

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 4/17/2006)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 4/17/2006)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **4/2011**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **4/2011**

Eric Maatta, Department Head

Date signed: 4/09/2007

Steve White, Dean

Date signed: 4/09/2007

M. Duane Nellis, Provost

Date signed: 4/11/2007

**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.*

Procedure for Faculty Evaluation in Chemistry

Approved November 20, 1996; Revised November 11, 1997
Revised July 2002, Approved July 27, 2002; Approved by the Provost, Sept 20, 2002;
Re-approved by the Chemistry Faculty April 17, 2006

Purpose of the Annual Evaluation

At the end of each calendar year the department head is required to prepare a written evaluation for each regularly appointed unclassified person who was employed for at least three months during the calendar year. The evaluation is intended to describe and assess the accomplishments and contributions of each unclassified employee, to provide guidance if progress in one or more areas of responsibility is deemed below expectations, and to make a faculty ranking that will be used in the assignment of the annual merit salary increase.

Allocation of Responsibilities

Faculty members who are in tenured and tenure-track positions are normally allocated responsibilities in scholarship (45%), teaching (45%), and service (10%). The percentages in these categories may vary as much as 10-20% from the norm, depending upon specific service and research loads and teaching assignments. The decision of a faculty member to change the allocations among scholarship, teaching, or service requires the concurrences of the faculty member, the department head, and the dean. If reduction in service in one or more areas of responsibility is requested and approved, then corresponding increases will be made in the other areas of the faculty member's responsibilities.

The Chemistry Department also has several unclassified employees who are not in tenured or tenure-track positions. In most instances, these persons will have appointments that will not involve scholarship.

Submission of Materials

At the end of each calendar year each faculty member should submit a completed "Professional Activities" report (see pages 1-9 for the requested format). Each faculty member is encouraged to submit supplementary materials that documents the faculty member's professional activities. These may include, but are not limited to, reprints of papers, proposals that have been submitted, course syllabi, and letters of commendation.

Evaluation Procedure

Teaching. Attributes that will be evaluated in this category include:

1. ability to challenge students intellectually, scholarly command of subject material, and clarity of presentations
2. fairness and equity in grading
3. ability to stimulate students' interest and appreciation of chemistry.
4. careful organization of lectures and laboratories, and pedagogical value of homework and examinations.
5. effectiveness of the supervision of research students and other coworkers.
6. facilitating student learning (e.g., help sessions, being available to help students outside class hours, and taking an interest in and meeting student learning needs).

The teaching evaluation will be based on the department head's general knowledge and observations; student comments, complaints, and compliments; the results of exit interviews with seniors and the Department's periodic surveys of chemistry alumni; the results of formal students' ratings of faculty; and the receipt of competitive awards and prizes. Students' ratings of faculty teaching will be conducted using the University-approved TEVAL evaluation form. Probationary faculty in tenure-track positions will be rated by students in each class in which they have had significant instructional responsibility. Students' ratings of teaching for tenured and other permanent members of the faculty will be conducted at least once annually in a course in which they have had significant teaching responsibility. These evaluations shall be conducted in the same manner as that for probationary faculty. Students' ratings will be considered in the evaluation of faculty for annual merit salary increases, reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

Each faculty member is expected to provide documentation of their teaching effectiveness. In addition to the results of student evaluations, this could include course materials such as syllabi, hand-outs, special projects, new or revised laboratory experiments, examinations, and supplemental learning material; and information on instructional techniques and other teaching innovations.

Scholarship. Each tenured and tenure-track faculty member is expected to establish and maintain a nationally recognized scholarship program in his/her discipline. Major weight in the annual evaluation will be given to published scholarly books and research, including research related to teaching, that appear in high-quality refereed journals; the winning of major extramural funding in amounts to meet the needs of a nationally competitive scholarship program; the receipt of competitive awards and prizes; and the presentation of invited, plenary lectures (e.g., ACS symposia, Gordon Conferences, seminars at Ph.D.-granting institutions and chemical industries). Less weight will be given to contributed papers and posters at professional meetings; papers that appear in conference proceedings; small, limited-competition research awards; and unsolicited contributions and presentations. The least weight will be given to papers, proposals, and other contributions that have been submitted but have not yet been acted upon. The evaluation of scholarship will also take into account solicited and unsolicited comments of other professionals who are familiar with the person's work.

Service. Each faculty member is expected to render service to the Department, College, University, and the chemical profession. Evaluation of service will take into account their amount and significance. Departmental service that has significant impact on the quality of our programs and that is highly valued includes the effective advising of students, active participation in the recruitment of graduate and undergraduate students, assisting in the preparation of departmental proposals, serving on appointed and elected committees, and participating in the normal affairs of the Department (e.g., faculty meetings, seminars, and meeting with departmental guests). Examples of service that are essential to the successful operation of the College and University include governance (e.g., College Committee on Planning and Faculty Senate), Dean's Advisory Committee, Pre-Med Evaluation Committee, scholarship selection committees, and various standing and ad hoc University and College planning and evaluation committees. Examples of important professional service include participation in the activities of local, regional, and national professional societies or organizations, including their leadership; organizing symposia and meetings; reviewing research proposals, papers, and books; acting as a resource person for schools, civic organizations, and

branches of government; and serving or participating on panels and in workshops.

Unclassified Employees in Non-Tenure Track Positions. The Chemistry Department has several faculty members and unclassified employees who are not expected or required to perform the full range of professional activities. Evaluation of these faculty and unclassified employees will be based on how well the person has performed in each of his or her areas of responsibility and the overall impact that each person has had on the Department's programs.

Additional Expectations of All Faculty Members and Unclassified Employees. Each faculty member and unclassified employee is expected to perform all job functions in a professional manner and to interact collegially with other University employees, students, and citizens of the State so as to promote a safe, harmonious working and learning environment.

Letter of Evaluation. After careful study and analysis of the information that been provided to the department head, an evaluation letter is written to each faculty member describing where the department head believes excellence has been achieved or where improvements are needed. Formulas that would require either assignment of a value to each contribution of each person or weight the distribution of effort will not be used in assessing the person's performance. Instead, the contributions of the faculty member will be judged on the basis of their overall impact on the Chemistry Department's teaching, scholarship, and service programs; how the Department's image and reputation have been enhanced locally, regionally, and nationally; the faculty member's experience; and the Department's expectations.

After the letters are written, each person is assigned to one of five categories:

Outstanding. Those faculty who are making an exceptional impact.

Exceeds Expectations. Those faculty who are making meritorious contributions in one or more areas and who are performing competently in all areas of responsibility.

Meets Expectations. Those faculty who are fulfilling their responsibilities competently.

Below Expectations. Those faculty who have fallen below expectations in one or more areas but whose overall performance has met minimum acceptable performance levels.

Unacceptable. Those faculty whose overall performance has fallen below the minimum acceptable level.

The category in which each faculty member is placed will determine his or her percentage merit raise. The percentages of salary increase may vary within a category, but the increases within any one category may not overlap those of another category unless the pay raise is zero percent.

When the letters are complete, each person will receive the original and one copy of his or her letter of evaluation. The person is then given one week to comment on his or her letter and ranking. During this one week period the following actions should occur:

(A) In all cases the faculty member will meet with the department head to discuss the letter of evaluation, possible changes in the areas of responsibility and their relative weights, corrective action (if needed), and the person's professional goals and objectives.

(B) Revision of the letter of evaluation and its ranking may be made following the above discussion if the department head and the faculty member agree to the revision.

(C) If a *tenured* faculty member has received an “unacceptable” ranking then the faculty member **may** request that a meeting of the eligible faculty discuss the issues that led to the “unacceptable” ranking being given. Procedures to be followed in this case are described in the section “**Minimal Acceptable Standards for Faculty Members**”.

(D) If any faculty member has received a ranking with which they are unsatisfied, and this matter cannot be resolved by discussion with the department head, the faculty member **may** request that the Executive Committee discuss the issues that led to the faculty member’s ranking and the faculty member’s concerns. As a result of this discussion the department head may agree to change the ranking.

(E) **In the event of disagreement** resulting from action (A), (B), (C) or (D), the faculty member may present a dissenting letter that will accompany the department head’s letter, and both letters will be sent to the Dean of Arts and Sciences. In cases where the Dean receives a dissenting letter in addition to the department head’s letter the Dean will report to the department head what ranking should be assigned to the faculty member.

(F) When action (C) and (E) has occurred, the faculty member will have written a dissenting letter to the Dean. In this case the department head **will report** the involvement of the Executive Council or Faculty Meeting to the Dean, together with the recommendation of the Executive Council or Faculty Meeting as appropriate. The votes cast will be reported, and individual members of the appropriate council or meeting will be allowed to make anonymous written comments that will be transmitted to the Dean by the department head.

(G) When action (D) has occurred **and** the faculty member decides not to write a dissenting letter to the Dean (i.e. action (E) has not occurred) the department head **will not report** the involvement of the Executive Council to the Dean, and all record of the Executive Council Meeting will be destroyed.

When the department head agrees to change a letter of evaluation as a result of the processes discussed above, then the original letter of evaluation will be destroyed and no details of the process will be conveyed to the Dean.

Minimal Acceptable Standards for Faculty Members

Tenured faculty

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to contribute to the three areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service. In some circumstances the faculty member, the department head, and the Dean may mutually agree to a reallocation of duties so that the faculty member's duties differ from the norm. If performance in one of the areas should no longer be required, then responsibilities in the remaining areas will be increased. For example, if research/scholarship is no longer required, then increased teaching and service duties will be assigned.

Due-process procedures for possible dismissal of a tenured faculty because of chronic low and unacceptable achievement are described in sections C31.5-C31.8 of the University Handbook. The department head is initially responsible for determining if a faculty member's overall job performance is unacceptable and for recommending remedial action. If remedial action fails and the faculty member's overall performance remains unacceptable, then the department head will inform the faculty member in writing of this determination.

Appeal Procedures

Faculty Discussion

At the faculty member's discretion, the department head's determination may be appealed to the department's eligible faculty. If an appeal is made, then the eligible faculty† (excluding the faculty member making the appeal) and the department head will meet to discuss the case.

Faculty Vote

On the first business day subsequent to the faculty's discussion of the faculty member making the appeal, each qualified member of the faculty will submit a written recommendation to the department head. The recommendation should be submitted inside a sealed, unsigned envelope that in turn is enclosed inside a plain, signed envelope. At the close of the business day, the Chair of the Executive Committee* and the department head will remove the sealed ballots from the envelopes in which they were transmitted, destroy the outer envelopes, and then open the ballots and record the vote. The results of the faculty vote and a summary of the written justifications will be transmitted to the faculty member making the appeal. The summary, which will be prepared by the Chair of the Executive Committee, will be appropriately edited to ensure confidentiality.

Report of the department head

The department head will review the recommendations of the voting faculty, report the votes and transmit the ballot forms (which may contain faculty comments) to the Dean, and make an independent recommendation to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences supporting or failing to support the "Unacceptable" evaluation. The department head will explain her/his recommendation in writing to the faculty member making the appeal and to the qualified faculty. The Dean will determine what the final evaluation ranking should be, and will report this ranking to the faculty member concerned and the department head.

†Chemistry Department practice appoints the longest serving elected member of the Executive Committee (a body elected by the faculty with one *ex officio* member - the department head) the Chair of the Executive Committee.

*Eligible faculty are tenured faculty members with the same or higher rank than the faculty member making the appeal.

Teaching. Evaluations may include, but are not limited to, formal and informal evaluations by current and former students; course syllabi, problem sets, laboratory experiments, and examinations; innovations in teaching methods and in course and curriculum development; students' performances on standardized examinations; knowledge of the subject matter being taught and presentation of the material in a clear and coherent manner; effective work with students and colleagues; meeting of classes on a regular basis and ready availability to students outside of the classroom during posted office hours, by walk-in, or by appointment; challenging the students intellectually; providing a learning environment that stimulates students' interest and appreciation for the field of study; and effective advising of undergraduate and graduate students. If the faculty member should wish, members of the Executive Council will attend a representative number of the faculty member's classroom lectures in order to assist in the evaluation of classroom instruction.

Scholarship/Research. Considerations should include scholarly publications, attendance and participation in professional meetings; pursuit of extramural grant funding for faculty, department, university and state programs; effectiveness and amount of work with undergraduate and graduate research students; and membership on the Graduate Faculty.

Service. Expectations shall include working effectively on departmental committees and the performance of service that benefits the Department, the College, the University, and the chemical profession.

Non-Tenure Track Unclassified Employees

The Chemistry Department employs several unclassified personnel whose work supports the department's instructional and research programs (e.g., Director of Freshman Laboratories, mass spectrometry, and glassblowing). As a result of the nature of their employment, these employees are evaluated on how effectively each one contributes in his or her way to the successful attainment of the department's goals and missions. The rating of "Unacceptable" will be awarded when the employees' job performance is determined to be inadequate by the department head and the elected members of the Executive Council concur by unanimous vote.

Professorial Performance Award: Criteria and Procedures

Approved by Chemistry Faculty April 17, 2006

The Professorial Performance Award, as approved by the KSU Faculty Senate on Feb. 14, 2006, serves as a reward to those at the rank of Professor who have continued to demonstrate strong performance since promotion. It is a merit-based award; it is neither a form of promotional review nor an elevation in rank to a "Senior Professor" level. The award consists of an addition to the individual's base salary equal to 8% of the average salary of all full-time faculty (computed as Instructor through Professor, excluding administrators at those ranks). Individuals may receive the Award multiple times with an interval of at least six years between successive Awards.

Eligibility. The candidate 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. The candidate must present evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review, and this productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to Professor according to the Department's current approved standards.

Timing. Eligible candidates will submit a Professorial Performance Award file to the Department Head in early January, at the same time that materials for Annual Evaluation are submitted.

Criteria. The criteria for the Professorial Performance Award will be those that the Department uses for promotion to the rank of Professor, *i.e.* the expectations in Teaching, Research, and Service as given below:

Teaching. Excellence in teaching is expected of each candidate. This includes both course content and the ability to communicate as judged by *e.g.* classroom visitations, syllabus review, acceptable course and teaching evaluations, *etc.* Other evidence for the quality of teaching might include: specific awards for teaching; improvements in the instructional program via the successful acquisition of extramural grants for instructional equipment, *etc.*; course initiation and major revision of existing courses; successful innovations in teaching methods; effective counseling and advising of students; and the achievements of former students.

The candidate should be effective in both graduate and undergraduate teaching; however, it may be expected that some persons may be better at one than the other. An important criterion will be the candidate's potential to sustain a life-long, high-quality teaching career.

Research. The candidate must have established and maintained a research program that has earned national recognition in the candidate's discipline and is acknowledged by leading experts in the field. Frequent publication of the results of the candidate's research in high-quality, refereed journals is required. The record of frequent publication must be for a sustained period of time and it must be clearly evident that the habit of consistent publication of carefully performed work in leading journals has been firmly established.

Communications, review articles, and monographs will be included in the evaluation. It is also expected that the candidate's work has been presented frequently in lectures and papers at other

institutions and scientific meetings.

Although both the amount and quality of research will be considered, the quantity of publications *per se* is less important than the quality of the published work and the record of sustained scholarly work. The publication record will also be considered in light of the field, the teaching load, and the availability of graduate students. The candidate should also have demonstrated the ability to obtain sustained extramural funding to support her/his research program. The current and cumulative amounts of extramural funding will be considered with regard to the availability of funds in that research area.

Other evidence for the quality of the research might include: national, regional, and local awards; the achievements of the candidate's former students; and the utilization of a sabbatical leave or leave of absence to enhance her/his research program.

Service. The candidate should have a sustained record of service to the Department. Such service will include the active recruitment of graduate students, assisting in the preparation of departmental proposals, serving on appointed committees, and participating in the normal functions of the department (e.g., faculty meetings, seminars, meeting with departmental guests, etc.). The candidate is expected to have demonstrated leadership ability. Evidence of leadership might include: serving as the chair of standing and *ad hoc* departmental committees, service on departmental and University policy-making and personnel selection committees, and substantive contributions in the development and promotion of research and teaching programs. Professional service should include participation in the activities of professional societies, including their leadership; organizing symposia or meetings; reviewing research proposals, papers, or books; *etc.*

What to submit. The candidate's submitted material will describe her/his achievements in research, teaching, and service during the evaluation period and should include:

1. A one page summary of accomplishments as they relate to the criteria for the Award.

Instructional Contributions

2. Statement of activities (classes taught, student advisement, thesis/dissertation direction, and any other evidence of instructional productivity).

3. Evidence for quality of teaching, such as student evaluations, outcomes of special instructional projects, awards, etc.

4. Other evidence of creativity and excellence in teaching such as innovative teaching methods, introduction of new courses, substantive revision of existing courses, etc.

Research Activities

5. One page summary statement of research activities.

6. List of publications for the evaluation period. Articles in press or accepted for publication may be included, if they are denoted as such.

7. List of grants and contracts funded during the evaluation period, including funding agency, funding level, duration, title, and collaborators. A separate list of proposals that were not funded during the evaluation period should also be supplied.

8. Lists of invited and contributed presentations at scientific meetings and symposia; research seminars at universities, industries, and government laboratories; and graduate student recruiting seminars.

9. A list of former and current students and the current status of each of them.

10. A discussion of the candidate's collaborative work with other research groups.

11. National, regional, and local awards or recognition; copies of articles or other materials that cite or discuss the importance of the candidate's work and contributions.

Service Contributions

12. A summary of the candidate's activities on departmental, college and university committees.

13. A summary of the candidate's activities in national, regional, and local professional societies.

14. Information concerning the candidate's organization of symposia, etc.
15. Evidence of the candidate's reviews of books, papers, and research proposals.
16. Evidence of substantive service and contributions to the scientific community.

Procedure. After reviewing the candidate's file in terms of the criteria outlined above, the Department Head will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials, along with a recommendation for or against the Award, and will forward it to the candidate. Each candidate for the Award will have an opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the Department Head, and will sign a statement acknowledging this opportunity.

Within seven working days after the discussion, each candidate will have the opportunity to submit a written statement of unresolved differences to both the Department Head and the Dean of Arts and Sciences.

The Department Head will submit the following items to the Dean of Arts and Sciences: 1) a copy of the departmental criteria and procedures document; 2) a copy of the evaluation and recommendation letter; 3) documentation establishing the opportunity for the candidate to review the recommendation with the Department Head; 4) any written statements of unresolved differences of opinion; and 5) the materials supplied by the candidate that served as the basis for the Award recommendation.

Subsequent stages will follow the appropriate sections of the University Handbook (currently sections C49.1 through C49.14).

Departmental Seminar. Each faculty member who receives a Professorial Performance Award is expected to present a seminar to the Department on his or her research within one year of the Award.

Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment Procedures and Criteria
Department of Chemistry
Adopted: February 1, 1994

Revised Sept.1996, Jan. 1998, Mar. 2000, Sept. 2001 and Aug. 2003; Re-approved Apr. 17, 2006

A. Tenure and/or Promotion

The University's criteria and procedures for tenure and promotion are given in the "Faculty Handbook". Candidates will normally be considered for tenure during the final year of the maximum probationary period, although, in exceptional cases, candidates with outstanding records in research, teaching, and service may be considered for tenure at an earlier date. In these exceptional cases, the request for an early tenure decision may be made either by the candidate submitting a written request to the department head by August 18 or by a majority of the tenured faculty with the concurrence of the candidate.

In the case of promotions, a request for consideration of promotion may be made either by a majority of the faculty members who are qualified to vote on the promotion or by the candidate submitting a written request to the department head by August 18. In the case of either promotion or tenure, the candidate has the right to proceed or withdraw from the process at any time.

1) Procedures

1.1) The Candidate's Responsibilities

1.1.1 Material required for Tenure and Promotion/ Mid Tenure Review Packages

The responsibility for collecting the information that demonstrates the candidate's accomplishments will be borne principally by the candidate. The candidate is encouraged to consult with the department head and members of the faculty concerning the content and preparation of the promotion/tenure document.

The process for tenure/promotion evaluation begins when either the candidate expresses in writing to the department head her/his intention to seek promotion/tenure or the candidate accepts the recommendation of the majority of the faculty members who are qualified to vote on the matter. The candidate will then prepare the portions of the promotion/tenure document that summarize her/his achievements in research, teaching, and service. The material must be presented in the format specified by the Office of the Provost (see Attachment 1) and will consist of:

A. Candidate's Statements

1. Candidate's statements of accomplishments (one page summary of why a candidate feels that he/she should be promoted/tenured).
2. Candidate's statements of five-year goals (one page summary).

B. Instructional Contributions

1. Statement of activities (one-page summary: classes taught, student advisement, thesis/dissertation direction, and any other evidence of instructional productivity).
2. Evidence for quality of teaching, such as student evaluations, outcomes of special instructional projects, awards, etc. (one page summary).
3. Other evidence of creativity and excellence in teaching such as innovative teaching methods, introduction of new courses, substantive revision of existing courses, etc.(one page summary).

C. Research Activities

1. Statement of research activities (one page summary).
2. List of publications, scientific presentations, and other scholarly achievements for the evaluation period. Articles in press or accepted for publication may be included, if they are denoted as such.

3. List of grants and contracts funded during the evaluation period, including funding agency, funding level, duration, title, and collaborators. A separate list of proposals that were not funded during the evaluation period should also be supplied.

D. Statement of Service Contributions (two-page summary)

1.1.2 Supporting Documentation

Detailed evidence will be presented under separate cover and labeled **Supporting Documentation**.

Examples of evidence that might be included are:

A. Teaching

1. List of courses taught.
2. Teaching evaluations
 - a. The standard evaluations that were furnished by all students who were enrolled in the candidate's courses for the relevant period or for the last three years, whichever is shorter.
 - b. *Additional evaluations that are obtained from a representative sample of former students in the candidate's classes. (The responsibility of the promotion/tenure or mid-tenure committee. The procedures that were used in obtaining the representative sample and the questions that were posed should be described.) This material is not required for normal annual reappointment.*
3. National, regional, and local awards or recognition.
4. Information concerning the introduction of new courses and/or substantive course revision.
5. Student test results on standardized examinations.
6. Other information that demonstrates the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

B. Research

1. A copy of each manuscript published or accepted for publication of work that has been performed at Kansas State University for the relevant period.
2. A list of all proposals submitted for funding and the status of each proposal. Copies of up to five funded and pending research proposals during the relevant period may be submitted. Reviewers' comments are appropriate as long as all reviews and summaries for the proposal are included.
3. Lists of invited and contributed presentations at scientific meetings and symposia; research seminars at universities, industries, and government laboratories; and graduate student recruiting seminars.
4. A list of former and current students and the current status of each of them.
5. A discussion of the candidate's collaborative work with other research groups.
6. National, regional, and local awards or recognition; copies of articles or other materials that cite or discuss the importance of the candidate's work and contributions.

C. Service

1. A summary of the candidate's activities on departmental, college and university committees.
2. A summary of the candidate's activities in national, regional, and local professional societies.
3. Information concerning the candidate's organization of symposia, etc.
4. Evidence of the candidate's reviews of books, papers, and research proposals.
5. Evidence of substantive service and contributions to the scientific community.

1.1.3 Future Plans

In addition to the documentation above, the faculty member should submit a five-year research and scholarly activities plan. The research plan, which is an extension of the one-page summary that is required by the University, should be consistent with available resources and should include a discussion of the significance of the proposed work and its relationship to her/his current work.

1.1.4 Research Seminar

Lastly, all candidates for promotion, tenure, and appointment for the fifth year will present a departmental research seminar that describes the results of the candidate's research studies for the relevant period. This seminar should be scheduled for the month of September for those candidates seeking promotion or tenure and the month of February for probationary faculty members seeking appointment for the fifth year.

2) Department's Responsibilities

Upon either receiving the candidate's written request or, with the candidate's concurrence, the recommendation of the majority of the faculty who are qualified to vote on the matter, the department head will appoint a two-person departmental promotion/tenure committee, with one of the persons serving as the chairperson. The function of this committee will be to obtain:

3) Letters from External Evaluators

The chairperson will request the candidate and the faculty who are qualified to vote on the matter to submit separate lists of potential external evaluators. Each list should contain at least **eight** names. The candidate's current or former collaborators and former mentors are specifically excluded as possible evaluators. The chairperson and the department head will inform the candidate of the names of all potential evaluators and provide her/him with an opportunity to comment on them. The candidate may, for cogent written reasons, request the chairperson and the department head to exclude certain individuals as external evaluators. With the advice of the faculty who are qualified to vote, the chairperson and the department head will choose the names of eight evaluators from the combined list to perform the external reviews. At least **four** evaluators will be chosen from the candidate's list. The chairperson and the department head will ensure that at least **three** evaluations are received from the evaluators from candidate's list and **three** evaluations are received from evaluators from the list generated by the chairperson and the department head. If necessary additional names will be requested from the candidate or selected by the chairperson and the department head.

The chairperson will write the external evaluators and provide them with (1) a copy of the candidate's curriculum vita, (2) a copy of the statements and materials specified by the Office of the Provost (see attachments), and (3) a copy of up to five of the candidate's publications (including manuscripts "accepted" and "submitted") resulting from studies conducted at Kansas State University. The materials and statements that are submitted to the reviewers must be identical to those submitted to the faculty and to the dean.

Each external reviewer will be requested to: (1) evaluate the candidate's research work and accomplishments, and (2) compare the candidate with others in the same general area of research who are at a comparable career level. When these letters are added to the candidate's promotion/tenure document, the letters will be accompanied by a copy of the letter that was sent to the evaluator by the chairperson. Unsolicited letters of evaluation and may be included in **Supporting Documentation**, but such letters cannot be substituted for the letters solicited by the chairperson. All solicited letters of evaluation concerning the candidate that are received must be included in the promotion/tenure document.

The identities of the external evaluators who submitted evaluations will be limited to the voting members of the faculty, the department head, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, the Dean's

Advisory Committee, University administrators and officials who are involved in the decision or review process, and other individuals, as may be required by the rules, regulations and laws of Kansas State University and the State of Kansas. In order to preserve confidentiality to the maximum extent permissible, letterheads, signatures, and any other material that might allow identification of the evaluators or their institutions will be deleted when photocopies of the evaluators' verbatim remarks are submitted for review to the candidate.

The candidate's promotion/tenure committee will also obtain additional information concerning the candidate's teaching effectiveness. The committee will interview a representative sample of current and former students, including those in the candidate's research group, to ascertain the candidate's degree of preparation, the timeliness and content of the candidate's course material, the candidate's fairness in grading and in the selection of examination material, and the ability of the candidate to excite and inspire the students. The procedures that are used to obtain a representative sample and the questions that are asked of each current and former student should accompany the survey results.

When six or more solicited letters of evaluation have been received and the summary of the candidate's teaching effectiveness has been prepared (chairperson: These materials should be available by the end of the second full week of October), the chairperson will make the promotion/tenure document available to the department head and to qualified members of the faculty for their inspection. By the end of the third full week in October, qualified members of the faculty and the department head will meet to discuss the case for promotion and/or tenure of the candidate.

4) Faculty Vote

On the first business day subsequent to the faculty's discussion of the candidate, each qualified member of the faculty will submit a written recommendation to the department head. The recommendation should be submitted inside a sealed, unsigned envelope that in turn is enclosed inside a plain, signed envelope. At the close of the business day, the chairperson and the department head will remove the sealed ballots from the envelopes in which they were transmitted, destroy the outer envelopes, and then open the ballots and record the vote. The results of the faculty vote and a summary of the written justifications will be transmitted to the candidate and the faculty. The summary, which will be prepared by the chairperson, will be appropriately edited to ensure confidentiality. Copies of the recommendation forms for promotion/tenure/mid-probationary review are provided in Appendix A.

5) Report of the department head

The department head will review the candidate's promotion/tenure document and the recommendations of the faculty and make an independent recommendation supporting or failing to support promotion/tenure of the candidate. The department head will explain her/his recommendation in writing to the candidate and to the faculty.

6) Appeal Procedures

If the candidate should wish to appeal the recommendation of either the faculty or the department head, the request for reconsideration must be made in writing by the candidate within three normal working days of the candidate's notification of the appeal recommendation. The candidate must present in writing the arguments for reconsideration and provide at that time to the chairperson and the department head any additional evidence that supports the candidate's position.

If the candidate requests reconsideration of the faculty's recommendation, the chairperson will convene a meeting of the qualified faculty by the end of the first week in November to consider the candidate's written arguments and additional evidence. Within one business day of the conclusion of the meeting, each qualified faculty member will submit a second, written recommendation to the department head. Participation in a reconsideration vote will be restricted to those members of the qualified faculty who participated in the original vote. The recommendations of the faculty and the department head will be transmitted in writing to the candidate and to qualified faculty.

7) Forwarding Procedures

After the candidate has studied the recommendations, the candidate decides whether or not to withdraw her/his application. If the candidate wishes to continue the process, then the promotion/tenure document is forwarded to the Dean. (In the case of a tenure decision involving the maximum probationary period and the mid-probationary review, the document must be forwarded.) The department head will include the results of the secret ballot (yes, no, abstain, and absent and not voting), the summary of the faculty's justifications, and her/his written recommendation following Section I of the promotion/tenure document. Similarly, the Dean will include her/his written recommendation when the document is forwarded to the Provost.

8) Schedule Summary

By August 18	The candidate declares her/his intention to seek promotion and/or tenure to the department head.
By the fourth Friday in August	The promotion/tenure committee is appointed and the candidate submits her/his portion of the promotion/tenure document to the department head.
By the end of the first full week in October	The chairperson of the promotion/tenure committee completes the document and submits it to the department head and to qualified members of the faculty for their examination. The action must be completed at least fourteen calendar days prior to the meeting of the qualified faculty and the department head.
By the end of the third full week in October	Qualified faculty and the department head will meet to discuss the candidate and the promotion/tenure document. By the close of the next business day, qualified faculty will forward to the department head the recommendation that he/she believes to be appropriate.
By the end of the fourth full week in October	The department head reports the results of the secret faculty vote to the faculty and adds her/his recommendation. The department head's recommendation is reported and made available to both the candidate and the faculty.
By the end of October	The candidate accepts or appeals the faculty's and/or the department head's recommendation (s).
By the end of the first week in November	Appeals, if any, are heard by the faculty and the department head and the final recommendations are made.
By early November	The department head will forward a written recommendation to the dean, accompanied by an explanation of her or his judgment. All recommendations and unedited written comments of the department's eligible tenured faculty members and the candidate's complete file are also forwarded to the dean. A copy of the department chair's/head's written recommendation alone is forwarded to the candidate.

B. Mid-Probationary Review

The mid-probationary review will normally be conducted during the second semester of the probationary faculty member's third full year at Kansas State University. This review is intended to provide tenure-track faculty members with assessments of their performances by the tenured faculty in the areas of research, teaching, and service; for the tenured faculty to comment on the probationary faculty member's long-range plans for research and other scholarly activities; to determine if the accomplishments and goals of the probationary faculty member are consistent with the missions and expectations of the Department; and to determine if reappointment for a fifth year of service is merited.

1) Candidate's Responsibilities

The procedure for mid-probationary review will be similar to the review procedure for promotion and/or tenure. The probationary faculty member will present to the department head by February 15 documentation of her/his accomplishments in research, teaching, and service. The format that should be followed and the types of evidence that should be provided will be the same as those for tenure/promotion (*vide supra*). Outside letters of evaluation will not be sought.

In addition to the documentation above, the faculty member should submit a three-year research and scholarly activities plan. The research plan should be consistent with available resources and should include a discussion of the significance of the proposed work and its relationship to her/his current work.

Lastly, the candidate will present a departmental research seminar that describes her/his research studies since coming to Kansas State University. This seminar should be scheduled for either February or the first week of March.

2) Department's Responsibilities

The department head will appoint a two-person committee to evaluate the probationary faculty member's research and teaching accomplishments. The tenured faculty members who are selected to serve on this committee will normally be those whose research interests are most closely related to those of the probationary faculty member. The committee will examine and analyze the materials that the probationary faculty member has provided. Additionally, the committee will interview a representative sample of current and former graduate and undergraduate students, including those in the candidate's research group, to ascertain the quality of the candidate's teaching. The procedures that were used to obtain a representative student sample and the questions that were asked should accompany the teaching evaluation. The committee's written report of the candidate's performances in teaching and research should be submitted to the department head by the end of the second full week in March. The action must be completed **at least fourteen calendar days prior to the meeting of the qualified faculty** and the department head, to allow the department head to make the report and documents available to the qualified faculty.

3) Faculty Vote

By the end of the fourth full week in March, tenured members of the faculty and the department head will meet to discuss the committee's report and the probationary faculty member's document. On the first business day subsequent to the faculty's discussion of the candidate, each tenured member of the faculty will submit a written recommendation to the department head concerning whether or not the probationary faculty member should be appointed to a **fifth** year of service at Kansas State University. The recommendation should be submitted inside a sealed, unsigned envelope, which in turn is enclosed inside a plain, signed envelope. At the close of the business day, the committee and the department head will remove the sealed ballots from the envelopes in which they were transmitted, destroy the outer envelopes, and then open the ballots and record the vote. The results of the faculty vote and a summary of the written justifications will be transmitted to the candidate and to the faculty. The summary, which

will be prepared by the committee, will be appropriately edited to ensure confidentiality.

4) Report of the department head

The department head will review the candidate's document, the committee's summary of the candidate's research and teaching effectiveness, and the recommendations of the faculty and make an independent recommendation supporting or failing to support appointment of the candidate to the fifth year of service. The department head will explain her/his recommendation in writing to the candidate and to the faculty.

5) Appeal Procedures

If tenured faculty and/or the department head should recommend that the probationary faculty member should not be reappointed, then the appeal procedure that is used in the case of denial of promotion and/or tenure may be used by the probationary faculty member (vide supra). All appeals must be resolved by the end of the third full week in April.

6) Forwarding Procedures

The recommendations of the tenured faculty and the department head supporting or opposing reappointment of the probationary faculty member will be transmitted to the Dean by the first Monday in May. The department head will include the results of the secret ballot (yes, no, abstain, and absent and not voting), the committee's summary of the faculty's recommendation(s), and her/his written recommendation.

C. Faculty Qualified to Vote on the Matters of Promotion/Tenure/and Mid-Probationary Review

All faculty who hold a rank equal to or higher than the rank being considered may vote on the question of promotion; faculty who hold tenure, regardless of rank, may vote on the questions involving the awarding of tenure and mid-probationary review. If a qualified faculty member cannot be present during the discussion of the candidate's promotion/tenure/mid-probationary review document or be present on the day that the vote is recorded, the qualified faculty member may leave her/his ballot and any statement that he/she may want incorporated into the discussion summary with the department head prior to the meeting and/or vote.

D.) Annual Reappointment

1) Provision of Supporting Documentation

An annual evaluation will be conducted of tenure track faculty, and instructors and other unclassified professionals holding regular positions.

These personnel will provide the department head with appropriate information that is listed under **Supporting Documentation** in section A.1.1.2 above for the relevant areas of Teaching, Research and Service. Section A.1.1.2.A.2.b (shown in italics) does not apply in this case. In the case of tenure track faculty all three areas of teaching, research and service will be relevant. The relevant areas will vary for the instructor or unclassified professional, for example most instructors would not have an expectation in research.

For convenience the teaching evaluations, for those unclassified faculty involved in teaching, will be kept by the Chemistry Department Secretary, and will only be made available to the unclassified personnel being evaluated, the department head, and qualified faculty involved in the evaluation process. *Qualified faculty will be all those faculty holding tenure.*

2) Timing of the Submission of Supporting Documentation and the Evaluation Meeting

All the material to be evaluated will be considered by the qualified faculty and the department head at a meeting to discuss the tenure-track faculty member, instructor or unclassified professional. A secret ballot of the qualified faculty will follow this meeting. The material to be considered must be made available to the department head **at least fourteen calendar days prior to the meeting of the qualified faculty** and the department head, to allow the department head to make the supporting documentation available to the qualified faculty.

3) Report to the Dean

The result of the secret ballot, together with the unedited written comments of the qualified faculty members, and the independent recommendation of the department head that will explain her/his judgment, will be forwarded to the Dean.

E.) Criteria for Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment

1) For Reappointment of an Instructor or Unclassified Professional with a Regular Position

Instructors normally are assigned duties corresponding to 90% teaching and 10% service. Other unclassified professionals may be assigned to teaching, research and service duties.

Reappointment requires demonstrated effective performance in the assigned areas.

2) For Reappointment of a Probationary Faculty Member

Teaching. Excellence in teaching is expected to have been demonstrated. The effective teacher will be recognized by: depth, breadth, and the importance and relevancy of the course's subject matter; effective course administration; and the ability to communicate effectively as judged by the faculty (classroom visitations, syllabus review, etc.) and students (acceptable course and teaching evaluations). Other examples of teaching effectiveness might include the successful direction of students in research or independent study; effective and diligent advisement of students; innovative instructional methods that inspire and excite the student; the introduction of new courses and/or the substantive revision of existing courses and laboratories; and, in exceptional cases, honors and special recognition for teaching excellence.

Research. By the end of the fifth semester of service, the probationary faculty member is expected to have received, or to have demonstrated substantial progress towards achieving, initial extramural research funding; is aggressively pursuing major extramural funding for her/his research program from one or more federal agencies; is publishing and presenting the initial results of carefully performed studies that have been conducted at Kansas State University; and is attracting able graduate and undergraduate students as coworkers to her/his research program.

Service. The probationary faculty member is expected to have participated in the normal functions of the department, to have performed service on appointed committees and for the benefit of the Department (e.g., assistance in the preparation of departmental proposals, recruitment of students, meeting with guests of the Department), and to have rendered service to the profession by way of reviewing manuscripts, proposals, etc.

3) For Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with Tenure

Teaching. Excellence in teaching is expected of each candidate. The effective teacher will be recognized by: depth, breadth, and the importance and relevancy of the course's subject matter; effective course administration; and the ability to communicate effectively as judged by the faculty (classroom visitations, syllabus review, etc.) and students (acceptable course and teaching evaluations). Other examples of teaching effectiveness might include the successful direction of students in research or independent study; effective and diligent advisement of students; innovative instructional methods that inspire and excite the student; the introduction of new courses and/or the substantive revision of existing courses and laboratories; the achievements of former students; and honors and special recognition for teaching accomplishments.

The candidate should be effective in both graduate and undergraduate teaching; however, it may be expected that some persons may be better at one than the other. An important criterion will be the candidate's potential to sustain a life-long, high-quality teaching career.

Research. The candidate must have established a quality research program. Quality in this sense denotes original research of significance to chemistry. Emphasis will be on research conducted at Kansas State University. The research program may be related to previous doctoral or postdoctoral research, but the candidate must have demonstrated the ability to organize and sustain an independent, viable research program.

Publication of the results of the candidate's research in refereed journals is expected. Review articles and monographs will also be considered. It is also desirable that the candidate's work be presented in lectures and papers at institutions and meetings. Both the quantity and quality of research articles will be considered. Because research in some areas may produce fewer publications for a given effort than in other areas, the quantity of publications *per se* is less important than quality. Productivity will be considered in the light of the field, the teaching load, and the number of available coworkers. It is expected that the candidate has actively sought and obtained extramural funding to support her/his research program. The extent of extramural funding obtained by the candidate will be considered with regard to the availability of funds in a given research area and the needs of the research program. The comments of the external referees will carry considerable weight in the faculty's evaluation of the candidate's research program.

Other evidence of the quality of the research program will include: invited papers and lectures, awards, reputation in her/his field among peers, potential for obtaining a national reputation in her/his research specialty, and potential for sustaining a life-long research career.

Service. The Department expects all faculty to render significant service on appointed committees and for the benefit of the Department (e.g., recruitment of graduate students, assistance in the preparation of departmental proposals, and attendance at departmental functions). Assistant professors will have an opportunity to participate fully in determining and meeting the goals of the Department.

The Department also expects service to be rendered to the chemical profession. This may involve participation in the activities of national professional societies, organizing symposia or meetings, reviewing research proposals, papers, books, etc.

4) For Promotion to Professor

Teaching. Excellence in teaching is expected of each candidate. This includes both course content and the ability to communicate as judged by the faculty (classroom visitations, syllabus review, etc.), current students (acceptable course and teaching evaluations), and the written or oral opinions of former students. Other evidence for the quality of teaching might include: specific awards for teaching; improvements in the instructional program via the successful acquisition of extramural grants for instructional equipment, etc.; course initiation and major revision of existing courses; successful innovations in teaching methods; effective counseling and advising of students; and the achievements of former students.

The candidate should be effective in both graduate and undergraduate teaching; however, it may be expected that some persons may be better at one than the other. An important criterion will be the candidate's potential to sustain a life-long, high-quality teaching career.

Research. The candidate must have established and maintained a research program that has earned national recognition in the candidate's discipline and is acknowledged by leading experts in the field.

Frequent publication of the results of the candidate's research in high-quality, refereed journals is required. The record of frequent publication must be for a sustained period of time and it must be clearly evident to the faculty and the external evaluators that the habit of consistent publication of carefully performed work in leading journals has been firmly established. Communications, review articles, and monographs will be included in the evaluation. It is also expected that the candidate's work has been presented frequently in lectures and papers at other institutions and scientific meetings.

Although both the amount and quality of research will be considered, the quantity of publications *per se* is less important than the quality of the published work and the record of sustained scholarly work. The publication record will also be considered in light of the field, the teaching load, and the availability of graduate students. The candidate should also have

demonstrated the ability to obtain sustained extramural funding to support her/his research program. The current and cumulative amounts of extramural funding will be considered with regard to the availability of funds in that research area.

Other evidence for the quality of the research might include: national, regional, and local awards; the achievements of the candidate's former students; and the utilization of a sabbatical leave or leave of absence to enhance her/his research program.

Service. The candidate for full professor should have a sustained record of service to the Department. Such service will include the active recruitment of graduate students, assisting in the preparation of departmental proposals, serving on appointed committees, and participating in the normal functions of the department (e.g., faculty meetings, seminars, meeting with departmental guests, etc.). The candidate for full professor is expected to have demonstrated leadership ability. Evidence of leadership might include: serving as the chair of standing and *ad hoc* departmental committees, service on departmental and University policy-making and personnel selection committees, and substantive contributions in the development and promotion of research and teaching programs.

Professional service should include participation in the activities of professional societies, including their leadership; organizing symposia or meetings; reviewing research proposals, papers, or books; etc.