

**Biochemistry and Molecular Biophysics
Department**

**Arts and Sciences
College**

Policy Statement Concerning:

Personnel Review and Evaluation Standards/Procedures

- **Performance Evaluation Criteria**
- **Annual Evaluation**
- **Reappointment Evaluation for:**
 - **Annual Reappointment Reviews**
 - **Mid-Tenure Review**
- **Tenure**
- **Promotion**
- **Professorial Performance Award**
- **Chronic Low Achievement**
- **Post-Tenure Review**
- **Non-Tenure Track Faculty Titles**

Approved by Faculty Vote on (September 5, 2019)

NEXT REVIEW DATE: September 4, 2024



Michal Zolkiewski
Department Head's Signature

09/23/2019
Date



Amit Chawrabh
Dean's Signature

9-23-2019
Date



Provost's Signature

9/24/2019
Date

Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biophysics

Kansas State University

Approved by Faculty Vote on September 5, 2019

Next review by September 4, 2024



Michal Zolkiewski, Department Head

Amit Chakrabarti, Dean

Charles S. Taber, Provost

CONTENTS

Chapter I	Faculty Identity	3
I.A.	Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty	3
I.B.	Director of the NMR Facility	3
I.C.	Research Faculty	3
I.D.	Instructors	3
Chapter II	Standards for Hiring, Tenure, and Promotion	4
II.A.	Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty	4
II.B.	Director of the NMR Facility	5
II.C.	Research Faculty	6
Chapter III	Criteria for Evaluation of Professional Accomplishments	8
III.A.	Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty	8
III.A.1.	Scholarship	8
III.A.2.	Teaching	10
III.A.3.	Service	11
III.A.4.	Other Professional Activities	12
III.B.	Director of the NMR Facility	13
III.C.	Research Faculty	13
III.C.1.	Scholarship	14
III.C.2.	Service and Other Professional Activities	14
III.D.	Instructors	15
Chapter IV	Annual Evaluation and Reappointment Procedures	16
IV.A.	Annual Performance Evaluation	16
IV.A.1.	Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty	16
IV.A.2.	Director of the NMR Facility	16
IV.A.3.	Research Faculty	17
IV.B.	Reappointment	17
IV.B.1.	Pre-Tenure Reappointment	17
IV.B.2.	Reappointment of Research Faculty	18
IV.B.2.	Reappointment of Instructors	18
Chapter V	Procedures for Tenure and Promotion	19
V.A.	Tenure-track	19
V.A.1.	Mid-Tenure Review Procedures	19
V.A.2.	Tenure and Promotion Review procedures	20
V.B.	Research Faculty	22
Chapter VI	Post-Tenure Review	24
Chapter VII	Professorial Performance Award	26

I. Faculty Identity

I.A. Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Tenured and tenure-track faculty appointed at the Assistant, Associate or Full Professor levels in the Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biophysics are expected to be active in scholarship, teaching, service, and other professional activities. The Department should recognize that different individuals may legitimately and usefully choose to focus their activities in different areas. The distribution of effort for each individual should be agreed upon by the individual and the Department Head and should be consistent with the collective needs of the Department and the University. In cases when faculty members have less than full-time appointments in the Department, expectations of their professional accomplishments should be proportional to the tenths of the time of appointment.

I.B. Director of the Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (NMR) Facility

The Director of the NMR Facility is a tenured or tenure-track faculty member. The Director has a major responsibility of maintaining and upgrading hardware and software for the facility and providing to users the NMR data and assistance with analysis. Contributions in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service are expected but it is understood that these are modified expectations relative to those of the other tenured or tenure-track faculty because of the special nature of the duties of the Director.

I.C. Research Faculty

Assistant, Associate or Full Research Professors are scientists performing research and necessary technological development in the Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biophysics. They are not required to teach regular courses, but they may teach on a volunteer basis. They may also contribute in other ways to the performance of the Department, for example, by training students and research associates, serving on committees, and directly obtaining external funding. According to the University Handbook, appointments as Research Faculty may be either as term or regular appointments. Research Faculty on term appointments are supported principally by external funding, and a term appointment implies no expectation of continued employment beyond the contract period. For a regular appointment, the individual is a member of the General Faculty and is afforded all perquisites of the General Faculty, including notice of non-reappointment. These guidelines do not supersede university requirements. The university's policies and procedures are stated in the University Handbook.

I.D. Instructors

Faculty on Instructor appointments have primary responsibilities in teaching and a limited service role determined in consultation with the Head. Reappointment requires demonstrated effective performance in the assigned areas, according to the indices of professional accomplishment for Instructors (Chapter III.D). Faculty at the level of Instructor may be assigned or volunteer for a limited load of service responsibilities, with agreement of the Head.

This service should have a primary focus on matters related to teaching functions of the Department or the University.

II. Standards for Hiring, Tenure, and Promotion

The content of this document reflects the fact that in the Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biophysics support for faculty positions comes from both the College of Arts and Sciences and the Agricultural Experiment Station. This document is to be taken into account in departmental consideration of merit salary increases, reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

II.A. Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Hiring

Faculty will be hired at Assistant, Associate, or Professor levels as a result of national searches. Assistant Professor candidates are expected to have a Ph.D. degree plus postdoctoral research experience, and to have published significant work in well refereed journals. Teaching skills must be demonstrated. To be hired at a level beyond the Assistant Professor, a candidate normally must meet all criteria and standards expected for promotion to the Associate Professor or Professor level. However, a faculty member with a very strong research background may be hired at a more advanced level even with limited teaching experience.

Tenure and Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Candidates must plan, develop, and sustain a competitive research program. This implies obtaining extramural support, carrying out state-of-the-art research, and publishing in well refereed journals. Student evaluations of teaching provided by the candidate must demonstrate effectiveness. The evaluations and other information must support high standards in all aspects of teaching. Service activities should at least include serving well on departmental committees. University and external service should develop after a competitive research program has been established.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Scholarship

To be considered for the rank of professor, high research productivity is required as demonstrated by:

1. significant refereed publications, strong grant support, several students (undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral) trained, and productive collaborative interactions. Gaps in research productivity or maintenance of extramural support will delay consideration.
2. local and national service (grant and publication reviewing), service on committees with research-related interests
3. national or international research presentations

Teaching

Sustained effective teaching in courses ranging from undergraduate to advanced graduate level must be documented and supported by student evaluations as well as other evidence, such as, innovative teaching materials, instructional techniques, tests or examinations, or evidence of special contributions to effective teaching for diverse student populations.

Service

The candidate is expected to have participated on departmental and university service committees and in external service with significant contributions in some areas of service.

II.B. Director of the Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (NMR) Facility

Hiring

The Director will be hired at Assistant, Associate, or Professor levels as a result of national searches. Candidates for Assistant Professor are expected to have a Ph.D. degree plus postdoctoral research experience in the area of NMR spectroscopy, as demonstrated by scholarly work published in well refereed journals. To be hired at a level beyond the assistant professor, a candidate normally must meet all criteria and standards expected for promotion to the Associate Professor or Professor level. However, a faculty member with a very strong research background may be hired at a more advanced level even with limited teaching experience.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Scholarship

The Director must demonstrate a high level of collaborative effort with investigators from within the Department as well as in other units, either on- or off-campus and show that there is major funding support for the facility through the collaborations. The Director must demonstrate that there are new active collaborations in progress. There must be a continuing record of well-refereed publications involving NMR research.

Teaching

Teaching effectiveness must be demonstrated by TEVAL evaluations as well as other evidence, such as, innovative teaching materials, instructional techniques, tests or examinations, or evidence of special contributions to effective teaching for diverse student populations.

Service

Service efforts will support the tenure decision but are not critical elements for a positive decision.

Promotion to Professor

Scholarship

The Director must demonstrate quality scholarship through:

1. extramural support of the NMR Facility by maintenance and enhancement grants with the Director as Principal Investigator or as de facto PI in cases where agencies require the Department chair as PI
2. a strong record of significant, refereed, NMR-intensive publications
3. contributions to the training of undergraduate and graduate students
4. local and national scholarship service through grant and publication reviewing
5. national presentations of research based on output of the NMR Facility

Teaching

Sustained effective teaching in appropriate courses must be documented and supported by student evaluations as well as other evidence, such as, innovative teaching materials, instructional techniques, tests or examinations, or evidence of special contributions to effective teaching for diverse student populations.

Service

The candidate is expected to have served on departmental and university committees.

II.C. Research Faculty

Hiring

An individual seeking a research faculty appointment in the Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biophysics must be engaged in professional research activities related to biochemistry. The credentials of the candidates for research faculty appointments must be equivalent to the credentials of those considered for regular faculty appointments.

Appointment above the level of Research Assistant Professor will be made if the candidate has credentials comparable to those defined for tenure-track Associate Professor and Professor appointments as outlined above in Section II.A. There is no teaching requirement although merit from teaching can support the appointment.

1. The candidate for a research faculty position shall prepare and submit to the Department Head a petition for appointment. This should include the candidate's curriculum vitae, a concise statement of current research interests, a summary of scholarly and professional activities, and the reason for seeking the appointment. If the research faculty position is to be supported from external funds, a recommendation from the tenured or tenure-track faculty member who is the Principal Investigator/direct supervisor must accompany the petition.
2. The Department Head then selects a chair *pro tem* of an appointment committee from among the tenured and tenure-track faculty of an appropriate rank. The candidate has the right to veto the selected chair *pro tem*. The approved chair *pro tem* then selects two additional tenured or tenure-track faculty members to assist by serving on this committee.
3. The candidate shall present a departmental seminar describing his or her research

activities.

4. The tenured and tenure-track faculty who are at a rank equal to or higher than the equivalent proposed research appointment will meet to discuss the candidate's appointment as a research faculty member and vote on the appointment. A simple majority vote is sufficient for approval.

A regular or term appointment as a research faculty member allows application for the Graduate Faculty membership. A research faculty member may be nominated for graduate faculty membership with authorization to direct M.S. research or may be nominated for membership with certification to direct Ph.D. students. This nomination is evaluated by the graduate faculty members of the Department and, if approved, forwarded to the Graduate School for consideration.

Promotion

A research faculty member may apply for promotion to the next higher rank. Criteria for promotion are listed below. Procedures for promotion are described in Section V.B. There is no teaching requirement although merit from teaching can support the promotion.

Promotion from Research Assistant Professor to Research Associate Professor

Scholarship

The candidate must demonstrate quality scholarship through:

1. planning, developing, and carrying out state-of-the-art research,
2. publishing in well-refereed journals,
3. working constructively to obtain extramural support, either as the lead PI or a co-investigator,
4. training undergraduate and graduate students,
5. national research presentations

Service

The candidate is expected to have served on graduate student supervisory committees. Other service efforts will support the promotion decision but are not critical elements for a positive decision.

Promotion from Research Associate Professor to Research Professor

Scholarship

To be considered for the rank of Research Professor, high research productivity is required as demonstrated by:

1. a significant record of refereed publications,
2. strong grant support (as the lead PI or a co-investigator) and productive collaborative interactions,
3. training of undergraduate and graduate students,

4. local and national service (for example, grant and publication reviewing),
5. national or international research presentations

Service

The candidate is expected to have served on graduate student supervisory committees. Other service efforts will support the promotion decision but are not critical elements for a positive decision.

III. Criteria for Evaluation of Professional Accomplishments

III.A. Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Introduction

The various indices are grouped under the headings: scholarship, teaching, service, and other professional activities. It is expected that every faculty member will be active to some degree under the first three headings; that is, no unusual merit attaches to keeping a research program in operation, managing competently a normal teaching load, and carrying a reasonable share of departmental and university chores. The order in which major headings are listed is not intended to indicate the superior importance of one general category of activity over another and this list is not exhaustive.

In categories III.A.1-3, the relevant activities are given in a rough order of decreasing importance. It should be recognized that this order is approximate only and cannot be interpreted rigidly in every case. The Head will evaluate and rank these accomplishments based on his/her knowledge of the relevant venues and his/her professional experience, in the context of the faculty member's career stage and academic history. For example, some publications may be less significant than some invited lectures, and particularly complimentary student reaction may sometimes be weighed more heavily than the renovation of a course.

III.A.1. Scholarship

III.A.1.a. Publications

- a. Journal articles. The valuation of publications should be as sensible as possible, and mindless paper-counting should be avoided. Some account should be taken of the rigor of refereeing to which papers are subjected and of the visibility of the journals to which they are submitted. Abstracts, preliminary reports, and papers appearing in un-refereed journals are generally less significant than definitive papers in substantial journals. Chief weight will be given to publications appearing in final form in print or on-line during the period under review. Papers accepted after all necessary revision or in proof should be considered significant. Manuscripts submitted for publication, under review, or in preparation will be of interest to the Department Head but will be given no weight in faculty evaluation.

- b. Invited review articles. These may be particularly significant since they represent not only publication but professional recognition as well.
- c. Book authorship. This may be given heavy emphasis in merit evaluations since it may represent much greater effort than a journal article. The Head will make the determination of its relative weight.
- d. Other scholarly publications.

III.A.1.b. Extramural support

Funds are more difficult to obtain from some sources than from others and some fields are more in fashion than others with the granting agencies. These variations in the difficulty particular individuals may have in obtaining funds need to be taken into account. However, substantial and continuing efforts in this direction are expected in every case. These efforts will be evaluated in the following order:

- a. Approval and funding of a new grant dealing with a problem new to the investigator.
- b. Approval and funding of a competitive renewal of a project in progress.
- c. Funding of continuation support and supplements to an existing grant.
- d. Proposals receiving favorable reviews but not funded.
- e. Grant application submitted.

III.A.1.c. Outside lectures

Opportunities to speak elsewhere generally represent appreciation outside the University of scholarly merit. The significance of this recognition depends on the nature of the invitation. A reasonable order of decreasing significance is the following:

- a. Invitation to speak at a national or international meeting
- b. Invitation to speak at a university active in research.
- c. Invitation to preside at a session of a national or international meeting.
- d. Invitation to speak at a small college or secondary school.
- e. Invitation to speak or preside at a regional meeting.
- f. Contributed paper at a national or international meeting.

- g. Local invitation to speak, for example, as part of the courses or seminar program of another department.
- h. Contributed paper at a regional meeting.

III.A.1.d. Review service

Review panel service and requests to review applications for a funding agency.

III.A.1.e. Editorship

Editorship of journal, book or symposium proceedings and requests to review manuscripts for journals.

III.A.1.f. Research leaves approved or completed

It is the intention of the Department that well-conceived research leaves be a regular part of faculty experience. Although leaves are attractive in themselves, they are also disruptive and, in some cases, require substantial financial sacrifice. Merit should be attached to research leaves for this reason. Consideration should be given to the state of the department in which the leave is spent and to the quality of the work accomplished. Particular merit should attach to research leaves partly or entirely supported by extramural funds.

III.A.2. Teaching

Neither formal classroom/laboratory teaching nor research training should be valued in preference to the other, since different individuals do best at one or the other and both are important.

For purposes of tenure, faculty are required to provide student evaluations of their course efforts. The evaluations provided should cover all courses taught, permitting a chronological evaluation. For purposes of annual evaluations and promotion, faculty must provide to the Head documented evidence of the effectiveness of their teaching. The normal expectation for submitted evaluations for tenure, annual evaluation, and promotion is that the results of student evaluations will be provided. This is required for all major service course offerings. Other means of evaluation may be used, and are encouraged, to provide the most thorough evaluation. Each faculty member is expected to provide some form of data, other than student ratings, supporting their teaching effectiveness. This may include: course materials such as reading lists, syllabi, handouts, examinations; information on instructional techniques, special projects, or other teaching innovations. Peer review letters from faculty in this or other departments who sat in on a significant portion of a course and which are directly submitted to the Head will also be considered. For very small classes, alternate methods of evaluation may be more appropriate, but, for example, a single letter from a student from a class of six would not be sufficient.

In addition to a high standard of teaching, it is expected that faculty perform with academic

integrity, promote scholarship and intellectual growth, be effective communicators, and have concern for students as individuals. The Head will take into consideration as part of teaching evaluation positive or negative evidence concerning these points and will apprise faculty members when serious concerns are involved.

Within the categories of formal teaching and research training, certain indices can be singled out for particular attention.

III.A.2.a. Formal teaching

- a. Development of a new course or of novel teaching methods.
- b. Substantial improvement in content or course materials for a course that has been offered before.
- c. Teaching a course that has been offered before by the Department but not by the particular individual.
- d. Competitive teaching award or unusually favorable student response.
- e. Unusually heavy teaching load either in contact hours or student numbers.

III.A.2.b. Research training

- a. Graduate degrees granted to students working in the laboratory of the faculty member.
- b. Graduate students supervised during the period under review.
- c. Undergraduate research students supervised.
- d. Advice on problems or techniques provided for students working with other supervisors.
- e. Service on supervising committees, especially for students presenting completed theses or dissertations during the review period.

III.A.3. Service

The following list is not exhaustive, and a number of unusual kinds of service may be appropriately considered under this heading. Some account must be taken of the fact that service of some kinds is likely to be done only at the request of the Department Head or of the administration and so opportunities for service may not be equally available for all faculty members. Consideration should be given to the time invested in particular activities, to the importance of the service to the Department and the University, and to the effectiveness with which the assigned work is done.

III.A.3.a. Departmental chores

- a. Standing service, for example, in undergraduate advising or management of graduate programs.
- b. Special service: one-time assignments to deal ad hoc with particular problems as they arise, for example, departmental equipment proposals or recruiting committee.

III.A.3.b. University chores

- a. Service on significant standing committees or in university governance.
- b. Ad hoc assignments to deal with specific problems.
- c. Offices held or service performed for local sections or student affiliates of professional societies.

III.A.3.c. Office held and committee assignments in national professional societiesIII.A.3.d. Consulting services for government agencies or commercial firms**III.A.4. Other Professional Activities**

Other professional activities include consulting, civic, governmental, or industrial service or meaningful participation in the activities of professional societies. There are a number of items which represent practice of the profession which do not fit exactly into the first three categories (III.A.1-3) listed above. In all of these instances the question which must be addressed by the Department Head and involved faculty member is the extent to which each activity makes a positive contribution to the successful operation of the Department. The faculty member concerned is responsible for indicating the benefits of such activities to the Department. Section D40 of the University Handbook deals specifically with the questions of conflicts of interest which could arise from employment or consultancy, and annual statements of financial interest are required by the state. Within these limits, professional activities should be evaluated as are the items in parts III.A.1-3.

- a. When the benefits to the Department and the professional development of the faculty member are other than purely financial, the holding of consultancy positions and/or seasonal or part-time employment in firms related to the profession may be significant. Such employment ought to be considered.
- b. Success in obtaining patentable inventions is another instance where a publication describing its nature may be of less significance than the successful further development of the invention. A patent may be roughly equivalent to a publication. Likewise, its impact may be evaluated by the use to which it is put.

- c. Distribution of research methods including computer programs, not ordinarily subjected to formal peer review, may represent a quite significant service to others in the university or the profession and may entail a great deal of intellectual, scholarly activity. Again, the use to which they are put indicates their significance to the scientific community.
- d. Holding an active position in a company developing research technology may provide significant benefits to the Department as well as the individual faculty member in the form of enhanced scientific recognition.
- e. Extensive service to governmental research or regulatory agencies can give the faculty member unique expertise, be of use to other faculty members, and enhance the reputation of the university.

III.B. Director of the NMR Facility

Contributions of the Director in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service are expected but it is understood that these are modified expectations relative to those of the other tenured or tenure-track faculty because of the special nature of the duties of the Director. As the primary research effort is to provide assistance with NMR analysis to other investigators, publications are expected to be collaborative rather than initiated by the Director of the facility. The Director is expected to obtain extramural support to assist with maintenance and enhancement of the facility. Other extramural support is normally anticipated to be of a collaborative nature with other investigators. Other aspects of scholarship are expected as for other faculty. Formal teaching is more limited with responsibility for seminar courses, lecture/laboratory courses dealing with NMR, and participation in biophysics courses. Research training involvement and service are the same as expected for other faculty.

III.C. Research Faculty

Introduction

All research faculty are expected to contribute scholarly and professionally to the Department and University community. It is expected that research faculty will seek extramural support, either as lead principal investigators or as co-investigators on grant proposals. The allocation of time to the various activities is made by the direct supervisor or by the Head of the Department, with the approval of the research faculty member.

Research Faculty members should:

- a. Show a strong research effort either as an individual or as a part of a group directed by a member of the Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty.

- b. Demonstrate interest in the activities of the Department by attending and participating, as often as possible, in faculty meetings and seminars. A research faculty member may serve on appropriate departmental standing or *ad hoc* committees. Research faculty members have limited voting privileges on general faculty matters. Exclusions are faculty recommendations on headship, tenured faculty appointments, tenure decisions, faculty promotions, admission of tenured faculty to the graduate faculty, course additions or deletions, and other departmental concerns easily identified as solely tenure-track faculty responsibilities.
- c. Develop or co-develop research or educational grant proposals to bring outside support to the department.
- d. Provide support to the existing research efforts and consultation to other members of the Department.
- e. If elected to the graduate faculty, serve on appropriate graduate student supervisory committees. If admitted to the BMB Graduate Group, a Research Faculty Member may serve as major professor for graduate students. Success in attracting extramural support is expected to accompany taking on the role of serving as a major professor for a graduate student.

Research Faculty are evaluated by the Department Head with concurrence of the Principal Investigator/direct supervisor on an annual basis. The following sections list the evaluation criteria for Research Faculty.

III.C.1. Scholarship

- a. Conducting experimental or theoretical studies on topics related to the grant(s) under which the research faculty member is funded
- b. Publication of papers in appropriate journals, monographs and proceedings. The valuation of publications is as described in the Evaluation Criteria for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty in section III.A.1.a. above.
- c. Presentations at appropriate professional meetings.
- d. Designing or modifying equipment, computational methods, or other tools related to the research program.
- e. Development of proposals for funding of research.
- f. Administration of research grants obtained by a tenured or tenure-track member of the Faculty.
- g. Supervision of post-docs, students, and support staff for research projects and

laboratories.

- h. Training of faculty, post-docs, students, and support staff.
- i. Mentoring of students, research associates, junior faculty and/or visitors.
- j. Providing support and consultation to other members of the Department.

III.C.2. Service and Other Professional Activities

- a. Serving on University, College, or Departmental committees which have direct impact on the research faculty member's area of research or research group.
- b. Review of research proposals and manuscripts for journals.
- c. Holding office in professional associations.
- d. Dissemination of knowledge in biochemistry to the community-at-large.

III.D. Instructors

1. Faculty appointed as Instructor have formal teaching as the major responsibility. For purposes of annual evaluation, Instructors must provide to the Head student evaluations and other appropriate evidence of the effectiveness their teaching for each course taught. This may include a portfolio of course materials such as reading lists, syllabi, hand-outs, examinations; information on instructional techniques, special projects, or other teaching innovations. Peer review letters from faculty in this or other departments who sat in on a significant portion of a course and which are directly submitted to the Head will also be considered.
2. In addition to a high standard of teaching, it is expected that faculty perform with academic integrity, promote scholarship and intellectual growth, be effective communicators, and have concern for students as individuals. The Head will take into consideration as part of teaching evaluation positive or negative evidence concerning these points and will apprise faculty members when serious concerns are involved.
3. Within the categories of formal teaching, certain indices can be singled out for particular attention.
 - a. Development of a new course or of novel teaching methods.
 - b. Substantial improvement in content or course materials for a course that has been offered before.

- c. Teaching a course that has been offered before by the Department but not by the particular individual.
- d. Competitive teaching award or unusually favorable student response.
- e. Unusually heavy teaching load either in contact hours or student numbers.

IV. Annual Evaluation and Reappointment Procedures

IV.A. Annual Performance Evaluation

IV.A.1. Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

1. In early December, the Head makes a request of each faculty member for a summary of activities and achievements to be prepared as an annual report. It is requested that the report be submitted to the Head by December 31.
2. The report is prepared by each faculty member based on the Criteria for Evaluation (Chapter III of this document). This document compiles academic activities, including Scholarship, Teaching and Service accomplishments during the past calendar year.
3. The Head reviews all annual reports in the first two weeks of January and then arranges a meeting with every faculty member to jointly consider: a) their accomplishments, b) their goals, c) any special circumstances influencing professional activities in the past or coming year, d) as needed (usually not), expectations and/or a need for altering goals and focus,* e) input from the faculty member concerning the direction and goals of the Department.
4. The Department Head generates an annual review report concerning each faculty member (described below). The Head provides each faculty member with a copy and makes revisions, as appropriate, based on comments of the faculty member. A copy signed by the faculty member is forwarded to the Dean.
5. The Head prepares an evaluation and ranking of each faculty member's accomplishments, based on the overall summary of his/her faculty accomplishments. The ranking categories should include at least the following: "exceeded expectations," "met expectations," "fallen below expectations but has met minimum acceptable levels of productivity," and "fallen below minimum acceptable levels of productivity."
6. The Head will maintain a record of the faculty members' annual performance evaluations and use this information in the distribution of merit raises, when such increases are available.

*Although there is a typically high degree of professional understanding of the faculty, it is the responsibility of the Head to bring up any existing concerns and it is the responsibility of the faculty member to seek clarification if there is any uncertainty in any area.

IV.A.2. Director of the NMR Facility

Director of the NMR facility is requested to submit an annual report of activity to the Head, based on the Criteria for Evaluation outlined in section III.B. The timeline for evaluation, ranking by the Head, and filing of the evaluation report to the Dean are similar to those for the tenure-track faculty.

IV.A.3. Research Faculty

Research Faculty are requested to submit an annual report of activity to the Head and to the Principal Investigator/direct supervisor, based on the Criteria for Evaluation listed in section III.C. Research Faculty are evaluated by the Department Head, with concurrence of the Principal Investigator/direct supervisor. The timeline for evaluation, ranking by the Head, and filing of the evaluation report to the Dean are similar to those for the tenure-track faculty.

IV.B. Reappointment

IV.B.1. Pre-Tenure Reappointment

We intend to provide a fair, accurate, useful, and orderly procedure to evaluate the professional development of probationary faculty in the Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biophysics. This document describes the roles and responsibilities of the tenured faculty, the Department Head, and the probationary faculty member in the assessment process so that all parties have a clear understanding of the expectations of the tenured faculty and the Department Head for the performance of the probationary faculty member. The department Head and the probationary faculty should consult the appropriate university and college calendars for the appropriate reappointment timelines.

1. Reappointment will be based on clear progress towards tenure. Suitable criteria include effective classroom teaching, progress towards establishing an externally funded scholarly agenda, and effective collaboration with colleagues. Probationary faculty with classroom responsibilities shall be rated by students at least once a year in each course that they teach.
2. Before submitting the letter of recommendation for reappointment of a probationary faculty member, the Department Head will solicit input from all tenured faculty members during each year prior to the awarding of tenure, at the appropriate time specified by the university and the college calendars. The probationary faculty member's curriculum vitae and other appropriate materials will be made available for review by the tenured faculty. It is the responsibility of the Department Head to initiate this process in a timely fashion and of the candidate and faculty to respond promptly. 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 also be made available to the eligible faculty.
3. The Department Head and the eligible faculty will meet at least fourteen calendar days after the review documents are made available, to discuss the candidate's eligibility for reappointment and progress toward tenure. Subsequent to this meeting there will be a ballot of the tenured faculty on reappointment of the candidate. Any member of the tenured faculty may, prior to the submission of any recommendation to the Department chair/Head, request the candidate meet with the tenured faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification,

the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate.

4. The Department Head will provide a letter which includes his/her recommendation and the rationale for the recommendation, redacted comments to protect anonymity, and the faculty vote to the candidate. The letter will become part of the candidate's reappointment file. This letter along with, all recommendations and non-redacted written comments of the Department's eligible tenured faculty members and the candidate's complete file are also forwarded to the Dean. The Department Head will also meet with the candidate to discuss the candidate's progress toward tenure.

IV.B.2. Reappointment of Research Faculty

Research Faculty are reappointed by the Principal Investigator/direct supervisor on an annual basis. Reappointment is based on satisfactory performance with criteria for evaluation listed in section III.C. Reappointment of a research faculty member on a term appointment is also contingent upon available funds.

IV.B.3. Reappointment of Instructors

Reappointment of Instructors requires demonstrated effective performance in the assigned areas, according to the Department's Evaluation Criteria for Instructors (section III.D).

At least two weeks before the College of Arts and Sciences deadline for a letter from the Department Head regarding reappointment of an Instructor, the Department Head will request the Instructor to provide a curriculum vitae and other appropriate materials to document performance and accomplishments. These will be made available for review by the tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Department. After obtaining input from the eligible faculty, the Department Head will forward a written recommendation and accompanying explanation to the Dean, along with the CV and other submitted documents, and the majority recommendation and written comments (unedited) of the departmental faculty members.

V. Procedures for Tenure and Promotion

V.A. Tenure-track

Prologue

Departmental criteria for tenure and promotion considerations are given in Chapter II. A separate section (section IV.B.1) also describes the Department's pre-tenure review procedures. University requirements concerning applications for tenure or promotion and the decision processes, including a timetable, are described in the University Handbook. The procedures given below specify responsibilities of the candidate, tenured faculty, and Department Head during promotion and tenure decisions. These guidelines do not supersede University requirements.

V.A.1. Mid-Tenure Review Procedures

1. By March 1 of her or his third year, the probationary faculty member will be asked by the Department Head to provide a current curriculum vitae and to assemble supporting material in the format required for tenure review, as specified by the Office of the Provost. This includes the candidate's statements of accomplishments and goals, summaries of research, teaching and service, and any supporting documentation.
2. The entire tenured faculty will review the candidate's progress.
3. The Department Head will meet with the tenured faculty to:
 - a. assess the candidate's productivity and progress;
 - b. identify areas of strength or weakness;
 - c. determine whether the candidate is meeting departmental expectations for consideration for tenure and promotion
 - d. vote on reappointment of the candidate

The Department Head will write a report based on this meeting.

4. The Department Head will meet with the candidate, review the faculty report, and provide an assessment and written recommendation.
5. The probationary faculty member will have the opportunity to respond to the recommendation and to furnish additional documentation if necessary.
6. The Department Head will submit the mid-tenure review materials to the Dean, by the date specified by the Dean.

V.A.2. Tenure and Promotion Review Procedures

Candidate's Responsibilities

During the appropriate year of their probationary period, probationary faculty will consult with the Department Head and Chair *pro tem* of the responsible faculty committee (below) about content, preparation, and timetable for assembly of the tenure document. Assistant professors being considered for tenure also will be considered for promotion. Faculty who wish to be considered for promotion or early tenure should submit a written request to the Department Head by August 1. Alternatively, a faculty member can accept prior to August 1 a recommendation by the majority of the eligible faculty members to become a candidate for promotion or early tenure and promotion. In consultation with the Department Head and Chair *pro tem*, the candidate will assemble supporting material in the format specified by the Office of the Provost. This includes the candidate's statements of accomplishments and goals, summaries of research, teaching and service, and any supporting documentation. Normally, a candidate also will present a departmental research seminar prior to the time the faculty meet to consider the candidacy. A candidate may elect to withdraw from consideration at any time during the proceedings, but for normal tenure consideration such a decision would constitute a failure to obtain tenure. Proof of worthiness commensurate with a positive recommendation rests with the candidate.

Department's Responsibilities

A. Formation of the Departmental Promotion/Tenure Committee

By August 5, the Department Head will appoint a separate Chair *pro tem* to oversee the promotion or tenure procedure for each candidate. The succession of faculty members serving as Chair *pro tem* will be determined from the list of tenured faculty of higher academic rank than the candidate based on years of faculty service in the Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biophysics at Kansas State University. Service as Chair *pro tem* for either tenure or promotion moves one to the end of the list. In cases of Board of Regents sanctioned leaves or other extenuating circumstances precluding service by a faculty member, the next eligible faculty member on the list will serve. The unavailable faculty member then becomes the Chair *pro tem* designate for the next year. In case of more than one candidate in a given year, the order in which the Chairs *pro tem* are appointed will follow the order in which the requests for consideration were received or the order in which the eligible voting faculty made their recommendations. Following the initial selection of a Chair *pro tem*, the candidate has the right of veto over that selection. If the candidate exercises that veto, the next eligible faculty member in the seniority order will be Chair *pro tem* and the name of the individual originally chosen placed next on the list. The Department Head will maintain the list according to eligibility. In consultation with the Department Head, the Chair *pro tem* will choose two additional faculty members (excluding the Head) of appropriate rank to assist in the process. The committee should include the most knowledgeable faculty member in the candidate's area of expertise.

B. Responsibilities of the Chair *pro tem* and Committee

1. Work with the candidate in regard to the content, organization, and schedule of preparation for the tenure or promotion document so that it meets all departmental and university requirements and deadlines for such documents.
2. Obtain from the candidate a list of no less than six potential external (off-campus) evaluators. This should be done by August 10. The list of external evaluators may include the candidate's postdoctoral mentors but should not include more than two collaborators in research or other scholarly endeavors. (For these purposes work done with a specified mentor would not constitute "collaboration" unless joint scholarly efforts were actively continued after the candidate joined the Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biophysics.) Comments from a candidate's Ph.D. mentor or graduate school classmates are generally less persuasive and should be avoided.
3. Generate a list of not less than six additional names of qualified evaluators obtained from the committee or from the faculty in general. After review of the list prepared by the committee, the candidate has, in confidence with the committee, the right to reject one of the potential evaluators for valid reasons which must be submitted in writing.
4. Identify a minimum of three evaluators from each list who are willing and able to serve in that capacity. If fewer than three of the evaluators selected by the committee are able to serve, the Chair *pro tem* will present the names of several additional qualified evaluators to the candidate. Again, the candidate has the right to reject one of the additional names. The process will be repeated if necessary to provide three evaluators selected by the committee, independent of mentors and collaborators.
5. Provide each of the six or more evaluators with the following: i) a copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae, ii) a copy of the candidate's statement of accomplishments during their time in the Department, and iii) copies of about five publications, including those "in press", selected by the candidate from work done by the candidate while a faculty member in the Department. This should be done by September 1 at the latest.
6. Ask the evaluators to analyze and critically evaluate the candidate's research and accomplishments. All outside evaluations must be in written form (signed letters as unalterable pdf files or FAXed letters are acceptable; simple e-mail messages lacking a signature and phone calls are not acceptable). Letters received from the evaluators will be made part of the candidate's tenure and promotion document. Letters related to the candidacy other than those solicited by the committee can be included as supplemental material in the document at the discretion of the committee.
7. Request that the candidate provide additional material to document research accomplishments, teaching effectiveness, and service responsibilities beyond the university requirements, if such are deemed helpful to strengthen the candidate's application or to otherwise aid the decision process.

8. Notify the Department Head and eligible faculty when the document is available for review. This should be done by October 1.
9. Convene a meeting not later than October 15 to discuss the qualifications of the candidate and obtain a vote on the recommendation of the eligible faculty. Within 3 business days the Chair *pro tem* will present to the Department Head and the candidate a written summary statement giving the tally of votes and describing the basis for the decision as extracted from the faculty discussions. Any written comments from the participating faculty regarding the candidacy will become part of the document, but will not be provided to the candidate. Written materials from participating faculty may be added at any time prior to transmittal to the Dean.

Note: The contents of the candidate's tenure or promotion document will remain confidential and be restricted in access to those assigned to make recommendations in regard to the worthiness of the candidate.

C. Department Head's Report

After review of the candidate's tenure or promotion document and the Chair *pro tem's* summary statement, written comments, if any, and vote tally, the Department Head will make an independent written recommendation to the voting faculty and the candidate. This should be done within one week.

D. Candidate's Appeal Procedure

A candidate may request reconsideration of a negative decision by faculty or Department Head within one week of receiving the summary statements. Following a written appeal from the candidate, the Chair *pro tem* will convene a meeting of the eligible faculty within 5 business days to consider the merits of the appeal. Following consideration of the appeal, the vote tally and written summary of the faculty discussion will be transmitted to the candidate and the Department Head.

After review of the appeal and the faculty's recommendation, the Department Head will transmit an independent, written recommendation to the voting faculty and the candidate.

E. Transmittal to Dean

The Head will transmit the required documents to the Office of the Dean of Arts and Sciences by the end of October (or as specified by the Dean). In addition, a more detailed letter of transmittal may be prepared by the Head and submitted to the Dean, provided it is consistent with the recommendation made by the Head to the faculty and candidate. Such a letter requires no further action by the faculty or the candidate.

The time-frame from start to finish of the candidate's and the Department's obligations extend from no later than August 1 through the end of October.

V.B. Research Faculty

1. An individual meeting the requirements may request a promotion through the Department Head. The Department Head then selects a chair *pro tem* of a promotion committee from among the tenured or tenure-track faculty members of appropriate rank. The candidate has the right to veto the selected chair *pro tem*. The approved chair *pro tem* then selects two additional tenured or tenure-track faculty members of appropriate rank to assist by serving on the committee.
2. The candidate shall prepare and submit to the committee a petition for promotion. This should include the candidate's curriculum vitae, a concise statement of current research interests, a summary of scholarly and professional activities, and the reason for seeking the promotion. If the research faculty position is to be supported from external funds, a recommendation from the tenured or tenure-track faculty member who is the Principal Investigator/direct supervisor must accompany the petition.
3. The candidate shall present a departmental seminar describing his or her research activities.
4. At least two outside letters are needed for promotion. To obtain the outside letters the candidate submits three names. The committee provides three names to the candidate. The candidate may then reject one name. The committee selects one name from each list to provide the two letters. The indices of professional accomplishment used in departmental consideration of promotion of research faculty are scholarship, service, teaching if applicable, and other professional activities. These indices are described in section III.C.
5. The committee may make a recommendation on the promotion. Tenured and tenure-track faculty at or above the research rank being sought must as a whole vote on the promotion. A simple majority vote is sufficient for approval.

VI. 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 professional proficiency for all members of the faculty throughout their careers, so they may more effectively fulfill the mission of the university. It is also designed to enhance public trust in the University by ensuring that the faculty community undertakes regular and rigorous efforts to hold all of its 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 alters or amends the University's policies regarding removal of tenured faculty members for cause (which are stipulated in the University Handbook). 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. Each tenured faculty member will be evaluated every six years.

The BMB 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).

A. Individuals who will conduct the review: The Department Head will chair the BMB post-tenure review committee (PTRC), and appoint 2 additional tenured faculty who will each serve a 3-year term on the review committee.

B. Individuals who are subject to post tenure review: Tenured regular faculty will be evaluated at 6 year intervals after receipt of tenure or promotion. The academic activities of the Department Head are the basis of his or her post-tenure review; he or she will undergo post-tenure review by the Dean using the same procedures as other faculty members.

Post-tenure review will be conducted for all tenured faculty either every six years, or in the sixth year following promotion or awarding of a major university performance award. The following events will reset the post-tenure review clock:

- a. application for promotion to full professor;
- b. application for the Professorial Performance Award (University Handbook C49);
- c. Receipt of a substantial college, university, national or international award requiring multi-year portfolio-like documentation, such as University Distinguished Professor, University Distinguished Teaching Scholar, an endowed chair or other national/international awards (see list of Faculty Awards <http://www.ksu.edu/provost/resources/natlwards.html>).

The schedule for post-tenure review may be delayed for one year to accommodate sabbatical leave, a major health issue, or another compelling reason, provided that both the faculty member and Department Head approve the delay. In the initial years following institution of this policy the Department Head will stagger post-tenure reviews to accomplish 2 or three per year, with the most senior individuals first.

C. Materials that the tenured faculty member will submit to initiate the review process:

- a. current *curriculum vitae*;
- b. *minivitaes* from preceding 6 years;
- c. a summary of the annual performance evaluations of the faculty member, written by the Department Head to protect confidentiality while summarizing relevant academic activity. The Dean of Arts and Sciences will provide this summary for evaluation of the Department Head.

D. Determination of the suitability of a faculty member's academic activities:

Consideration of:

- a. scientific publications;
- b. research funding;
- c. teaching;
- d. service at the university, national and international levels;
- e. six annual performance evaluations.

E. Departmental Report on Post-Tenure Review: The PTRC will consider the materials and submit a written report to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences for approval and processing.

VII. Professorial Performance Award

Starting One's Candidacy

On December 1, faculty members wanting to be considered for the Professorial Performance Award starting the following fiscal year will submit a packet of information to the Head of the Department, detailing their accomplishments in research, teaching and service for the previous six years, including the year of filing for the award. (Note: The Department Head will submit his or her packet directly to the Dean for evaluation.)

Criteria to Be Used

Broad criteria for eligibility will be those indicated in the Professorial Performance Award of the University Handbook, namely:

1. The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at Kansas State 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; and
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.

More specific criteria are those laid out for consideration for full professor status in our departmental tenure and promotion document:

Research

High research productivity as demonstrated by:

- a. significant refereed publications, strong grant support, several students (undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral) trained, and productive collaborative interactions
- b. local and national service (grant and publication reviewing), service on committees with research-related interests
- c. national or international research presentations

Teaching

Sustained effective teaching in courses ranging from undergraduate to advanced graduate level must be documented and supported by student evaluations.

Service

The candidate is expected to have participated on departmental and university service committees and in external service with significant contributions in some areas of service.

Forwarding the Information to the Dean of the College

For the most part, these accomplishments should be presented to the Head in the form of lists. The candidate may also submit a narrative making his or her case for the award and may submit appropriate supporting materials. The Head will evaluate the information and make his or her decision on the award for the candidate. In the case of a negative recommendation, the Head will discuss the decision and the written evaluation with the candidate, who will be shown the letter that the Head intends to submit to the Dean. The candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. If the Head continues to maintain a negative recommendation, the candidate has the right to withdraw the application or to submit a letter of rebuttal to the Dean that would accompany the packet as it goes to the Dean.

VIII. Minimal Standards/Chronic Low Achievement Policy

Departmental faculty are evaluated annually by the Department Head, using the criteria described in Chapter III. All faculty are expected to be continuously productive in scholarship, teaching, and service. Scholarship must be established by evidence of new developments germane to the field of biochemistry, molecular biology, or biophysics. Scholarship can minimally involve: obtaining research results and making useful advances publicly available in due time, producing novel insights from the integration and analysis of results and trends in the field, or developing information, approaches, and/or materials to enhance understanding of biochemistry to be used in formal teaching or for dissemination to a general audience. Teaching minimally requires preparing adequately for and making scheduled presentations based on the assigned teaching responsibility, completing all work needed to create a meaningful assignment of student grades, and performing these duties in a professional manner (i.e. acceptable to most professionals in the field). All input from students (evaluations, documentation of concerns as well as accolades, etc.) will be considered. Adequate preparation requires material taught to be reasonably up-to-date. Course teaching is considered assigned when, in an appropriate time frame, the assignment is made and conveyed by the Head to the faculty member and accepted by the faculty member's assent. (Reasons for not accepting an assignment must be conveyed in a timely manner.) When an assignment involves an accepted standing rotation developed by the Head, requests to be replaced must be well justified and conveyed to the Head at least 6 months prior to the scheduled teaching, with the exception of serious concerns that develop closer to or during the scheduled times. Serious concerns include health problems or other reasons for which exceptions are made in the University Handbook. Service duties will range greatly. With requisite consideration of a faculty member's rank, other roles, and extenuating circumstances (such as a health problem), each faculty member is expected to participate in routine service duties assigned at a typical level to meet Department and/or University needs. That service is minimally acceptable when a faculty member participates in a reasonable share of such service and makes useful contributions.

Any concern that the stated minimal standards in any of the above areas are not being met will be raised by the Head during the annual evaluation based on the annual written progress report of the faculty member. This will be followed by the Head and the faculty member developing, in association with the annual evaluation process, a written agreement consistent with the above guidelines as to the level of activity and achievement in an area of concern that is needed to meet or exceed a minimally acceptable performance. A judgment regarding success will then be provided in subsequent written annual evaluation by the Head until a judgment is made that there is no longer a concern. If a case should arise in which a faculty member either cannot come to agreement with the Head on a minimum-acceptable level of enterprise in a given area or disagrees with a subsequent judgment in an annual report, these will be reviewed by departmental faculty with the same or higher academic rank. A vote of those faculty will be considered to favor a position when it is supported by 60% of the eligible faculty. In accordance with Section C31.5 of the University Handbook, procedures for "dismissal for cause will be considered at the discretion of the appropriate Dean" based on input from the Department including all eligible faculty "if a tenured faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which minimal standards are not met."

