

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

**ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on May 12, 2006)**

**PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on May 12, 2006)**

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARDS): **5/2011**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **5/2011**

**Anand Desai, Department Head
Date signed: 6/28/06**

**Yar Ebadi, Dean
Date signed: 6/28/06**

**M. Duane Nellis, Provost
Date signed: 6/28/06**

*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.

INTRODUCTION

A continuous process of professional development by the Department's faculty members is essential in order to:

1. provide students with quality instruction reflecting the current state of knowledge and practice within the field;
2. continually enhance the academic and professional stature of the department's program within both the academic and professional communities;
3. provide a scholastic climate that will attract and retain a high-quality faculty;
4. contribute to the knowledge and leadership of the financial community.

The Department's periodic evaluation and assessment of the faculty's performance is necessary to ensure that these objectives are accomplished. The following sections describe the policies and procedures to be followed for such periodic evaluations.

GENERAL POLICY AND DEFINITIONS

The department's policy for the evaluation and promotion of faculty should encourage and reward a broad spectrum of professional activities, with each faculty member's evaluation based on teaching, research and related scholarly activities, and professionalism and service. These three criteria are described in detail in the following sections. These categories are not intended to be rigid. A specific activity might be listed in one category for one faculty member and in a different category for another depending on the precise nature of the activity.

TEACHING

Teaching includes communicating knowledge to students and developing the intellectual foundation necessary to prepare students for life-long learning. Teaching also involves preparing students for entry into professional and scholarly disciplines. Effective teaching is based upon sound scholarship and continued intellectual growth. Faculty should be able to arouse curiosity, stimulate creativity, and develop and organize instructional materials. Academic advising is also an essential instructional activity.

During the faculty member's appointment, teaching performance must be measured and must demonstrate both effectiveness and continued improvement. The quality of teaching is admittedly difficult to evaluate; however, this difficulty does not eliminate the need for measurement. Accordingly, both internal and external sources of information should be included in the evaluation. The following list is organized into broad categories considered appropriate for assessing teaching effectiveness. This list should not be considered exhaustive; further forms of evidence may be found in the Faculty Handbook.

A. Instruction.

Normally faculty will administer the official student teaching evaluation form "TEVAL" for each course taught and submit the results to the Department Head. (See Exhibit 1 for a consent form for the TEVAL to be used for this purpose.) Exceptions may be permitted in unusual circumstances.

The TEVAL form should be considered one of several methods of evaluating an instructor's teaching effectiveness. Other methods include, but are not limited to:

1. Graduating senior exit interviews
2. Alumni evaluations concerning quality of instruction
3. Peer evaluation
4. Competitive awards or recognition for outstanding teaching
5. Student feedback to the Dean or Department Head (which should be documented)

The instructor is encouraged to gather these additional types of evaluations where appropriate.

B. Curriculum management, development, and innovations. These may include:

1. Development of new and/or innovative courses and/or curricula.
2. Innovations in existing courses with respect to content, instructional techniques, or course materials.
3. Development and preparation of courses using alternate methods of instruction, including videotaping, computer facilitation, etc.
4. Coordination of multi-section courses.
5. Team teaching or interdisciplinary teaching.
6. Pedagogical research

C. Scholastic and professional development that contributes to teaching effectiveness:

1. Supervision of independent study, masters' or doctoral theses, or serving on thesis or dissertation committees.

2. Writing textbooks and text-related materials such as guides, case books, instructor's manuals, instructional and educational games, simulations and test banks, and reviewing such materials (including instances in which the faculty member receives compensation from non-university sources).
3. Presentations at workshops and seminars related to teaching methods and techniques.
4. Consulting services in which one applies his/her area of expertise (within the limits of University policies).
5. Designing, conducting, or teaching management and executive development programs.
6. Involving students in faculty research projects and consulting activities.
7. Faculty residencies and other professional development activities that will enhance teaching effectiveness.

D. Individual counseling and faculty advisor work with student groups.

In evaluating the evidence of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness, a number of other factors should be considered, such as: (1) the distribution of student grades within each class, (2) the number of semesters a course has been taught, (3) the quality of facilities available for classes and related activities, (4) class size, (5) the number of new preparations and class sections taught during the year, and (6) level of the course (e.g., junior, senior, graduate).

RESEARCH AND RELATED SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

Research and related scholarly activities include a broad spectrum of creative activities that requires critical examination and investigation. The finance department values both basic and applied research and related scholarly activity. The results of research and related scholarly activities should be shared with others through recognized channels appropriate to the discipline.

A. Publications:

1. Journal articles. In the evaluation of journal articles, the primary consideration is the quality of the article and the impact that it has on the body of knowledge.

Both single-authorship and joint-authorship of journal articles are encouraged in this department. To help facilitate the evaluation of a journal article with more than one author, an effort should be made to document the faculty member's contribution.

Additional consideration should be given to the rigor of the review process to which papers are subjected and the stature of the journals.

The following classifications may serve as guidelines for evaluating journal quality.

- a. Refereed journals of national and/or international significance in which the leading research in the field is published.
 - b. Refereed journals of national significance in which research making a significant contribution to the field is published.
 - c. Other refereed journals of national significance.
 - d. Refereed journals of regional significance, trade journals, refereed conference proceedings, refereed cases, etc.
 - e. Citations and reprints of articles in textbooks.
2. Invited articles. These may be particularly significant since they represent not only publication but professional recognition as well.
 3. Textbooks, textbook revisions, reference books, and related materials should be evaluated consistent with their contribution to the field.
 4. Published book reviews of scholarly or practitioner books in the field should also be considered a contribution to scholarship within the field and should be evaluated accordingly.
- B. Working papers which, although not yet published, receive citations in recognized journals and inquiries and comments from peers.
- C. Other Scholarly Activities:
1. The presentation of a working papers at refereed meetings should be evaluated based on the quality of the paper and the rigor of the review process. All authors of multiple-authored working papers should receive equal credit without regard to who actually makes the presentation at the meeting. Serving as a "discussant" at a scholarly meeting should also be favorably recognized in the faculty member's evaluation, although at a lower level than a "presentation."

The following classifications, ranked in order of importance may serve as guidelines for evaluation of the symposia:

- a. National or international symposia and competitive papers sessions.
- b. Regional symposia and competitive papers sessions.

- c. Other symposia: e.g., symposia at other universities and research institutions.

Invited presentations of papers or projects at scholarly meetings or awards received for "Best Paper" or inclusion in proceedings that publish only selected papers from the meetings should be considered when weighing the quality of the paper.

2. The development and acceptance of research proposals. The primary criterion for evaluating faculty efforts in preparing research proposals is the competitiveness of the review process.
3. Acting as a reviewer for a scholarly journal or for a scholarly meeting, or chairing a conference or a conference session.
4. Attendance at academic or professional conferences without program participation can contribute to scholarly development and should be considered as such. This activity, however, should not be given much weight in the evaluation process.

PROFESSIONALISM AND SERVICE

The department expects that each faculty member will approach their responsibilities with a high degree of professionalism. Professionalism implies that each faculty member is responsible for being an active participant in the activities of the department and college.

Service activities provide opportunities for faculty to apply professional expertise, to participate in the governance and mission of the university, and to be an advocate for the department. Excellence in service entails the faculty member's contribution toward results which reflect favorably on the individual's academic status and favorably on the department, college, or university. Faculty should document achievements that resulted from their service activity. The evaluation process shall consider contribution towards results through service and much less on mere attendance at committee meetings.

Service responsibilities may be fulfilled in a number of ways, many of which are listed below. Faculty members are not expected to be active in all or even most of these activities. The following list is merely indicative of the variety of services that may be performed. Other areas of service are listed in the Faculty Handbook.

A. Within the University:

1. Service to the university and college includes but is not limited to:
 - a. Chairing of, or active membership on college or university-wide committees.

- b. Organizing and sponsoring, or participating in, student professional societies and clubs;
 - c. Directing or participating in activities associated with College or University centers or institutes.
2. Service to the department includes but is not limited to:
- a. Chairing of, or active membership on departmental standing or ad hoc committees;
 - b. Assuming administrative responsibilities;
 - c. Participating in and supporting department activities.
- B. Outside the University:
1. Service to the profession includes but is not limited to:
- a. Serving as an officer of professional organizations at all geographic levels;
 - b. Chairing of, or active membership on professional committees at any geographic level;
 - c. Developing, organizing, or conducting conferences and/or seminars at any geographic level.
2. Service to the community directly related to professional and scholarly activities includes but is not limited to:
- a. Serving on evaluation teams for business and civic organizations;
 - b. Active membership on business or civic boards and committees; and
 - c. Speeches to groups as a representative of the department, college, or university.
 - d. Other activities that enhance the reputation of the University, College, and Department, such as interviews with the media, panel discussions, and/or workshops related to the faculty member's area of expertise.

ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluation of teaching, research and related scholarly activities, and professionalism and service activities should be based on valid supporting material. The Department Head should inform each faculty member concerning the timing of performance evaluations. A suggested procedure for gathering evaluation evidence follows:

1. At the beginning of the calendar year, each faculty member shall outline goals for the three areas of performance (teaching, research and related scholarly activities, professionalism and service, etc.). These goals shall be discussed with the Department Head, resulting in goals that are mutually agreed upon. A copy of these goals should be sent to the Dean's Office within a month of their discussion.
2. At the end of the calendar year, the Department Head shall request annual faculty activity reports. Activity reports consist of the faculty member's documentation of his or her performance in teaching, research and related scholarly activities, professionalism and service, and other activities during the past year. Such documentation includes (but is not limited to) copies of journal articles, acceptance letters for working papers, conference programs in which the faculty member participated, evidence of teaching effectiveness (in the case that TEVAL or other formal performance measurement media is used, student's comments, if applicable, shall also be included), and other relevant supporting documents. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to gather and organize the documentation for the Department Head. Requests by the Department Head for activity reports should be made at a reasonable interval prior to their due date so that faculty members can be complete and clear in their activity reports.
3. The Department Head shall be responsible for the evaluation of faculty member activity reports for purposes of recommending salary adjustments.
4. Each faculty member shall be provided with feedback by the Department Head concerning evaluation of her/his performance in each category.
5. In case of a disagreement the faculty member shall have an opportunity to discuss the evaluation with the Department Head within a reasonable period of time prior to formal presentation of the evaluation to the Dean. If a disagreement persists, after discussions with the Department Head, the faculty member may request a meeting with the Dean for the purpose of attempting to resolve the disagreement. Such a meeting will be convened as soon as possible after the faculty member's meeting with the Department Head.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

For annual reviews, only the current year's progress should be considered in performance evaluation. For projects which extend across more than one calendar year, progress will be evaluated based upon the extent to which the project is brought closer to successful completion during the year for which the faculty member is being evaluated. Thus, a single project may affect a faculty member's evaluation in many periods. For example, a research paper that is written in one period may be considered evidence of being active in research and related scholarly activities. The rewriting and acceptance of the paper by a major journal in a subsequent period would be considered evidence of a significant research and related scholarly activities accomplishment.

As stated previously, each faculty member, in consultation with the Department Head, sets goals for performance in each of the areas of activity at the beginning of each calendar year. These goals shall include the specific weights (to be mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and the Department Head) that the faculty member wishes to assign to each performance area. This process recognizes that the roles of individual faculty members within the department may be different, and such differences should be reflected in the evaluation process. The specific combination of weights assigned to the performance areas may vary depending on the different roles, as well as the faculty member's rank. For example, the recommended combinations for tenure-track assistant professors may be different than those combinations for tenured associate professors. However, weights for the department should, on average, be responsive to college or university-wide guidelines currently in effect.

In general, the weights for tenure-track and tenured faculty should fall within the following ranges:

	Tenure-Track Faculty		Tenured Faculty	
	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
Teaching	40%	60%	40%	60%
Research and related scholarly activities	40%	60%	20%	60%
Professionalism and service	0%	10%	0%	20%

In cases where additional emphasis is needed to provide the faculty with an opportunity to devote efforts to meritorious research and related scholarly activities or teaching, the Department Head may use discretion to negotiate such modifications, as needed, in the weighting factors to enhance departmental objectives.

There are no recommended weights for non-tenure track instructors. Weights for each instructor will be negotiated with the Department Head.

Faculty performance is rated on an integral scale of zero to four in the areas of teaching, research and related scholarly activities, and professionalism and service. The following definitions shall be used for performance evaluation:

- (4) Significantly exceeds expectations
- (3) Exceeds expectations
- (2) Meets expectations
- (1) Fails to meet expectations, but meets the minimum acceptable levels of productivity
- (0) Fails to meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity

The following table may be used for summary purposes:

Performance Evaluation Chart

	Rating	Weight	Rating x Weight
Teaching			
Research and related scholarly activities			
Professionalism and service			
	Weighted-Average Performance Score		

If a tenured faculty member receives a rating of zero for any of the three categories, then the Department Head shall determine, consistent with the departments goals and objectives, whether the provision of Faculty Handbook paragraph C31.5 shall be invoked. The Department Head shall notify the faculty member of such in writing and suggest remedial action, as set forth in paragraph C31.5.

Exhibits 2-4 are provided to facilitate faculty members' preparation of annual activity reports.

PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD

The following refers to the departmental criteria and procedures for the Professorial Performance Award. This award was approved by the University in spring of 2006, and is intended to recognize excellent and sustained performance of full professors. The general guidelines and procedures for this award follow sections C49.1 to C49.14 in the *University Handbook*.

In order to qualify for this award, the candidate must be a fulltime full professor and have been in rank at Kansas State University at least six years since the last promotion or professorial performance award. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review according to the criteria shown below.

CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD

The general criteria and standards for the Professorial performance Award are consistent with those set forth by the Department for promotion to full professor. The Department's "Policy Statement for Decisions Concerning Annual Evaluations, Reappointment, Mid-Probationary Review, Promotion and tenure, and Minimum Productivity Standards". Candidates for this award should provide evidence of continued and sustained national or international recognition in either teaching or research and related scholarly activities. This evidence will consist of activities beyond that provided for either the initial promotion to the rank of full professor, or the previous professorial performance award, if any. While the award shall not be granted solely based on service activities, the candidate should provide evidence of continued and sustained service and leadership on Departmental, College, and University Committees, and/or service to the profession.

Research:

The research portfolio should provide strong evidence that the candidate continues to maintain a national or international reputation in a research area in finance. Examples of evidence that shall be considered may consist of, but is not limited to, the following: publication of heavily cited scholarly papers in top-tier academic journals publishing finance or financial economics research, research awards at the national or international level, and professional recognition of scholarship. A sustained record of extramural funding of research efforts may also be used as evidence of sustained research productivity.

Teaching:

The teaching portfolio should provide strong evidence that the candidate continues to maintain a national or international reputation in teaching. Examples of evidence that shall be considered may consist of, but is not limited to, the following: publication of a nationally recognized textbook used in undergraduate or graduate finance courses, nationally recognized innovations pedagogy, and awards for teaching excellence at the national level. Evidence of high quality teaching within the department must also be included in the portfolio. This may consist of syllabi, examinations, and student evaluations, and examples of courseware materials.

PROCEDURES

Recommendations for the Professorial Performance Award will follow the timeline associated with the annual evaluation review outlined in the University Handbook.

Full professors who are eligible for the award will self-nominate and compile and submit a file that documents his or her professional accomplishments for the previous six years in accordance with the criteria and standards established by the department. This file is submitted to the department head in January, at the time of annual evaluations. The department head will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's material 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 used to determine qualification for the award,
- b. Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation.
- c. Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation,
- d. The candidate's supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award.

MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE PRODUCTIVITY STANDARDS

This policy statement is the response of the Department of Finance to the requirements mandated by Section C31.5 of the *Faculty Handbook*. Section C31.5 requires each department or unit to establish policies describing minimum-acceptable productivity standards as well as procedures for enforcing these requirements. In conformity with Section C31.6 of the *Faculty Handbook*, this policy describes departmental standards that are separate and distinct from individually initiated annual goals and performance plans. In conformity with Section C31.5 and related sections (e.g., C31.6, C31.7, and C31.8) of the *Faculty Handbook*, this policy is concerned with revocation of tenure and should in no way be confused with criteria for the initial awarding of tenure or other pre-tenure evaluations. As such, these criteria are exclusively for tenured faculty holding regular full-time faculty positions. Infrequent events, such as sabbaticals, may require special adjustments to the application of this policy.

The Department of Finance as an academic unit strives to maintain a roughly equal and major emphasis on teaching and research and related scholarly activities. Within this broader context, professional service also represents an essential task for the professorate that is important to the overall functioning of the Department and cannot be ignored. Performance below minimum acceptable standards in *any* assigned area of teaching, research and related scholarly activities and professionalism and service constitutes failure to meet overall minimum performance standards, and is a cause for evoking the process envisioned by C31.5 through C31.8 of the *Faculty Handbook*.

IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

The Department Head will indicate in writing to the tenured faculty member when performance falls below minimum acceptable standards in either teaching, research and related scholarly activities, or professionalism and service as indicated by the annual evaluation.

The Department Head and faculty member who fails to meet the minimum standards will jointly develop a corrective action plan with key benchmarks, time schedules and close oversight and review by the Department Head included in the ensuing review process. It is important that the corrective plan be formulated early in the calendar year. Therefore, the Department Head shall make every effort to complete annual evaluations by the first of March. In cases of disagreement over the corrective action plan, the Dean will determine the appropriate resolution. If either the Department Head or faculty member deems it appropriate, a peer review group, determined by the Department Head, will be created to assist the Department Head in monitoring and evaluating the faculty member's performance. The Department Head will also communicate in writing the actions the faculty member needs to take to improve their performance. The tenured faculty member will inform the Department Head about activities designed to improve performance and submit evidence of improvement.

Exceeding minimum-acceptable standards and avoiding the process outlined in C31.5 through C31.8 (and potential revocation of tenure) requires that a faculty member under the special review process outlined above satisfy each of the standards set forth below. The Dean of the College of Business Administration will be notified by the Department Head about the names of tenured faculty members who fail again to meet the minimum-acceptable levels for the second

year after the Department Head's suggested course of action has been completed. The Dean of the College of Business Administration has the discretion to dismiss a tenured faculty member if he/she receives two successive evaluations below minimally acceptable standards or three evaluations below minimally acceptable standards in any five-year period.

The faculty in the Department of Finance consider tenure essential for promoting an environment of free inquiry and scholarship. Prior to labeling a tenured faculty member a chronic low achiever, the Department Head must take action to help the faculty member improve their performance and make sure that duties have been assigned equitably. The Department Head and faculty member may agree to reallocate the faculty member's time to avoid duties in the area of deficient performance and reassign the person to areas of better performance. This reassignment must be possible in terms of the Department's mission and needs.

MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE PRODUCTIVITY STANDARDS

The following represent the Department's minimum acceptable standards for productivity in each of three areas: teaching, research and related scholarly activities, and professionalism and service.

A. Teaching.

The minimum acceptable productivity standard in the area of teaching is determined by a combination of students evaluations (TEVAL) and a Department Head adjustment based on other criteria outlined below. A teaching "score" is computed as

$$0.8[(AS_1 + AS_{14})/2] + 0.2[\text{Department Head Adjustment}]$$

where AS_1 is the weighted average adjusted score for TEVAL Question 1 (Overall effectiveness as a teacher) for all courses taught in the evaluation year, weighted by the number of students responding in each course, and AS_{14} is the weighted average adjusted score for TEVAL Question 14 (Amount learned by student in the course) for all courses taught in the evaluation year, weighted by the number of students responding in each course.

The Department Head Adjustment is based on the Head's evaluation of non-TEVAL indicators such as:

1. Class characteristics: size of class, type of class (lecture versus case oriented), continuing or new course preparation for the faculty member.
2. Course materials: syllabi, exams, course notes.
3. Other: curriculum development, non-TEVAL student feedback, and if deemed necessary, peer evaluation of the faculty member's instruction quality.

The Department Head Adjustment shall be no less than $[(AS_1 + AS_{14})/2]$ and no greater than 5.0 (the maximum score on the TEVAL instrument). The minimum value ensures that the Department Head's Adjustment does not undermine the student evaluations as to the overall effectiveness of the faculty member and the amount learned.

The critical value of the composite teaching “score” defined above is 2.50. A faculty member shall have failed to meet the minimum productivity standards for teaching if the faculty member receives a score below 2.50 in the evaluation year.

B. Research and related scholarly activities.

Within a four-year window, including the current evaluation year, the faculty member should have at least two of the following, based on either an actual publication/presentation or an acceptance letter, but not both:

1. Refereed journal article
2. Refereed conference presentation
3. Academic or scholarly book
4. Non-refereed journal article
5. Non-refereed conference presentation

A maximum of one non-refereed journal article/non-refereed presentation would count towards satisfying the minimum acceptable standard of productivity for research and related scholarly activities.

C. Professionalism and service.

Service on one committee per year, with satisfactory performance as per the committee chair. The presumption is that performance is satisfactory, but the Department Head may seek an evaluation from the entire committee.

PROMOTION AND TENURE

GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Recommendations for promotion and tenure are described in the Faculty Handbook (para. C70 - C156). For promotion and tenure decisions, the Department Head shall call a meeting of those faculty members of higher rank than the individual being considered, or the tenured faculty (for tenure evaluation). The purpose of this meeting shall be to evaluate the candidate's achievements and qualifications, and to vote on the promotion or tenure recommendation. The candidate's performance and potential shall be evaluated in all relevant activities including: teaching, research and related scholarly activities, and professionalism and service.

PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION

The following procedures are to be used in conjunction with the criteria listed in the Faculty Handbook (Para. C70-C156).¹

1. Instructors seeking promotion to assistant professor should have the appropriate terminal degree as described in the Faculty Handbook (para. C130), and demonstrate evidence of teaching and research and related scholarly activities competence.
2. Assistant professors seeking promotion to the rank of associate professor should submit a portfolio that demonstrates the candidate's proficiency in teaching, research and related scholarly activities, and professionalism and service. This portfolio should also provide evidence of superior ability in either teaching or research and related scholarly activities.
3. Associate professors seeking promotion to the rank of full professor should provide evidence that the candidate has gained national recognition in either teaching or research and related scholarly activities.
4. Tenure Criteria. General tenure criteria are described in the Faculty Handbook (para. C70 - C116 and Appendix C) and in this document.

Consistent with C36.1 and C112.2 of the *Faculty Handbook*, outside reviewers may be asked to evaluate the candidate's package. In that case, each faculty member should provide the Department Head the names of two references outside the university who are qualified to evaluate the individual for this tenure decision. The evaluation of these two references, in addition to those provided by another two individuals, other than the two listed by the candidate, will supplement the evaluation of the resident tenured faculty to arrive at a decision. For this review, the cumulative research and related scholarly activities achievements of the faculty member up to the tenure review cut-off date should be considered. Primary emphasis should be placed on the research and related scholarly activities productivity during the five

¹ Although these requirements are necessary, they are not automatically sufficient.

years immediately preceding the submission of the tenure application. However, significant accomplishments prior to that five-year period will also be considered.

MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW

Policies regarding mid-probationary review are described in the Faculty Handbook (para. 92). For a typical tenure-track appointment, this review will take place during the third year of the faculty member's appointment. Unlike the tenure application which is reviewed both at the college and university level, the review of the mid-probationary review document is performed solely within the College of Business Administration. The documentation for this review is similar to that for the tenure decision, except that outside reviewers will not participate in the mid-probationary review.

ANNUAL REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

University Policy requires that the Department conduct annual reviews of faculty on probationary status for the purpose of reappointment of such faculty. The policies and procedures are covered in Sections C50.1 through C56 of the University Handbook, and is available online at <http://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/fhbook/fhsecc.html>. Appendix A of the Handbook covers the Standards for Notice of Non-Reappointment. This Appendix is also available online at <http://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/fhbook/fhxa.html>.

Within the context of this reappointment review, and the standards and criteria set forth in this document, each faculty member on probationary status should submit the following items annually:

1. Complete and current vita.
2. List of all courses taught while at KSU (include syllabus, class size and GPA for each section).
3. TEVAL numerical scores and transcribed student comments for each section taught.
4. Current status of all research projects listed in the vita as either a) under review b) under revision c) working paper or d) work in progress. Expected completion dates and target journals for each such research project should also be indicated.
5. List of committees and faculty member's role (member/chair).
6. Other items that the faculty member deems pertinent.

Note that items 2,3,5 and 6 are cumulative in nature in that these items should include information since the faculty member's appointment at KSU. Questions regarding the required documentation should be addressed to the department head. The department head shall request submission of these documents each fall semester.

As detailed in Sections C50.1 through C56 of the University Handbook, the reappointment file shall be reviewed by the department's tenured faculty and the head. A recommendation of the tenured faculty and the head will be forwarded to the Dean of the College, along with the reappointment file. The recommendations shall be based on the criteria set forth earlier in this document and applied to the cumulative record of the faculty member.

EXHIBIT 1

CONSENT FORM

I hereby consent to the administration of the TEVAL student evaluation of instruction form in my classes during the _____ semester, 20__, and to the return of the summary of such evaluations by Planning & Evaluation Services directly to the Department of Finance for use by the Department Head in merit pay, promotion, and/or tenure decisions.

I further consent to having all written comments by students on the TEVAL form copied, before submission to Planning and Evaluation Services, by the Finance Department secretarial staff for retention and review by the Department Head.

Signature

Date

EXHIBIT 2

TEACHING EVALUATION OUTLINE

The following are suggested items for evaluation of teaching activities during the year.

I. For quantitative aspects of teaching duties, fill out the following table:

	Course Number	# of Sections	Class Size	GPA
Spring				
Summer				
Fall				
Intersession				
Independent study				

Provide information on textbook-related materials prepared during the year, containing a description and title of the work, name of co-authors, if any, stage of completion, and name and date of publication.

II. For qualitative aspects of teaching, provide the following information (if applicable):

- A. Copies of printouts of TEVAL (or other appropriate) evaluation forms and all comments (if used) for each course taught. If the TEVAL form is not used, faculty should provide an alternate measure of teaching effectiveness (mutually agreed upon with the Department Head).
- B. Descriptions of new courses developed in the academic year, new syllabi, or new teaching methods or techniques used for the first time during this period.
- C. Descriptions of new material used for teaching, such as new texts, cases, practical applications, projects, or guest speakers invited over the semester.
- D. Document any teaching awards, teaching grants, or other evidence of teaching effectiveness.
- E. Describe professional meetings attended (relevant to teaching duties).
- F. Document newly acquired certifications relevant to teaching (such as the CFA).

EXHIBIT 3

RESEARCH AND RELATED SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES EVALUATION OUTLINE

The following are suggested items for evaluation of research and related scholarly activities during the year. Please submit an outline of your work as described in A - C (below).

- A. Research projects: Describe the status of each research project at the beginning and end of the year, detailing the work during the current year required to bring the project to its present form. Include all editorial comments received during the current year.
- B. Research monographs and scholarly texts: Detail the nature of the research, its beginning and end of year status, and the work required during the current year to bring the research to its present form. Include all presentations, submissions and acceptances, and editorial comments received during the current year.
- C. Other activities: Describe other qualified research activities, which include:
 - 1. Receipt of research awards at professional meetings.
 - 2. Receipt of research grants.
 - 3. Acting as a reviewer for scholarly journals.
 - 4. Acting as a discussant or as a reviewer at professional meetings.
 - 5. Attending seminars, classes, or workshops intended to enhance the individuals ability to conduct research.
 - 6. Attendance at professional meetings.

EXHIBIT 4

PROFESSIONALISM AND SERVICE EVALUATION OUTLINE

The following are suggested items for evaluation of professionalism and service activities during the year. Please submit an outline of your work as described in I, II and III (below).

I. Departmental Service Activities:

- A. Serving as advisor to student departmental organizations.
- B. Serving on departmental committees or task forces.
- C. Student advising.
- D. Assisting in departmental administration.
- E. Participation in departmentally sponsored activities.

II. Service to the university and college, including:

- A. Organizing, sponsoring, or advising student organizations;
- B. Membership on, or chairing of, university, college, or ad-hoc committees;
- C. Assuming direct administrative responsibilities;
- D. Membership in the Faculty Senate or Graduate Council, or participation in other faculty government activities.

III. Outside service to the community and the profession, including:

- A. Serving as an officer or committee member in professional organizations;
- B. Addressing professional groups, civic groups, or the community through speeches or media;
- C. Providing consulting services to business firms, private non-profit organizations, and governmental agencies;
- D. Membership on the advisory board for businesses or other institutional organizations;
- E. Providing continuing education to the people of the world;
- F. Developing the ability for service through educational and professional study.