 In general, faculty meetings shall be conducted in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order, Revised, and shall be conducted in detail at any meeting where two members of the voting faculty so request.
- 1.5.5 One representative of the undergraduate and one representative of the graduate constituencies of the Department shall participate in meetings of the faculty, except that at discretion of the Chairperson, Associate Chairperson or the Department Advisory Committee, faculty meetings may be closed to all but the voting faculty of the Department.
- 1.5.6 On issues of Department policy, the mode of participation in faculty meetings by the body of faculty and student representatives shall be as a delegated authority.
- 1.5.7 Participation of student representatives shall be in the same mode as faculty participation, except as reserved. Matters reserved to the faculty are:

1.5.7.1 Policy concerning salary, leaves, insurance, retirement, and fringe benefits of faculty.

1.5.7.2 Decisions concerning the appointment, salary, reappointment, promotion, tenure or dismissal of individual faculty members.

1.5.7.2.1 Evidence from students regarding the teaching performance of faculty shall be considered in decisions concerning the above matters.

1.5.7.3 Matters affecting the professional responsibility of the faculty to establish and maintain the intellectual authority of the University.

1.5.8 A member of the voting faculty (cf. 1.2.1) shall be appointed by the Department chairperson as secretary of the faculty. This person shall keep minutes of the faculty meetings, record votes, and file copies of minutes of meetings.

1.5.9 Notices of occurrence of faculty meetings and the agenda for meetings shall be made available to all faculty and the student representatives at least two days in advance.

1.5.10 Action for the meeting body may be taken by a majority of the qualified voting members present and voting at a meeting for which an agenda has been distributed in advance.

## 1.6 Terms and Conditions for Voting Faculty Appointments

1.6.1 The terms and conditions of employment shall be provided in writing to a faculty member at the time of appointment. These terms will include:

- The time-period covered by the appointment.
- Salary provision.
- The general expectations in regard to the professional responsibilities of the person being appointed.
- Who will evaluate the faculty member's professional performance and recommend salary adjustments.
- Conditions other than the appointee's performance of responsibilities that may make a further appointment inadvisable.

- Specification of the position as corresponding to Voting Faculty or non-Voting Faculty status (see 1.1) and explanation of the term.
- The Department chairperson shall deliver in writing to the non-tenured faculty member at the time of appointment, a copy of the Department's bylaws, which specify the procedures for action on the status of non-tenured faculty.
- The Department chairperson will also provide the Department's 'Guidelines for voting on Tenure, Reappointment and Promotion' (Appendix 1), 'Guidelines for annual evaluation faculty' (Appendix 2), and 'Guidelines for evaluation of faculty in teaching, research, outreach and service' (Appendix 3).

1.6.2 A non-tenured faculty member appointed on the tenure system who is not given a further appointment after the expiration of a specific term shall be given reasons in writing upon his or her written request. The Department chairperson shall be charged with transmitting these reasons to the faculty member.

1.6.3 When substantive issues of tenure are in the process of being formed, formal opportunities will be provided for students to represent their views regarding the faculty member's teaching performance according to Section 2.7.

## 1.7 Mentoring Process for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

The following paragraphs describe a mentoring process intended to provide assistance in integrating pre-tenured faculty members into the MSU community. The purpose of the process is to provide constructive advice from post-tenure peers so that performance expectations for pre-tenured faculty are clearly communicated throughout the years preceding the tenure decision.

1.7.1 Within six months of initial appointment, the Department Chairperson will assign a mentoring committee of 3 post-tenured faculty peers (a committee chairperson and 2 members) to assist new faculty in developing a specific set of performance expectations for that person, consistent with the Department's "Guidelines for evaluation of faculty in teaching, research, outreach and service (Appendix 3)".

1.7.2 Within nine months of initial appointment, each new pre-tenured faculty member will provide to the Department Chairperson for approval, in writing, a set of performance expectations developed in consultation with her/his mentoring committee. At least once each year pre-tenured faculty members will meet with their mentoring committee to discuss performance expectations and, if appropriate, suggest revisions to performance expectations. The mentoring committee chairperson shall

provide a summary of the committee's recommendations from this meeting to the Department Chairperson and the pre-tenured faculty member. These recommendations should comprise constructive advice to guide future activities of the pre-tenured faculty member.

- 1.7.3 Following this annual meeting the pre-tenured faculty member will meet with the Department Chairperson as part of their annual performance review, at which time any changes to performance expectations will be discussed and approved by the Department Chairperson. The Department Chairperson will provide a written summary of the performance evaluation to the pre-tenured faculty member and her/his mentoring committee.

## 1.8 Annual Performance Reviews

- 1.8.1 Each faculty member will be evaluated annually by the Department Chairperson consistent with the Department's "Guidelines for annual evaluation of Faculty" (Appendix 2).
- 1.8.2 Each faculty member will provide to the Department Chairperson for approval, in writing, a set of performance expectations consistent with these bylaws (see 1.6), the Department's "Developing Performance Expectations for Fisheries and Wildlife Faculty" (Appendix 4) and "Elements of a strong P&T Package" (Appendix 5) documents. These performance expectations will be reviewed during the annual evaluation.
- 1.8.3 Activities and metrics used to assess scholarly activity and scholarship in Research, Teaching, Outreach and Engagement, Leadership, and Service will be consistent with the Department's "Guidelines for evaluation of faculty in teaching, research, outreach, and service" (Appendix 3) and "Elements of a strong P&T Package" (Appendix 5).

## 1.9 Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

- 1.9.1 The reappointment, promotion, and tenure process will be consistent with the Department's "RPT Process Timeline" (Appendix 6), "Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure" (Appendix 7), and "Faculty mentoring in the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife" (Appendix 8).
- 1.9.2 The scholarly output, teaching, service, and leadership expectations for retention, tenure, and promotion to associate and full professor will be consistent with the Department's "Guidelines for evaluation of faculty in teaching, research, outreach, and service" and "Elements of a strong P&T Package" (Appendix 5).

## **2. Students**

- 2.1 The student constituency of the Department shall include currently registered undergraduate and graduate students who have been admitted as majors in the Department through the normal University admittance procedures.
- 2.2 The undergraduate and graduate students shall be separate constituencies for the purpose of participation in decision making processes.
- 2.3 The students of the undergraduate and graduate constituencies shall be responsible for selecting, according to patterns of their own choice, their representatives to meetings of the faculty and departmental committees to which they are parties.
- 2.4 In addition to faculty meetings (cf. 1.4.5), representatives of undergraduate and graduate constituencies shall participate in the work of the Department Advisory, Graduate and Curriculum Committees. One representative from each constituency, or alternates in those persons' absence, may sit with these groups.
- 2.5 The terms of office for student representatives to departmental committees shall be one year, except that a selected representative may request that the selecting body provide a replacement to complete a term in office. A student may serve a maximum of two consecutive terms in a particular office.
- 2.6 Membership in a committee shall in all cases carry with it, for student representatives, the right to vote on all matters that fall within the purview of the committee, except for matters that are reserved to the faculty (cf. 1.5.7).
- 2.7 When substantive issues are in the process of being formed regarding appointment, salary, reappointment, promotion, tenure or dismissal of individual faculty members, the undergraduate and graduate constituencies may request that the Department Advisory Committee hear their representatives. The Chair of the Department Advisory Committee shall announce a meeting of that group forthwith, and the student representatives may present information solicited from within or without their constituency to be considered along with other evidence.

## **3. Department Organization**

- 3.1 Department Chairperson
  - 3.1.1 The duties, responsibilities and term of office of the Department chairperson are specified in Bylaws for Academic Governance of the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources and the University.
    - 3.1.1.1 The Department Chairperson will conduct annual evaluation of faculty consistent with the Department's 'Guidelines for annual evaluation of Faculty' (Appendix 2).

3.1.2 When it becomes necessary to choose a Department Chairperson, a selection committee of Department members will be established. This committee known as the Department Chair Search Committee will consist of an Associate Chairperson of the Department (with the exception in the case that Associate Chairperson is applying for the position), four members from the Faculty (cf. 1.2.1) of the Department, one staff member of the Department and one graduate student of the Department (identified by the Graduate Student Organization). An undergraduate liaison shall be identified (by the Fisheries and Wildlife Club) for enhanced engagement with the Department Chair Search Committee. In addition, one non-voting member from outside of the Department may be appointed by the Dean. The faculty of the Department shall elect four members from the faculty to serve on the Department Chair Search Committee including representation from specialist or fixed-term faculty. The chair of the Department Chair Search Committee shall be selected from amongst the tenured FW faculty and will be chosen by the Department Chair Search Committee members in a consultation mode with the Dean. The chair of the Department Chair Search Committee will be the principal point of contact with the Dean. The Department Chair Search Committee shall represent the department during the process of search, screening and selection. The Department Chair Search Committee will review, consider, apply, and support the FW Community Norms and DEI Guidelines for the duration of the chairperson search.

3.1.2.1 If the Associate Chairperson becomes a candidate for Department Chairperson, then the Associate Chairperson shall no longer serve on the Department Chairperson Selection Committee.

3.1.3 The Department Advisory Committee shall manage the process electing faculty and staff members to the committee per procedures outlined in the appendix.

3.1.3.1 Any member of the Department Advisory Committee who becomes a candidate for Department Chairperson must vacate the Department Advisory Committee position. In such a case, the voting faculty will hold an election to select one of their members to re-fill the Department Advisory Committee vacancy.

3.1.4 Being mutually consultative to the Dean and the departmental faculty during the search, screening and selection processes, the committee shall:

3.1.4.1 Establish criteria for the position to be filled in accord with the aims and goals of the Department.

- 3.1.4.2 Establish a time schedule.
- 3.1.4.3 Solicit nominations for the position from professional colleagues from within and outside of the Department and from the Dean of the College.
- 3.1.4.4 Develop biographical information on nominees and provide this information to the faculty and administrative officers involved in the selection process.
- 3.1.4.5 Assist the Dean in ranking candidates for the position.
- 3.1.4.6 Issue an invitation to members of the departmental faculty and student body to communicate with the Dean regarding individual preferences and reasons for preferences among the candidates.
- 3.1.4.7 Assist the administration in planning for visits to the campus by off-campus candidates.
- 3.1.4.8 Consult with the Dean in the final selection of the chairperson of the Department.

## 3.2 Department Associate Chairperson

### 3.2.1 Choosing an Associate Chairperson

- 3.2.1.1 If the Department Chairperson deems it essential to the proper, efficient and effective management of departmental affairs to have an Associate Chairperson, then the Department Chairperson may select from the faculty a faculty member who mutually agrees to serve as an Associate Chairperson. A faculty member cannot simultaneously serve as both Associate Chairperson and as a faculty-elected Department Advisory Committee member. Should a Department Advisory Committee member be selected to serve as Associate Chairperson, the faculty, through proper election procedures, must fill the newly vacated Department Advisory Committee seat.
- 3.2.1.2 If the need, as perceived by the Department Chairperson in consultation with the Department Advisory Committee, does not exist for an Associate Chairperson, then an Associate Chairperson need not be selected.

- 3.2.1.3 The term of service as Associate Chairperson shall be at the discretion of the Department Chairperson.
- 3.2.1.4 If the Department Chairperson position becomes vacated, the Associate Chairperson will remain as Associate Chairperson and will fulfill all duties of the Department Chairperson until an interim Department Chairperson or permanent Department Chairperson is selected.
  - 3.2.1.4.1 If the Associate Chairperson is selected as interim Department Chairperson, then the new interim Department Chairperson can select a new Associate Chairperson (cf 3.2.1.1) who would serve on the Department Chairperson Selection Committee (cf 3.1.2).
  - 3.2.1.4.2 The Associate Chairperson may or may not be retained by the new Department Chairperson.

### 3.2.2 Duties and Responsibilities of the Associate Chairperson

- 3.2.2.1 The Associate Chairperson shall chair all department meetings in the absence of the Department Chairperson.
- 3.2.2.2 The Associate Chairperson shall have the authority to represent, with voting rights if needed, the best interests of the department at all meetings, conferences, events or discussions that the Department Chairperson deems necessary for the Associate Chairperson to attend.
- 3.2.2.3 The Associate Chairperson shall have the same authority and responsibility for proper fiscal and personnel management of the department and departmental affairs as the Department Chairperson during the Department Chairperson's absence. Such transactions shall be made in close consultation, agreement, and concurrence with the Department Chairperson's decisions.
- 3.2.2.4 Additional duties of the Associate Chairperson shall include:
  - 3.2.2.4.1 Assist the Department Chairperson in overseeing the general undergraduate program, including supervision of the Undergraduate Advisor, coordination of undergraduate advising, recruitment, curriculum development, and student activities.

- 3.2.2.4.2 Assist the Department Chairperson in overseeing the graduate program, including coordination of recruitment, admission, scholarship, fellowship, and assistantship administration.
- 3.2.2.4.3 Assist the Department Chairperson in academic personnel matters such as annual review, reappointment, promotion and tenure.
- 3.2.2.4.4 Assist the Department Chairperson in alumni and development activities and programs.
- 3.2.2.4.5 Assist the Department Chairperson in departmental planning, including academic, staff development, faculty and budget planning.
- 3.2.2.4.6 Represent the Department Chairperson when he/she cannot attend meetings and events; provide administrative approvals in the absence of the Department Chairperson.
- 3.2.2.4.7 Participate as a member of the Department Chairperson Selection Committee (cf 3.1.2).

### 3.3 Committees

3.3.1 Committees, with the exception of the Department Advisory Committee, shall be appointed by the Departmental chairperson with faculty approval. Except as provided hereinafter, they shall have a minimum of three faculty members, each to serve an overlapping term of three years unless designated to fill the unexpired term of former members. Unless provided otherwise hereinafter, the senior member in longevity on the committee shall be its chairperson. Terms of office shall begin on the 1st day of Fall Term.

#### 3.3.2 Standing Committees

##### 3.3.2.1 Department Advisory Committee

3.3.2.1.1 The Advisory Committee is intended to serve as an open channel of communication between the Department and the chairperson. Its functions are two-fold: to assist the chairperson in the discharge of that person's responsibilities by a direct representation of opinion, and

to provide liaison with the College Advisory Council.

- 3.3.2.1.2 The Advisory Committee shall consist of three members elected from the voting faculty (cf. 1.2.1), and one representative each from the graduate and undergraduate constituencies of the Department. Faculty will serve an overlapping term of three years unless designated by faculty consensus to fill the unexpired term of a former member. Unless provided otherwise hereinafter, the senior member in longevity on the committee shall be its chairperson. The Department chairperson and associate chairperson will not serve on this committee. The secretary of the Department faculty (cf. 1.4.8) shall solicit nominations from the voting faculty. Election will be conducted by closed ballot. The nominee receiving the largest number of votes shall constitute the new faculty member to the committee replacing the faculty who had served for the previous 3 years.
- 3.3.2.1.3 This committee shall, at a minimum, meet quarterly to advise the departmental chairperson regarding current problems in education, research and service programs, budgetary matters, physical facilities, and personnel matters in the chairperson's jurisdiction. Should a matter of concern to the faculty arise in these areas such that timing of a scheduled meeting of the committee does not serve the best interest of the faculty, the Department chairperson and the chairperson of the Advisory Committee shall arrange for a special meeting.
- 3.3.2.1.4 The Advisory Committee is charged with the responsibility to work with the Dean to establish criteria and procedures for filling the position of departmental chairperson as that position becomes vacant (cf. 3.1.2 and 3.1.3).
- 3.3.2.1.5 Regarding matters of appointment, salary, reappointment, promotion, tenure, or dismissal of individual faculty members, procedures will be consistent with the Department's 'Guidelines for voting on Tenure, Reappointment and Promotion' (Appendix 1), and 'Guidelines for annual evaluation of the Faculty' (Appendix 2). The Advisory Committee shall arrange to have faculty opinion presented to the Department chairperson. In these regards, the Advisory Committee

shall appoint subcommittees. For voting on tenure and reappointment for tenure-stream positions within the tenure system, the following can vote: (a). FW tenure-stream faculty with tenure. For voting on reappointment and continuing award status for academic specialists within the continuing system, the following can vote: (a) FW tenure stream faculty with tenure, and (b) FW academic specialists with continuing award status. For voting on promotion for tenure stream or fixed term ranked faculty, the following can vote: (a) FW ranked faculty (i.e, assistant professors, associate professors, professors), either tenure-stream or fixed-term, of higher rank than the candidate. For voting on promotion from specialist to senior specialist, the following can vote: (a) FW ranked faculty with rank of professor (“full professors”), either tenure- stream or fixed-term, and (b) FW Senior academic specialists, continuing system or fixed-term.

3.3.2.1.6 When reappointment, tenure or promotion of individual faculty members is under consideration in the Department, the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee shall provide the opportunity for the affected faculty members to confer with this committee before a decision is made regarding- their case.

3.3.2.1.7 When appointment, salary, reappointment, promotion, tenure, or dismissal of individual faculty members are under consideration in the Department, the Advisory Committee shall hear representatives of student constituencies of the Department as provided in section 2.7.

3.3.2.1.8 This committee shall nominate, with faculty approval, candidates for the College Advisory Council, College Standing Committees, Academic Council and the University Standing Committees.

3.3.2.1.9 The chairperson of the Advisory Committee shall provide liaison with the College Advisory Council in the conduct of elections and other College matters.

### 3.3.2.2 The Graduate Committee

3.3.2.2.1 The Graduate Committee shall be concerned with the

admission of graduate students to the Department and the evaluation of their academic progress after admission.

3.3.2.2.2 This committee shall act on all applications and recommend for admission, with or without provisional stipulations, or for rejection. Only students approved by the Graduate Committee shall be admitted.

3.3.2.2.3 This committee shall recommend the relative merits of acceptable candidates for assistantships or fellowships.

3.3.2.2.4 This committee shall prepare and periodically revise a clear statement of admission requirements, rules necessary for maintenance of student status and for tenure of an assistantship, conditions for termination or withdrawal of graduate students and degree requirements. This statement must be available to all graduate students.

3.3.2.2.5 This committee shall serve as an assembly for the discussion of graduate academic matters with the students.

### 3.3.2.3 The Curriculum Committee

3.3.2.3.1 The Curriculum Committee shall annually review graduate and undergraduate education and academic advising for the purpose of developing suitable long-term academic goals for the Department.

3.3.2.3.2 This committee shall represent the position of the Department in dealing with curriculum committees of other departments, and those of the College and University, regarding matters of curriculum affecting the Department's students.

3.3.2.3.3 The Curriculum Committee shall prepare for distribution to undergraduates a statement of those requirements for the Bachelor's degree that are established by the Department.

3.3.2.3.4 This committee shall serve as an assembly for the

discussion of academic matters with the students.

#### 3.3.2.4 The Committee for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

3.3.2.4.1 The Committee for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion shall be concerned with fostering diversity, equity, and inclusion (defined broadly, see below) in all departmental activities including, but not limited to, teaching, research, and outreach and engagement. This committee will be responsible for drafting a strategic plan for diversity, equity, and inclusion for the department that is voted on by the faculty and that shall be revisited and voted on every 5 years.

3.3.2.4.2 Herein, the term diversity incorporates the ways in which people differ (in their totality) and encompasses the range of different characteristics that make one individual, or one group vary from another. A broad definition includes not only race, ethnicity, and gender — the groups that most often come to mind when the term diversity is used — but many other characteristics that may include age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, education, marital status, language, and physical appearance. Inclusion is defined as actively ensuring all individuals and/or groups participate in all processes, activities, and decision/policymaking in a way that fosters a culture of belonging, collaborative practice, and mutual respect. And, equity is defined as the fair unbiased treatment, access, opportunity, and advancement for all people, while promoting justice through identifying and eliminating barriers that have and continue to prevent the full participation of all people.

3.3.2.4.3 This committee shall be responsible for creating a plan for diversity, equity, and inclusion that includes annual goals, actions, outcomes, and measures of success, as well as timelines for achieving different components of the plan.

3.3.2.4.4 In consultation with the chair, the committee may represent the department on matters of diversity, equity, and inclusion to other groups on campus, in our college, and throughout the university broadly.

3.3.2.4.5 This committee shall compile and provide educational information to the departmental community in many areas related to diversity, equity, and inclusion including, but not restricted to, social justice, equity, implicit bias, sexual misconduct, bystander awareness and strategies, representation in science, and many others. To meet this goal, the committee may host workshops and training, recommend that the department sponsor activities on campus or elsewhere, and/or provide information on a departmental platform.

### 3.3.2.5 The Fisheries and Wildlife Awards Committee

3.3.2.5.1 The Awards Committee shall promote and encourage the nomination of FW faculty, graduate students and staff for association, university, and college awards.

3.3.2.5.2 The Awards Committee shall consist of three members of the voting faculty, one graduate student, one undergraduate student, and one staff member.

3.3.2.5.3 At a minimum, the Awards Committee shall meet with the Department chairperson and/or relevant Associate chairperson during Spring semester to propose nominations. The timing of this meeting should roughly correspond to that of the call for All-University Award nominations.

3.3.2.5.4 The Awards Committee shall facilitate the compilation of nominating packets and the timely submission of nominating materials.

3.3.2.5.5 The Awards Committee shall maintain a database of awards, award descriptions, names of FW nominees and FW award winners.

3.3.2.5.6 The Awards Committee shall maintain a repository of application materials for all submitted nominations.

### 3.3.2.6 The Communications Committee

3.3.2.6.1 The Communications Committee shall guide the development, implementation, and evaluation of a Communications Strategy for the Department. This

Communications Strategy will inform external Department communications and shall be regularly updated to reflect changing needs and available resources.

3.3.2.6.2 The Communications Committee shall consist, at minimum, of three members of the voting faculty, one graduate student, one undergraduate student, and one staff member, and may include at least one research associate.

3.3.2.6.3 The Communications Committee may undertake certain tasks identified in the Communications Strategy but will primarily serve in an advisory and supportive role to the Department on issues related to external Department communications. To provide leadership and guidance, the Communications Committee may compile and provide information and opportunities to increase Department capacity and effectiveness of external communications. To meet this goal, the committee may host workshops and seminars, or provide information on good communication practices on a Departmental platform. The Communications Committee is not expected to develop or deliver communication products for the Department.

### 3.3.3 Ad hoc Committees

3.3.3.1 Ad hoc committees may be appointed by the departmental chairperson or by the Department Advisory Committee. Membership and duties of ad hoc committees shall be determined at the time of their appointment.

3.3.3.2 Ad hoc committees will be discharged upon completion of their duties, but in any case, will expire after one calendar year.

## 4. Grievance and Hearing Procedures

### 4.1 Constituency

Any (unit) faculty member with the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, lecturer, instructor, assistant instructor, research associate, specialist, or librarian may initiate a grievance procedure, alleging violation of existing policies or established practices by an administrator, by filing a complaint with the FGO (Faculty Grievance Official) pursuant to the procedures set forth in the Faculty Grievance Procedure, as described in Section 1.4

(Academic Personnel Policies) of the Faculty Handbook.

## 4.2 Initiation of Grievances and Hearing Procedures

### 4.2.1 Initiation of Grievances

4.2.1.1 A Faculty member who feels aggrieved may without delay discuss the matter in a personal conference with the FGO. The FGO shall determine if the grievance falls under the Faculty Grievance Procedure, the University Committee on Tenure or the Anti-Discrimination Judicial Board.

4.2.1.2 In order to establish and retain access to the formal hearing mechanisms at the (unit) level, a faculty member must submit a written grievance statement to the FGO within 30 days of his/her first knowledge of the alleged violation.

4.2.1.3 The grievance statement shall set forth the alleged violation of existing policy or established practices, a concise statement of the facts relevant to the grievance, the name(s) of any administrator(s) whose action is at issue, the approximate date on which the alleged action-took place, and the redress sought.

4.2.1.4 The FGO shall forward a copy of the grievance statement to the administrator(s) named within 10 days of receipt of the grievance.

### 4.2.2 Informal Resolution

4.2.2.1 The FGO shall investigate the grievance and make every reasonable effort to resolve it informally. The FGO may recommend dropping the grievance as lacking in merit or for other just cause. Such a recommendation, however, shall not be binding on the grievant.

4.2.2.2 Within 40 days of the filing of the grievance statement, the parties and the FGO shall attempt to resolve the grievance informally. If the FGO determines that the grievance cannot be resolved informally, notice shall be provided to the parties. If the faculty member wishes to pursue the grievance, a written request for a formal hearing must be submitted to the FGO within 30 days of such notice. Failure to submit such a request will constitute a waiver of the faculty member's right to pursue the grievance.

4.2.2.3 The FGO shall determine after consultation with both parties the appropriate hearing level (department/unit, college, university) and shall notify the administrator at the appropriate level of the

written request for hearing.

#### 4.3 Formal Hearing Procedures

4.3.1 A (unit) hearing panel shall be established by the FGO in the following manner:

4.3.1.1 A hearing panel shall consist of three members, drawn by lot from the unit faculty. All drawing shall be conducted by the FGO.

4.3.1.2 The FGO shall notify each Party of the names drawn for the hearing panel and within 10 days either party may challenge any member for cause. In addition, each party shall have one peremptory challenge. Cause shall be determined by the (unit) advisory council or its designee(s). Challenged members shall be replaced pursuant to the procedures stated in 4.3.1.1.

4.3.2 The hearing panel shall conduct a hearing according to the procedures stated below and according to guidelines in Articles 3 and 6 of the Faculty Grievance Procedure.

4.3.2.1 A hearing shall commence within 14 days of the establishment of the hearing panel.

4.3.2.2 The FGO shall assemble the hearing panel and shall supervise selection of the Presiding Officer from among the members of the hearing panel.

4.3.2.3 The Presiding Officer shall apply the rules of procedure consistent with the guidelines stated in Article 6 of the Faculty Grievance Procedure.

4.3.2.4 The hearing panel shall decide whether the preponderance of the evidence does or does not support the allegation(s) made by the grievant.

4.3.2.5 Findings and recommendations of hearing panels shall conform to existing policy and procedures in the (unit).

4.3.2.6 Whenever a hearing panel loses a member, the hearing shall be terminated and a new panel selected.

4.3.2.7 Hearing panels shall report their findings and recommendations in writing within 14 days of the completion of the hearing to the FGO, who shall forward them to the grievant, the respondent, and the administrator who is the respondent's immediate

supervisor.

4.3.3 The (dean, chairperson, or director) shall provide written notification of his/her decision to the parties to the grievance and to the FGO within 14 days of his/her receipt of the findings and recommendations of the hearing panel. Failure to provide written notification shall result in automatic appeal.

4.3.4 If the grievance is not satisfactorily resolved, either party may appeal the decision within 14 days of the receipt of the decision of - the appropriate administrator, in accordance with the procedures established in Article 5 of the Faculty Grievance Procedure.

4.3.4.1 Failure to appeal within the prescribed time shall be deemed to be acceptance of the decision.

#### 4.4 Student Grievances

Procedures for resolving student grievances are outlined in the University document, Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University, incorporated into these bylaws by reference; the University publication, Graduate Student Rights -and Responsibilities; and in the bylaws of the Student Senate.

4.4.1 Procedures for resolving student academic grievances are described in the Departmental document, Academic Hearing Procedures for the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife (FW), incorporated into these bylaws by reference.

### 5. Establishment of Bylaws

#### 5.1 Interpretation

5.1.1 The Department Advisory Committee shall be the final authority with regard to interpretation of these bylaws.

5.1.2 Nothing in these bylaws is intended to nor should be construed to supersede content of the Michigan State University Bylaws for Academic Governance or the bylaws of the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources.

5.1.3 In all matters not specifically addressed in these bylaws and subject to the jurisdiction of the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, the Department will adhere to any and all applicable College and/or University policies and practices.

#### 5.2 Amendments

Proposed amendments must be circulated among persons with voting status at least one week before the meeting at which they are to be voted upon.

5.2.1 Approval of amendments requires a two-thirds vote in favor thereof.

5.2.2 Amendments of the bylaws shall be published.

### 5.3 Review of the Bylaws

5.3.1 The departmental bylaws shall be reviewed by the voting faculty at intervals not to exceed five years. If changes are made, the revised Bylaws shall be published.

5.3.2 The departmental bylaws shall be reviewed by the College Advisory Council and the Dean at intervals not to exceed five years.

*Appendix 1: Guidelines for Voting on Tenure, Reappointment, and Promotion*

**Guidelines for Voting on Tenure, Reappointment and Promotion**

*Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Michigan State University*

May 12, 2020

General principles

1. A FW faculty member can be an academic specialist, a tenure stream faculty, or a fixed term faculty.
2. All FW faculty members have the right to vote on all departmental business except for some decisions regarding votes on tenure, reappointment, and promotion (as governed by college bylaws).
3. We outline the principles regarding voting below, with an associated table that specifically states who votes on which decisions.

Principles for voting on Tenure and Reappointment (see attached table for details)

1. For voting on tenure and reappointment for tenure-stream positions within the tenure system, the following can vote:  
FW tenure-stream faculty with tenure
2. For voting on reappointment and continuing award status for academic specialists within the continuing system, the following can vote:
  - a. FW tenure stream faculty with tenure
  - b. FW academic specialists with continuing award status

Principles for voting on Promotion (see attached table for details)

1. For voting on promotion for tenure stream or fixed term ranked faculty, the following can vote:
  - a. FW ranked faculty (i.e., assistant professors, associate professors, professors), either tenure-stream or fixed-term, of higher rank than the candidate.
2. For voting on promotion from specialist to senior specialist, the following can vote:
  - a. FW ranked faculty with rank of professor (“full professors”), either tenure-stream or fixed-term
  - b. FW Senior academic specialists, continuing system, or fixed term

Suggestions for application of the above principles

1. The department chairperson and his/her administrative staff are responsible for maintaining a list of all faculty and their status with regard to voting.
2. This list will be provided to the DAC each fall to facilitate the voting process so that the DAC can inform those with the right to vote about decisions that will be put forth that year.
3. We believe the faculty should discuss a process for voting on promotion, reappointment, and tenure decisions so as to encourage more active participation by faculty. Currently, participation in meetings by faculty with votes on these decisions to discuss candidates is low, and the DAC often has to repeatedly contact some individuals in order to obtain their votes.
4. In particular, we believe that the open meeting should be dropped to make the meeting shorter and more critical for faculty with votes on the decisions to attend. Non-voting faculty, staff, and students should be invited to provide the faculty with votes on the decisions their input in writing prior to the meeting of the voting faculty. We think that the DAC should take this task on.

## Appendix 2: Guidelines for Annual Evaluation of Faculty

### **Guidelines for Annual Evaluation of Faculty** *Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Michigan State University* April 27, 2020

Faculty evaluation of annual performance, progress toward promotion and/or tenure and professional development is understood to be the shared responsibility of an individual faculty member and his/her chairperson(s). The intent of this document is to provide general guidance on the process of faculty evaluation; not all situations can be covered, but look to the spirit of the document for guidance. These guidelines apply to peer-input on evaluation of tenure stream faculty<sup>1</sup> and faculty who are fixed-term and academic specialists<sup>2</sup>, as these terms are defined in the bylaws of the Department and the university. It is understood that the faculty of the Department should provide peer-input to the annual evaluation process.

#### **Overview of major dates:**

Evaluation period	<i>January - December (calendar year)</i>
Written documentation by faculty member	<i>January 31</i>
Performance meetings with chairperson	<i>February - April</i>
Written performance evaluations by chairperson	<i>April 30</i>
Written response by faculty member to chairperson	<i>May 15</i>

#### **Evaluation timing:**

We recommend an annual evaluation process based on the calendar year. Performance evaluations should cover performance over the previous year and longer term progress toward promotion, tenure, and other career objectives. The annual performance evaluation meeting of the chairperson and the faculty member should occur as soon as practical after the end of the evaluation period. We recognize that faculty members will need some time to document accomplishments from the previous year and that the chairperson has many faculty to evaluate. Thus, we suggest that review meetings be scheduled from February to April, and that an attempt be made to schedule meetings first with pre-tenured faculty<sup>2</sup> members and specialists in the continuing appointment system that are in their probationary period, as well as any faculty member seeking promotion during the evaluation period. There should be sufficient time after the written evaluation is provided to a faculty member to allow the faculty member to respond in writing before any final decision is made with regard to merit and/or market increases.

#### **Annual performance written documentation by faculty:**

We recommend the establishment of standards for written documentation by faculty of their accomplishments and plans, and that these remain as consistent as possible from year to year. Materials prepared by faculty should include information that is required to fill out Form D<sup>3</sup>, so as to provide a basis for evaluation of progress toward promotion and/or tenure, to help pre-tenured faculty prepare for the tenure process, for associate professors to prepare for promotion to full professor, and for continued professional development of full professors. The faculty member's documentation should include an annually updated

---

<sup>1</sup> Defined by the department bylaws as: *Any tenure-stream faculty and academic specialists within the continuing appointment system; or, fixed-term faculty and academic specialists who have at least 60 full-time equivalent service months.* The faculty have approved to change the minimum service months to 36 months to be consistent with university guidelines.

<sup>2</sup> Defined as faculty in the tenure stream system, but prior to acquiring tenure.

<sup>3</sup> Note that for academic specialists, the correct form is Form C. For the remainder of this document however, we will use the term Form D to refer to both of these forms.

brief narrative regarding the scholarship of their work and future plans, similar to what is required for tenure and promotion packages. For consistency sake, it is also appropriate for full professors to include information that is required in Form D. Having all faculty provide similar information will facilitate consistency among the materials that the chairperson sees which should aid the overall evaluation process.

Attendance at annual performance evaluation meetings:

For pre-tenure and other early career faculty, the mentoring committee<sup>4</sup> chairperson should generally attend the evaluation meeting. The purpose of attendance of the mentoring committee chairperson is to ensure that the mentoring committee is aware of advice the chairperson is providing to the faculty member, to allow the mentoring committee chairperson to assist the faculty member if any clarifications are needed, and to promote interactions between the mentoring committee and the department chairperson with a view toward consistent advice. The mentoring committee and its chairperson are not acting in an evaluative role. Post-tenured faculty can ask that a mentor attend their evaluation meeting, if they believe this is necessary, to serve the same function the mentoring committee chairperson serves for pre-tenured faculty. The faculty member can request a follow up meeting following the annual evaluation meeting.

The chairperson can request that the associate chairperson or another designated faculty member attend the review meeting to assist him/her in documenting the discussion. In addition, for cases where faculty have de facto supervisors (e.g., a center director is a supervisor of that center's associate director) in principle, the supervisor should be a part of the evaluation process done by the chairperson and should generally attend the evaluation meeting.

Annual performance evaluation meetings:

The annual performance evaluation meeting should include a review of the faculty member's assignment and of the faculty member's written performance expectations if needed. Performance should be evaluated in the context of previous appraisals, recommendations, and trajectory. Both the assignment and the written performance expectations should be updated based on the discussions in consultation with the mentoring committee where applicable. A copy of the current written performance expectations should be provided in writing to the faculty member and the chairperson of the mentoring committee if applicable prior to the annual performance evaluation meeting and kept in the faculty member's personnel file.

Annual written performance evaluations:

In accord with the bylaws of the department and the MSU Faculty Handbook, a written performance evaluation needs to be prepared by the chairperson for each faculty member for each year and also provided to each faculty member's mentoring committee, where applicable. The overall evaluation of performance should reflect the faculty's percentage assignment in each area. This evaluation should be based on notes taken during or immediately after that meeting, and should summarize the discussion during the meeting, and indicate whether the faculty member is exceeding, meeting or failing to meet expectations, in each area of their assignment and in their overall performance. The evaluation process should include a shared understanding of a) the faculty member's objectives and priorities for the coming year and b) the measures to be taken, both by the faculty member and the departmental administration, to alleviate constraints identified in the review of the previous year's performance, and c) suggestions for where faculty effort should be focused in the coming year. In cases where the faculty member is failing to meet expectations, the written review needs to clearly indicate what alternative accomplishments or actions would have met expectations. The review should also indicate what accomplishments or potential accomplishments deserved/would have deserved particular commendation. That is, the evaluation should provide the faculty

---

<sup>4</sup> See section 3.5.2 of the FW Bylaws for description of the mentoring committee. Briefly, the chairperson will work with faculty members to form a mentoring committee as soon as practical within six months of initial appointment. The department chairperson will keep records of the membership of each faculty member's mentoring committee.

member clear advice on how to improve their performance.

Special concerns for faculty with joint appointments:

For faculty with joint appointments, where the tenure home is in FW, we suggest that the faculty follow FW protocols and use Form D for the written documentation. However, when the faculty's tenure home is in another unit, he/she can provide the written documentation form that is used in his/her tenure home. However, we suggest that the faculty member ensure that all of the information that is in Form D has been provided in the written report required by the other unit. In cases where information from Form D is missing, the faculty must provide the additional information to the chairperson in written form as a supplement.

In the interest of transparency and clear communication it is suggested that when possible, faculty members with joint appointments have annual performance evaluation meetings jointly with the relevant lead administrators for all the units within which they are jointly appointed and the mentoring committee chair. In the event that the mentoring committee chair cannot attend this meeting, the faculty member should have the option of having a follow up meeting with that person and the Fisheries and Wildlife chairperson.

Special concerns for faculty with partial or full support from external partners:

When a faculty member's position involves substantial partnership with an agency outside of the university, the chairperson should obtain annual written input from the external agency prior to the annual performance evaluation meeting with the chairperson. This written input should be shared and discussed with the faculty member during the annual evaluation meeting.

Process of assigning merit and market raises:

We suggest that the chairperson create a table of recommended raises, with justification provided. At this point, there should be a mechanism for faculty representatives to discuss these annual recommendations of market and merit increases with the chairperson to bring some accountability to the raise process. This table should be presented to and discussed with the department advisory committee, to allow feedback to be provided before final decisions are made. This faculty committee would not make independent evaluations of individual faculty performance; rather they would simply provide feedback and advice to the chairperson.

Faculty merit and market raises:

Market increases would generally be reserved for faculty who have at least met expectation on a sustained basis (typically three years or more), would sometimes be awarded for sustained exceeding of expectations, positive trajectory in expectations, or exceptional accomplishments within a year, but could reflect other considerations besides performance including need to adjust their salary to be competitive with other institutions or reasonably comparable to other faculty with similar appointments and performance, or the need to reach a compromise recommendation with another department in the case of joint appointments.

Faculty members should receive a 'departmental raise overview report' from the department putting their raise in context. This report would explicitly denote what the "average" or "base" merit increase is, what the faculty member's overall percentage increase was, and what amount of the increase, if any, is attributable to a market adjustment, tenure bonus, etc.

**GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY**  
**IN**  
**TEACHING, RESEARCH, OUTREACH and SERVICE**  
**DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE**  
**Revised April 27, 2020**

This document presents guidelines for evaluation of faculty performance, including annual evaluations as well as reappointment, tenure and promotion. These guidelines should be used by individual faculty members, especially pre-tenured faculty, and by their formal mentoring committees to aid development and use of a set of performance expectations following the process described in the Department Bylaws. The guidelines describe activities, achievements, and products that constitute evidence of scholarship in each of our primary mission areas: teaching, research, and outreach. A brief description of expectations in the area of service to the Department and University is also included.

Evaluations in the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife must first of all recognize that teaching, research, and outreach are equally important to the Department's mission. International activities shall be evaluated in the context of teaching, research, and/or outreach. Each of these major assignments will be evaluated in proportion to the time and effort called for in the initial letter of appointment to the Department or revisions agreed upon and documented during annual evaluations. The evidence of scholarship described in this document is intended to be used to develop expectations specifically within the context of each faculty member's actual appointment and assignment.

The Department Advisory Committee will coordinate the review by a committee of peers of the performances of candidates for reappointment, promotion and tenure. This committee shall consist of all MSU faculty that are also voting faculty of the Department at or above the rank for which the candidate is being considered, and it will function within the framework of the Department Bylaws (paragraph 3.2.2.1.5). Recommendations from each faculty member will be made in writing to the Department Advisory Committee chairperson, who will inform the Department Chairperson of the outcome of the faculty vote in writing. External reviews from at least three peers (not employed by Michigan State University) must be conducted for candidates being evaluated for the ranks of Associate Professor and Professor. These reviewers will be selected by the Chairperson from lists of potential reviewers prepared independently by the candidate and the Chairperson. The final recommendation from the Department to the Dean is the responsibility of the Chairperson. All candidates shall be informed in writing of the Chairperson's recommendation.

The faculty promotional process shall include a mentoring system that assists new faculty in developing formal plans in teaching, research, and extension and/or outreach, as described in the Department Bylaws (paragraph 3.4). The plans will be developed by the faculty member and an assigned mentoring committee and submitted to the Department Chairperson for approval. This process is intended to guide new faculty in developing their career in the Department and assist the faculty and Chairperson in setting specific benchmarks for future evaluation of achievements for re-appointment, tenure and promotion considerations. Implementation of the process will be supervised by the Department Chairperson.

A conceptual framework for defining scholarship is presented in the next section, based on the premise that achievement of scholarship is central to meeting performance expectations as a faculty member. This is followed by a comprehensive set of examples of evidence of scholarship for each of the mission areas:

teaching, research, and outreach. These examples are intended to provide guidance to faculty and their mentoring committees as they work together to develop expectations for performance and to document their accomplishments in anticipation of the re-appointment, promotion and tenure process. While considering the guidelines it is important to recognize that the diversity of faculty appointments in the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife means that individual faculty are not expected to demonstrate scholarship in all of the areas described below – the guidelines should assist in the identification of potential areas of scholarship. It remains the responsibility of each faculty member, in consultation with her/his mentoring committee and with the approval of the Department Chair, to develop a set of specific expectations that is appropriate for their appointment and assignment.

## **OVERALL EXPECTATIONS FOR SCHOLARSHIP ACROSS THE FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE MISSION: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

The Department of Fisheries and Wildlife recognizes that the key to evaluation of faculty performance for reappointment, promotion and tenure lies in determining whether candidates have achieved scholarship in each of our primary mission areas: teaching, research, and outreach. To that end these guidelines provide examples of activities and achievements that will be recognized as evidence of scholarship. For each mission area we provide a large number of examples; it is not our intention to suggest that the standard of scholarship achievement necessary for successful promotion, etc. is to provide evidence that reflects all, or even a large proportion of these examples. Rather, the examples are intended to guide faculty members and their mentoring committees in selecting a set of performance expectations suitable for the specific appointment/assignment of that faculty member. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair, with advice from the mentoring committee, to determine whether the set of performance expectations developed through an individual faculty member's mentoring process will be sufficient, if met, to ensure successful progress through the tenure system.

The examples of expectations for each mission area have been organized around a common conceptual framework for scholarship. The framework comprises four distinct but not mutually exclusive theme areas for scholarship:

- **Creation:** what products, ideas, and concepts does the candidate *create* to accomplish teaching, research, or outreach objectives? General examples would include proposals and plans.
- **Discovery:** what kinds of *discoveries* result from the candidate's teaching, research, or outreach activities? General examples would include experimental results and advancement of best practices.
- **Integration:** what does the candidate do to *integrate*, extend, interpret, or apply her/his teaching, research, or outreach? General examples would include collaborations, integrative or synthetic publications.
- **Reflection:** what does the candidate, or his/her peers, do to *reflect* on the impact and effectiveness of her/his teaching, research, or outreach? General examples would include peer recognition, awards, evidence of intellectual growth or adaptation.

The examples presented in each mission area sometimes overlap with, or arguably belong in, more than one theme area. However, the theme areas are presented to provide a common framework for organizing the examples in each mission area and to illustrate the breadth of activities and achievements that are germane to scholarship.

## **EXPECTATIONS FOR PERFORMANCE IN TEACHING**

Quality in teaching and advising are fundamental to the Department, College and University missions. All Department faculty with teaching appointments are expected to demonstrate that quality in teaching and advising as well as a continuing commitment to scholarship that contributes to effective instruction and dissemination of knowledge. These expectations also recognize that teaching encompasses many forms,

including classroom instruction advising, and mentoring activities for all levels of students, and activities that extend beyond campus, state and national boundaries. It is recognized that important contributions are also essential to the Department, College and University missions and will be considered as a part of the evaluation process. Regardless of appointment, all Departmental faculty should be committed to high standards in teaching and the scholarship of teaching, and some contributions to teaching and advising are essential components of a faculty member's responsibilities.

#### Examples of evidence of scholarship in teaching

##### A. Creation

- a. *Clear teaching goals and objectives.* The candidate's overall teaching program and each individual course should have clearly delineated goals and specific learning objectives. These goals and objectives should strongly relate to the discipline or disciplines upon which the overall teaching program or specific course is based and should connect their instructional efforts to the teaching goals of Fisheries and Wildlife, the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources and other related disciplines. These goals should enhance students' opportunities to pursue employment or additional learning within the field and reflect an understanding of student learning differences.
- b. *Adequate preparation and planning for teaching.* The course materials should indicate a comprehensive knowledge of the current content of the discipline and should clearly demonstrate expertise beyond the typical textbook level reflecting new developments in the field and utilizing current reference materials. The syllabi provided to students should communicate clearly the course goals and expectations to the students. These course materials should give evidence to the incorporation of diverse learning methods that support the diverse learning styles of the student population. Courses offered by the faculty member should effectively utilize appropriate learning technology to enhance the learning experience.
- c. *Effective presentation.* The instructional process should utilize a diversity of educationally appropriate methodologies to accomplish course goals. Evidence should indicate that ample opportunities for questions and feedback related to the course goals, objectives and the instructional process are provided to students. The instructor should also document effective presentation structure and technique. The instructor should use language that represents the discipline, but also is understood by the student audience. Videotape of a typical class session would serve as an appropriate documentation.

##### B. Discovery

- a. *Evidence of study.* Course materials should reflect the scholarship of the faculty member, such that this scholarship is evident to peers within their discipline and to peers within the Department. Peer-reviewed articles and invited presentations are desired avenues for this evidence. All faculty members should use evaluative methods regularly to monitor goals and objectives and document this self evaluation of teaching/learning activities.
- b. *SIRS reports.* The SIRS responses from students should be viewed as acceptable by the reviewing faculty and administration. The responses from various reporting systems are used by the faculty member to modify the teaching system or process to enhance student learning. Written student comments are documented and analyzed for instructional evaluation and enhancement. A trend in SIRS scores and/or comments indicating positive changes in the courses being taught should be evident.
- c. *Peer review.* The faculty member should present new or unique teaching ideas to international, national or local programs or seminars and in peer-reviewed teaching or discipline-related journals. The faculty member is recognized within his/her discipline as a leader in the instructional process as

indicated by being a requested participant in teaching/learning symposia or workshops and/or is a requested author in teaching-related publications. Course syllabi, handouts, and lecture notes should be made available to peers for review and comment. In addition, peers should be invited and encouraged to attend classes and provide feedback to the instructor. Guest lectures by the faculty member and participation in team teaching can be evaluated by peers.

- d. *Significant results.* The faculty member receives extraordinary SIRS results. The faculty member receives awards and other external recognition for teaching excellence. Graduated students and alumni may recognize the faculty member's impact. Employers provide testimonials on the performance of students in their employ. Scores on national or state certification tests related to the course content are passing and beyond.

### C. Integration

- a. *Evidence of study.* The course syllabus references intellectual material from other disciplines, shows evidence that the course content has been effectively integrated with other disciplines where appropriate. Faculty member's materials and presentations utilize conceptual models or maps of topics to create student understanding. Articles, popular and peer reviewed, presentations and guest lectures give evidence to knowledge of other intellectual disciplines. The feedback given to students on written assignments assists the student to connect and integrate their knowledge with other concepts or disciplines.
- b. *Appropriate methods.* Course syllabi indicate the integration of technology, multiple forms of assessment and instructional approaches, and the integration of diversity. The faculty member should demonstrate command of a diversity of teaching/communication methodologies. A myriad of methods is used to communicate and evaluate the teaching and learning process. Teaching methods encourage students to think interactively. The class assignments encourage students to utilize references from other disciplines. The faculty member uses flexible scheduling and student groupings to accomplish course goals and objectives. The faculty member utilizes smart boards, projectors, computers and Internet connectivity to accomplish teaching objectives.
- c. *Assessment and monitoring.* The faculty member uses a diversity of evaluation methods to monitor the instructional process. The faculty member uses peers from other disciplines to attend class, review course materials and provide feedback that is utilized teaching enhancement. A record is maintained of students who become majors or succeed in graduate studies that can be related to the instructor's influence.
- d. *Evidence of transforming and extending knowledge.* Student journals reflect growth on the integration and extension of knowledge. Excerpts from student papers and projects indicate integration and extension of knowledge. Students participate in poster sessions, paper presentations, management plans or other planning strategy related to the course, its discipline and other disciplines. The faculty member participates in professional society committees and University curriculum/teaching committees. The faculty member works with other colleagues and departments in the development of course materials, improvement of instruction or the integration of curricula. Faculty participation in off-campus activities, clubs and local community groups related to teaching activities is desirable.

### D. Reflection

- a. *Reflective critique.* Student evaluation forms are discussed with peers and administration to foster the professional development of the instructor. The faculty member utilizes student evaluation forms, journals or performance plans to identify their own learning needs related to content, instructional process and evaluation methodology. Modifications, recommendations and observations are kept in organized notes or a journal for contemplation and application to

instructional process. The faculty member has actively pursued communication with colleagues within the department, university, and the wider academic community to improve the instructional process. The faculty member attends professional conferences and makes changes in content and teaching methods as a result.

- b. *Evaluation.* The faculty member has made an assessment of their teaching performance that results in significant change each semester. SIRS forms, midterm evaluations, journals and other feedback mechanisms are utilized for self-evaluation. The faculty member utilizes student learner needs as well as their own to evaluate the learning system. Feedback from peers and colleagues are maintained in a systematic fashion so that they can be used for instructional evaluation.
- c. *Modification based on assessment and peer review.* The faculty member develops a systematic plan based on reflection and evaluation from students and peers to improve student learning. The faculty member documents how the course has changed as a result of student feedback and instructor growth. Instructional innovations are documented and evaluated for their effectiveness.
- d. *Peer and student recognition.* The faculty member receives awards from student groups or professional societies for their instruction. Special recognition for the publication of a instructional innovation or methodology by a peer-reviewed organizations, societies or journals is received. Graduated students, alumni and employers who provide testimonials on the impact of their instruction, recognize the faculty member.

### **EXPECTATIONS FOR PERFORMANCE IN RESEARCH**

All departmental faculty – regardless of appointment – must be committed to maintaining high standards in research. Research activities contribute to keeping a faculty member current in their academic field and can enhance all scholarly endeavors associated with departmental and university missions including teaching and outreach. Scholarship can be demonstrated through discovery of knowledge, integration across disciplines, application to problem-solving, and dissemination of knowledge to the professional community and to society. Faculty research and scholarly activities should be guided by our departmental mission to provide benefits to our partners and to society in general. Faculty should demonstrate leadership in developing and maintaining an active and productive research program and whose impact extends beyond the University to regional, national and even international levels. Appropriate research activities may take many forms ranging from applied problem solving to fundamental discovery of disciplinary knowledge.

Quality of research and scholarly contributions is a key decision factor and will be measured as a function of impacts relative to the mission of the Department and the discipline(s) within which the research was conducted. Value is also placed on collegiality, teamwork and collaboration with other members of the Department, University and colleagues from other institutions. However, the candidate is also expected to demonstrate an individual leadership role in developing and disseminating scholarly accomplishments. Candidates must demonstrate commitment to continued improvement in intellectual and performance capabilities to ensure they remain current in their respective fields and sustain high levels of scholarly achievement.

#### Examples of evidence of scholarship in research

##### A. Creation

- a. *Program focus, well-defined goals.* A productive, high impact research program must show clear evidence of focus and well-defined goals. **All** faculty should be able to clearly describe the broad goals of their research and specific objectives related to those goals. They should also be able to clearly demonstrate how their research activities and products are related to, and focused on the achievement of those goals.

- b. *Generation of research funding.* A strong indication of scholarship in research is evidence of sustained success at obtaining extra-mural support for research, including funding that enables sustained support for graduate students. All research funding is evidence of scholarship, regardless of source, magnitude, and *contribution* to university revenues through indirect costs. It is recognized that the diversity of faculty in our Department implies a diversity of funding opportunities. Nevertheless, it is important to document the kinds and sizes of grants obtained, particularly when success is achieved at obtaining research grants from highly competitive sources.
- c. *New, innovative directions for research.* Evidence of scholarship in creativity also comes from development and pursuit of novel research ideas – ideas at the cutting edge of science in a particular discipline or set of disciplines. All faculty are expected to stay abreast of new discoveries and developments in their areas of expertise. Evidence of this can be provided by demonstrating research activities that seek advances at the forefront of a discipline or that partially shift the focus of a faculty member’s research in a new direction.

## B. Discovery

- a. *Publications in peer-reviewed journals.* Dissemination of new research findings through publication in peer-reviewed outlets is the primary form of evidence of *research* productivity. All peer-reviewed publications for which the faculty member is a co-author are important to demonstrating scholarship. The reputation of the journal in which papers are published is a factor in the evaluation, although it is recognized that the nature of the research being disseminated has a large influence on the range of suitable publication outlets. It is desirable for some of the publications to be ones in which the candidate is the lead author.
- b. *Other publications.* Research findings are not always presented in peer-reviewed outlets. Evidence of scholarship in research also includes publications in non-peer-reviewed outlets – e.g., technical reports, bulletins, press-releases for new findings, progress and completion reports to funding agencies, etc. While these publications do not carry as much weight in the evaluation process, they are an important part of the evidence of scholarship in research.
- c. *Presentations/communications at professional meetings.* The sharing of research findings through oral and poster presentations of scientific meetings is an important part of the research communication process. All such presentations, including those delivered by students and colleagues collaborating with the candidate, should be documented as evidence of research scholarship.
- d. *Patents, etc* Occasionally faculty may produce other research products, such as patentable inventions, that also constitute important evidence of scholarship in the area of discovery

## C. Integration

- a. *Knowledge of subject and context for research program.* All faculty should be able to demonstrate leading-edge familiarity with their research area. They should be able to describe their research in a broad context, demonstrating how the science they pursue fits into a larger context, and how findings within their own area of interest might be integrated into other science in a way that advances the broader discipline.
- b. *Synthetic and integrative publications and presentations.* Evidence of scholarship in the area of research integration can come from publications and presentations that synthesize an area of science, including review papers, modeling analyses, state-of-science reports, etc.

Scholarship in this area is important, particularly as a faculty member's research program matures and she/he becomes recognized as an expert in a particular subject area.

- c. *Collaborations with other disciplines.* The Department views synthetic, integrative, cross-disciplinary science as a critical area of research, particularly in the disciplines relevant to fish and wildlife science and management. The extent to which individual faculty are involved in multi-disciplinary collaborations is expected to vary depending on the kind of research they do and on their appointment/assignment. Nevertheless, evidence of productive collaborations with researchers from other disciplines should be documented whenever it occurs.

#### D. Reflection

- a. *Peer recognition.* Recognition by one's peers is a clear indication of the achievement of scholarship in research. Acknowledgments from journal editors and conference organizers for valued research communications should be documented. For more senior/experienced faculty examples of peer recognition would include the receipt of awards from professional societies and invited presentations, especially keynotes and opening addresses at professional meetings.
- b. *Service in research.* All researchers are expected to contribute to the scientific community providing services, particularly by contributing to the peer-review process for funding agencies and journals. Service in this area demonstrates scholarship in research because demand for such service is a reflection of a faculty member's standing in her/his peer community.
- c. *Impact of research.* All faculty are expected to reflect on the impact that their research is having, both on the advancement of their discipline(s) and on the conservation and management of natural resources. Being able to clearly demonstrate how one's research is contributing to these goals is a very important aspect of scholarship in research.

### **EXPECTATIONS FOR PERFORMANCE IN OUTREACH**

Outreach and Extension are important to the Departmental, College and University mission and fundamental to the Land Grant philosophy. For Departmental purposes, we accept the MSU definition of outreach as a form of scholarship that involves generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with university and unit missions (MSU Provost's Committee on University Outreach 1993). Outreach is an umbrella term describing the full array of potential communications activities the Department provides to interact with varied stakeholders. MSU Extension (MSUE) is a specific subcategory of outreach; Extension programs extend research-based knowledge through the formal network of MSU Extension community-based offices or in other forms using MSUE delivery systems, approaches, or organizational structures such as Area of Expertise (AoE) teams.

Traditionally, outreach programming has required the identification of clientele needs, development of partnerships with researchers to address unanswered needs, and the dissemination of knowledge, technology and research results to enable clientele to make better informed decisions. This view of outreach scholarship is still relevant. Yet today, outreach is designed to foster individual, social group, and organizational transformation, and outreach practices are designed around ever-growing theoretical and practical research bases. As our notions of outreach have evolved, so too have our definitions of scholarship. For example, a 2003 MSU document defines Extension scholarship as "the systematic generation, integration and application of knowledge based on both concepts and practice with the intent of improving peoples' lives. Scholarship of Extension takes place through an interactive, dynamic, and expanding process in which both concepts and practice are advanced through a continuing process for improved knowledge that is validated

by peers” (MSUE Work Group, 2003).

All Department faculty are expected to demonstrate competence in and commitment to outreach. Departmental expectations recognize that outreach and Extension encompass many forms, including activities and programs that extend beyond campus, state and national boundaries. In general, though, outreach refers to scholarship that contributes to effective information transfer to clientele, engagement with social groups and organizations, and/or documentable change and impacts for individuals and/or social systems. Our Department recognizes that outreach is performed by faculty without specific outreach or Extension appointments. In the reappointment, tenure and promotion processes, scholarship in outreach will be evaluated for all faculty members regardless of assignment, but specific expectations will vary depending on the candidate’s appointment, subject matter specialty, explicit agreements and the goals, needs and resources of the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife.

In considering the role of faculty without formal appointments in outreach or Extension, CANR policy states: “All College faculty should be committed to maintaining standards of excellence in outreach, and some contribution to outreach is an important and essential component of a faculty members’ responsibilities regardless of assignment.” (Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion, CANR, 1995). Faculty without formal MSU Extension or outreach appointments are expected to actively participate in the transfer of their research results to appropriate clientele groups.

Numerous useful sources provide valuable background for criteria and evidence to demonstrate outreach scholarship. Most useful in deciding on evidence of quality and beneficial impact of outreach is the MSU publication “Points of Distinction: A Guidebook for Planning & Evaluating Quality Outreach” (<http://www.msu.edu/unit/outreach/pubs/pod.pdf>). As this guidebook demonstrates, successful peer reviewed publications, acquisition of grants, and presentations to peers, are not the only criteria appropriate in establishing a record of effective scholarship in outreach and Extension.

#### Examples of evidence of scholarship in outreach

##### A. Creation

- a. *Program/activity organization.* All faculty should be able to describe the broad goals of their outreach work. Outreach programs and activities should reflect a high level of organization; examples of evidence of this include objectives, content that demonstrates the individual’s command and knowledge of subject matter relevant to the outreach, and/or plan for implementation using particular pedagogical techniques. Programs/activities should demonstrate the faculty member’s process for making decisions (perhaps with stakeholders) regarding program/activity objectives, content, implementation and evaluation. An outreach or Extension program or set of activities that achieves meaningful impacts must show evidence that systematic, research-based thought has provided the base for action. Even ongoing, routine and reactive outreach activities (such as replying to phone calls and email inquiries) may be summarized and documented to show how scholarly thought is the basis for action. Documentation should provide a reviewer with a thorough understanding of the outreach program/activity.
- b. *Generation of outreach funding and in-kind support.* One indication of scholarship in outreach is sustained success in obtaining internal MSU and extra-mural funding and in-kind support (e.g., services, donated goods/supplies, financial gifts, endowment donations). Evidence should demonstrate the kinds and sizes of funding and support acquired, and where appropriate, the engagement processes for including stakeholders and partners in funding procurement processes. As with research support, all outreach funding provides evidence of scholarship, regardless of source, magnitude, and contribution to university revenues.

- c. *Needs assessment and stakeholder engagement.* Prior to and throughout design and delivery of outreach programs/activities, scholarship entails the use of at least some activities such as needs assessment, environmental scans, SWOT analyses, situation analysis, continuous quality improvement (CQI), LOGIC models, community engagement, or one of many other processes. Evidence of scholarship must include documentation of such processes and of how the data gathered influenced decisions regarding outreach programs/activities.
- d. *Facilitation of stakeholder groups and engagement within an outreach context.* Nearly all faculty have the opportunity for creation of outreach innovations or application of research. Some faculty have responsibilities or opportunities to convene new groups representing, for example, an Area of Expertise team, a new committee, or an assemblage of partners. Others have opportunities to engage with learners in community-based contexts as they facilitate visioning, planning, or action processes to stimulate individual or organizational change. Regardless, the process of facilitation leads to scholarly creation of outreach efforts. Evidence of facilitation scholarship should include documentation of systematic group processes used, results of facilitated processes, and impacts of facilitation and leadership on individuals, social groups, or organizations.
- e. *New, innovative outreach.* Evidence of scholarship in outreach creation emerges from *developing* new outreach endeavors. All faculty should stay current with new communications tools and processes related to their specific form(s) of outreach work. Evidence of innovation can be demonstrated by showing how one's programs/activities recombine or realign existing outreach efforts, or are unique among state, national or international outreach in a particular technical subfield. Faculty should also effectively utilize the capability of individual and program-oriented internet resources, particularly up-to-date, informative web pages, to achieve outreach communication objectives.

## B. Discovery

- a. *Outreach research questions.* Faculty should be able to demonstrate scholarship in pursuing avenues of inquiry through their outreach work. This can range for example, from simply posing questions related to outreach audience characteristics and needs, to investigating immediate post-program feedback on audience satisfaction, to in-depth outreach research studies considering questions about program/activity/materials design, delivery, and impacts. Documentation of these questions can occur along a spectrum from brief project report narratives to detailed theses, dissertations, reports, and peer-reviewed papers.
- b. *Innovation and discovery in outreach design, delivery, or pedagogy.* Outreach activities may lead to new discoveries in program/activity/materials design, outreach implementation strategies, and even in basic approaches to and methods of teaching/instruction. These discoveries should be documented through reports, articles or other products, and where possible, peer-reviewed, shared with partners, and/or disseminated to peers through conferences/symposia.
- c. *Discovery through evaluation of processes, outputs, outcomes, impacts.* All faculty conducting outreach work should consider evaluation methods and results appropriate to the nature and scale of the program/activity. Clientele/learner satisfaction is only one measure that can be used in assessing the scholarship of outreach; in addition, process evaluation (recording outreach processes and their suitability), output documentation (e.g., numbers of clientele reached, resources generated through outreach), and assessment of outcomes for clientele, and investigating of longer-term impacts on individual's behaviors or social systems are all scholarly endeavors that can be documented to display scholarship (see C.a. and C.c. below). Evidence should be provided on the discovery of effects of an individual's outreach in terms of

clientele impacts such as enhanced understanding, behavioral change, and subsequent performance and accomplishment when applicable. Evidence should also be presented to show that outreach inspires, stimulates, fosters, and changes attitudes facilitating life-long learning, leadership development, and achievement by individuals and clientele groups.

C. Integration

- a. *Publications in peer-reviewed journals.* Ample opportunity exists for faculty to demonstrate their outreach scholarship both in journals focused on outreach as well as in technical, discipline-specific journals. All publications for which the faculty member is a co-author are important to demonstrating scholarship. The reputation of the journal in which papers are published is a factor in the evaluation, although it is recognized that the nature of the outreach being disseminated and the individual's appointment and assignment will have a large influence on the range of suitable publication outlets.
- b. *Materials, publications, curricula (with peer-review).* All faculty should display efforts to generate and/or mentor students in the generation of outreach products. Ways of accomplishing outreach scholarship include: visual materials such as slide sets, computer-based audio-visual presentations, web sites, written materials such as articles, papers, reports, bulletins, handbooks, fact sheets, newsletters, notebooks, compiled curricula, and popular journal articles; provision of informational resources to policy makers and other audiences through print or other forms (list based on MSUE Work Group, 2003). If possible and appropriate, peer-review, stakeholder and audience review or pilot testing of such materials will enhance scholarship.
- c. *Presentations with stakeholders, clientele, partners, internal outreach groups/committees/teams.* All faculty should demonstrate their outreach work by documenting scholarly presentations. Oral presentations and stakeholder involvement may include oral presentations such as talks, speeches, seminars, workshops, radio and TV programs; working with clientele groups including boards, councils, committees, task forces, workgroups, or other partners (list based on MSUE Work Group, 2003). Faculty should document when and where these presentations or meetings occurred, number and types of stakeholders served, the extent of their own leadership in convening such meetings, and any evidence of participant feedback or impact.
- d. *Collaborations and partnerships.* The extent to which faculty foster outreach collaborations and partnerships will vary depending on the program/activity and the nature of the individual's appointment and assignments. Scholarship includes demonstration of continued progress to develop partnerships with researchers and other stakeholders to address unanswered needs and disseminate knowledge, technology and research results to target audiences.
- e. *Peer acceptance, adoption, application, dissemination.* Demonstrated peer acceptance or adoption of outreach contributions and methods can be used as evidence of quality. When possible, evidence of scholarship can be demonstrated through letters or other indicators that an individual's outreach work has received peer acceptance, has been adopted by other outreach or resource management systems, has been applied in new contexts, or has been disseminated through conferences, symposia, meetings, printed or other materials, etc.
- f. *Professional service to professional outreach organizations, internal and external outreach or Extension bodies.* All faculty are expected to contribute to professional bodies in at least one area of their work. Ample opportunities exist to participate in professional service in outreach venues, especially if the individual has a large outreach or Extension appointment or assignment. Examples of such service encouraged include serving on regional and national

outreach committees, serving as a reviewer, and serving in a leadership role in MSU Extension AoE teams or other similar outreach programming bodies.

#### D Reflection

- a. *Portfolio.* It is recommended, although not required, that faculty members with outreach responsibilities maintain a portfolio. Portfolios provide a means of archiving and organizing evidence which demonstrates desirable improvements and innovations in outreach. “A diversified portfolio of scholarly products, educational works, and outcomes may include some of the following indicators...: workshop and conference materials, educational manuals and teaching guides, new curricula and courses, computer programs, simulations, problem analyses, informational databases, newsletters, newspaper articles, fact sheets, bulletins, reports, magazine articles, books, proceedings of seminars, conferences and professional meetings, abstracts, grant proposals, educational games, videotapes, audio cassettes, CDs, results of partnering efforts with clientele organizations” (MSUE Work Group, 2003). A portfolio should also reflect scholarly outreach goals of the individual, examples of processes used to achieve these goals or produce outreach products, and the individual’s reflection on change in approaches, revisions of materials or activities, and professional development.
- b. *Academic peer evaluation and recognition.* Peer evaluation through local, state, national or international recognition of outreach activities, products, programs, program materials, and delivery methods is highly desirable. Recognition by one’s peers is a clear indication of the achievement of scholarship in outreach. Examples of this include awards, invited presentations, letters of commendation or thanks, and invitations to serve on outreach bodies such as panels, committees, task forces, etc.
- c. *Clientele leadership, learning, recognition.* In outreach work, it is sometimes important to foster individuals’ or social systems’ capacity for facilitation and leadership in order to sustain the outreach effort. This is done through community engagement processes, “train-the-trainer” programs, volunteer development efforts, and leadership training institutes. Evidence that our outreach audience members and partners receive awards or recognition can also demonstrate scholarship and impact.
- d. *Clientele and partner performance input.* Finally, given the Land Grant *mission* of MSU and CANR, it is vital that clientele and partner performance input be sought, used for improvement, and documented. Informal evidence of scholarship might be displayed through clientele letters offering feedback or thanks for programming activities, or many other forms. Examples of formal input from clients and partners regarding outreach performance include feedback from management and other governmental and non-governmental agencies regarding an individual’s outreach work, or comments submitted by MSUE field staff regarding a faculty member’s performance. When this performance input is appropriate to the faculty member’s appointment and assignment, it should be included to document outreach scholarship.

### **EXPECTATIONS FOR UNIVERSITY CITIZENSHIP PERFORMANCE**

It is expected that all faculty shall exhibit appropriate conduct in professional activities related to their employment. This includes, but is not limited to, responsible fulfillment of administrative duties, appropriate management of grant funds, following proper rules and procedures and maintaining professional relationships with colleagues. Rules of professional conduct pertaining to research, teaching and other academic responsibilities of faculty members exist at the College and University levels and it is expected that faculty will conduct themselves in accordance with these guidelines.

It is also expected that faculty will initiate a continuing program of service through committee, administrative and public service activities. Such activities include but are not limited to service on academic committees and administration responsibilities. For example, evidence that candidates have been contributing members of standing and ad hoc committees at the Department, College and University levels would demonstrate service acceptable for re-appointment, tenure and promotion considerations.

Evidence of effective completion of administrative responsibilities assigned to faculty for which there is no special salary adjustment shall be considered service of equal value to committee assignments.

Service to the public beyond the University shall be evaluated as Outreach as discussed in the previous section of these guidelines.

## Developing Performance Expectations for Fisheries and Wildlife Faculty December 2008

Faculty in the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife are expected to have an approved set of performance expectations to help guide the annual evaluation and reappointment, promotion and tenure processes. This is clearly stated in our Bylaws (see Box 1) and is reflected in our recently approved Annual Evaluation Guidelines (see Box 2).

At the present time, we do not have performance expectations on file for any member of the core or pre-core faculty. I would like to address this deficiency during 2009. As I stated at a recent faculty meeting, I would like all faculty to include a draft set of performance expectations in their annual review materials, due at the end of January 2009.

Neither our Bylaws nor our Annual Evaluation Guidelines provide much concrete guidance on what the performance

expectations should look like. I believe that they should (1) reflect the individual faculty member's assignment; (2) account for situations where faculty have joint-appointments with other units; (3) provide a meaningful basis for determining whether there is evidence, either annually or at a decision point for reappointment/promotion/tenure, that expectations are being met at a reasonable level; and (4) not be so rigid as to be difficult to adapt to changing circumstances. On this basis I conclude that your expectations should document the criteria that are indicative of scholarship or scholarly activities in each of your assignment areas, and summarize the kind of evidence that can be used to assess whether these criteria are being met.

**Box 1: From the Bylaws for Academic Governance, Fisheries and Wildlife (Spring 2004)**

- 3.5.3 Within nine months of initial appointment, each new pre-tenured faculty member will provide to the Department Chairperson for approval, in writing, a set of performance expectations developed in consultation with her/his mentoring committee. At least once each year pre-tenured faculty members will meet with their mentoring committee to discuss performance expectations and, if appropriate, suggest revisions to performance expectations. The mentoring committee chairperson shall provide a summary of the committee's recommendations from this meeting to the Department Chairperson and the pre-tenured faculty member. These recommendations should comprise constructive advice to guide future activities of the pre-tenured faculty member.
- 3.5.4 Following this annual meeting the pre-tenured faculty member will meet with the Department Chairperson as part of their annual performance review, at which time any changes to performance expectations will be discussed and approved by the Department Chairperson. The Department Chairperson will provide a written summary of the performance evaluation to the pre-tenured faculty member and her/his mentoring committee.

In 2004-05 I served on an ad-hoc committee, with Dave Johnson and Shari Dann, whose task was to develop a set of guidelines for the evaluation of faculty in Fisheries and Wildlife. The report we produced (dated May 2005, attached), was intended to provide guidance for faculty in the development of their performance expectations. Please review this document and consider it a resource as you prepare a draft set of performance expectations. I recently asked Geoff Habron to try and tackle the issue of performance expectations for himself, and he used the 2005 document as the basis for developing criteria for his assignment, as well as coming up with a more general framework for faculty with a range of assignments. Geoff has told me he would be willing to share the result of his efforts with anyone who is interested, so feel free to follow up with him if you like.

As you know, our College is in the process of reviewing its approach to defining scholarship and scholarly activities *across the mission* and it makes sense for our performance expectations process to be consistent with the College model, especially insofar as reappointment, tenure and promotion are concerned. CANR has defined scholarship and scholarly activities in the following way:

**Box 2. From the Guidelines for annual evaluation of core and pre-core faculty (April 10, 2008)**

Annual performance evaluation meetings:

The annual performance evaluation meeting should include a review of the faculty member's assignment and of the faculty member's written performance expectations if needed. Performance should be evaluated in the context of previous appraisals, recommendations, and trajectory. Both the assignment and the written performance expectations should be updated based on the discussions in consultation with the mentoring committee where applicable. A copy of the current written performance expectations should be provided in writing to the faculty member and the chairperson of the mentoring committee if applicable prior to the annual performance evaluation meeting and kept in the faculty member's personnel file.

**Scholarship** across the mission – irrespective of whether it is associated with teaching, research, or Extension-outreach-engagement – involves creating something new and valuable (that is, makes a contribution) in a disciplinary, professional, multidisciplinary, or interdisciplinary field; having the work validated as such by peers; and making the work “public”, that is, available in an academically legitimate location for use in teaching, research, or Extension-outreach-engagement work.

**Scholarly activity** across the mission includes all activities associated with teaching, research and Extension-outreach-engagement wherein persons undertake work that is informed by an academically recognized body of knowledge, undertaken in a scholarly manner, and evaluated as having quality with impact.

[Adapted from MSU CANR – “Strengthening faculty scholarship across the mission” 1/25/08]

*Appendix 5: Elements of a Strong P&T Package*

**Department of Fisheries and Wildlife  
Elements of a Strong P&T package  
April 2011**

Promotion and Tenure packages are judged not measured, and it is recognized that packages will vary according to a candidate's appointment and his or her individually-tailored Performance Expectations document. The bullet points listed below provide specific examples of how a package is judged with respect to the "bottom line" in each P&T category. In addition to these guidelines, the Department also expects that P&T decisions will foster the existing culture of collegiality within the Department. Candidates are also strongly encouraged to reference the parallel "Elements" document of the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources.

**1. Reappointment to Assistant Professor**

**Bottom line:** clear evidence that the candidate is establishing a program that can achieve excellence in the area(s) of major appointment. The candidate does not need to be there yet, but there should be clear signs that they are on their way.

Benchmarks include:

- In Research
  - Obtains sufficient funding to initiate a program
  - Increasingly, some funding should be sought from competitive national sources (USDA, NSF, NIH etc.)
  - Attract students and/or post-docs
  - Finishes publishing prior work (PhD post-doc) and ideally has MSU work published or in press
- In Teaching
  - Is recognized as a solid teacher by colleagues and students
  - Shows true interest in teaching/evidence of innovation
  - Obtains very good SIRS summary scores (1's and 2's) and/or is showing evidence of improvement
  - Attends teaching and learning seminars
  - Presents and/or publishes on their teaching experiences and activities
- In Outreach
  - Obtains sufficient funding to initiate a program
  - Is recognized by clientele and colleagues as interested and dedicated to outreach
  - Shows initiative/innovation in outreach
- In Service
  - Contributes to Departmental/College/University activities when asked
  - Evidence of potential for contributions at national level
    - Journal peer reviewer
    - Membership/activity in state/regional/ committees

## 2. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

**Bottom line:** clear evidence that the candidate has established a program of excellence in the area(s) of major appointment and has at least minimum good performance in area(s) of minor appointment. There should be evidence of national recognition from solicited letters.

Benchmarks include:

- In Research
  - Obtains sufficient funding to support and grow a program
  - Obtains funding from diverse sources including competitive national sources (e. g., USDA, NSF, NIH)
  - Attracts students/post-docs.
  - Has graduated students (in a timely manner) who obtain suitable positions
  - Has established a record of consistent publication in peer-reviewed journals
  - Publishes in the best journals available for the particular discipline as measured by impact factors and within-discipline journal rankings
  - Is achieving suitable citation rates
  - Is invited to give presentations at peer universities and national meetings
  - Sought out as journal peer reviewer
- In Teaching
  - Is recognized as an excellent teacher by colleagues and students
  - Shows passion/innovation
  - Consistently obtains excellent to very good SIRS summary scores (1's and low 2's)
  - Shows consistent evidence of scholarship in teaching and learning
  - Mentors graduate and undergraduate students
- In Outreach
  - Obtains sufficient funding to support and grow a program
  - Is recognized by clientele and colleagues as excellent in outreach
  - Shows passion/innovation
  - Shows evidence of scholarship in outreach
- In Service
  - Contributor to Departmental activities
  - Contributes to College/University level activities
  - Contributor at national level
    - Participation in regional/national committees
    - Organizes national symposia, meetings, workshops
    - Sits on grant review panels

## **Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure**

Tenure Stream and Fixed Term Faculty

Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Michigan State University

Revised May 2020

This document describes the procedures for reappointment, promotion, and tenure (RPT) for all tenure-stream faculty; whose tenure home is in the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife; and for promotion of fixed-term faculty in the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife. Faculty with joint appointments should follow the guidelines of their tenure home. The intent of describing the procedures is to promote transparency and fairness. The deadlines below for each step of this process are mandatory. Failure to meet these deadlines will result in the candidate forfeiting his/her right to proceed through the RPT process for that year.

### **Detailed steps in chronological order:**

1. Department chair (hereafter, Chair) announces to the faculty at the first faculty meeting of the spring semester that the RPT cycle is commencing and reminds candidates to review the Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.
2. Each candidate wishing to be considered for reappointment, promotion or tenure announces this intention to the Chair. This may occur in the annual-review meeting, or another meeting, between the Chair and the candidate and documented in writing in an email to the Chair. This notification is the responsibility of the candidate.  
**Deadline:** April 15
3. The Chair will convene a meeting with all candidates wishing to be considered for reappointment, promotion or tenure to review the departmental RPT procedures and timeline. Arranging this meeting is the responsibility of the Chair.  
**Deadline:** April 15 to May 1
4. Each candidate will provide the Chair with a list of six potential external reviewers (and a list of anyone from whom NOT to solicit letters). The Chair's office, with input from faculty having similar expertise to the candidate, if possible, also compiles a list of six potential reviewers. In soliciting reviewers, a maximum of two letters should be from reviewers suggested by the candidate. Note that CANR requires a minimum of 4 external letters. This step does not apply for candidates seeking reappointment.  
**Deadline:** May 1
5. For candidates with externally funded appointments (external to MSU), the Chair solicits a letter from the external funding source to include in the packet.  
**Receive Letter Deadline:** September 1
6. The Chair provides each candidate with one or more examples of the primary components of the RPT materials that the candidate is responsible for producing (i.e., CV, reflective essay, and Form D) from recent past candidates (with permission of the past candidate(s)).  
**Deadline:** May 1
7. The candidate and Chair decide on a faculty member to present the candidate's packet for the RPT committee (see #15a below for a description of this committee) meeting in the upcoming fall. The presenter's role is not one of advocacy, but of information synthesis and communication. The Chair speaks to the proposed presenter, and if they agree, then they meet with the candidate over the summer to begin to discuss the

candidate's packet. The presenter must be at or above the rank the candidate is seeking. The presenter must be confirmed by the indicated deadline.

**Deadline:** The last day of spring semester

8. Each candidate for promotion and/or tenure provides their CV, reflective essay and three representative publications, and other content (e.g., teaching portfolio, engagement portfolio) needed for thorough evaluation of their assignment, to the Chair for distribution to external reviewers. Candidates will have an opportunity to update their CV and essay before distribution and final submission to the department (and college) RPT committees. Note: this step does not apply to those applying for reappointment.

**Deadline:** June 15

9. The Chair sends out the candidate's materials (CV, reflective essay, a description of the candidate's assignment, other relevant content (see #8) including any changes to it, and three representative publications) to the external reviewers.

**Deadline:** June 22

10. External letters are due.

**Deadline:** September 15

11. Each candidate provides their materials to the Chair, which include: Form D, CV, reflective essay, three representative publications, performance expectations, description of appointment and assignment, other relevant content (see #8), and electronic copies of SIRS (or equivalents). These materials are final versions. Each candidate is encouraged to provide draft versions to the Chair well before this date to ensure there are no formatting issues or omissions in the packet. Guidelines for preparation of materials can be found at:

[https://www.canr.msu.edu/facultystaff/faculty\\_development/reappointment-tenure-and-promotion](https://www.canr.msu.edu/facultystaff/faculty_development/reappointment-tenure-and-promotion)

**Deadline:** September 15

12. The Chair meets with each candidate to discuss their packet.

**Deadline:** September 22 to November 30

13. Each candidate gives a seminar (45 minutes, plus 15 minute question and answer period) on their program of scholarship (research, teaching, and/or outreach). The seminar is open to all, and voting faculty at rank higher than the candidate are expected to attend. The seminar must occur in early fall prior to the RPT committee meeting. Each seminar will be video-recorded and made available (online) to all members of the RPT committee. The intent of the seminar is to present the candidate's area of scholarship, which may be in research, teaching, and/or service/outreach, and provide an overview of the candidate's scholarly activities.

For definitions of scholarship and scholarly activities see the document titled, [CANR-Faculty Statement on Scholarly Activities, Scholarship, and Impact](#)

[https://www.canr.msu.edu/facultystaff/faculty\\_development/demystifying-reappointment-tenure-and-promotion](https://www.canr.msu.edu/facultystaff/faculty_development/demystifying-reappointment-tenure-and-promotion)

**Deadline:** September 1 to 3<sup>rd</sup> Friday of October.

14. The Chair uploads each candidate's packet of materials (as defined below) to a secured online environment and makes available to the departmental RPT committee.

**Deadline:** September 22

Detailed description of materials to made available to the RPT committee:

- a) Form D
- b) CV. Each candidate's CV should include information on scholarship in research, teaching, service, outreach, and extension (if relevant).
- c) Reflective essay (maximum 5 pages, single spaced)

- d) SIRS, or equivalents (the 2-page summary for each course in PDF form). If the candidate chooses to include student comments from SIRS, they can include a synthesis of the comments or quotes in Form D or their CV
- e) Three representative publications
- f) Performance expectations
- g) Description of candidate's appointment and assignment
- h) Minimum of 4 letters from external reviewers
- i) An example of the letter sent to the external reviewers
- j) If applicable, addition materials sent to letter writers (see #8 above)

15. The RPT committee meets to discuss each candidate's packet.

**Deadline:** 4<sup>th</sup> Friday of October

FW-RPT Review Committee description and procedures:

- a) Membership of the RPT committee includes all faculty members at or above the rank of the candidate (refer to excel document on the FW faculty online depository); the DAC chair facilitates the meeting. If the DAC chair is not a Full Professor then an alternative DAC member or member of DAC from the previous year presides over the meeting. Committee members unable to attend due to travel or sabbatical are expected to participate virtually/remotely if possible
- b) All RPT committee members are obligated to review each candidate's packet, attend the RPT committee meeting, and participate in the discussion
- c) The Chair attends the meeting and their role is primarily to listen to the discussion and to provide information related to the candidate's packet
- d) Presenters (see #7 above) should take no more than 10 minutes to provide a synthesis/summary of the candidate's materials. Within the presentation, the presenter should devote time that is approximately proportional to the candidate's assignment (i.e., research, teaching, outreach, service).
- e) At least 1 hour should be allocated per candidate for discussion

16. Each member of the RPT committee submits their vote using the secure online survey tool created by the DAC chair. At the time of their vote, each member of the RPT committee must indicate whether they saw the seminar, attended the RPT committee meeting, and/or reviewed the candidate's packet.

**Deadline:** One week after the RPT committee meeting

17. The DAC chair compiles the votes and written comments and forwards them to the Chair's office.

**Deadline:** One week after votes are due

18. Recommendations for reappointment, promotion, and tenure are forwarded from the department in the form of a letter from the Chair to the College. At this time, or soon thereafter, the Chair meets with each candidate and shares (verbally) the vote and their recommendation to the College.

**Deadline:** 2nd Friday of December

*Appendix 7: Faculty Mentoring in the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife*

Faculty Mentoring in the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife College of Agriculture and Natural Resources

Michigan State University

**Approved by FW Voting Faculty – Revised April 27, 2020**

The Department of Fisheries and Wildlife (FW) is strongly committed to the professional development and success of its faculty<sup>1</sup>, and views mentoring as a critical component of this commitment. The Department recognizes there are many forms of mentoring – formal, informal, peer – and values each. This formal mentoring policy is, therefore, in no way to be viewed as a substitute for the many important additional forms of mentoring that might benefit a faculty member. The Department believes that mentoring is a component of a faculty member’s entire career trajectory and thus the mentoring policy should not be confined to mentoring only for, and through, the RPT process. Similarly, any faculty member, at any stage in their career, might benefit from mentoring.

The Department recognizes that faculty within FW have diverse career stages, appointments, assignments, backgrounds, mentoring needs, and professional goals. Therefore, this formal mentoring policy is intended to be flexible while offering sufficient structure to facilitate a formal process as appropriate and desired. It is expected that the makeup of mentoring committees will be reviewed annually and will change regularly as the needs of the faculty mentee changes.

A faculty member may opt out of having a formal mentoring committee. However, all faculty members are encouraged to carefully consider whether they have sufficient mentoring support to help them to meet their professional expectations and accomplish their career goals. The default assumption is that early-career and mid-career faculty members will have a formal mentoring committee, and that senior faculty members<sup>2</sup> will not have a formal mentoring committee. If an early-career or mid-career faculty member opts out of having a formal mentoring committee, this needs to be documented in the annual review letter.

The Department recognizes that there are many parties that benefit from a successful Department mentoring program. We recognize that good mentoring helps foster a healthy and appropriate work/life balance for all faculty.

### **Welcoming Committee Makeup**

During the first year of a faculty mentee’s appointment, the Department Chair, in consultation with the Associate Chair and the Department Advisory Committee (DAC), will create and assign a “welcoming” committee appropriate for the faculty mentee. In addition to two FW faculty mentors for

---

<sup>1</sup> The term “faculty” in this policy refers to all department members at all ranks within the following categories: Specialists, Fixed-term, Tenure-stream.

<sup>2</sup> “Early-career” faculty are pre-tenure and typically at the rank of Assistant, “mid-career” faculty are typically tenured and Associate, “senior” faculty are typically tenured and Full. In many cases the equivalent exists for fixed term faculty and specialists.

a majority FW appointment, and one FW mentor for a minority FW appointment, the welcoming

committee will include an FW staff person who will serve as the main staff contact for the mentee. FW faculty mentors may include junior faculty who have been recently hired, but should include a mid-career or senior faculty member.

### **Mentoring Committee Makeup**

In each of the subsequent years, the Department Chair, in consultation with the faculty mentee, will assign the mentoring committee. Typically this committee will be composed of three members, but variation from this number is acceptable. Unless there are extraordinary circumstances, assignments are reviewed at the mentee's annual evaluation meeting with the department chair and the mentoring committee membership may be readily changed or augmented to meet the evolving needs of the mentee. Mentees should come to the annual review meeting with a proposed list of next year's mentoring committee and an explanation for suggested changes. The annual mentoring committee will consist of those faculty members most able to successfully assist the mentee in their pursuit of their goals at that stage in their career, as agreed upon between the mentee and the Department Chair.

Mentoring committees can include mentors at the same or a higher rank than the mentee, mentors outside of FW or even MSU, and even members outside the university (e.g., agency, industry). Mentoring committees will normally include at least one senior faculty member from FW. In the case of jointly appointed faculty where the faculty member holds a majority appointment in FW, the mentoring committee should include at least one member of the non-majority unit. If FW is not the majority unit then the mentees majority appointment mentoring policy supersedes FW's policy.

### **The Role of the Mentor and Mentoring Committee**

In general terms, the role of the mentoring committee is to actively offer the mentee professional advice on teaching, research, engagement, and other faculty duties. Mentors and mentoring committees should always act in the best interest of the mentee and act as aid in the professional development of a mentee.

MSU provides training for, and further information on, mentoring: see <http://www.adapp-advance.msu.edu/mentoring-content-2>

Other resources will be made available to mentors from the Department Chair's office.

### **The Role of the Mentee**

It is important that the **mentee take the lead in expressing her or his needs to the mentor committee**. This includes both topics for discussion and a meeting schedule. The normal expectation is that there will be a meeting once per semester with each member of the mentoring committee or with the committee as a whole, but variations from this may be appropriate or necessary in some circumstances.

### **Meetings and Topics**

To best serve the various professional needs of faculty members, mentoring discussions will inevitably vary. However, appropriate topics for mentoring discussions might include the trajectory of a mentees research program, teaching, extension and outreach (or engagement) efforts, service requirements, mentoring of students, professional networking, work/life balance, or time management strategies.

**Evaluation**

Of mentee: The formal mentoring committee is explicitly linked to the Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) processes of FW by virtue of being voting faculty members in the RPT process. Beyond this, however, there is no expectation for the mentoring committee to evaluate mentees. A report from the mentoring committee may be submitted to the Department Chair following a formal mentoring meeting, at the request of the mentee. The mentoring committee is responsible for submitting this report.

Of mentors: The Department will fully acknowledge the role of mentoring as an important component of a faculty member's FW service expectation.

**Dispute Resolution**

In the case of a dispute between the mentee and the mentoring committee, the mentee should first seek resolution through the Department Chair. The mentee may also seek resolution through the Department Associate Chair or through the DAC. The mentee should also be aware that MSU provides other campus resources for dispute resolution, specifically the MSU Ombudsman, and the Faculty Grievance Officer.

**Boundaries of Confidentiality**

It should be assumed that mentoring discussions are confidential unless otherwise explicitly stated or in cases of sexual harassment, illegal acts, or other items that are required, by law, to be reported. The Department encourages mentors and mentees to have an explicit discussion about what confidentiality means, or about what is or is not confidential between mentees and mentors.

**Policy Review**

This policy will be reviewed by the Department every five years, beginning in 2017.

*Appendix 8: Selection Procedure for the Department Chair Search Committee  
April 2020*

The Department Advisory Committee (DAC) shall produce a nomination ballot for the following positions on the search committee:

1. Tenure system faculty
2. Fixed term and Specialist faculty
3. Staff

The nomination ballot shall consist of a list of all eligible persons in each category. Eligible persons are individuals whose employment would normally be expected to extend beyond the period of a normal search, willingness to serve has been determined, and who are not scheduled for sabbatical or other leave. The chair of the DAC will distribute an email to all faculty and staff requesting that they present their opt-out case if unwilling or unable to serve on the search committee.

Nominators may select up to three persons from each of the categories. All faculty and staff in any of the three categories above may submit nominations from each category.

Following the nomination poll, DAC will construct a second ballot. After reconfirming eligibility and lack of intent to apply for the Department Chair position, the second ballot will consist of the following:

1. List of the Associate Chairs
2. All nominated tenure system faculty
3. All nominated fixed term and Specialist faculty
4. All nominated staff

All faculty and staff may vote for persons in each of these four categories. The vote will be constructed using a rank-choice method, whereby voters would rank their choices in each category (1=first preference, 2=2<sup>nd</sup> best preference, etc.). This method has been found to avoid splitting votes of similar candidates, resulting in outcomes that are more preferred by voters.

Following the poll, the Associate Chair with the top vote score, the two top vote score tenure system faculty, the top vote score continuing or fixed term faculty member, and top vote score staff member shall join the committee.

Concurrent to the faculty and staff nomination and voting process, the DAC will contact the President of the Graduate Student Organization to request that they produce a self-nomination process and vote on their own for a representative to serve on the Department Chair Search Committee. Candidates should be informed that the search is likely to take seven months, and that they will be expected to organize informal interactions with finalists and graduate students.

The DAC shall also work with the FW Undergraduate Academic Advisor, in conjunction with the Fisheries and Wildlife Club, to identify an undergraduate liaison to the search committee. The liaison should be a junior undergraduate student, majoring in Fisheries and Wildlife, and in good academic standing. Candidates for liaison should be informed that the process is likely to take seven months. The FW

Undergraduate Academic Advisor and the Undergraduate Liaison will organize informal interactions with finalists and the FW undergraduate student community.