

DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 9/25/09)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 9/25/09)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **9/2014**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **9/2014**

Gary Mortenson, Department Head

Date signed: 9/25/09

Brian Spooner, Interim Dean

Date signed: 9/25/09

Ruth Dyer, Interim Provost

Date signed: 9/29/09

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

**DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY**

**Evaluation Procedures, Minimum Standards, Statement of Collegiality,
Professorial Performance Award**

CONTENTS

Evaluation Procedures	2
Annual Evaluation Timeline for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty	2
Unclassified Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Professional Staff Evaluation	3
Merit Salary	4
The Evaluation Portfolio	6
<i>Teaching, Creative/Research, and Service</i>	
<i>Teaching Portfolio Suggested List of Materials</i>	
Workload Formula	8
Mid-Tenure Review	10
Promotion and Tenure	11
<i>Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure</i>	
<i>Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor</i>	
Minimum Performance Standards	16
Statement of Collegiality	18
Professorial Performance Award Guidelines	19

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Annual Evaluation Timeline

December:

Faculty members submit to the Department Head a file summarizing their activities for the preceding calendar year. The file must include an annual summary of significant effort in the categories of Teaching (which includes student advising), Creative/Research, and Service. In addition the file must include a curriculum vita, one- and five-year plans, and a teaching portfolio. (See appendix for reporting template and for format of portfolio.)

December/January:

Merit Salary Committee (see description under “committees”) members and the Department Head read the files and make individual assessments on each faculty. They meet with the Department Head and report their assessments.

*Faculty **in the second year** of their employment receive notice of non-reappointment six months prior to the end of the academic year.

January/February:

After consulting with the Merit Salary Committee, the Head assigns numerical evaluations of faculty members in each of the three areas using a scale of 1-5, 5 being the highest.

Summary letters are submitted to the faculty. The letter includes a statement addressing the perception of whether the faculty member has

1. Fallen Below Minimum Acceptable Levels of Productivity regarding
2. Fallen Below but met Minimum Acceptable Levels of Productivity regarding
3. Met
4. Exceeded
5. Far Exceeded

the expectations of the department (see expectations) in each of the three evaluation categories (Teaching, Creative/Research, Service).

“Allocation of Effort Description” goes to faculty. Faculty members may negotiate the distribution of percentages assigned to each of the three categories of Teaching, Creative/Research, and Service.

A conference with the Department Head is scheduled to go over the evaluation. At that time, faculty members are asked to sign the evaluation indicating the meeting has taken place.

Faculty members may rebut the evaluation. Rebuttals must be submitted in writing directly to the Department Head. If rebuttals remain unresolved, the faculty member may articulate their position, in written form, with supporting documentation to the Dean.

Faculty members receive the original evaluation. At their evaluation conference with the Department Head they sign the original and return it to the Head. The faculty member receives a copy for their records. The original document is submitted to the Dean and a copy of that evaluation is kept in the Department personnel file for each faculty member.

***First year** faculty members receive notice of non-reappointment three months prior to the end of the academic year during their first full year of employment.

May/July:

***After their second full year** of employment faculty members receive notice of non-reappointment one full year in advance of termination.

Actual salary amounts are determined once monies are allocated to the university by the state government in the spring. Contracts are usually sent out between May and July.

*Note: Faculty on a tenure-track appointment must go through the reappointment process until they are granted tenure. In this process probationary faculty submit evaluation materials (vita & activities file) to the Head who distributes these materials to all faculty. Recommendation letters are requested from all full-time faculty members. The full and associate professors then meet to vote on reappointment. The Head then reports the findings and the vote in a narrative letter to the Dean.

Unclassified Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Professional Staff Evaluation

All unclassified personnel who are non-tenure track employees submit evaluation materials documenting their departmental activities by following the same timelines as tenured and tenure-track faculty. This includes the submission of load reports, a vita, yearly activities, and one-year plans. These professionals are not required to submit teaching portfolios and five-year plans. The Head includes evaluation letters on unclassified non-tenure track staff activities and recommendations, as appropriate, to the Dean at the same time all other evaluation letters for tenured and tenure-track faculty members are submitted.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Merit Salary

- 1) Each semester the faculty member submits a load report describing all Teaching/Advising, Creative/Research, and Service activities. The Department Head uses these reports as a basis for calculating load averages consisting of the Department Head's perception of the percentage of load for each of the three major areas: Teaching/Advising, Creative/Research, and Service. These averages are given to the faculty member at the conclusion of their evaluation letters. Faculty members may negotiate the distribution percentages during their annual conference with the Head if so desired.

Prior to the evaluation, faculty members are asked to update their vita and to submit a summary of what they consider to be their significant efforts for the preceding calendar year.

A one- and five-year projection of professional goals is also requested from each faculty member. Since these projections are annually updated, changes may be expected to occur. The focus and content of the goals are an important line of communication between the faculty member and the Department Head to consider both personal and departmental needs. Progress toward the successful completion of the stated goals is considered in the evaluation process.

In addition, a portfolio consisting of supporting materials for Teaching, Creative/Research, and Service is submitted for consideration.

- 2) The Merit Salary Committee is elected by the faculty each year to serve in an advisory capacity to the Department Head regarding the evaluation of faculty. This committee reviews submitted materials and makes recommendations on all three areas of faculty assignment: Teaching, Research/Creative, and Service.
- 3) This process includes university sanctioned student evaluations. Non-tenured faculty have student evaluations of their courses each semester. (Non-tenured faculty teaching the same course each semester only need to do repeated courses once each academic year.) Tenured faculty have a rotating schedule for their regular classes to avoid excessive duplication of evaluation. The Merit Salary Committee, in conducting its review process, will utilize student evaluations as well as the faculty member's portfolio to evaluate teaching effectiveness.
- 4) The Department Head, after consultation with the Merit Salary Committee, assigns a numerical evaluation using a scale of 1 to 5 (with 5 being the highest) to each of

the three areas (Teaching, Creativity/Research, Service). A letter is then written to each faculty member that includes concerns as well as positive statements concerning the individual's performance. The wording of the Department Head's evaluation letter will clearly state both the Department Head's scores (1-5) and the *average* of the Head's number with the Merit Salary Committee's scores for that review year.

- 5) A conference is held with the individual faculty members and the Department Head. Faculty members sign a copy of the evaluation letter stating that it has been reviewed. If there is disagreement, faculty members have the opportunity to articulate their position in written form with any supporting documentation to the Dean.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The Evaluation Portfolio

Teaching:

The Teaching portion of the portfolio should represent materials from each course taught, including syllabi and exams (as appropriate), and may include such documentation as programs from student recitals, relevant reviews, letters of appreciation, special course materials, etc.

Creative Research:

Creative/Research efforts may be documented by such items as concert programs, reviews, letters of invitation to conferences, relevant pages from conference schedule booklets, letters of acceptance for journal articles, relevant newspaper clippings, etc.

Service:

Service includes service to the department/university, to the profession, and to the public (if profession-based). Documentation can include letters of appreciation, relevant newspaper clippings, etc.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The Teaching Portfolio

Suggested List of Materials:

(One-inch wide three-ring binder is recommended for the presentation of material.)

A Full Description of Your Teaching Activities

Materials for Classroom Teaching

Current course syllabi (should be on file in the music office)

Instructional materials such as reading lists, recordings, films, etc.

Tests, special projects, presentations, and SLO assessments

Materials for Studio Teaching

Division policy

Studio policy

Repertoire requirements

Jury requirements

Performance requirements (such as seminar or student recitals)

Practice requirements

Attendance policy

Method of evaluation

Innovative teaching methods or special assignments

Students' achievements

Degree recitals (including programs)

Awards and honors

Solo performances (featured soloist or role in opera/theater program)

Acceptance into graduate or pre-professional programs

Acceptance of teaching positions or professional opportunities

Materials for Ensemble Teaching

Repertoire

Classroom policy

Attendance policy

Method of evaluation

Innovative teaching methods or special assignments

Performances (including programs)

Awards and honors

University sanctioned student evaluations of courses and teachers.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Workload Formula

Categories for determining workload:

Classroom, Ensembles, Studio, and Advising

Credit hours generated *are not considered* in the formula

Classroom is based on a Full Time Equivalent (FTE) of 12 contact hours/weekly

Ensembles are based on an FTE of 18 contact hours/weekly

Studio is based on an FTE of 18 contact hours/weekly

Advising credit is given at a rate of 4 student advisees = 1/100 of FTE

FORMULA: # of advisees x 0.25

A total workload percentage is the sum of the four categories.

The two semesters are averaged to determine the year's load.

It should also be noted that other factors, at the discretion of the Department Head, may be considered in assessing a faculty member's workload. These factors would include a heavy service component, chairing a division, having a large number of advisees, etc.

Scenarios:

(Typical load distributions explained across disciplines.)

Classroom:

For **classroom teaching**, the FTE value is based on the number of contact hours.

- For example, Theory 2 meets 3 hours per week. Therefore the FTE value is 3 hours.
- Low Brass Techniques meets 2 hours per week, although it is only assigned one credit hour. Since the FTE value is based on contact hours, the FTE value for this course is 2 hours.
- If a faculty member's load consists entirely of classroom teaching, teaching 4 classes that meet 3 hours per week would establish a full 12 hours of FTE credit.

Studio:

For **studio teaching**, the FTE value is $\frac{2}{3}$ of the contact hours of applied teaching.

- For example, if a studio piano instructor teaches 18 contact hours of applied students, the FTE value would be 12 ($\frac{2}{3} \times 18 = 12$).

Most KSU applied music faculty members teach a mix of classroom and studio courses.

- For example, if a faculty member teaches Theory 2 (FTE of 3) and has 13.5 hours of applied contact hours (FTE of 9, which is two-thirds of 13.5), an FTE of 12 would be established.

Courses that are taught by more than one faculty member (such as Clarinet and Saxophone Techniques), or courses that use a GTA to teach a percentage of class, will have the FTE reduced accordingly.

- For example, the flute instructor typically shares the Flute and Double-Reed Techniques course with the double-reed instructor. The course meets twice a week, so the total FTE value is 2. The flute instructor would therefore receive an FTE value of 1.

If the flute instructor also teaches Theory 1 (FTE of 3), and has 12 hours of applied contact hours (FTE of 8), an FTE total of 12 would therefore be established.

Ensembles:

For **ensemble teaching**, the FTE value is based on the number of rehearsal hours. This is significant because the credit hour value of ensemble classes is typically low (usually 1 hour).

Ensemble periods at KSU are typically an hour and 50 minutes long. For the purposes of assessing the FTE value, this would count as 2 hours.

- For example, a faculty member directs the Symphony Band, which rehearses 6 hours per week, and directs the Marching Band, which rehearses 6 hours per week. The total FTE value would therefore be 8 hours ($2/3 \times 12 = 8$).

This faculty member also teaches the instrumental conducting course, which meets twice a week. The FTE value of this course would then be 2 hours. Added to the 8 hours of ensemble, this would result in an FTE value of 10.

Music History/Literature/Theory Load Considerations:

Courses listed in the catalog in the Music History/Literature/Theory area and carrying course numbers of 500 or higher that have an enrollment of ten students or higher will have one hour added to the professor's contact hour total. Music 714 (Orchestration) and 801 (Introduction to Graduate Studies) carry the one-hour bonus with an enrollment of five or higher because they are so time intensive.

Music 230, 320, and 360 (Theory 2-4) also have one hour added to their contact hours when enrollment reaches ten students or higher.

Professors of any of these courses that have enrollments of thirty students or higher may negotiate an additional contact hour into their load calculation.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Mid-Tenure Review

New faculty members are assigned faculty mentors who assist tenure-track faculty during the period leading up to the Mid-Tenure Review, and from that review through the time that leads to the tenure decision. The Mid-Tenure Review normally takes place during the second semester of the third year of a tenure-track appointment.

The faculty member under consideration is asked to complete Sections III through VI of the “Promotion and Tenure Documentation” packet that can be accessed via the Internet: (<http://www.k-state.edu/academic/services/forms/promotio.html>). This material, along with the Department Head’s description of the faculty member’s responsibilities and a current vita, is made available for review by the Personnel Evaluation Committee. This committee makes recommendations regarding the strengths and/or weaknesses of the candidate’s materials to the Department Head. The Department Head then meets with the faculty member under consideration to transmit these recommendations and suggestions from the committee. The materials are then made available to the entire faculty for review.

Tenured faculty members are asked to write a narrative concerning the candidate’s reappointment, including a positive or negative recommendation, and to provide a written statement concerning the candidate’s progress toward tenure.

The Department Head writes a recommendation on reappointment and a one-paragraph statement on progress toward tenure. This, together with the candidate’s materials, is forwarded to the Dean’s office.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Promotion and Tenure

The Department of Music follows the eligibility requirements for promotion and tenure as outlined in the *KSU Faculty Handbook*. Although tenure consideration is determined by contractual agreement, it is expected that the individual faculty member will initiate a request for consideration for promotion at such time as he or she feels that the necessary criteria have been met.

Forms pertaining to promotion and tenure can be accessed via the KSU Provost's Office Web Site (<http://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/forms/promotio.html>).

The faculty member under consideration completes the "Promotion and Tenure Documentation" packet and submits this information with supporting materials in time for review by the entire departmental faculty.

Recommendation letters and supporting narrative are solicited from all departmental faculty. In addition to the letters a paper ballot is distributed to faculty eligible to vote for promotion and/or tenure. The Head tallies the vote and reports the outcome to the Dean. Tenured associate and full professors may cast ballots for candidates seeking tenure and promotion to associate professor. Only full professors may vote for candidates seeking promotion to the rank of full professor. Recommendations from all faculty members are considered as supporting materials for the final decision. Under normal circumstances, the letters written by the faculty are seen only by the Department Head and Dean. All concerned must proceed in the knowledge that all documents will be reviewed and scrutinized should there be a grievance filed within the university or legal action pursued outside the university in the case of a disputed decision. All documents generated in the process of tenure and promotion should be treated in a highly confidential manner and preserved for clarity should the need arise.

Letters from at least three external evaluators from the candidate's discipline are solicited by the Department Head and are submitted with the candidate's materials. The external evaluators contacted are selected by the Department Head from lists submitted by the candidate, faculty colleagues, and/or the Department Head.

The Department Head prepares a written recommendation and a summary of the departmental faculty's recommendations. These are included in the candidate's package which is then forwarded to the Dean.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES
Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

TEACHING

Document evidence that students are being engaged in the teacher's field of expertise and that students are challenged to grow as musicians through their coursework (in courses, seminars, field experiences and workshops offered by the Department of Music).

EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVE TEACHING

- ✓ Documentation of well organized syllabi for all courses taught
- ✓ Offering enrichment seminars & workshops
- ✓ Advising & mentoring undergraduate & graduate students
- ✓ Involving students in faculty scholarly & creative activities
- ✓ Student achievement in scholarly & creative activities
- ✓ Serving on or leading master & doctoral committees
- ✓ Contributing to curricular development, interdisciplinary programs & collaborative learning projects
- ✓ Studying curricular, mentoring and pedagogical issues
- ✓ Student evaluations, TEVAL: *Demonstrate a record of TEVAL scores that show consistency with regard to competencies in teaching across the range of questions. Seeking additional feedback from students in the form of written comments is highly desirable.*

CREATIVE ENDEAVOR AND RESEARCH

Document a record of progression selected from the following categories appropriate to the faculty member's specific field of endeavor. Music faculty frequently serve in both academic and performance capacities. Crossover in creative and research activities is common, valued, and encouraged. Faculty who are considered performance-oriented may present at an academic conference, publish articles, or edit music. Academic faculty might perform or accompany others in recital or in conference presentations.

PERFORMANCE	ACADEMIC
On and off-campus performances at the local, state, and national levels	Presentations delivered at local, state, and national conferences
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Presence in the community, state, & nation through attendance at music conferences/workshops ✓ The creation & dissemination of pedagogical materials ✓ Solo/chamber/large-group participation on a professional level 	Publications in the form of reviews, columns, feature articles, entries, chapters, monographs, books as appropriate within the faculty member's discipline (delineating refereed and non-refereed status)
Professional consulting / adjudicating	Professional consulting / adjudicating

Document submissions for grants with an indication of those that have been submitted versus those that were funded.

SERVICE

Institutional Service includes administrative, committee, student recruitment, and advising work done on the Department, College, and University levels. Professional Service includes contributions to discipline-related organizations at the local, regional, national, and international levels. Other types of service may include public or community service.

INSTITUTIONAL	PROFESSIONAL	PUBLIC/COMMUNITY
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Departmental: committees, recruiting activities, assisting student organizations ✓ Service to the College of Arts & Sciences ✓ University service 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Holding office in a professional organization, organizing conferences or sessions, or chairing sessions ✓ Editorial or refereed activities undertaken in the context of work done by professional organizations or by other academic institutions ✓ Adjudicating performances or exhibitions for national/professional organizations ✓ Service to the profession 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Engagement activities that involve the candidate in partnerships with the community (ex: jointly developed/financed/administered projects that address issues of mutual concern & contribute to regional growth & development) ✓ Consulting work (paid/ unpaid) that benefits the university or the discipline ✓ Community outreach ✓ Community-based service learning projects that are not listed under the teaching section

MERIT SALARY EVALUATIONS: In all 3 areas of evaluation faculty should consistently receive scores that demonstrate that they are evaluated between "meeting expectations" (3.0) and "exceeding expectations" (4.0).

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor*

Full professor is the highest academic rank at Kansas State University. Standards for achievement and performance are higher for promotion to full professor than to associate professor. *The candidate must substantially exceed the requirements for the rank of associate professor.* Evaluation will focus on activities taking place *after* promotion to associate, particularly activities occurring within the last five years. The desired range of assessment by the Merit Salary Committee is between 3.5 and 4.0 in all three areas of assessment. The individual must adhere to all of the standards required for promotion to associate professor with the following additional requirements:

TEACHING

Documented outcomes of teaching must demonstrate tangible results at national or international levels of activity. Examples can include student participation, presentation, and/or performance at national and/or international conferences, competitions, master classes, and/or workshops. Compelling evidence must show that an impact has been made on the advancement of pedagogical practices in one's area(s) of emphasis at the national or international level. TEVAL or other measures of teaching assessment must demonstrate consistency in the high quality of instruction for courses taught at the university. A narrative explaining any anomalies in scoring assessment should be provided to the head at the time of application for full professor. Evidence of students' professional achievements following degree completion is an important indicator of instructional quality. Examples of student accomplishment include professional positions held, evidence of advancement in the field, awards or recognition for exemplary professional work, completion of further advanced degrees, performance awards, and teaching assistantships or fellowships.

CREATIVE/RESEARCH

The candidate for promotion to full professor will have become a mature, productive, and well-documented performer, conductor, scholar, or composer on a national or international level. In areas appropriate to academic emphasis, evidence will include publications such as books or scholarly articles in prominent periodicals in the professor's field of expertise, with refereed publications given strong preference. In the areas of scholarly presentation, performance, and conducting, activities on national or international levels that result in published reports or reviews are important indicators of career development. Performing, conducting, or scholarly presentation at national or international venues that document an application, review process, or special invitation requirement for acceptance will carry greater weight in arguing the case for full professor. National and international performances or presentations that do not result in documentation are also considered valuable indicators of success, and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Significant indicators of success in composition include commissions, awards, performances, commercial recordings, and commercial publication. For all areas, a steady level of documented activity appropriate to a professor's area(s) of concentration is required.

SERVICE

The candidate must document service-related activities well beyond the department in the external professional community to which they belong. Examples of professional service that indicate progress toward promotion to full professor include, but are not limited to: serving as a moderator or on a panel at a major conference; serving as a conference or events organizer; chairing or serving on committees for professional organizations; serving at the editorial level for a prominent publication; serving as an officer, on the board of directors, or in some prominent capacity for organizations in their field. Within the university, examples of service could include serving on a college or university-level committee, serving in the KSU Faculty Senate, service to the KSU Foundation, Alumni Association, Department of Athletics, or serving on a high level administrative search.

Forms for promotion are available on the Provost's web site at the following location:
<http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/index.html>

** Engagement in both academic and performance-related endeavors is common at KSU. This crossover between academic and performance realms is common, valued, and encouraged, and must be considered carefully during the promotion from one academic rank to another. It is important that the candidate for full professor work with a faculty mentor who has achieved this rank. This will help the candidate fully understand the expectations and preparation needed*

MINIMUM PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
Kansas State University
Department of Music

Introduction:

Although the primary mission of the Department of Music at Kansas State University is teaching, our faculty must include:

- performers and conductors who excel in their chosen art and who exhibit, through artistic and creative endeavors, high standards of professional excellence.
- members who are active in music education scholarship, since the majority of the department's majors pursue degrees in music education.
- specialists in musicology, music theory, and composition.

Collectively, our faculty's teaching, creative efforts, and research are important to the reputation and image of the department at a local, regional, national, and international level. Many find their duties and responsibilities to be in more than one area. The realization of this necessity is important and was considered in the formulation of the *Minimal Performance Standards* for the Department of Music.

MINIMAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

Teaching: Minimal Performance Standards include:

- being well versed, and remaining current, in one's subject area.
- being present, and punctual, for scheduled class meetings; for studio teachers, providing make-up lessons in case of the teacher's absence.
- providing goals and objectives for the course of study through syllabi, course overviews, and other handouts.
- delivering instruction that is based upon the stated goals and objectives geared to student achievement.
- being accessible to students to answer questions and provide guidance.

Because the Department of Music's primary mission is Teaching, most faculty members will have this criterion as the primary portion of their individual workloads and assignments. Deficiencies in this area could be catastrophic, potentially, to one's evaluation. Therefore, special care should be taken to make sure that the load allocations are as accurate as possible.

Creative/Research: Minimal Performance Standards include:

- remaining current, in one's subject area.
- maintaining appropriate creative/research efforts.
- articulating goals and objectives in accordance with departmental policy and then demonstrating how these goals and objectives have been realized in recitals, lectures, workshops, symposia, conferences, or publications.

Service: Minimal Performance Standards in this area are threefold, being profession-based, institution-based and public-based. Faculty members are expected to make contributions in one, or more, of these areas, as outlined in the departmental document, “Merit Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria.” Minimally, faculty members should:

- contribute positively to the department through attending faculty meetings.
- accept appropriate committee assignments.
- assist with appropriate outreach activities of the department, including recruiting new students.

Collegiality: Minimal performance standards are that faculty members should make a good-faith effort to adhere to the department’s Statement of Collegiality.

University Procedures:

Faculty Handbook paragraph C31.5 prescribes specific action to be taken by the Department Head if a faculty member’s performance does not meet minimal standards:

Chronic failure of a tenured faculty member to perform his or her professional duties, as defined in the respective unit, shall constitute evidence of “professional incompetence” and warrant consideration for “dismissal for cause” under existing university policies. Each department or unit shall develop a set of guidelines describing the minimum-acceptable level of productivity for all applicable areas of responsibility for the faculty, as well as procedures to handle such cases. In keeping with regular procedures in matters of tenure ([C112.1](#) and [C112.2](#)), eligible departmental faculty will have input into any decision on individual cases unless the faculty member requests otherwise. When a tenured faculty member’s overall performance falls below the minimum-acceptable level, as indicated by the annual evaluation, the department or unit head shall indicate so in writing to the faculty member. The department head will also indicate, in writing, a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member. In subsequent annual evaluations, the faculty member will report on activities aimed at improving performance and any evidence of improvement. The names of faculty members who fail to meet minimum standards for the year following the department head’s suggested course of action will be forwarded to the appropriate dean. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which minimum standards are not met, then “dismissal for cause” will be considered at the discretion of the appropriate dean.

To access this specific information on the Provost’s Web Site follow this link:
(<http://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/fhbook/fhsecc.html#30.1>)

STATEMENT OF COLLEGIALITY

Faculty members are evaluated on their record of teaching, scholarship, and service. Additionally, they will be evaluated on their ability to participate in the life of the department.

Faculty are expected to:

- attend faculty meetings.
- use facilities appropriately.
- be available to colleagues and students.
- be willing to engage in meaningful professional dialogue.
- respond favorably to reasonable assignments.
- maintain a demeanor that reflects positively upon the department.
- be respectful of other divisions within the department when scheduling events

PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD GUIDELINES

Criteria and Evaluation Procedures for the Professorial Performance Award

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

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

1. The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in the highest rank at Kansas State at least six years since the last promotion Or Professorial Performance Award;
2. The candidate must show evidence of *sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review*;
3. The candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, creative activity/research and service in this period of six or more years must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards.

Eligible candidates for performance review must compile and submit to the Department Head a file that documents his or her professional accomplishments for at least the previous six years. The file will be reviewed by a committee composed of full professors who will provide a recommendation to the Department Head. The Department Head will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials in terms of the criteria, standards, and guidelines established along with a recommendation for or against granting the award. A copy of the Department Head's written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate.

Each candidate who is eligible 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. Each candidate has the opportunity to submit a written statement of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation to the Department Head and to the Dean.

The Department Head will submit the following items to the Dean:

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

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