

SOUTHEAST AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 8/24/2006)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 8/02/2006)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **8/2011**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **8/2011**

Lyle Lomas, Department Head

Date signed: 8/24/2006

Fred Cholick, Dean

Date signed: 8/25/2006

M. Duane Nellis, Provost

Date signed: 9/29/2006

**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.*

ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATIONS: PROCEDURES, CRITERIA, AND STANDARDS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION, PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD CRITERIA AND STANDARDS, AND CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS

Faculty Evaluation: Procedures, Criteria, and Standards for Annual Merit Evaluation

Faculty at the Kansas State University Southeast Agricultural Research Center will be evaluated by the Research Center Head on an annual basis. The evaluation period shall be the preceding calendar year. The evaluation process will consist of the following steps:

1. Faculty members shall submit a summary of accomplishments from the past year to the Research Center Head on or about January 15 using the attached format.
2. The Research Center Head shall review accomplishments of the previous year and schedule individual visits with unclassified staff members.
3. Following individual visits, the Research Center Head shall write a letter to each staff member which provides an up-to-date description of duties, comments on performance during the past evaluation period, and lists expectations and suggestions for performance in the following year.
4. The Research Center Head shall schedule individual follow-up visits with each faculty member to discuss contents of the letter upon request.
5. Each faculty member shall sign their letter of evaluation acknowledging that they have read it.

Faculty members will be evaluated on how well they have performed their assigned responsibilities. A weighted evaluation score will be determined for each faculty member based on the percent effort for each of their assigned responsibilities and how well each of these responsibilities were performed. Evaluation scores of faculty members will be compared on a relative basis and used for determining merit salary increases.

Faculty performance evaluation score categories include: 1) exceeded expectations, 2) met expectations, 3) fallen below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity, and 4) fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity.

Criteria and Standards for Evaluation, Tenure, Promotion, and Mid-Probationary Review
Standards for evaluation, tenure, promotion, and mid-probationary review are subjective. The research center does not have simple lists of accomplishments that guarantee the granting of tenure and/or promotion or a successful mid-probationary review. Instead, faculty members are evaluated based on their accomplishments relative to the performance expectations of their assigned responsibilities. In addition, all faculty members are expected to have accomplishments in the non-directed service category. Criteria for evaluation, promotion, tenure, reappointment

and mid-probationary review will include the following items:

I. Research Activities

A. Publications

1. Refereed publications will carry more weight than any other publication.
2. Non-refereed publications.
3. Computer software.
4. The number of publications should be appropriate to the subject area and appointment.

B. Extramural Funding. Faculty are expected to seek extramural funding to support research that is consistent with their existing program and the missions of the SEARC and the KAES. Extramural funding supplements financial support from state appropriations. The level of extramural funding should be appropriate for the subject area and the available funding opportunities. While grants that are funded receive the most recognition, grant proposals submitted but not funded are also acknowledged since they help faculty develop ideas and priorities for their research programs.

C. Presentations. Presentations to local, regional and national audiences are important for professional development of the individual. Invited presentations are more significant than volunteered presentations because they show recognition of the individual's research program.

D. Student training. Student training may involve serving as a supervisor for an undergraduate intern or a member of a M.S. or Ph.D. committee. Training of students provides opportunities to further their education and career development and benefits the research program by providing additional technical assistance, producing new information and facilitating interdepartmental and/or interdisciplinary exchanges.

II. Research Attributes. Assessment of the significance and focus of the research is extremely important. Does the research contribute to the scientific body of knowledge? Assessment of the research is independent of a basic or applied research program. The research program should be sufficient in depth to develop areas of expertise within the guidelines of the job description. However, research programs with excessive breadth may make only limited contributions to science and to the stated position description.

A. Relevance. The research should be relevant to the individual's position description and the mission of the Southeast Agricultural Research Center and the Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station.

B. Creativity. Willingness to develop or try new concepts or use innovative approaches.

C. Interdisciplinary Research. While independent research is valuable, interdisciplinary research requires additional effort and many of the current public

needs require an interdisciplinary approach. These efforts are encouraged and will be recognized.

III. Continuing Education/Professional Development: Examples include: workshops, professional meetings and sabbaticals.

IV. Professional Recognition and Distinction: Recognition and awards by peers or clientele for outstanding research achievements.

V. General Recognition of Service

A. Directed Service, to include but not limited to:

1. Crop variety performance testing.
2. Herbicide testing.
3. Supervision of foundation seed production.
4. Supervision of general farming operations.
5. Supervision of station herd.

B. Non-Directed Service, to include but not limited to:

1. Committee memberships (departmental, college, university, national or professional).
2. Other assignments with professional societies to include: program chair, associate editor, technical editor, etc.
3. Advisory and consulting activities.
4. Participation in non-appointment activities.

C. Faculty Citizenship. Ability to coexist and cooperate with faculty peers.

FORMAT FOR ANNUAL FACULTY ACCOMPLISHMENT REPORT

- I. Research
 - A. Accomplishments (Brief summary of research projects you have been involved with during the past year as project leader)
 - 1. Title of research project
 - 2. Names of investigators with project leader listed first
 - 3. Objectives (Include year and expected duration of study, example: year 2 of a 5 year study)
 - 4. Results
 - B. Interdisciplinary efforts (Complete this section only for research projects for which you are not the project leader)
 - 1. Title of research project
 - 2. Names of investigators with project leader listed first
 - 3. Your contribution to the project
- II. Publications
 - A. Refereed publications
 - 1. Manuscripts published during the past 5 calendar years
 - 2. Manuscripts accepted for publication during the past year and in press
 - 3. Manuscripts submitted during the past year that are in the review process but not yet accepted for publication
 - B. Abstracts
 - C. Proceedings of meetings or symposiums
 - D. KAES publications
 - 1. Reports of Progress
 - 2. Keeping Up with Research
 - 3. Special Publications
 - E. Extension publications
 - F. Trade publications
 - G. Books or chapters for a book
 - H. Computer programs
 - I. Department reports
- III. Professional activity
 - A. Memberships in professional societies
 - B. Committee assignments
 - C. Meetings attended
 - D. Presentations given
 - 1. Voluntary
 - 2. Invited
- IV. Grants (List funding agency, funding level (total and amount received by SEARC),

expected duration, title, and names of scientists involved with project leader listed first)

A. Awarded

B. Submitted and in review process

C. Applied for but rejected

V. Contributions other than research

A. SEARC (Committee assignments, weather station, foundation seed production, general farming and livestock operations, etc.)

B. KSU (Committee assignments, etc.)

VI. Special honors and awards

VII. Research goals and plans for the next year (Be very specific.)

VIII. Problems that exist in fulfilling your assigned responsibilities and achieving your goals

IX. Additional support needed to be effective in fulfilling your assigned responsibilities

PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD

Significance of Award

The Professorial Performance Award rewards strong performance at the highest rank with a base salary increase in addition to that provided for by the annual evaluation process.

Criteria for the Award

In order to be eligible for this award, each of the following conditions must be met:

1. The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at Kansas State for at least six years since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award.
2. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review for the Professorial Performance Award and must have exceeded expectations on at least one-half of the annual faculty performance evaluations and met or exceeded expectations on the remainder during this period of time.^a
3. The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards.

Procedure

1. Eligible candidates must compile and submit a file to the department head prior to the specified deadline (usually in January) that documents her or his professional accomplishments for at least the previous six years. This file should contain the following items:
 - a. Name of candidate, name of department/unit, date promoted to professor, average distribution of assignment during evaluation period (research, instruction, service, cooperative extension, administration)
 - b. Responsibilities during evaluation period (maximum of one page summary)
 - c. Candidate's statement of accomplishments (maximum of two page summary)
 - d. Summary of service contributions and special recognitions. Statement should provide evidence of leadership. A list of committees on which the person served may be provided. (maximum of two page summary)
 - e. Listing of publications and creative achievements
 - f. List of funded grants and contracts
2. The department head will review the file for the purposes of determining eligibility for the Professorial Performance Award, will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials in terms of the criteria, standards, and guidelines established, along with a recommendation for or against the award.
3. The department head will provide the candidate with a copy of the written evaluation and recommendation for or against the award.
4. Each candidate will have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the department head, and each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation.

5. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, each candidate has the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation to the department head and to the dean.
6. The department head must submit the following items to the appropriate dean:
 - a. A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award.
 - b. The department head's written evaluation and recommendation for or against the award.
 - c. Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation.
 - d. Any written statement of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation.
 - e. The candidate's file and supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award.
7. The dean will review all evaluation materials and recommendations to ensure that the evaluations are consistent with criteria and procedures established by the department for the Professorial Performance Award.
8. A dean who does not agree with the department head's recommendations must attempt to reach consensus through consultation. If this fails, the dean's recommendation will be used. If any change has been made to the department head's recommendations, the dean must notify the candidate, in writing, of the change and its rationale. Within seven working days after notification, such candidates have the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations to the dean and to the provost. All statements of unresolved differences will be included in the documentation to be forwarded to the next administrative level. All recommendations will be forwarded to the provost.
9. The provost will review all evaluation materials and recommendations to ensure that (a.) the evaluation process was conducted in a manner consistent with the criteria and procedures approved by the unit, and (b.) there were no inequities in the recommendations based upon gender, race, religion, national origin, age or disability.
10. If the provost does not agree with recommendations for Professorial Performance Awards made by subordinate administrators, an attempt must be made to reach consensus through consultation. If this fails, the provost's decision will prevail. The candidate affected by the disagreement must be notified by the provost, in writing, of the change and its rationale.
11. Upon official notification of approval from the Office of the Provost, the dean will consolidate the Professorial Performance Award with salary increases resulting from annual evaluation and issue the candidate a contract that includes the candidate's salary for the next fiscal year. The Professorial Performance Award will become a part of the professor's base salary.

^aFaculty performance evaluation score categories include: 1) exceeded expectations, 2) met expectations, 3) fallen below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity, and 4) fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity.

CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS

Performance Expectations and Minimum Acceptable Levels of Productivity

Research

Faculty members are expected to publish research results in refereed journals on a timely basis as research projects are completed. Scientists are expected to average 1.0 refereed journal article point annually per 10 tenths of time spent conducting research as listed in assigned responsibilities in their respective annual letters of evaluation. This process recognizes that although faculty members are considered as having full-time research appointments by the KAES, they are also assigned other responsibilities which do not lead to refereed publications that they must perform in order for the SEARC to fulfill its mission. Publication records over the past five years will be considered.

Refereed journal article publication points will be assigned as follows: 1 point for being first author of an article, 1/2 point for being second author of an article, and 1/3 point for being third author or greater of an article. The expectation is an average of 1.0 journal article point annually per 10 tenths of research time over the past five years. The minimum acceptable level of productivity is an average of 0.6 journal article point per 10 tenths of research time annually over the past five years. Special consideration may be given to faculty members that fail to meet the minimum acceptable levels of productivity due to circumstances beyond their control such as adverse weather conditions (i.e. drought, flood, hail, etc.) which delayed progress of research projects, start-up time needed for new faculty members to collect data needed to publish refereed journal articles, long-term research projects that may require more than 5 years of data collection, or other related circumstances.

Crop Variety Testing

Testing of crop varieties is perhaps one the most widely recognized activities of K-State Research and Extension by Kansas farmers even though this activity seldom leads to refereed publications. Crop variety testing is a site specific activity within southeastern Kansas as well as across the state due to environmental differences such as river bottom vs. upland soils and presence of diseases or pests such as the soybean cyst nematode. Crop variety testing is listed as a responsibility of two different agronomists at the SEARC. The minimum acceptable level of productivity for crop variety testing would be to test crops assigned by the state coordinator in the KSU Department of Agronomy and to make sure that there are an adequate number of entries representative of the area. Expectations would be that crops are planted and harvested on a timely basis, necessary cultural practices performed, appropriate measurements taken, and cooperation and coordination maintained with the state coordinator.

Service

The successful day-to-day function of professional societies, departments, and universities is dependent upon individuals who are willing to unselfishly give their time and talents for the common good of their profession, department, or university.

Department. Service to the department is perhaps more critical at smaller units such as the

SEARC where there are a limited number of individuals to share these responsibilities and everyone must carry their part of the load if the unit is to function effectively. Expectations for service to the department would include supervision of classified employees in maintenance of equipment used for either their respective research program or general farming at the SEARC, maintenance and upkeep of general use facilities as well as those used exclusively for individual research projects, assisting with other research programs as needed whenever possible, and capitalizing on opportunities to cooperate with other scientists, classified personnel, and the unit head to improve the operation of the SEARC. The minimum acceptable level of productivity for service to the department would be to supervise classified employees in the conduct of assigned research programs, maintenance of equipment used by their respective projects, and assist with field days and advisory committee meetings as requested by the unit head.

University. Expectations for service to the university include a willingness to accept appointments to committees, attend committee meetings, and accept other similar responsibilities as requested. The minimum acceptable level of productivity for service to the university would be to comply with university regulations as outlined in the KSU Faculty Handbook.

Profession. Expectations for service to the profession would be to present an abstract at a national professional meeting annually when appropriate. The minimum acceptable level of productivity would be to attend at least one national professional society meeting annually.

Community. The expectation and minimum acceptable level of productivity for community service would be to represent Kansas State University, K-State Research and Extension, and SEARC in a positive manner in the community.

Chronic Low Achievement Procedures

Chronic failure of a tenured faculty member to perform his or her professional duties shall constitute evidence of "professional incompetence" and warrant consideration for "dismissal for cause" under existing university policies. Research center faculty have developed a set of guidelines describing the minimum-acceptable level of productivity for all applicable areas of responsibility for the faculty which are listed in "Expectations and Minimum Acceptable Levels of Productivity". When a tenured faculty member's overall performance falls below the minimum-acceptable level, as indicated by the annual evaluation, the research center head shall indicate so in writing to the faculty member. The research center 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 improving 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 any five-year period in which minimum standards are not met, then "dismissal for cause" will be considered at the discretion of the appropriate dean.

PROMOTION, TENURE, MID-TENURE REVIEW AND REAPPOINTMENT

Reappointment of Faculty on Probationary Appointments

Faculty members on probationary appointments are evaluated annually to determine whether or not they will be reappointed for another year. These annual evaluations also serve as an opportunity to provide feedback to a faculty member on probationary appointment about his or her performance in comparison to the research center's standards for tenure.

Procedures outlining reappointment of faculty members on a probationary appointment can be found in Sections C50.1 - C56 of the Faculty Handbook. Prior to October 1, the candidate compiles documentation of his or her professional accomplishments using Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation at Kansas State University (<http://www.ksu.edu/academicservices/depthead/promotion/promotio.html>) and submits this document to the research center head. This document along with a cumulative record of written recommendations and accompanying explanations forwarded to the candidate from previous reappointment meetings, and any written comments from relevant individuals outside the department will comprise the reappointment file. The research center head shall make the candidate's reappointment file available to all tenured faculty members at the research center and other eligible faculty for at least 14 days before a meeting of eligible faculty is held to 1) discuss the candidate's eligibility for reappointment and progress toward tenure and 2) to cast a ballot on reappointment of the candidate. Prior to this meeting, any member of the eligible faculty may request the candidate meet with the eligible faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate. All discussions at this meeting regarding candidates being considered for reappointment are confidential. Secret ballots will be used and written comments encouraged. Absentee ballots can be cast provided that they are submitted to the research center head prior to the meeting. Ballots will be kept in research center files for at least two years.

Following the vote by tenured faculty, the research center head will forward a written recommendation and accompanying explanations to the dean, along with the candidate's complete file, the majority recommendation and unedited written comments of each of the research center's tenured faculty members. The research center head will also meet with the candidate to discuss the separate issue of the candidate's progress toward tenure. The research center head's written recommendation and accompanying explanations alone will be made available to the candidate and will become part of the candidate's reappointment file. The dean, along with the recommendation of the research center head and, on behalf of the college, forwards a written recommendation and accompanying explanation to the provost, and the majority recommendation and any written comments (unedited) of the faculty members in the department. The candidate's complete file will be available to the provost upon his/her request. Final authority in resolving conflicting opinions regarding reappointment is delegated to the provost.

Candidates are informed of the college's recommendation prior to the time that the file and recommendations are forwarded to the provost. Faculty members must be explicitly informed in writing of a decision not to renew their appointments in accordance with The Standards of Notice of Non-Reappointment. (See Appendix A of the Faculty Handbook.)

Mid-Probationary Review of Faculty Members on a Probationary Appointment

A formal review of a probationary faculty member is conducted midway through the probationary period. Unless otherwise stated in the candidate's contract, the mid-probationary review shall take place during the third year of appointment. This review provides the faculty member with substantive feedback from faculty colleagues and administrators regarding his or her accomplishments relative to departmental tenure criteria. A positive mid-probationary review does not insure that tenure will be granted in the future nor does a negative review mean that tenure will be denied.

Procedures outlining mid-probationary review of faculty members on a probationary appointment can be found in Sections C92.1 - C93 of the Faculty Handbook. Procedures for the mid-probationary review are similar to procedures for the tenure review and are established by the research center faculty in consultation with the research center head and the dean. Prior to October 1, the candidate compiles documentation of his or her professional accomplishments using Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation (<http://www.ksu.edu/academicservices/depthead/promotion/promotio.html>) and submits this document to the research center head. This document along with a cumulative record of written recommendations and accompanying explanations forwarded to the candidate from previous reappointment meetings, and any comments from individuals outside the department relevant to the assessment of the candidate's performance will also be made available to the eligible tenured faculty will comprise the mid-probationary review file. The research center head shall make the candidate's mid-probationary file available to all tenured faculty members at the research center and other eligible faculty for at least 14 days before a meeting of eligible faculty is held to 1) discuss the candidate's reappointment and progress toward tenure and 2) to cast a ballot on reappointment of the candidate. Prior to this meeting, any member of the eligible faculty may request the candidate meet with the eligible faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate. All discussions at this meeting regarding candidates being considered for mid-probationary review are confidential. Secret ballots will be used and written comments encouraged. Absentee ballots can be cast provided that they are submitted to the research center head prior to the meeting. Ballots will be kept in research center files for at least two years.

The research center head may discuss the review and assessment by the tenured faculty members in the department with the dean, and shall provide a letter of assessment to the candidate, including a summary of faculty comments and suggestions. This letter of assessment and the faculty report will become a part of the candidate's reappointment and mid-probationary review file. The research center head will discuss the review and assessment with the candidate. After receiving the assessment, the candidate has the right to submit a written response for the file within 14 days. The research center head forwards a written recommendation and accompanying explanations to the dean, along with the candidate's mid-probationary review file and the result of the vote of tenured faculty at the research center. The candidate's mid-probationary review file as well as other materials specified in Section C92.2 of the Faculty Handbook, and a copy of the departmental criteria and standards will be forwarded to the college advisory committee.

The dean will provide a letter of assessment to the candidate that includes a summary of recommendations from the college advisory committee. The provost is responsible for making final recommendations to the president.

Tenure and Promotion

There can be no simple list of accomplishments that, when achieved, guarantee that a faculty member will obtain tenure. Instead, tenure is granted. This action, taken by the Kansas Board of Regents, is based on the assessment by the tenured faculty of the university that a candidate has made outstanding contributions in appropriate academic endeavors. By granting tenure only to such individuals, the continued excellence of the university is ensured. Procedures for evaluation and granting of tenure are outlined in Sections C100.1-C116.2 of the Faculty Handbook. Tenure is not granted below the rank of associate professor except in special circumstances approved by the provost. For persons appointed at the rank of assistant professor, the maximum probationary period for gaining tenure and promotion to associate professor consists of six (6) regular annual appointments at Kansas State University at a probationary rank.

In these cases, decisions of tenure must be made before or during the sixth year of probationary service. Candidates not approved for tenure during the sixth year of service will be notified by the dean that the seventh year of service will constitute the terminal year of appointment. For persons appointed at the rank of associate professor or professor, the maximum probationary period for gaining tenure consists of five (5) regular annual appointments at Kansas State University at probationary ranks. Tenure decisions must be made before or during the fifth year of probationary service. Candidates not approved for tenure during the fifth year of service will be notified by the appropriate dean that the sixth year of service will constitute the terminal year of appointment. Faculty members on probationary appointments who have met the criteria and standards for tenure prior to the above maximum times may be granted early tenure. Because candidates may be considered for tenure at any time during their probationary period, no time credit shall be granted for service prior to employment at Kansas State University.

Faculty members may expect to advance through the academic ranks on the basis of demonstrated individual merit in relation to their association with the university's mission and with their own disciplines. Each higher rank demands a higher level of accomplishment. Promotion is based upon an individual's achievements related to the specific criteria, standards, and guidelines developed by departmental faculty members in consultation with the research center head and the appropriate dean. Procedures for granting promotion of faculty with academic rank are outlined in Sections C120-C156.2 of the Faculty Handbook. Promotion to associate professor rests on substantial professional contributions that reflect excellence in teaching, research and other creative endeavor, directed service, or extension. Promotion to professor is based on attainment of excellence in the assigned responsibilities of the faculty member and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies. While there is no explicit time in rank required for promotion, the median time for promotion at Kansas State University has been about six years. Promotion may be granted earlier when the faculty member's cumulative performance at rank clearly meets the standards for promotion.

Recommendations for tenure and/or promotion are considered annually. Faculty members in the final year of probation will be automatically reviewed for tenure and/or promotion unless they resign. A faculty member may request an early tenure and/or promotion review. Ordinarily, this is done after consultation with the research center head and the tenured faculty members at the research center. The candidate compiles documentation of her or his professional accomplishments using the Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation (<http://www.ksu.edu/academicservices/depthead/promotion/promotio.html>) and submits this document to the research center head. When appropriate, written comments may be solicited by professionals outside of the research center at the request of the candidate and/or research center head. A cumulative record of recommendations from the reappointment and mid-probationary review meetings, and any outside reviews that have been solicited by the department chair/head will also be made available to the eligible faculty. All of this information will become a part of the candidate's file. The research center head is advised by the eligible faculty members of the research center regarding the qualifications of the candidate. The research center head is responsible for making the candidate's file and departmental promotion and tenure criteria documents available to eligible faculty members at the research center at least 14 calendar days prior to the scheduled meeting date to discuss the candidate's petition. Eligible tenured faculty members will individually review the candidate's file, considering the department's criteria, standards, and guidelines for tenure and/or promotion, and will then meet to discuss the candidate's petition. All recommendations and written comments of eligible departmental faculty are forwarded to the department chair/head. Prior to this meeting, any member of the eligible faculty may request the candidate meet with the eligible faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate. Tenured faculty members are eligible to participate in the evaluation procedure for tenure. Faculty members holding a rank equal to or higher than the rank being sought by the candidate can participate in the evaluation for promotion. All discussions at this meeting regarding candidates being considered for tenure and/or promotion are confidential. Secret ballots will be used and written comments encouraged. Absentee ballots can be cast provided that they are submitted to the research center head prior to the meeting. Ballots will be kept in research center files for at least two years.

The research center head will forward a written recommendation to the dean, accompanied by an explanation of her or his judgement. All recommendations and unedited written comments of the research center's eligible faculty members and the candidate's complete file are also forwarded to the dean. A copy of the research center head's written recommendation alone is forwarded to the candidate. A copy of the candidate's file and the departmental tenure criteria documents will be forwarded to the college advisory committee. The committee's specific charge is to assure that all applicable procedures have been followed and that the department/unit in arriving at a recommendation did so by fairly applying established criteria, standards, and guidelines for tenure. The committee, in advising the dean, will base its recommendation exclusively on a comparison of the candidate's credentials with the criteria, standards, and guidelines of the candidate's department. The committee will report its findings in writing to the dean. The committee's report must specifically contain a statement as to whether or not all applicable procedures were followed. The report must also explain the rationale behind the

committee's recommendation by providing a detailed evaluation of the candidate's credentials with regard to how they meet or fail to meet the specific criteria, standards, and/or guidelines of the candidate's department/unit. A minority committee report is required when the committee's recommendation is not unanimous. The dean, after consulting with the department research center head and the college advisory committee and after discussing his or her recommendations with the head and the committee, will submit his or her written recommendation to the Dean's Council accompanied by the recommendations and unedited written comments of the research center head, the departmental faculty, and the college advisory committee, and the departmental tenure criteria documents, no sooner than seven calendar days following notification to the candidate. The dean's recommendation and the recommendation of the college advisory committee will be copied to the research center head and the candidate. Candidates are informed of the college's recommendations prior to the time that the file and recommendations are forwarded to the deans council. Candidates may withdraw from further consideration for tenure and/or promotion by submitting to the dean a written request for withdrawal. This must be done within seven calendar days following notification of the college's recommendation. Withdrawal by a candidate who is in the final year of probationary period may be done only by formal resignation.

The deans council meeting will be chaired by the senior dean (longest serving), and the provost will not be a party to the discussions. The dean of the candidate's college will abstain from voting when the council votes on the candidate, and will notify the candidate and the candidate's department chair/head of the council's vote. If the finding of the deans council differs from those of the research center head and/or the college dean, written justification must be provided as to how the candidate's credentials meet or fail to meet the research center criteria, standards, and/or guidelines, to the candidate, dean of the candidate's college, and the research center head. If the finding of the deans council is to not grant tenure and/or promotion, the candidate may appeal this decision to the provost within a period of fourteen calendar days of receiving notification. If the provost concurs with the finding of the deans council to not grant tenure and/or promotion, the candidate then has the option to file a grievance with the General Grievance Board. If the finding of the deans council is to grant tenure and/or promotion, the case is then reviewed by the provost. If the provost does not concur with the finding of the deans council, then the provost will offer to arrange a meeting with the candidate, the senior dean, and a tenured faculty moderator mutually acceptable to the provost and the candidate, within a period of fourteen calendar days of notification of provost's decision. If no agreement is reached, then the provost will provide the candidate, the research center head, the dean of the candidate's college, and the deans council, written reasons for the decision. At that point, the candidate has the option to file a grievance with the General Grievance Board. The provost will send his or her recommendation of the cases that are to be granted tenure and/or promotion to the president. Decisions to deny tenure and/or promotion are not forwarded to the president. When the provost's recommendation disagrees with that of the deans council, the provost will provide a written explanation of her or his judgment to the Dean's Council, the dean, the research center head, and the candidate. The president has final authority for granting tenure and/or promotion. Candidates are notified of the university's action when the provost's recommendation to grant tenure and/or promotion are forwarded to the president.