

## **DIVISION OF BIOLOGY**

### **ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 5/11/06)**

### **PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 5/11/06)**

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES \*(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **5/2011**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES\*: **5/2011**

**Brian Spooner, Director**

**Date signed: 4/09/07**

**Steve White, Dean**

**Date signed: 4/10/07**

**M. Duane Nellis, Provost**

**Date signed: 4/10/07**

\*Each academic department is required by University Handbook policy to develop department documents containing criteria, standards, and guidelines for promotion, tenure, reappointment, annual evaluation and merit salary allocation. These documents must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty members in the department, by the department head or chair, by the dean concerned, and by the provost. In accordance with University Handbook policy, provision must be made to review these documents at least once every five years or more frequently if it is determined to be necessary. Dates of revision (or the vote to continue without revision) must appear on the first page of the document.

***PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES***

***ANNUAL MERIT EVALUATION, REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION***

**Kansas State University Division of Biology**

Originally approved by faculty  
May 3, 1978

Amended and approved by faculty  
March 4, 1982

Amended and approved by faculty  
February 9, 1989

Amended and approved by faculty  
November 8, 1993

Amended and approved by faculty  
October 6, 1995

Amended and approved by faculty  
January 28, 1997

Amended and approved by faculty  
February 24, 2003

Amended and approved by faculty  
August 20, 2004

Amended and approved by faculty  
May 11, 2006

# Procedures and Process

## Annual Merit Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

### Division of Biology

#### *I. Rationale and Basis*

##### **I-A. Faculty Evaluation**

Evaluation of faculty members is necessary for personnel decisions affecting annual merit salary increases, reappointment, tenure and promotion. Furthermore, annual evaluations aid faculty in their professional development and provide a mechanism for ensuring that the standards and objectives of the Division of Biology are met and accomplished. The procedures and processes for evaluation and assessment are important in that they assure that personnel decisions and faculty development are based on achievements and expectations that are both understood and reasonable. This document addresses the procedures for evaluation in the Division of Biology.

##### **I-B. Criteria and Standards**

The Division of Biology has a broad mandate in the instruction of (at the undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral levels), and scholarly research on, biological principles. The focus of faculty activity in the Division of Biology is excellence in instruction and/or research, as recognized by peers, and faculty evaluation will stress individual scholarly achievements in these areas as well as contributions in nondirected service. These evaluations will be within the context of the effort distribution expectations for each faculty member, which are established between the faculty member and the Division Director. It is expected that effort distribution in instruction, research, and service will reflect the strengths of individual faculty members, and the mission and objectives of the Division. With regard to tenure and promotion to associate professor, the candidate will have achieved independence in scholarly pursuits and developed a scholarly program in research and/or instruction which has gained a degree of professional recognition, and shows high promise of sustained contributions. Expectations for promotion from associate professor to professor are considerably higher, including leadership in scholarly research and/or instructional activities, and strong professional recognition at the national and international levels.

The system of tenure at Kansas State University provides academic freedom, which allows senior faculty to best use their talents in pursuing excellence in scholarship and instruction. There is a concern in the state community that this system protects faculty who chronically underachieve, and who ought to be held to a set of minimal expectations. Chronic underachievement will not be tolerated in the Division of Biology. For faculty members with an effort distribution in research, minimal expectations include regular scholarly productivity, as evidenced by activities such as publication in peer-reviewed journals, synthesis of biological concepts in book chapters or review articles, presentations as seminars or at professional symposia, and the submission of patents, in addition to an active search for funding to support these scholarly activities. For faculty members with an effort distribution in instruction, minimal expectations include both a reasonable quantity and quality of instructional activities, including, for example, activities in teaching, advising, and curriculum development and support. Minimal expectations in service include a regular degree of participation in activities, such as committees, panels, and groups, at the Division, University, State, or National levels, which further individual and collective academic or professional goals.

#### *II. Procedures*

##### **II-A. Annual Merit Salary Evaluations**

All regular faculty at the rank of instructor and above will be evaluated annually for merit salary considerations, providing also a basis for establishing the effort distribution for the coming year. This evaluation, normally for a calendar year ending December 31, will include completion of an effort report by each faculty member outlining responsibilities and achievements in instruction, research and nondirected service. This report will include a portfolio which documents the scholarship in research and instruction and provides evidence concerning the extent and scope of nondirected service.

Portfolio items to document scholarship in research can include: a listing of publications (journal articles, review articles, book chapters, etc, with those having been peer-reviewed clearly identified); descriptions of how published works

have been cited in the professional literature; platform or poster presentations at regional and national meetings; seminars and invited symposium presentations; patents submitted or obtained; software developed; listing of grant proposals current, pending, or submitted to support research activities; and notices of awards or special recognition for research activities.

Portfolio items to document scholarship in instruction can include: copies of syllabus materials presented to classes; descriptions of changes in course delivery from previous offerings; copies of exams, quizzes, and problem sets showing the level of course materials; notices of awards or special recognition for educational activities; anecdotal information and student comments showing the impact of the instructional activities on student progress; lists of theses and tangible evidence of scholarly achievements by students directed by the candidate; advising activities; listing of grant proposals current, pending, or submitted to support instructional activities; listing of publications and presentations related to instruction (including peer-reviewed journal articles, books, etc.); and peer evaluations of classroom and additional instructional scholarly activities. Student evaluations of instructional activities, obtained in a manner which is controlled for student motivation and other possible bias, must also be included as one component of the portfolio.

Portfolio items to document nondirected service can include: listing membership on Division, College, and University committees; service to national or societal committees; professional reviewing activities of manuscripts, grants, or textbooks; service on funding agency panels; and editorial activities. Such listings should also document the role(s) which the faculty member plays and the level of individual responsibility.

The effort report provided by the faculty member will be the basis for an evaluation by the Division Director. This evaluation will consider a faculty member's accomplishments relative to effort distribution, and will include a recommendation for any merit salary increase. The evaluation will also serve as a basis for establishing the effort distribution for the next year. Changes in effort distribution will normally be considered for post-tenure faculty on the basis of ability, need, and achievement (e.g., increased research effort in cases where both extramural funding and publication productivity justify predicted increased achievement expectations, and the Division's ability to accommodate the concomitant decrease in instructional effort). Before the Director's evaluation, merit salary recommendation, and past and future effort distribution assignments are submitted to the Dean, each faculty member will have the opportunity to discuss the written review with the Director and must sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review and discuss the evaluation.

If the Director concludes that the overall accomplishments of a faculty member do not meet the minimum expectations of the Division of Biology, the Director and that faculty member will meet and devise a plan whereby the situation can be corrected. If a faculty member receives such an evaluation in two consecutive years, or three times within a five-year period, the Director will proceed with options as defined in II-F.

## **II-B. Professorial Performance Award**

Consistent with section C49 of the University Handbook, faculty members who have attained the rank of Professor can be eligible for a Professorial Performance Award. The Professorial Performance Award rewards strong performance at the highest rank with a base salary increase in addition to that provided for by the annual evaluation process. Candidates for this award must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at Kansas State University for at least six years since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award. Eligible candidates for review will compile and submit a portfolio that documents her or his professional accomplishments for at least the previous six years. This portfolio will contain materials documenting the candidate's performance in scholarship, instruction, and service as indicated in section II-C above. The Division Director will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials in terms of the current criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the Division of Biology, along with a recommendation for or against the award. Each candidate for the award will have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the Division Director, and each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, each candidate has the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation to the department head and to the dean. A copy of the Division Director's written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate. Recommendations for this award will follow the timeline associated with the annual evaluation review, as outlined in section II-A above.

## **II-C. Chronic Underachievement**

Should the Director conclude for two consecutive years, or for three years within a five-year period, that the overall accomplishments of a faculty member do not meet the minimum expectations of the Division of Biology, the Director will exercise one of two options.

1. The Director may recommend to the Dean that a set of corrective measures be established to help the faculty member attain success in his/her professional endeavors. These measures may include requiring the faculty member to specify a set

of goals and a reasonable plan and timeline for attaining them, reassignment of responsibilities, within the context of the needs of the Division, to areas which more closely match the talents of the faculty member, and establishing a mentoring relationship between the faculty member and a more successful faculty member who could provide advice and guidance. Should the Director choose this option, the following steps will be followed:

a. The Director will meet with the faculty member to inform him/her of the decision, and to define those corrective measures which will be employed.

b. The faculty member has the right to request that additional faculty input be provided to the Director, to influence both the initial evaluation of the accomplishments and the set of corrective measures. The Director will then ask the Biology Tenure and Promotion Committee for additional input.

c. The Director will forward his/her recommendation to the Dean.

2. The Director may recommend to the Dean that the faculty member be dismissed from employment at the University. Should the Director choose this option, the following steps will be followed:

a. The Director will inform the faculty member of this decision.

b. The Director will seek additional input by asking that the Biology Tenure/Promotion Review Committee examine the credentials of the faculty member. The Committee will provide a substantive rationale for their support or non-support of the recommendation of the Director. The Committee report should include results of a numerical vote. The faculty member may request that the Director not seek this additional faculty input.

c. The Director will forward the recommendation, along with all the documentation used to formulate the recommendation, to the Dean.

## **II-D. Evaluation of Faculty Members on Probationary Tenure-earning Appointments**

### *II-D.1 Periodic Evaluations*

Faculty members on probationary tenure-earning appointments will be reviewed and evaluated by three independent processes:

1. Faculty members on probationary appointments will be periodically reviewed with regard to reappointment. The candidate will provide a curriculum vitae and instructional evaluations. The Director will add the cumulative prior written reappointment recommendations to the candidate's materials (in accord with section C53.1 of the University Handbook) and then will make these available for, and will request input from, eligible faculty before making a recommendation to the Dean on reappointment. Minimum time for faculty access to the materials, prior to providing input to the Director, will be 10 working days.

2. Faculty members on probationary appointments will be reviewed annually by the Division of Biology Tenure and Promotion Committee, with the emphasis of the review on the progress of the faculty member in the tenure-earning process. Faculty will provide the Director with a curriculum vitae and appropriate supporting materials of accomplishment in teaching, research and nondirected service. This information will be given to the Tenure and Promotion Committee and, after review, and in consultation with the Committee, the chair of the Committee will provide the candidate and the Director written commentary of the review and the candidate's progress toward tenure. The goal of this review is to provide constant guidance and feedback to the faculty member in order to facilitate success in the tenure-earning process.

3. A Mid-Term Tenure Review will be conducted during the third year of appointment. This review, mandated by University guidelines, is to provide the candidate with substantive feedback with regard to progress in meeting the Division's tenure criteria. Documentation for this review is identical to that of the review for tenure and promotion, except that comments from outside reviewers are not required.

### *II-D.2 Review for Tenure and Promotion*

The procedures for tenure and promotion are identical to the requirements in the KSU University Handbook. The Division Director will solicit from each candidate a portfolio documenting scholarship in instructional, research, and service activities. In addition to the portfolio, each candidate is expected to present a Division seminar in his/her area or discipline of scholarly activity.

Portfolio items to document scholarship in research can include: a listing (with copies provided) of publications (journal articles, review articles, book chapters, etc, with those having been peer-reviewed clearly identified); descriptions of how published works have been cited in the professional literature; platform or poster presentations at regional and national meetings; seminars and invited symposium presentations; patents submitted or obtained; software developed; listing of grant proposals current, pending, or submitted to support research activities; and notices of awards or special recognition for research activities.

Portfolio items to document scholarship in instruction can include copies of syllabus materials presented to classes; descriptions of changes in course delivery from previous offerings; copies of exams, quizzes, and problem sets showing the level of course materials; notices of awards or special recognition for educational activities; anecdotal information and student comments showing the impact of the instructional activities on student progress; listing of theses and tangible evidence of scholarly achievements by students directed by the candidate; advising activities; listing of grant proposals current, pending, or submitted to support instructional activities; listing of publications and presentations related to instruction (including peer-reviewed journal articles, books, etc.); and peer evaluations of classroom and additional instructional scholarly activities. Student evaluations of instructional activities, obtained in a manner which is controlled for student motivation and other possible bias, must also be included as one component of the portfolio.

Portfolio items to document nondirected service can include: listing membership on Division, College, and University committees; service to national or societal committees; professional reviewing activities of manuscripts, grants, or textbooks; service on funding agency panels; and editorial activities. Such listings should also document the role(s) which the faculty member plays and the level of individual responsibility.

The candidate should include in the portfolio a listing of goals and objectives which will guide professional activities for the next five years.

The portfolio will be provided to the Division of Biology faculty for their evaluation to provide tenure/promotion recommendations to the Director. The Division Director will request from the candidate a list of up to 6 names of potential outside reviewers (the Director may increase the reviewer pool size by the addition of reviewers that he/she identifies), who are recognized leaders in the candidate's scholarly field, and will obtain at least 3 outside reviews. The portfolio, plus the outside reviews, will be provided to the Biology Tenure and Promotion Committee, who will provide an independent assessment and recommendation to the Director concerning the tenure/promotion decision.

The Division Director will consider the responsibilities of the candidate during the evaluation period, the accomplishments of the candidate in fulfilling those responsibilities, the assessments provided independently by eligible faculty and the Biology Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the comments by the outside reviewers, and will use this information to provide the Dean with a recommendation concerning the tenure/promotion decision.

## **II-E. Review for Promotion to Professor**

Faculty who have been in rank for a period of time may request consideration for promotion to the next level. According to the University Handbook, the median time in rank at the time of promotion at KSU has been about 6 years. The Division Director will solicit from each candidate a portfolio documenting scholarship in instructional, research, and service activities, and attesting to the national prominence of the candidate. In addition to the portfolio, each candidate is expected to present a Division seminar in his/her area or discipline of scholarly activity.

Portfolio items to document scholarship in research can include: a listing (with copies provided) of publications (journal articles, review articles, book chapters, etc, with those having been peer-reviewed clearly identified); descriptions of how published works have been cited in the professional literature; platform or poster presentations at regional and national meetings; seminars and invited symposium presentations; patents submitted or obtained; software developed; listing of grant proposals current, pending, or submitted to support research activities; and notices of awards or special recognition for research activities.

Portfolio items to document scholarship in instruction can include copies of syllabus materials presented to classes; descriptions of changes in course delivery from previous offerings; copies of exams, quizzes, and problem sets showing the level of course materials; notices of awards or special recognition for educational activities; anecdotal information and student comments showing the impact of the instructional activities on student progress; lists of theses and tangible evidence of scholarly achievements by students directed by the candidate; advising activities; listing of grant proposals current, pending, or submitted to support instructional activities; listing of publications and presentations related to instruction (including peer-reviewed journal articles, books, etc.); and peer evaluations of classroom and additional

instructional scholarly activities. Student evaluations of instructional activities, obtained in a manner which is controlled for student motivation and other possible bias, must also be included as one component of the portfolio.

Portfolio items to document nondirected service can include: listing membership on Division, College, and University committees; service to national or societal committees; professional reviewing activities of manuscripts, grants, or textbooks; service on funding agency panels; and editorial activities. Such listings should also document the role(s) which the faculty member plays and the level of individual responsibility.

The candidate should include in the portfolio a listing of goals and objectives which will guide professional activities for the next five years.

The portfolio will be provided to the Division of Biology faculty for their evaluation to provide promotion recommendations to the Director. The Division Director will request from the candidate a list of up to 6 names of potential outside reviewers (the Director may increase the reviewer pool size by the addition of reviewers that he/she identifies), who are recognized leaders in the candidate's scholarly field, and will obtain at least 3 outside reviews. The portfolio, plus the outside reviews, will be provided to the Biology Tenure and Promotion Committee, who will provide an independent assessment and recommendation to the Director concerning the promotion decision.

The Division Director, in light of the responsibilities of the candidate during the evaluation period, the accomplishments of the candidate in fulfilling those responsibilities, the assessments provided independently by eligible faculty and the Biology Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the comments by the outside reviewers, will provide the Dean with a recommendation concerning the promotion decision.

#### **II-F. Itemized Listing of Responsibilities in Tenure and/or Promotion Activities**

The following list presents these activities and the responsibility of each participant in the process:

##### The Director:

1. Identifies and contacts all faculty eligible for tenure and/or promotion. Interviews potential candidates to reach a conclusion concerning the desirability and feasibility of consideration for tenure and/or promotion. Consideration for tenure may be a mandatory requirement for reappointment. Describes the evaluation process to the candidates and requests from them the documentation which will be required to ensure a meaningful evaluation.
2. Selects three or more off-campus reviewers from a pool of names submitted by the candidate and by the Director. The Director contacts the selected reviewers to solicit their evaluations of the candidate and forwards a copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae to each reviewer. The Director shall make clear in writing to the reviewers that their comments will not be made available to the faculty candidates or to the general faculty, although they will be made available to the Biology Tenure and Promotion Committee and will be forwarded to the Dean.
3. Adds the outside reviews to the information packet prepared by the candidate for the Director and the members of the Biology Tenure and Promotion Committee.
4. Compiles general faculty recommendations, votes, and comments, and assesses the report of the Biology Tenure and Promotion Committee.
5. Develops recommendations for the Dean.
6. Communicates with the Tenure and Promotion Committee to discuss recommendations to be made to the Dean.
7. Discusses the recommendation decision with each candidate. The Director may also provide the candidate with transcribed faculty comments (edited to avoid individual identity), a copy of the Tenure/Promotion Committee letter to the Director, and a copy of the Director's letter to the Dean.
8. Forwards the following to the Dean: the recommendation, the Tenure and Promotion Committee vote, the vote of the Biology faculty, verbatim comments of the Committee and the faculty, the candidate's credentials, and the outside reviews.

##### The Candidate:

1. Prepares a curriculum vitae in compliance with the standard format used in the Division of Biology.

2. Provides a portfolio which documents achievements in scholarship regarding instruction, research, and service. This portfolio must include documentation in the common KSU format provided by the Provost.
3. Submits up to six names of potential outside reviewers who are recognized leaders in the candidate's scholarly field. The outside reviewers should not have, or have had, strong affiliation with the candidate so that they can provide objective evaluations without conflict of interest; any affiliation with the candidate must be made clear. The Director has the prerogative of seeking additional reviewers.
4. Presents a Division seminar in his/her area or discipline of scholarly activity.

Faculty (Assistant Professor and above)

1. Reviews information in the curriculum vitae and supporting documents and forwards comments and a recommendation for tenure and/or promotion to the Director. In the event that a candidate is a member of another faculty member's immediate household, that faculty member shall be excused from participation in the evaluation process.
2. Faculty comments will be identified as to name, academic rank, tenure status, section affiliation, and the level of interactions between the faculty member and the candidate. A transcribed copy of faculty comments will be included with the materials submitted by the Director to the Dean (but will not be included in the materials provided to the Tenure/Promotion Committee).

Tenure and Promotion Committee:

1. Annually assesses progress of faculty working toward tenure by examination of updated credentials, with a goal to provide substantive feedback to aid in faculty improvement. Provides a written assessment for the faculty member, with a copy forwarded to the Director.
2. Evaluates credentials of candidates during the Mid-Term Tenure Review.
3. Evaluates credentials of candidates for promotion and tenure; these consist of materials provided by the candidate, plus outside letters solicited by the Director.
4. After receiving the relevant materials from the Director, the chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee assigns primary responsibility for each candidate to an appropriate member of the Tenure and Promotion Committee. At the discretion of the chair, additional committee members may be asked to provide secondary reviews.
5. The primary and secondary reviewers may discuss issues with the candidate to clarify questions and comments. The reviewers then present the collected information in closed session to the committee, and the committee discusses in depth the merits of the tenure and/or promotion request.
6. All members vote approval or disapproval of a candidate's application, and the committee provides a substantive report on the rationale for the approval/disapproval recommendation.
7. The committee vote and recommendation for tenure and promotion are forwarded in writing to the Director.

***III. Tenure and Promotion Committee***

**Composition and Selection of the Tenure and Promotion Committee**

The committee shall represent the breadth of the Division and consist of seven tenured full-time faculty members who hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. One member from each of the Sections of the Division shall be elected by the general faculty. No faculty member can be eligible for election from more than one Section; for the purposes of this election, eligible faculty members who are affiliated with multiple Sections must declare a "primary" Section on whose ballot their names will appear; The remaining members shall be appointed by the Director. One member will be appointed by the Director as the committee chair. The chair will convene the meetings, assign reviewers and write the evaluation statement transmitted to the Director after committee approval.

In the event a committee member is under consideration for promotion, he/she will be excused from promotion-related deliberations for that academic year. Likewise, consistent with the University nepotism policy, should a member of a

committee member's immediate household be under consideration for tenure and/or promotion, that committee member will be excused from all related deliberations for that academic year.

The committee will conduct its affairs with no less than five members present. In the event that fewer than five members are able to convene, the Director will appoint an alternate.

As elected representatives complete their terms, each full-time regular faculty member at ranks of assistant professor and above with primary appointment in the Division of Biology shall vote for new representation from faculty in the affected section or from the Division at-large. The person with the most votes (ties will be decided by a run off ballot) will be elected to membership. All elected member terms will be for three years. Members appointed by the Director shall serve a one-year term. There shall be no restrictions regarding succession for either appointed or elected members of the committee.

#### ***IV. Process Review***

Review of these procedures by the faculty of the Division of Biology will take place at least every five years.