

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 5/01/06)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 5/01/06)

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

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: <http://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/add/eng/bio/index.htm>

Jerry Frieman, Department Head

Date signed: 5/11/06

Steve White, Dean

Date signed: 5/26/06

M. Duane Nellis, Provost

Date signed: 6/26/06

*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

Approved by the Department of Psychology, Kansas State University,
May 1, 2006

Introduction

The mission of the Department of Psychology at Kansas State University has three components: teaching, research, and service. Faculty are expected to contribute to each of these three missions in varying degrees. Performance in these three broad, interrelated domains provides the basis for evaluations that facilitate decisions and recommendations pertaining to annual merit-salary increases, reappointment of nontenured faculty (including mid-tenure reviews), tenure, and promotions.

Unless otherwise negotiated by individual faculty members and the Department Head (see below), performance in the three domains is weighted for evaluation purposes according to the following percentages: teaching (50%), research (45%), service (5%). In a department that provides education and training at the graduate as well as the undergraduate levels, it must be acknowledged that it is often difficult to separate meaningfully teaching and research activities. For example, supervision of masters theses or doctoral dissertations demands competence and reflects accomplishment in both the teaching and research domains.

Faculty are encouraged to discuss adjustments in teaching, research, and service assignments with the Department Head. Any such adjustment should be based on both the faculty member's strength and the department's needs. As a general rule, faculty members could increase their teaching load by a maximum of two courses a year to allow a reduction in their research obligations (teaching would move to .70 and research would be reduced to .25). Similarly, a faculty member could increase their research tenths to .65 by buying out of a maximum of two courses a year (reducing the total teaching load from .50 to .30). In the latter case, the faculty member would generally be expected to have another source of funding to allow the department some means to cover class obligations. Although each of the cases would be negotiated on an individual basis, the overall teaching needs of the department could not be compromised (For example, if a large number of faculty 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 would then have to disallow some buy-outs). Conversely, the department needs to meet its research and scholarship expectations and only a limited number of shifts to more teaching would be authorized. Because tenure decisions are based on competencies in all areas, it is generally expected that non-tenured, tenure track faculty would maintain a balance of teaching, research, and service responsibilities.

Annual faculty performance evaluations and merit-salary recommendations constitute the building blocks of mid-tenure reviews and subsequent tenure and

promotion recommendations. The criteria that guide annual evaluations are therefore identical to those that govern tenure and promotion recommendations; and the specific standards that apply to tenure and promotion recommendations are based on the standards that guide annual performance evaluations.

The next section of this document describes the procedures, criteria, and standards used by the Department of Psychology to generate annual faculty performance evaluations in the teaching, research and service domains that contribute to recommendations pertaining to merit-salary increases. Subsequent sections elaborate on those procedures and standards (the criteria remain unchanged) as they apply specifically to mid-tenure reviews and to tenure and promotion recommendations.

Annual Performance Evaluations and Merit Salary Recommendations

Procedures

At the beginning of each calendar year, the Department Head meets individually with each faculty member to discuss his or her goals and aspirations for the coming year in the teaching, research, and service domains. The typical percentages that guide the relative weighting of performance in these domains (i.e., 50%, 45%, 5%) can be adjusted for the coming year with the mutual concurrence of the faculty member and the Department Head. (Faculty members may also request an adjustment to these ratios during the academic year in the event that unforeseen opportunities or obligations arise.)

At the end of each calendar year, the Department Head generates a written evaluation of each faculty member's performance in each of the three domains (teaching, research, and service), based in large part on the goals and aspirations identified during the earlier meeting. An overall evaluation that reflects the relative weights (negotiated earlier) to be attached to performance in the three domains is also generated, along with each faculty member's percentile standing relative to his or her colleagues within the Department of Psychology. Subsequent recommendations pertaining to merit-salary increases are based on these percentile standings. Each faculty member examines his or her own written performance evaluation, and is encouraged to discuss any misunderstandings or disagreements with the Department Head. Faculty are then asked to sign their evaluation, indicating only that they have had an opportunity to review the document and discuss it with the Department Head. (Their signature does not indicate that they agree with the Department Head's assessment). After creating copies for the faculty member and the Department Head, signed evaluations are forwarded to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Although the Department Head makes every reasonable effort to obtain appropriate and necessary information and documentation for the purpose of making annual merit-salary evaluations, it is ultimately each faculty member's responsibility to provide the Department Head with all required materials, as well as any and all materials the faculty member deems relevant. This applies particularly to students' ratings of faculty performance and to other indices of teaching effectiveness.

Experienced faculty members are periodically reacquainted with these procedures. New faculty members are provided with a copy of this document upon their appointment.

Teaching

Criteria. Evaluation of faculty performance in this domain focuses on (but is not necessarily limited to) the following items (listed in no particular order of relative importance):

- (1) Effectiveness in the classroom, which is inferred from...
 - (a) ...students' ratings and other forms of feedback, which are mandatory for every course, both undergraduate and graduate.. Formal student ratings based on forms approved for use by the university (e.g., TVALS, IDEA) are required for at least one course during each calendar year (and are encouraged for all undergraduate courses).
 - (b) ...alternative sources of information, which might include (but need not be College Teaching, etc.)
 - (c) ...course descriptions, schedules, and syllabi (including textbooks and goals and the learning objectives for a given course.
- (2) Contribution to faculty (and graduate student) development of teaching excellence, which is inferred from...
 - (a) ...efforts to assist faculty colleagues and graduate students who want to improve their teaching skills, which might include (but need not be limited to) participation in a teaching circle, participation in the department's Teaching Apprenticeship Program for graduate students, and departmental presentations devoted to teaching excellence.
 - (b) ...attending conferences or delivering off-campus presentations devoted to
 - (c) ...application for (and success in obtaining) intramural and especially

- (3) Advising undergraduate psychology majors, which is inferred from:
 - (a) ...number of majors advised.
 - (b) ...advisees' ratings of the quality of advising received (obtained from surveys administered to seniors prior to and after graduation).
- (4) Mentoring graduate students, which is inferred from:
 - (a) ...number of graduate students supervised as "major professor," and
 - (b) ...membership on other graduate students' research committees, and numbers of those who complete M.S. theses, preliminary examinations, or Ph.D. dissertations.
- (5) Other, miscellaneous indices of performance in the teaching domains.

Standards. The following standards or expectations apply to the criteria of teaching effectiveness listed above:

- (1) Effectiveness in the classroom:
 - (a) Students' numerical ratings of faculty classroom performance are a source of information that would reflect effectiveness in the classroom. Although it is impossible to determine the precise numerical values that reflect an effective level of teaching, it is expected that the numerical scores and percentage rankings are above the 30th percentile in whichever system one is using on university approved instruments. Faculty receiving percentile rankings 30% or less for an individual course are required to provide additional sources of information relative to effective teaching. It is expected that faculty collect student rating data where appropriate, reflect upon that data, and discuss future goals and plans with the Department Head using this information. (**REQUIRED** as indicated in Teaching Criterion I.a. above)
 - (b) Alternative sources of information pertaining to effectiveness in the classroom, such as videotapes or written evaluations of teaching performance based on observations by faculty colleagues or the Department Head, are expected to reflect consistently effective performance in the classroom (in the context of the instructor's stated goals or learning objectives for a given course). (**ENCOURAGED**)

- (c) Course schedules and syllabi are expected to include a cogent statement of the faculty member's goals or learning objectives for a given course, assigned textbooks or other written materials that are timely and relevant to those goals and learning objectives, and assigned examinations or other exercises that permit assessment of students' progress and ultimate achievement in the course. (**REQUIRED** as indicated in Teaching Criterion I.c. above)
- (2) Faculty (and graduate student) development:
- (a) Alternative sources of information that describe efforts to assist faculty colleagues and graduate students who want to improve their teaching skills might take the form of participation in a teaching circle, participation in the department's Teaching Apprenticeship Program, or participation in special departmental or university events (e.g., colloquia, workshops, etc.) designed to facilitate teaching excellence (among other possibilities). Specific expectations will vary according to the manner in which faculty choose to satisfy this criterion. In any case, information submitted to the Department Head is expected to convey a strong commitment to helping faculty colleagues and graduate students to develop and improve their teaching (some information germane to Teaching Criterion 2.a. above is **REQUIRED**)
 - (b) (**ENCOURAGED**- faculty are encouraged to attend conferences or deliver off-campus presentations devoted to teaching excellence)
 - (c) (**ENCOURAGED**- faculty are encouraged to apply for and obtain extramural funding to support the department's teaching mission)
- (3) Advising undergraduate psychology majors:
- (a) New psychology majors are assigned to faculty advisors in a way that tends to equalize the numbers of undergraduate advisees across faculty. Nevertheless, because majors may change advisors at any time, the number of advisees assigned to a particular faculty member reflects (at least in part) students' assessments of the quality of advising received. Beginning with the third year in a tenure-track position, faculty are expected to serve as academic advisors to "their share" of the department's undergraduate majors (i.e., approximately the number of majors requiring advising divided by the number of faculty advisors in the department).

(REQUIRED)

- (b) Student open-ended comments regarding their advising experiences with a given faculty member, generally made during Senior Exit Interviews and in the Alumni Surveys, should be positive in tone. **(REQUIRED)**

- (4) Mentoring graduate students:
 - (a) At any given time, faculty are expected to be serving as “major professor” for at least one graduate student (assuming sufficient graduate student demand for the faculty member’s area(s) of interest and expertise). Faculty are further expected to encourage those students to complete the requirements for their masters degrees, to pass preliminary examinations, and to complete the requirements for their doctoral degrees in a timely basis (the definition of which may vary with students individual needs, limitations, etc.) **(REQUIRED)**

 - (b) At any given time, faculty are expected to be serving on the research committees of at least three other graduate students, and to encourage those students to complete the requirements for the M.S. degree, to pass preliminary examinations, and to complete the requirements for the Ph.D. degree on a timely basis (the definition of which may vary with students’ individual needs, limitations, etc.). **(REQUIRED)**

- (5) Other miscellaneous indices of teaching performance:

Faculty are expected to be members of the Graduate Faculty, and certified to direct doctoral dissertations.

Research

Criteria. Evaluation of faculty performance in this domain focuses on (but is not necessarily limited to) the following items (listed in no particular order or relative importance):

- (1) Publication...
 - (a) ...of articles in peer-reviewed, professional journals.

 - (b) ...of books and/or book chapters (including textbooks and research-based

- (2) Presentations at international, national, and regional conferences and meetings.

- (3) Seeking and obtaining extramural and intramural funding (i.e., grants and contracts) to support research activities.
- (4) Reviewing activities.
- (5) Other, miscellaneous indices of performance in the research domain, including (but not limited to) citations of one's research, discussion of one's research in books authored by others, inclusion of one's work in books of readings, etc.

Standards. Given the substantial time commitments inherent in designing, conducting and publishing and/or presenting research, in writing book chapters and books, and in preparing, submitting and revising proposals to obtain extramural (and, to a lesser extent, intramural) financial support, productivity in this domain is evaluated on the basis of a three-year "rolling average" (i.e., one's work during the past three years is assessed). The following standards or expectations apply to the criteria of research effectiveness listed above:

- (1) Publications:
 - (a) Faculty are expected to publish empirical and/or theoretical articles in respected, peer-reviewed, professional journals. Judgments concerning the quality of articles and the journals in which they appear are left to the Department Head (who considers such factors as a journal's publisher and circulation and rejection rates, among other indices of an article's impact on the field). Numbers of articles published during any given three-year period will depend upon the substance of the papers and the reviewing and publication schedules of the journals, among other factors. Having acknowledged these factors, along with the simple truth that quantification of research productivity (especially by counting journal articles) is fraught with dangers, faculty are expected to publish or have in press a minimum of two papers during any given three-year interval. **(REQUIRED)** Papers authored by faculty as sole or first author (or as co-author with one or more graduate or undergraduate students), are deemed more meritorious than papers published as second or lower ranking author (although evidence of collaborative skills is important, too).
 - (b) Given adequate dissemination of one's work through published articles (and presentations at professional conferences and meetings--see Research Standard 2 below), publication of books and book chapters during any given three-year interval is not a necessity (and is therefore only

ENCOURAGED). Thus, there are no minimal expectations in this area. When books and/or book chapters are published during a given three-year interval, judgments concerning the quality of that work are left to the Department Head. The same comments that appear in research Standard 1.a. above pertaining to order of authorship also apply here.

(2) Presentations:

Because the delays inherent in publication of articles and books are often meetings is important to the timely dissemination of research and theory associated with attending such conferences and meetings are borne almost entirely by faculty members themselves (out of their own personal funds). With this important reservation in mind, faculty are expected to make at least three professional presentations (e.g., symposium presentations, paper or poster sessions, etc.) at international, national or regional conferences or meetings during any given three-year interval.

(REQUIRED) Once again, judgments concerning the quality of the presentation and the prestige of the conference or meeting are left to the Department Head. The same comments that appear in Research Standard 1.a. above pertaining to order of authorship also apply here.

(3) Extramural funding:

During any given three-year interval, faculty are expected either: (a) to obtain such support **(REQUIRED)**. Judgments concerning the quality of proposals and the numbers of research dollars obtained or requested are left to the Department Head. The same comments that appears in Research Standard 1.a. above pertaining to order of authorship also apply here.

(4) Reviewing:

Although volunteers are occasionally solicited, ad hoc reviewers for based on the potential reviewers' experience, expertise, and professional ad hoc reviewer for at least one journal, publisher, or granting agency. **(REQUIRED)** Journal editors and consulting editors/members of editorial review boards, and action editors are invariably selected on the basis of prior reviewing experience and professional reputation. Although faculty are **ENCOURAGED** to accept such positions, there are no specific expectations concerning editorial activities.

(5) Other miscellaneous indices of research performance:

Under appropriate circumstances (e.g., junior faculty, opportunity to present/attend international conferences or meetings, etc.), faculty are **ENCOURAGED** to apply for intramural support for their research activities (i.e., USRG or FDA grants from the Graduate School).

Service

Criteria. Evaluation of faculty performance in this domain focuses on (but is not necessarily limited to) the following items (listed in no particular order of relative importance):

- (1) University service...
 - (a) ...as a member of university, college, and department task forces and
 - (b) ...in elected positions at the university (e.g., Faculty Senate, Graduate
 - (c) ...in appointed administrative positions at the university, college, and
 - (d) ...through informal citizenship behaviors that promote high morale and
- (2) Professional service...
 - (a) ...as an officer of an international, national, or regional professional organizations
 - (b) ...as a member of task forces or committees created by such professional
 - (c) ...as an organizer of professional meetings, of service as chair of
- (3) Other miscellaneous indices of performance in the service domain.

Standards. The following expectations or standards apply to the criteria of service effectiveness listed above:

- (1) University service:
 - (a) Faculty are expected to serve on a reasonable number of department (**ENCOURAGED**). Although there are no specific expectations concerning

university or college committees or task forces, faculty are **ENCOURAGED** to accept such positions and responsibilities within reasonable limits, especially after they have earned tenure.

- (b) Although there are no specific expectations that faculty will seek or serve
 - (c) There are no specific expectations that faculty will seek or accept additional administrative responsibilities at the university, college, or department levels. If such opportunities arise, faculty are expected to discuss them with the Department Head in order to identify the implications for the department's teaching and research missions of accepting such responsibilities (**ENCOURAGED**).
 - (d) Given the nature of informal "citizenship" behaviors, specific expectations are all but impossible to articulate. Behaviors that undermine morale
- (2) Professional service:
- (a) Although there are no specific expectations that faculty will seek or serve in elected positions in international, national, or regional professional organizations, faculty are **ENCOURAGED** to serve in such capacities within reasonable limits.
 - (b) There are no specific expectations that faculty will serve on task forces or committees created by such professional organizations, or that they will agree to act as chair of such bodies. If such opportunities arise, faculty are **ENCOURAGED** to serve in such capacities within reasonable limits.
 - (c) Although there are no specific expectations that faculty will organize professional meetings or chair paper/poster sessions at such meetings, faculty are **ENCOURAGED** to engage in such activities within reasonable limits.
- (3) Other miscellaneous indices of service performance:
- (no specific expectations)

Tenure Recommendations

Procedures

The Department of Psychology is guided by the policies and procedures stipulated by Faculty Senate, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the office of the Provost as they pertain to circulation of probationary service, the roles of annual and mid-tenure (see the following section) reviews, and performance standards that apply to tenure recommendations. Specific department procedures include the following:

- *At the conclusion of each nontenured faculty member's annual (written) performance evaluation, the consistency (or lack thereof) between the previous year's performance and the level of performance typical of faculty who have earned tenure in the past is described. That statement is specifically addressed during the nontenured faculty member's subsequent discussion with the Department Head concerning the previous year's performance and goals for the coming year.
- * A mid-tenure review is conducted during the third year of the nontenured faculty member's probationary period (see next section).
- * During the fifth year of the nontenured faculty member's probationary period (or sooner, if a faculty member arrives at the university with experience that is credited toward the probationary period), the Department Head and the candidate for tenure complete the appropriate sections of the document package that must be submitted to the college and university. In consultation with the candidate for tenure and other knowledgeable, tenured faculty members in the department, the Department Head solicits written recommendations from at least three outside reviewers who are familiar with the candidate's work. (Former academic advisors or professors, relatives, or close personal friends of the candidate are typically not asked to serve as external reviewers.) The Department Head then makes the candidate's file (including information pertaining to performance in the teaching, research, and service domains) available for review by all tenured faculty members in the department. Those faculty subsequently meet (as a group) with the Department Head to discuss the candidate's qualifications for tenure, and to generate a departmental recommendation via secret ballot, the results of which are immediately announced to those who participated in the vote. The Department Head then conveys to the Dean a written recommendation that may or may not be consistent with the results of the department's ballot-based recommendation, and informs tenured faculty members regarding the nature of that recommendation and the rationale that supports it.

The performance criteria in the teaching, research, and service domains that guide the department's and the Department Head's recommendation(s) to the Dean regarding tenure are the same as those described above in the context of annual merit-salary evaluations. The standards or expectations associated with those criteria in the context of tenure recommendations represent logical, reasonable extensions of the standards that apply to annual performance evaluations. However, given the importance (and relative irrevocability) of decisions to award or deny tenure, recommendations in this context are based upon very careful scrutiny of the candidate's accomplishments and credentials.

Standards

Teaching:

- (1) Effectiveness in the classroom:
 - (a) During the candidate's probationary period, it is expected that the numerical scores and percentage rankings are above the 30th percentile in whichever system one is using on university approved forms. In the absence of such consistency, a positive trend during the probationary years that culminates in ratings at this level may also be deemed acceptable. Student rating data will be collected where appropriate. The candidate should provide evidence that the data are used to improve teaching skills, a process that would include both a critical examination of the data and serious self-reflection. Similar standards apply to formal, written, qualitative (i.e., non-quantitative) student evaluations of the candidate's teaching performance.
 - (b) Alternative sources of information pertaining to effectiveness in the classroom (e.g., videotapes, written evaluations based on faculty colleagues or the Department Head's observations, etc.) are expected to reflect consistently effective teaching performance during the candidate's probationary period. In the absence of such consistency, a positive trend during the probationary years that culminates in evidence of effective performance in the classroom may also be deemed acceptable.
 - (c) Throughout the candidate's probationary period, course schedules and syllabi are expected to include cogent descriptions of the goals and learning objectives for each course, timely and relevant assigned reading materials, and evaluative exercises (e.g., exams, papers, etc.) that permit valid assessment of students' academic performance.

(2) Faculty (and graduate student) development:

- (a) During each calendar year of the probationary period, the candidate is expected to work with faculty colleagues and graduate students who want to improve their teaching skills. Among other alternatives, these efforts may take the form of participation in a teaching circle, in the department's Teaching Apprenticeship Program, or in special departmental or university events (e.g., colloquia, workshops, etc.).
- (b) Although there are no specific expectations that candidates will attend conferences or deliver off-campus presentations devoted to teaching excellence during the probationary period, such activities will be viewed favorably during tenure deliberations.
- (c) Although there are no specific expectations that candidates will apply for (and obtain) extramural funding to support the department's teaching mission during the probationary period, such applications will be viewed favorably during tenure deliberations.

(3) Advising undergraduate psychology majors:

- (a) By the third year of the probationary period, and each year thereafter, candidates are expected to serve as academic advisor to "their share" of the department's undergraduate majors (i.e., approximately the number of majors requiring advising divided by the number of faculty advisors in the departments). Faculty should gradually increase their numbers of advisees during the first two years.
- (b) Student open-ended comments regarding their advising experiences with a given faculty member, generally made during Senior Exit Interviews and in the Alumni Surveys, should be consistently positive in tone.

(4) Mentoring graduate students:

- (a) Within the first year or two of the probationary period, candidates are expected to satisfy the requirements for Graduate Faculty status and to be certified to direct doctoral dissertations. During the remaining years of the probationary period, candidates are expected to serve as major professor for at least two graduate students, who are expected to make noticeable progress toward completion of their degree requirements (e.g., completion of thesis or dissertation, satisfactory performance on preliminary examinations, etc.).

- (b) After becoming a member of the Graduate Faculty, candidates are expected to serve (continuously) on the research committees of at least three other graduate students (who are expected to make noticeable progress toward completion of their degree requirements).

(5) Other miscellaneous indices of teaching performance:

(no specific expectations)

Research:

(1) Publications:

- (a) Keeping in mind the dangers inherent in evaluating research productivity by counting published articles, positive tenure recommendations are typically supported by no fewer than approximately six papers published (or “in press”) 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 four of these publications.
- (b) There are no minimum expectations concerning publication of books or book chapters during the probationary period. Within the discipline of psychology, faculty who publish a book during the probationary period are the exception rather than the rule. Invitations to contribute chapters to books edited by others, which are less rare during the probationary period, will be accorded appropriate recognition when tenure recommendations are made.

(2) Presentations:

Recalling the same caveat expressed in Research Standard I.a. above, as well as the extremely low level of financial support for travel forthcoming from the university, positive tenure recommendations are typically supported by no fewer than six presentations (i.e., papers, poster sessions, symposia, etc.) at international, national, or regional conferences or meetings. The candidate is expected to be sole or first author, or co-author with graduate or undergraduate students, of at least four of these professional presentations.

(3) Extramural and intramural funding:

During the probationary period, candidates are expected either: (a) to obtain extramural research funds from a public or private agency or foundation for a

period of not less than one year; or (b) to submit at least two viable proposals to governmental agencies or private foundations in an effort to obtain such funds. During any three-year interval of the probationary period when a nontenured faculty member is without extramural funding, the candidate is expected to submit at least one proposal for intramural funds to support research activities or travels.

(4) Reviewing.

The candidate is expected to serve as an ad hoc reviewer for at least one journal, publisher, or granting agency during the probationary period. It is unrealistic to expect nontenured faculty members to serve as journal editors or members of editorial review boards during the probationary period. (Of course, candidates who do serve in such capacities will be accorded appropriate recognition when tenure recommendations are made.)

(5) Other miscellaneous indices of research performance:

(no specific expectations)

Service:

(1) University service:

- (a) The candidate is expected to serve on a reasonable number of department committees, and to assume the role of committee chairs as requested by the Department Head during the probationary period. There are no specific expectations concerning membership on university or college committees or task forces.
- (b) There are no specific expectations that candidates will seek or serve in
- (c) There are no specific expectations that candidates will seek or accept
- (d) Specific expectations concerning “citizenship” behaviors are impossible to articulate. Candidates are expected to eschew behaviors that undermine

(2) Professional service:

- (a) There are no specific expectations that candidates will seek or serve in

elected positions in international, national, or regional professional organizations during the probationary period.

- (b) There are no specific expectations that candidates will serve on task forces or committees created by such professional organizations, or that they will act as chair of such bodies during the probationary periods.
 - (c) There are no specific expectations that candidates will organize professional meetings during the probationary period. Candidates who chair one or more paper/poster sessions at professional meetings will receive appropriate recognition during tenure deliberations.
- (3) Other miscellaneous indices of service performance
- (no specific expectations)

Mid-Tenure Review

Procedures

The Department of Psychology is guided by the policies and procedures stipulated by Faculty Senate, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Office of the Provost as they pertain to the timing and process of mid-tenure review. Specific department procedures include the following:

- * At the conclusion of each nontenured faculty member's annual (written) performance evaluation, the consistency (or lack thereof) between the previous year's performance and the level of performance typical of faculty who have earned tenure in the past is described. That statement is specifically addressed during the nontenured faculty member's subsequent discussion with the Department Head concerning the previous year's performance and goals for the coming year .
- * During the third year of the nontenured faculty member's probationary period, the Department Head and the faculty member complete the appropriate sections of the document package that must be submitted to the college. The Department Head then makes the faculty member's file (including information pertaining to performance in the teaching, research, and service domains) available for review by all tenured faculty members in the department. Those faculty subsequently meet (as a group) with the Department Head to discuss the nontenured faculty member's progress toward a positive tenure recommendation, and to generate a departmental recommendation via secret ballot, the results of which are immediately announced

to those who participated in the vote. The Department Head then conveys to the Dean a written recommendation that may or may not be consistent with the results of the department's ballot-based recommendation, and informs tenured faculty members regarding the nature of that recommendation and the rationale that supports it.

Criteria and Standards

The performance criteria in the teaching, research, and service domains that guide the department's and the Department Head's recommendation(s) to the Dean at the time of the mid-tenure review are the same as those described above in the context of annual merit-salary evaluations. The standards or expectations in those three domains are predictably more demanding than those that apply to annual performance evaluations, but less exacting than the standards or expectations that guide tenure recommendations. In those instances where cumulative or quantitative standards or expectations guide tenure recommendations (e.g., numbers of articles published or papers presented at professional meetings), the nontenured faculty member should be about "half-way there" at the time of the mid-tenure review. Where the focus is on acceptable levels of performance (e.g., student ratings of teaching performance in the classroom, or student ratings of faculty performance as academic advisors), the nontenured faculty member should be at, or at least approaching, the level(s) deemed necessary for a positive tenure recommendation.

Promotion Recommendations

Procedures

The Department of Psychology is guided by the policies and procedure stipulated by Faculty Senates the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of the Provost as they pertain to the timing and process of moving promotion recommendations. Specific department procedures include the following:

- * At the conclusion of each assistant or associate professor's annual (written) performance evaluation, the consistency (or lack thereof) between the previous year's performance and the level of performance typical of faculty who have earned promotion to associate professor or professor (depending upon the faculty member's current rank) in the past is described. That statement is specifically addressed during the faculty member's subsequent discussion with the Department Head concerning the previous year's performance and goals for the coming year.
- * During an assistant professor's fifth year and an associate professor's sixth year in rank (sometimes sooner, sometimes later, depending upon the faculty member's level of

performance), the Department Head and the candidate for promotion complete the appropriate sections of the document package that must be submitted to the college and university. In consultation with the candidate for promotion and other knowledgeable faculty members in the department who hold academic rank equal to or greater than that for which the candidate is being considered, the Department Head solicits written recommendations from at least three “outside reviewers” who are familiar with the candidate’s work. (Former academic advisors or professors, relatives, or close personal friends of the candidate are typically not asked to serve as external reviewers.) The Department Head then makes the candidate’s file (including information pertaining to performance in the teaching, research, and service domains) available for review by all faculty members in the department who hold academic rank equal to or greater than that for which the candidate is being considered. Those faculty subsequently meet (as a group) with the Department Head to discuss the candidate’s qualifications for promotion, and to generate a departmental recommendation via secret ballot, the results of which are immediately announced to those who participated in the vote. The Department Head then conveys to the Dean a written recommendation that may or may not be consistent with the results of the department’s ballot-based recommendation, and informs the faculty who participated in the vote regarding the nature of that recommendation and the rationale that supports it.

The performance criteria in the teaching, research, and service domains that guide the department’s and the Department Head’s recommendation(s) to the Dean regarding promotion are the same as those described above in the context of annual merit-salary evaluations. The standards or expectations associated with those criteria in the context of promotion recommendations represent logical, reasonable extensions of the standards that apply to annual performance evaluations. Specifically, recommendations regarding promotion to the rank of associate professor are guided by the same standards or expectations that apply to tenure recommendations (see above). Indeed, promotion to associate professor and the granting of tenure are decisions that are necessarily made in tandem and must be consistent. The standards or expectations that guide recommendations regarding promotion to professor, which are more demanding, are listed below.

Standards for Promotion to Professor

Teaching:

- (1) Effectiveness in the classroom:
 - (a) During the candidate’s years as an associate professor, it is expected that the

numerical scores and percentage rankings are above the 30th percentile in whichever system one is using on university approved instruments. Similar standards apply to formal, written qualitative (i.e., non-quantitative) student evaluations of the candidate's teaching performance.

- (b) Alternative sources of information pertaining to effectiveness in the classroom (e.g., videotapes, written evaluations based on faculty colleagues or the Department Head's observations, etc) are expected to reflect consistently effective teaching performance during the candidate's time in rank as an associate professor.
- (c) Throughout the candidate's time in rank as an associate professor, course schedules and syllabi are expected to include cogent descriptions of the goals and learning objectives for each course, timely and relevant assigned reading materials, and evaluative exercises (e.g., exams, papers, etc.) that permit valid assessment of students' academic performance.

(2) Faculty (and graduate student) development:

- (a) During each calendar year of the candidate's time in rank as an associate professor, the candidate is expected to assist faculty colleagues and graduate students who want to improve their teaching skills. Among other alternatives, these efforts may take the form of participation in a teaching circle, in the department's Teaching Apprenticeship Program, or in special departmental or university events (e.g., colloquia, workshops, etc.).
- (b) Although there are no specific expectations that candidates will attend conferences or deliver off-campus presentations devoted to teaching excellence during time in rank as an associate professor, such activities will have a favorable effect on promotion recommendations.
- (c) Although there are no specific expectations that candidates will apply for (and obtain) extramural funding to support the department's teaching mission during time in rank as an associate professor, such activities will have a favorable effect on promotion recommendations.

(3) Advising undergraduate psychology majors:

- (a) Candidates are expected to serve as academic advisor to their share of the department's undergraduate majors (i.e., approximately the number of majors requiring advising divided by the number of faculty advisors in the

department) during time in rank as associate professor.

- (b) Student comments and ratings of advising, as revealed in Senior Exit Interviews and Alumni Surveys, should consistently be positive in tone and reflect a commitment to quality advising on the part of the candidate.

(4) Mentoring graduate students:

- (a) Candidates for promotion to professor are expected to be certified to direct doctoral dissertations. During time in rank as an associate professor, candidates are expected to serve as “major professor” for at least two additional graduate students (over and above the minimum number of two required for positive recommendations regarding tenure and promotion to associate professor), who are expected to make noticeable progress toward completion of their degree requirements (e.g., completion of thesis or dissertation, satisfactory performance on preliminary examinations, etc.).
- (b) Throughout their time in rank as an associate professor, candidates are expected to serve (continuously) on the research committees of at least three other graduate students (who are expected to make noticeable progress toward completion of their degree requirements).

(5) Other miscellaneous indices of teaching performance:

(no specific expectations)

Research:

(1) Publications:

- (a) Keeping in mind the dangers inherent in evaluating research productivity by counting published articles, positive recommendations for promotion to professor are typically based on not fewer than approximately fourteen papers published (or “in press”) 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 eight of these publications.
- (b) Most successful candidates for promotion to professor will have published at least one or two invited chapters in books edited by others. Although there are no minimum expectations concerning publication of books, such accomplishments will be accorded appropriate recognition when promotion recommendations are made.

(2) Presentations:

Recalling the same caveat expressed in Research Standard I.a. above, as well as the extremely low level of financial support for travel forthcoming from the University, positive recommendations for promotion to professor are typically based on no fewer than approximately thirteen presentations (i.e., papers, poster sessions, symposia, etc.) at international, national or regional conferences or meetings. The candidate is expected to be sole or first author, or co-author with graduate or undergraduate students, of at least eight of these professional presentations.

(3) Extramural funding:

Most successful candidates for promotion to professor will have obtained extramural research funds from a public or private agency or foundation. In the absence of such funding, candidates are expected to have submitted at least four viable proposals to governmental agencies or private foundations in an effort to obtain such funds.

(4) Reviewing:

Most successful candidates for promotion to professor will have served as an ad hoc reviewer for several professional journals, publishers, and/or granting agencies during their years as assistant and (especially) associate professor. Service as an editor, consulting editor/editorial board member, or action editor for a professional journal is especially deserving of recognition when making decisions regarding promotion to professor.

(5) Other miscellaneous indices of research performance:

(no specific expectations)

Service:

Recommendations regarding promotion to the rank of professor are guided by basically the same standards or expectations that apply when the criteria of performance effectiveness in the service domain (listed above) are used to guide recommendations concerning tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor. The only modification to these standards is a general expectation that faculty who have earned tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor will be more inclined (than their nontenured colleagues) to serve on College and

University committees and task forces.

Procedures and Standards for Professorial Performance Awards

Procedures

The Professorial Performance Award (PPA) rewards strong performance at the highest rank with a base salary increase in addition to that provided for by the annual evaluation process. The Performance Award review, it is important to note, is not a form of promotion review. It does not create a "senior" professoriate. Furthermore, the Professorial Performance Award 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 with a record free of notable deficiencies. All requirements of the Faculty Handbook C49.1 to C49.14 are to be followed.

Criteria for the award will adhere to the following guidelines: 1. The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at Kansas State at least six years since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award; 2. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review; and 3. The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards. Recommendations for the Professorial Performance Award will follow the timeline associated with the annual evaluation review outlined in the University Handbook.

Eligible candidates for review compile and submit a file that documents her or his professional accomplishments for the previous six years in accordance with the standards outlined below. The department head will provide a copy of the file and seek input concerning eligibility for the Professorial Performance Award from full professors (excluding the person applying for the award).

The department head will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials in terms of the criteria, standards, and guidelines established, along with a recommendation for or against the award.

Each candidate for the award will have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the department head, and each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, each candidate has the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation to the department head and to the dean.

A copy of the department head's written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate.

The department head must submit the following items to the appropriate 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 can serve as the basis for adjudicating eligibility for the award.

Standards

Teaching:

(1) Effectiveness in the classroom:

- (a) During the candidate's last six years as a professor, it is expected that the numerical scores and percentage rankings are above the 30th percentile in whichever system one is using on university approved instruments. Similar standards apply to formal, written qualitative (i.e., non-quantitative) student evaluations of the candidate's teaching performance.
- (b) Alternative sources of information pertaining to effectiveness in the classroom (e.g., videotapes, written evaluations based on faculty colleagues or the Department Head's observations, etc) are expected to reflect consistently effective teaching performance during the last six years as a professor.
- (c) During the last six years as a professor, course schedules and syllabi are expected to include cogent descriptions of the goals and learning objectives for each course, timely and relevant assigned reading materials, and evaluative exercises (e.g., exams, papers, etc.) that permit valid assessment of students' academic performance.

(2) Faculty (and graduate student) development:

- (a) During each calendar year of the candidate's during the last six years as a professor, the candidate is expected to assist faculty colleagues and graduate students who want to improve their teaching skills. Among other alternatives, these efforts may take the form of participation in a teaching circle, in the department's Teaching Apprenticeship Program, or in special departmental or

- university events (e.g., colloquia, workshops, etc.).
- (b) Although there are no specific expectations that candidates will attend conferences or deliver off-campus presentations devoted to teaching excellence, such activities will have a favorable effect on recommendations for a PPA.
 - (c) Although there are no specific expectations that candidates will apply for (and obtain) extramural funding to support the department's teaching mission, such activities will have a favorable effect on recommendations for a PPA.
- (3) Advising undergraduate psychology majors:
- (a) Candidates are expected to serve as academic advisor to their share of the department's undergraduate majors (i.e., approximately the number of majors requiring advising divided by the number of faculty advisors in the department) during the last six years as a professor.
 - (b) Student comments and ratings of advising, as revealed in Senior Exit Interviews and Alumni Surveys, should consistently be positive in tone and reflect a commitment to quality advising on the part of the candidate.
- (4) Mentoring graduate students:
- (a) Candidates are expected to be certified to direct doctoral dissertations. Candidates are expected during the last six years as a professor to serve as "major professor" for at least two graduate students, who are expected to make noticeable progress toward completion of their degree requirements (e.g., completion of thesis or dissertation, satisfactory performance on preliminary examinations, etc.).
 - (b) During the last six years as a professor, candidates are expected to serve (continuously) on the research committees of at least three other graduate students (who are expected to make noticeable progress toward completion of their degree requirements).
- (5) Other miscellaneous indices of teaching performance:
- (no specific expectations)

Research:

(1) Publications:

- (a) Keeping in mind the dangers inherent in evaluating research productivity by counting published articles, positive recommendations for a PPA are typically based on not fewer than approximately six papers published (or “in press”) during the last six years as a professor 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.
- (b) Most successful candidates will have published at least one or two invited chapters in books edited by others. Although there are no minimum expectations concerning publication of books, such accomplishments will be accorded appropriate recognition when a PPA is made.

(2) Presentations:

Recalling the same caveat expressed in Research Standard I.a. above, as well as the extremely low level of financial support for travel forthcoming from the University, positive recommendations for a PPA are typically based on no fewer than approximately six presentations (i.e., papers, poster sessions, symposia, etc.) at international, national or regional conferences or meetings. The candidate is expected to be sole or first author, or co-author with graduate or undergraduate students, of at least three of these professional presentations.

(3) Extramural funding:

Most successful candidates for a PPA will have obtained extramural research funds from a public or private agency or foundation. In the absence of such funding, candidates are expected to have submitted at least two viable proposals to governmental agencies or private foundations in an effort to obtain such funds.

(4) Reviewing:

Most successful candidates for a PPA will have served as an ad hoc reviewer for several professional journals, publishers, and/or granting agencies during their last six years as professor. Service as an editor, consulting editor/editorial board member, or action editor for a professional journal is especially deserving of recognition when making decisions regarding a PPA.

(5) Other miscellaneous indices of research performance:

(no specific expectations)

Service:

There is a general expectation that faculty who are professors will be more inclined to serve on College and University committees and task forces.

Minimal Performance Standards
(originally approved by Department Faculty February 3, 1997)

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:

- * At the end of each calendar year, the Department Head generates a written evaluation of each faculty member's performance in three domains (teaching, research, and service), based in large part on criteria contained herein and the goals and aspirations identified during a meeting between the Department Head and the faculty member at the beginning of the year. An overall evaluation that reflects the relative weights (negotiated earlier) to be attached to performance in the three domains is also generated.
- * In the annual review, an overall evaluation is indicated as Outstanding, Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory. Faculty who perform their overall responsibilities at an Unsatisfactory level will be deemed as falling below the minimal performance standards listed below.
- * When a faculty member's 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 end of the year, the Department Head will ascertain if the performance of the faculty member has improved as desired. If performance level has not been acceptable, i.e., the overall evaluation is still Unsatisfactory, the process of identifying goals and achievements will again be followed as described above. In addition, 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 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 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.

Standards and Criteria for Minimal Performance

All faculty in the Department of Psychology are expected to fulfill the three basic missions of the department and the university: teaching, research, and service. Although these are listed separately, one must recognize that considerable overlap exists and that a given activity oftentimes involves multiple missions, e.g., the training of graduate students.

Teaching. Faculty are expected to provide undergraduate and graduate students with quality instruction in the classroom and by mentoring students outside the classroom. The minimal requirements for teaching activities are as follows:

- (1) Faculty are expected to teach the equivalent of two courses per semester unless the faculty member is on leave or sabbatical; deviations from this criterion must be previously approved by the Department Head.
- (2) Except for emergencies or if appropriate steps are taken, faculty should be present for all class periods and office hours.
- (3) Student ratings, as taken from the TVAL form or from any other university approved form, for the items “amount learned” and “teacher effectiveness” must be above “L” (lowest 10%) for all classes.
- (4) Academic advising of undergraduate psychology majors must be assumed by each faculty member commensurate with the area and type of advising done.
- (5) All faculty are expected to be the major advisor to a minimum of one graduate student (assuming sufficient graduate student demand for the faculty member’s area(s) of interest and expertise) or provide an equivalent amount of service to support the graduate program.

Research. Every faculty member in the Department of Psychology is expected to engage in scholarly activities and to maintain an active and continuous program of

research. For annual evaluation, research activity is evaluated on a rolling three year basis. The minimal performance criteria listed below, then, reflect those criteria for the **three year period**:

- (1) Faculty must demonstrate evidence of progress toward publication of at least one journal article, book chapter, book, or grant proposal.
- (2) Faculty should also make a minimum of one research presentation at a professional meeting.

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. The minimal criteria for performance in the service domain are as follows:

- (1) Faculty in the Department of Psychology must actively participate on departmental committees as requested by the Department Head.
- (2) Faculty must also provide service outside of the department by fulfilling at least one of the following criteria:
 - (a) Faculty should have provided significant effort in at least one committee or task force within the university.
 - (b) Faculty can also provide service to professional organizations or by serving as an ad hoc reviewer for a journal or funding agency. Faculty may fulfill this criterion by providing appropriate public service and/or consulting.