

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 4/18/06)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 1/31/05)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **4/2011**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **1/2010**

Amit Chakrabarti, Department Head

Date signed: 4/6/07

Steve White, Dean

Date signed: 4/09/07

M. Duane Nellis, Provost

Date signed: 4/10/07

**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.*

PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION, REAPPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Adopted by Physics Faculty: January 31, 2005

Approved by Provost: March 7, 2005

Departmental Document on Professorial Performance Award (Section III-D and Section VII) approved by Physics Faculty on April 18, 2006

Approved by Provost: April 10, 2007

Expires: March 7, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	4
II. CHARACTERISTICS OF AN EFFECTIVE FACULTY MEMBER.....	4
A. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES: TEACHING	5
B. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES: RESEARCH	6
C. SERVICE AND PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES	6
III. CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION	6
A. REAPPOINTMENT OF NON-TENURED, TENURE TRACK FACULTY	7
B. TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	7
1. <i>Scholarly Activities: Research</i>	7
2. <i>Scholarly Activities: Teaching</i>	7
3. <i>Service and Professional Activities</i>	8
C. PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR	8
1. <i>Scholarly Activities: Research</i>	8
2. <i>Scholarly Activities: Teaching</i>	8
3. <i>Service and Professional Activities</i>	9
D. CRITERIA FOR PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD	8
1. <i>Time in Rank</i>	8
2. <i>Scholarly Activities: Research</i>	8
3. <i>Scholarly Activities: Teaching</i>	8
4. <i>Service and Professional Activities</i>	8
IV. PROCEDURES CONCERNING THIS DOCUMENT	9
V. PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE.....	10
A. CANDIDATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES	10
<i>Scholarly Activities: Research</i>	10
<i>Scholarly Activities: Teaching</i>	11
<i>Service</i>	11
B. DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSIBILITIES	11
1. <i>Letters from External Evaluators</i>	11
2. <i>Teaching Documentation</i>	12
C. FACULTY VOTE.....	13
D. REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD.....	13
E. APPEAL PROCEDURES.....	13
F. FORWARDING PROCEDURES	13

VI. MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW	14
A. DEPARTMENT HEAD'S RESPONSIBILITIES.....	14
B. CANDIDATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES.....	14
C. FACULTY VOTE.....	14
D. REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD.....	15
E. APPEAL PROCEDURES.....	15
F. FORWARDING PROCEDURES.....	15
G. REPORT FROM THE DEAN.....	15
VII. PROCEDURES FOR PROFESSORIAL AWARDS	14
A CANDIDATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES.....	14
B. DEPARTMENT HEAD'S RESPONSIBILITIES.....	14
C. CANDIDATE'S REVIEW OF THE RECOMMENDATION.....	14
VIII. FACULTY QUALIFIED TO VOTE ON THE MATTERS OF PROMOTION/TENURE AND MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW	16
IX. ANNUAL EVALUATION	16
A. FACULTY MEMBER'S RESPONSIBILITY.....	16
1. <i>Scholarly Activities: Research</i>	17
2. <i>Scholarly Activities: Teaching</i>	17
3. <i>Service and Professional Activities</i>	17
B. AVAILABILITY OF FACULTY PORTFOLIOS.....	18
C. DEPARTMENT HEAD'S RESPONSIBILITY.....	18
D. MERIT PAY INCREASES.....	18
X. MINIMUM PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR ADDRESSING PERFORMANCE DEFICIENCIES	19
A. MINIMUM PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.....	19
1. <i>Scholarly Activities: Research</i>	19
2. <i>Scholarly Activities: Teaching</i>	20
3. <i>Service</i>	20
B. PROCEDURES FOR ADDRESSING PERFORMANCE DEFICIENCIES.....	21
APPENDIX A	23
BALLOTS	23
APPENDIX B	24
FORMS FOR PRESENTING SUMMARIES OF ACTIVITIES FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION	24
APPENDIX C	26
TIME TABLES	26
A. PROMOTION AND TENURE.....	26
B. MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW.....	26
C. ANNUAL EVALUATION.....	27
D. REAPPOINTMENT OF NON-TENURED FACULTY.....	27

I. INTRODUCTION

The Department of Physics faculty must evaluate its members regularly in order to:

- help the Department Head provide feedback, commendations and constructive criticism to members of the Department in an ongoing effort to enhance the overall quality of the Department's efforts,
- provide information to the Department Head to help him/her in the determination of annual salary adjustments,
- provide information to non-tenured faculty about advancement at the mid-point between his/her initial appointment and tenure decisions,
- determine if a faculty member has earned the right to be tenured at KSU, and
- determine if a faculty member has earned the right of promotion to Associate Professor or Professor.

This document is a statement of the Department's policies, procedures, and criteria for reaching decisions on these important and complex issues. The time tables for action relevant to this document is presented in [Appendix C](#). The policies, procedures, and criteria included in this document are based on the Department's long standing practices as stated in a short document originally passed by the faculty in 1983, the Department's procedures to evaluate the quality of teaching passed by the faculty in 1989, the KSU *University Handbook*, the University's *Handbook for Annual Evaluation of Unclassified Personnel* (July, 1990), and the University's document *Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustments, Tenure, and Promotion* (September, 1992), a memo from the Provost on the subject of promotion, tenure, leaves and emeritus consideration (August, 1992), a statement on tenure and promotion passed by the Physics Department in the 1970s, and the AAUP Guidelines on Tenure and Promotion. The KSU *Faculty Handbook* contains the University's policies and procedures.

II. CHARACTERISTICS OF AN EFFECTIVE FACULTY MEMBER

Each member of the Department of Physics faculty is a unique individual who can contribute to the Department's overall mission in many diverse ways. Because of this diversity it is difficult to list a set of goals or criteria which all faculty must reach or demonstrate in order to be considered an effective and positive contributor to our efforts. However, we can state some general concepts which guide our department as it strives to create an environment in which high quality teaching, learning, research and service can occur. All faculty are expected to contribute to scholarly activities and service to the professional and university community. Within scholarly activities we generally distinguish between teaching and research. However, we note that this distinction is not always easy to make. For example, when a faculty member is developing a new course or a different approach to teaching, he/she is involved in research on the pedagogy of physics as well as teaching. Likewise, when she/he is collaborating with a graduate student or post-doctoral associate on research, she/he is involved in instructional activities. These types of scholarly activities will always involve a combination of both research and teaching. Taking this difficulty of clearly distinguishing different types of activities into account, we establish approximate guidelines for the allocation of a faculty members' time as 50% teaching and related scholarly activities, 40% research and related scholarly activities, 10% service and professional activities.

A. Scholarly Activities: Teaching

The Department's teaching activities can be divided into three groups of courses -- the introductory courses (PHYS 100 - PHYS 299), the advanced undergraduate courses (PHYS 300 - PHYS 699), and the graduate courses (PHYS 700 - PHYS 999). This division is not strictly accurate because senior undergraduates will sometimes enroll in graduate course, and graduate students frequently enroll in upper-level undergraduate courses. However, the division will suffice to allow us to define our expectations in teaching.

While all courses offered by the Department are important to fulfilling the Department's teaching mission within the University, some courses are particularly vital to that mission. These courses include the introductory service courses, the courses required for graduation with an undergraduate degree in physics, and the graduate core courses.

The introductory service courses are taken by a large fraction of the KSU undergraduate population. Because of the large enrollments in these courses and the importance of communicating the content, methods, and excitement of physics to these students, they require a large fraction of our teaching resources. In return we gain a general population which can better understand and appreciate physics and, when appropriate, better apply it to other endeavors.

The courses which we have selected as required for each of the undergraduate degrees form a set of knowledge which all well-educated physicists must know. To prepare our students for graduate studies or for employment we must provide the best instruction possible.

The graduate core courses form the basis upon which the students will complete their research for a graduate degree and upon which they will rely for the remainder of their professional careers. These courses, therefore, require our careful attention.

Other specialty courses are also important to our students' educations. They cannot be overlooked, but they are not as critical to our teaching effort as the course described above. Therefore, we expect all faculty to be committed to very high quality teaching in the courses described in the above paragraphs.

Typically, a faculty member should be able to teach at all three of the levels described above. At the introductory level he/she should be able to teach independent sections of the service courses as well as recitations and studios. For advanced courses she/he should demonstrate the ability to teach effectively at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. All members of the Department are expected to help maintain balance and fairness in the teaching loads by accepting particularly difficult or time-consuming teaching assignments (such as lecturing in one of the service courses or preparing new approaches in advanced courses) approximately once in every four years. When a faculty member is being considered for promotion and/or tenure, she/he will typically have taught successfully at two of the three levels of teaching since her/his previous promotion or since joining our faculty.

While most faculty should be able to demonstrate an ability to teach a wide variety of courses and will probably teach at all levels during his/her career, not all faculty will be able to teach with equally high quality at all levels. In making and accepting teaching assignments the Department's faculty and administration will work to develop and exploit the strengths of each faculty member. In this way we will continually work toward developing the best possible teaching program.

B. Scholarly Activities: Research

Research in physics is a complex activity which can involve many different components. The components which are part of an effective research program include:

- conducting experimental and/or theoretical studies on topics of current interest,
- development of proposals for external, and occasionally University, funding of research work.
- administration of research grants,
- supervision of support staff for research projects and laboratories,
- training of support staff and students,
- mentoring of students, research associates, junior faculty and visitors,
- providing support and consultation to other members of the Department, and
- other activities which support the existing research efforts of the department and/or the University.

These activities should result in a high level of research productivity in the Department and to high visibility for KSU within the appropriate national and international research communities. While not all research will produce immediate tangible results, we anticipate that, on a regular basis, the typical faculty member will be involved in one or more of the following:

- publication of papers in appropriate journals, monographs and proceedings,
- presentations at appropriate professional meetings,
- distribution of materials which will aid the research or teaching of other scholars,
- development of products and/or patents,
- consultation with other scholars and researchers,
- obtaining external support for research efforts,
- the development of a reputation for high quality research, and
- collaboration in research with students, post-doctoral fellows, and other scientists.

The complex nature of research and the number of different types of items listed above makes it unlikely that every faculty member will contribute equally to all of the areas listed. However, each faculty member is expected to show a strong research effort either as an individual or as a part of a group of faculty working on projects of common interest. Typically, a faculty member will be cited by his/her colleagues here and/or elsewhere as providing important contributions to the advancement of physics.

C. Service and Professional Activities

Members of our faculty are expected to participate effectively in Departmental committees and, to a reasonable extent, fulfill service responsibilities within or outside the University. There are a wide variety of ways to meet the expectations of the Department in these areas. Areas of service are listed in the University Handbook.

III. CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION

The University's criteria for reappointment, tenure and promotion are given in the [University Handbook](#) (sections C100-C103 and C130-C140). In addition the Department of Physics by action of its faculty has established criteria to be considered.

A. Reappointment of Non-tenured, Tenure Track Faculty

To be reappointed on an annual basis non-tenured, tenure track faculty should be making adequate progress toward tenure and promotion as described below. Tenured faculty will vote on the reappointment, and the Department Head will follow the forwarding procedure as described in VI.F.

B. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Under present University policy an assistant professor cannot receive tenure unless he/she is also promoted to associate professor. (*Effective Faculty Evaluation*, pp 30-31.) Thus, the criteria for tenure and for promotion to associate professor are identical

1. Scholarly Activities: Research

- a. The candidate for promotion and tenure should have demonstrated that he/she has the potential to acquire a national reputation in an appropriate sub-field of physics. The judgment of this potential will be made by the tenured faculty with the advice of faculty in the candidates sub-field and external referees.
- b. The quality of his/her work in physics should be reflected by his/her publications. These publications should be, at least, similar in number and quality of other researchers who are or were at a similar state in their careers working in an equivalent sub-field of physics and at an institution which has an equivalent standing in the physics community. In making these comparisons the faculty will use its own judgments and seek the advice of external referees.
- c. He/she should have worked constructively to bring outside support to the Department through proposals which would provide extramural funding for research. Examples of this effort include the following.
 - i. If eligible the candidate should have submitted proposals to programs, such as DOE Outstanding Junior Investigator, NSF /CAREER or ESPCoR First Award, which focus on the funding of research for junior faculty.
 - ii. If appropriate and eligible, the candidate should have sought funding from applicable KSU programs which provide funding for research activities and/or the development of proposals.
 - iii. The candidate should have prepared proposals and/or contributed effectively to collaborative proposals which have been submitted to agencies that support research in the candidates specialty.

Except for internal KSU proposals the candidates proposals should have sought sufficient funding to support adequately his/her research, including the support of graduate students and post-doctoral research associates.

- d. He/she should have worked effectively with one or more of the following:
 - i. other faculty members
 - ii. students

- iii. other scientists in a common collaborative research endeavor.

2. Scholarly Activities: Teaching

To be considered for tenure and promotion the candidate should have demonstrated his/her ability to teach effectively at two of the three levels of instruction. As an aid to addressing the determination of teaching effectiveness the candidate should submit approved teacher evaluations for all classes taught each semester, copies of syllabi and exams, and links to course Web pages.

In assessing the candidate's teaching the department will address the following questions:

- a. Is the candidate teaching physics which is appropriate for the courses involved?
- b. Are the syllabi and tests at an appropriate level for the students in the course?
- c. Is the candidate teaching in a way which is contributing to high quality teaching in the Department?
- d. Is the candidate an effective advisor to graduate and undergraduate students?
- e. Is the candidate helpful to other faculty in their teaching efforts?
- f. Is the candidate actively and productively addressing issues which could improve the quality of teaching in the Department?
- g. Does the candidate seem to be communicating effectively with students?

3. Service and Professional Activities

The candidate for promotion and tenure should have served as an effective member of Departmental committees. He/she should demonstrate an ability to serve in other capacities which are described in [Section II.C](#) of this document.

C. Promotion to Professor

The promotion from Associate Professor to the rank of Professor is based on demonstrated distinction in teaching, research and scholarly activities, and service and professional activities. Considerations for promotion to the rank of Professor are:

1. Scholarly Activities: Research

- a. The candidate should have acquired a national and/or international reputation in some area of physics.
- b. The quality of his/her work in physics should be reflected by his/her publications.
- c. He/she should have worked constructively to bring outside support to the Department through proposals which would provide extramural funding for research.
- d. He/she should have worked effectively with one or more of the following:
 - i. other faculty members
 - ii. students
 - iii. other scientists in a common collaborative research endeavor.

2. Scholarly Activities: Teaching

The candidate should have demonstrated the ability to teach effectively at two of the three levels of instruction. The questions to be addressed are described in [Section III.B.2.](#) of this document.

3. Service and Professional Activities

The candidate should have demonstrated a leadership role in service to the Department, University or professional associations.

D. Criteria for Professorial Performance Award

Eligibility for the Professorial Performance Awards is based on continued demonstrated distinction in teaching, research and scholarly activities, and service and professional activities. Criteria for the Professorial Performance Awards are:

1. Time in Rank

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. Scholarly Activities: Research

- a. The candidate should have maintained a national and/or international reputation in some area of physics.
- b. The quality of his/her work in physics should be reflected by his/her publications.
- c. He/she should have worked constructively to bring outside support to the Department through proposals which would provide extramural funding for research.
- d. He/she should have worked effectively with one or more of the following:
 - i. other faculty members
 - ii. students
 - iii. other scientists in a common collaborative research endeavor.

3. Scholarly Activities: Teaching

The candidate should have maintained the ability to teach effectively at two of the three levels of instruction. The questions to be addressed are described in [Section III.B.2.](#) of this document.

4. Service and Professional Activities

The candidate should have continued to maintain a leadership role in service to the Department, University or professional associations.

IV. PROCEDURES CONCERNING THIS DOCUMENT

After the final version of this document has been approved by the Physics Faculty, it will become the document which describes faculty evaluation. It will supersede all previous departmental documents on this topic.

This document, upon approval, will be posted on the Departmental Web site within two weeks of its approval. When a new tenured or tenure-track faculty member joins the Department, she/he will be given the link to this document by the Department Head during the first week of the semester in which she/he begins at KSU.

Each year, as soon as the specific dates for any of the actions listed in [Appendix C](#) are known to the Department Head or the office staff, they will be posted on the Department's Web pages.

This document will expire five years from the date of its most recent approval.

V. PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

The University's criteria and procedures for tenure and promotion are given in the [University Handbook](#). Candidates will normally be considered for tenure during the final year of the maximum probationary period, although, in exceptional cases, candidates with outstanding records in research, teaching, and service may be considered for tenure at an earlier date. In these exceptional cases, the request for an early tenure decision may be made either by the candidate submitting a written request to the Department Head by September 15 or by one of the tenured faculty or the Departmental Advisory Committee, with the concurrence of the candidate, submitting a written nomination to the Department Head by September 15.

In the case of promotions, a written request for consideration of promotion may be made with the candidate's concurrence by a faculty member who is qualified to vote on the promotion, or by nomination of the Departmental Advisory Committee, or by the candidate submitting a written request, to the Department Head by September 15. The Department Head will inform the faculty of candidates being considered for promotion by September 20.

A. Candidate's Responsibilities

The 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 document.

The process for tenure/promotion evaluation begins automatically at the beginning of the final year of the probationary period, or when the candidate expresses in writing to the Department Head her/his intention to seek early promotion/tenure, or the candidate accepts the written nomination for early tenure by at least one of the faculty who are qualified to vote on the matter. The candidate will then prepare the portions of the promotion/tenure documentation that summarize her/his achievements in research, teaching, and service. The material must include all information required by the University and be presented in the format specified by the Office of the Provost. (See <http://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/depthead/promotion/promotio.html> and <http://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/forms/promotio.html>.)

Additional Supporting Documentation

This supporting documentation should include:

Scholarly Activities: Research

1. A copy of each manuscript published, accepted, or submitted of work that has been performed while a Kansas State University faculty member for the relevant period.
2. Copies of all research proposals during the relevant period. Reviewers' comments may be included.

3. Lists of invited and contributed presentations at scientific meetings and symposia; research seminars at universities, industries, and government laboratories; and graduate student recruiting seminars.
4. A list of former and current students and the current status of each of them.
5. A discussion of the candidate's collaborative work with other research groups.
6. 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.

Scholarly Activities: Teaching

1. List of courses taught.
2. Teaching evaluations
3. The standard evaluations that were furnished by all students who were enrolled in the candidate's courses for the relevant period or for the last three years, whichever is shorter.
4. National, regional, and local awards or recognition.
5. Information concerning the introduction of new courses and/or substantive course revision.
6. Other information that demonstrates the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

Service

1. A summary of the candidate's activities on Departmental, College and University committees.
2. A summary of the candidate's activities in 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. Other service to the University and the department.

In addition to the documentation above, the faculty member should submit a five-year research and scholarly activities plan. The research plan, which is an extension of the one-page summary that is required by the University, 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.

Lastly, all candidates for promotion and tenure will present a colloquium that describes the results of the candidate's research studies for the relevant period. The candidate should arrange for this colloquium to be scheduled for the month of September. If the candidate has presented a Departmental colloquium during the current calendar year, the Department Head with the concurrence of the Advisory Committee may waive the requirement of an additional colloquium.

B. Department's Responsibilities

Upon either receiving a written request or Departmental Advisory Committee nomination for promotion, the Department Head will obtain the following documents and information.

1. Letters from External Evaluators

The Department Head will request the candidate and the faculty who are qualified to vote on the matter to submit separate lists of potential external evaluators. The candidate's former mentors are specifically excluded as possible evaluators. The Department Head will inform the candidate of the names of all potential evaluators and provide her/him with an opportunity to comment on them. The candidate may, for cogent written reasons, request the Department Head to exclude certain individuals as external evaluators. With the advice of the 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 copy of the candidate's statement, and (3) a copy of up to five of the candidate's publications (including manuscripts "accepted" and "submitted") resulting from studies conducted as a Kansas State University faculty member. With the referees concurrence this documents will be provided in electronic form or by links to Web pages. 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. When these letters are added to the candidate's promotion/tenure document, the letters will be accompanied by a copy of the letter that was sent to the evaluator. All solicited letters of evaluation concerning the candidate that are received must be included in the promotion/tenure document.

2. Teaching Documentation

The Department Head will gather additional information by direct contact with students and with other faculty who have taught with the candidate. In speaking with students the Department Head will collect information on the students' perception of the candidate's

- preparation for teaching,
- appropriateness of teaching methods and style,
- appropriateness of the content of courses,
- fairness in grading,
- equity of treatment of all students, and
- individual consultation with students.

In discussing the candidate with others who have taught with him/her the Department Head will collect information about other faculty members' perceptions of the candidate's

- interactions with other faculty in collaborative efforts such as teaching recitations,
- general interest and ability to teach at all levels of instruction,
- preparation for teaching,
- appropriateness of teaching methods and style, and
- appropriateness of the content of courses.

When four or more solicited letters of evaluation have been received, the Department Head will make these materials available for inspection by the qualified faculty by the end of the second full week of October. By the end of the third full week in October, qualified members of the faculty and the Department Head will meet to discuss the case for promotion and/or tenure of the candidate. The candidate will be represented by an advocate at this meeting. The advocate may be the qualified faculty member who requested consideration of the candidate for promotion/tenure,

a member of the Departmental Advisory Committee, or a qualified faculty member who is appointed by the Department Head.

C. Faculty Vote

Within five business days subsequent to the faculty's discussion of the candidate, each qualified member of the faculty will submit a written recommendation/ballot to the Department Head. A recommended form for the ballot is given in [Appendix A](#). At the close of the voting period, the Department Head will open the ballots and record the vote. The results of the faculty vote and a summary of the written justifications will be transmitted to the candidate and the faculty. The summary, prepared by the Department Head, will be appropriately edited to ensure confidentiality. Copies of the recommendation forms for promotion/tenure/mid-probationary review are provided on the [Provost's Web site](#).

D. Report of the Department Head

The Department Head will review the candidate's promotion/tenure documentation, external reviews, the recommendations of the qualified faculty, and the vote of the qualified faculty. The Department Head will then formulate an independent recommendation either supporting or failing to support promotion/tenure of the candidate. The Department Head will forward his/her written recommendation, a written summation of the recommendations of the qualified faculty, and the results of the vote of the qualified faculty to the candidate, the physics faculty, and the Dean. In cases of promotion and/or early tenure the Department Head may choose not to forward a recommendation to the Dean if the recommendation is negative. Notification on the above matters to the candidate and the faculty should precede the transmittal of recommendations to the Dean by an amount of time sufficient to be in compliance with the appeal procedures given in Section E. below. On the date of transmittal of the recommendation for promotion/tenure to the Dean's office the Department Head will explain his/her recommendations in writing to the candidate and the faculty. The Department Head will report any new information or decisions concerning the candidate's status as soon as it may become available.

E. Appeal Procedures

If the candidate should wish to appeal the recommendation of either the faculty or the Department Head, a written request for reconsideration must be submitted within three working days of the candidate's notification of the recommendations. In the case of promotion and/or early tenure where no recommendation is to be forwarded to the Dean, the candidate who wishes to appeal the lack of such recommendation must request reconsideration in writing within three working days of the receipt of notification not to forward a recommendation to the Dean.

If the candidate requests reconsideration of the faculty's recommendation, the Department Head will convene a meeting of the qualified faculty at least one week before recommendations must be sent to the Dean 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 members of the qualified faculty, and will be conducted in the same manner as in the original vote. The recommendations of the faculty and the Department Head will be transmitted in writing to the candidate and to qualified faculty.

F. Forwarding Procedures

After the candidate has studied the recommendations, the candidate decides 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 period and the mid-probationary review, the document must be forwarded.) The Department Head will include the results of the secret ballot, the summary of the faculty's justifications, including verbatim comments from the ballots, and her/his written recommendation.

VI. MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW

The mid-probationary review will 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 performances by the tenured faculty in the areas of research, 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.

A. Department Head's Responsibilities

At the beginning of the academic year in which the review is to occur the Department Head will inform the candidate of the review and of his/her responsibilities concerning the review.

The Department Head will interview a representative sample of current and former graduate and undergraduate students, including those in the candidate's research group, to ascertain the quality of the candidate's teaching. The students' teaching evaluations of the faculty member will also be reviewed by the Department Head.

B. Candidate's Responsibilities

The procedure for mid-probationary review will be similar to the review procedure for promotion and/or tenure. The probationary faculty member will present to the Department Head by January 15 documentation of her/his accomplishments in research, teaching, and service. The format that should be followed and the types of evidence that should be provided will be the same as those for tenure/promotion. Outside letters of evaluation need not be sought.

In addition to the documentation above, the faculty member should submit a three-year research and scholarly activities plan. 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.

Lastly, the candidate will present a departmental colloquium that describes her/his research studies since coming to Kansas State University. The candidate should arrange for this colloquium to be scheduled before February 15.

C. Faculty Vote

By the end of February, tenured members of the faculty and the Department Head will meet to discuss the probationary faculty member's performance. After the faculty's discussion of the candidate, each tenured member of the faculty will submit a ballot/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 a summary of the written justifications will be transmitted to the candidate and the faculty. The summary, which will be prepared by the Department Head, will be appropriately edited to ensure confidentiality.

D. Report of the Department Head

The Department Head will review the candidate's documentation, the summary of the candidate's research and teaching effectiveness, 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 and to the faculty.

E. Appeal Procedures

If tenured faculty and/or the Department Head should recommend that the probationary faculty member should not be reappointed, then the appeal procedure that is used in the case of denial of promotion and/or tenure may be used by the probationary faculty member. All appeals must be resolved one week before recommendations are to be sent to the Dean.

F. Forwarding Procedures

The 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 the last Friday in March. The Department Head will include the results of the secret ballot, the summary of the faculty's recommendation, including verbatim comments from the ballots, and her/his written recommendation.

G. Report from the Dean

The candidates file will be reviewed by the College of Arts & Science Deans Advisory Committee. The Dean will provide an assessment letter to the candidate. ([University Handbook C92.4](#))

VII. PROCEDURES FOR PROFESSORIAL AWARDS

A. Candidate's Responsibilities

Eligible candidates will compile and submit a file that documents her/his professional accomplishments for at least the previous six years in accordance with the criteria stated in Section IIID.

B. Department Head's Responsibilities

The department head will evaluate the candidate's performance and seek input from other full professors for their evaluation of his/her performance. The weighting of each of the three categories in Section IIID will be consistent with the candidate's responsibilities as stated in his/her annual letter of responsibility. The Department Head will, then, prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials in terms of the criteria stated in Section IIID and make a recommendation for or against the award. The Department Head's recommendation will occur in sufficient time so that the candidate may review and respond to the recommendation as stated in the University Handbook, [Section C49.6](#).

After the candidate has had the opportunity to review the recommendation as described in Section C below, the department head will forward his/her written recommendation to the candidate and to the Dean along with documentation as described in the University Handbook, [Section C49.7](#).

C. Candidates Review of the Recommendation

Each candidate who is eligible for the award will have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the Department Head and will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review and discuss the evaluation. Within ten working days after the review and discussion, the candidate may submit to the Department Head and Dean a written statement reflecting unresolved differences regarding the evaluation. Consistent with annual evaluation, the candidate may appeal to the Dean for resolution as described in the University Handbook Sections [C49.8-C49.11](#).

VIII. FACULTY QUALIFIED TO VOTE ON THE MATTERS OF PROMOTION/TENURE AND MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW

All faculty 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, the qualified faculty member may leave any statement that he/she may want incorporated into the discussion summary with the Department Head prior to the meeting. All eligible faculty may vote by electronic ballot even if they are not present at KSU during the time of the vote.

IX. ANNUAL EVALUATION

Following University procedures the Department Head will evaluate each faculty member for his/her contributions to teaching, research and service.

A. Faculty Member's Responsibility

The faculty member must provide an up-to-date vita and a report on activities during the current year. The report should follow the format described in [Appendix B](#). In addition, each faculty member should provide the following documentation:

1. Scholarly Activities: Research

Each faculty member should submit copies of all published and unpublished papers or reports which have been completed or published during the year and other materials related to faculty member's research activities. If some of these materials are not in printed format (e.g. videodiscs, CD-ROMs or computer programs) a written description of the item will be submitted in lieu of the actual work. Copies of all proposals submitted for grants will be part of each faculty members permanent file.

2. Scholarly Activities: Teaching

Three components are needed in any attempt to document the quality of one's instructional activities. The first is a self-report on activities inside and outside of the classroom. The second is a set of documentation which can allow one's colleagues to see that the course was indeed academically sound, and the third is an indication that the instructor communicated effectively with the students in the course. Together these materials can provide any concerned person with rather complete documentation on the quality of a faculty member's instructional activities.

The report on one's own instructional activities is perhaps the most important component because it can document the instructional activities which are not a part of a formal classroom but which are a fundamental component in the educational process in our department. Every faculty member should report, in short paragraphs, instructional work with graduate students and undergraduates, work in helping our students prepare to present seminars or papers at meetings, and the direct supervision of graduate students who are working on research projects. Information should be provided concerning any activities which took place in the classroom and which might be considered by other faculty to be particularly notable. For example, if a faculty member has taken the time to revise and reorganize the content of a course or to rewrite a lab manual, it should be included in a report of teaching. Finally, if a faculty member has tried anything different or innovative in classes, a report on successes and failures could be extremely valuable. (The failure of an innovation in teaching should never be considered a reflection of low quality teaching).

To document the academic quality of a course each faculty member must present a "portfolio" which contains all written information which was presented to the students during the semester. This collection should include a course syllabus, the course examinations, and other handouts such as reference materials and homework assignments. Distributions of students grades on examinations can also be useful. (For print material prepared by the office staff, this material will be collected automatically by the office staff. Each time class materials are prepared, the office staff can place a copy in a file for teaching documentation. If a faculty member prepares his/her own instructional materials, he/she is responsible for inserting it into the portfolio.)

Collection of data about the student's perceptions of instruction should be completed by using one of the questionnaires which are available through the Office of Planning and Evaluation Service. In general the Department's faculty will use the TEVAL form. However, faculty members who are interested in collecting information for use to improve their teaching may use the IDEA form as a substitute. While this form was not created as a method of documenting the quality of teaching, many of the questions on it can be used for that purpose.

3. Service and Professional Activities

Any appropriate documentation.

B. Availability of Faculty Portfolios

All documentation should be provided to the Department Head by a time that he/she will specify and will be consistent with reporting to the Dean on schedule. Each faculty member should review the documentation of his/her colleagues.

In general this documentation will be placed on the Department's Web site in a password protected file and in the Physics Library so that all faculty may review it. If a faculty member wishes to have any documents treated as confidential and not placed on the Web site or in the library, he/she should inform the Department Head when submitting the materials.

C. Department Head's Responsibility

The Department Head will elicit from every faculty member impressions of the performance of his/her colleagues, and other aspects of Departmental operation, by a time that he/she will specify and that will be consistent with reporting to the Dean on schedule.

The Department Head will prepare an evaluation of each faculty member. He/she will use feedback from other faculty and the written documentation as primary sources for his/her conclusions. The criteria for judging a faculty member's performance will be the same as those for promotion and tenure and will be appropriate for the faculty member's present rank.

The Department Head will prepare a letter of evaluation for each faculty member, for performance in each of the three areas, along with an overall evaluation. This letter will be addressed to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The evaluation ratings should be divided into no more than 4 categories. Prior to submission of the evaluation results to the Dean, the overall results of the evaluation process shall be reported to the faculty as a whole.

The minimum information to be supplied by the Department Head in this report is:

1. The number of faculty members assigned to each category in each of the three areas of responsibility.
2. The number of faculty members assigned to each category in the overall evaluation.
3. The rationale and method for the assignment of the various categories.

The individual faculty member will be provided the opportunity to review the evaluation letter prior to its submission to the Dean. In the event of a disagreement between the faculty member and the Department Head concerning the evaluation rating, the faculty member has the right to append his/her viewpoint to the letter of evaluation.

The evaluation letter and evaluation ratings of an individual faculty member shall be strictly confidential.

D. Merit Pay Increases

Merit pay increases will be based on an average of each faculty member's evaluation over the three most recent years. For faculty who have fewer than three years of service the merit pay increase will be based on an average of all years of service. Sabbatical years will be included in the calculation of the averages but leaves without pay will not.

X. MINIMUM PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR ADDRESSING PERFORMANCE DEFICIENCIES

As required and described by sections C31.5 to C31.8 of the KSU [*University Handbook*](#), the Faculty of the Department of Physics herein set forth the minimum acceptable level of faculty performance and the procedures which must be completed prior to the revocation of tenure and dismissal for cause of any faculty member within the Department.

The collective strength of a faculty is related to the abilities and level of contribution individual faculty provide toward meeting the Department's missions. The contribution of individual faculty members is expected to vary both in area (teaching, research, and service) and in level of performance. Contributions of individual faculty may change over time, and that circumstances beyond the control of the faculty member may cause the level of performance to decline.

The cornerstone of performance assessment in academics is peer review. Because the initial granting of tenure and promotion involves the collective assessment of a candidate's documented performance and potential by the departmental faculty, that faculty is the appropriate group to be involved in deciding whether or not an individual faculty member's performance does not measure up to a minimum acceptable level of productivity.

The determination that a faculty member's performance is below minimum acceptable limits in any area must be judged in relation to the resources provided to the faculty member, the level of responsibility that the faculty has in each area, and the faculty member's specific area of expertise (as demonstrated by previous acceptable levels of performance). In the same fashion, a finding that minimum-acceptable levels of performance are not being met must be weighted against what would normally be expected from other faculty with the same credentials, levels of responsibility, and levels of experience. Furthermore, a determination that minimum levels of performance are not being met is not appropriate if resources are not provided that would allow a faculty member to meet minimum levels of performance. Failure to meet minimum-acceptable levels of performance because of a documented medical problem is also not grounds for revocation of tenure and dismissal for cause.

A. Minimum Performance Standards

All tenured faculty members should (1) provide a competent level of instruction, (2) be active in scholarly research, and (3) contribute to the university and/or the professional community in a service capacity. The proportion of these activities shall be agreed upon annually in writing by the faculty member and the department head.

1. Scholarly Activities: Research

Tenured faculty are expected to be engaged in scholarly research. Evidence of scholarly activities may include any of the following:

- Publications in scholarly journals, books, book chapters, reports in conference proceedings, technical reports, book reviews;
- Submission of manuscripts for publication;
- Presentations at professional conferences;
- Participation as principal or co-principal investigator or co-investigator on research grants or proposals;

- Collaboration in research with students, post-doctoral associates, or other co-workers; and
- Receipt of fellowships based on scholarly performance.

Other acceptable evidence of scholarly activities may be mutually agreed upon between the faculty member and the department head.

2. *Scholarly Activities: Teaching*

Tenured faculty are expected to:

- Maintain knowledge in subjects which they teach;
- Provide students with guidelines to courses which they teach, including a statement of the goals and scope of the course and procedures for grading;
- Meet classes as scheduled or arrange for an alternative learning experience;
- Be accessible to students through office hours and/or other arrangements;
- Provide guidance to graduate students under their direction, through supervision of research and advice regarding their course of study.

3. *Service*

Tenured faculty are expected to contribute to the department, university and/or professional community in some service capacity. Examples of activities that constitute service to the department include (but are not limited to):

- Participation in standing or *ad hoc* departmental committees;
- Editing of departmental newsletter;
- Organizing workshops or weekly seminars;
- Undergraduate advising;
- Supervision of support staff;
- Departmental administration;
- Supervising or participating in University Open House;
- Participating in the Department's fund raising activities; and
- Outreach activities (working with public schools, REU programs, etc.)

Examples of service activities outside the department include (but are not limited to):

- Service on a standing or *ad hoc* college or university committee or Faculty Senate;
- Service as an officer in an international, national, or regional professional organization;
- Organizing conferences and workshops on behalf of a professional organization.
- Review of manuscripts for a peer-reviewed scholarly journal;
- Review of grant proposals on behalf of funding agencies.

Other forms of service may be mutually agreed upon between the faculty member and the department head.

B. Procedures for addressing performance deficiencies

Section C31.5 of the KSU [*University Handbook*](#) provides guidelines for appropriate actions to be considered in case a Department Head in consultation with departmental faculty determines the performance of a faculty member to be below the minimum acceptable standards. This document describes procedures that need to be followed internally before the matter is brought to the attention of the College Dean.

For a faculty member's overall performance rating to fall below the minimum, he/she must be deficient in at least two of the three areas under evaluation (research, teaching and service) in any one evaluation period or deficient in one of these three areas for two consecutive evaluation periods, unless it is determined by the Department Head that notable strengths in research and/or teaching outweigh the deficiencies.

If the Department Head determines that a faculty member fails to meet minimum standards, the Department Head will provide a full written description of the area which is judged not to meet minimum levels of acceptable performance and the level of performance that is necessary to meet minimum levels of acceptable performance. The faculty member must be permitted the opportunity to respond in writing for the record. Together, the Department Head and faculty member are to develop a plan of action designed to correct the alleged deficiencies. This plan must include specific expectations that are to be met, and what new resources will be provided. The goal is to provide a means whereby the faculty member will soon exceed minimum acceptable performance.

If the faculty member and Department Head cannot agree on a plan of corrective action and specific criteria for exceeding minimum levels of acceptable performance, the Department Head and Faculty member will submit their respective proposals for review by the tenured faculty of the Department. The tenured Departmental Faculty working as a committee of the whole (a faculty member who has been elected by a majority vote will serve as presiding officer) will determine the preferred plan of corrective action as determined by a majority vote of all tenured faculty. The tenured faculty may agree with the Department Head, the Faculty member, or provide an alternative plan.

An assessment regarding success in meeting minimum standards of performance (or progress towards this goal) will be provided to the Faculty member by the Department Head- in subsequent written evaluations. Failure by the faculty member to progress towards acceptable performance will result in a written reassessment by the Department Head of the plan of corrective action and a determination as to the specific reason(s) for the faculty member failing to make progress towards meeting or exceeding minimum levels of acceptable performance.

Dismissal for cause will be allowed to progress to a full review by all tenured faculty if in the judgment of the Department Head, a faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which minimum standards are not met, reasonable attempts to amend the faculty member's performance have failed, and that additional attempts to improve the faculty member's performance are unlikely to be successful.

The Department Head will prepare a full written account of the basis for proposing that tenure be revoked and that the faculty member be dismissed for cause. The report must include a detailed account of the evidence related to the finding that minimum-acceptable levels of performance have and are not being met and that constructive attempts to correct the deficiency have failed repeatedly. The faculty member will have twenty (20) working days to prepare a rebuttal which will be submitted to the Department Head. The Department Head, after reviewing the faculty member's response, must choose within 5 days to continue the process of working with the faculty member in hopes of having the faculty member meet minimum acceptable levels of performance or to submit his/her report and the faculty member's rebuttal to the Departmental tenured faculty for review and vote on whether revocation of tenure and dismissal for cause is warranted.

The Department Head's report and the faculty member's rebuttal (if provided) will be submitted for review by all tenured faculty. The Department Head and faculty member must be given the opportunity, but are not required, to address the tenured faculty members. The tenured faculty, acting as a committee of the whole (a faculty member which has been elected by a majority vote will serve as presiding officer) will consider and discuss the evidence the Department Head has provided and the faculty member's written rebuttal. The tenured faculty may ask questions which the Department Head and faculty member may answer if they wish. A vote of two-thirds or more of all tenured faculty is necessary for the faculty to find that revocation of tenure and dismissal for cause is appropriate.

The re-initiation of this procedure by the Department Head against the same faculty member can only occur after a period of not less than one (1) year following completion of the previous faculty review and vote. It is expected that during this time the Department Head will have undertaken additional steps to improve the faculty member's performance.

APPENDIX A

Ballots

- [Ballot for Promotion and/or Tenure](#)
- [Ballot for the Reappointment](#)

APPENDIX B

Forms for Presenting Summaries of Activities for Annual Evaluation

Any appropriate method of reporting annual activities is acceptable. However, it is recommended the faculty use one of the two methods available in the links below.

Version 1: [Word document](#) [PDF file](#) [TEXT file](#)

Version 2: [Word document](#) [PDF file](#) [TEXT file](#)

The faculty member should provide this report in electronic format (PDF preferred) or hard copy. In addition, each faculty member should provide a copy of an up-to-date vita.

Independent of the form used, the annual report should cover the faculty member's completed activities for the calendar year. Activities in progress may be reported to date. Listed below are items that should be reported.

1. Teaching

- Formal courses taught. Give title and semester.
- List of students who have earned M.S. or Ph.D. degrees with you as the major advisor.
- Students for whom you are the major advisor.

1. Publications, and Research Grants Awarded

- Published papers. Please enclose one copy of each paper. Give complete reference, if the reprint is not available.
- Grants and Contracts. Give title, amount, identify funding agency, grant period and your role.
- Research, writing and scholarly work in progress
- 2. Unpublished books and articles. Give status of the manuscript: in preparation, submitted for publication (indicate journal), in press (indicate journal).
- Grants and contracts applied for. Indicate status.
- Other Scholarly Activities
 - Conferences attended. Indicate the nature of your participation.
- 3. Editorial responsibilities.
- Memberships on boards and committees of professional organizations.
- Collaborative research. List research associates at KSU and scientists from other institutions with whom you collaborated in research.
- University service
- Membership on departmental, college, and University boards and committees.
- Any Other Relevant Additional Information Not Included Above.

NOTE: The information supplied by each faculty member may either be designated as private information for the Department Head only or as public information. Unless the faculty member requests otherwise all public information will be made available on the Web in a password protected file. The password will be available to all tenured and tenure-track faculty. Faculty who do not wish documentation place on the web will have their documentation place on reserve in the Physics Library.

APPENDIX C

Time Tables

Each year when the deadlines for tenure, promotion, mid-probationary review and annual evaluation are established by the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences, the Department Head will establish the deadlines for Departmental actions. These deadlines will follow as closely as possible the time tables below. The Department Head will make adjustments to these dates to account for his/her travel, the candidate's travel, professional meetings which will be attended by a significant number of faculty, and holidays.

Once the Dean establishes the calendar for a given year, the Department Head will have a time table created and will make it available on the Department Web site [from this link.](#)

A. Promotion and Tenure	
<i>Date by which action must be completed</i>	<i>Action</i>
First week of Fall Semester*	The Department head informs the candidates who are in the final year of the probationary period of their responsibilities in preparing for the tenure decision.
Six weeks before XXX	Nominations and written requests for early tenure and for promotion due in Department Head's office.
No later than one month before XXX	Candidate presents a Departmental Colloquium.
No later than one month before XXX	Candidates prepare materials.
One month before XXX	Candidate's materials become available for faculty inspection.
No later than 2 weeks before XXX	Faculty meet to discuss the candidate. Faculty votes.
No later than 1 week before XXX	The Department Head informs the candidate and the faculty of his/her recommendation.
XXX: Date established by Dean's Office	Department Head sends recommendations to the Dean and reports to the candidate and faculty.
The following dates are not controlled by the Department. As each of these events occur, the Department Head will inform the candidate and the faculty of the action.	
	The Dean sends materials and summary sheet for each candidate to the Dean's Council for review.
	Review by Council of Academic Deans.
	The Dean forwards recommendations to the Provost.
	The Dean mails a letter which informs the candidates of the decision.
B. Mid-Probationary Review	
<i>Date by which action must be completed</i>	<i>Action</i>
Semester in which the review will occur.	The Department Head informs the candidate of his/her responsibilities.
Fall Semester	The Candidate prepares materials.
No later than one month before YYY	The Candidate submits materials to the Department Head. Those materials become available for faculty inspection.

No later than one month before XXX	The Candidate has presented a Departmental Colloquium by this date.
No later than 2 weeks before XXX	The faculty meets to discuss the candidate. Faculty votes.
No later than 1 week before XXX	The Department Head informs the candidate and the faculty of his/her recommendation.
YYY: Date established by the Dean	The Department Head forwards the recommendation to the Dean.
C. Annual Evaluation	
<i>Date by which action must be completed</i>	<i>Action</i>
Six Weeks before ZZZ	Report of scholarly and professional activities due.
Five Weeks before ZZZ	Relevant portions of these materials are placed in the library for faculty inspection.
No later than two weeks before ZZZ	Faculty members provide peer evaluation and input to the Department Head.
One week before ZZZ	Letters of evaluation are available for faculty review and for discussion with the Department Head.
ZZZ: Date established by the Dean	The Department Head send the letters of evaluation to the Dean
No later than two weeks after ZZZ	Department Head reports the results of the review to the faculty.
D. Reappointment of non-tenured faculty (A different time table will be created for first year, second year and the other years.)	
<i>Date by which action must be completed</i>	<i>Action</i>
One month before WWW	Candidate provides vita and other relevant materials which become available for faculty inspection.
No later than 2 weeks before WWW	Faculty meet to discuss the candidate. Faculty votes.
No later than 1 week before WWW	The Department Head informs the candidate and the faculty of his/her recommendation.
WWW: Date established by the Dean	The Department Head send recommendation to the Dean