

DEPARTMENT OF MODERN LANGUAGES

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on 11/09/2012)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on 11/09/2012)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **11/09/2017**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **11/09/2017**

Salvador A. Oropesa, Department Head
Date signed: 11/12/2012

Peter Dorhout, Dean
Date signed: 11/12/2012

April C. Mason, Provost and Senior Vice President
Date signed: 11/27/2012

**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.*

Personnel Document - Department of Modern Languages
Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion & Annual Evaluation Procedures and Criteria
Revised: November 9, 2012

PART I: Personnel Committee, Reappointment, Annual Evaluation, Chronic Low Achievement, Professorial Award

I. Introduction

The following document outlines the basic procedures regarding appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion and salary adjustments in the Department of Modern Languages. It complements the current version of the *University Handbook*, and it also defines in general terms the categories of professional responsibility (teaching, research, creative endeavor, public and institutional and professional activities). In some instances, it provides examples of appropriate activities; such examples are not intended to be exhaustive. The policies and procedures outlined in this document are designed to allow faculty members as much leeway as possible in utilizing fully their particular talents and to provide ample opportunity for them to submit information to the Head, the Personnel Committee and the Promotion Committee so that equitable and fair judgments of their professional contributions can be made.

Kansas State University is a research university. The Department of Modern Languages has both undergraduate and graduate programs. Thus, research is to be considered as a normal part of all faculty members' duties. Five classes a year is accepted as a normal teaching load.

NB: Before voting on matters concerning the Personnel Document, appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion, the Head will call a faculty meeting in accordance with the policies of the *University Handbook*. Voting by proxy is allowed only on departmental policy matters and with written authorization. Voting for the election of the Personnel Committee will be carried out by secret ballots distributed at the meeting.

II. Personnel Committee

The Personnel Committee of the Department of Modern Languages shall be composed of three members, one each from the French, German, and Spanish sections. No faculty member may serve more than two consecutive years on the committee. When a Personnel Committee member completes two consecutive years of service that person becomes ineligible to be a candidate in the subsequent Personnel Committee selection. Elections shall be held in the fall semester; terms shall begin on January 1.

In order to assure continuity on the Personnel Committee, one member will serve a two-year term. To accomplish this, after the two new members are selected, a second secret ballot will be held to select the person who will serve the two-year term, becoming chair of the Committee in the second year.

To mitigate inequities in salary, the Personnel Committee should review faculty salaries at least every five years (in years ending in zero and five) and suggest equity adjustments if warranted.

The Personnel Committee will also function as the Departmental Committee on Planning.

III. Appointment Procedures

The Department Head will form search committees in consultation with the faculty. Search committee members will be drawn from faculty of Modern Languages and from other departments as needed. A student may be asked to serve on search committees per recommendation and approval of the tenured faculty members serving on the committee. The Search Committee, in consultation with the Head, will be responsible for collecting vitae and other pertinent materials, evaluating them, and making a recommendation to the faculty concerning the candidates. As part of the search process, faculty members of the Department will make a recommendation to the Head. Before submitting a recommendation to the Dean, the Head shall explain his or her decision to all faculty in written form.

IV. Reappointment Procedures

The Head of the Department will collect from each non-tenured faculty member being considered for reappointment all appropriate materials. This will occur according to the calendar established by the Dean of Arts & Sciences. Materials will consist of:

- 1) Student evaluation of all courses taught at K-State
- 2) Evidence of research activity (books, articles, proceedings, papers presented at professional conferences, chairing or moderating at professional meetings, etc.)
- 3) Evidence of service (departmental or university committees, contributions to professional organizations, etc.)

Once such materials have been collected, they will be held for a minimum of fourteen days in the departmental office for evaluation by those faculty members with tenure. The department Head and the eligible faculty will meet at least fourteen calendar days after the review documents are made available, to discuss the candidate's eligibility for reappointment and progress toward tenure. The Head may solicit informal advice from non-tenured faculty members. Each tenured faculty member will indicate a positive or negative recommendation to the Head, who, in turn, will submit his or her recommendation to the Dean. Before submitting the recommendation to the Dean, the Head's written recommendation and accompanying explanations alone will be made available to the candidate.

Criteria for Reappointment of a Probationary Faculty Member

Teaching Effectiveness and Instructional Support:

The faculty member should demonstrate evidence of strong teaching skills and effectiveness as suggested by ratings by students, course syllabi, narrative descriptions, and other means. In addition to the appropriateness of the depth and breadth of the faculty member's course to the experience and skill level of the students, other examples of relevant factors are good course administration and the ability to communicate well. Additional indicators of teaching effectiveness might include the successful direction of students in research or independent study, effective and diligent advising, the introduction of new and/or revised courses, or teaching awards or special recognition.

Faculty with special responsibilities as coordinators of basic language programs in their sections shall have this contribution taken into account. The Head shall consult other faculty members and graduate teaching assistants in order to assess the quality of the supervision.

Research:

There should be evidence of ongoing research activity through, for example, the preparation and submission of scholarly articles, ongoing work on more extensive manuscripts, the presentation of papers or workshops at professional conferences, and the publication of book reviews. Although there is no quota on research output from one year to the next, it is expected that the candidate should demonstrate the potential to meet the standards for promotion with tenure at the end of the probationary period.

Service:

The probationary faculty member is expected to have participated in the normal functioning of the Department, to have performed service on appointed committees at the departmental or university levels, and to have rendered service to the profession through involvement in professional organizations, and activities.

V. Annual Evaluation of Faculty Members

Faculty members must meet once a year with the Head of the Department at the beginning of the upcoming evaluation period to discuss:

- 1) The most recent evaluation (if the faculty member so desires).
- 2) The goals in teaching, research, and service for the upcoming evaluation period.

It is expected that the previous year's statement will be considered during the annual evaluation and goal-setting process.

Materials evaluated for the calendar year shall reflect the faculty member's contributions in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Faculty members who have been on leave or sabbatical for one semester will submit student evaluation of two courses (or three if one course has fewer than seven students). The evaluation of the research and service categories will follow the normal procedure. In the event that the faculty member is on sabbatical or leave of absence for an entire evaluation period, teaching and service will be figured by taking the average of the performance in those categories from the previous three evaluations. The evaluation of the research category will follow the normal procedure. A faculty member may request, subject to the concurrence of the Department Head, that the total evaluation be figured from the three previous evaluations. These materials shall be presented to the Personnel Committee on a Departmental Activities Sheet which may be accompanied by a narrative (see suggestion on the following pages).

Faculty members on phased retirement are expected to remain active and continue working towards the goals of the Department. Consequently their yearly evaluation will cover the areas of teaching, research, and service to a level commensurate with the terms of their contract and the mission of the Department. At the discretion of the Head, the minimums/maximums for each category can be adjusted so as to correspond to the faculty member's duties and responsibilities. Faculty members on phased retirement will submit their evaluation material to the Personnel Committee as stipulated in the Personnel Document.

Based upon the recommendation of the Personnel Committee and subsequent discussions, the Head shall write for the individual faculty member an evaluation in which that person's accomplishments will be rated on a scale that includes the categories of Excellent, Very Good, Good, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory. The Head's letter shall mention any significant achievement of the faculty member during the evaluation period under review. Such achievements may include a special reward or recognition or extraordinary service to the department, the university, the profession, or the community. At the discretion of the Head and upon recommendation of the Personnel Committee, this extraordinary achievement may be recognized by a higher rating in the relevant category. This evaluation will be used as the basis for recommended salary adjustments for the next academic year. The percentage raise for all faculty members in a given category shall be approximately the same. Not all categories must be filled.

Weighing Scale

	<u>Teaching</u>	<u>Research</u>	<u>Service</u>
Maximum	60	45	25
Minimum	40	25	10

The faculty member may choose a weighting within the limits of the maximum and minimum figures in five-point increments. In special circumstances, for example when the faculty member has a teaching load of fewer than four courses, the Head and the faculty member, with the concurrence of the Personnel Committee, may agree on a different scale. The total must equal 100 points.

Example:

	<u>Teaching</u>	<u>Research</u>	<u>Service</u>
Professor X	60	25	15
Professor Y	40	40	20
Professor Z	50	25	25

Faculty members recognize that the highest level in each category demonstrates substantially more work than normal and a higher quality of contribution in that area. In research it represents a greater volume and quality of scholarship. Faculty with special responsibilities as coordinators of basic language programs in their sections shall

have this contribution taken into account. The Head shall consult other faculty members and graduate teaching assistants in order to assess the quality of the supervision. Faculty members who receive a reduction in teaching load to coordinate the basic language programs may still specify a weighting factor for teaching up to 50%.

To encourage faculty members to present most fully their professional contributions to the Department, this document attempts to outline the various categories of professional work. The following lists are not exhaustive. Faculty members should feel free to submit additional information beyond what is required and supportive materials. The lists are meant merely as guides.

A. Teaching and Instructional Support

For the purpose of annual review and the determination of merit increases in teaching, tenured and non-tenured faculty members who teach six courses shall submit four annual course evaluations; those who teach five courses shall submit three annual evaluations; those who teach four classes, three classes, or two classes shall submit two. These evaluations will use the TEVAL form. Any evaluation submitted must represent at least 75% student participation. In the event of an evaluation submitted with less than 75%, an additional evaluation must be submitted.

If one of the classes has fewer than 7 students, the faculty member must submit another evaluation with six or more respondents. In the event that this requirement cannot be met, evaluations from each class must be submitted. If a faculty member wishes to include more than the required evaluations in the average obtained for student evaluation of teaching, she or he may do so as long as said evaluations represent at least 75% participation by students and the courses are part of the faculty member's regular course load. Summer teaching evaluations may be included in the annual evaluation materials; however summer course evaluations cannot substitute for a regular semester course evaluation. All minimum enrollment requirements still apply.

The maximum weighting factor in teaching shall normally not exceed 10% times the number of courses taught. However, under exceptional circumstances as noted below, an additional 5% may be added to the weight for teaching on agreement with the Head and the faculty member to reflect the special duties of the latter during that year. For example, if a faculty member teaches at least five courses in a calendar year (counting only regular load classes), exceptional circumstances may include: 1) a large total number of students in a given year, and 2) the difficulties inherent in the preparation and evaluation of the large classes. To receive this additional 5%, the faculty member must submit an additional course evaluation and supporting documentation. Faculty who teach two or three courses must negotiate the weighting factors for the research and service categories with the Head at the beginning of the spring semester.

TEVALS

The rating obtained from the current TEVAL forms for overall teaching effectiveness (RAW score) will correspond to 80% of the teaching evaluation.

A set of additional tabulated, department-specific questions will correspond to 10%. The instructor will include the proposed departmental questions in the TEVAL. For each question students will assign a number, 1 to 5, from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

The department-specific questions are:

- .1. The instructor encouraged the use of the target language in class.
- .2. The course promoted proficiency in the target language.
- .3. The course promoted awareness of cultures where the target language is spoken.
- .4. The course promoted critical thinking.
- .5. The course promoted student creativity.
- .6. The number of assignments (exams, compositions, and other graded work) was appropriate to the level

of the class.

.7. The difficulty of assignments (exams, compositions, and other graded work) was appropriate to the level of the class.

.8. Assignments (exams, compositions, and other graded work) were relevant to course goals.

.9. Assignments (exams, compositions, and other graded work) helped me learn the material in this course.

.10. The instructor maintained class focus.

.11. The instructor was approachable.

.12. The instructor was responsive to student needs.

All twelve questions must be included on the departmental section of the TEVAL. Every student in the class will receive a copy of the questions in this order. For specific courses approved to be taught in English, the instructor may opt to choose "N/A" on questions 1 and 2. The average score for these twelve questions will be taken to determine 10% of the teaching evaluation.

Additional material will correspond to 10% of the overall teaching evaluation as established in the Personnel Document.

Faculty members may include additional questions on the TEVAL form. For multiple-section courses, faculty members should agree on using the same additional questions.

The numerical scale for this category shall be as follows:

Excellent	4.25-5.00
Very Good	3.75-4.24
Good	3.25-3.74
Satisfactory	2.75-3.24
Unsatisfactory	0.00-2.74

The faculty should list on the Departmental Activities Sheet all courses taught. In addition, the number of students in each class and the TEVAL response rate should be noted. Faculty members may also note any special circumstances or responsibilities.

For example:

- Large 700-level classes (12 or more).
- Large undergraduate classes (23 or more).
- Large total of students.
- Major responsibility for multiple sections.
- TELEbridge or TELEnet courses.
- New courses.
- Supervision of teaching assistants.
- Conducting additional help sessions.
- M.A. theses.
- Special studies, problems courses.

The Personnel Committee and the Head may add up to a maximum of 0.2 points to the teaching evaluation to recognize special responsibilities or circumstances in teaching.

Faculty must submit a statement of at most two pages describing the methods used in their courses, the special problems presented by their courses during the evaluation year, the problems encountered the last time the course was taught (if applicable), and the changes in teaching and methods adopted to deal with problems. Each year the Personnel Committee will devise criteria for evaluating these statements, will rate them on a five-point scale, and will combine the results with the results of student course evaluations, weighing the statements 10%, the student

course evaluations on the TEVAL 80%, and the Departmental TEVAL questions 10%. Faculty may submit additional materials optionally if they feel such materials might be useful in illuminating problems encountered or in justifying requests for recognition of special circumstances related to teaching.

Some examples are:

1. Brief description of method of presentation including statement of purpose for the course.
2. The major points of the course.
3. Tests, student papers, student portfolios, and student presentations.
4. Syllabi.
5. Information on awards won by students.
6. MLA theses supervised during evaluation year.
7. Statements of teaching philosophy.
8. Peer course observations and evaluations.
9. An explanation in case of a disagreement with the student evaluation of the course.
10. Reference to recent development in the field which were utilized.

B. Research

For effective teaching, faculty members must be conversant with the latest research findings in their field in order to provide students with the most authoritative information and criticism available. They should also be familiar with pedagogical developments in the field of teaching language and literatures.

In the area of research, the following standards will apply:

Excellent	4.25-5.00	acceptance or publication of a scholarly book, or the acceptance or publication of two or more articles
Very Good	3.75-4.24	acceptance or publication of <u>one</u> article
Good	3.25-3.74	papers presented at scholarly meetings, several critical reviews
Satisfactory	2.75-3.24	book reviews
Evidence of scholarly activity	1.00-2.74	documented research for an article, writing research grants
Unsatisfactory	0.00	no scholarly activity documented

Consideration of publication venue and length will permit a more accurate evaluation of accomplishments for each individual.

The Personnel Committee will make every effort to guarantee consistency in each of these judgments.

Some examples of research activities are:

- Books
- Articles accepted in refereed journals
- Papers presented at professional conferences
- Translations
- Critical anthologies
- Annotated bibliographies
- Book reviews
- Organizing panels and chairing sections at conferences
- Ongoing research

- Grants received
- Grant Proposals

If faculty members so desire, they may submit a narrative description of their research projects. For example, they may wish to consider the following:

- 1) Has the research suggested further avenues of study?
- 2) Has it changed, modified, or enhanced the direction of the faculty member's theoretical position?
- 3) Does the research have special significance for the field?
- 4) Have colleagues here or elsewhere commented on the research?
- 5) If it is ongoing research, at what stage is it? What are the plans regarding publication? Will the research appear in leading publication venues?
- 6) If the work in progress is not for publication or to be read as a paper at a professional meeting, what bearing does it have on the faculty member's professional duties?

Credit for book: a faculty member may declare ongoing research for a book on the annual evaluation for the maximum period of five years at satisfactory ranking (2.75). During this period, clear and concrete evidence such as completed chapters is required before credit can be allotted. Once the project is published, an additional three years of excellent (4.25) will be awarded. The faculty member can enhance that rating through evidence of other scholarly activity. Dissertations published as books will receive three years of excellent rating (4.25) but no credit will be granted for ongoing research.

The term "book" means a scholarly monograph in the faculty member's area of expertise. Co-authored books and book-length belletristic works will be considered at the discretion of and after prior consultation with the Head. Critical editions, edited collections, and bibliographies, annotated or not, will not be counted as books. In addition, collections of previously published articles and publications from vanity presses will not be considered as books.

In order to receive credit for research, faculty members must submit letters of acceptance and copies of chapters, articles, or book reviews. Letters from colleagues commenting about specific research will also be useful.

Faculty members may begin to claim credit for published research anytime between the year of acceptance and one year after it appears in print.

Credit for work in progress on an article can count for one year only. No credit for an ongoing book or article will be granted unless at least one article has been published by the individual within the last three years.

C. Service

Excellent	4.25-5.00
Very Good	3.75-4.24
Good	3.25-3.74
Satisfactory	2.75-3.24
Unsatisfactory	0.00-2.74

Excellent: outstanding contributions to section and department in addition to extensive contributions to one or more additional areas (university, profession, community); or extensive contributions to section and department as well as outstanding contributions to one or more additional areas.

Very Good: extensive contributions to section and department as well as significant contributions to one or more additional areas (university, profession, community).

Good: contributions beyond minimal in section and department (major contributions, initiatives, committees) as well as service to at least one additional area (university, profession, or community).

Satisfactory: minimal, proportionate service at section and departmental level (holding required number of office hours, proportionate advising of majors and/or graduate students, assisting with visiting scholars or students, attendance at meetings).

Unsatisfactory: less than minimal service.

Some examples of service activities are:

I. Section & Department:

- Proportionate share of responsibilities (office hours, advising of majors and for study abroad, meeting with students, regular attendance at meetings) in section and department
- Committees in section or department
- MA or Ph.D. committees
- Leading contributions in section (undergraduate or graduate advising, section head, scheduling, club advisor) and department
- Initiatives in section (organization of student events, departmental events, lectures, curricular proposals/reform, recruitment, etc) and department
- Organizing of departmental efforts in university initiatives (Open House, Majors Fair, Study Abroad Fair, All-University campaign, United Way, etc.)
- STTCL
- Search committees
- Student-centered activities

II. University or College:

- Interdisciplinary program committees
- University projects or partnerships
- Search committees and other committees
- Fund-raising

III. Profession:

- Service on the board of a journal or organizations
- Advanced placement reader
- Editorial service
- Evaluation of scholarly manuscripts, conference abstracts, or instructional materials
- Service at professional meetings (organizing panels, conferences, sessions, moderating, etc)
- Promotion reviews

IV. Community

In this category the following points may be considered:

- 1) How much work was involved in each activity and what was the quality of the work?
- 2) What was the significance and extent of the participation?
- 3) Has the activity provided valuable experience and/or contributed to the understanding of the profession?
- 4) How has this activity contributed to the Department, the University, the profession or the community?

A Note on the Criteria and Standards for the Annual Evaluation

Teaching effectiveness is evaluated according to TEVAL ratings as indicated in this document and in recognition of special circumstances. For the categories of Research and Service we have agreed to use a numerical scale modeled on the TEVAL form to evaluate relative success and productivity during the evaluation year. Relative success in research standards is defined on page 6 in this section. Service contributions are evaluated in terms of their relative importance to the Department, the University, and the profession and according to the distribution of responsibilities in teaching, research, and service for each individual. A careful comparison is made of the service contributions and overall assignments of each person in order to determine the relative level of performance in this category. The rating of Excellent represents a wide range of important service activities. A Satisfactory rating implies that

minimal service was performed during the calendar year.

VI. Minimum Standards for Retention of Tenure (Chronic Low Achievement)

Because the Department has faculty members serving in varied ranks and capacities in the various languages taught, how rank may affect yearly expectations will be dealt with on an individual basis in accordance with the Provost's policy requiring each faculty member to set his or her own yearly goals. In all of the following categories, the Department assumes that each tenured faculty member will uphold high standards of professional honesty and integrity in each category. If a tenured faculty member receives a rating of unsatisfactory in teaching, research or service for two consecutive years or three out of five years, this will constitute evidence of chronic low achievement and warrant consideration for dismissal for cause.

For further clarification of the purpose of minimum standards and their use, consult the *University Handbook*, Section C31.5 - 31.8.

A. Teaching and Instructional Support

1. Faculty will provide instruction appropriate to the mission of the department.
2. Faculty will provide students with the following information in writing for each course they teach:
 - a. what the aims or purpose of the course are
 - b. how the course will be organized
 - c. how the students will be evaluated (including the effect of absences on their grades)
3. Faculty will meet scheduled classes regularly 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 a reasonable number of regularly scheduled office hours at times convenient to students.
5. Faculty will arrange for student evaluation of teaching in accordance with departmental, college, and university regulations.
6. The evaluation of teaching must not fall into the unsatisfactory category as defined in the Department's Personnel Document.

B. Research and Scholarship

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

1. Research, writing, critical editing that results in sole-edited or co-edited book, writing reviews, translating and/or publishing scholarly, critical, creative or pedagogical work related to the mission of the department.
2. Presenting such work at local, state, regional, national, or international meetings
3. Integrating the results of research or scholarship into teaching or service
4. The evaluation of research must not fall into the unsatisfactory category as defined in the Department's Personnel Document.

C. Service

For each evaluation period, faculty will be active participants in the ongoing activities and business of their respective sections and the Department. Additionally, faculty will engage in other 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 administration of the College.
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 administration of the University.
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 in professional organizations, and assisting journals and publishers or academic on-line lists.

D. Procedure for Appealing an Overall Rating of Unsatisfactory

In the event that a faculty member receives an overall rating of unsatisfactory, the faculty member may appeal said rating to the General Faculty Grievance Board, following the procedures outlined in Appendix G in the *University Handbook*.

E. Procedures for the Annual Evaluation of Newly Appointed Faculty Members

- 1) Newly appointed faculty members with no formal academic experiences at the assistant professor level or above shall be evaluated only on the basis of teaching for the first semester of their initial appointment.
- 2) Newly hired faculty members with prior formal teaching experience at the assistant professor level or above shall be treated as regular faculty for purpose of annual evaluations.

Based upon the recommendation of the Personnel Committee and subsequent discussions, the Head shall write the individual faculty member's letter of recommendation for salary adjustment to the Dean, as prescribed in the current University Handbook. Before submitting the letter of recommendation to the Dean, each faculty member shall receive a copy of the letter, and shall have the opportunity to discuss the recommendation with the Head. The following categories will be used to indicate the faculty member's contribution to the Department: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory. The percentage raise for all faculty members in a given category shall be approximately the same, and not all categories must be filled.

VII. Annual Evaluation of Part-Time Faculty

Once a year, normally in the spring semester, the Head shall meet with each part-time instructor to review the teaching evaluations from the prior year and other matters pertaining to the individual's teaching. Accordingly, each part-time instructor should have every class evaluated by students using the TEVAL form prepared by the Office of Educational Resource.

VIII. Mid-Probationary Review: Procedures

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

The procedure for mid-probationary review will be similar to the review procedure for promotion and/or tenure, and

will be consistent with procedures outlined in the current version of the University Handbook. The format to be followed and the types of evidence to be provided will be the same as those for tenure/promotion. In addition to the documentation above, the faculty member should submit a three-year research and scholarly activities plan.

As stated in Section C92.1 of the K-State *University Handbook*, a positive mid-probationary review does not ensure that tenure will not be granted in the future, nor does a negative review necessarily mean that tenure will be denied.

Mid-Probationary Review: Criteria

It is expected that the candidate demonstrate evidence of being on-track towards promotion toward the rank of associate professor at the end of the probationary period. Such evidence would include the documentation of effective teaching, published research, and a record of satisfactory departmental and professional service.

IX. Professorial Performance Award

The minimum criteria for these awards are:

1. The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in rank 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.
3. The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to the current approved departmental standards (please see p. 12).

The faculty must notify the Department Head that she or he wishes to be considered for this award on or before January. At that time the candidate will gather a file which includes:

1. A letter requesting that she or he is considered for the Professorial Performance Award.
2. A current CV.

The Personnel Committee or the Head may ask questions relating to the professor's performance before a decision is reached.

The Head, in consultation with the Personnel Committee, will subsequently make an appropriate recommendation to the Dean. The candidate will have the opportunity to discuss the Head's written evaluation and recommendation. In the case of a negative recommendation, the candidate may make a written appeal to the Head and the Dean. This must be done within seven working days of the initial discussion.

PART II: Tenure and Promotion

I. Tenure Procedures

The Head shall collect all pertinent materials from the faculty member being considered for tenure. These will include a summary of his or her achievements and plans in research, teaching, and service in the format specified by the Office of the Provost. The faculty member seeking tenure shall compile detailed information for each of the years employed at K-State in the following areas:

- 1) Teaching: The faculty member must submit all student evaluations for courses taught during the probationary period at K-State.
- 2) Research: All publications, papers presented, panels and meetings chaired, and other research activity.
- 3) Service: Evidence of all service contributions to the Department, University, and the profession.

Evaluation of the candidate's dossier by recognized scholars in the candidate's area of expertise from institutions

other than K-State are an essential part of this file. The following procedures will be used to select outside reviewers. The candidate will provide a list of five names. The Head will choose two outside evaluators from this list. Similarly, the Head in consultation with members of the candidate's section and other scholars will prepare a list of five names of potential evaluators. The candidate will have the right to delete any two of the five names. A total of at least four letters will be required, two from each list, except that if the candidate and the Head mutually agree on one or more names, the total number of evaluators may be limited to three. The outside evaluators must be associate or full professors. Should someone from the approved list decline the request to serve as an outside evaluator, another name from the two lists will be selected in the manner prescribed above until the requisite number of evaluators is obtained. If additional names on the list are required, they will be submitted by the candidate and the Head in equal number. Should the Head determine that there is a need for more than a total of four reviewers, the candidate has the right to select the same number of additional reviewers as the Head. All tenured faculty members will be asked to review the complete dossier and to make their recommendation to the Head. Before submitting the recommendation to the Dean, the Head shall explain his or her decision to the candidate and to the tenured faculty.

II. Promotion Procedures

Promotion is an acknowledgment of continued intellectual contribution to the Department, the University, and the Profession. For that reason candidates for promotion will be judged of their accomplishments while at K-State. Any faculty member may make in writing nominations for promotion to any rank. Faculty members may also nominate themselves. Such nominations should be made to the Head.

Candidates shall submit materials which contain all pertinent information about their teaching, research, and service efforts at K-State and, if appropriate, at other institutions. These materials shall be supplemented by letters from outside evaluators. The procedures shall be the same as those indicated above for tenure decisions, including the system by which outside reviewers are chosen. The evaluation and recommendation by the Head and the faculty shall be consistent with the guidelines of the current edition of the University Handbook. Before submitting a recommendation on promotion to the Dean, the Head shall communicate his or her decision to the faculty member seeking promotion and to the faculty entitled to vote on the candidate's application for promotion.

III. Promotion Criteria

A. Promotion to Assistant Professor

1. Teaching: Demonstration of an average rating of Very Good to Excellent in teaching.
2. Research: Demonstration of a program of research. Research may be on pedagogy, literary theory, practical criticism, or the theory and practice of translation and should be in refereed journals in the appropriate language, critical reviews, and papers presented at conferences are examples of material that would count as research.
3. Service: Demonstration of a fair and reasonable amount of service to the department.
4. Completion of the Ph.D. in the appropriate subject area.

B. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

The guidelines below are the minimal standards necessary for consideration for the rank of associate professor. Meeting the minimum standards does not in itself guarantee promotion.

1. Teaching: Demonstration of outstanding teaching since the last promotion (sustained ratings of Very Good to Excellent). This is measured by student evaluations, the extent to which the candidate has contributed to the teaching mission of the section, the intellectual rigor of his or her courses, special teaching awards, pedagogical innovations, and similar considerations.
2. Research/Creative Endeavor: Substantial achievement in an ongoing research program since the last promotion. The minimum expectation is at least four single-authored, peer-reviewed articles, essays in a collection, book chapters, or other evidence of scholarly activity (see pages 6-7). However, the candidate may include in this total, in consultation with the department head,

collaborative or belletristic published work that is also peer-reviewed. The research may be carried out in theoretical or practical criticism, pedagogy, language acquisition, or linguistics in the candidate's area of expertise.

3. Service: Demonstration of a fair and reasonable amount of service to the department. In addition, substantial service outside the department, for example, to the college, to the university, to the profession, or to the community, is expected. This means that the candidate has regularly and willingly accepted service assignments and successfully performed his or her duties.

C. Promotion to Professor

The rank of professor presupposes a superior record in all three areas of faculty activity. The candidate is expected to demonstrate leadership in his or her assigned responsibilities. The standards for promotion to full professor are substantially higher than those for promotion to associate professor.

The guidelines below are the minimal standards necessary for consideration for the rank of professor. Meeting the minimum standards does not in itself guarantee promotion.

1. Teaching: Demonstration of outstanding teaching since the last promotion (sustained ratings of Very Good to Excellent). This solid record of successful teaching is measured by student evaluations, the extent to which the candidate has contributed to the teaching mission of the section, the intellectual rigor of his or her courses, special teaching awards, pedagogical innovations, and similar considerations.

2. Research/Creative Endeavor: Demonstration of significant research since the last promotion. The candidate is expected to have a national reputation in the field. This can be demonstrated by discussions of and references to his or her work in the scholarly literature, invitations to give lectures, presentations of papers, contributions of articles to edited collections, requests to referee manuscripts, and the like. The minimum expectations since the last promotion are: (1) a book (see definition page 7) or a reasonable equivalent (i.e., a substantial number of refereed articles) and (2) five single-authored, peer-reviewed articles, essays in a collection, book chapters, or other evidence of scholarly activity (see pages 6-7).. However, the candidate may include in this total, in consultation with the department head, collaborative or belletristic published work that is also peer-reviewed. The research may be carried out in theoretical or practical criticism, pedagogy, language acquisition, or linguistics in the candidate's area of expertise.

3. Service: Demonstration of a sustained and substantial record of service to the department. In addition, substantial service outside the department, for example, to the college, to the university, to the profession, or to the community, is expected. This means that the candidate has regularly and willingly accepted service assignments and has successfully performed his or her duties since the last promotion.