

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES (including Professorial Performance Award Criteria and Chronic Low Achievement Standards)

(Approved by Faculty Vote on) 9/13/06

PROMOTION, TENURE, and REAPPOINTMENT

(Approved by Faculty Vote on) 9/13/06

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES: 9/13/11

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: 9/13/11

Linda Brigham, Department Head
Date signed: 9/14/06

Stephen White, Dean
Date signed: 9/15/06

M. Duane Nellis, Provost
Date signed: 9/18/06

*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.

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

GUIDELINES, STANDARDS, AND PROCEDURES

FOR

ANNUAL MERIT EVALUATION, AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE
AWARD, REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, TENURE, MID-TENURE REVIEW,
AND CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS

Merit Evaluation Process	4
Distribution of Responsibilities	4
Submission of Materials to the PAC	4
General Guidelines for Preparing PAC Materials	5
Election of Personnel Advisory Committee	8
The PAC Evaluation Process	8
Chronic Low Achievement	9
Appeals of Evaluations	13
Evaluation of Faculty on Sabbatical or Leave	13
Professorial Performance Award	15
Reappointment Process	16
For Tenure-Track Faculty Members	16
For Regularized Instructors	17
Reappointment Criteria	18

Promotion and Tenure	20
Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	21
Standards for Promotion to Professor	21
Procedures for Promotion and Tenure	23
Mid-Probationary Review	24

Merit Evaluation Process This section describes the annual merit review process.

All faculty members' annual merit evaluations and rankings are determined by the Head but with specific recommendations, including a prose narrative and final evaluation numbers, provided by the English department's Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC). The following paragraphs describe the annual distribution of individual faculty's responsibilities, the election of PAC members, and PAC procedures.

1. Distribution of Responsibilities Each faculty member will meet with the department Head to jointly establish goals and objectives for each faculty member for the upcoming evaluation period. This meeting is generally held toward the end of the spring semester to discuss the next academic year's assignments and distribution of responsibilities. This distribution of responsibilities, as percentages, is used in calculating a faculty member's merit (as explained below). Individual faculty members and/or the department Head may schedule, as needed, additional meetings, at any time prior to submission of materials to the PAC, to adjust goals and objectives in light of new information or changed circumstances (attainment of a Fulbright teaching award or sabbatical, for example).

2. Submission of Materials to be Reviewed by Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC)

The PAC will expect each faculty member's file of review materials to contain the following:

- a) Faculty Activity Sheet
- b) Up-to-date vita. When reporting publications, faculty should use standard MLA format.
- c) One-page synopsis ("roadmap") of the materials a faculty member is turning in to the PAC for the year. This synopsis should list each item a faculty member is turning

into the PAC for the year year. The synopsis should be keyed to both the self evaluation and to the support materials so that the PAC can quickly see what materials the faculty member has submitted as well as their relationship to the claims the faculty member is making.

d.)Self Evaluation. Includes explanations of the materials as well as any claims for merit in any of the faculty member's areas of responsibility.

e) Support Materials. Evidence to support claims for merit.

3. General Guidelines for Preparing Materials to be presented to PAC:

a) Because several people need to review each faculty member's materials, the faculty member is responsible for making those materials easily accessible and understandable. Reviewers rightly expect that the one-page synoptic overview provides a key to the materials which allows them to find the evidence they seek quickly and efficiently.

b) Because this is an annual merit review, materials should cover only achievements in the last August-to-August period.

c) Each group or specific piece of evidence should be labeled and in separate labeled file folders if necessary. To avoid potential misfiling or inability to return materials to the appropriate file, faculty should clearly label each of the items he or she has included.

d) Vitae. An up-to-date vita alone should allow reviewers to see at a glance what a faculty member has already achieved and when he or she achieved it so faculty should observe

the rules of logical classification and avoid such obfuscations as representing publications, works submitted, and oral presentations in one list under one heading.

e) Self evaluation. A faculty member should supply convincing evidence for each claim he or she makes. The self evaluation is the opportunity to strengthen a case by explaining more fully matters that may be merely referred to or even omitted in a vita. This, for example, is the appropriate place to outline special efforts in teaching or service and to characterize the merit of activities. A faculty member should clearly state why an activity is meritorious and should indicate clearly achievements in each area of assigned responsibility. Faculty members are responsible for making their cases for merit to the PAC

f) Teaching. In general a faculty member can include anything he or she wishes as supporting materials to show competence or merit in teaching. Each faculty member should provide the following as part of their portfolio on teaching:

- Which classes have been taught in the reporting period indicating titles as well as course numbers. When titles do not in themselves sufficiently indicate the course's content, a brief description should be included. A faculty member may and perhaps should include syllabi, tests, assignments and the like.

- Student Evaluations. Every faculty member must include unedited student evaluations as well as the summary sheet which accompanies that set of evaluations; a faculty member should not simply remove unfavorable or less-than-favorable evaluations from the group. The Faculty Handbook is quite specific and pointed about student evaluations, and the department's rules follow those of the university. All faculty shall be rated by students at least once a year in each course they teach.

The PAC will award lower numbers in teaching to those faculty who do not turn in the required number of complete packets of student evaluations; as the Handbook says, such materials will be considered "incomplete and presumed inadequate."

- Supervision of MA reports should be reported as teaching. Indicate the student being directed, the topic, and the graduation date of the student.

- Advising should be reported as teaching.

g.) Research/Creative Endeavor.

- Publications should normally be reported in their year of acceptance. However, all credit for a publication is awarded in the year a faculty member first reports a publication.

- When reporting any publication, faculty should indicate the type of publication—book, refereed article, review, short story, poem, essay and so on. If an offprint is available, it should be included. If a piece has been accepted but an offprint is not yet available, an acceptance letter with a typewritten manuscript of that piece should be included.

- For work in progress, faculty should include a brief description of the project and be specific about what progress he or she wants credited for in a particular reporting period; the PAC needs to be able to see what work was actually done on a project in a given year's reporting period.

- Presentations should be reported in the year they are given; all credit for presentations is awarded at that time. Along with the title of the presentation, faculty should indicate the venue and date and include a written version of their remarks.

- Faculty should report any awards or distinctions earned during the year for research or creative endeavor. Because all credit for a publication or presentation is given at the time of first reporting, faculty should not report previously claimed publications or presentations unless each is in fact a new achievement of some sort. Some examples of “new” achievements related to previously reported work include newly accepted articles that were previously reported as presentations; the same (or slightly revised) presentation given in a new forum; reprints of articles, stories, poems

(though reprints do not count as much as newly accepted work, reprints are considered a mark of both quality and continued influence).

h) Service. Faculty should report brief descriptions of any relevant service to the department, university, community, state or other relevant entity. Included in this category are departmental and university committee assignments as well as any ad hoc committees or work. Included also is service to the profession such as work for literary societies, professional organizations, and so on.

4. Election of Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC) The Personnel Advisory Committee consists of four members, one from each rank within the department. At least one male and one female must be on each year's PAC. PAC members are elected to evaluate their colleagues for the previous year. No faculty member may serve more than two years on the PAC in any five-year period.

5. The Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC) Evaluation Process:

a) The PAC elects a chairperson who coordinates the evaluation process.

b) Each PAC member reads through, on his/her own, each packet of file materials submitted by faculty for the annual merit review process, evaluating each faculty member in the areas of teaching, research, and service based on the information made available in each file. Instructors may be evaluated, depending upon their job description, on teaching alone or teaching and service; instructors are not to be given research responsibilities and, therefore, are not evaluated in that area. In evaluating each colleague's file, the PAC member assigns a number from one to ten in each of the appropriate areas of responsibility. A "one" represents little or no contribution in a given area, and a "ten" represents superior achievement (for example, a published refereed book, a university-wide teaching award).

c.) The PAC meets as a group to compare individual members' numbers for each faculty member in each area in which that colleague is evaluated. In all cases, the PAC attempts to reach a consensus regarding the merit score for each faculty member in all areas in which that person is evaluated. If no consensus can be reached in a given

category of endeavor, the four scores of the individual PAC members are averaged. Members of the PAC are not present when their own files are discussed.

d) After the deliberations described in step c above are complete, the faculty member's consensus number in each area is then multiplied by his or her distribution of responsibilities percentage for that area. For example, a colleague receiving a 4 for teaching and having teaching count as 70% would receive a 2.8 in teaching for the current evaluation period. These calculations for each area in which the colleague is evaluated also appear on his/her annual evaluation.

e) After the final merit scores for all colleagues have been determined, the PAC chair divides the faculty into four groups and assigns each PAC member a group of faculty for which to write drafts of their individual evaluation summaries. After all summaries are written, at a meeting the summaries are read and discussed and finally edited by the group. In this way the narrative for each faculty member reflects the consensus judgment of the group.

f) The PAC then ranks faculty from top to bottom with the highest total merit score number at the top and the lowest at the bottom. The PAC then reconsiders each individual colleague's overall merit score to be sure it reflects the consensus judgment of the group. The final consensus number is reported to the Head.

g.) The Head is responsible for determining final rankings and for making merit recommendations to the Dean. In the event the Head changes the PAC's ranking of a colleague, this change should be reported to the PAC, in writing, by the Head and shall be reported to the colleague in the event of a grievance, in writing, by the Head.

h) Tenured faculty whose overall performance falls below the minimum accepted level of performance as defined below shall be placed in the "unsatisfactory" category. When a tenured faculty member is placed in the unsatisfactory category, the Head will indicate so in writing to the faculty member and also indicate in writing a suggested course of action to improve the performance of that faculty member. In subsequent annual evaluations the faculty member will include in his or her materials submitted for merit review a report on activities aimed at improving performance and any evidence of improvement.

i) The names of faculty members who fail to meet minimum standards the year following the Head's suggested course of action will be forwarded to the Dean, and the faculty member will be so notified. In subsequent evaluations of the faculty member by the Head, the faculty member will submit a report to the Head on activities aimed at improving performance and any evidence of improvement. Should the Head determine that for two successive evaluations or three evaluations during a five-year period minimum standards are not met, the Head will follow the administrative procedures concerning "chronic low achievement" detailed in C31.5 in the Faculty Handbook. Input regarding the situation will be obtained from the tenured faculty unless the faculty member objects. It should be noted that the outcome of following these procedures may be "dismissal for cause."

j) Minimum acceptable levels of productivity in teaching, research, and service are defined below:

Because the department has so many faculty members serving in such varied ranks and capacities, how rank may affect yearly expectations will be dealt with on an individual basis, in accordance with the Provost's policy for each faculty member to set his or her own yearly goals.

Teaching: For the period under review,

1. Faculty will provide instruction appropriate to fulfill the mission of the department.

2. Faculty will provide students with the following information for each course they teach:
 - a. what the aims or purposes of the course are,
 - b. how the course will be organized, and
 - c. how the students will be evaluated. [This last will be in writing.]

3. Faculty will meet regularly scheduled classes except for

- a. illness, accident, or attendance at professional meetings,
- b. occasional times where other forms of instruction are scheduled during, or in lieu of, class time; for example individual conferences, a film too long to be viewed during class, a workday for students to use the library.

4. Faculty will hold regularly scheduled office hours.

5. Faculty will arrange for student evaluations of teaching according to departmental and university regulations.

Research and Scholarship: For the period under review, faculty will actively pursue scholarship, which may include, but is not necessarily limited to, any of the following:

1. researching, writing, editing, and/or publishing scholarly, critical, creative, or pedagogical work,
2. presenting such work at local, state, regional, national, or international meetings, or
3. integrating the results of research or scholarship into teaching or service.

Service: For the period under review, faculty will engage in departmental, college, university, or professional service, which may include, but is not necessarily limited to, any of the following:

1. participating on departmental standing and ad hoc committees, working in a departmental administrative position, or participating in other service capacities as may be arranged with the Head of the department.
2. participating on college standing and ad hoc committees, working in a college administrative position, or participating in other service capacities as may be arranged with the Dean of the college,

3. participating on university standing and ad hoc committees, serving in the Faculty Senate, working in a university administrative position, or participating in other service capacities as may be arranged with the Provost and/or other university administrators,

4. participating as an officer, on boards, or in other ways for professional organizations, publications, or publishers, or

5. providing professionally related community service.

k) The department Head calculates the rolling averages for each faculty member to arrive at a final numerical ranking for all faculty members. Following the Snell report guidelines and decisions made in departmental meetings in 1990-1991, rolling averages are calculated so that the present year's number counts 50%, the previous year's number counts 30%, and the number from two years ago counts 20%. A particular faculty member's rolling average for the year, then, is determined by feeding into the above formula the appropriate numbers. The rolling average is also reported to the faculty member on his/her annual evaluation.

l) Each faculty member receives his/her merit evaluation for the year and is asked to return a signed copy to the Head. All faculty are given the opportunity to review and discuss their written evaluations. In cases where a colleague feels that his or her particular evaluation does not fairly represent his or her accomplishments and wishes a formal review by the PAC, the Head conveys a written request with substantiating materials to the PAC (see "Appeals of Merit Evaluation" below).

m) All evaluations (with faculty signatures), along with a description of the evaluation process and a ranked list of faculty, from top to bottom, are sent to the Dean.

5. Appeals of Merit Evaluation

a) A faculty member who wishes to question a merit evaluation should meet with the Head to review and discuss the evaluation. This review and discussion should take place within seven working days from the time the faculty member receives the annual evaluation from the Head. If, following this discussion, the faculty member wishes the PAC to reconsider the evaluation, the faculty member should submit to the Head a formal written request for a review. This written request should be received by the Head within seven working days of the Head's previous discussion with the faculty member. The faculty member's written request for PAC reconsideration of the evaluation should specify the exact nature of the reasons for appeal. Along with the review request, the faculty member should also provide any supporting documents he or she wishes the PAC

to consider in addition to the faculty member's previous PAC materials, which should still be on file with the PAC.

b) The department Head is responsible for bringing all formal appeals and supporting materials provided by the faculty member to the PAC, who will reconvene and consider each specific appeal. A written response from the PAC will be forwarded to the department Head regarding each appeal. When changes in the narrative, merit numbers, or ranking are recommended, the PAC will draft a revised version of the faculty member's evaluation. The department Head will convey in writing any changes made in a faculty member's evaluation as a result of an appeal.

c) If a faculty member feels the appealed version of his or her evaluation is acceptable, the new version is signed by the faculty member and is forwarded to the next administrative level, the Dean of Arts and Sciences. If a faculty is dissatisfied with the appealed version of the evaluation and wishes to continue the appeal, he or she should submit to the Head, statements of unresolved differences. These statements should be received by the Head within seven working days after the colleague has received the PAC's report on the appeal. All documents and supporting materials involving the appeal, plus a cover letter from the Head, are then forwarded to the Dean of Arts and Sciences.

6. Evaluation of Faculty on Sabbatical or Leave Without Pay (LWOP)

a) During the year of a sabbatical or lwop, faculty may choose between:

1. Submitting materials for evaluation of the preceding year's work according to the department's deadline, i.e. following the normal process along with all other faculty members.

2. Choosing not to turn in evaluation materials during their leave. Individuals choosing this option will receive the rolling average from their preceding three years. Individuals choosing this option but who have not been with the department for three full years will receive the averaged score for the years served to date.

b) During the year following a sabbatical or lwop, the PAC will, following section C44 of the Faculty Handbook, evaluate faculty as follows:

1. For faculty on sabbatical or leave for a portion of the year, evaluations are normally based on their performance during the period they were engaged in university assignments, adjusted proportionally to encompass the entire year. Thus, faculty taking a semester's sabbatical or leave will normally turn in materials covering the semester during which they were not on leave.

2. For faculty on sabbatical or leave for the entire year:

i. In the case where the faculty member has submitted materials for review the previous year (6.a.1.above), the rolling average evaluation for the previous three years will be the merit score for the year the faculty was on sabbatical or leave. Individuals who have not been with the department for three full years will receive the rolling average score for the years served to date.

ii. In the case where the faculty member did not submit materials for review the previous year (6.a.2 above), he/she will submit materials for evaluation of the preceding two year's work (the leave year and the year preceding) according to the department's deadline, i.e. following the normal process along with all other faculty members.

iii. If extraordinary circumstances prevail in the submission of evaluation material surrounding a leave, the faculty member may petition the department head to override the above procedures with a timetable acceptable to both parties.

Professional Performance Award

The Professional Performance Award (PPA) is a university-wide program available to faculty at the rank of Professor. As described in sections C49.1-C49.14 of the Faculty Handbook, the award is designed to reward "strong performance" of professional duties by providing a base salary increase beyond what is given in the annual evaluation process. Unlike the move from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor or Associate Professor to Professor, the PPA is not a promotion. There are no faculty members of a rank higher than the candidate who deliberate in the PPA process. Moreover, it is not a right accorded to every faculty member at the rank of Professor, nor is it granted simply for meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies.

Eligibility and Timing. An eligible candidate for a PPA must be a full-time Professor and have been in rank at least six years since promotion to Professor or since the last PPA. Eligible candidates are encouraged to discuss their candidacy in advance with the Department Head.

Criteria. As explained in section CP49.2 of the Faculty Handbook, a candidate for the PPA must show "evidence of sustained productivity" in at least the last six years before the PPA review, and such productivity "must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to Professor according to current approved departmental standards." A successful PPA candidacy in the Department of English will be marked by distinguished achievement in teaching, research, and service of the kind required for promotion to Professor (see section 3g of this document for details).

Candidate Responsibilities. A Professor who applies for a PPA review should compile and submit a file that documents his or her professional accomplishments in teaching, research, and service in accordance with the criteria outlined above. This file should be complete and submitted to the Department Head no later than October 1.

Review Procedure. The Department Head will review the candidate's PPA file and prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials in terms of the criteria outlined above, along with a recommendation for or against the award.

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. As is the case in Annual 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. A copy of the Department Head's written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate.

Submission of the PPA Review to the Dean of Arts and Sciences. Following the review and evaluation of the candidate's file, the department head will submit the following items to the Dean of Arts and Sciences:

1. A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award.
2. A copy of the Department Head's written evaluation of the candidate's qualification for the award.
3. Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation.
4. Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation.
5. The candidate's supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award.

Reappointment Process This section describes the timing, procedures, and criteria for reappointment in the Department of English. All non-tenured faculty in the Department of English are evaluated annually for reappointment.

1. **Timing.** The time frame for reappointment varies depending upon years of service:

a) non-tenured faculty in their first year at KSU are evaluated for reappointment in the spring of their first year; notice of non-reappointment must be given by March 1st.

b) non-tenured faculty in their second year at KSU are evaluated for reappointment in the fall of their second year; notice of non-reappointment must be given by December 15th.

c) non-tenured faculty with more than two years of service are evaluated in the spring of each year; notice of non-reappointment must be given by May 31st.

2. **Reappointment Procedures**

- a) **Tenure-track faculty members**

Tenure-track faculty members undergo a probationary period, normally six years, during which they accumulate a file of accomplishments that will, at the end of the period, serve as documentation for a tenure application. Each year, the candidate's file is reviewed by the tenured faculty and assessed in terms of whether or not it demonstrates cumulative progress towards tenure.

1) The department Head informs each candidate for reappointment to compile and submit documentation of his or her professional accomplishments.

2) Each non-tenured faculty member submits to the Head a file of materials to be reviewed by the department faculty members who are eligible to make recommendations to the department Head. Candidates for reappointment should submit a self-evaluation and other relevant materials as evidence of their accomplishments. Candidates for reappointment will also be expected to consult the Faculty Handbook and Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustment, Tenure and Promotion to ascertain what can be submitted for evidence of accomplishment. Copies of these documents can be found on the computer information base "Unicorn" or in the main departmental office. If a candidate is still unclear about what evidence to include in his or her reappointment materials, he or she should consult with the Head of the department.

3) The department Head makes available to all the eligible faculty members the files of each non-tenured faculty member being considered for reappointment. Though the department Head may seek input from any faculty member, votes of only tenured faculty in the department are reported to the dean. Any member of the tenured faculty may, prior to the submissions of any recommendations to the department Head, request that a candidate meet with the eligible faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate.

4) Faculty submit to the department Head their recommendations for reappointment or non-reappointment of each non-tenured faculty member.

5) The department Head forwards to the dean: a) his or her written recommendation and accompanying explanation regarding reappointment or non-reappointment, b) the candidate's complete file, and c) the majority recommendation and all written comments (unedited) of the voting faculty.

b. Regularized Instructors

Annual reappointment for regularized instructors takes place in an institutional context that warrants a procedure distinct from that of reappointing tenure-track faculty during the probationary period. These instructors are reappointed annually for as long as they are employed at this rank, and may therefore be subject to reappointment while having considerable seniority. And because these faculty members do not have research obligations, their file is not cumulative as is the case for tenure-track faculty; a file concerning a single year of an instructor's appointment, identical to the file considered for merit allocation, is generally sufficient to document the basis for reappointment in a given year. Therefore, the Personnel Advisory Committee that advises the Department

Head on annual merit will also function as a Personnel Advisory Committee for instructor reappointment.

1. After completing annual evaluation of all faculty and instructors eligible for merit, the Personnel Advisory Committee will reconsider the files for instructors for the purposes of reappointment. The committee members will submit ballots to the Department Head indicating their votes and comments. The Instructor member of the committee will not, of course, participate in judging his or her own file for this purpose; for this person, only three ballots will be submitted to the Head.

2. When PAC is finished with the reappointment files of all instructors, these files will be made available to all faculty members eligible to comment for a period of two weeks. Eligible faculty include other instructors subject to reappointment. As is the case with tenure-track faculty, all faculty members eligible to vote on instructor reappointment may request a meeting with the candidate. Note: because the duties of instructors are often quite different from those of many faculty members eligible to vote, abstention from voting in the case of instructors is considered to be a null vote, neither negative nor positive.

3. The Department Head may call a meeting on the reappointment of a given instructor if there are questions to be resolved concerning reappointment. The Department Head will not recommend non-reappointment without meeting with the faculty eligible to vote in order to discuss the reappointment case.

4. The Department Head will recommend reappointment or non-reappointment to the Dean, responding to input from the Department and providing the vote.

[The rest of the process, the extra-departmental procedure for reappointment, is explained in sections C54, C55, and C56 of the Faculty Handbook. Faculty members must be explicitly informed in writing of a decision not to renew their appointments in accordance with the Standards of Notice of Non-Reappointment (see Appendix A of the Faculty Handbook).]

3. Reappointment Criteria Faculty are evaluated for reappointment in all the areas in which they are assigned responsibility. Reappointment and recommendations are based on the faculty member's total period of service. These evaluations differ from the annual evaluation for merit salary purposes in their stress on lasting contributions, consistency of performance, and versatility.

a. Tenure-Track Faculty

1) Published Research and/or Creativity

When research or creative activity is part of the candidate's assigned responsibility, the candidate for reappointment should demonstrate commitment to and excellence in research and/or creativity. Such commitment and excellence are evidenced by the regular publication or acceptance for publication of high-quality, original manuscripts, whether authored or co-authored, and may include the following: the regular presentation of high-quality work (such as at readings and/or conferences; the publication of collections and/or editions; the procurement of grants and/or fellowships; awards for and/or the reprinting of one's work; and so forth. Other evidence of accomplishment in research and creative activity is described on pages 9-10 of Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustment, Tenure and Promotion, and candidates for reappointment should consult this resource when preparing their reappointment files. Since the field of English is composed of numerous disciplines and sub-disciplines, each of which has its own expectations and norms, and since no mathematical formula can determine the quality/quantity of the various kinds of research and/or creativity for even one of those disciplines or sub-disciplines, the department does not require a fixed quantity of scholarship and/or creativity in any one category before a candidate can be reappointed.

2) Teaching

The candidate for reappointment should demonstrate sustained excellence in and commitment to teaching. Teaching includes efforts to assist students in gaining knowledge, understanding, and proficiency, advising undergraduate students, and supervising graduate students. The kinds of evidence necessary to show such sustained excellence and commitment may include regular student and peer evaluations although other sources should be examined. Summary evaluations of teaching should include information regarding teaching effectiveness, preparation of instructional materials and syllabi, and student assessment. Faculty should provide evidence in all these areas in their reappointment materials. No one such kind of information should count for more than half of the evaluation for teaching effectiveness. Other evidence of accomplishment in teaching is described on pages 7-9 of Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustment, Tenure and Promotion, and candidates for reappointment should consult this resource when preparing their reappointment files.

3) Service

When service is part of a candidate's assigned responsibility, the candidate for reappointment should demonstrate excellence in and commitment to service. The kinds of evidence necessary to show such excellence and commitment may include regularly accepting committee assignments and successfully performing one's duties on those committees; organizing, directing, and/or participating in special meetings/seminars; advising student organizations; chairing and/or organizing conferences and/or conference sessions; participating in professionally-related community service; and so forth. Other evidence of accomplishment in service is described on pages 10-11 of Faculty

Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustment, Tenure and Promotion, and candidates for reappointment should consult this resource when preparing their reappointment files.

b. Regularized Instructors

Instructors are reappointed in accord with their assigned areas of responsibility for the year.

Promotion and Tenure This section describes the guidelines, standards, and procedures for promotion, tenure, and mid-tenure review.

1. Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure. The following guidelines mirror those of the university as proclaimed in the Faculty Handbook and Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustments, Tenure, and Promotion.

a) Tenure should be granted only to those who demonstrate individual excellence and whose expertise corresponds to the present and anticipated continuing needs of the university. Thus tenure decisions are based mainly on candidates' contribution to institutional mission. Tenure evaluation is not merely the sum of the annual merit evaluations.

b) Because institutional excellence is enhanced by faculty versatility, a faculty member who can perform outside a narrow specialty is of greater value to the institution. Recommenders should, therefore, consider a candidates' ability to function across major areas of work, i.e. teaching, research and other creative endeavors, as well as directed and non-directed service.

c) “. . . The beginning faculty member is serving a kind of internship . . . and . . . he/she may not always be the best judge of his/her own effectiveness. An occasional word of caution, advice, or encouragement from experienced colleagues can therefore be very salutary. If the time comes that the department, division, and administration conclude that his/her connections with the institution should be severed, the responsible officials of the institution should feel completely free to explain to him/her the basis of their decision. However, if reasons are given for nonreappointment, the institution does not assume the burden of demonstrating the validity of its reasons. To be sure, the faculty member may question whatever reasons are given him/her. But unlike the tenured teacher, he/she does not as a probationer have what can be considered a claim to his/her position, and it would thus seem unreasonable to compel the institution to account for this exercise of its prerogative, much less carry the burden of justifying its decision.” A junior faculty member will not, however, be given notice of non-reappointment for reasons which violate his/her academic freedom.

d) Tenure should be awarded to those who are excellent overall and who are at least adequate in every significant aspect of job performance. Behaviors that adversely affect collegiality or are chronically disruptive influence tenure decisions.

e) Because no probationary time is transferred into Kansas State University, candidates may request that they be considered for tenure and promotion at any time during the probationary period.

f) Promotion to Associate Professor. Because promotion to associate professor must confer tenure and because tenure is not given to assistant professors (effective July 1994), a positive decision of promotion to associate professor is also a positive decision for tenure. For persons appointed at the rank of assistant professor, the maximum probationary period for gaining promotion and tenure consists of six regular annual appointments. Candidates not approved for tenure during the sixth year of service will be notified by the Dean that the seventh year of appointment will constitute the terminal year of appointment.

g) Promotion to professor is based on attainment of national or international recognition in the person's academic field, as determined by peers within the discipline of English language and literature. The successful candidate for promotion must show steady attention to scholarship, with continued professional development and distinguished achievement since the last promotion. The candidate must show excellence in teaching, research or creative activity, and service. Distinguished achievement in research or creative activity consists of significant accomplishment beyond the credentials submitted for promotion to Associate Professor, and usually includes reputable publication, or acceptance, of a single-authored book since the last promotion. A candidate may instead present equivalent work that has demonstrably attained national or international reputation; the candidate must demonstrate, both to the department and to the outside reviewers, the work's equivalence. Distinguished achievement in teaching consists of demonstrated excellence in the classroom, as well as pedagogical or curricular innovation or creativity. Distinguished achievement in service consists of a record demonstrating serious commitment to the institution and the profession.

2. Standards for Tenure

Each candidate for tenure will ordinarily be judged on his or her research/creativity, teaching, and service. While the department recognizes that some overlap exists among these categories, for the sake of simplicity each will be considered separately below. In addition to meeting these criteria, all candidates will also be expected to consult the Faculty Handbook and Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustment, Tenure and Promotion for relevant standards and criteria. Copies of these can be found on the computer information base "Unicorn" or in the main departmental office.

a) Published Research and/or Creativity

The candidate must demonstrate sustained excellence in and commitment to research and/or creativity. The kinds of evidence necessary to show such sustained excellence should include the regular publication or acceptance for publication of high-quality, original manuscripts, whether authored or co-authored, and may include the following: the regular presentation of high-quality work (such as at readings and/or conferences; the publication of collections and/or editions; the procurement of grants and/or fellowships; awards for and/or the reprinting of one's work; and so forth. Since the field of English is composed of numerous disciplines and sub-disciplines, each of which has its own expectations and norms, and since no mathematical formula can determine the quality/quantity of the various kinds of research and/or creativity for even one of those disciplines or sub-disciplines, the department does not require a fixed quantity of scholarship and/or creativity in any one category before a candidate can be recommended for tenure. At the same time, however, the department believes that candidates should usually be able to accomplish research and/or creativity equivalent to the placement with respected journals and/or presses of four manuscripts before the tenure-review process begins. It will be the responsibility of each candidate to show how his or her portfolio of work achieves not only the department's standard of quantity, but its standards of excellence and consistency.

b) Teaching

The successful candidate for tenure must demonstrate sustained excellence in and commitment to teaching. Teaching includes efforts to assist students in gaining knowledge, understanding, and proficiency, advising undergraduate students, and supervising graduate students. The kinds of evidence necessary to show such sustained excellence and commitment may include regular student and peer evaluations although other sources should be examined. Such other sources may include regular student requests to direct programs of independent study and/or participate in Master's Reports, class materials, course development materials, special contributions to teaching diverse student populations, pedagogical publications and awards, evidence of subject matter mastery, and contributions to particular needs of the Department, as laid out in Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustment, Tenure and Promotion (7-9). The department does not require a fixed quantity of excellence in any one category before a candidate can be recommended for tenure; it will be the candidate's responsibility to show that his or her record of teaching achieves the department's standards of excellence and consistency.

c) Service

The successful candidate for tenure must demonstrate sustained excellence in and commitment to service. The kinds of evidence necessary to show such sustained excellence and commitment may include regularly accepting committee assignments and successfully performing one's duties on those committees; organizing, directing, and/or participating in special meetings/seminars; advising student organizations; chairing and/or organizing conferences and/or conference sessions; participating in professionally-related community service; and so forth. The department does not require a fixed

quantity of excellence in any one category before a candidate can be recommended for tenure review; it will be the candidate's responsibility to show that his or her record of service achieves the department's standards of excellence and consistency.

3. Procedures for Promotion and Tenure. The following steps in evaluating candidates for promotion and tenure follow suggestions found in the Faculty Handbook and Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustments, Tenure, and Promotion. For promotion to full professor the procedures are the same as for associate professor except that only full professors examine the candidate's file and only full professors' votes are counted.

a) When a candidate wishes to be considered for tenure and/or promotion, she or he compiles and submits a file that documents all of her or his professional accomplishments in all the assigned areas of responsibility. For assistant professors, this file is made available to all tenured faculty in the department each of whom should individually review the candidate's file. For associate professors, the file is made available to all the full professors. The department Head is responsible for making the candidate's file available in a timely manner.

b) The department Head will arrange for the candidate to be assessed by three outside reviewers who are recognized and respected professionals in the candidate's field. These external peer reviewers will be asked to assess the candidate's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion. The department Head will provide each reviewer the pertinent materials from the candidate's file and a written description of the candidate's responsibilities during the period being evaluated. Because outside reviewers are most likely to be familiar with and able to judge a candidate's research and other creative endeavors and are likely to review only that area of performance, outside reviews will be weighted accordingly.

The department Head will ask faculty, including the candidate for tenure and/or promotion, for a list of names of outside peer reviewers. The final selection of outside reviewers is, however, the department Head's responsibility. Outside reviewers should be objective; therefore, comments from a candidate's major professor or graduate school classmates may be regarded as less than persuasive and should be avoided. The outside reviewers' responses will be made available to the voting faculty members to consider in making their recommendations regarding tenure and/or promotion.

c) For assistant professors the department Head calls a meeting of the tenured faculty to discuss each individual candidate's case. Any tenured faculty member may request that a candidate meet with the tenured faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate. For associate professors the Head calls a meeting of the full professors to discuss the candidate's case. Any full professor may request that a candidate meet with the full professors to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate.

d) After the meeting(s) of the tenured (or full professor) faculty, the department Head requests written recommendations and comments including reasons for the recommendations from each tenured (or full professor) faculty member. The faculty should be aware that their recommendations and comments (unedited), along with the candidate's complete file, are forwarded to the Dean.

e) The department Head forwards a written recommendation to the dean, accompanied by the explanation of her or his judgment, as well as the vote of the appropriate faculty. All written recommendations and written comments (unedited) of the tenured (or full professor) faculty members and the candidate's complete file also are forwarded.

4. Mid-probationary review. A review more formal than annual reappointment reviews is conducted of probationary faculty members during their third year of employment (unless otherwise stated in the candidate's contract). The procedures for this review are the same as for the tenure review except that outside peer reviewers are not consulted. Faculty should include in their comments to the Head indications of whether or not they believe the person under review is on track for a positive tenure decision. All written recommendations and written comments (unedited) of the tenured (or full professor) faculty members and the candidate's complete file also are forwarded to the Dean.