

PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES

ANNUAL MERIT EVALUATION, REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

Kansas State University Division of Biology

Originally approved by faculty
May 3, 1978

Amended and approved by faculty
March 4, 1982

Amended and approved by faculty
February 9, 1989

Amended and approved by faculty
November 8, 1993

Amended and approved by faculty
October 6, 1995

Amended and approved by faculty
January 28, 1997

Amended and approved by faculty
February 24, 2003

Amended and approved by faculty
August 20, 2004

Amended and approved by faculty
May 11, 2006

Amended and approved by faculty
May 11, 2011

Amended and approved by faculty
April 22, 2014

Amended and approved by faculty
May 6, 2015

Amended and approved by faculty
November 19, 2021

Procedures and Processes

Annual Merit Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Division of Biology

I. Rationale and Basis

I-A. Faculty Evaluation

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

I-B. Criteria and Standards

The Division of Biology has a broad mandate to generate and disseminate new and existing high-quality biological scientific knowledge, in a supportive, diverse, and equitable environment, to students, professional colleagues, and the public through teaching, research, and outreach. The focus of faculty activity in the Division of Biology is excellence in instruction and/or research, as recognized by peers. Faculty evaluation will stress individual scholarly achievements in these areas as well as contributions in nondirected service. These evaluations will be within the context of the effort distribution expectations for each faculty member, which are established or reaffirmed annually between the faculty member and the Division Director. It is expected that effort distribution in instruction, research, and service will reflect the responsibilities of individual faculty members and the mission and objectives of the Division. With regard to tenure and promotion to associate professor, the successful candidate will have achieved independence in scholarly pursuits and developed a scholarly program in research and/or instruction with a significant degree of professional recognition, and the candidate will show high promise of sustained contributions. Expectations for promotion from associate professor to professor are considerably higher, including evidence of leadership in scholarly research and/or instructional activities, and strong professional recognition at the national and international levels.

The system of tenure at Kansas State University provides academic freedom, which allows senior faculty to best use their talents in pursuing excellence in scholarship and instruction. There is a concern in the State community that this system protects faculty members who chronically fail to perform and who ought to be held to a set of minimum expectations. Chronic low achievement will not be tolerated in the Division of Biology. For faculty members with an effort distribution in research, minimum expectations include regular scholarly productivity, as evidenced by activities such as publication in peer-reviewed journals, synthesis of biological concepts in book chapters or review articles, presentations at seminars or at professional symposia, and the submission of patents, in addition to an active search for funding to support

these scholarly activities. For faculty members with an effort distribution in instruction, minimum expectations include both a reasonable quantity and quality of instructional activities, including, for example, activities in teaching, advising, and curriculum development and support. Minimum expectations in service include a regular degree of participation in activities, such as committees, panels, and professional groups or societies, at the Division, University, State, National or International levels, which further individual and collective academic or professional goals.

II. *Procedures*

II-A. Annual Merit Salary Evaluations

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

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

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

Portfolio items to document nondirected service can include: a listing of membership on Division, College, and University committees; service to national or societal committees; professional reviewing of manuscripts, grants, or textbooks; service on funding agency panels; editorial activities, mentoring activities; outreach activities; and contributions to institutional diversity, equity, inclusion and accessibility. Such listings should also document the role(s) which

the faculty member plays and the level of individual responsibility.

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

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

II-B. Professorial Performance Award

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

II-C. Post-tenure Review

The purpose of post-tenure review at Kansas State University is to enhance the continued professional development of tenured faculty. The process is intended to encourage intellectual vitality and ensure professional proficiency for all faculty members throughout their careers, so that they may more effectively fulfill the mission of the University. Periodic review is also designed to enhance public trust in the University by ensuring that the university community undertakes regular and rigorous efforts to hold all faculty members accountable for high professional standards.

Kansas State University recognizes that the granting of tenure for university faculty is a vital protection of free inquiry and open intellectual debate. It is expressly recognized that nothing in this policy for post-tenure review alters or amends the University's policies regarding removal of tenured faculty members for cause or for chronic low achievement (which are stipulated in the University Handbook). Moreover, this policy and any actions taken under it are separate from and have no bearing on the chronic low achievement or annual evaluation policies and processes.

The Division of Biology policy on post-tenure review follows the overarching purpose, principles, objectives, and procedures in the university policy on post-tenure review (see University Handbook, Appendix W), which was approved by Faculty Senate on February 11, 2014.

Each full-time tenured faculty member shall undergo a review every six calendar years; this review will occur during the fall semester. The purpose of this review is to allow the faculty member and the Director an opportunity to develop mutually agreed-upon goals to guide the faculty member during the next six years. The faculty member will prepare and submit materials for review; these will include (but not be limited to) copies of his/her annual effort evaluations (see section II-A) that were submitted since the last review. If all annual evaluations were “meets expectations” or “exceeds expectations”, the review will be considered complete, and the Director will share with the faculty member a letter indicating that the post-tenure review was performed and that the faculty member is progressing satisfactorily. If one or more of these evaluations was less than “meets expectations”, the faculty member and the Director will meet to discuss the report and generate goals for the faculty member for the next 6 years. The discussion and the goals will be summarized in a brief letter, drafted by the Director and signed by both parties. A similar meeting and outcome can be requested by a faculty member even if all the effort report evaluations met or exceeded expectations. Note: if evaluations for two consecutive years, or for three years within a five-year period, are judged to be below expectations, the Chronic Low Achievement Policy (II-D of this document) will be implemented in place of the post-tenure review.

If the faculty member undergoes an extensive performance review (e.g., application for promotion, application for a Professorial Performance Award, appointment as a University Distinguished Professor, receipt of an award that was preceded by preparation and submission of evaluative documents, etc.), the clock for the post-tenure review is reset, and the faculty member will next be evaluated six calendar years later.

II-D. Chronic Low Achievement

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

1. The Director may recommend to the Dean that a set of corrective measures be established to help the faculty member attain success in his/her professional endeavors. These measures may include requiring the faculty member to specify a set of goals and a reasonable plan and timeline for attaining them, reassignment of responsibilities, within the context of the needs of the Division, to areas which more closely match the talents of the faculty member, and establishing a mentoring relationship between the faculty member and a more successful faculty member who will provide advice and guidance. Should the Director choose this option, the following steps will be followed:

- a. The Director will meet with the faculty member to inform him/her of the decision, and to define those corrective measures which will be employed.
- b. The faculty member has the right to request that additional faculty input be provided to the Director, to influence both the initial evaluation of the accomplishments and the set of corrective measures. The Director will then ask the Biology Tenure and Promotion Committee for additional input.
- c. The Director will forward his/her/their recommendation to the Dean

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

- a. The Director will inform the faculty member of this decision.
- b. The Director will seek additional input by asking that the Biology Tenure and Promotion Committee to examine the credentials of the faculty member. The Committee will provide a substantive rationale for its support or non-support of the recommendation of the Director. The Committee report should include results of a numerical vote. The faculty member may request that the Director not seek this additional faculty input.
- c. The Director will forward the recommendation, along with all the documentation used to formulate the recommendation, to the Dean.

II-E. Evaluation of Faculty Members on Probationary Tenure-earning Appointments

II-E.1 Periodic Evaluations

Faculty members on probationary tenure-earning appointments will be reviewed and evaluated by

three independent processes. In all cases the Director will provide information about deadlines, and guidelines about materials to be prepared, sufficiently in advance of the deadlines to allow faculty members and other involved parties (e.g., the Tenure and Promotion Committee) time for preparation and review.

1. Faculty members on probationary appointments will be reviewed annually with regard to reappointment. The candidate will provide a CV and instructional evaluations. The Director will add the cumulative prior written reappointment recommendations to the candidate's materials (in accord with section C53.1 of the University Handbook) and then will make these available for, and will request input from, eligible faculty before making a recommendation to the Dean on reappointment. Minimum time for faculty access to the materials, prior to providing input to the Director, will be 14 calendar days. Annual deadlines for review and documentation vary somewhat in the first two years of the appointment compared to subsequent years. See section C162.3 of the University Handbook for the specific deadlines that apply in specific years of the appointment.

2. Faculty members on probationary appointments will be reviewed annually, during the spring semester, by the Division of Biology Tenure and Promotion Committee, with the emphasis of the review on the progress of the faculty member in the tenure-earning process. Faculty will provide supporting materials describing accomplishments in teaching, research, and nondirected service, following guidelines provided by the Director. This information will be given to the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and, after review, and in consultation with the Committee, the chair of the Committee will provide the candidate and the Director written commentary of the review and the candidate's progress toward tenure. The goal of this internal review is to provide regular guidance and feedback to the faculty member to facilitate success in the tenure-earning process.

3. A Mid-Term Tenure Review will be conducted during the third year of appointment. This review, mandated by University guidelines (see sections C92.1-C92.4 of the University Handbook), is to provide the candidate with substantive feedback with regard to progress in meeting the Division's tenure criteria. The general timeline for these processes is set by sections C50.1-C56 of the University Handbook, but specific deadlines are set by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and may vary slightly from year to year. Documentation for this mid-tenure review is identical to the requirements for the review for tenure and promotion, except that evaluations from outside reviewers are not required.

II-E.2 Review for Tenure and Promotion

The procedures for tenure and promotion are identical to the requirements in the University Handbook; see sections C110-C116.2 and C150-C156.2. The Division Director will solicit from each candidate a portfolio documenting scholarship in instructional, research, and service activities. In addition to the portfolio, each candidate is expected to present a Division seminar in his/her area or discipline of scholarly activity, typically early in the fall semester.

Portfolio items to document scholarship in research can include: a listing (with copies provided) of publications (journal articles, review articles, book chapters, etc., with those having been peer-

reviewed clearly identified); descriptions of how published works have been cited in the professional literature; platform or poster presentations at regional and national meetings; seminars and invited symposium presentations; patents submitted or obtained; software developed; listing of grants active during the evaluation period, submitted or pending grant proposals to support research activities; and notices of awards or special recognition for research activities.

Portfolio items to document scholarship in instruction can include copies of syllabus materials presented to classes; descriptions of changes in course delivery from previous offerings; copies of exams, quizzes, and problem sets; notices of awards or special recognition for educational activities; anecdotal information and student comments showing the impact of the instructional activities on student progress; listing of dissertations, theses, and other evidence of scholarly achievements by students directed by the candidate; advising activities; listing of grants active during the evaluation period, submitted or pending grant proposals to support instructional activities; listing of publications and presentations related to instruction (including peer-reviewed journal articles, books, etc.); and peer evaluations of classroom and additional instructional scholarly activities. University required teaching evaluations (TEVALs) must be included as one component of the portfolio and may be supplemented by additional assessment(s) of student learning outcomes/experience.

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

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

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

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

II-F. Review for Promotion to Professor

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

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

Portfolio items to document scholarship in instruction can include copies of syllabi materials presented to classes; descriptions of changes in course delivery from previous offerings; copies of exams, quizzes, and problem sets showing the level of course materials; notices of awards or special recognition for educational activities; anecdotal information and student comments showing the impact of the instructional activities on student progress; lists of dissertations, theses and other evidence of scholarly achievements by students directed by the candidate; advising activities; listing of grants active during the evaluation period, submitted or pending grant proposals to support instructional activities; listing of publications and presentations related to instruction (including peer-reviewed journal articles, books, etc.); and peer evaluations of classroom and additional instructional scholarly activities. University required teaching evaluations (TEVALs) must be included as one component of the portfolio and may be supplemented by additional assessment(s) of student learning outcomes/experience.

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

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

The portfolio will be provided to the Division of Biology faculty for their evaluation to provide promotion recommendations to the Director. The Director will request from the candidate a list of up to six names of potential outside reviewers, along with their professional credentials and qualifications for reviewing scholarship in the candidate's area. A candidate's prior professional or personal relationship with potential reviewers must be disclosed, and care should be taken to

avoid obvious conflicts of interest (e.g., collaborators, co-authors, former mentors or advisees, etc.). The Director may increase the reviewer pool size by the addition of reviewers that he/she/they identifies, and the Director will obtain at least 3 outside reviews. These reviewers will be recognized leaders in the candidate's scholarly field. The portfolio, plus the outside reviews, will be provided to the Biology Tenure and Promotion Committee, who will provide an independent assessment and recommendation to the Director concerning the promotion decision.

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

II- G1. Itemized Listing of Responsibilities in Tenure and/or Promotion Activities

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

The Director:

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

7. Forwards the following to the Dean: the recommendation, the Tenure and Promotion Committee vote, the vote of the Biology faculty, verbatim comments of the Committee, the candidate's credentials, and the outside reviews.

The Candidate:

1. Prepares a complete and detailed CV
2. Provides a portfolio which documents achievements in scholarship regarding instruction, research, and service. This portfolio must include documentation in the common KSU format required by the Provost.
3. Submits up to six names of potential outside reviewers who are recognized leaders in the candidate's scholarly field. The outside reviewers should not have, or have had, strong affiliation with the candidate such as research collaborations, publication co-authorship(s), a previous mentoring relationship, etc., so as to provide objective evaluations without conflict of interest. Any current or prior affiliation of the candidate with an outside reviewer must be fully disclosed when names are submitted. The Director has the prerogative of seeking additional reviewers.
4. Presents a Division seminar in his/her area or discipline of scholarly activity, typically early in the fall semester.

Faculty (Tenure-track Assistant Professor and above)

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

Tenure and Promotion Committee:

1. Annually assesses progress of faculty working toward tenure by examination of cumulative and updated credentials, with a goal to provide substantive feedback to aid in faculty improvement. Provides a written assessment for the faculty member, with a copy forwarded to the Director.
2. Evaluates credentials of candidates during the Mid-Term Tenure Review.

3. Evaluates credentials of candidates for promotion and tenure; these consist of materials provided by the candidate, plus letters from outside reviewers solicited by the Director.
4. In the event a candidate is a member of a Tenure and Promotion Committee member's immediate household, that member is excused from participation in the evaluation process, and will be replaced by a temporary committee member identified by the Director. Other potential COIs between a candidate and member(s) of the Tenure and Promotion Committee such as research collaborations, publication co-authorship(s), a mentoring relationship, etc., shall be disclosed and evaluated by the committee and Director as to whether temporary adjustments to the Tenure and Promotion Committee are warranted.
5. After receiving the relevant materials from the Director, the chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee assigns primary responsibility for evaluation of each candidate's materials to an appropriate member of the Tenure and Promotion Committee. At the discretion of the chair, additional committee members may be asked to provide secondary reviews.
6. The primary and secondary reviewers may seek clarification of any materials provided by the candidate, but this process will be done through the Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair, who will seek any such clarification from the candidate. The reviewers then present the collected information in a closed session to the committee, and the committee discusses in depth the merits of the tenure and/or promotion request. The chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee cannot assign a primary or secondary reviewer who also serves as the candidate's academic mentor in the Division of Biology.
7. All members vote approval or disapproval of a candidate's application, and the committee provides a substantive report on the rationale for the approval/disapproval recommendation.
8. The committee vote and recommendation for tenure and promotion are forwarded in writing to the Director.
9. All deliberations of the Biology Tenure and Promotion Committee are treated as confidential and are not to be divulged to anyone except the Director and other committee members.

II-G2. Evaluation of Non-tenure Track Faculty Members

Non-tenure track instructional faculty members, with primary responsibilities in teaching and advising, may be recruited, hired, and appointed into regular or term positions, as Instructor, Advanced Instructor, or Senior Instructor, in the absence of a terminal degree (usually PhD), or as Teaching Assistant Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, or Teaching Professor, if holding a terminal degree (usually PhD). Initial appointment rank, and subsequent promotions in rank, are based on advanced degree(s) and experience, and achievements over time within a given rank. Guidelines for evaluation of non-tenure track faculty members can be found in Section C of the University handbook. Some relevant sections include C30-C37, C40-C43, C45-C46, and C50-

C66.

II-G2.1 Periodic Evaluations

Regular non-tenure track instructional faculty members will be reviewed and evaluated by two independent processes (in addition to the annual merit salary evaluation described in section II-A). In both cases, the Director will provide information about deadlines and guidelines about materials to be prepared, sufficiently in advance of deadlines to allow for preparation and review.

1. Annual Reappointment Evaluation

Regular, non-tenure track, faculty in positions of instructor or teaching assistant professor and those at higher ranks will be reviewed annually with regard to reappointment.

Each faculty member will provide an updated CV and cumulative instructional and advising evaluations. The Director will make these available for, and request input from, eligible faculty (all regular non-tenure track and tenured/tenure track faculty) before making a recommendation to the Dean on reappointment/non-reappointment. Minimum time for faculty access to the materials, prior to providing input to the Director, will be 14 calendar days.

Annual deadlines for review and documentation vary somewhat in the first two years of the appointment compared to subsequent years, when the deadline for provision of the CV and cumulative instructional and advising evaluations will be January 15. See Appendix A of the University Handbook for the specific deadlines that apply in specific years of the appointment.

2. Annual Evaluation of progress toward promotion

Regular and term non-tenure track faculty, who do not yet hold the highest academic rank for which they are eligible, will be reviewed annually during the spring semester, by the Division of Biology Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee, with emphasis on the progress of the faculty member toward promotion in rank. Faculty will provide the Director with an updated cumulative annual review form describing accomplishments in teaching and advising, research and/or scholarship, and service, CV, cumulative teaching and advising evaluations by January 15. This information will be given to the Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee, and, after Committee review, the Committee chair will provide the faculty member and the Director written commentary of the review and the faculty member's progress toward promotion. The goal of this internal review is to provide regular guidance and feedback to the faculty member in order to facilitate success in professional advancement.

II-G2.2 Review for Promotions in Rank

The average time in rank interval prior to consideration for promotion is expected to be 5 years, although shorter and longer intervals are possible. The Division Director will solicit from each candidate a portfolio documenting teaching and advising activities, research, scholarship and other creative activities, and service activities.

Portfolio items to document teaching and advising activities can include copies of syllabi; materials presented to classes; copies of exams, quizzes, and problem sets; notices of awards or special recognition for educational activities; anecdotal information and student comments showing the impact of the instructional activities on student progress; listing of dissertations, theses, and other evidence of scholarly achievements by students directed by the candidate (if she/he/they is a member of the graduate faculty); advising activities; listing of grants active during the evaluation period, submitted or pending grant proposals to support instructional scholarly activities; listing of publications and presentations related to instruction (including peer-reviewed journal articles, books, etc.); and peer evaluations of classroom and additional instructional scholarly activities. University required teaching evaluations (TEVALs) must be included as one component of the portfolio and may be supplemented by additional assessment(s) of student learning outcomes/experience. Student evaluations of advising also should be included.

Portfolio items to document research, scholarship, and other creative activities, if relevant, can include: descriptions of major changes in course delivery from previous offerings; development of new courses; descriptions of research activities; a listing (with copies provided) of publications (journal articles, review articles, book chapters, etc., with those having been peer-reviewed clearly identified); descriptions of how published works have been cited in the professional literature; platform or poster presentations at regional, national and international meetings; seminars and invited symposium presentations; patents submitted or obtained; software developed; listing of dissertations, theses, and other evidence of scholarly achievements by students directed by the candidate; listing of grants active during the evaluation period, submitted or pending grant proposals to support research activities; and notices of awards or special recognition for research activities.

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

The candidate should include in the portfolio a listing of goals and objectives that will guide professional activities for the next five years. The portfolio will be provided to the Division of Biology faculty for their evaluation and individual promotion recommendations to the Director. The portfolio also will be provided to the Biology Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee, who will provide an independent assessment and recommendation to the Director concerning the promotion decision.

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

II-H Itemized Listing of Responsibilities in Teaching Faculty Promotion Activities

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

The Director:

1. Identifies and contacts all instructors, advanced instructors, assistant teaching professors, and associate teaching professors eligible for promotion. Interviews potential candidates to reach a conclusion concerning the desirability and feasibility of consideration for promotion. Describes the evaluation process to the candidates and requests from them the documentation that will be required to ensure a meaningful evaluation.
2. Compiles general faculty recommendations, votes, and comments, and assesses the report of the Biology Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee.
3. Develops recommendations for the Dean.
4. Discusses the recommendation decision with each candidate, and provides the candidate with a copy of the Director's letter of recommendation to the Dean. The Director may, but is not required to, also provide the candidate with transcribed faculty comments (edited to avoid individual identity), and a copy of the Biology Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee's letter to the Director.
5. Forwards the following to the Dean: the Director's recommendation, the Promotion Committee letter and vote, the vote of the Biology faculty, and the candidate's credentials.

The Candidate:

1. Prepares a complete and detailed CV.
2. Provides a portfolio that documents achievements in scholarship regarding instruction, research, scholarship, and service, as appropriate based on effort distribution. This portfolio must include documentation in the common KSU format required by the Provost.

Faculty (all, including regular non-tenure track and tenured/tenure track):

1. Reviews information in the CV and supporting documents and forwards comments and a recommendation for promotion to the Director. In the event a candidate is a member of another faculty member's immediate household or family, that faculty member shall be excused from participation in the evaluation process.
2. Faculty comments will be identified as to name, academic rank, tenure status, and the level of interactions between the faculty member and the candidate. A transcribed copy of faculty comments may be provided to the candidate.

Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee:

1. Annually assesses progress of non-tenure track faculty (regular and term) working toward promotion by examination of updated credentials, with a goal to provide substantive feedback to aid in faculty improvement. Provides a written assessment for the faculty member, with a copy forwarded to the Director.
2. Evaluates credentials of candidates for promotion; these consist of materials provided by the candidate. In the event a candidate is a member of a Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee member's immediate household, that member is excused from participation in the evaluation process and will be replaced by a temporary committee member identified by the Director. Other potential COIs between a candidate and member(s) of the Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee such as research collaborations, publication co-authorship(s), a mentoring relationship, etc., shall be disclosed and evaluated by the committee and Director as to whether temporary adjustments to the Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee are warranted.
3. After receiving the relevant materials from the Director, the chair of the Promotion Committee assigns primary responsibility for each candidate to an appropriate member of the Committee. At the discretion of the chair, additional committee members may be asked to provide secondary reviews.
4. The Committee Chair may discuss issues with the candidate to clarify questions and comments. The reviewers then present the collected information in a closed session to the committee, and the committee discusses in depth the merits of the promotion request.
5. All members vote approval or disapproval of a candidate's application, and the committee provides a substantive report on the rationale for the approval/disapproval recommendation.
6. The committee vote and recommendation for promotion are forwarded in writing to the Director.
7. All deliberations of the Biology Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee are treated as confidential information, and are not to be divulged to anyone except the Director.

III. Tenure and Promotion Committee, and Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee

III-A. Composition and Selection of the Tenure and Promotion Committee

The committee shall represent the breadth of the Division and consist of seven tenured full-time faculty members who hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. Four members-at-large shall be elected by the general faculty; these members shall serve three-year terms. The Director shall appoint the remaining members; these members shall serve one-year terms. These appointments shall be made to achieve balance on the committee in situations where the elected

membership does not include faculty members who will be needed for evaluation of candidates in particular substantial research areas (e.g., Developmental Biology, Microbiology, Ecology, Evolution, Virology, Genetics etc.). The Director will appoint a member of the committee as the committee chair. The chair will convene the meetings, assign reviewers, and oversee drafting of the evaluation statement transmitted to the Director after committee approval.

In the event a committee member is under consideration for promotion, he/she/they will be excused from promotion-related deliberations for that academic year. Likewise, and consistent with the University nepotism policy (PPM Chapter 4095), should a member of a committee member's immediate household be under consideration for tenure and/or promotion, that committee member will be excused from all related deliberations for that academic year. Other potential COIs between a candidate and member(s) of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, such as research collaborations, publication co-authorship(s), a mentoring relationship, etc., shall be disclosed and evaluated by the committee and Director as to whether temporary adjustments to the Tenure and Promotion Committee are warranted.

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

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

III-B. Composition and Selection of the Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee

The committee shall represent the breadth of the instructional activities of the Division and consist of five full-time faculty members who hold the rank of Advanced Instructor, Senior Instructor, Associate Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, Professor, or Teaching Professor, including both tenured and non-tenure track members on regular appointments. The Director shall appoint the members; these members shall serve renewable one-year terms. These appointments shall be made to achieve a committee composed of individuals with recognized achievements in teaching, advising, and service. The Director will appoint a member of the committee as the committee chair. The chair will convene the meetings, assign reviewers and write the evaluation statement transmitted to the Director after committee approval. In the event that a non-tenure track committee member is under consideration for promotion, he/she/they will be excused from promotion-related deliberations for that academic year. Likewise, and consistent with the University nepotism policy (PPM Chapter 4095), should a person of a committee member's immediate household be under consideration for promotion, that committee member will be excused from all related deliberations for that academic year. Other potential COIs between a candidate and member(s) of the Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee such as research collaborations, publication co-authorship(s), a mentoring relationship, etc., shall be disclosed and evaluated by the committee and Director as to whether temporary adjustments to the Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee are warranted. The committee will

conduct its affairs with no less than four members present. In the event fewer than four members are able to convene, the Director will appoint an alternate. There shall be no restrictions regarding succession for appointed members of the committee.

IV. Process Review

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