

Faculty Handbook
Kasha Laboratory

Adopted by the Faculty
April 2007

Scope of Document

This document is intended to delineate common procedures and responsibilities followed in the Institute of Molecular Biophysics. These procedures and practices are intended to supplement the Institute By-laws. Modifications require a simple majority vote of all IMB Faculty, as outlined in the By-laws.

1. Procedure for Selecting the KLB Institute Director.

At the beginning of the Director's last year, the Executive Committee meets to determine whether the Director should be considered for reappointment, or whether a new Director should be identified. The Dean has the option to appoint an outside member to this committee. The Executive Committee canvasses the KLB faculty to determine whether an external candidate should be sought. If the faculty desire to search for an external Director, the Executive Committee must report this to the Dean, who must approve the search.

If the decision is to proceed with an internal candidate, the Executive Committee must canvas Institute faculty, including the MOB Program Director and the non-tenure track faculty Faculty Directors, to identify potential candidates. Candidates for Director are not limited to faculty housed in the KLB but must be part of the Molecular Biophysics faculty. The Institute faculty prioritize the candidates by designating on a secret ballot their first choice as 3, their second as 2, and their third priority as 1. Director nominations will not be accepted from the floor during balloting. The Executive Committee collects ballots and determines whether the person receiving the highest cumulative score accepts the nomination. The Executive Committee then presents this name to the Dean. The nominee assumes the duties of Director provided that mutually satisfactory negotiations have been completed between the nominee and the Dean. Failing agreement with the Dean, the process is repeated. The nominee assumes Director duties on the first day of the Fall semester following their election.

A recommendation to replace a sitting Director prior to the end of his or her term can be made. This recommendation can be initiated by any IMB faculty member and requires a two thirds vote of the IMB faculty for a recommendation to the Dean.

2. Procedure for Selecting the MOB Program Director.

In the last year of the Program Director's term, the Institute Director must determine whether to continue with the current Program Director, or whether a new Program Director should be identified, upon advice from the KLB Executive Committee and the MOB Executive Committee. If a new Program Director is desired, the Director must identify suitable candidate(s) for presentation to the MOB faculty. The MOB faculty prioritize the candidates by designating on a secret ballot their first choice as 3, their second as 2, and their third priority as 1. The Institute Director then determines whether the nominee with the highest cumulative total score is willing to serve as Program Director.

This process should be completed by mid-fall of the last year of the current Program Director's term so that the leading nominee can participate in student recruiting that year. The nominee's term starts on the first day of the Fall semester following their election.

3. Procedures Pertaining to Promotion

a. Tenure-track, primary appointment outside of KLB

The Institute Director will participate in the annual review of all tenure-earning faculty who have not achieved the rank of Professor by writing annual evaluation letters to be submitted to the Chair of those faculty

members' departments. In addition, the Director will perform the following:

- i. *Mentor Committee.* Upon appointment in KLB, an Assistant Professor will be assigned by the Director a mentoring committee consisting of two tenured faculty with primary research space allocation in KLB. The Mentor Committee will provide guidance regarding grant preparation, graduate student / postdoctoral mentoring, publications, committee work, and teaching.
- ii. *Third-year review.* Upon completion of the faculty candidate's third year, the Institute Director will provide to the home department a written evaluation of the progress made towards tenure. In preparing this letter, the Director will communicate with the home department regarding specific procedures followed for third-year review in that department.
- iii. *Tenure and Promotion.* According to University and College policy, faculty can be nominated for tenure after completion of their fifth year (in extraordinary circumstances, consideration for tenure and promotion may come earlier; see [Tenure and Promotion](#) and the [Dean of Faculty Web Page](#) for more information). Tenure is awarded through the home department of the faculty member, but the candidates performance in the KLB should contribute strongly to the evaluation process.
- iv. The Director will provide a letter for the faculty members tenure and / or promotion binder. The Director's letter must specifically address the preparation of the candidate for tenure and promotion to the specific level being considered. The Director's letter will discuss the development and intellectual status of the candidate's research, especially with regard to the interdisciplinary nature of the work; on the candidate's mentoring (ability to move students towards degree completion; participation in undergraduate research, postdoctoral mentoring, etc); and on service specific to the Institute and / or MOB graduate program. If the candidate has performed teaching specifically assigned through the KLB, the Director will provide an evaluation of the instructional ability of the faculty member.

b. Non-tenure track, primary appointment in KLB, E&G funded.

Annual performance evaluation of non-tenure track faculty is performed by the Director. Each of the facilities performs a unique mix of research and training support. A balance of research and training support appropriate to that Facility must be clearly defined in the annual Assignment of Responsibilities. The University provides minimal criteria for promotion of non-tenure track faculty (see [OP-C-7-D6 PROMOTIONS](#) and [Minimal Requirements](#)). In addition to these criteria, the Director must also consider the following criteria:

- i. *Facility management.* The promotion binder must contain an evaluation of facility management and technical expertise must be included in the binder.

- ii. *Training / Education.* Facility managers must contribute to the training mission of the KLB. An evaluation of the participation in the training / education mission must be included in the binder.
 - iii. *Promotion Committee.* A Promotion committee consisting of two tenure-track faculty and one non-tenure track faculty / facility manager is convened by the KLB Director, with input from the candidate.
 - iv. *Binder.* A promotion binder is generated that contains a written recommendation from the Promotion Committee, two letters of recommendation from faculty users of the relevant facility, and the KLB Director's recommendation.
- c. **Non-tenure track, primary appointment in KLB, C&G funded.**
Annual performance evaluation of non-tenure track faculty is performed by their immediate supervisor, in consultation with the Institute Director. The University provides minimal criteria for promotion of non-tenure track faculty (see [OP-C-7-D6 PROMOTIONS](#) and [Minimal Requirements](#)). In addition to these criteria, the Director must also consider the following criteria:

4. Procedures pertaining to Faculty Additions.

Faculty Additions.

As a multi-disciplinary research facility, the KLB does not have tenure-track faculty lines. However, KLB is home to the Structural Biology program and to the Computational Biophysics Center of Excellence. Procedures for faculty replacement in these programs are as follows:

i. *Structural Biology Faculty.* The Structural Biology program contains 10 tenure-track faculty lines, five of which are now associated with the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry and five with the Department of Biological Sciences. To initiate a search to fill one of these lines, the Director must request permission to do so from the Dean and the Chair of the Department with the vacated line. After receiving approval to conduct the search, the Institute Director appoints a search committee consisting of structural biology faculty from the two home departments. The Chair of the affected Department may assign up to two additional faculty members from that department to participate on the committee. Following interview of the candidates, the Structural Biology faculty make a recommendation for hiring to the relevant department, which then votes and makes a recommendation to the Dean.

Faculty hired through the Structural Biology program should be housed in the KLB, if possible. Otherwise, office and laboratory space must be provided by the home department. SRAD return will be split 50/50 with the home department and the KLB.

The KLB Director has responsibility for determining 50% of the annual assignments of responsibilities for faculty hired into the Structural Biology Program, including teaching and service assignments.

ii. Computational Biophysics Center of Excellence. The Computational Biophysics Center of Excellence created three faculty lines through the School for Computational Science that are currently assigned to Chemistry and Biochemistry (two lines) and to Physics (one line). To initiate a search to fill one of these lines, the KLB Director must inform the SCS Director, the Chair of the relevant Department, and the Dean of the desire to do so. Upon approval, the KLB Director forms a search committee that also includes faculty representation from the SCS and the relevant home department. Similar procedures to those for hiring Structural Biology faculty are followed.

Faculty hired through the COE should be housed in the KLB, if possible. Otherwise, office and laboratory space must be provided by the home department or SCS. SRAD return will be split 34 / 33 / 33 with SCS, the KLB and the home department, respectively, regardless of where the candidate's research and office space is located. The Institute Director does not assign responsibilities for COE faculty.

5. Facility Director Duties

A. Primary Duties

The primary responsibilities of the Facility Directors are those duties which constitute adequate performance of the Director and reasonable functionality of the Facility.

1. The most critical duty the Facility Director must perform is to maintain his or her Facility in good working order. This includes a number of sub-duties enumerated below.
 - The instruments and services that the Facility provides to the users will be made available to the users with an appropriate degree of reliability. Although service interruptions due to equipment breakage, etc. are unavoidable and may be beyond the Director's control, efforts should be made to minimize the frequency and duration of such outages.
 - The Facility Director will provide a clean, safe, and stable working environment for the users.
 - Training and assistance shall be provided to users to enable them to perform routine tasks making use of Facility resources in a safe, effective manner.
 - The Facility Director is expected to exercise good fiscal judgment. This includes staying within the Facility's annual budget, for which a proposal shall be submitted to the Institute Director on an annual basis. It is expected that Facility spending should remain in line with historical trends. Notable deviations shall be addressed in the budget proposal. The annual budget shall include normal operating costs such as, but not limited to: standard consumables, maintenance and other contracts, annual fees, and other non-equipment items to cover normal operation and routine wear and tear of Facility equipment. One time purchases and large projects requiring significant fiscal outlay are not included in the annual

budget. When possible, Directors should include foreseeable large expense items in a separate category in the annual budget proposal. Should large expense situations arise after submission of the annual budget, the Facility Directory should apprise the Institute Director with as much notice as is reasonably possible.

- Each of the Facilities represents a significant investment of Institute resources. As such, the Director is expected to plan for the future direction of the Facility in addition to his or her duties pertaining to present operations. Impending replacement or addition of equipment should be communicated to the Facility's major users to facilitate the inclusion of such items in grant proposal or other methods of funding.
2. Facility Directors are expected to maintain a high level of technical expertise in areas appropriate to his or her facility and thus serve as a knowledge resource for the IMB community. This includes, but is not limited to, attendance of workshops, symposia, and conferences.
 3. When consulted, Facility Directors should advise researchers on matters pertaining to his or her areas of expertise. This can include advice on methods of analysis and purchase of equipment or supplies, general design of experiments or sets of experiments, performance of short feasibility studies, written description of Facility resources for granting purposes, etc. Detailed work or analysis beyond this level and/or collaborative research effort is generally encouraged, but is considered to be a Secondary or Additional Duty (see points 6 and 11).
 4. In conjunction with user training (*c.f.* 1C above), the Facility Director should provide documentation, or references or links to documentation to users when given reasonable notice. Where appropriate and not cost prohibitive, manuals, either printed or electronic, should be available for use by the users. Shared access to documentation is sufficient.
 5. Each Facility Director represents a facet of IMB to other organizations, both within and outside of FSU. As such, the Directors are expected to behave in a professional and collegial manner when representing the Institute.

B. Secondary Duties

In addition to the main duties noted above, there are several secondary duties that the Facility Directors are expected to perform. Although these are less critical to the function of the facility, the Facility Director should be able to fulfill many of them when viewed over a moderate time period (6-12 months). Performance of these is predicated on a lack of higher priority items requiring the immediate attention of the Facility Director.

6. The Facility Director should attempt to provide intermediate or advanced training and consultation to users and researchers when appropriate. This constitutes more time consuming and comprehensive service than in point 3 above. Assistance with research topics at this level could be expected to merit an acknowledgement or possibly co-authorship.

7. The Facility Director should maintain a proactive stance in meeting the future needs of the users. This should include, where possible, planning for the probable lifespan of equipment, expansion of the types or levels of service available to the users, and broadening of the Facility's user base.
8. Where appropriate, the Facility Directors are encouraged to run workshops or demonstrations, author how-tos, tutorials, FAQs, etc.

C. Additional Duties

These are duties assigned to or undertaken by the Facility Director above and beyond his or her normal role as Facility Director. In the case of a Facility Director performing such duties, it should be recognized that the Facility Director is providing extra benefit to some combination of the Institute, University, or community at large. The absence of performance of additional duties should not in any way be held against the Facility Director. These duties should not have any negative impact on the Facility Director's performance of his or her primary or secondary duties.

9. The Institute Director may assign auxiliary duties to the Facility Director. These are typically, but not necessarily, related to the Facility or to another area of his or her expertise.
10. As a result of the Facility Director's role as a liaison to other organizations on campus or in the community (*c.f.* point 5), he or she may be asked to serve on committees, or otherwise provide service and expertise outside of IMB. Such service during working hours is subject to the approval of the Institute Director. It should be recognized that such service reflects well on the Institute, and is a direct representation of the external organization's respect for the Facility Director.
11. Facility Directors are encouraged to take an active role in the ongoing research of the Institute and affiliated departments. Time permitting, and with the agreement of the research faculty in charge of the project, Facility Directors are encouraged to work collaboratively with the faculty here at FSU. By definition, this is work beyond the scope of items 3 and 6. The Facility Director should reasonably expect to be a co-author of papers resulting from the collaboration.

D. Advisory Committee and User Meetings

Each Facility Director, working in conjunction with the Institute Director shall appoint an Advisory Committee of three research faculty members, at least two of which shall be from IMB and reasonably considered a part of the Facility's user base. The committee will be advisory only, not supervisory. It is intended that the committee will help the Facility Director maintain priorities and directions in line with the desires of the users, advise the Facility Director on policies and procedures, and generally assist in ensuring that the Facility meets the needs of the users. Committee members are encouraged to

work with the Facility Director in obtaining funds for equipment from sources external to the Institute.

The Facility Director should convene a general users meeting at least annually. Attendees should include the Director and Advisory Committee, and be open to attendance by any and all users or prospective users of the Facility. The Facility Director should give a short presentation on the scope of services offered by the Facility as well as its current standing and direction. Following the presentation should be an open discussion of issues pertaining to the Facility, and its direction and governance.

Subsequent to the meeting, the Facility Director will submit a report to the Advisory Committee summarizing the significant topics of discussion, suggested areas of improvement, if any, and any other relevant feedback from the users. As part of the report, the Facility Director should either rebut or otherwise address the user's concerns. Upon the Facility Director and Advisory Committee reaching consensus of the accuracy of the report and the Facility Director's response to any issues of concern, the report will be submitted to the Institute Director. If consensus is not achieved, the Facility Director and Advisory Committee may submit separate reports.