

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on 11/15/2010)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on 11/15/2010)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **November 2015**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **November 2015**

Jerry Frieman, Department Head
Date signed: 11/16/2010

Brian Spooner, Interim Dean
Date signed: 11/18/2010

April C. Mason, Provost and Senior Vice President
Date signed: 12/19/2010

*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.

**Criteria, Standards, and Procedures for
Annual Merit Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure**

Department of Psychology
Kansas State University

Approved by the Department of Psychology
November 15, 2010

Introduction

Faculty in the Department of Psychology at Kansas State University may have assigned responsibilities in each of the following domains: teaching, research, service, and nontraditional contributions to the mission of the department. Performance in these broad, interrelated domains provides the basis for evaluations that facilitate decisions and recommendations pertaining to annual merit-salary increases, reappointment of non-tenured faculty (including mid-tenure reviews), tenure, promotions, and Professorial Performance Awards.

The standard load performance in the four domains is weighted for evaluation purposes according to the following percentages: teaching (50%), research and scholarship (45%), service (5%), and nontraditional contributions (0%). Adjustments to the load may be negotiated with the Department Head, with the constraint that the total load must always sum to 100%. Each faculty member will meet annually with the Department Head to discuss the previous year's annual evaluation and to establish goals and objectives for the next year. Any adjustments to the load will be negotiated or renewed at that time.

Faculty members are encouraged to discuss adjustments in teaching, research, service, and nontraditional contributions with the Department Head. Any such adjustment should be based on both the faculty member's strength and the department's needs.

Although each of the cases would be negotiated on an individual basis, the overall teaching needs of the department must not be compromised. For example, if a large number of faculty members become very successful with grants and contracts and there are many requests for buying out of classes, such a situation may jeopardize our overall teaching mission; the Department Head may then have to disallow some buy-outs.

Annual faculty performance evaluations and merit-salary recommendations constitute the foundations of mid-tenure reviews and subsequent tenure, promotion recommendations, and Professorial Performance Awards. The criteria that guide annual performance evaluations are therefore identical to those that govern other evaluations. At the end of each calendar year, the Department Head collects information and generates a written evaluation of each faculty member's performance in their assigned domains based on the criteria in this document. An overall evaluation that reflects the relative weights for each domain (negotiated earlier) is also generated.

The next section of this document describes the procedures, criteria, and standards used by the Department of Psychology to generate annual faculty performance evaluations. The performance criteria are viewed as guidelines for evaluating faculty members at different levels of their careers, although there is room for flexible application of those guidelines depending on special circumstances that may arise.

In addition to satisfying the specific criteria identified in each of the core areas, faculty members and unclassified employees are expected to perform all job functions in a professional manner and to interact collegially with other University employees, students, and citizens of the State so as to promote a safe, harmonious working and learning environment. Examples of collegial behaviors include: positive and supportive interactions with students, staff and colleagues within

the department; working constructively and co-operatively within the department; regular attendance at department events including brown bags, colloquia, graduate and undergraduate convocations, alumni advisory council events, etc.; and a willingness to promote the departmental mission in all areas. Behaviors that adversely affect collegiality or are chronically disruptive may be reflected in negative annual evaluations and/or promotion and tenure decisions.

In cases where performance in any of the core areas and/or in the area of collegiality is deemed unsatisfactory, the Department Head would provide feedback and assist in generating a plan for attempting to correct any deficiency. Consistent failure to meet minimum standards, outlined in each of the specific sections, could result in a negative evaluation. Faculty members should strive to exceed the minimum standards in all areas.

Criteria and Standards for Performance

Teaching

Faculty members of all ranks will be evaluated, for both promotion and merit evaluation purposes, in the domain of teaching, which also includes advising and mentoring. All faculty members are expected to contribute to both the undergraduate and graduate educational missions of the Kansas State University Psychology Department. This includes both teaching and mentoring/advising at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Faculty members will provide evidence of their contributions and effectiveness in these domains by submitting materials for evaluation to likely include, but not be limited to: course syllabi, student learning objectives, and materials; evidence of student learning; quantitative and narrative teaching evaluations for all courses taught to include evaluation of the student learning objectives in the courses taught; efforts to improve teaching; efforts to assist others in teaching; scholarly activities (e.g., conference presentations, workshops, publications) related to teaching, mentoring, and/or advising; numbers of students advised at the undergraduate level; evaluations of advising at the undergraduate level; numbers of students supervised as “major professor” at the graduate level; the progress of the students supervised; and memberships on other graduate students’ supervisory committees. While it is not prudent to set hard minimums on these criteria, successful faculty are expected to be continuously active in undergraduate and graduate teaching and mentoring/advising and to achieve quantitative ratings (e.g., TEVAL) of generally better than the 30th percentile in terms of their instructor effectiveness in their courses.

In the event that faculty members advise or supervise students from institutions other than Kansas State University (e.g., students from a previous academic institution, Summer Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program (SUROP) students) during the evaluation period, this evidence may be considered as well.

Research and Scholarship

The faculty member must establish and maintain a research program that has earned recognition by leading experts in their field. Regular publication in high-quality, refereed journals is expected. It is also expected that the faculty member’s work will have been presented frequently at scientific meetings and/or other institutions. Although both the amount and quality of research

will be considered, the quantity of publications is less important than the overall record of scholarly work. The faculty member should also regularly submit proposals for extramural funding to support his/her research program. Faculty members are encouraged to apply for intramural support (e.g., USRG or FDA awards) for their research activities whenever appropriate. Finally, it is expected that faculty members will provide regular reviews for journals, publishers, and granting agencies; service as editors, service on editorial boards, as well as service to professional societies is also recognized.

The record of accomplishment will be considered in light of his/her field, teaching load, service activities, extent of nontraditional contributions, and availability of resources. Given the substantial lead-time inherent in research and scholarship, productivity will be evaluated on a three-year rolling average. Faculty members are expected to maintain an average rate of at least one publication per year, at least one presentation per year, and at least one proposal for extramural funding every three years. These guidelines may be adjusted by the department head in light of the negotiated percentages in the four performance categories.

Note: Papers authored by faculty as sole or first author (or as coauthor with graduate or undergraduate students) are deemed more meritorious than papers published as second or lower-ranking author, although evidence of collaboration, including interdisciplinary collaboration, is also valued. Similarly, grant proposals on which faculty are PIs are deemed more meritorious than grant proposals on which faculty are co-PIs, collaborators, or consultants.

Service

Many of the activities of the department, college, university, and profession rely upon the faculty to serve as committee members or provide service in some other role. Therefore, faculty members are expected, at a minimum, to actively participate on departmental committees as requested by the Department Head and/or provide service outside of the department by providing significant effort in at least one committee or task force within the University. Given the nature of informal “citizenship” behaviors, specific expectations are all but impossible to articulate. Nevertheless, in line with expectations regarding collegiality within the department, faculty members are expected to eschew behaviors that undermine morale and/or constructive relationships within and across administrative units. Finally, there is a greater expectation that faculty members who have earned tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor and above to serve on College and University committees and task forces.

Nontraditional Contributions

Faculty members may choose to engage in activities during any given semester that contribute to the mission of the department or the university but that may not easily or appropriately fit into the areas of teaching, research, or service. When opportunities for such endeavors arise, the faculty member and the Department Head may make arrangements to adjust percentages and allow for credit towards promotion, tenure, and merit evaluations through a nontraditional contributions category. The specific percentage allotments will depend on the nature of the activity, the time commitments, and the extent of the contributions to be made. Activities that would constitute nontraditional contributions may include but need not be limited to obtaining of funding that is not competitive yet provides faculty and/or student support. Similarly,

entrepreneurial endeavors that provide additional funding and prestige to the department and/or university and the creation of partnerships with other institutions that do not easily or appropriately fall under the categories of teaching, research, or service may be recognized.

Annual Reappointment and Mid-Tenure Review

Faculty members at the rank of Assistant Professor, or at the rank of Associate Professor without tenure, will be required to provide evidence of their productivity in the areas described above on an annual basis using forms provided by the Department Head. This evidence will be evaluated by the Department Head and the tenured faculty according to the procedures described below. The tenured faculty will meet to discuss the productivity of the non-tenured faculty member being evaluated, and that meeting will conclude with each of the tenured faculty voting on the reappointment of the non-tenured faculty member by secret ballot. This vote will be used for informative purposes to aid in the Department Head's decision-making process. The Department Head's recommendation will be sent to the Dean of Arts and Sciences, who will also receive the result of the faculty vote. Feedback received during the meeting and from the secret ballots will be summarized by the Department Head and provided to the non-tenured faculty member.

In the third year of this probationary period, the Department Head and tenured faculty will conduct the mid-tenure review of the non-tenured faculty member. This review will be similar to that conducted at the annual reappointment meetings, but will more closely examine the cumulative evidence of productivity to determine the likelihood the non-tenured faculty member will earn tenure on his or her current trajectory. The feedback provided to the non-tenured faculty member will identify strengths and weaknesses in performance across the domains of evaluation.

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Evaluation Period

Each candidate for promotion to associate professor with tenure typically will be evaluated based on his or her accomplishments in the core areas over the previous five post-doctoral years. This period would be the length of time used during the evaluation period for a candidate who begins his or her post-doctoral career as a tenure-track assistant professor at Kansas State University and is evaluated for promotion and tenure during the normal time course (i.e., in his or her sixth year at Kansas State). It is possible for a candidate to have post-doctoral experience (i.e., any professional position since the earning of the doctoral degree) prior to being hired as a tenure-track assistant professor at Kansas State University and subsequently be evaluated for promotion and tenure more quickly than the normal time course (i.e., before his or her sixth year at Kansas State). In this case, his or her previous five years (i.e., some combination of time at Kansas State and elsewhere) may be used as the evaluation period at the discretion and permission of the Head of the Psychology Department.

Guidelines for Performance

In general, faculty members who are promoted to associate professor with tenure will have shown evidence of contribution and effectiveness in each of the core areas during the evaluation

period. The successful candidate's performance will generally include but not be limited to: (1) publishing at least one peer-reviewed journal article for each year of the evaluation period, (2) giving at least one conference presentation for each year of the evaluation period, (3) securing extramural funding and/or submitting at least two proposals for extramural funding, (4) being continuously and effectively involved in undergraduate and graduate teaching and mentoring/advising, (5) receiving positive quantitative (i.e., better than 30th percentile on instructor effectiveness) and narrative evaluations in all courses taught, (6) contributing to Psychology Department and University service activities, and (7) performing all activities in a professional and collegial manner. Performance in the area of nontraditional contributions will contribute to the overall evaluation in a manner and proportion consistent with the percentage of time and effort negotiated with the department head.

Evaluation Process

During the first few weeks of the Fall semester in the year in which the candidate is evaluated for promotion to associate professor with tenure, the candidate will submit a tenure/promotion package using the forms and following the guidelines outlined by the College of Arts and Sciences. In addition, the Head of the Psychology Department will request feedback from current and previous students and will request a list of 8-10 external evaluators from the candidate. Additional information may be solicited from other external evaluators. These external evaluators will be asked by the Department Head to review the candidate's record of productivity in the core areas, and to write letters of evaluation of the candidate based on these materials. At least three external reviews must be obtained. These letters will be used as additional information in evaluating the candidate's productivity and potential for success as an associate professor with tenure. The candidate should provide a list of eight to ten potential external evaluators. None of these may be individuals with whom the candidate has previously collaborated (e.g., submission of a coauthored manuscript, conference presentation, and/or grant proposal). The candidate should provide contact information and a short biography for each evaluator. The biographies may include numbers of publications, awards won, positions held (e.g., editorships, academic society offices), and so forth.

Promotion to Professor

Evaluation Period

Promotion to professor will involve an evaluation of the candidate's accomplishments in each of the core areas during the years when they held the rank of associate professor.

Guidelines for Performance

In general, faculty members who are promoted to professor will have continued to demonstrate evidence of contribution and effectiveness in each of the core areas. In addition to continuing to meet the criteria for obtaining the rank of associate professor, individuals seeking promotion to professor should demonstrate the following: (1) more substantial involvement in mentoring graduate students and serving on graduate committees both within and outside the department, (2) a continuous record of publication (at least one article per year) in high quality peer-reviewed professional journals and a minimum of fourteen journal articles over their entire career, (3) a

continuous record of presentation at international, national, or regional conferences or meetings and/or other academic institutions (at least one presentation per year) and a minimum of fourteen presentations over their entire career, (4) increased involvement in scholarship activities such as reviewing articles and grants, service as an editorial board member or member of a grant review panel, service as an editor for journals or books, service as an officer for professional societies, organization of conferences or conference symposia, etc., and (5) increased involvement in service on University committees and task forces as well as continued service to the department.

Evaluation Process

The evaluation process will occur in the same fashion as in the promotion to associate professor with tenure.

Procedures and Standards for Professorial Performance Awards

The Professorial Performance Award (PPA) rewards strong performance at the highest rank with an increase in base salary beyond that provided by the annual evaluation process. The PPA, it is important to note, is not a form of promotion review; it does not create a “senior” professoriate. Furthermore, the PPA is not a right accorded to every faculty member at the rank of Professor. Nor is it granted simply as a result of a candidate’s routinely meeting assigned duties. All requirements of the Faculty Handbook C49.1 to C49.14 are to be followed.

Evaluation Period

The evaluation period comprises a period of at least six years since the last promotion or PPA.

Guidelines for Performance

Criteria for the PPA adhere to the following guidelines: (1) the candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at K-State at least six years since the last promotion or PPA, (2) the candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity over the last six years before the performance review, and (3) the candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards.

The candidate’s performance should be at or above the standards expected for full professors during the evaluation period. Those recommended for a PPA are expected to have published no fewer than six papers during the last six years in high quality, peer-reviewed professional journals. The candidate is expected to be sole or first author, or co-author with graduate or undergraduate students, of at least three of these publications. Finally, successful PPA candidates will have submitted at least two proposals for extramural funding (or other commensurate activities) during the last six years.

Evaluation Process

Eligible candidates will submit a file that documents their professional accomplishments for the previous six years. The Department Head will provide a copy of the file and seek input from other PPA full professors. A copy of the Department Head's written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate. Each candidate has the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation to the Department Head and to the Dean of Arts and Sciences.

The Department Head must submit the following to the Dean: (a) a copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the PPA, (b) the candidate's supporting materials that serve as the basis for adjudicating eligibility for the PPA, (c) documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation, and (d) written statements of any unresolved differences concerning the evaluation.

Minimal Performance Standards

Procedures

The Department of Psychology is guided by the policies and procedures stipulated by the Faculty Senate, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the office of the Provost as they pertain to the definition of Chronic Low Achievement by a faculty member and the procedures to handle such cases. Specific departmental procedures include the following:

- When a tenured faculty member's overall performance level becomes Unsatisfactory, as indicated by the annual evaluation, the Department Head will indicate so in writing to the faculty member. In keeping with regular procedures in matters of tenure, eligible departmental faculty will have input into any decision on individual cases unless the faculty member requests otherwise. The Department Head will provide, in writing, a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member. In subsequent evaluations, the faculty member will report on activities aimed at improving performance and evidence of improvement.
- At the subsequent annual evaluation, the Department Head will ascertain if the performance of the tenured faculty member has improved as desired. If performance level has not been acceptable, that is, the overall evaluation is still Unsatisfactory, the name of the faculty member involved will be forwarded to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.
- At any time after a tenured faculty member has been identified as performing below minimal acceptable levels, this individual has the option of appealing their case to the faculty in the department. The faculty would have the responsibility of determining if there were extenuating circumstances that would argue for changing the overall evaluation.
- If a tenured faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in a five-year period that are overall Unsatisfactory, then 'dismissal for cause' will be considered at the discretion of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.