

DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on December 4, 2009)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on December 4, 2009)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **December 2014**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **December 2014**

Richard Marston, Department Head

Date signed: December 9, 2009

Brian Spooner, Interim Dean

Date signed: December 10, 2009

April C. Mason, Provost and Senior Vice President

Date signed: March 13, 2011

*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
GEOGRAPHY DEPARTMENT
Calendar Year _____

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Allocation of Responsibility

Three categories of responsibility are evaluated:

- 1) Teaching and Advising (to include classroom teaching, supervision of theses and dissertations, supervision of independent study hours, and advising)
- 2) Research, and
- 3) Service

As agreed upon at the December 1, 1999 faculty meeting, the distribution of responsibility for annual evaluation will be the same for each faculty member unless a change is requested by a faculty member and agreed to in writing by the department head. The standard distribution of responsibility is 50% research, 40% teaching, and 10% service. The research responsibility may range from 30 to 70% and the teaching response may range from 20 to 60%. Usually, an increase in research allocation will be associated with external funding. The service responsibility will normally remain at 10%, unless a very strong case, such as editorship of a major journal, is presented.

Adjustments in the percentage of teaching responsibility may include a change in the number of classes offered. All faculty will teach at least one course per semester (two per academic year) and no more than three classes (or sections) per semester (six per academic year). Reductions in the number of classes offered must take into account the departmental need to ensure that required courses are offered. The department head has the responsibility of determining whether or not a change in the number of classes offered and/or a change in allocation of responsibility is in the best interest of the department, and therefore, acceptable.

Evaluation of Materials

Each member of the faculty should provide a personal resume form using the format as outlined on pages 9-11. The resume format gives each person the opportunity

to present all the information that should be considered in determining performance related to expectations and in determining faculty merit salary increases. Faculty members may wish to circulate among themselves copies of these individually completed forms.

In addition, each faculty member is encouraged to voluntarily submit any other materials that will help to evaluate their performance. Those materials may include, but are not limited to, student evaluations of teaching performance, course outlines, pending grant proposals, and reprints of publications.

Evaluation Scaling Procedures

As agreed upon at the February 25, 1998 faculty meeting, each faculty member is evaluated in each of the three categories on a continuous scale ranging between one and seven such that:

- 7 = Outstanding
- 6 = Very Good
- 5 = Good
- 4 = Average
- 3 = Minimally acceptable
- 2 = Unsatisfactory
- 1 = No Evidence of Accomplishment

Each person's ratings are weighted by category and added together. The total evaluation score establishes one's overall ranking in the department and will be used in determining merit salary increases.

University policy requires that an overall assessment of each faculty member's performance be classified as 1) exceeds expectations, 2) meets expectations, or 3) fails to meet expectations. As agreed to at the faculty meeting on December 4, 2009, scores below 2.5 reflect a failure to meet expectations. Those between 2.5 and 5.5 indicate that the faculty member meets expectations. Scores between 5.5 and 7.0 correspond with exceeding expectations.

Evaluation Discussion

Faculty members will be given the opportunity (should they desire) to discuss with the department head or evaluation committee the content of their evaluation materials, their accomplishments, concerns or any other matters that relate to their professional activities over the evaluation period. In addition, faculty members will be

asked to discuss with the head their statement of professional goals in teaching, service, and research for the upcoming evaluation period as per parts 10, 16 and 21 on the personal resume form. This conversation will take place before the evaluation is complete. Each faculty member is notified, in writing, of the head's evaluation before it is forwarded to the dean. The department head will also provide a written narrative emphasizing strengths and weaknesses for each evaluation category.

A weighted rolling average of the faculty member's overall annual evaluation calculated from the current year and the previous three years will be used as the basis for assigning merit salary increases. A weight of 40% is assigned to the current evaluation year, 30% to the previous year, 20% to the evaluation results from two years prior, and 10% to the result from three years before. For tenure-track faculty with fewer than four years of service, the assigned weights will be 100% for one year of service; 60% and 40% for two years of service; 50%, 30%, and 20% for three years of service. The annual summary score provided in the faculty evaluation report for each faculty member will be multiplied by the appropriate weighting for each year and then summed to result in a weighted average for that year's merit consideration. Faculty are told what the recommended percentage salary increase will be, once the department's allocation of salary money is confirmed by the dean.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Teaching and Advising

Areas to be evaluated in this category include classroom teaching, supervision of theses and dissertations, M.A. research reports, topic hours, problems courses, and advising.

Attributes evaluated in this category include:

- 1) ability to intellectually challenge students;
- 2) scholarly command of the subject;
- 3) facilitating student learning, interest, and appreciation for a field of study (being available to help students; taking an interest in student learning needs);
- 3) clarity and coherence of presentation; and
- 4) contribution of teaching and advising effort to the missions of the university, college, and department.

The evaluation is based upon general knowledge and observations; discussions with

advisees and other students, including exit interviews; unsolicited student concerns, complaints, and compliments; comments from peers; information on the personal resume; syllabi, examinations, and voluntary student surveys; department summaries of faculty and their advisees; and all TEVAL or IDEA evaluations conducted during the calendar year. Faculty members may include any other items in their teaching and advising portfolio.

Research

In this category, evaluation is on the basis of the preceding five years rather than on the single preceding year. As a general guideline, major emphasis is given to published scholarly books and research appearing in major academic journals. Substantial weight is given to publication in other refereed journals and grant proposals accepted for funding. Some consideration is given to book chapters and commentaries or short notes that appear in refereed publications and submitted grant proposals. Less emphasis is given to paper presentations at professional meetings, book reviews, and non-refereed papers in conference proceedings. Least weight is given to bibliographies, articles that appear in newsletters, current papers in progress, and papers yet to be accepted. Peer recognition of research contributions will also be considered. More emphasis is placed on recent accomplishments than earlier activity within the five-year evaluation window. A bibliography contained in the resume, reprints of recently published research, and copies of funded proposals provide the basis for the evaluation.

Service

Service activities include contributions to the department, college, university, and community (if professionally related), and participation in professional activities, organizations, panels, and workshops, and service-oriented grants. The evaluation takes into account the amount and quality of the professional activities, as well as the general contribution of the faculty member to the department's welfare. Significant consideration is given those activities that make an important contribution to the well being of the department, college, university, community, or profession.

PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD

The Professorial Performance Award, as discussed in section C 49 of the University Handbook, rewards strong performance at the highest rank with a base salary increase in addition to that provided for by the annual evaluation process. Criteria for the award include all of the following: 1) the candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in that 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 Department of Geography standards, outlined in Section 4.3 of the "Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment Procedures and Criteria" document.

Eligible candidates for review will compile and submit a file that documents professional accomplishments for at least the previous six years. The application file, which is due at the same time as annual evaluation materials, should consist of a cover letter requesting evaluation, copies of Annual Resumes for the evaluation period, and any other materials that the candidate wants to submit. 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.

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 has 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.

MINIMAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

All faculty members must 1) provide a competent level of instruction, 2) maintain a research program, and 3) perform service responsibilities. Each of these three areas are essential to the mission of the department.

Teaching

The Department of Geography offers bachelors, masters, and Ph.D. degrees with a limited number of faculty positions. Quality teaching is a high priority for all geography degree programs. Teaching includes classroom instruction, preparing new or revised course materials, conducting seminars, advising undergraduate and graduate students, supervising master's thesis and doctoral dissertations, overseeing independent study courses, and mentoring students outside the classroom. Although all professors teach undergraduates, masters level, and doctoral students, some may focus their efforts more on undergraduate education while others carry on a larger responsibility for graduate instruction. The faculty believes that distributing formal teaching assignments to correspond with faculty strengths should continue in the future.

Faculty are expected to:

- Maintain an up-to-date knowledge in each subject taught,
- Provide a clear and coherent style of presentation,
- Provide a learning environment that stimulates students' interest and appreciation for a field of study,
- Intellectually challenge students,
- Facilitate student learning outside the classroom,
- Achieve status as members of the Graduate Faculty,
- Meet students' academic advising needs,
- Be accessible to students during posted office hours,
- Meet classes on a regular basis or provide an alternative learning experience.

Research

The Department of Geography began the doctoral program in August 1996. Publication in major refereed journals and success in securing sponsored research grants helped to pave the way for the program approval. Every faculty member in the Department of Geography is expected to be a scholar and maintain a continuous research program. Evidence of accomplishment in research is expected in each annual reporting period.

Research activities are interpreted to include such activities as publication in peer reviewed periodicals, scholarly books, book chapters, reports in proceedings, technical reports, book reviews, research presentations at professional meetings, participating as a principle investigator or a research scientist on sponsored research grants, receipt of fellowships, and submission of grant proposals and manuscripts for review. Research programs may be oriented toward either applied or basic research and may also include philosophical, educational, or humanistic content associated with the field of geography. All members of the department are expected to have published research.

Service

Faculty members in the Department of Geography have a long history of significant contributions in service at the departmental, college, university, community, and national levels. While service outside the department is strongly encouraged and rewarded by the current faculty evaluation system, meeting expectations for service at the departmental level is considered sufficient to meet the minimal performance standard. Departmental service activities are expected from every faculty member and each is assigned specific areas of responsibility, such as:

- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| Graduate Program Committee | Lead Undergraduate |
| Advisor | |
| Environmental Geography I GTA Coordinator | GTU Advisor |
| Visiting Scholars Coordinator | Lab Coordination |
| Telefund | Instructional Equipment |
| Flower Fund | Administration of labs |
| Recorder of Faculty Meeting Minutes | Departmental Webpage |
| Employment Information Coordinator | Hallway Displays |
| Computer Equipment Maintenance | Alumni Newsletter |
| Weekly Newsletter | Graduate Program |
| Director | |
| Departmental Listservs | Advisory Board Liaison |
| University Open House Coordinator | |

These responsibilities are necessary for the function of the department and each faculty member's designated responsibility must be carried out.

Administrative Action for Chronic Low Achievement

In the areas of teaching, research, and service a score below 2.5 reflects a failure to

meet expectations. Chronic low achievement is defined as a situation when a score below 2.5 occurs for three consecutive years in the same area of responsibility. If the department head has determined that the performance of a tenured faculty member qualifies as chronic low achievement, then the following course of action will be followed.

1. The procedures as outlined in Section C-31.5 through C-31.8 of the Faculty Handbook must be followed.
2. Even if the faculty member's *overall* performance may be deemed as acceptable, this does not mean that poor performance in a substantial area of responsibility can be allowed to continue. In this situation, it is expected that the department head will outline in writing corrective measures to ensure that minimal acceptable standards be reached. A schedule will be developed for monitoring progress in the area of concern. At the same time, and subject to the requirements of the departmental mission, it may be appropriate to rearrange a faculty member's distribution of time and effort out of the area of concern. However, if the area of concern is essential for the mission of the Department, that area can not be de-emphasized in the event of poor performance. It is the position of the College of Arts and Sciences that failure to reach minimal acceptable levels of performance in an area deemed essential to the Department's mission, even after corrective measures have been prescribed will constitute unacceptable overall performance causing section C-31.5 through C-31.8 to be invoked.

The department head's assessment of whether or not a faculty member's performance is at least minimally acceptable will be based on the expectations listed above. The relationship between a person's minimal performance expectations and their professional goals in teaching, service, and research are discussed each year as part of the formal annual evaluation process.

PERSONAL RESUME

1. NAME

2. PRESENT RANK

3. ACADEMIC DEGREES

Each degree earned, year awarded, institution.

4. KSU ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT

List each rank you have held at KSU, instructor or higher, with dates. List in chronological order with current rank last.

5. OTHER ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE

List institution you have been a member of while holding rank of instructor or higher with institution's name followed by dates in residence.

TEACHING AND ADVISING

Calendar Year xxxx

6. CLASSROOM TEACHING AND CLASS PREPARATION

List courses taught, number of students enrolled, innovations and professional development activities, major course revisions, new courses prepared, etc.

7. THESES, M.A. RESEARCH REPORTS, AND DISSERTATIONS SUPERVISED

List any students whose theses, research reports, and/or dissertations were completed under your supervision during the calendar year shown above.

Also list those students for which you served as a member of their thesis or dissertation committee.

8. TOPICS AND PROBLEMS COURSES SUPERVISED

List courses, students, and nature of project (research problem, reading problem, remedial review, etc.)

9. ADVISING

Identify your advisees and discuss the manner in which you conduct advising.

10. GOALS IN TEACHING AND ADVISING FOR THE UPCOMING YEAR

Identify your personal teaching goals and objectives for the upcoming evaluation period and indicate the proportion of time you would like to devote to these

activities.

SERVICE
Calendar Year xxxx

11. DEPARTMENT SERVICE

List contributions made to the department. Include committee assignments, special projects, editorial efforts, promotional activities on campus, etc.

12. UNIVERSITY SERVICE

List University or College committees, membership on PhD examination committees for other departments, etc.

13. COMMUNITY SERVICE

Identify off-campus lectures, interviews, consultations, testimony, etc.

14. PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS ATTENDED

All meetings attended during the calendar year.

15. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Participation in professional organizations, organizing or chairing sessions, offices held, etc.

16. GOALS IN SERVICE FOR THE UPCOMING YEAR

Identify your personal service goals and objectives for the upcoming evaluation period and indicate the proportion of time you would like to devote to these activities.

RESEARCH
Calendar Years yyyy - xxxx

17. PUBLICATIONS

Please list all professional publications, during the 5 years yyyy through xxxx inclusively, and any other works, which have been unconditionally accepted for publication.

18. PRESENTATIONS AT PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS

List all the research papers you have presented orally or as posters at professional meetings during the 5 years yyyy through xxxx together with the name of the conference, date, and place.

19. RESEARCH GRANTS

For the last five years, list a) research grant proposals that have been funded or proposals that are currently accepted for funding, b) other grants such as those for travel, equipment, educational advancement etc., and c) unfunded proposals.

20. CURRENT RESEARCH

Identify current (current year only) research activities, which are intended for publication, verbal presentation at a professional meeting, or acquisition of research funds. Include papers, manuscripts, and grant proposals that are in review, work in revision, etc.

21. GOALS IN RESEARCH FOR THE UPCOMING YEAR

Identify your personal research goals and objectives for the upcoming year and indicate the proportion of time you would like to devote to these activities.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS AND ACHIEVEMENTS

Calendar Year xxx

22. List contributions or achievements not accounted for above. Please describe these contributions in the context of your professional activities.

Signed _____

Date _____

**PROMOTION, TENURE, AND REAPPOINTMENT
PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA**

**DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY**

1.0 Introduction

This document discusses the subjects of promotion, tenure, and mid-tenure review. This first section is a brief introduction and identifies faculty voting eligibility. Section 2 describes the procedures for promotion and/or tenure. Section 3 is concerned with mid-probationary review, and Section 4 describes the criteria considered and departmental evaluation standards.

1.1 Faculty Qualified to Vote on the Matters of Promotion/Tenure/Mid-Probationary Review

All faculty whose tenure home is in Geography and who hold a rank equal to or higher than the rank being considered may vote on the question of promotion; faculty who hold tenure, regardless of rank, may vote on the questions involving the awarding of tenure and mid-probationary review. If a qualified faculty member cannot be present during the discussion of the candidate's promotion/tenure/mid-probationary review document or be present on the day that the vote is recorded, the qualified faculty member may leave her/his ballot and any statement that he/she may want incorporated into the discussion summary with the Department Head prior to the meeting and/or vote.

2.0 Procedures for Promotion and/or Tenure

The University's criteria and procedures for promotion and tenure are given in Section C of the "University Handbook" (<http://www.k-state.edu/academic-services/fhbook/>). The request for a tenure evaluation at Kansas State University may be made either by the candidate submitting a written request to the Department Head by August 15 or by a majority of the tenured faculty with the concurrence of the candidate.

In the case of promotions, a request for consideration of promotion may be made either by a majority of the faculty who are qualified to vote on the promotion or by the candidate submitting a written request, which includes the candidate's list of four or more recommended external reviewers, to the Department Head by August 15. In the case of either promotion or tenure, the candidate has the right to proceed or withdraw from the process at any time. In the case of tenure decision involving the maximum probationary appointment period, the document must be forwarded.

2.1 Candidate's Responsibilities.

Faculty members are expected to contribute to the mission of the Department, the College, and the University through teaching, research, and service. As assignments and areas of expertise vary, faculty in the Department of Geography can contribute to the overall mission in diverse ways. Because this diversity makes it difficult to establish one format for the reporting of all faculty

accomplishments and contributions, it is the obligation of each faculty member to substantiate her/his particular expertise and accomplishments. Responsibility for collecting the information that demonstrates the candidate's accomplishments will be borne principally by the candidate. The candidate is encouraged to consult with the Department Head and members of the faculty concerning the content and preparation of the promotion/tenure evaluation documents.

The process for promotion/tenure evaluation begins when either the candidate expresses in writing to the Department Head her/his intention to seek promotion/tenure or the candidate accepts the recommendation of the majority of the faculty who are qualified to vote on the matter. The candidate will then prepare the portions of the promotion/tenure document that summarize her/his achievements in research, teaching, and service using the format specified by the Office of the Provost (see <http://www.ksu.edu/academicservices/forms/promotio.html>) and will include:

2.1.1 Statements by Candidate

1. Section III A: Candidate's statement of accomplishments (one page summary of why a candidate feels that she/he should be promoted/tenured).
2. Section III B: Candidate's statement of five-year goals (one page summary).

2.1.2 Instructional Contribution

1. Section IV A: Statement of activities, including: classes taught, student advisement, theses and dissertations directed, and any other evidence of instructional productivity (one-page summary).
2. Section IV B: Evidence for quality of teaching, such as student evaluations, instructional projects, awards, etc. (one page summary).
3. Section IV C: Other evidence of scholarship and creativity in instruction, such as innovative teaching methods, introduction of new courses, substantive revision of existing courses, etc. (one page summary).

2.1.3 Research Contribution

1. Section V A: Statement of research activities (one page summary).
2. Section V B: Publications, scholarly presentations, and other professional achievements for the evaluation period. Articles in press or accepted for publication may be included, if they are denoted as such. A copy of up to five of the candidate's publications will be made available for departmental review.
3. Section V C: List of grants and contracts funded during the evaluation period, including funding agency, funding level, duration, title, and collaborators. A separate list of proposals that were not funded during the evaluation period may also be supplied.

2.1.4 Service Contribution

1. Section VI: Statement of service activities (two page summary).

The candidate's statements and supporting documentation are due to the Department Head by September 1st.

2.2 Supporting Documentation

Examples of evidence that may be included are:

2.2.1 Teaching

1. List of courses taught.
2. Teaching evaluations
 - a. Standardized student evaluation forms and other student evaluations of teaching.
 - b. Other evidence of external evaluation of classroom teaching.
 - c. Evidence of self-evaluation of teaching.
3. National, regional, and local awards or recognition.
4. Information concerning the introduction of new courses and/or substantive course revision.
5. Information about advising responsibilities, methods, and level of effort.
6. Other information that demonstrates the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

2.2.2 Research

1. A copy of each manuscript (published, accepted, or submitted) that has been produced at Kansas State University and other items from the evaluation period.
2. Copies of all research proposals during the evaluation period.
3. Lists of invited and contributed presentations at scientific meetings, symposia and research seminars at universities.
4. National, regional, and local awards or recognition; copies of articles or other materials that cite or discuss the importance of the candidate's work and contributions.

2.2.3 Service

1. A summary of the candidate's activities on Department, College, and University committees.
2. A summary of the candidate's activities in international, national, regional, and local professional societies.
3. Information concerning the candidate's organization of symposia, etc.
4. Evidence of the candidate's reviews of books, papers, and research proposals.
5. Evidence of substantive service and contributions to the scientific community.
6. A summary of departmental duties performed during the probationary appointment period.

2.3 Department's Responsibilities

The Department Head will prepare a Description of Responsibilities During the Evaluation Period (as per Provost directive) to be co-signed by the Department Head and candidate at the time of initial appointment (see Section 4.2 or Section 4.3). The Department Head will coordinate with the qualified faculty acquisition of the following materials:

2.3.1 Letters from External Evaluators

The Department Head will request that the candidate and the faculty who are qualified to vote on the matter submit separate lists of potential external evaluators. The candidate's doctoral dissertation and master's thesis advisors are specifically excluded as possible evaluators. With the input of qualified faculty, the Department Head will choose the names of two evaluators from each list to perform the external reviews. If one or more of the initially chosen external evaluators should be unable or should decline to review the candidate, then the Department

Head should make a reasonable attempt in her/his selection of alternate external evaluators to keep in balance the number of external evaluators selected from the two lists. The Department Head will write the external evaluators and provide them with (1) a copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae, (2) a two- to four-page statement by the candidate discussing both professional accomplishments and near-term research plans, (3) for tenure candidates, a copy of the Description of Responsibilities During the Tenure Evaluation Period, and for candidates seeking promotion to Professor, a copy of Section 4.3 of this document (Criteria for Promotion to Professor), (4) a copy of up to five of the candidate's publications (including manuscripts "accepted" and "submitted") resulting from studies conducted during the evaluation period. Each external reviewer will be requested to: (1) evaluate the candidate's research work and accomplishments, and (2) compare the candidate with others in the same general area of research who are at a comparable career level. All solicited letters of evaluation concerning the candidate that are received must be included in the promotion/tenure document. The identities of the external evaluators will not be revealed to the candidate.

All supporting documentation provided by the candidate and external reviewer comments will be made available to the qualified faculty for a suitable time period.

2.3.2 Faculty Vote

After qualified faculty's discussion of the candidate's accomplishments, each qualified member of the faculty will complete the recommendation for reappointment form and submit it to the Department Head. The written recommendation should be submitted inside a sealed envelope. The results of the faculty vote and a summary of the written justifications will be transmitted to the candidate and the qualified faculty.

2.3.3 Report of the Department Head

The Department Head will review the candidate's promotion/tenure document and the recommendations of the faculty, and make an independent recommendation supporting or failing to support promotion/tenure of the candidate. The Department Head will explain her/his recommendation in writing to the candidate.

2.4 Appeal Procedures

If the candidate should wish to appeal the recommendation of either the faculty or the Department Head, the request for reconsideration must be made in writing by the candidate within three normal working days of the candidate's notification of the recommendation. The candidate must present to the Department Head the written arguments for reconsideration and provide any additional evidence that supports the candidate's position at that time.

If the candidate requests reconsideration of the faculty's recommendation, the Department Head will convene a meeting of the qualified faculty to consider the candidate's written arguments and additional evidence. Within one business day of the conclusion of the meeting, each qualified faculty member will submit a second, written recommendation to the Department Head. Participation in a reconsideration vote will be restricted to those members of the qualified faculty who participated in the original vote. The reconsideration recommendations of the faculty and the Department Head will be transmitted in writing to the candidate and to qualified faculty.

2.5 Forwarding Procedures

After the candidate has studied the recommendations, the candidate should decide whether or not to withdraw her/his application. If the candidate wishes to continue the process, then the promotion/tenure document is forwarded to the Dean. (In the case of a tenure decision involving the maximum probationary appointment period, the document must be forwarded.) The Department Head will include the results of the secret ballot (yes, no, abstain, and absent and not voting), a summary of the faculty's justifications, and her/his written recommendation following Section I of the promotion/tenure document. Similarly, the Dean will include her/his written recommendation when the document is forwarded to the Provost.

2.6 Schedule Summary

The following schedule should be considered as a general guide. Dates vary slightly from one year to the next. Consult the University Calendar and with the Department Head for specific dates.

August 15 th	The candidate declares her/his intent to seek promotion and/or tenure to the Department Head, provides a list of potential external reviewers, a C.V., the two-four page statement of professional accomplishments and research plans, and five sets of copies of up to five publications.
September 1 st	The candidate submits her/his portion of the promotion/tenure document to the Department Head.
October 15 th	The Department Head completes the promotion/tenure document and submits the document to qualified members of the faculty for their examination.
October 21 st	Qualified faculty and the Department Head meet to discuss the promotion/ tenure document. By the close of the next business day, each qualified faculty member forwards to the Department Head the recommendation that she or he believes to be appropriate.
October 24 th	The Department Head reports the result of the faculty vote to the faculty and adds her/his recommendation to the promotion and/or tenure document. The vote and the Department Head's recommendation are made available to the candidate.
November 1 st	Unless the file is withdrawn, the promotion and/or tenure document is forwarded to the Dean.

3.0 Mid-Probationary Review

The mid-probationary review will normally be conducted during the second semester of the probationary faculty member's third full year at Kansas State University. This review is intended to provide tenure-track faculty members with assessments of their performance by tenured faculty in their areas of research (both at Kansas State University and by external reviewers), teaching, and service; for the tenured faculty to comment on the probationary faculty member's long-range plans for research and other scholarly activities; to determine if the accomplishments and goals of the probationary faculty member are consistent with the missions and expectations of the Department; and to determine if reappointment for a fifth year of service is merited.

3.1 Candidate's Responsibilities

The procedures for mid-probationary review are similar to the review procedure for promotion and/or tenure. Outside letters of evaluation will be sought. By January 15, the probationary faculty member presents to the Department Head a list of four or more potential external reviewers, a C.V., the two-four page statement of professional accomplishments and research plans, and five sets of copies of up to five publications. By April 1, the candidate will provide documentation of her/his accomplishments in research, teaching, and service using the same format as for promotion/tenure.

In addition to Section III-B (the statement of five-year goals in teaching, research, service, and other scholarly activity), the candidate should provide an additional one- to two-page research and scholarly activities plan that specifically addresses the next three years. The research plan should be consistent with available resources and should include a discussion of the significance of the proposed work and its relationship to her/his current work. These materials will be made available to the qualified faculty.

3.2 Department's Responsibilities

The same department responsibilities followed for tenure and promotion will be followed as part of the mid-tenure review.

3.2.1 Faculty Vote

By the middle of April, tenured members of the faculty and the Department Head will meet to discuss the probationary faculty member's documents. On the first business day subsequent to the faculty's discussion of the candidate, each tenured member of the faculty will submit a written recommendation to the Department Head concerning whether or not the probationary faculty member should be appointed to a fifth year of service at Kansas State University. The results of the faculty vote and the summary of the written justifications will be transmitted to the candidate and the faculty.

3.2.2 Report of the Department Head

The Department Head will review the candidate's documents, and the recommendations of the faculty, and make an independent recommendation supporting or failing to support appointment of the candidate to the fifth year of service. The Department Head will explain her/his recommendation in writing to the candidate. As per section C92.1 of the KSU Faculty Handbook, a positive mid-probationary review does not ensure that tenure will be granted in the future; nor does a negative review necessarily mean that tenure will be denied.

3.3 Appeal Procedures

If tenured faculty and/or the Department Head should recommend that the probationary faculty member should not be re-appointed, then the probationary faculty member may appeal the decision by presenting additional evidence to the tenured faculty and/or the Department Head. All appeals within the department must be heard by the end of April.

3.4 Forwarding Procedures

The summary recommendations of the tenured faculty and the Department Head supporting or opposing reappointment of the probationary faculty member will be transmitted to the Dean by May 1st. The Department Head will include the results of the secret ballot (yes, no, abstain, and absent and not voting), the faculty's recommendation(s), and her/his written recommendation.

4.0 Criteria for Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment

4.1 Criteria for Reappointment of a Probationary Faculty Member

4.1.1 Teaching

The candidate must provide documented evidence that she/he is an effective and diligent teacher. The effective teacher will be recognized by: depth, breadth, and the importance and relevancy of the course's subject matter; effective course administration; and the ability to communicate effectively as judged by the faculty (possible classroom visitations, syllabus review, etc.) and students (acceptable teaching evaluations). Other examples of teaching effectiveness might include the successful direction of students in research or independent study; effective and diligent advisement of students; innovative instructional methods that inspire and excite the student; introduction of new courses and/or the substantive revision of existing courses and laboratories; and honors and special recognition for teaching excellence.

4.1.2 Research

By the end of the sixth semester of tenure-track service, the probationary faculty member is expected to have submitted an extramural research grant proposal (and continue to aggressively pursue extramural funding for her/his research program from one or more agencies/foundations); and to be publishing and presenting the initial results of carefully performed studies to her/his research program. Leadership roles on publications are expected.

4.1.3 Service

The probationary faculty member is expected to have participated in the normal functions of the department, to have performed service on appointed committees and for the benefit of the department, and to have rendered service to the profession by way of reviewing manuscripts, proposals, etc.

4.2 Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with Tenure

Each untenured faculty member and the Department Head sign a document, "Description of Responsibilities During the Tenure Evaluation Period," that discusses the criteria for tenure. The following text is taken verbatim from the document, "Description of Responsibilities During the Tenure Evaluation Period:"

It is the responsibility of the tenure-seeking faculty member in Geography to offer high quality instruction, contribute new knowledge and ideas through creative activity and original scholarly research, and perform professional service to the discipline, the university, and the department. The candidate must demonstrate expertise and research productivity in her/his area of specialty. The granting of tenure is based on sustained achievements that identify the candidate for tenure as being a leader in her/his field, or as having demonstrated substantial potential for becoming so. Tenure will not be granted simply as a result of routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies.

For tenure, the candidate must demonstrate significant professional accomplishment and excellence in the performance of the assigned duties, including service (10 *percent*), teaching (40 *percent*), and research (50 *percent*). The promise of continued professional growth is especially important in the tenure decision. Public and institutional service and professional activities are factors in the total evaluation of the candidate for tenure, although these are of less significance relative to the research and teaching. The candidate has the responsibility for providing service and leadership to geography or the candidate's specialty within geography, or to make knowledge and ideas available to the public.

In teaching, the candidate must provide documented evidence that she/he is an effective and diligent teacher. Effective teaching is based on sound scholarship, continued intellectual growth, the ability to communicate effectively, concern for students as individuals, and academic integrity. The candidate should demonstrate

- 1) substantive, content-based instruction;
- 2) ability to organize materials and present them clearly and logically;
- 3) ability to arouse curiosity and stimulate creativity in students;
- 4) diligence and skill in advising students;
- 5) formal supervision of students (thesis, topics, problems courses); and
- 6) constructive informal interaction with students outside the classroom.

In research, there should be convincing evidence that the candidate has developed a record of independence, has established a pattern of productivity, and is building a strong national reputation in her/his area of expertise. The candidate's research record will be judged for its quality, quantity, and consistency. Peer-reviewed, research oriented publications important to geographers will be emphasized. For collaborative publication efforts, there must be a written indication of the candidate's contribution. Extramural funding of the candidate's activities will be viewed favorably.

The University uses an extended trial period to allow the candidate to perform and grow as a faculty member. To be selected for tenure, the candidate must demonstrate that she/he is among the best-qualified members of the profession based on the qualitative standards of others in her/his area of specialization within the discipline of geography.

4.3 Criteria for Promotion to Professor

4.3.1 Teaching

The candidate must provide documented evidence that she/he is an effective and diligent teacher. This includes both course content and the ability to communicate as judged by the faculty and the current students (acceptable teaching evaluations). Other evidence for the quality of teaching might include: specific awards for teaching; improvements in the instructional program via the successful acquisition of extramural grants for instructional equipment, etc.; course initiation and major revision of existing courses; successful innovations in teaching methods; effective counseling and advising of students; direction of graduate thesis and dissertation research; and the achievements of former

students.

The candidate should be effective in both graduate and undergraduate teaching; however, it may be expected that some persons may be better at one than the other. An important criterion will be the candidate's potential to sustain a life-long, high-quality teaching career.

4.3.2 Research

The candidate must have established and maintained a research program that has earned international or outstanding national recognition in the candidate's area of specialty within the discipline of geography and is acknowledged by leading authorities in the field.

A sustained level of publication of the candidate's research findings in high-quality, refereed journals or through scholarly books is required. It must be clearly evident to the faculty and the external evaluators that the habit has been firmly established of consistent publication of carefully performed work in leading journals or books. Published papers, review articles, and book reviews will be included in the evaluation. It is also expected that the candidate's work has been presented frequently in lectures and papers at other institutions and scholarly meetings.

Other evidence for the quality of research might include: an ability to obtain extramural funding to support her/his research program; national, regional, and local awards; the achievements of the candidate's former students; and the utilization of a sabbatical leave or leave of absence to enhance her/his research program.

4.3.3 Service

The candidate for full professor should have sustained record of service to the Department. The candidate for full professor is expected to have demonstrated leadership ability. Evidence of leadership might include: service on department and university policy making and personnel selection committees, and substantive contributions in the development and promotion of research and teaching programs.

Professional service should include participation in the activities of professional societies, including their leadership; organizing symposia or meetings; reviewing research proposals, papers, or books.