

DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on)

CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT PROCEDURES

(Approved by Faculty Vote)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT):

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*:

, Department Head

Date signed:

, Dean

Date signed:

James R. Coffman, Provost

Date signed:

*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.

CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY

Approved by the faculty of the Department of Geology, December 3, 1996

INTRODUCTION

Every year in early January, each faculty member will submit to the department head a portfolio of accomplishments from the previous year. This portfolio must include a brief summary in outline form, not more than five pages, of the activities in each of the major categories (teaching, research, service) and subcategories listed below. It should also include a statement of how the faculty member has met or exceeded his or her expectations (which were established in consultation with the department head the previous January). Faculty members may submit as much additional or supplementary material in their portfolios as they wish.

After reviewing all the materials submitted (usually by mid January) by each faculty member, a written evaluation will be prepared by the department head that will include one of the following ratings:

- outstanding
- exceeded expectations
- met expectations
- fallen below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity
- fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity

After an individual faculty member has had a chance to review the department head's written evaluation of her performance, and any necessary changes have been made, the written evaluation will be forwarded to the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences with the signatures of the faculty member and the department head. In the event of areas of disagreement between the faculty member and the department head, the faculty member may write a statement of dissent to the dean which will accompany the department head's evaluation. The department head will evaluate the performance of each faculty member in the department relative to each other for the purpose of assigning merit raises.

At the beginning of the evaluation year the department head will establish the tenths distribution for faculty members through consultation with each individual. The tenths distribution usually will be: teaching 0.4, research 0.4, service 0.2, however, the meetings at the beginning of the year will be used to establish the goals and expectations for each individual faculty member, and the tenths distribution will be adjusted, if necessary, so that each individual is evaluated fairly. Any changes in an individual's yearly plan during the year need to be formally discussed and agreed upon with the department head. Each faculty member should prepare a brief statement of goals for the coming year relative to the categories and subcategories listed below; this statement should be submitted with the portfolio of the previous year's accomplishments.

Expectations for "standard" performance ("meets expectations") are given below. In order to meet expectations in each major category, a person can perform at at least a standard level in each subcategory, or exceed expectations in some subcategories but devote less energy to others. Either way, the total performance in the major categories of teaching, research, and service should at least meet expectations. Any decision to deviate from devoting

efforts to each subcategory should be written down as part of the faculty member's goals and expectations for the coming year, and must be approved by the department head.

TEACHING

Teaching Load - A standard teaching load will be the equivalent of two, three-hour courses per semester per year). Aside from required classes, classes with low enrollments (<5; including independent senior-thesis supervision) will be given equal per-hour credit if they are taught in addition to the teaching load; otherwise they count for much less.

Quality of Teaching - Standard will be clear documentation of quality from the faculty member, e.g., a statement that includes information on the material presented in the class and teaching methods, objectives of the class and whether they have been met, evidence that students have been given attention and courtesy, consultation with other faculty members who teach courses for which the question are prerequisites, etc. Ratings above standard depend on independent documentation of such as high ratings from peer reviewers or observers in classrooms (to be prearranged with individual faculty members in consultation with the department head), teaching awards, evidence of efforts to improve teaching skills, such as participation in workshops designed to facilitate teaching excellence, etc.

Student Evaluation of Teaching - All faculty will use the TEVAL system developed by the Office of Educational Improvement. Faculty members who do not feel adequately evaluated by this means submit their own evaluation forms in addition to TEVAL. Standard expectations will be for TEVAL to average between 3 and 4. To receive a rating greater than "meets expectations" higher TEVAL or other substantive evidence of high student regard for teaching should be submitted.

Participation in the Graduate Program - Assessment will be based upon number of graduate students being supervised, or other evidence of a strong commitment to the graduate program. As far as supervising graduate students is concerned, standard will be supervision of one student who is on track to graduate in two years during the evaluation period (including student's progress toward meeting departmental requirements and eliminating deficiencies, time required for students to complete the M.S. degree); supervising three on-track graduate students will increase the rating, but supervision of additional students will not. Because it is not always possible for each faculty member to supervise one or more graduate students given year, and because the graduate program is an integral part of the department and requires support from each faculty member, faculty members who are not supervising graduate students should devote an equivalent amount of time to supporting the graduate program. Commitment to the graduate program other than through supervision of graduate students might include service on geology thesis committee, substantial recruitment efforts, special seminars, field trips, or workshops specifically for geology students, efforts to obtain external financial support for GRAs, successful efforts to improve the number of graduate students in the department, etc.

Academic Advising and Informal Teaching - Undergraduate advising will be evaluated based upon documentation from faculty of quality advising, student complaints/praises of advising, ease with which students meet graduation requirements, etc. (In the case of the graduate advisor, evaluation will be based upon documentation of advising of graduate students until they are turned over to a major professor.) Because all faculty do their fair share of advising, ratings above standard will depend on independent documented evidence of exceptional effort and success in advising. Informal teaching includes field trips, interaction with clubs, encouragement and assistance to students in professional activities, etc. Informal teaching also includes the teaching of students enrolled in independent study courses (these will be considered part of the teaching load).

RESEARCH

Presentations - Expectations for standard will be one paper (with pre-review of abstract) presented to a national or international meeting. Local or regional meetings, and seminars or colloquia at other universities carry less weight than national or international meetings. To exceed expectations presentations should be in prestigious meetings, conferences, or symposia.

Publications - One manuscript *accepted* for publication per year (averaged over the last three years) in a national or internationally recognized refereed journal is standard in this subcategory. (Faculty members provide separate lists of (1) publications *accepted* during the evaluation year, (2) publications *accepted* during the previous two years, and (3) other publications.) Length and quality of the publication and quality of the journal will be considered (journals would rank from highest quality to lower quality like this: *Nature* or *Science*, society journals, peer-reviewed trade journals, regional journals, state or peer-reviewed publications, open-file reports and guidebooks). Book writing or editing will be evaluated based on written documentation that substantial progress toward publication is being made. Abstracts not considered publications, and are counted under presentations.

Research Proposals - Every year, each faculty member should submit at least one proposal for external funding (standard). Whenever possible, proposals should include provisions to support graduate students and support other fundamental needs in the department. Joint proposals are especially encouraged, but benefits to the Department of Geology, especially with regard to SRO, will be considered. Also considered will be the depth of the proposal, and difficulty of receiving support from the agency in question. Grants will be granted in cases of multi-year grants requiring such large amounts of faculty time that submitting proposals would be a hardship, especially if the department benefits substantially from the grants and university grants are important, but count for less than external funds.

SERVICE

Departmental Service - This category includes work for the good of the department (e.g., work on ad hoc committees, special tasks to increase the visibility or attractiveness of the department and its programs to improve student experiences in the department, coordinator of intro labs, seminar coordinator, student clubs, work on displays, vehicles, etc.).

Other Service Activities (A faculty member should plan to devote time and effort to at least two of the subcategories listed below.)

College and University Committees - Includes college committees, faculty senate committees, university committees, grievance boards, advisory boards.

Society Activities - Includes society committee service or service as an officer in a geologic or scientific society.

Editor or Reviewer - Includes reviewing of manuscripts and/or grant proposals. Service as an editor of a prestigious journal would rank highly and may require adjustment of teaching or research tenths.

Public Service and Consulting - Includes all activities related to geology that involve interactions with the public, and consulting activities in geology. Non-geological public service is not included.

OUTLINE FOR ANNUAL SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES

TEACHING

Teaching Load - List classes, credit hours, number of students

Quality of Teaching - A brief statement by faculty member plus supporting documentation

Student Evaluation of Teaching - TEVAL scores for all classes and other substantive evidence of high regard for teaching.

Participation in the Graduate Program - List graduate students supervised and indicate their progress, or other work in support of the graduate program.

Academic Advising and Informal Teaching - Indicate number of students advised and provide any documentation of quality advising. Describe any informal teaching during the evaluation year.

RESEARCH

Presentations - List presentations, date, location, invited or volunteered

Publications - Provide separate lists of (1) publications *accepted* during the evaluation year, (2) publications *accepted* during the previous two years, and (3) other publications.

Research Proposals - List proposals submitted, funding agencies, amount requested, direct benefits to the department (GRAs, permanent equipment, etc.)

SERVICE

Departmental Service - List and describe efforts for the good of the department.

Other service Activities - Describe efforts in at least two of the sub-subcategories listed below.

- College and University Committees
- Society Activities
- Editor or Reviewer
- Public Service and Consulting

MINIMUM-ACCEPTABLE LEVELS OF PRODUCTIVITY

(Approved by the Faculty of the Department of Geology, December 10, 1996)

As noted in the Introduction above, unless prior arrangements are made with the department head, the following minimum-acceptable levels of productivity apply each year to each faculty member.

Teaching:

- teach the equivalent of two classes per semester
- achieve adjusted relative status for TEVAL scores on "amount learned" and "teacher effectiveness" above
○L○ (lowest 10%) on all classes
- service on one masters thesis committee, or equivalent amount of service to support graduate program
- fair share of academic advising

Research:

- one presentation at a professional meeting or colloquium
- evidence of progress toward the publication of a journal article or book
- submission of one grant proposal (or involvement in ongoing funded research of significant benefit to the department)

Service:

- fair share of work for the good of the department
- evidence of significant effort in at least one of the "Other Service Activities" outside of the department

DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY - KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION DECISIONS

Approved by Departmental Faculty on September 2, 1993

1. At the beginning of the semester in which the decision is to be made, the Department Head meets with the Candidate to discuss procedure and schedule. The Candidate will provide the Head with input re

possible external references.

2. The Department Head will, after getting input from the Candidate and appropriate faculty, select outside references, requesting their evaluation of the candidate's professional accomplishments and potential. At least one of the external referees will be from the list proposed by the candidate. The candidate's current or former collaborators and former mentors are specifically excluded as possible evaluators. The Head will write the external evaluators and provide them with (1) a copy of the curriculum vitae, (2) a copy of the candidate's statement, and (3) a copy of up to five of the candidate's publications (including manuscripts "accepted" and "submitted") resulting from studies conducted during the evaluation period. Each external reviewer will be requested to evaluate the candidate's research accomplishments relative to others in the same general area of research at a comparable career level.
3. The Candidate will prepare materials for faculty consideration, using the University form (SEE Attachment A). Reprints of publications, a complete Vitae, results of student evaluations of teaching, and any other materials that the Candidate wishes to include should accompany the University form (SEE Attachment A).
4. The Department Head reviews the Candidate's materials and meets with the candidate to recommend additions or modifications to the dossier and to determine the advisability of proceeding further in the promotion or tenure process prior to the end of the probationary period.
5. The Department Head schedules a meeting of the eligible faculty (tenured faculty in the case of a promotion decision and faculty at or above the rank sought in the case of promotion) in the department and makes the Candidate's dossier available to the eligible faculty at least one week prior to the meeting.
6. The eligible faculty meet to discuss the Candidate's materials. Faculty members may request additional information or a meeting with the candidate. If so, a second meeting of eligible faculty may be necessary. After eligible faculty are satisfied that they are able to make an informed decision, the meeting(s) adjourn.
7. By 5:00 PM on the second working day after the faculty meeting, eligible faculty members will provide ballots to the Department Head, indicating a vote of yes, no, or abstain and a written justification for their vote.
8. The Department Head will tally the votes of eligible faculty and transmit the faculty's and Head's recommendations to the Dean, where appropriate.

9. As soon as the departmental recommendation is formulated, the Department Head will meet with candidate to discuss that recommendation and any concerns raised during the process.

DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY - KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES FOR REAPPOINTMENT DECISIONS

Approved by Departmental Faculty on September 2, 1993

1. At the beginning of the semester in which the decision is to be made (Fall semester during the first and second years, and Spring semesters during the second and subsequent years), the Department Head meets with the Candidate to discuss procedure and schedule.
2. The Candidate will prepare materials for faculty consideration, using the University form for Promotion and Tenure (SEE Attachments A and B). Thus, the Candidate will begin building his or her dossier for promotion and tenure decisions to come. Reprints of publications, a complete Curriculum Vitae, results of student evaluations of teaching, and any other materials that the Candidate wishes to include should accompany the University form.
3. The Department Head reviews the Candidate's materials and meets with the candidate to recommend additions or modifications to the dossier.
4. The Department Head schedules a meeting of the eligible faculty (tenured faculty in the Department of Geology) and makes the Candidate's dossier available to the eligible faculty at least one week prior to the meeting.
5. The eligible faculty meet to discuss the Candidate's materials. Faculty members may request additional information or a meeting with the candidate. If so, a second meeting of eligible faculty may be necessary. After eligible faculty are satisfied that they are able to make an informed decision, the meeting(s) adjourns.
6. By 5:00 PM on the second working day after the faculty meeting, eligible faculty members will place their ballots to the Department Head, indicating a vote of yes, no, or abstain and a written justification for their vote.
7. The Department Head will tally the votes of eligible faculty, review faculty comments, and transmit the faculty's and Head's recommendations to the Dean.

8. As soon as the departmental recommendation is formulated, the Department Head will meet with candidate to discuss that recommendation and any concerns raised during the process.

DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY - KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Ballots to be Used for Faculty Input Regarding

Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

Recommendation for Tenure

I have examined the materials submitted by _____ in support of reappointment conferring tenure. On basis of the materials, supplemented by discussions with other faculty who were qualified to vote on this matter, I recommend as follows:

Approve

Disapprove

Abstain

Justification:

for Promotion _____ **Recommendation**

I have examined the materials submitted by _____ in support of Promotion to the rank of _____ basis of the materials, supplemented by discussions with other faculty who were qualified to vote on this matter, I recommend as follows:

Approve

Disapprove

Abstain

Justification:

for Reappointment **Recomm**

I have examined the materials submitted by _____ in support of Reappointment for the academic year _____. On the basis of the materials, supplemented by discussions with other faculty who were qu
vote on this matter, I recommend as follows:

Approve

Disapprove

Abstain

Justification:

DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY - KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES FOR MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW

Approved by Departmental Faculty on September 2, 1993

In the Department of Geology, the mid-probationary review for a tenure-track faculty member is the reappointment decision taking place in the Spring semester of his or her third year, which involves consideration of reappointment for the fifth year of service. In case the individual has received credit toward tenure for faculty appointment at other institutions, the mid-probationary review will take place at least two years prior to the tenure review. The departmental procedure for reappointment requires candidates to submit the same documentation that they submit for promotion and tenure, with the exception of outside letters, and because departmental criteria for reappointment include progress toward tenure, the procedure for mid-probationary review is quite similar to that for reappointment.

1. At the beginning of the semester in which the decision is to be made (Spring semester of the third year or Spring semester two years prior to the tenure decision, if individual has received credit toward tenure for previous service), the Department Head meets with the Candidate to discuss procedure and schedule.
2. The Candidate will prepare materials for faculty consideration, using the University form for Promotion and Tenure (SEE Attachments A and B). Reprints of publications, a complete Vitae, results of student evaluations of teaching, and any other materials that the Candidate wishes to include should accompany the University form.
3. The Department Head reviews the Candidate's materials and meets with the candidate to recommend additions or modifications to the dossier.
4. The Department Head schedules a meeting of the eligible faculty (tenured faculty in the Department of Geology) to be held as part of the March faculty meeting and makes the Candidate's dossier available to the eligible faculty at least one week prior to the meeting.
5. The eligible faculty meet to discuss the Candidate's materials. Faculty members may request additional information or a meeting with the candidate. If so, a second meeting of eligible faculty may be necessary. After eligible faculty are satisfied that they are able to make an informed decision, the meeting(s) will adjourn.
6. By 5:00 PM on the second working day after the faculty meeting, eligible faculty members will place their ballots to the Department Head, indicating a vote of yes, no, or abstain and a written justification.

vote.

7. The Department Head will tally the votes of eligible faculty, review faculty comments, and transmit faculty's and Head's recommendations and the candidate's complete dossier to the Dean.
8. As soon as the departmental recommendation is formulated, the Department Head will meet with candidate to discuss that recommendation and any concerns raised during the process.

ATTACHMENT B - SUMMARY OF MATERIAL TO BE PRESENTED BY THE CANDIDATE FOR REAPPOINTMENT, MID-TENURE REVIEW, TENURE, OR PROMOTION

Department of Geology, Kansas State University

MATERIAL PRESENTED ON UNIVERSITY FORM

1. Statements by Candidate.
 - a. Candidate's statement of accomplishments (one page summary of why a candidate feels they should be promoted/tenured).
 - b. Candidate's statement of five-year goals (one page summary).
2. Instructional Contributions
 - a. Statement of activities (one-page summary: classes taught, student advisement, thesis/dissertation, and any other evidence of instructional productivity).
 - b. Evidence for quality of teaching, such as student evaluations, outcomes of special instruction projects, awards, etc. (one page summary).
 - c. 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).
3. Research Activities
 - a. Statement of research activities (one page summary).
 - b. 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.
 - c. List of grants and contracts funded during the evaluation period, including funding agency, level, duration, title, and collaborators. A separate list of proposals that were not funded during the evaluation period should also be supplied.
4. Statement of Service Contributions (two page summary)

-
-
SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION - To be presented under separate cover.

1. Teaching

- a. List of courses taught.
- b. Teaching evaluations
 - i. 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 longer.
 - ii. Additional evaluations that are obtained from a representative sample of former students of the candidate's classes. (The procedures that were used in obtaining the evaluations and the questions that were posed should be described.)
 - iii. National, regional, and local awards or recognition.
 - iv. Information concerning the introduction of new courses and/or substantial revision.
 - v. Student test results on standardized examinations.
 - vi. Other information that demonstrates the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

2. Research

- a. A copy of each manuscript published, accepted, or submitted of work that has been performed at Kansas State University for the relevant period.
- b. Copies of all research proposals during the relevant period. Reviewers' comments may be included.
- c. Lists of invited and contributed presentations at scientific meetings and symposia; research conducted at universities, industries, and government laboratories; and graduate student recruiting seminars.
- d. A list of former and current students and the current status of each.
- e. A discussion of the candidate's collaborative work with other research groups.
- f. National, regional, and local awards or recognition; copies of articles or other materials that discuss the importance of the candidate's work and contributions.

3. Service

- a. A summary of the candidate's activities on Departmental, College and University committees.
- b. A summary of the candidate's activities in national, regional, and local professional societies.
- c. Information concerning the candidate's organization of symposia, etc.
- d. Evidence of the candidate's reviews of books, papers, and research proposals.

- e. Evidence of substantive service and contributions to the scientific community.

DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY - KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

Approved by the departmental faculty on September 2, 1993.

FOR REAPPOINTMENT:

1. Potential to become distinguished in some area of geology.
2. Quality performance as a teacher as indicated by: depth, breadth, currency, and relevance of the subject matter; course administration; and the ability to communicate effectively.
3. Continued progress toward earning tenure.
4. Record of effective work as an individual and with other faculty members for the department and for the University.
5. Quality of work in geology that is reflected by publications which appear in quality journals and books, by the quality of students that he or she attracts to geology, and by other indications such as invitations to make presentations at meetings.
6. Effectiveness in bringing outside financial support to the department through his or her research program, through proposals for improving the teaching program, through grants for acquiring departmental research instruments, or other individual or collective efforts on behalf of the department.

FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND FOR TENURE:

1. Potential to become distinguished in some area of geology.
2. Reputation such that he or she would be invited to join our faculty as an associate with tenure.
3. Quality performance as a classroom teacher and as a supervisor and mentor of graduate students. Quality will be measured by: depth, breadth, currency, and relevance of matter; course administration; and the ability to communicate effectively. Directing students in research or independent study; advising; innovative instructional methods; introduction of new courses; revision of existing courses and laboratories; and achievement of former students will also be considered. An important criterion will be the candidate's potential to sustain a life-long, high-quality teaching career.
4. Record of effective work, as an individual and with other faculty members, in service to the department, the University, and the geologic profession.
5. Quality of work in geology that is reflected by publications in quality journals and the quality of students that he or she attracts to geology, and by other indications such as invitations to make presentations at meetings. The candidate must have demonstrated ability to organize and sustain an independent, viable research program. Because some areas may produce fewer publications for a given effort than in other areas, the quantity of publications is less important than quality. Productivity will be considered in light of the field, the teaching load and other departmental responsibilities, and the available coworkers.
6. Effectiveness in bringing outside financial support to the department through his or her research program, through proposals for improving the teaching program, through proposals for acquiring departmental research instruments, or other individual or collective efforts on behalf of the department. The candidate is expected to have actively sought and obtained extramural funding to support her/his research program. The extent of funding obtained by the candidate will be considered with regard to the availability of funds in a given area and the needs of the research program.

FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR:

1. Distinguished reputation in geology, such that he or she would be invited to join o

the rank of Full Professor.

2. Continued quality performance as a classroom teacher and as a supervisor and mentor of graduate students.
3. A record of sustained scholarly work that is evidenced by publications in quality journals, books, by the quality of students that he or she attracts to geology, and by other indicators such as invitations to make presentations at meetings. Publication of the results of the candidate's research in high-quality, refereed journals is required. Communication articles, and monographs will be considered. It is also expected that the candidate's work has been presented frequently in lectures and papers at other institutions and scientific

Although it is important to demonstrate continued productivity since promotion to Professor with tenure, the absolute number of publications and presentations is less than their significance, as measured by citations and reputation among peers in the expertise. The publication record also will be considered in light of the field, teaching, and other departmental responsibilities, and the availability of graduate students.

4. Effectiveness in bringing outside financial support to the department through his or her research program, through proposals for improving the teaching program, through proposals for acquiring departmental research instruments, or other individual or collective efforts on behalf of the department. The candidate should have demonstrated the ability to obtain funding to support her/his research program. The amount of extramural funding will be considered with regard to the availability of funds in that research area.
5. Continuing record of effective work in service to the department, the University, and the geologic profession. Some examples include recruitment of graduate students, preparation of departmental proposals and reports, and service on departmental, College or University committees. Professional service should include participation in the activities of professional societies, as committee member or officer; organizing symposia or meetings; reviewing research proposals, papers, or books, etc.

NOTE: The Faculty Handbook (1993 Edition) provides other guidelines for faculty members concerning procedures, rights and privileges.

PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING CASES OF PRODUCTIVITY BELOW MINIMUM-ACCEPTABLE

Following section C31.5 in the Faculty Handbook:

When a tenured faculty member's overall performance falls below the minimum-acceptable level, as in the annual evaluation, the department or unit head shall indicate so in writing to the faculty member. The department head will also indicate, in writing, a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member. In subsequent annual evaluations, the faculty member will report on activities aimed at performance and any evidence of improvement. The names of faculty members who fail to meet minimum standards for the year following the department head's suggested course of action will be forwarded to the appropriate dean. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in a year period in which minimum standards are not met, then "dismissal for cause" will be considered at the discretion of the [Dean of Arts and Sciences].