

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 4/24/2007)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 4/24/2007)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **4/2012**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **4/2007**

Lloyd Thomas, Department Head

Date signed: 4/24/2007

Steve White, Dean

Date signed: 4/25/2007

M. Duane Nellis, Provost

Date signed: 4/30/2007

**Each academic department is required by University Handbook policy to develop department documents containing criteria, standards, and guidelines for promotion, tenure, reappointment, annual evaluation and merit salary allocation. These documents must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty members in the department, by the department head or chair, by the dean concerned, and by the provost. In accordance with University Handbook policy, provision must be made to review these documents at least once every five years or more frequently if it is determined to be necessary. Dates of revision (or the vote to continue without revision) must appear on the first page of the document.*

FACULTY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Department of Economics
Kansas State University

April 24, 2007

I. The Weights and Merit System

For tenure-track faculty without extra responsibilities (e.g., administration, above-normal teaching loads) the normal weights assigned are:

Research	40 percent
Teaching	40 percent
Service	20 percent

The following scale will be used to evaluate faculty:

0	no merit
1-3	some merit
4-7	high merit
8-10	exceptional merit

Faculty should be notified not only of their score, but also of the mean score and the range of scores (for research, teaching, service, and total) of the Department. These numerical evaluations should be supplemented with written comments by the Department Head in order to provide useful feedback, discuss individual situations with the faculty member, and so forth. Accompanying these comments should be an overall assessment of the faculty member's performance according to the categories: "exceeded expectations," "met expectations," "fallen below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity," and "fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity." The "fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity" category corresponds with that described in the department's Minimum Acceptable Productivity document.

II. Evaluation of Faculty

As part of the evaluation process, each year every faculty member is expected to complete the Faculty Reporting and Evaluating Form, including the statement regarding one-year and longer-term goals. The Form should be accompanied by teaching evaluations, copies of publications, copies of papers out for review, copies of referee reports rendered by faculty, copies of editors' letters requesting revision and re-submission of articles, letters indicating acceptances of articles for publication, and other appropriate documentation.

The goal statement is not intended to be a contractually binding statement, but rather one that will serve as the basis for a dialogue between the faculty member and the Department Head with regard to the consistency of the faculty member's goals and the evaluation criteria set forth in this document. This is consistent with Sec. C45.1 of the *Faculty Handbook* that "It is expected that the previous year's statement will be considered during the annual evaluation and goal setting process."

In evaluation of all aspects of faculty performance—teaching, research, and service—the performance in the most recent year shall have the greatest weight. However, legislated pay increases differ from year to year. Evidence of performance may not flow at constant rate over time. For these reasons, the Department Head shall take into account performance over the past three to five years in making evaluations. In effect, the evaluation score for teaching, research, and service shall be a weighted moving average of performance over the past three to five years with the largest weight on the most recent year.

A. Evaluation of Teaching

The department has the mission of teaching a wide variety of up-to-date economics courses, ranging from introductory courses offered in large classes constituted predominantly by non-majors to advanced courses with small enrollment constituted predominantly by students specializing in economics. These courses require a variety of faculty teaching styles, skills and approaches. Evaluation will take account of the faculty member's contribution to the department's teaching mission.

The Department Head should consider the following in evaluation of teaching performance (no order of ranking implied):

1. Course content, including currency of material presented, syllabi, appropriateness of course structure, and amount of student work required, activities that promote active learning, level of presentation, examinations, course improvements, use of the WWW and so forth. Particularly in upper-class courses, evidence of challenging students through use of homework, term papers, essay examinations, and other measures should be considered.

2. The number of course preparations a faculty member is responsible for during a given semester (and over time) and new course preparations.

3. Interviews with both undergraduate and graduate majors at KSU including students in Senior Seminar. Such interviews may have additional functions and benefits for the Department besides providing general feedback to the Department Head regarding the classroom experiences of students.

4. The standardized student-evaluation results and other instruments of evaluation.

To facilitate interpretation of teaching evaluation forms, the Department should use the same form in all multi-section courses. Currently, the department uses the TEVAL form. All evaluations should be administered by a representative of the Department Head, normally a GTA

or Departmental secretary, and should normally be administered in the last month of the semester. The proportion of enrolled students filling out the evaluation form should be taken into consideration. The teacher is not to see the results until the grades are submitted at the end of the semester.

Although the computerized evaluation form should normally be used in all multi-section classes, it may be appropriate, especially in small graduate-level courses, for instructors to use a different instrument involving more extensive written comments by the students. Such instructors may develop and utilize an instrument of their own choice if they desire. Whatever the instrument chosen, it should be administered by a representative of the Department Head.

The standardized evaluation scores are likely to be influenced by the grading standards of the instructor. In cases where the grading standards are significantly less rigorous than the Departmental norm for comparable courses, the Head should take due consideration in interpreting the numerical scores on the standardized form. In other words, the Department Head will make an effort to distinguish "popularity" from "quality" of the instruction. The Department Head should seek to eliminate all incentive of faculty members to alter their grading scheme for the purpose of obtaining better teaching evaluation scores. The Department Head should also seek to eliminate incentives of faculty members to avoid teaching large principles (and other large lecture) classes in which it is relatively difficult to achieve high evaluation scores by adjusting upward the reported TEVAL scores in large lecture classes.

Even though University policy does not mandate that faculty members must share their student evaluations with the Department Head, this is the normal procedure. In the event that the Department member does not wish to share these evaluations with the Head, the burden of proof is on the faculty member to provide compelling, alternative evidence of teaching performance to the Head. For example, in lieu of using student evaluations, the instructor may ask the Head to sit in on lectures and may provide other evidence of teaching effectiveness.

Tenured faculty are to be held to the same standards of submitting evidence of teaching performance annually as are non-tenured faculty.

B. Evaluation of Research and Scholarly Activity

Because research often requires years to complete and its impact, e.g., as measured by citations and other indicators of recognition and quality, may not be felt for years, and because legislated pay increases differ from year to year, it is especially important that evaluation of research performance be based on a weighted moving average over the past three to five years. For this reason, faculty members should submit a professional vita each year in addition to indicating research completed and published over the most recent year.

In evaluating research and scholarly activity, the Department Head should use six levels of priority:

1. Priority 1. (a) The highest priority should be given to refereed articles in top-level journals. This should include general economics journals of "top ten" national quality. Also,

within the first priority but at a somewhat lower level of credit are publications in top-level economics journals in the fields of specialization--e.g., *Journal of Development Economics*, *Journal of Regional Science*, *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking*, *Journal of Public Economics*, *Journal of Econometrics*, *Journal of Law and Economics*, *Journal of International Economics*, *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, and so forth.

(b) The highest priority should also be given to the most prestigious external grants and contracts. Receipt of extramural grants and contracts is an important indicator of research activity, and may benefit the department directly through financial resources to support graduate students and so forth. Recognition for grants should be based on the nature of the grantor, the magnitude of the grant, and the benefit to the Department.

2. Priority 2. (a) Refereed articles in prestigious journals (other than top ten) and highly respected (but not number one) journals in the specialized fields. (b) Other grants and contracts. (c) Other scholarly activity such as specialized professional books and textbooks. In evaluating books, the Department Head should make a judgment on the quality and value to the Department.

3. Priority 3. Refereeing activity and presentations at national and international economics meetings. Refereeing activity in good quality journals is an indicator of one's recognition and accomplishment within the field. Presentations at national meetings help enhance the national reputation of the Department.

4. Priority 4. Publication in less-prestigious journals.

5. Priority 5. Presentations at regional and non-national level meetings.

6. Priority 6. Unpublished manuscripts or working papers, seminar presentations in the Department or elsewhere, book reviews, and other evidence of scholarly activity.

There are several indicators of research and scholarly output within the above framework. For example, citations in the literature may give an indication of the standing or quality of a particular article or book. When citation statistics are used, no rule based on order of authorship will be employed.

Considerable discretion should be given to the Department Head in making determinations in the above framework. A publication in a top-rated journal (*AER*, *JPE*, *QJE*, *RESTAT*, etc.) will normally count more heavily than one mid-level or numerous low-level publications. Publication in top journals, especially those used to rank economics departments, do more to enhance the prestige and reputation of the Department than publications in lesser journals. They also have a greater impact on the market value of the faculty member in the academic labor market. Although journal quality is neither static nor easily measured, journal rankings—which are published periodically—can serve as a first approximation. The Department Head should recognize, however, that some articles in mid-level journals may have more impact on the discipline via citations, and may be of higher quality than some articles in the top journals. This is normally documented through citations and therefore may not be

recognized until several years pass. Generally, articles should be counted more heavily than notes or communications. Co-authored work shall be counted less heavily than solely authored work.

C. Evaluation of Service

Service is highly important to the Department. In evaluating service, the Department should use the following priority scheme, with particular emphasis on Priority 1(a) and 1(b) activities.

1. Priority 1. Departmental service.

(a) Undergraduate advising and graduate supervising.

Providing advice and direction to students is an important and a multifaceted activity often requiring significant time and skill.

Graduate supervising includes directing Ph.D. dissertations and Master's theses. The Department Head shall assess the quality as well as quantity of work done by faculty members in supervising dissertations. One indicator is potential publishability of the final product. It is expected that the Department Head shall examine all Ph.D. dissertations completed under the purview of each faculty member within the relevant period of faculty evaluation.

Undergraduate advising may take the form of providing guidance and answering questions for choosing courses, providing research opportunity for undergraduate students to conduct projects, helping students applying for national or international scholarships, writing letters of recommendation for undergraduate students, helping undergraduate students get jobs upon graduation, and providing information for job search or graduate study. Advisors of undergraduates will be evaluated annually by their advisees and these evaluations will be considered in the service evaluation. Normally, faculty who have been in the department for at least three years are expected to provide undergraduate advising unless exempted by the department head because of heavy responsibilities elsewhere, e.g., graduate advising.

(b) Other departmental service.

This may take many forms, including but not limited to the following: writing Ph.D. preliminary and field examinations, serving as a non-supervisory member on Ph.D. dissertation and Master's theses committees, serving as Director of Graduate Studies or Director of Undergraduate Studies, serving on the graduate committee and/or faculty recruiting committees, participating at open house and telethon, guiding independent study of students, and serving on various departmental committees.

A reasonable measure of departmental service is the amount of time and effort devoted to such activities, together with the benefits provided to the Department.

2. Priority 2. Professional service and University service. Professional service may take the form of serving as an officer in professional associations, serving on editorial boards,

organizing sessions at professional meetings, serving as paper discussant at professional meetings, evaluating grant proposals, evaluating candidates for promotion and tenure at other universities, and so forth. University service may take the form of serving on faculty senate, college and university-wide committees, Ph.D. committees outside the Department, and other forms of University service.

3. Priority 3. Community service. Giving talks, writing articles for the newspaper, giving media interviews, and performing other service that helps provide recognition to the Department and University.

III. Criteria and Evaluation Procedures for the Professorial Performance Award

The Professorial Performance Award rewards strong performance at the highest rank with a base salary increase in addition to that provided for by the annual evaluation process (*Faculty Handbook*, Sections C.49.1 & C.49.12). The award is not a promotion but a salary performance award. The Professorial Performance Award is part of the annual evaluation process and is based on the Department Head's recommendation to the Dean.

Consistent with Sec. C49.2 of the *Faculty Handbook*, the department's criteria for the award are based on the following guidelines:

1. The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in the highest rank at Kansas State at least six years since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award;
2. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review; and
3. The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards (see Section XI of the Department's Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion document).

Candidates eligible for performance review must compile and submit a file that documents their professional accomplishments for at least the previous six years to the Department Head. The Department Head will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials in terms of the criteria, standards, and guidelines established, along with a recommendation for or against the award. A copy of the Department Head's written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate.

Each candidate for the award will have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the Department Head, and each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, each candidate will have the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation to the Department Head and to the Dean.

The Department Head submits the following items to the Dean:

- a. A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award,
- b. Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation,
- c. Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation,
- d. The candidate's supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award.

As in annual evaluation, a candidate could appeal to the Dean for a resolution. For details, see Sec. 49.8 through Sec. 49.11 of the *Faculty handbook*.

The Professorial Performance Award document must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty in the department, by the Department's Head, by the Dean, and by the Provost. Provision must be made for a review of the document at least every five years as a part of the review of the procedures for annual merit evaluation or whenever standards for promotion to full professor change.

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS

MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE LEVEL OF PRODUCTIVITY¹

Following section C31.5 of the Faculty Handbook, the department head will determine “when a tenured faculty member’s overall performance falls below the minimum acceptable level.” The research and teaching guidelines proposed herein shall guide the department head's decision in this regard.

Minimum Acceptable Levels for Research

It is expected that faculty members provide evidence of scholarship on a regular basis. A faculty member in the Department of Economics will have met the minimum acceptable level of productivity with regard to research when he or she has documented the requisite degree of both effort and performance in conducting economic research. At a minimum, this requires that:

- (R1) The individual has submitted or re-submitted a research paper for publication, or presented a paper at a professional conference, or submitted a major grant proposal in the last two years; and has satisfied at least one of the following:
- (R2) The individual has published or had accepted for publication one refereed article (or substantive note or communication) in a quality general interest or field journal in the last three years, or two such papers in the last five years. The default criterion is that the journal be listed in the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI). Unless the journal is listed in the SSCI, the faculty member bears the responsibility for demonstrating that the journal is viewed highly in the economics profession or that it is a respected outlet for teaching scholarship.[See the Statement of Terms and Conditions at the end of this document.]
- (R3) The individual has published or had accepted for publication a scholarly book or research monograph in the last three years. (Acceptable publications include first edition textbooks, book chapters, and edited volumes.)
- (R4) The individual has secured an external contract or extramural funding in the last three years that contributes to scholarship and the financial well-being of the university in a manner of some significance.

¹ These guidelines apply to tenured and tenure-track faculty only.

- (R5) Faculty members may be granted a one-year extension at the discretion of the department head for (R1), (R2), (R3), or (R4) under certain conditions. These conditions include, but are not strictly limited to, at least one of the following:
- (1) The faculty member develops a new course or substantially restructures an existing course that is equivalent to a new course. This may include, for example, development of a distance learning course, a course taught over the Internet, or a course that involves extensive computer laboratory time. In addition, faculty members who teach a disproportionately large number of graduate classes and/or who teach graduate classes in place of faculty members who are on leave and/or who are teaching a graduate class for the first time may qualify for this extension.
 - (2) The faculty member is writing a study guide, test bank, or revising a textbook. This extension may be granted only if the scholarly work does not satisfy the requirements of R3.
 - (3) The faculty member is engaged in some other scholarly pursuit that is expected to enhance the overall reputation of the department, the college, or the university.
 - (4) The faculty member has supervised a relatively large number of doctoral dissertations in the past three years.

The Committee recommends the following exceptions/qualifications to the above-stated requirements:

- (i) New faculty members, who are working on completing their degrees or who have received the Ph.D. within the last calendar year, will be granted one free year before the above conditions apply. This means that new faculty members who qualify will have three years from the effective date of their appointment to satisfy R1 and four years from the effective date of their appointment to satisfy R2, R3, or R4. [See the Statement of Terms and Conditions at the end of this document.].
- (ii) Faculty members may be granted extensions and/or exceptions from the above specific requirements upon a showing that (1) The faculty member is submitting papers to top-tier general interest and field journals with particularly long notification lags; or (2) The faculty member has compiled evidence of exemplary research performance in the past. Evidence of such exemplary research performance may be documented by extensive citations to the author's work in the economics literature, or by his/her appointment to the editorial board of a quality general interest or field journal. [The default criterion is that the journal be listed in the SSCI.] These activities, though important in their own right, should not serve to substitute indefinitely for a consistent record of quality research performance.
- (iii) The minimum research requirements listed above should be changed proportionately for faculty members with a reduced research weight. The default teaching load for a faculty member with a zero research weight is 4-4. The department head should consider reducing

the default teaching load for a faculty member that (i) teaches course sections with an inordinately large enrollment; (ii) has multiple course preparations; or (iii) otherwise makes an extraordinary contribution to the teaching and/or advising mission of the department.

- (iv) As a general guideline, a faculty member with a 3-3 teaching load should be able to return to a 2-2 teaching load upon having accepted for publication two papers within four years—with the clock starting the first semester in which the faculty member begins a 3-3 teaching load. (Cross reference point 3 under “Statement of Terms and Conditions.”)
- (v) A faculty member with a 3-3 teaching load that receives formal notification (and so informs the department head) of the second paper being accepted for publication shall be returned to a standard 2-2 teaching load within a reasonable time period. As a general guideline, a faculty member should be returned to a standard 2-2 teaching in the next semester if formal notification of the second paper being accepted for publication is received at least four months in advance of the start of the next semester.
- (vi) A faculty member with a 3-3 teaching load shall be given a “grace period” of no less than one year prior to receiving a second unacceptable rating due to a failure to satisfy the minimum acceptable levels for research. The clock for the “grace period” starts in the first semester in which the faculty member begins a 3-3 teaching load.

Minimum Acceptable Levels for Teaching

Students have a right to expect:

- courses that contain current material
- comprehensible and accurate presentation of material
- objective and accurate evaluation of their performance
- reasonable access to faculty for help and consultation
- respectful treatment

Faculty are also expected to:

- conduct classes in a competent and professional manner
- assess student performance with thoughtfully prepared examinations, assignments, and other relevant criteria
- hold students accountable to reasonable standards of performance
- foster student learning
- hold regular office hours
- meet classes at their scheduled times

The Department head should consider course materials, evidence that classes demonstrate the appropriate level of rigor, and student feedback before concluding that a faculty member has failed to meet minimal acceptable productivity in teaching.

Minimum Acceptable Levels for Service

A faculty member in the Department of Economics will have met the minimum acceptable level with regard to service if he or she satisfactorily performs all committee assignments.

Minimum Overall Acceptable Levels

A faculty member will have failed to meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity overall if the faculty member fails to meet minimum acceptable productivity in a major area of responsibility. A major area of responsibility is defined as an area of teaching, research, or service in which the faculty member has a weight of 20 percent or more.

As indicated in section C31.7, the department head and the faculty member may agree to a reallocation of the faculty member's time so that he/she has a reduced weight in the area of deficient performance and increased weight(s) in other areas. For example, a faculty member deficient in research may increase his/her teaching load and/or service responsibilities. The initial revised set of area weights should provide a faculty member with a reasonable opportunity to return to the standard 40-40-20 weights for teaching, research, and service, respectively.

Appeals

The department head will determine when a faculty member's overall performance has "failed to meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity." The head will also indicate in writing a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member, and the head and faculty member will meet together with the goal of agreeing on an appropriate course of action to improve performance to an acceptable level. While this document does not preclude any particular way that the head and faculty member may come to an agreement, one way of reaching an agreement may be for the faculty member to accept a revised set of area weights. In subsequent evaluations the faculty member will report in writing on activities aimed at improving performance and provide any evidence of improvement, and this will become part of the documentation for subsequent evaluations. If the department head determines that the faculty member has fallen below minimum acceptable levels of productivity in the subsequent year's evaluation or in the third such evaluation within a five year period, then, unless the faculty member does not wish it, a meeting of the department's tenured faculty will be held to review the department head's decision. Before the tenured faculty vote, the head will present documentation supporting the findings of the failure of the faculty member to meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity, and the faculty member being considered will also be able to present an oral and/or written appeal to the tenured faculty. At a subsequent meeting, the department head's evaluation will be validated if approved by a majority vote of the appeals committee (tenured faculty excluding the department head and the individual faculty member in question). Voting will be by secret ballot. If validated, the name of the faculty member who is determined to have failed to meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity will be forwarded to the dean.

If the department head rejects the tenured faculty vote, so that the head proposes to forward to the dean the name of the faculty member as not having met minimum acceptable levels of productivity, the head, before forwarding the name, will submit in writing to the individual in question and the tenured faculty his/her reasons for rejecting the tenured faculty decision. Also, the head, in transmitting his/her

recommendation to the dean, will report the vote count by the tenured faculty. In addition, the faculty member being considered will have the right to transmit his/her appeal to the dean, in writing. The faculty member has the right to forward the assessment of the appeals committee to the dean.

Statement of Terms and Conditions

1. The appeals committee is comprised of all tenured faculty members excluding those faculty members filing appeals. In addition, the department head will recuse himself or herself from any vote of the appeals committee that involves an appeal of the department head's decision.
2. A tie vote of the appeals committee shall be decided in favor of the faculty member filing the appeal.
3. The appeals committee should determine the minimum requirements necessary for a faculty member to be re-instated at the default weightings subject to the following two guidelines: (1) The faculty member must demonstrate a commitment to research that exceeds the minimum acceptable levels of productivity outlined above; and (2) There should be no more than one change in any faculty member's percentage weightings in any given academic year. (Cross-reference point iv under "Minimum Acceptable Levels for Research.")
4. Evidence that a publication appears in quality research outlet may include, but is not strictly limited to the following: (1) The editorial board is comprised of scholars with established reputations in the economics discipline; (2) The publication is refereed; (3) The publication is cited with some frequency in the reference sections of articles that appear in publications listed in the SSCI; and (4) Economists at top twenty universities or with significant name recognition in the field have published in this journal within the last five years.
5. Sabbaticals are irrelevant to the process of administering these guidelines for the purpose of satisfying the minimum research requirements. The teaching and service requirements are not applicable. Faculty leaves without pay and/or medical leaves of one semester or more should be treated as grace periods for a time period not to exceed the length of the leave. For example, a one year unpaid leave would provide the faculty member with a maximum additional year to satisfy the specific requirements.
6. For the purposes of administering the guidelines in this document, sole-authored articles will be counted the same as multiple-authored articles, and the order in which the authors' names appear on the article will be of no consequence.
7. The faculty member may satisfy the R1 research requirement by demonstrating satisfactory progress on a first edition textbook. Satisfactory progress on a first edition textbook may be demonstrated by a letter of commitment or signed contract from the publisher.

8. The faculty member must resort to the appeals process in order to satisfy the R1 research requirement for study guides, test booklets, and later edition textbooks. See also the qualifying statement on time extensions for satisfying the research requirements under R5(2).
9. In administering the evaluation guidelines in this document it is important to maintain an appropriate balance between fairness to faculty members and meaningful standards that enable the department to realize its full potential.
10. The requirements for tenure are independent and likely exceed the minimum acceptable levels of productivity for performance listed here. Hence, no inferences should be drawn about the likelihood of a particular faculty member being awarded tenure or being continued in employment during the probationary period given that he or she has satisfied the minimum expectations for performance set forth in this document.
11. Amendments to this document may be proposed at any time. A majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty is required to pass any amendment.
12. This document should be reviewed in its entirety by a departmental committee at least once every five years.
13. Once officially approved, this document becomes part of the broader document, Faculty Evaluation Criteria, Department of Economics.

PROCEDURES FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

Department of Economics

Kansas State University

April 24, 2007

- I. This document has two purposes. First, it summarizes many of the reappointment, tenure, and promotion details discussed in the *Faculty Handbook*, Section C. The *Faculty Handbook* can be found at www.ksu/uauac/fhbook. Items in this document taken from the *Faculty Handbook* are placed in quotations and referenced. Faculty are encouraged to consult the *Faculty Handbook*, Section C, for additional detail on university procedures and protocol. Second, as noted in Section C31.1, "It is not possible at the university or college levels to establish detailed criteria and standards for annual merit salary adjustments, reappointment, promotion, and tenure." These criteria are established by "the faculty of each academic department or unit." This document also describes the current departmental standards and criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion and outlines methods used to evaluate teaching, research and service in section XI below.
- II. Calendar of Procedures: The Department of Economics follows the calendar for reappointment, tenure, and promotion as set forth annually by the Dean or Provost; the document is available from the department head.
- III. Reappointment of non-tenured faculty--general procedures
 - A. The department head announces a meeting of tenured faculty to consider reappointment of non-tenured faculty. The head makes available to faculty members all materials provided by the candidate and may supplement it with other material the head considers relevant for the reappointment decision, such as comments solicited from students and faculty.
 - B. "The candidate compiles and submits documentation of his or her professional accomplishments in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the department." (*Faculty Handbook*, Section C62.)
 - C. Tenured faculty and the department head meet to consider candidates for reappointment. Faculty vote formally with a secret ballot for each candidate.
 - D. The head conveys the faculty vote and comments to the Dean, along with the head's own recommendations.
 - E. The head also conveys his/her comments and suggestions to each candidate and, for tenure-track candidates, the faculty's comments regarding the candidate's progress toward tenure. The letter to the candidate should make reference to the department's tenure and promotion document.
 - F. "A faculty member may request an early tenure review. Ordinarily, this is done after consultation with the department head and the tenured faculty members in the department." (*Faculty Handbook*, Section C110.)
- IV. First-year faculty
 - A. Consideration for reappointment of instructors and new assistant professors emphasizes teaching effectiveness.

- B. Individuals with substantial professional experience may, in addition, be evaluated with regard to other activities, e.g., administration and research. Such would be the case for a person hired at the level of associate or full professor.

V. Second-year faculty (evaluated twice during the academic year)

- A. The evaluation of second-year faculty will generally have a broader focus than evaluation of first-year faculty.
- B. For tenure-track faculty, evaluation will incorporate the faculty member's research program, as well as other responsibilities of the faculty member.

VI. Third-year faculty and mid-probationary review

- A. *Faculty Handbook*, Section C92.1, states in part:

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

[The procedure is essentially the same as that used in the final review for tenure except that outside reviews are not mandatory: the candidate provides statements of accomplishments, of future goals, and of contributions to instruction, research, and service. The candidate's file is examined by the dean and the dean's advisory committee.]

- B. *Faculty Handbook*, Section C92.2, states in part:

“The department head may discuss the review and assessment of the tenured faculty members in the department with the dean, and shall provide a letter of assessment to the candidate, including a summary of faculty comments and suggestions.... After receiving the assessment, the candidate has the right to submit a written response for the file.”

The head provides a letter of assessment to the candidate. This letter summarizes the head’s assessment of the candidate as articulated in the head’s recommendation letter to the dean.

Faculty Handbook, Section C92.3, states in part:

“Comments also may be solicited from students, and other relevant faculty members in the college or university, and from outside reviewers.”

VII. Fourth-year and fifth-year faculty

- A. Evaluation of faculty in the fourth and fifth years will focus on their progress toward achieving a performance level that warrants tenure.
- B. The department head will convey in writing to candidates their progress toward achieving a favorable departmental recommendation for tenure. The letter to the candidate should make reference to the department’s tenure and promotion document.

VIII. Sixth-year faculty

- A. "Faculty members in the final year of probation will be automatically reviewed for tenure unless they resign." (*Faculty Handbook*, Section C110.)
- B. "Tenure is not granted below the rank of associate professor, except in special circumstances approved by the provost." For faculty hired at the assistant professor level, recommendation for tenure is generally concurrent with the recommendation to promote to associate professor. (*Faculty Handbook*, Section C13.)
- C. Early in the fall semester of the sixth year, the department head will consult with probationary faculty regarding the preparation of a file to support recommendation for tenure and promotion.
- D. As part of that file, the candidate provides statements of accomplishments, of future goals, and of contributions to instruction, research, and service. The department head provides the candidate's file ("Promotion and Tenure Documentation") to tenured economics faculty and to the dean for his/her review and review by the dean's advisory committee.
- E. The College of Arts and Sciences requires an outside review of the candidate's research and publication for tenure and for promotion to associate and full professor. Probationary faculty will be asked to supply names of at least five potential outside reviewers, who are recognized for excellence in the candidate's discipline and who can provide an unbiased evaluation. The department head seeks peer review from at least two persons on the candidate's list and adds two or more of the head's choosing. The head formally requests reviews from these individuals. An example of the head's letter to outside reviewers is on file for inspection by faculty.
- F. Tenured faculty members review the candidate's file and make recommendations to the head; this consists of a secret ballot and written comments. The results of the faculty vote and the faculty's unedited, written comments regarding tenure and promotion are forwarded to the dean by the department head.
- G. The department head forwards his/her own recommendation to the dean "accompanied by an explanation of her or his judgement." (*Faculty Handbook*, Section C112.5.) The head shall discuss with the voting faculty the content of the recommendation letter that he/she intends to transmit to the dean. This discussion may take place at the same meeting in which the ballots are cast or, at the discretion of the head, a subsequent meeting. Any voting faculty member may subsequently elect to write a separate letter to the dean, either concurring or dissenting with the head's articulated position. The head provides a letter of assessment to the candidate. This letter summarizes the head's assessment of the candidate as articulated in the head's recommendation letter to the dean.

[Note: The department's recommendation is only one step of the procedure for receiving tenure at Kansas State University. The College of Arts and Sciences Dean's committee on tenure and promotion and the dean also make recommendations. The provost, who reviews the candidate's file and the several recommendations, makes the final recommendation to the Board of Regents.]

IX. Promotion of tenured faculty

- A. Consideration for promotion is not automatic. "A faculty member, after consultation with the department chair/head or appropriate departmental faculty, may request a review for promotion. The candidate compiles and submits a file that documents his or her

- professional accomplishments in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the department." (*Faculty Handbook*, Section C151.) This procedure normally begins early in September.
- B. Associate professors may request feedback from the head concerning their progress toward satisfying the requirements for promotion during the annual evaluation process.
 - C. The procedure for promoting tenured faculty is, in general, identical to the procedure for recommendation of tenure. However, faculty who evaluate the candidate are limited to those of higher rank than the candidate.
- X. Instructors on regular (non-temporary) appointment are evaluated annually. Such instructors "must be explicitly informed in writing of a decision not to renew their appointments in accordance with the standards of notice of non-reappointment." (*Faculty Handbook*, Section C60.)
- XI. Criteria and standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Promotions to all ranks are based on the following standards. However, criteria for promotion to full professor include the additional standard indicated in B.3. below.
- A. Teaching. The department expects high quality teaching, and to that end establishes the following criteria and means of evaluation.
 1. Reappointment, tenure, and promotion require that faculty be evaluated via a formal evaluation instrument and/or interviews with students and classroom observation by the head. This evaluation should establish that the faculty member's teaching practices are consistent with high standards of scholarship and student learning. The department head considers the impact on evaluations of items such as grading standards of the instructor, course content, number of students in the class, level of the class (e.g., introductory or graduate).
 2. Particularly in upper-level courses, the department expects faculty to challenge students with assignments that, in part, develop skills valued by prospective employers and/or graduate and professional schools. These assignments may entail analysis of data, term papers, group projects, class presentations, case studies, etc. Examinations and class assignments may be reviewed by tenured faculty as part of the review process.
 3. Lecture presentations are expected to be modified over time to incorporate advances in the discipline.
 - B. Research. The department expects high quality research, and to that end establishes the following criteria and means of evaluation.
 1. Reappointment, tenure, and promotion require that faculty pursue a continuously active research program, evidenced by publications in highly regarded refereed journals. The department also considers other evidence of scholarly activities, such as publication of books, editorial board membership, citations of work in the SSCI, applications for research grants, presentations at conferences, etc.
 2. The department takes special note of research activities that promote the national reputation of the department.
 3. Promotion to full professor requires that a faculty member achieve a national reputation for scholarship in his/her field. This normally requires multiple publications in highly regarded journals. Other factors that can provide evidence of national reputation include a record of receipt of significant research grants, significant citation of one's work by

- other scholars in the field writing in highly regarded journals (as indicated, for example, by SSCI), editorships or service on editorial boards, publication of books and/or monographs, or substantial activity in refereeing articles for economics journals.
- C. Service. The department expects all members to provide significant service to the department, the university, and the community; and to that end the department establishes the following criteria and means of evaluation. [Note: The department weighs most heavily service to the department; professional and university service ranks second, and community service third.]
1. Departmental service
 - a. Faculty are evaluated on the basis of their contributions to graduate students, in particular, their contributions to Ph.D. dissertations and Masters' theses and reports. Quality of the final product and value added are important criteria. Particularly in the case of Ph.D. dissertations, quality may be demonstrated by subsequent publication of the research.
 - b. Faculty are also evaluated with respect to service to undergraduates: advising, assistance with job placement and applications to graduate school, providing research experiences, and other assistance.
 - c. Other departmental service: recruiting of faculty and students, committee work, and other activities listed in the department's faculty evaluation document.
 2. University and professional service
 - a. The department considers service to the university through such activities as membership in faculty senate, college and university committees, etc.
 - b. The department considers service to the profession through such activities as serving as officers in organizations, organizing conference sessions, etc.
 3. Community service includes the following: presentation to groups, articles for newspapers, media interviews, and other service that provides recognition to the department and university.
- D. The departmental document, *Faculty Evaluation Criteria*, provides additional detail on the evaluation of teaching, research, and service. In general, the candidate should anticipate that consistent ratings on the departmental annual evaluations of “exceeds expectations” increase the likelihood of a favorable recommendation from the department concerning promotion/tenure. Conversely, the candidate should anticipate that consistent ratings on the departmental annual evaluations of “fails to meet expectations” decrease the likelihood of a favorable recommendation from the department concerning promotion/tenure. In general, consistent ratings of “meets expectations” do not carry any informational content in this regard.
- E. In general, the candidate should anticipate that satisfaction of the standards for minimum acceptable productivity are necessary but not sufficient for a favorable recommendation from the department concerning promotion/tenure.