Kennesaw State University
College of Science & Mathematics
Department of Biology and Physics

Guidelines for Faculty Performance, Tenure, and Promotion

June 29, 2012

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

The Department of Biology and Physics is a unit of the College of Science and Mathematics (CSM) at Kennesaw State University. The Department will be recognized as a collaborative, collegial and diverse group of scholars who value excellence in teaching and mentorship, who are active in campus leadership and who are successful in research activities that may involve both undergraduate and graduate students.

The work of a university faculty member at Kennesaw State University involves many different facets that include the four areas of: 1) Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring; 2) Research and Creative Activity; 3) Professional Service; and 4) Administrative Leadership. We believe that individual faculty should develop goals that reflect their unique ways of contributing to the university and departmental goals. These goals are developed and evaluated each year in the Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA) and Annual Review Document (ARD) process and serve to support the faculty member in his/her annual evaluations as well as in tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review (TP&PTR) decisions. This document is designed to provide guidance with respect to the standards of performance expected by the Department of Biology and Physics in each of the areas.

II. Alignment of the Department of Biology and Physics with the University and College Strategic Plan, Mission, and Faculty Performance Guidelines

The Department of Biology and Physics is committed to achieving the Mission and Strategic Plans of the department, the College of Science and Mathematics, and Kennesaw State University. The guidelines published here are intended to support and elaborate on the guidelines for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review that have been established by the University and the College of Science and Mathematics, as applied to faculty in the Department of Biology and Physics.

The Department of Biology and Physics acknowledges and supports the Resolution on the Primacy of Departmental Tenure and Promotion Guidelines approved by the Faculty Senate (approved April 9, 2007)**,** which includes the following:

1. Department T&P Guidelines that have undergone approval at all levels (department, college, dean, and provost) are in essence an understanding between the faculty member and the university.

2. Reviews of T&P portfolios at each level (department T&P committee, department chair, dean, provost, and if need be, college T&P committee) shall be based upon the criteria detailed in the department T&P guidelines, as well as general guidelines established by the college and university. Given that department T&P guidelines are most discipline-specific and approved at all levels, these are understood to be the primary basis for T&P decisions. In the

case of joint appointments, reviews will be based on the criteria spelled out in the joint appointment agreement.

3. Letters written in review of T&P portfolios at each level (department T&P committee, department chair, dean, provost, and if need be, college T&P committee) shall make specific and detailed reference to the current department T&P guidelines in justifying the T&P decisions made by that committee or individual. Appropriate references must also be made to college and university T&P guidelines.

III. General Guidelines for Faculty Performance

Faculty performance in the Department of Biology and Physics is evaluated following the general guidelines established by the University and specific guidelines and expectations established by the Department. University guidelines concerning performance and evaluation are provided in Sections Four and Five of the KSU Faculty Handbook. University guidelines provide guidance on the processes of annual performance review, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. The Faculty Performance Guidelines of the Department of Biology and Physics provide department-specific guidelines that will be used as the primary basis for arriving at tenure and promotion decisions. Faculty should consult The KSU Faculty Handbook (available on KSUs Academic Affairs website) and this document as he/she establishes goals and prepares for the annual review or tenure and promotion process.

Faculty preparing a portfolio for tenure and/or promotion are expected to address and document major accomplishments in the performance areas reflected in their FPA. As indicated in the Faculty Handbook, the portfolio narrative and documentation should **focus on quality and significance**. **Merely reciting or enumerating individual tasks, courses taught, projects, and accomplishments does not address quality and significance. It is incumbent upon faculty to discuss and evaluate the quality and significance of their accomplishments under review.**

IV. Department Specific Guidelines for Each Area of Review

This section provides examples of specific activities appropriate for each performance area. Tangible, disseminated, and peer-reviewed products that arise from faculty activities in any performance area are considered scholarship; examples of scholarship for each performance area are also provided. Lastly, this section provides various measures that can be used by the faculty member to demonstrate the quality and significance of their activities and accomplishments. In all cases, the list of examples given is meant to be illustrative, and not exhaustive.

A. Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring

As stated in the KSU Faculty Handbook *"Highly effective teaching and learning are the central institutional priorities of Kennesaw State University."* As such, teaching and mentoring effectiveness is considered to be fundamentally essential for continued faculty employment, tenure, and promotion in rank. In the Department of Biology and Physics, teaching, supervising and mentoring activities may include, but are not limited to:

- High quality teaching across a variety of instructional settings (classroom, instructional laboratory, seminar, directed study, tutorials, undergraduate and graduate research and scholarship, field studies, study abroad, etc.).
- Incorporating effective pedagogical methods into classes, such as group activities, writing exercises, teaching with technology, etc.
- Developing and/or implementing new or innovative instructional materials.
- Curricular (e.g. new course, certificate program, or program) development, modification, implementation and evaluation.
- Grant development for teaching and education related awards.
- Mentoring students either by individual attention during office hours or extra tutoring sessions.
- Providing student letters of recommendation.
- School-based supervision in science and mathematics education programs.
- Professional student advisement for our degree program or professional school and student career mentorship.
- Mentorship of undergraduate and/or graduate students in degree programs, particularly, in research and scholarship.

Teaching activities may be considered scholarship when tangible and disseminated results are produced. Examples include:

- Dissemination of results as publications in peer-reviewed scientific and/or professional journals, monographs, book chapters, on-line reviewed publications, technical reports, educational web-based products, etc.
- Professionally reviewed presentations at conferences, consortia, seminars, etc.
- The development and dissemination of innovative materials and programs for educators, students, or the general public (e.g. museum exhibits, teaching materials, etc.).
- Externally funded grants for teaching and education related activities. Note that internal awards, such as Mentor-Protégé Awards, Faculty Summer Research Grants, or Faculty Incentive Awards, are considered primarily as seed funding in preparation for pursuit of external grants, and not scholarship *per se*.
- Textbooks, laboratory manuals, and similar published materials are considered scholarship if they have been externally reviewed.

Faculty are required to present and use *all* student comments provided through KSU's online student evaluation to assess and demonstrate their effectiveness in teaching, supervision, and mentoring for each course that they teach (every term).

In addition, faculty are required to use at least one additional measure to assess their teaching effectiveness. Additional sources of evidence that can be used to assess and demonstrate teaching, supervising and mentoring effectiveness include, but are not limited to:

- Peer evaluation of course materials and delivery by an experienced faculty member, including evaluation of written materials, assessment techniques, and in-class delivery methods.
- Externally validated supplemental assessment instruments administered by the faculty member or peer. An externally validated instrument is one that has been endorsed by a peer or other outside party. Examples of supplemental assessment instruments include student questionnaires that gather learning focused feedback, pre and post content assessments, and concept inventories. Faculty should specifically address any modifications or improvements that were made (or why none were made) based on the findings of the assessment instrument. It is not sufficient to simply note that a supplemental assessment instrument is used.
- Student group or classroom interviews conducted by someone other than the instructor.
- Sample syllabi, exam, and course materials.
- Student success after graduation (e.g. acceptance into a graduate or professional program; securing a job in a related field).
- Graduate and alumni acknowledgements (comments or letters unsolicited by the faculty member, e.g. a letter from KSUs Career Services Center indicating that a graduate(s) has recognized you as making a difference in their academic growth.
- Unsolicited and solicited letters from students (clearly indicate if a letter is solicited or unsolicited).
- Teaching and/or advising awards.
- Scholarship of teaching (publications on innovative teaching strategies).

B. Research and Creative Activity

The Department of Biology and Physics recognizes a process of research that can include idea generation, identification of necessary resources, gathering and analyzing data, theoretical and computational calculations and/or modeling, and disseminating the results at professional meetings and in peer-reviewed formats. All aspects of this process are considered necessary scholarly activity. Scholarship, however, is defined specifically as a creative, intellectual work that is disseminated and professionally reviewed by peers in the discipline. This may include research based on the faculty member's training and expertise ("discipline-based research"), teaching and learning-based research, or other appropriate efforts as defined in the Faculty Performance Agreement.

Scholarly activity in research and creative activity may include, but is not limited to:

- Establish an active, focused, sustainable, data generating, research program.
- Mentor undergraduate or graduate students in directed study projects or related research mentorships.
- Establish collaborative relationships within the department, college, or university, or with colleagues at other institutions.
- Grant development for external and internal awards.

Research rises to the level of scholarship when it becomes disseminated and peer-reviewed. Scholarship includes, but is not limited to:

- Discovery or applied research activities disseminated in peer-reviewed scientific and professionally based journals, monographs, book chapter, on-line peer-reviewed publications, etc.
- Industrial research leading to patents, presentations, or publications in refereed journals.
- Publication and dissemination of research in technical reports written for governmental agencies if the report is peer-reviewed by other professionals in the field.
- Publication of peer-reviewed textbooks and review articles.
- Presentations at professional conferences, consortia, seminars, etc. including any presentations produced from student mentorship.
- Externally funded grants.

Sources of evidence that can be used by faculty to address the quality and significance of their research and creative activities may include, but are not limited to:

i. External evaluation letter(s) from an individual(s) in the field. Faculty applying for tenure and/or promotion in rank are *strongly encouraged* to include in their portfolio an external letter(s) evaluating their research and scholarship products. The most effective evaluation letters are from distinguished individuals in the candidate's field who are in a position to provide an authoritative assessment of the *quality* of candidate's research and to comment on its *significance* in the discipline. The candidate may contact potential reviewers or he/she may ask the chair to provide the names of potential reviewers. The candidate should initiate the request early spring term to ensure receipt of a letter before the portfolio due date. When external evaluation letters are used, faculty must note any personal and/or professional relationship they may have with the reviewer.

ii. Peer-reviewed publications:
   - The impact factor for the journal.
   - The citation number by others in the field.
   - The H index - an index based on a set of an individual's cited papers (i.e. the number of publications) and the number of citations that they have received in other publications.

- An external review by peer in the field (note: reviewer should disclose the relationship with faculty member).
- For multi-authored papers (be sure to describe your specific contributions to the publication), documentation of quality and significance of faculty contribution can include letter(s) from coauthor(s).

iii. Grants or Contracts:
- Evidence of funded proposal, such as an award notification.
- Degree of competitiveness of the program or funding agency (i.e. number of proposals received and funded by the funding agency or program).
- Letter from other co-PIs (for multi-authored proposals) that documents your contribution to the proposal, the significance of your contribution to the success of the proposal, and your role in the proposed project.
- For unfunded proposals: All reviewer comments, the proposal score (if given by the funding agency) *and* a copy of the grant application (include cover page with signatures)

iv. Book Chapters:
- Publisher reviews of chapter.
- External review by editor(s) or by an expert in the field.

v. Textbooks or Books:
- (textbook) Indicate number of adoptions relative to comparable textbooks.
- External review by peer in the field.

vi. Online Publishing of New Curricula or Teaching Materials:
- Number of adoptions or uses.
- External letters of support.
- Number of downloads.

vii. Conference Presentations:
- Document if presentation was invited.
- Note quality of conference for the research.
- Note scope of conference (regionally, nationally, or internationally attended).

viii. Invited Colloquia:
- Note scope of colloquium (regionally, nationally, or internationally attended) and quality of the colloquium.

ix. Workshops
- Note scope of workshop (regionally, nationally, or internationally attended).
- Participant evaluations.

x. Technical Reports:
- Indicate if report resulted in policy or procedural actions and the scope of the action.
- External letter(s) of support documenting the quality and value of the report.

- Serving as expert witness for agency or company.

xi. Patents:
- Indicate the type and stage of the patent. Stages of patents may include (in chronological order): invention, disclosure, provisional application, full application, patent granted, and commercialization.

xii. Supervised Research:
- Participant author on professional presentation.
- Participant author on peer-reviewed publication.
- Documented participant success after graduation, such as acceptance into a professional or graduate program or securing a job in a related field.

xiii. All/Any Forms of Research and Creative Activities
- Award/recognition for work and/or scholarship.

Evaluation of a faculty member's research effectiveness will be based upon evidence that a faculty member has systematic inquiry activities associated with teaching or scientific research, the majority of which are associated with their research program established at KSU. Further, a faculty member's research activities should: a) encompass notable levels of discipline expertise, b) be innovative or logically contribute to the discipline or professional knowledge base, c) be replicable or elaborated (i.e. sustainable), d) be documented and peer reviewed. Within the Department of Biology and Physics, it is recognized that the faculty represent very diverse disciplines, such as field biology, microbiology, astronomy, particle physics, etc. The pace of research is acknowledged to vary among the subdisciplines, especially those that require long periods of time for significant data collection. In addition, research involving student mentorship often takes longer to achieve substantial results. When evaluating faculty from such a range of disciplines, differences in the time required for establishing a research program, time required for data collection and analysis, and need for external funds must be taken into account. None the less, faculty should be able to show that their performance in this area meets the criteria expected for academics in their field.

C. Professional Service

Professional service involves the application of a faculty member's academic and professional skills and knowledge to the completion of tasks which benefit or support individuals and/or groups in the institution, the University System, professional associations, or external communities at the local, state, regional, national, or international levels. For science education programs, a strong service function is recognized as a fundamental dimension of faculty activity, and necessary to facilitate effective delivery of programs and students services within the university. In the Department of Biology and Physics, faculty professional service activities include but are not limited to:

- Leadership and/or active participation in university, college, or department level activities, committees, faculty governance bodies, task forces, etc.

- Leadership and/or significant achievements in activities among professional organizations at the international, national, regional, and state level (boards, standing committees, ad hoc committees, task forces, etc.).
- Leadership and/or consulting/advising among a broad base of relevant community, state, regional, or national organizations, agencies, schools, or businesses.
- Working on outreach to schools (elementary, middle or high schools) and to community colleges, including presentations at schools, teacher workshops, judging science fairs, working with the Science Bowl and Science Olympiad, etc.
- Serving as coordinator for accredited programs. Examples include but are not limited to the Biology Education and Cytogenetic Programs.
- Organizing a regional, national, or international conference.
- Serving as an official faculty mentor for new faculty.
- Developing and/or maintaining departmental, college, or university documents such as the part-time faculty handbook, program brochures, departmental web pages, etc.
- Supervision and maintenance of shared equipment.
- Coordinating laboratories or courses.
- Providing Service work to industry not leading to scholarly publications.
- Leadership (faculty sponsor/advisor) in student-based professional clubs, honor societies, etc.
- Promotional and recruiting activities for department, college, and/or university.
- Professional review of external accreditation reports or self-studies.
- Editorships/reviewer board membership of professional journals or scholarly books/monographs.
- Professional review of journal articles, books, etc.
- Accreditation self-study development, planning, assessment.
- Other service duties that are mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and the department chair that are not assignable to other areas.

Service activities may be considered scholarship when tangible, disseminated, and peer-reviewed results are produced. Scholarship of service alone is not sufficient to meet, nor can it substitute for, the criteria for research and creative activity required for tenure and/or promotion. Scholarship of service is distinguished from routine service work by the significance and scope of the leadership and the products produced by the activity. Examples include:

- Authoring a significant institutional document for the Department, College or University.
- Making significant contributions to writing institutional self-study reports, governance documents or other notable institutional documents.
- Preparation of accreditation reports, such as the reports required for continued accreditation of the Biology Education, Physics Education, and Cytogenetic programs.

Sources of evidence that can be used by faculty to assess and demonstrate the quality and significance of professional service may include, but are not limited to:

- The impact of the service role on students (or a student population), the department, college, university, and/ or profession.
- The product(s) developed in the course of a service role (indicate your specific contribution to the product).
- The impact of the service product on students, the department, college, university, and/or profession.
- Policy or procedural changes that result from the service role (note the nature and scope of the change).
- Recognition by others of your contribution and/or leadership in the service activity (e.g. receipt of a Service Award from the college, university, or a professional organization; a letter of acknowledgement or appreciation – indicate if letter was solicited or unsolicited).

Professional service activities will be evaluated based upon the nature and extent to which the individual applies professional expertise at: a) the University community in support of teaching, service, and research functions, b) the local, state, regional, national, or international professional organizations, and c) to community and/or non-profit organizations, governmental groups, or private business/agencies whose missions align with this department, college and university.

D. Administrative Leadership

Administrative leadership describes those activities required of a faculty member or administrator that provide direct support to operations of the college, department or unit. Faculty with significant administrative leadership contributions will include the dean of the college, associate and assistant deans, department chairs, assistant department chairs, center directors, and degree program directors or coordinators.

Administrative leadership roles are assigned by the faculty member's supervisor.

Administrative leadership activities may include:

- Day-to-day operational management of the administrative unit.
- Budgeting and budget reporting.
- Strategic and operational planning.
- Scheduling courses and events for the unit.
- Supervision of faculty and staff.
- Staffing functions, including screening, hiring and training employees of the unit.
- Conducting performance reviews of faculty and staff.
- Marketing degree programs and unit activities.

- Other work assignments that are directed toward the successful operation of the administrative unit.

Sources of evidence that can be used by faculty to assess and demonstrate the quality and significance of administration and leadership may include, but are not limited to:

- Faculty reviews of administrative performance.
- Accreditation, growth, sustainability of program.
- External recognition of a program.
- Letters of support from peer(s) and/or supervisor addressing effectiveness in managing and advancing the necessary fiscal, physical, interpersonal, and intellectual environments.

V. Workload Models

University guidelines specify that each department will establish flexible guidelines as to the expectations of faculty members in the four faculty performance areas. The Department of Biology and Physics recognizes five workload models: Teaching Emphasis, Teaching-Hybrid, Teaching –Research Balance, Research Emphasis, and Administrative Emphasis. These models take into consideration departmental, college and university needs and the professional goals of faculty. It is probable that a faculty member will have different emphases and assignments at different points in his/her career and will therefore consider transitioning between available models. The workload model followed will be determined by the chair, in consultation with the faculty member, based on departmental, college and university needs, and specified in the FPA. These models are described below and summarized in Table 1 at the end of this document.

In the Department of Biology and Physics, many classes have laboratories or other components that involve significant effort in terms of time spent, while only counting as one credit hour. In addition, there may be large single lecture sections that are split into several laboratory sections. Therefore, in the following workload models teaching workload has been expressed in terms of contact hours.

Teaching workload will be determined by the chair, in consultation with faculty, based on departmental, College and University needs. In addition, when establishing a teaching workload for a given semester, the department chair will take into consideration class size for an assigned course, the number of different course preparations assigned, and assignment of a new course preparation. Supervision of secondary science teacher candidates in BED 4417/4475/6417/6475 and PHED 6417/6475 will be assigned workload credit as agreed upon with the Bagwell College of Education.

A. Teaching Emphasis Model

The Teaching Emphasis Model provides a workload model for faculty employed full-time in a tenured or non-tenure seeking position with annual review and renewal, whose primary responsibility and interests are in the teaching and supervision of students in a variety of settings. Faculty following this model will typically carry a teaching load of 15 – 18 contact hours per week of class instruction per semester. They do not have specified expectations in scholarship, but are expected to perform selected service activities (e.g. participate in student advisement, serve on committees, serve as a course coordinator, or other necessary tasks or service roles). Faculty may perform research and creative activity (rather than service) as agreed upon in their FPA. **This model is not available to faculty seeking tenure nor to tenured faculty seeking promotion.** With approval of the department chair, however, a tenured faculty with specific circumstances, talents and primary interest in this area may choose this model.

It is understood that lecturers will generally be on the Teaching Emphasis Model. Lecturers do not have specified expectations in scholarship but will be expected to participate in a minimum level of service (i.e. allocate no more than 5% of their time to service activities), such as student advisement, serve on committees, or serve in other roles as needed (e.g. course coordinators). Promotion and rehiring decisions will be made considering the faculty member's success in achieving requirements of their model during the evaluation period (see details for Teaching, Supervision and Mentoring in section IV).

The Department of Biology and Physics follows the University's guidelines concerning lecturers and senior lecturers: "*In most cases faculty hired as lecturers or senior lecturers have as their primary responsibility teaching, supervising, and mentoring and are therefore expected to be highly effective in these areas. Unless otherwise set forth in a Faculty Performance Agreement, there are no expectations for scholarship and their service responsibilities may be limited to the minimum necessary to successfully teach their assigned courses (e.g., attendance at relevant department meetings and participation on appropriate department committees). In many cases their responsibilities will primarily be devoted to teaching multiple sections of the same undergraduate courses. The heavy teaching load of these individuals offsets the absence of a full range of regular faculty responsibilities that normally rounds out the typical full undergraduate faculty load at KSU. Because of this, lecturers and senior lecturers are expected to demonstrate exceptional teaching ability in order to qualify for reappointment at KSU. In some cases the responsibilities assigned to a lecturer or senior lecturer may be individualized and unique. In such cases the responsibilities should be delineated in the Faculty Performance Agreement*"

Lecturers who have served for a period of at least six years at KSU may be considered for promotion to senior lecturer. The process for promotion will be the same as that used for promotion within the professorial ranks. A portfolio, following the format required by the University, will be submitted and evaluated at each level of review required by University promotion procedures, following the same schedule of deadlines. The portfolio for promotion to senior lecturer should demonstrate exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the institution, especially in the areas established in the faculty member's FPA.

B. Teaching-Hybrid Model

The Teaching-Hybrid Model provides an option for faculty who desire the flexibility to structure the time spent in each performance area in ways that meet their commitments, interests, and talents and departmental needs. The model combines a teaching focus with a secondary emphasis in the area of research and creative activity and/or service. Faculty on this workload model will have a teaching load of approximately 9 -12 contact hours per week of course instruction per semester. The remainder of faculty effort will be divided between professional service activities and research and creative activity. The proportion of effort that will be placed in each of the three performance areas will be determined by the chair, in consultation with the faculty member, based on departmental, college and university needs, and specified in the FPA. It is expected that faculty following this workload model will spend a greater proportion of effort in professional service than faculty following other workload models. Unless agreed upon in a faculty member's FPA, only tenured faculty will follow this workload model. Teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty on this model, and excellence in the area of Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring is expected.

C. Teaching-Research Balance Model

The Teaching-Research Balance Model provides an option for faculty with interests and talents in research and creative activity. The model provides an opportunity for a teaching focus with a secondary emphasis in research and creative activity. Faculty following this workload model will have a teaching load of 8 – 10 contact hours per week of course instruction per semester (averaging 9 contact hours per week of course instruction over the academic year). Teaching load may be adjusted if provided for or stipulated by a grant or other source. Faculty on this model must participate in a minimum level of service (i.e. allocate no less than 5% of their time to professional service activities). The actual proportion of effort that will be placed in all workload areas will be determined by the chair, in consultation with faculty, based on departmental, College and University needs, and specified in the FPA. Teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty on this model, and excellence in the area of Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring is expected. Faculty are required to show scholarship in at least one area. This could be scholarship of research and/or

scholarship of teaching. The criteria for scholarship are specified in this document (refer to section IV). A new faculty member (unless otherwise stated in writing by the department chair and approved by the dean) will be working under this model for the pre-tenure period. This workload model will likely be followed by tenured faculty seeking promotion. The criteria for performance and evaluation will be consistent with rank of the faculty as outlined in Tables II - IV located at the end of this document.

D. Research Emphasis Model

The Research Emphasis Model provides an opportunity for faculty to concentrate on specific scholarship activities. This model is available to research active faculty. Faculty requesting this model must demonstrate exceptional quality and significance of scholarly output relative to others in their field. Criteria that may be used to support a request for this workload model include: acquired external funding; recent and pending publications; collaborations; and potential for continued research outcomes. The typical teaching load for this model will be approximately 6 contact hours per week of course instruction per semester. This can be reduced to one 3 credit hour course per semester if so provided or stipulated by a grant or award. Faculty on this model must participate in a minimum level of service (i.e. allocate no less than 5% of their time to professional service activities). In addition to quality teaching and service commensurate with rank, the faculty member is required to show continued significant progress in scholarship annually in their FPA. It is expected that the faculty member will show a greater level of scholarship (i.e. greater quantity of scholarship and/or products of more significance) than those following the Teaching- Hybrid or Research Balanced Models.

E. Administrative Emphasis Model

The Administrative Model provides a workload model for academic department chairs, assistant/associate deans and other administrative faculty with 12 month contracts for whom the majority of their time and effort is committed to the administration of academic departments, degree programs, centers or other administrative responsibilities. For the purpose of clarification, administrative faculty are those for whom 50% or more of their workload is administrative in function. The typical teaching load for these faculty will vary from 0 – 6 credit hours per week of class instruction per semester (e.g. a single 3 credit hour course per academic year). Selection of this model must be done with the support and written approval of the faculty member's supervisor, including the dean of the CS&M. The performance criteria for these faculty will be the aggregate performance of the unit and/or program(s) supervised by the faculty. Faculty engaged in the Administrative Emphasis Model are required to be active in multiple levels of service and to establish strong and effective leadership practices. The requirement of Teaching and Research and Creative Activity

contributions will be assessed within the context of the overall needs of the administrative unit. This model requires written approval by the dean.

It is assumed that a faculty member's workload assignment will change as the faculty member's interests and activities change. **The workload model and the proportion of effort that will be placed in each of the four performance areas will be determined by the chair, in consultation with the faculty member, and specified in the FPA (described below in section VI).**

VI. Annual Review of Faculty Performance

Faculty performance is evaluated annually. The role(s) upon which each faculty member will be evaluated will be outlined in his/her Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA) for the review period. This agreement is developed by the faculty member in consultation with the faculty member's chair and is subject to approval by the dean. As per University guidelines, if the faculty member and the chair cannot reach agreement on the FPA, the dean will make the final determination.

According to the KSU Faculty Handbook, faculty should address the following in their FPA*:* ***the workload model followed for the review period and the relative emphasis in each of the performance areas; a clear detailed description of the general responsibilities planned/expected in each area; an explanation of the manner in which activities relate to departmental and college mission and goals; the scholarly activity expected in each performance area; and a description of the scholarship expectations in each performance area.***

The following year, the faculty member will address the activities and accomplishments in each performance area for the review period in their Annual Review Document (ARD). In the ARD the faculty member should make specific reference to the planned/expected responsibilities and scholarship expectations detailed in the previous year's FPA, as well as note the quality and significance of reported activities and accomplishments.

The ARD is evaluated independently by both the chair and the dean. The chair and dean have the right and obligation to factor in degree of difficulty of a faculty members activities and accomplishments in the evaluation. In addition, the evaluation will take into consideration the faculty member's career stage.

The overall outcome of an evaluation will be categorized as 'not meeting (or not achieving) expectations', 'meeting expectations', or 'exceeding expectations.' If a faculty member has adequately met the activities and goals outlined in the FPA for the review period (addressed in the accompanying ARD), then he/she will be rated as 'meeting expectations.' If a faculty member has not met the expectations in any one of the three performance areas (as detailed in their FPA for that review period), they will be rated as 'not meeting expectations'. An evaluation of 'exceeding

expectations' may be given when a supervisor finds that a faculty member has substantial activities and/or tangible products beyond those outlined in their FPA. In the event that the faculty member and chair cannot reach agreement on the evaluation of his/her ARD, the dean will make the final determination.

In the case where a faculty member has been rated as 'not achieving/meeting expectations', the faculty member must provide a formal faculty development plan in their FPA for the next review period. The plan should address *how* deficiencies cited will be corrected by: a) defining the specific goal(s) or outcome(s) that is(are) to be achieved; b) outlining the specific activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goal(s) or outcome(s); c) identifying appropriate sources of faculty development, whether on campus or at other campuses or locations; d) setting appropriate times within the next review period by which the specified activities and goals or outcomes should be accomplished; and e) indicate appropriate criteria by which progress will be monitored. Face-to-face meetings and discussions between the faculty member and chair are required to ensure thorough exploration of all options and clear communication of the understandings reached. Tenured faculty may wish to renegotiate their workload model.

For tenured faculty, receipt of two unsatisfactory annual reviews may result in modification of a faculty member's workload model. This modification may include an adjustment in the proportion of time spent in each performance area *or* movement to a different workload model. Face-to-face meetings and discussions with the chair are required to ensure thorough exploration of all options and clear communication of the understandings reached.

VII. Review of Faculty Performance for Tenure and Promotion

From KSUs Faculty Handbook (Section 5, V): "*Academic tenure is an employment status at the University that assures a tenured faculty member of continuous appointment from contract year to contract year, except under conditions of dismissal for cause or financial exigencies.* ***Years of service or successful annual reviews alone are not sufficient to qualify for tenure. It should only be granted to those faculty members whose achievements demonstrate the quality and significance expected of their current rank and who demonstrate potential for long-term effectiveness at the University. All tenure-track faculty are expected to produce scholarship in at least one performance area … consistent with departmental , college, and university guidelines … ."***

Faculty preparing for tenure and promotion are strongly encouraged to consult the University Faculty Handbook. The information provided here is meant to emphasize a few important points concerning preparation of the portfolio:

- The portfolio narrative must address quality and significance of activities, accomplishments, and scholarship performed over the review period, rather

than simply listing/presenting products or 'what' was taught/done/accomplished.

- The case presented in the narrative must demonstrate a consistent, self-directed progression of professional growth in all areas. The faculty member must communicate a continuity across the years of the review period that transcends individual annual review outcomes.
- A favorable review is dependent upon the case made by the faculty member in his/her narrative (and supporting documentation). A poor narrative and/or lack of relevant documentation is grounds for a negative decision.
- Portfolios that are not complete with all required pages and sections will not be reviewed.

VIII. Expectations for Tenure and Promotion

To be awarded tenure, a faculty member must meet the expectations for his or her rank in each performance area of evaluation (i.e. teaching, supervision and mentoring, research and creative activity, and professional service). For faculty who entered KSU at the assistant professor rank or above, the probationary period is 5 to 6 years of service in rank, with a mandatory review for tenure being conducted in the sixth year of employment according to the University's tenure and promotion calendar.

Faculty members seeking promotion should already be meeting the expectations of the next rank. University guidelines specify the minimum service in rank that is necessary before promotion can be requested: for faculty without credit for previous work experience, 5 years as assistant professor for promotion to associate professor; for faculty receiving credit for previous work experience, 4 years as assistant professor for promotion to associate professor; 5 years as associate professor for promotion to professor. Promotion in rank is based upon performance and established criteria, and not the faculty member's time in service.

The Department of Biology and Physics expects that tenure-track and tenured faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion in rank will demonstrate effectiveness and leadership in the area of Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring, develop a focused, sustainable and productive research program in their area of expertise, and demonstrate significant contributions and leadership in the area of professional service. Specific expectations by rank for each of the performance areas are provided in Tables II (Expectations in the Area of Teaching, Supervision and Mentoring), III (Expectations in the Area of Research and Creative Activity), and IV (Expectation in the Area of Professional Service). Faculty considering application for tenure or promotion are strongly encouraged to consult this document and section IV and V of the KSU Faculty Handbook.

For promotion to the rank of professor, it is expected that the faculty member will be highly accomplished in each performance area (refer to Tables II – IV). After promotion to associate professor, a faculty member considering promotion to

professor must continue to focus their efforts in research and creative activity. In addition, they must excel in one other performance area. A professor is expected to demonstrate that they are a highly accomplished teacher and mentor, a nationally recognized scholar, as evidenced by a continuous record of peer-reviewed publications and broad dissemination in national/international settings, and have a well-established record of service that reflects a pattern of growth and development in breadth, depth, leadership, and significance of professional service activities.

IX. General Expectations of Faculty

The Department of Biology and Physics requires a baseline of service from all faculty members. This baseline of service includes:

- Meet all classes and deliver the departmentally accepted content for all courses taught;
- Attending required department, College and University meetings, seminars, and graduation;
- Working effectively with colleagues on appropriate ad hoc and chartered committees;
- Meeting with students and members of the community on issues related to the mission of the department and College;
- Contributing ideas and effort to improve department offerings and functions.

X. Revisions to the Departmental Guidelines

The Department of Biology and Physics Tenure and Promotion Committee and Department Faculty Council shall periodically review the Department Guidelines and make recommendations to the department chair regarding needed revisions. Requests to review department guidelines and/or make revisions may also come from the department chair and/or dean of the College of Science and Mathematics. When revisions are to be made, the department chair shall convene an ad hoc committee comprised of the department T&P committee, and other members of the department faculty appropriate to the process of review and revision of the Guidelines. Revisions to the guidelines shall be voted on by all full-time permanent faculty of the department. Revisions must be approved by the chair, the dean of the CSM and the provost.

Table I: Workload Models for the Department of Biology and Physics

Workload Models		Teaching Emphasis	Teaching-Hybrid	Teaching-Research Balance	Research Emphasis	Administration Emphasis
Average % effort given to each performance area:	[a]TSM	80–90 (Ex. 15-18 contact hrs./week/ semester)	50-70 (Ex. 9-12 contact hrs./week/semester)	50 (Ex. 8 – 10 contact hrs./week/semester)	35 (Ex. 6 contact hrs./week/semester)	10-20 (Ex. One 3 credit course/year)
	[b]R&CA	0 - 10*****	10 - 40 (avg. 8 – 16 hours/week)	45 (avg. 18 hrs./week)	60 (avg. 24 hrs. or more/week)	0-35
	[c]PS	5 – 20 (avg. 2 – 8 hrs./week)	10 - 40 (avg. 8 hrs. or more/week) ******	5 (avg. 2 hrs./week)	5 (avg. 2 hrs./week)	50-80**
		• This model will be used primarily by faculty who are hired as 'Lecturers'; • Tenured faculty not seeking promotion may follow this workload model as agreed upon in their FPA;	• Only tenured faculty will follow this workload model (unless agreed upon in a faculty's FPA).	• New tenure track faculty will typically follow this workload model; • Tenured faculty seeking promotion will likely follow this model or the Research Emphasis Model.	• Faculty following this model must have demonstrated exceptional quality and significance of scholarly output; • If specifically stated in and money is provided for by a grant or other source, a faculty member can reduce the % of effort spent in the area of TSM to 3-5 contact hours per term.	• Administrative activities are those that provide direct support to the operations of the department or college; • This model is intended to define the workload of the Dept. chair or other administrative faculty on 12 month contracts;

[a]TSM – Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring; [b]R & CA – Research and Creative Activity; [c]PS – Professional Service

*** Faculty following the Teaching Emphasis model may perform R & CA (rather than service) as agreed upon in their FPA.**

**** Administrative leadership may substitute for professional service for program directors or coordinators, assistant department chair, and similar positions that provide significant administrative activities.**

Table II: Expectations for Tenure and Promotion by Rank for Faculty in the Department of Biology and Physics in the Performance Area of Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring

General expectations for tenure and promotion in rank are described in section VIII of this document. For **tenure**, faculty members must meet the expectations for his or her rank in each area of evaluation. For **promotion**, faculty members must **already be meeting the expectations of the next rank**.

Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
An assistant professor should: • Have a well-stated philosophy of teaching and learning. They will be able to demonstrate how this philosophy has guided them in the development and selection of classroom pedagogies and activities for the courses they teach; • Be able to demonstrate that they are a competent and highly effective teacher*; • Be proficient in the delivery of two courses; • Have teaching skills and knowledge sufficient to mentor an in-coming assistant professor in one of the two courses; • Have a clearly defined niche in advising and mentoring of undergraduate and/or graduate students.	In addition to continuing the expectations of the assistant professor, the associate professor should demonstrate or develop: • Leadership in curricular development in their area of expertise; • A clearly defined role in mentoring incoming and junior faculty teaching in their area of expertise; • Leadership in advising and mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students in their area of expertise; • Other advanced activities in this performance area (refer to Section IV).	The professor is expected to *continue performing* at the level achieved at the time of promotion from associate to full professor. In doing so, he/she will be highly effective and accomplished in this area and have made significant contributions to curricular development, and should be able to demonstrate such. **A faculty member who has chosen to excel in this area is expected to demonstrate significant leadership in curricular and instructional initiatives, evaluations in the department or discipline, and/or advising and mentoring.

* Refer to section IV. A (Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring) for assessment and demonstration of teaching effectiveness.

** The professor is expected to demonstrate that they are highly accomplished in each performance area. After promotion to associate professor, a faculty member considering promotion to professor must continue to focus their efforts in research and creative activity. In addition, they must excel in one other performance area.

Table III: Expectations for Tenure and Promotion by Rank for Faculty in the Department of Biology and Physics in the Performance Area of Research and Creative Activity.

General expectations for tenure and promotion in rank are described in section VIII of this document. For **tenure**, faculty members must meet the expectations for his or her rank in each area of evaluation. For **promotion**, faculty members must already be meeting the expectations of the next rank.

Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
An assistant professor should: • Have evidence that they have established a clearly defined, focused, well-structured research program in their area of competence. • Have evidence that their research program is sustainable. • Have an established peer-reviewed publication and presentation record in their research discipline since joining KSU. In other words, a portion of the effort expended to complete a publication or presentation must be accomplished while a faculty member of KSU. • Have evidence of ongoing efforts to secure external funding to support their research/creative activity.	In addition to continuing the expectations of the assistant professor, an associate professor should: • Have evidence that their research program has contributed in a meaningful way to the body of knowledge in their area of expertise. • Have a significant peer-reviewed publication record and demonstrate that they are the intellectual driving force behind the reported scholarship • Have presentations at meetings • Have evidence of a focused concerted effort and progress towards obtaining external support to maintain their research program, as required by the nature of their research.*	The professor: • Is expected to continue to contribute to the body of knowledge in their area of expertise. • Should have national recognition as evidenced by a continuous record of peer-reviewed publications *and* broad dissemination in national/international settings. • Should have a record of competitive external funding to support their research, as required by the nature of the research.

* Refer to Section IV. B for sources of evidence that can be used to address efforts made to secure external funding.

Table IV: Expectations for Tenure and Promotion by Rank for Faculty in the Department of Biology and Physics in the Performance Area of Professional Service.

General expectations for tenure and promotion in rank are described in section VIII of this document. For **tenure**, faculty members must meet the expectations for his or her rank in each area of evaluation. For **promotion**, faculty members must already be meeting the expectations of the next rank.

Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
An assistant professor should: • Have evidence that he or she has contributed in a meaningful manner to department, college or university service efforts in at least one area. • If they have not been involved significantly in department, college or university level service, they should be able to demonstrate significant involvement in service to their discipline.	An associate professor should: • Have taken on a leadership role in departmental, college, university service or taken a leadership role in professional service within their discipline.	The professor is expected to *continue performing* at the level achieved at the time of promotion from associate to full professor. This will result in a well-established record of service that reflects a pattern of growth and development in breadth, depth, and significance of professional service activities. *A faculty member who has chosen to excel in this area is expected to have a significant record of leadership roles at department, college, and/or university committees and/or in the professional/academic community.

* The professor is expected to demonstrate that they are highly accomplished in each performance area. After promotion to associate professor, a faculty member considering promotion to professor must continue to focus their efforts in research and creative activity. In addition, they must excel in one other performance area.