

**Kennesaw State University
College of Science & Mathematics
Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology**

**Guidelines for Faculty Performance, Promotion, and
Tenure**

January 21, 2017

*(Updated Feb 21, 2019 to include Appendix B – Workload Metrics for
Each Area of Review)*

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	1
II. Alignment of the Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology with the University and College Strategic Plan, Mission, and Faculty Performance Guidelines	1
III. General Guidelines for Faculty Performance	2
IV. Department Specific Guidelines for Each Area of Review	2
A. Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring	3
B. Scholarship and Creative Activity	4
C. Professional Service	7
V. Workload Models	10
A. Teaching Emphasis	10
B. Teaching-Hybrid	11
C. Teaching-Research Balance	12
D. Research Emphasis	12
E. Administrative Emphasis	13
F. Research Faculty	13
G. Clinical Faculty	14
VI. Annual Review of Faculty Performance	14
VII. Review of Faculty Performance for Promotion and/or Tenure	16
VIII. Expectations for Promotion and/or Tenure	17
IX. Post-Tenure Review	20
X. General Expectations of Faculty	20
XI. Revisions to the Departmental Guidelines	21
Table I Summary of Workload Models	22
Table II Expectations for Tenure & Promotion by Rank for the Performance Area of Teaching, Supervision and Mentoring	23
Table III Expectations for Tenure & Promotion by Rank for the Performance Area of Scholarship and Creative Activity	24
Table IV Expectations for Tenure & Promotion by Rank for the Performance Area of Professional Service	25
Table V Expectations for Promotion in Rank for Research Faculty	26
Appendix A External Evaluation Letters for Promotion in Rank	27
Appendix B Workload Metrics for Each Area of Review	28

I. Introduction

The Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology 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 areas of: 1) Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring; 2) Scholarship and Creative Activity; and 3) Professional Service. 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 (T, P & PTR) decisions. This document is designed to provide guidance with respect to the standards of performance expected by the Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology in each of the areas.

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

The Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology 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 Molecular and Cellular Biology.

The Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology 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 Molecular and Cellular Biology is evaluated following the general guidelines established by the University and the College of Science and Mathematics, and specific guidelines and expectations established by the Department. University guidelines concerning performance and evaluation are provided in Section Three 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 Molecular and Cellular Biology provide department-specific guidelines that will be used as the primary basis for arriving at tenure and promotion decisions. Faculty should consult the current KSU Faculty Handbook (available at the KSU Handbook portal or Faculty Affairs website), CSM Guidelines for Faculty Performance and Evaluation, 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 throughout SECTION 3- Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance in the Faculty Handbook, the portfolio narrative and documentation should **focus on quality and significance of one's accomplishments**. As stated in the Faculty Handbook, "*Quality and significance are the primary criteria for evaluating faculty performance.*" **Merely reciting or enumerating individual tasks, courses taught, projects, and accomplishments does not address the degree of quality and significance. It is incumbent upon faculty to discuss and demonstrate 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. **Note: Workload metrics for each performance area are provided in Appendix B.**

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 Molecular and Cellular Biology, teaching, supervising and mentoring activities may include, but are not limited to:

- High quality teaching across a variety of instructional settings (e.g. 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 and corresponding reports 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 KSU's 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. Scholarship and Creative Activity

The Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology 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.

Research and creative activities may include, but are 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. 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).
- ii. 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)
 - iii. Book Chapters:
 - Publisher reviews of chapter.
 - External review by editor(s) or by an expert in the field.
 - iv. Textbooks or Books:
 - (textbook) Indicate number of adoptions relative to comparable textbooks.
 - External review by peer in the field.
 - v. Online Publishing of New Curricula or Teaching Materials:
 - Number of adoptions or uses.
 - External letters of support.
 - vi. Conference Presentations:
 - Document if presentation was invited.
 - Note quality of conference for the research.
 - Note scope of conference (regionally, nationally, or internationally attended).
 - vii. Invited Colloquia:
 - Note scope of colloquium (regionally, nationally, or internationally attended) and quality of the colloquium.
 - viii. Workshops
 - Note scope of workshop (regionally, nationally, or internationally attended).
 - Participant evaluations.
 - ix. 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.
 - x. 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.

- xi. 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.
- xii. 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 Molecular and Cellular Biology, it is recognized that the faculty represent diverse disciplines, such as genetics, cell biology, developmental biology, microbiology, evolutionary biology, biochemistry, 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. In the Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology, 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 (e.g. the Cytogenetic Program).
- 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 scholarship 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 report required for continued accreditation of the B.S. in Biology degree program and the Cytogenetics program.

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

align with this department, college and university. 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).

Administrative leadership is a special form of professional service. This type of service includes 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 and 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 three faculty performance areas. The Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology recognizes the following workload models: Teaching Emphasis, Teaching-Hybrid, Teaching–Research Balance, Research Emphasis, Administrative Emphasis, Clinical Faculty and Research Faculty. 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 I** at the end of this document.

Workload metrics for each performance area are provided in Appendix B.

In the Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology, 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 the teaching workload has been expressed in terms of contact hours.

Teaching workload will be determined by the Department 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.

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 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 scholarship 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 10% 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 Molecular and Cellular Biology follows the University's guidelines concerning lecturers and senior lecturers: *"In most cases, lecturers' and senior lecturers' primary responsibility is teaching and therefore are expected to be highly effective teachers. In most cases, their responsibilities will primarily be devoted to teaching multiple sections of the same undergraduate courses. The heavy teaching load of these individuals constitutes a full workload and offsets the absence of a full range of regular faculty responsibilities that normally rounds out the typical full undergraduate faculty workload at KSU. In rare cases, the responsibilities assigned to a lecturer or senior lecturer may be individualized and differ from the typical lecturer or senior lecturer workload described above. In such cases, the responsibilities must be specified in the FPA.*

Unless otherwise set forth in the Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA), there are no expectations for scholarship. 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)."

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 scholarship 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 scholarship and creative activity. The proportion of effort that will be placed in each of the three performance areas will be determined by the Department 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 not seeking promotion 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 scholarship 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 10% 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 Department 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.

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 10% 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 higher significance) than those following the Teaching-Hybrid or Teaching-Research Balance 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% - 80% of their workload is administrative in function. The typical teaching load for these faculty will vary. Faculty on this workload model will teach a minimum of one 3 credit hour course (or its equivalent) over the course of an academic year. Teaching will account for 0 - 20% of faculty time over the course of an academic year. Administrative leadership is a special form of professional service, and faculty following this model may allocate the remainder of their time (0 – 35%) to other forms of professional service. 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 Scholarship and Creative Activity contributions will be assessed within the context of the overall needs of the administrative unit.

F. Research Faculty Model

The Research Faculty Model provides a workload model for non-tenure track faculty who contribute to the scholarship and creative activity of the Department through engagement in scholarly and creative research appropriate to their field of specialization. Their contributions in this area should have a substantial impact on research in the Department and at KSU. In this regard, research faculty are expected to maintain an active, externally-funded research program that strengthens the research portfolio of the Department. They are not expected to be involved in classroom teaching. However, research faculty may direct undergraduates and graduates in their research, and they may also serve on thesis committees. Any professional service activities will have a research emphasis. Thus, faculty following this workload model will spend 80 -100% of their time on scholarship and creative activity. Time spent performing relevant professional service (e.g. serving as a thesis committee member, performing grant or manuscript reviews) or directing students in their research will account for 0 – 20% of their time.

G. Clinical Faculty Model

The Clinical Faculty Model is a non-tenure track workload model for faculty who are educator-practitioners in professional departments, who have a background in their disciplinary areas and who practice the discipline in the work setting (KSU Faculty Handbook). Clinical faculty are strongly involved in clinical, classroom, laboratory, and/or field based teaching, with expectations of high quality performance in teaching, supervision, and student mentoring. Clinical faculty include researchers from clinical or industrial settings, health professionals, educator-practitioners and other professionals teaching courses that contribute to an established certification and/or licensure program offered at KSU. Clinical faculty may teach and mentor students in campus and off-campus settings, and they are expected to maintain professional credentials (e.g. certification, licensure) and current practices in their specialty area. This is distinguished from adjunct faculty, who might also be practitioners out in the field, but teach solely in a traditional classroom setting or via online instruction. Faculty following this workload model will have a teaching load of approximately 12 – 15 contact hours per week of course instruction per semester. The remainder of their time (10 – 30 %) will be spent on professional activities and professional service. Specific duties and expectations for faculty following this model will be determined by negotiation with the Department Chair upon contract. However, they do not have specified expectations in scholarship. Teaching, supervision, and mentoring are the primary responsibilities of faculty on this model, and excellence in these areas is expected.

It is assumed that a tenure-track 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 three performance areas will be determined by the Department 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 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. Workload metrics for each performance area are provided in Appendix B.** 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, the FPA lists the faculty member's goals and priorities for a period agreed upon by the faculty member and his or her supervisor(s) to fit current and anticipated circumstances. The FPA must: "*clarify the general responsibilities and relative emphasis of the individual in teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and professional service; articulate the manner in which the faculty member's activities relate to the departmental and college mission and goals; identify the expectations for scholarly activity in all of the faculty member's performance areas; identify the performance area(s) that will include scholarship expectations and describe those expectations.*"

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 Promotion and/or Tenure

From KSU's Faculty Handbook (Section 3): *"Experience is correlated with professorial rank, but years of service or successful annual reviews alone are not sufficient to qualify for a promotion in rank."* From KSU's Faculty Handbook (Section 3): *"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, termination or layoff of tenured personnel due to program modification, 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 ...**"*

In addition to the Department's *Guidelines for Faculty Performance, Promotion, and Tenure*, faculty preparing for promotion and/or tenure should consult the University Faculty Handbook and the CSM Guidelines for Faculty Performance and Evaluation. The information provided here is meant to emphasize some important points concerning preparation of the portfolio:

- Two binders must be submitted. 'Binder 1' should contain the university's portfolio Cover Page (from Faculty Affairs), the Narrative, a Vitae, previous Annual Review Materials (including ARDs and FPAs), a copy of the Department of MCB's Faculty Performance Guidelines (with completed signature page), external evaluation letters and supporting materials (such as Pre-tenure Review Letters) since their last pre-tenure, tenure and/or promotion review.
- 'Binder 2' will contain supporting evidence. There is no limit to the quantity of supporting evidence that may be included, however the faculty member and department chair are expected to collaborate to ensure that all material is a representative sample of the work completed during the review period.
- The portfolio narrative must address quality and significance of activities, accomplishments, and scholarship performed over the review period, rather than simply listing or briefly describing products or 'what' was

taught/done/accomplished. (see the KSU Faculty Handbook for page limitation and format criteria for the narrative)

- 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.
- External evaluation letters from individuals in the candidate's field of scholarship must be included in the portfolio. Faculty submitting a portfolio requesting promotion should consult the KSU Faculty Handbook for details of this university policy and process. The majority of letters must come from individuals who are neither co-authors nor dissertation committee members. These letters will evaluate the candidate's research and scholarship products and comment on their significance in the discipline. The candidate and the department chair will collaborate to develop a mutually acceptable, hierarchized list. This process should be initiated early in the spring term to ensure receipt of a letter before the portfolio due date in August. Refer to the KSU Faculty Handbook for details on the process of obtaining external letters.
- 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.
- Once a portfolio is submitted, no new material can be added. However, updating information (e.g. a submitted paper being accepted for publication, a submitted grant being awarded funding) may be included in a response letter from the candidate and this information considered by subsequent levels of review. Previous levels of review will not reconsider their decision based on this status change.
- Portfolios that are not complete with all required pages and sections will not be reviewed.

VIII. Expectations for Promotion and/or Tenure

Tenure-track, non-tenure track, and tenured **faculty members seeking promotion should already be meeting the expectations of the next rank.** Faculty members serving in tenure-track positions must be reviewed and recommended for promotion during or before their sixth full academic year of service at KSU or be given a terminal employment contract in their seventh year. The minimum service in rank needed for promotion is 4 years. Promotion in rank is based upon performance and established criteria, and not the faculty member's time in service.

Faculty members serving in tenure-track positions must be reviewed and recommended for tenure during or before their sixth full academic year of service at KSU. In addition, a faculty member must, at a minimum, be at the rank of associate professor before a request for tenure can be considered. Faculty at the rank of assistant professor may elect to be concurrently reviewed for both promotion to

associate professor and tenure, however the awarding of tenure can only be approved *after* a positive decision on promotion to associate professor has been made. Untenured associate professors may elect to apply for tenure or be concurrently reviewed for tenure and promotion to full professor. In summary, to be awarded **tenure, a faculty member must, at a minimum, be meeting the expectations for associate professor in each performance area of evaluation** (i.e. teaching, supervision and mentoring, scholarship and creative activity, and professional service) *and demonstrate the intent and capacity to continue developing professionally in all areas.*

The Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology expects that **tenure-track and tenured faculty** seeking promotion in rank and/or tenure 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 Scholarship and Creative Activity), and IV (Expectation in the Area of Professional Service).** Faculty considering application for promotion or tenure are strongly encouraged to consult this document and sections 2 and 3 of the KSU Faculty Handbook.

As indicated in a previous paragraph, tenure-track faculty at the rank of assistant professor should already be meeting the expectations of an **associate professor** in all three performance areas when requesting promotion to that rank. For **promotion to the rank of associate professor**, it is expected that the faculty member will have: 1) demonstrated highly effective teaching and mentoring and demonstrated leadership in curricular development in their area of expertise; 2) evidence of an established, productive, and sustainable research program for which they are the intellectual driving force; such evidence should include presentations at scientific meetings, peer-reviewed publications, and a concerted effort towards obtaining external support to support their research program; and 3) demonstrated meaningful contributions and leadership to the department, college, university and/or a professional organization's service efforts (refer to **Tables II – IV**). For **tenure**, faculty members must demonstrate the intent and capacity to continue developing professionally in these areas.

For promotion of tenured faculty 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 scholarship 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.

Lecturers who have 5 years of consecutive service at KSU may be considered for optional promotion to senior lecturer. The process for promotion will be the same as that used for promotion within the professorial ranks. A portfolio will be submitted and evaluated at each level of review required by University promotion procedures, following the same schedule of deadlines. The format and contents of a lecturer's portfolio will follow the same guidelines as that of tenured and tenure-track faculty who are reviewed for tenure and promotion. The portfolio for promotion to senior lecturer should demonstrate exceptional teaching ability and effectiveness and extraordinary value to the institution, especially in the areas established in the faculty member's FPA. Preparation of a portfolio for third year and sixth year performance reviews or post-promotion review is not required

The guidelines for appointment, reappointment, and promotion of **research faculty** are described in the CSM Guidelines for Appointment and Promotion of Research Faculty. Faculty following this workload model are expected to be fully funded by external grant money, and this position includes *no* possibility of tenure. Annual reappointment is based on 1) the availability of external funds that support the research and the position, and 2) a satisfactory annual review that is performed by the department chair. Research faculty may be assistant research professors, associate research professors, or senior research professors. Typically, the research assistant professor will have an initial appointment funded by an active grant awarded to another member of the College of Science and Mathematics. The requirements and expectations for each rank are provided in Table V. The process for promotion will be the same as that used for promotion within the tenure-track professorial ranks. A portfolio, following the format and deadlines required by the University, will be submitted and evaluated at each level of review required by University promotion procedures.

Clinical faculty positions are non-tenure track and are appointed on a year-to-year basis. However, clinical assistant and associate professors may be considered for optional promotion in rank. The minimum service in rank needed for promotion is 4 years. The duties and rank of a clinical faculty member will be established at the time of hiring, based on negotiation with the Department Chair and Dean. Clinical faculty rank (clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor, or clinical professor) will be based largely on professional background, accomplishments, and experience. In the areas of teaching and professional service, clinical faculty are expected to adhere to the same standards of performance as tenured and tenure-track faculty. Likewise, for promotion in rank, clinical faculty are expected to demonstrate the same standards of performance as tenured and tenure-track faculty. The portfolio for promotion should demonstrate exceptional teaching ability, professional activities, and professional service and extraordinary value to the institution, especially in the areas established in the faculty member's FPA. The process for promotion will be the same as that used for promotion within the tenure-track professorial ranks. A

portfolio, following the format and deadlines required by the University, will be submitted and evaluated at each level of review required by University promotion procedures. Preparation of a portfolio for third year and sixth year performance reviews is optional.

IX. Post-Tenure Review

All tenured faculty members, beginning in the sixth year, five full years after the faculty member's most recent promotion, are required to perform a post-tenure review. The primary purpose of post-tenure review is to examine, recognize, and enhance the performance of all tenured faculty members. The overall outcome of the assessment will be categorized as either: 1) Achieving Expectations in Post-Tenure Performance, or 2) Not Achieving Expectations in Post-Tenure Performance. The KSU Faculty Handbook (section 3) describes the guidelines for differentiating between achieving expectations and not achieving expectations in post-tenure performance. To summarize: To receive 'achieving expectations in post-tenure performance' a faculty member must have three or more positive annual reviews over the last five years and have met the performance and quality expectations of his or her area of emphasis over the period of evaluation. Specifically, they must continue to be a highly effective teacher and satisfactory in scholarship and service, relative to the workload described in their FPAs.

Two binders must be submitted for a post-tenure review. 'Binder 1' should contain the university's Cover Page (from Faculty Affairs), the Narrative, a Vitae, all annual review documents (including ARDs and FPAs) and supporting material since their last promotion, tenure, or PTR review, and a copy of the Department of MCB's Faculty Performance Guidelines (with completed signature page). 'Binder 2' will contain supporting evidence. External letters addressing teaching, scholarship, or service are not required for post-tenure review. Additional information concerning post-tenure review can be found in the KSU Faculty Handbook (section 3).

X. General Expectations of Faculty

The Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology 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.

XI. Revisions to the Departmental Guidelines

The Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology Promotion and Tenure 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 Department Chair, the Dean of the CSM and the Provost.

Table I: Workload Models for the Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology (Note: Workload metrics for each performance area are provided in Appendix B.)

Workload Model	Average % Effort Given to Each Performance Area:		
	^a TSM	^b S&CA	^c PS
Teaching Emphasis	80-90 (Ex. 12 - 15 contact hrs./week/ semester)	0 - 10*	10 (4 hrs./week)
<i>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.</i>			
Teaching-Hybrid	60-80 (Ex. 9-12 contact hrs./week/ semester)	< 30 (avg. 4 – 10 hours/week)	10 - 30 (4 - 12 hrs. or more/week)
<i>This model will be used primarily by tenured faculty not seeking promotion as agreed upon in their FPA.</i>			
Teaching-Research Balance	60**** (Ex. 9 contact hrs./week/ semester)	30 (avg. 12 hrs. or more/week)	10 (avg. 4 hrs./ week)
<i>New tenure track faculty will typically follow this workload model. Tenured faculty seeking promotion will likely follow this model or the Research Emphasis Model.</i>			
Research Emphasis	40 (Ex. 6 contact hrs./week/semester)	50 (avg. 20 hrs. or more/week)	10 (avg. 4 hrs./week)
<i>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.</i>			
Research Faculty	0 – 10 (directed student research)	80 - 100	0 – 10
<i>This model will be used by faculty hired as research professors, research associate professors, or research assistant professors.**</i>			
Clinical Faculty	70-80 (Ex. 12 contact hrs./week/ semester)	0 – 10*	10 – 30 (avg. 8 or more hrs./week)
<i>This model will be used by faculty hired as clinical professors, clinical associate professors, or clinical assistant professors.** Specific duties and expectations for faculty following this model will be determined annually upon contract.</i>			
Administrative Emphasis	0-20 (Ex. One 3 credit course/year)	0-35	50-80
<i>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.</i>			

^aTSM – Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring; ^bS & CA – Scholarship and Creative Activity;

^cPS – Professional Service

* Faculty may perform R & CA (rather than service) as agreed upon in their FPA; ** This position is non-tenure track. *** Teaching load will include no more than two different course preparations and attention should be given to class size.

Table II: Expectations for Promotion and Tenure by Rank for Faculty in the Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology 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 **promotion**, faculty members must **already be meeting the expectations of the next rank**. For **tenure**, faculty members must **demonstrate the intent and capacity to continue developing professionally in this area**.

Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
<p>An assistant professor should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>In addition to continuing the expectations of the assistant professor, the associate professor should demonstrate or develop:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). 	<p>The professor is expected to <i>continue performing</i> 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.</p> <p>After promotion to associate professor, a faculty member considering promotion to professor must continue to focus their efforts in scholarship and creative activity. In addition, they must excel in one other performance area. A faculty member who has chosen to excel in this area is expected to demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

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

General expectations for tenure and promotion in rank are described in section VIII of this document. For **promotion**, faculty members must already be meeting the expectations of the next rank. For **promotion**, faculty members must **already be meeting the expectations of the next rank**. For **tenure**, faculty members must **demonstrate the intent and capacity to continue developing professionally in this area**.

Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
<p>An assistant professor should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>In addition to continuing the expectations of the assistant professor, an associate professor should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.* 	<p>The professor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <i>and</i> broad dissemination in national/international settings. • Should have a record of competitive external funding sufficient to support their research, as required by the nature of the research.

* Refer to Section IV. B (Scholarship and Creative Activity) for sources of evidence that can be used to address efforts made to secure external funding.

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

General expectations for tenure and promotion in rank are described in section VIII of this document. For **promotion**, faculty members must **already be meeting the expectations of the next rank**. For **tenure**, faculty members must **demonstrate the intent and capacity to continue developing professionally in this area**.

Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
<p>An assistant professor should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>An associate professor should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have taken on a leadership role in departmental, college, and/or university service or taken a leadership role in professional service within their discipline. 	<p>The professor is expected to <i>continue performing</i> 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.</p> <p>After promotion to associate professor, a faculty member considering promotion to professor must continue to focus their efforts in scholarship and creative activity. In addition, they must excel in one other performance area. 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.</p>

Table V: Expectations for Promotion by Rank for Research Faculty in the Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology.

General expectations for promotion in rank are described in section V-G and VIII of this document. For **promotion**, faculty members must already be meeting the expectations of the next rank. Faculty following this workload model are expected to be fully funded by external grant money, regardless of rank.

Assistant Research Professor	Associate Research Professor	Senior Research Professor
<p>An assistant research professor should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have evidence of an established a clearly defined, focused, well-structured research program in their area of competence. • Have evidence that their research program is sustainable. • Establish a 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 and clear potential to secure independent external funding (as co-principal or principal investigator) to support their research/creative activity. 	<p>In addition to continuing the expectations of the assistant professor, an associate research professor should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 significant presentations at meetings. • Have secured independent external funding as a co-principal or principal investigator and be the intellectual lead on at least one major grant. • Have demonstrated consistency and direction in his/her research. • Have a minimum of four years of experience at the Assistant Research Professor level (or equivalent) either at KSU or another institution. 	<p>The senior research professor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is expected to continue to contribute to the body of knowledge in their area of expertise through a well-established, independent research program. • Should have national recognition, as evidenced by a continuous, strong record of peer-reviewed publications <i>and</i> broad dissemination in national/international settings. • Should have a consistent record of continuous external funding to support their research. • Have a minimum of four years of experience at the Associate Research Professor level (or equivalent) either at KSU or another institution.

Appendix A: External Evaluation Letters for Promotion in Rank

As indicate in section VII (Review of Faculty Performance for Promotion and/or Tenure), external evaluation letters from individuals in the candidate's field of scholarship must be included in the portfolio. These letters will evaluate the candidate's research and scholarship products and comment on their significance in the discipline. Faculty should refer to the KSU Faculty Handbook for University policy regarding external evaluation letters and the process of obtaining these letters. Some of salient details of this process are as follows:

- i. The person submitting a portfolio (herein after referred to as the "candidate") and the department chair/immediate supervisor (herein after referred to as "chair") develop a list of potential evaluators, twice the minimum number of the total required, with the candidate supplying at least half the names on the list.
- ii. During the spring semester prior to submission of the portfolio, the chair and the candidate will discuss potential evaluators and in collaboration will develop a mutually acceptable, hierarchized list. The majority of letters must come from individuals who are neither co-authors nor dissertation committee members. If the candidate and the chair cannot reach agreement on the list of potential letter writers, the dean will make the final determination of the list.
- iii. Individuals who pose a conflict of interest (such as friends, relatives, KSU co-workers) will be removed from the list.
- iv. Neither the chair nor the candidate may solicit a letter concerning Scholarship/Creative Activity from outside of the mutually agreed upon list.
- v. The chair contacts potential evaluators (on the mutually composed list) to request their assistance.
- vi. If a potential evaluator accepts, the chair will send them review instructions, the KSU faculty member's CV, department guidelines for promotion and tenure, and reprints and/or professional portfolios or other documentation as appropriate by discipline. It is unnecessary to have all materials evaluated. The candidate should select the work to be shared with the evaluator. Materials should be shared electronically with the evaluator to the degree possible.
- vii. If a potential evaluator declines, the chair will choose another individual in the order of the list.
- viii. Once packets are sent to evaluators, no additional information regarding the candidate's research/creative activity will be sent to the external letter writer.
- ix. The evaluator will send their letter to the department chair who will add the letter to the candidate's portfolio materials.
- x. All letters received will be included in the portfolio.
- xi. If fewer than the number of letters requested by the chair are received, the chair will so note in the portfolio and the review will proceed.
- xii. The candidate will not see the letters unless the candidate expressly requests a copy of the letters pursuant the Georgia Open Record Act.

Appendix B. Workload Metrics for Each Area of Review

In the College of Science and Mathematics (CSM), the norms for workload effort expected in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activity (S/CA), and service for tenure-track faculty who are untenured and tenured faculty with a demonstrably active and productive program of research are 60%, 30%, and 10%, respectively. In the Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology (MCB), teaching percentages are expressed in terms of weekly contact hours per semester; contact hours correspond to the listed course meeting times in the course schedule. 10% teaching corresponds to 3 contact hours per week during a 15 week semester. Accordingly, 60% teaching corresponds a total of 18 contact hours in an academic year. To take into account additional demands of grading, office hours, etc., adjustments (multipliers) are made for class size as follows: class size between 120 and 179 students counts 2x the contact hours, and class size over 180 students counts 3x the contact hours for the course.

For Lecturers and Senior Lecturers, the norms for teaching/ scholarship-creative activity/ service are 100%/ 0%/ 0% or 90%/ 0%/ 10% depending on departmental needs.

Workload adjustments are made from these norms depending on whether or not a faculty member is meeting expectations in the current model and on changes in career focus that a faculty member may have. Only in the case that a faculty member is externally funded (and perhaps in other special cases that are approved by the Dean) will the research/creative activity workload be greater than 30% and only in special cases (which are approved by the Dean) will the professional service load be greater than 10%.

Teaching

The KSU faculty handbook states that “*All teaching faculty are expected to emphasize excellence in teaching...*” Further, the handbook states that “*Teaching effectiveness at KSU will be assessed and evaluated not only from the perspective of the teacher’s pedagogical intentions but also from the perspective of student learning,*” and that “*every faculty member is expected to demonstrate scholarly activity in all performance areas.*”

To demonstrate excellence in and a scholarly approach to teaching, all faculty are expected to:

1. Collect and evaluate quantitative outcome data regarding student learning. Examples of quantitative instruments include, but are not limited to, pre- and post-test assessments, concept inventory, and student performance in subsequent courses or post-graduation. Faculty members must be prepared to justify the quantitative nature of the outcome data collected.
2. Revise courses from semester to semester based on this outcome data; making these revisions deliberately and then systematically assessing the effect of the revisions on students’ learning,
3. Over a rolling 6-year period, participate in at least one Professional development activity such as attending workshops and conferences related to teaching. These may include:
 - a. College of Science and Mathematics Faculty Learning Communities
 - b. KSU Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning workshops
 - c. Professional Society workshops focused on teaching and learning
4. Over a rolling 6-year period for at least one course, conduct a longitudinal study that demonstrates how your instructional practice and changes to that practice have impacted student outcomes.

Scholarship and Creative Activity (S/CA)

The KSU faculty handbook states that “*Scholarly researchers ... approach their scholarship and creative activity in a systematic and intentional manner. They have a clear agenda and plan for their work in this area.*” In S/CA, during any consecutive 6-year period, tenure-track faculty are expected to:

1. Have 1 peer-reviewed product for every 10% workload effort in S/CA over a rolling 6-year period.
 - a. For example, faculty on a 60/30/10 teaching/SCA/service workload model are expected to produce 3 peer-reviewed products in a 6 year cycle. Similarly, a faculty member with a 10% SCA workload is expected to have 1 peer-reviewed product in a 6 year period. It is understood, that not all RCA products generated require equal effort or are equal in quality. Therefore, it is incumbent on the faculty member to provide significance and quality metrics for each RCA product, especially in the event they do not meet departmental and college productivity standards
 - b. Peer-reviewed papers must be published in journals recognized by Google Scholar; faculty member should avoid publishing in journals widely considered to be predatory (e.g. journals that appear in Beall’s list).
 - c. In addition to peer-reviewed papers in journals, many of the examples given in section IV. B in the Departments Faculty Performance Guidelines qualify as peer-reviewed products (funded grants, patents granted, books and book chapters published by commercial publishers, technical reports reviewed by government agencies, etc.). Faculty members must be prepared to justify the peer-reviewed nature of their research products. Products without clear peer-review will not be counted.
2. Have a number of extramural presentations equal to the number of peer-reviewed products in the 6-year rolling time period for the work-load model. Understanding that budgets limit travel and that student travel is a priority for our program, an extramural presentation given by a student describing work done in a faculty member’s lab and on which the faculty member is senior author, will count as a presentation.
3. Have a number of internal presentations commensurate with the number of students participating in research in the faculty member’s lab. Understanding that students contribute differently to various projects, this number is not required to equal the number of students performing research. An intramural presentation given by (a) student(s) describing work done in a faculty member’s lab and on which the faculty member is senior author will count as a presentation. Faculty members must be prepared to justify the number of internal presentations.
4. Be active in generating and submitting proposals to funding agencies to sustain their research/scholarship program. This activity may include
 - a. Submitting proposals to external agencies to support S/CA efforts
 - b. Using feedback from an unsuccessful proposal submission to focus projects by:
 - i. Obtaining additional preliminary data to demonstrate proof of concept
 - ii. Rework proposal concepts based on referee reports.
 - c. Securing internal funding to seed projects and obtain preliminary data to support subsequent proposals to an external agency. Receiving any internal funding from CSM or

the Office of the Vice President of Research comes with the expectation that a proposal to an external agency will be produced, and internal funding should only seed projects and not be considered as a way of sustaining research/scholarship programs. Internal funding will be considered as meeting the goals of S/CA if it results in a proposal to an external agency.

The amount of effort in proposal generation and submission and the type (internal vs. external) and level of activity (frequency of submission) should be appropriate for the percentage of workload dedicated to S/CA and should scale with the percentage of effort in a faculty member's workload dedicated to S/CA (e.g. a higher percentage of S/CA should equate to greater effort and success in external funding). Simply submitting proposals to funding agencies without a clear aim is not enough; the scholarly, iterative process described in the faculty handbook should be followed. Faculty members in the College of Science and Mathematics should have success in securing funding from agencies external to the University before consideration of promotion to Professor.

Professional Service

Faculty members in the College of Science and Mathematics will engage in service activities that help advance the mission of the College, and that bring external visibility to the College. The KSU faculty handbook states that *“Good documentation of scholarly service describes the role of the faculty member in each service activity, how he or she uses their expertise in the role, and clearly demonstrates the outcome or impact of the service activity.”* Examples of activities include, but are not limited to:

1. Serving on Department, College, and/or University Committees,
2. Providing Ad hoc reviews of manuscripts for professional journals,
3. Providing Ad hoc reviews of proposals to funding agencies,
4. Serving on a funding agency review panel,
5. Serving on the Editorial Board for professional journals,
6. Organizing or presiding over technical sessions of a professional conference,
7. Providing technical assistance based on your disciplinary expertise to a community organization,
8. Providing technical assistance to a local community organization in an educational capacity.

In Annual Review Documents, simply listing service activities does not address the role played, the unique contribution made, nor the alignment between these activities and the mission of the Department, College and/or University. The faculty member must discuss their contributions in the context of the Department, College and/or University mission, and indicate the quality and significance of their Professional Service activities. Bearing in mind that a service workload of 10% equates to approximately 120 hours per academic year, faculty members should address the time spent on performing each service activity.

Kennesaw State University

Academic Affairs

Approval Form for Department Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

A copy of this form, completed, must be attached as a cover sheet to the department guidelines included in portfolios for 3rd Year Review, Promotion and Tenure and Post-Tenure Review.

I confirm that the attached guidelines, dated **1/21/2017**, were approved by the faculty of the Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology in accordance with department bylaws:

Dale Lynn Vogeliien/ Dept. P&T Chair
Name (printed or typed) / Title (DFC chair, etc.)

Dale Lynn Vogeliien / June 19, 2017
Signature/ Date

Department Chair Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

Donald McGarey
Name (printed or typed)

Donald McGarey / 6-19-17
Signature/ Date

College Review Committee (P&T), Chair Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

Nikolaš Kidonakis
Name (printed or typed)

Nikolaš Kidonakis / 06/23/2017
Signature/ Date

College Dean Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

Mark Anderson
Name (printed or typed)

Mark Anderson / 6/19/2017
Signature/ Date

Provost Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

W. Ken Harmon
Name (printed or typed)

W. Ken Harmon / 6/8/17
Signature/ Date