

DEPARTMENT OF MARKETING

**ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on April 27, 2006)**

**PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on April 27, 2006)**

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARDS): **4/2006**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **4/2006**

**Kevin Gwinner, Department Head
Date signed: 7/07/06**

**Yar Ebadi, Dean
Date signed: 7/07/06**

**M. Duane Nellis, Provost
Date signed: 7/07/06**

*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

The department's policy for faculty evaluation encourages and rewards a broad spectrum of professional activities, with each faculty member's evaluation based on some combination of teaching, research, professional service and professional development. These four criteria are described in detail in the following sections. Teaching, research, professional service and professional development are each recognized as important activities in accordance with the mission statements of Kansas State University and the College of Business Administration. Criteria are based on what is expected of a faculty member at a major land-grant university such as Kansas State University.

These categories are not intended to be rigid. A specific activity might be listed in one category for one person and in a different category for another depending on the precise nature of the activity, the needs of the department, and the career goals for a particular faculty member. Teaching and research are given the most weight in the evaluation process.

To maintain continual progress toward excellence in these four areas, the Department must periodically assess the performance of its members and use those assessments as the basis for decisions regarding salary adjustments, reappointments, promotion, and tenure. The purpose of this policy statement is to supplement the *University Handbook* guidelines for evaluating faculty members for salary adjustments, reappointment, promotion, and tenure in the Department of Marketing.

This policy statement reflects the policies and procedures developed for the University by the Faculty Senate, and outlined in Sections C and D, Appendices A, C, and Q and other related parts of the *University Handbook* (2004). Each faculty member is provided with a copy of the *University Handbook* and is expected to become familiar with it. All materials related to tenure & promotion, annual reappointment, as well as annual merit evaluations will be due to the Department Head consistent with the dates specified in the Department Head's Manual, Office of Academic Services (<http://www.ksu.edu/academicservices/depthead/>).

GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Evaluation of performance compares accomplishments to responsibilities, resources, and department standards. The evaluation of teaching, research, professional service, and professional development activities is based upon valid supporting material supplied by the faculty. Standards of performance in personnel evaluations are expectations. The establishment of standards and the measurement of performance should be as objective as possible. Nevertheless, evaluation involves numerous subjective judgments because all responsibilities, resources, objectives, and accomplishments are not easily quantifiable. Therefore, flexibility should be permitted in defining comparable expectations and measuring performance. When subjective evaluation is needed, the Department Head must use good, professional judgment to fairly and clearly communicate expectations and to evaluate performance based on these expectations.

The purpose behind presenting criteria is to clarify as much as possible evaluation philosophy and expectations. The evaluator for the annual evaluation is the Department Head. Evaluators for the annual reappointment of untenured faculty, Mid-Probationary Review, tenure and promotion include the Department Head and tenured faculty within the department.

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Annually in December, faculty in the Department of Marketing with a formal assignment of five tenths or greater are requested to prepare documentation for their Annual Performance Evaluation Summary using the department's annual planning and evaluation guidelines. This document includes an Annual Faculty Progress Report, a set of goals for the coming calendar year as stated in the Department's Annual Performance Goals and Plans document, and a mutually agreed upon (with the Department Head) tenths assignment for the areas of teaching, research, professional service, and professional development.

The Annual Faculty Progress Report is composed of specific information relative to faculty activities in teaching, research, professional service, and professional development. Activities for each faculty member are reviewed and summarized by the Department Head, and an individual, written Annual Performance Evaluation Summary is arranged and conducted in January. 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 will be made at a reasonable time prior to their due date so that faculty members can be complete and clear in their reports.

In January, the Department Head shall evaluate faculty member performance in each of the four performance areas of teaching, research, service, and professional development for the preceding year. Performance in each area shall be categorized and quantified by the Department Head as follows:

- 4 = Exceeded expectations
- 3 = Met expectations
- 2 = Fallen below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity
- 1 = Fails to meet expectations and fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity

The Department Head is responsible for the evaluation of faculty member activity reports for purposes of recommending merit salary adjustments. A summary narrative is prepared by the Department Head, describing overall performance, strengths, and deficiencies in each area of assignment. The Annual Performance Evaluation Summary is presented in draft form to the faculty member for examination. Each faculty member meets with the Department Head to discuss the faculty member's performance relative to his or her overall assignment, and determine if impediments exist which have prevented him or her from obtaining his or her goals. Each faculty member is encouraged to discuss questions about, or corrections to, his or her Annual Performance Evaluation Summary during these meetings. The faculty member and Department Head sign the final document, which is forwarded to the Dean. The faculty

member's signature indicates the document has been read, but does not indicate agreement or disagreement with the content.

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. The faculty member will have the option of providing a letter to the Department Head, which details the nature of the disagreement. The Department Head will sign the letter of dissention and deliver it unedited to the Dean. The Department Head's signature indicates the document has been read, but does not indicate agreement or disagreement with the content.

In evaluating a faculty member's annual performance it is important to avoid distortions caused by arbitrary time periods. Furthermore, faculty activities may extend over many evaluation periods. If credit for the activity is given in only a single period, faculty may be discouraged from engaging in long-term projects.

Generally, annual performance evaluations with respect to elite journal publications, major grants, or major curricular innovations are based upon a moving average concept that considers activities over a multi-year period with the greatest weight being placed on the current period. Specifically, an elite publication (e.g., *Journal of Marketing*) will carry a relatively higher weight for a 3 year period. Similarly, obtaining a major grant which has the effect of bringing in substantial monies for use by the Department, or a major curricular innovation, will carry a higher weight for a two year period.

Departmental resources such as summer school courses, travel money, Graduate Assistants, and secretarial support are allocated on the basis of fulfilling the department mission as determined by the Department Head in consultation with the faculty. Effort will be expended to give all faculty support for their teaching, research, professional service, and professional development activities to help fulfill the Department's mission.

REAPPOINTMENT OF FACULTY ON PROBATIONARY APPOINTMENTS

Faculty members on tenure-track appointments are evaluated annually in November for consideration of reappointment for another year. The Department Head will notify a faculty member in writing of a decision not to renew his or her appointment. The Department Head will make the candidate's file available for review by the tenured faculty in the department. The tenured faculty will make recommendations to the Department Head regarding the candidate's reappointment. The Department Head's recommendation will then be forwarded to the Dean for a final decision regarding reappointment.

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND PLANS

Each faculty member, using the Department's Annual Performance Goals and Plans document, shall outline goals for the four areas of performance for the coming year. These shall be discussed with the Department Head, resulting in goals that are mutually agreed upon. A copy of these goals will be sent to the Dean's Office within a month of their discussion.

These goals shall include the specific weights that the faculty member wishes to assign to each performance area. This process recognizes that the roles of 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 from those combinations for tenured associate professors. These, in turn may vary from those of tenured full professors. Service weights of 20% or higher for Associate and Full Professors are typically discouraged, and would only be possible after appropriate negotiation with the Department Head. In general, the weights for tenure-track and tenured professors should fall within the following ranges:

	Minimum	Maximum
Teaching	30%	60%
Research	20%	60%
Service	5%	30%
Professional Development	5%	10%

There are no recommended weights for non-tenure-track instructors. Weights for each full-time instructor will be negotiated with the Department Head and be based upon the needs of the department. Instructors do not have any research responsibility and accordingly will have a 0% weight assigned to research. Each faculty member at the rank of assistant professor or higher is expected on an annual basis to display a minimum level of competence and activity in each one of the four areas. Instructors are expected on an annual basis to display a minimum level of competence in all areas except research.

For untenured assistant professors, the minimum teaching and research allocation is 40% each, and the maximum service allocation is 15%. Continual professional development is expected of all faculty members. The Annual Performance Goals and Plans can be found in Appendix A. The procedures for computing annual merit raises can be found in Appendix B.

TEACHING

Teaching includes communicating knowledge to students and developing the intellectual foundation necessary to prepare students to continue learning for themselves. Teaching also involves preparing students for entry into professional and scholarly positions, and continued

intellectual growth. Faculty should be able to arouse curiosity; stimulate creativity and critical thinking; and develop, organize, and present instructional materials in a timely manner that enhances the academic and professional reputation of the department and its programs. Academic advising pertaining to marketing and career mentoring is an essential instructional activity and is expected of all faculty.

During the faculty member's appointment, teaching performance must be measured, and it should demonstrate both effectiveness and continued improvement. 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.

Consideration must be given to how well the teaching assignment corresponds to the individual's teaching program. If there is not a good fit between instructor and course, but the department has to maintain the assignment, this should be taken into consideration during the evaluation procedures.

The department provides a comprehensive, flexible yet rigorous portfolio approach to teaching evaluation that includes several types of evidence that can be collected, presented, and evaluated as a portfolio. 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 *University Handbook*.

A. Instructional evaluations:

Faculty will administer the TEVAL for each course taught and annually submit the forms to the Department Head. Faculty will summarize TEVAL scores for the Department Head by presenting each item score for each course in a summary table. The format to be used for summarizing TEVALs can be found in Appendix C. Although the TEVAL reports can now be administered in a paper as well as online format, for consistency sake, the Department of Marketing requires each faculty member to administer TEVAL forms using the paper format.

In addition to the TEVAL reports, materials documenting course content, such as syllabi, reading lists, case studies, term papers, and exams, should be provided by faculty. The summary teaching portfolio for each class may be accompanied by documentation supplied by the instructor that states circumstances which he or she thinks may have influenced the course evaluations. Circumstances may include, but are not limited to, level of course, number of students, level of difficulty, case development, computer assignments, grading standards, course composition (e.g., general education course), popularity of topics, teaching method issues, changes in methods, experimentation, and so forth. Additional methods of evaluation include:

1. Graduating senior and M.B.A. student exit interviews.
2. Alumni evaluations concerning quality of instruction.

3. Peer evaluation which includes a comprehensive, critical review by knowledgeable colleagues of each faculty member's entire range of teaching activities. Recordings of class presentations might be viewed by peers or the Department Head to evaluate the presentation of material.
4. Competitive awards or recognition for outstanding teaching.
5. Student feedback to the Dean or Department Head which has been documented.
6. Company surveys of former students who are now employed by a particular firm.
7. Evaluation of syllabi, reading lists, examinations, term papers, case studies, computer assignments and other course material.

B. Curricular management, development, and innovations, among which may be:

1. Curricula changes and development of new, innovative courses including distance learning. The majority of course development effort falls into the semester the course is first taught, with some spillover into the second time a course is taught. In addition to development of a new course, there will be semesters where maintenance occurs and when substantial updating of material occurs. Some courses require more frequent updating than others which should be recognized.
2. Activities involving teaching abroad and development/implementation/facilitation of study abroad opportunities for Kansas State University students.
3. Innovations in existing courses with respect to subject content, instructional techniques, or course materials. Faculty should periodically review the latest information related to their courses and make every effort to incorporate significant new information, so that students will have the latest knowledge available.
4. Development and preparation of courses using alternate methods of instruction, including multimedia presentations, computer facilitation, and so forth, that teach the students applications of course material.
5. Coordination of multi-section courses.
6. Team teaching or interdisciplinary teaching.
7. Pedagogical research.
8. Syllabi, examinations and samples of graded exams, term papers, case studies, textbooks, and so forth, might be evaluated for their suitability and coherence.
9. The availability of the faculty members to students.
10. Whether the course goals and objectives as stated in the syllabus were met.

C. Scholastic and/or professional growth that contributes to teaching effectiveness, among which may be:

1. Supervision of independent study and student internships, practicum course management, participation on MBA and MACC program of study committees, and serving on thesis or dissertation committees.
2. Writing textbooks and text-related materials such as guides, case books, instructor's manuals, games, simulations and test banks, and reviewing such materials.

3. Presentation of or attendance at workshops and seminars relative to teaching methods and techniques.
 4. Consulting services in which one applies his/her area of expertise. This must be conducted within the limits of University policies.
 5. Designing, conducting, or teaching local, regional, or state executive development programs.
 6. Involving students in faculty research projects and consulting activities.
 7. Recruiting marketing majors.
- D. Individual student counseling and mentoring activities, and faculty advisor work with student clubs, organizations, and companies.

RESEARCH

Research includes a broad spectrum of scholarship and other creative activities that requires critical examination and investigation of marketing phenomena. These endeavors are directed toward discovering new ideas, developing new interpretations of existing ideas, or participating in the application and dissemination of these ideas. The results of research, scholarship, and/or creative activity should be shared with others through recognized channels appropriate to the discipline. The department strives to create a scholastic environment that will attract and retain high quality faculty and help fulfill our responsibility to the marketing profession and the state of Kansas.

Evaluating research productivity and quality involves a myriad of accomplishments to be considered. Research often results in numerous intermediate steps which ultimately end in finished products. Evidence of a productive research program is essential and attempts should be made to assess the quality of the research program.

Research productivity needs to be assessed in accordance with individual position appointments. Individuals having relatively high percentages of research appointments are expected to exhibit proportionally more productive research programs than those having smaller percentage appointments.

A. Publications:

1. In the evaluation of journal articles, book chapters, conference proceedings and cases, the primary consideration is the quality of the outlet and the impact that these publications have on the profession. The following classifications, ranked in order of importance, serve as guidelines for evaluating journal quality, book chapters, conference proceedings and cases.
 - a. Published refereed articles in marketing journals and journals from related disciplines of national and/or international significance.
 - b. Refereed book chapters.

- c. Refereed national and/or international conference proceedings and presentations.
- d. Refereed regional conference proceedings, and presentations.
- e. Refereed Cases.

Recognition of scholarly research contributions in the form of research awards, number of citations, and reprints of articles in books shall be considered. Additional consideration is given to the rigor of the review process to which papers are subjected and the stature of the journals. The number of publications must be considered jointly with the number and order of authors. Sole authorship will receive most credit, followed by senior authorship, and so forth. Collaborative work is strongly encouraged.

- 2. Invited review articles which may be significant because they represent not only a publication but professional recognition as well.
- 3. Student textbooks.
- 4. Published book reviews of scholarly or practitioner books in the field should also be considered as a contribution to scholarship within the discipline and should be evaluated accordingly.
- 5. Scholarly books and non-refereed chapters in scholarly books.
- 6. Instructor's manuals, textbook revisions, study guides, test banks, computer software and related materials are seen as a contribution to the discipline.

B. The development and acceptance of research grant proposals is considered a valued activity. Grants received from sources external to KSU are viewed as especially significant. For all grants, the dollar amount of the monetary award will be one indicator used to assess the significance of the grant writing activity.

C. Other Scholarly Research Activities:

- 1. Papers presented at other marketing symposia, such as symposia at other universities and research institutions.
- 2. Invited presentations of papers or projects at national or regional scholarly meetings.
- 3. Attendance at refereed academic or professional conferences without program participation can contribute to scholarly development and should be considered valuable.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Service activities provide opportunities for faculty to apply professional expertise, to participate in the governance and mission of the university, and to voice positions unique to the department. Excellence in service entails the faculty member's contribution toward results which reflect favorably on the individual's academic status and/or the department, college, or university. Faculty should document achievements that result from their service activity. The evaluation

process will place more weight on contribution towards results and much less on mere attendance at committee meetings. Attendance at committee, department, and college faculty meetings is expected.

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. Indeed, some faculty may elect to be involved minimally in service activities. The following list is indicative of the variety of services that may be performed for evaluation. Other areas of service are listed in the *University 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, 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 opportunities and/or responsibilities.
- c. Participating in and supporting department activities and goals.
- d. Serving as a mentor for students and new faculty is an important professional leadership role that provides valuable service to students, new faculty members, the department, and the university. Faculty evaluation should recognize contributions made serving as an effective mentor. Mentoring activities should be summarized in the evaluation documentation.

B. Outside the University.

1. Service to the profession includes, but is not limited to:

- a. Serving as an officer of national or international professional marketing organizations.
- b. Chairing of, or active membership on, national or international professional marketing committees.
- c. Developing, organizing, or conducting national or international marketing conferences and seminars.
- d. Serving on editorial boards of book publishers, professional journals, or conference publications.

- e. Serving as a panelist, chair, discussant, or moderator at professional conferences and seminars.
 - f. Serving as a reviewer for refereed marketing journals and conference papers.
2. Service to the community directly related to professional and scholarly marketing 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.
 - c. Speeches to groups as a representative of the department, college, or university, especially to recruit new students or educate members of a civic organization about the discipline.
 - d. Solicited presentations in the mass media including Internet, television shows, radio interviews, and newspaper articles that pertain to faculty expertise in marketing.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Professional development activities are efforts an individual undertakes to become capable of better teaching, research, and professional service. It is not necessarily synonymous with current teaching, research, or service performance, because professional development activities may improve future performance. All faculty should be engaged in activities that help maintain or enhance their intellectual capital.

This area encompasses a wide scope of activities, and the following list is indicative of the variety of those activities:

1. Participation at academic or professional development meetings, including the CBA Research Seminar.
2. Development of research, teaching, and student mentoring, and advising skills through attending workshops, study leaves, and academic conference sessions.
3. Faculty residencies or a visiting appointment at another institution.
4. Self-study toward specific academic or professional marketing objectives. For example, professional certification, learning about new research tools, and increased specialization in particular areas of expertise are seen as appropriate activities.
5. Consulting on substantive business problems.
6. Academic sabbaticals for professional development.

MINIMUM-ACCEPTABLE LEVELS OF PRODUCTIVITY

In accordance with Section C31.5 through C31.8 of the *University Handbook*, the faculty of the Department of Marketing have established minimum-acceptable levels of productivity for each of the four performance areas for tenured faculty. Per C31.5 and related clauses (e.g., C31.6,

C31.7, and C31.8), this policy is concerned with revocation of tenure and should not in anyway be confused with criteria for the initial awarding of tenure. As such, these criteria are exclusively for tenured faculty in a regular nine-month faculty position. Chronic failure to meet the minimum-acceptable levels constitutes evidence of professional incompetence.

The Department of Marketing as an academic unit strives to maintain a roughly equal and major emphasis on teaching and research. Within this broader context, professional service and professional development also represent essential tasks for the professorate which are important to the overall functioning of the Department and cannot be ignored. Below minimum-acceptable performance in any of these categories is cause for evoking the process envisioned by C31.5 through C31.8. The Department Head will indicate in writing to the tenured faculty member when his or her overall performance falls below the minimum-acceptable level as indicated by the annual evaluation.

The Department Head and faculty member who fails to meet minimum standards will jointly create a performance plan with key benchmarks, and time schedules. Close oversight and review by the Department Head will be included in the ensuing review process. 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 with membership 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 his or her 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 or 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 Marketing consider tenure essential for promoting an environment of free inquiry and scholarship. No single individual has the right to determine the revocation of tenure without input from the department faculty. Prior to labeling a tenured faculty member a chronic low achiever, the Department Head must take action to help the faculty member improve his or her 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 of Marketing's mission and needs.

The following represent minimum departmental standards for productivity.

1. All tenured faculty are expected to satisfactorily design and manage their courses to promote student learning about the discipline. Tenured faculty must achieve a minimum TEVAL rating of 2.0 (averaged over a two year period) for all courses. The average is based upon a summation of teacher effectiveness (#1) and amount learned (#14) divided by two as listed on the TEVAL rating form for each course. The average for each course is then summed and divided by the number of courses.
2. All tenured faculty are expected to engage in at least one professional development activity every two years.
3. All tenured faculty are expected to satisfactorily contribute to the Department, College, University, and/or discipline through professional service. Tenured faculty must serve on at least one committee every two years.
4. All tenured faculty are expected to make scholarly contributions to the discipline. Tenured faculty are expected to publish a minimum of one refereed conference proceeding and one refereed journal article every four years.

The chronic low achiever label can be enacted when a tenured faculty member fails to meet any of the above listed performance standards.

TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA

General criteria for promotion and tenure are stated in the *University Handbook* in Section C. The following statements offer additional guidelines for the Department Head and the faculty.

A. Assistant to Associate Professor

The requirements to be eligible for consideration for promotion and tenure from assistant to associate professor include:

1. A portfolio of scholarly research activities, as described on pages 7 and 8 of this document, shall be considered in the evaluation for promotion and tenure. However, refereed journal articles shall be considered the major indicator of research for this decision. Further, journal quality (as outlined in Section A1 on page 7) shall play a significant role in the evaluation of a candidate's research. We explicitly recognize that individual faculty may select unique research paths that reflect excellence in scholarship. Each assistant professor should be a major contributor to and/or a principal author of a majority of his or her articles. Assistant professors are required to demonstrate that they are capable of establishing and independently conducting a research program that leads to published refereed articles in marketing journals.
2. A teaching portfolio approach will be used in the assessment of quality teaching. Teaching activities as described on pages 4 - 7 of this document shall be considered in the evaluation for promotion and tenure.

3. Although teaching and research are the most important criteria in the granting of tenure and in the promotion from assistant to associate professor, services and professional development contributions are considered valuable activities. A portfolio approach demonstrating accomplishments in the areas of service and professional development (as outlined on pages 8 – 10 of this document) shall be used in the evaluation for promotion and tenure.
4. Receiving, as a minimum, a rating of "meeting expectations" on the candidate's annual evaluations in the areas of teaching, research, service, and professional development during the probationary period.
5. Assistant professors must have attained membership on the Graduate Faculty prior to their Mid-Probationary Review.

B. Associate to Full Professor

The requirements to be eligible for consideration for promotion from associate to full professor include:

1. Achieving national/international recognition for contributions to the profession.
2. Continued excellence in teaching, research, and service, as described on pages 4 through 9 of this document. We recognize that individual faculty scholarship activities in these areas will change as faculty advance in rank. Professional development activities are also highly valued and will be used in the evaluation of promotion to full professor.
3. A portfolio of scholarly research activities, as described on pages 7 and 8 of this document, shall be considered in the evaluation for promotion.
4. Candidates for full professor must demonstrate leadership in professional service by serving on University, College, and Departmental committees. Candidates must demonstrate an active role in advancing the mission of the Department and College.
5. The candidate must provide evidence of continued teaching excellence. A teaching portfolio approach will be used to evaluate a candidate's teaching performance.

FACULTY COLLEGIALITY

Collegiality, while a less crucial issue relative to teaching and research, will be explicitly addressed in the annual evaluation and in tenure and promotion decisions. Minor interpersonal style issues that do not affect mission-related contributions will not be considered, nor will professional or philosophical differences. Indeed, the faculty values and highly desires a wide range of professional and philosophical perspectives, vigorous debate on issues facing the department, and independent thoughts and free expression of those thoughts in a professional manner. Relevant collegiality factors include interpersonal integrity, adherence to professional ethics, effective management of disagreement and conflict, cooperation, generosity with intellectual resources, and mutual respect. Faculty members are expected to maintain a collegial conduct and behavior such that the Department of Marketing and the College of Business Administration can accomplish their respective missions in an effective manner.

PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD CRITERIA

The intent of this award is to recognize excellent and sustained high quality performance of faculty at the rank of full professor. To be eligible, the faculty member must be a full time faculty member and have been at the full professor rank at KSU for at least the 6 years immediately prior to being considered for the award.

The criteria for this award are comparable with the quality and breadth of requirements needed to be considered for promotion from associate professor to full professor in the Department of Marketing. Specifically, the following requirements, which parallel the requirements used in considering candidates for promotion from associate to full professor, will be used as the evaluative criteria for the Professorial Performance Award.

1. Continued national/international recognition for contributions to the profession.
2. Continued excellence in teaching, research, and service, as described on pages 4 through 9 of the department's Tenure and Promotion document. Professional development activities are also highly valued and will be used in the evaluation of the Professorial Performance Award.
3. A portfolio of scholarly research activities, as described on pages 6 - 8 of the department's Tenure and Promotion document, shall be considered in the evaluation for the Professorial Performance Award.
4. Candidates for the Professorial Performance Award must demonstrate leadership in professional service by serving on University, College, and Departmental committees. Candidates must demonstrate an active role in advancing the mission of the Department and College.
5. Candidates for the Professorial Performance Award must provide evidence of continued teaching excellence, as described on pages 5-8 of the department's Tenure and Promotion document. A teaching portfolio approach will be used to evaluate a candidate's teaching performance.

The procedures for determining awardees will follow a timeline consistent with the activities associated with the annual evaluation review process and the procedures described in section C49 of the University Handbook. The criteria for the Professorial Performance Award will be reevaluated every five years or earlier if the department's Policy Statement for Evaluation Decisions Concerning Annual Evaluations, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure is changed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Appreciation is extended to the Departments of Management, Accounting, Finance, Entomology, Philosophy, Plant Pathology and Agronomy for some of the content of this document.

APPENDIX A

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE GOALS & PLANS

The following format is used to specify annual performance goals and plans for the calendar year. This section is completed by the faculty member and presented to the Department Head in January with the Annual Performance Evaluation Summary.

Name:

Performance Period: Annual Year (**List Year**)

Teaching
___%

Teaching Performance Weighting:

Planned or Actual Courses:

Spring:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Summer:

- 1.
- 2.

Fall:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

On an attached sheet, summarize noteworthy developmental plans for a particular course and new pedagogical thrusts in your teaching. Also, note related key milestone events and time frame. This is intended to (1) help you organize your teaching enrichment efforts, and (2) let the Department Head know the highlights and general directions of your changes. A one page explanation will generally be adequate.

Research:
_____ %

Research Performance Weighting:

On a separate sheet identify your intended research outcomes such as article submissions, conference presentations, textbooks, and other pedagogical writings, etc., for (**List Year**). A title and two sentence description per outcome will generally be adequate.

For each outcome, create an action plan that identifies key milestone events such as data collection completion, analysis completion, submission, etc. and associated completion dates. For most outcomes, two to three supporting milestone events will be adequate.

Professional Service Activities: **Service Performance Weighting:** _____%

In the space below identify your anticipated professional service activities for the Department, College, University, or professional marketing organizations. Please understand that all service demands cannot be completely anticipated and that your service responsibilities may evolve in the face of changing demands. I will always discuss changes in service demands with you.

Professional Development: **Professional Development Weighting:** _____%

What new professional skills or knowledge areas are you going to add to your portfolio of competencies this year? This could include improving or expanding existing skills or knowledge areas. Two to three professional development goals will be appropriate for most faculty members. On an attached page present: (1) your professional development goals for **(List Year)** and (2) identify ways that the Department Head could help you obtain each goal.

The foregoing plans and goals are agreed upon by the Department Head and the faculty member as reasonable performance objectives for the calendar year. Both parties agree that circumstances beyond the control of either may cause actual performance results to differ from those anticipated. The faculty member will consult with the Department Head prior to undertaking major activities which would cause significant deviation from the plan. If such deviations occur, the annual goals specified by a faculty member in January may be modified by September 1 of a given year with approval from the Department Head.

January, _____ **(List Year)**
Date

Department Head Signature

Faculty Signature

APPENDIX B

ANNUAL MERIT INCREASE AND MARKET ADJUSTMENT RECCOMENDATION PROCEDURES

The following procedures are used to determine merit raises for tenure-track and tenured faculty in the Department of Marketing for **(List Year)**.

1. Tenure-track and tenured faculty merit raises are based upon the percentage of time allocated to teaching, research, professional service, and professional development, and the faculty member's annual evaluation rating for each of these categories. The following **(List Year)** time allocation factors are used in conjunction with the **(List Year)** Annual Evaluation Narrative written by the Department Head and signed by the faculty member to rate faculty for an annual merit percent increase. The time allocations are jointly determined by the faculty member and Department Head in January when annual goals are developed. *Fictitious examples of the process are given below.*

Name	Faculty Responsibilities	Time Allocation for Each Category	Annual Evaluation Rating for Each Category
Professor A	Research	45%	Meets Expectations - 3
	Teaching	45%	Exceeds Expectations - 4
	Professional Service	5%	Meets Expectations - 3
	Professional Development	5%	Meets Expectations - 3
Professor B	Research	45%	Meets Expectations - 3
	Teaching	45%	Meets Expectations - 3
	Professional Service	5%	Meets Expectations - 3
	Professional Development	5%	Meets Expectations - 3
Professor C	Research	50%	Meets Expectations - 3
	Teaching	40%	Exceeds Expectations - 4
	Professional Service	5%	Exceeds Expectations - 4
	Professional Development	5%	Exceeds Expectations - 4

2. The following numbers are multiplied by the time allocation for teaching, research, professional service, and professional development to assign an overall rating for each category for merit salary adjustments for each faculty member.

- 4 = Exceeds Expectations
- 3 = Meets Expectations
- 2 = Falls below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity
- 1 = Fails to meet expectations and has fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity

3. The following formula is used to determine a numerical rating for each professor's overall (**List Year**) annual evaluation. The time allocations for each category are assigned from the numbers determined by the Department Head and each faculty member during the annual goal planning process in January.

Name	Research (List Year Time Allocation) X Rating	Teaching (List Year Time Allocation) X Rating	Professional Service (List Year Time Allocation) X Rating	Professional Development (List Year Time Allocation) X Rating	Overall Rating
Professor A	$(.45) \times 3.0$ 1.35	$(.45) \times 4.0$ 1.8	$(.05) \times 3.0$.15	$(.05) \times 3.0$.15	3.45
Professor B	$(.45) \times 3.0$ 1.35	$(.45) \times 3.0$ 1.35	$(.05) \times 3.0$.15	$(.05) \times 3.0$.15	3.0
Professor C	$(.50) \times 3.0$ 1.5	$(.40) \times 4.0$ 1.6	$(.05) \times 4.0$.2	$(.05) \times 4.0$.2	3.50

4. Each faculty member's individual overall rating is divided by the average score for the Department. The average Departmental score is computed by adding the overall ratings for the faculty and dividing by the number of faculty rated.

Name	Overall Annual Rating
Professor A	3.45
Professor B	3.0
Professor C	3.50
	9.95
	Sum of ratings
	÷ 3
	3.31
	Number of faculty
	Average faculty rating for the Department for (List Year)

5. Each faculty member's individual overall annual rating for the Department is divided by the average tenure-track and tenured faculty rating for **(List Year)** to achieve a final rating for **(List Year)**.

Name	Overall Annual Rating		Average Faculty Rating for Department	=	Final Rating for (List Year)
Professor A	3.45	÷	3.31	=	1.04
Professor B	3.00	÷	3.31	=	.90
Professor C	3.50	÷	3.31	=	1.05

6. Each faculty member's final rating is multiplied by the percent merit raise allocated to the Department by the State, University, and Dean of the College of Business Administration.

Name	Final Rating for 2000	X	State Merit Percent Increase	=	Recommended Annual Merit Percent Increase
Professor A	1.04	X	3.15%	=	3.27%
Professor B	.90	X	3.15%	=	2.83%
Professor C	1.05	X	3.15%	=	3.30%

7. This final merit salary recommendation for tenure-track and tenured faculty for **(List Year)** is based upon the numerical calculations presented below in which the recommended annual merit percent increase is multiplied by the nine month salary:

Name	Recommended Annual Merit Percent Increase	+	9 Month Salary	=	(List Following Year) Recommended Salary
Professor A	3.27%	+	60,000	=	61,962
Professor B	2.83%	+	60,000	=	61,698
Professor C	3.30%	+	60,000	=	61,980

The following procedures are used to determine merit raises for instructors in the Department of Marketing for **(List Year)**. *Fictitious examples of the process are given below.*

- Instructors' merit raises are based upon the percentage of time allocated to teaching, professional service and professional development and the faculty member's annual evaluation rating for each of these categories. Instructors do not have any research responsibilities; rather, they teach additional sections of marketing courses. The following **(List Year)** time allocations factors are used in conjunctions with the **(List Year)** Annual Evaluation Narrative written by the Department Head and signed by the instructor to arrive at a merit percent increase. The time allocations are jointly determined by the faculty member and Department Head in January when annual goals are developed.

Name	Instructor Responsibilities	Time Allocation for Each Category	Annual Evaluation Rating for Each Category
Instructor A	Teaching	80%	Exceeds Expectations - 4
	Professional Service	15%	Meets Expectations - 3
	Professional Development	5%	Meets Expectations - 3
Instructor B	Teaching	80%	Meets Expectations - 3
	Professional Service	15%	Meets Expectations - 3
	Professional Development	5%	Meets Expectations - 3
Instructor C	Teaching	80%	Exceeds Expectations - 4
	Professional Service	15%	Exceeds Expectations - 4
	Professional Development	5%	Exceeds Expectations - 4

- The following numbers are multiplied by the time allocation for teaching, professional service, and professional development to assign an overall rating for each category for merit salary adjustments for each instructor.

- 4 = Exceeds Expectations
- 3 = Meets Expectations
- 2 = Falls below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity
- 1 = Fails to meet expectations and has fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity

3. The following formula is used to determine a numerical rating for each instructor's overall **(List Year)** annual evaluation. The time allocations for each category are assigned from the numbers determined by the Department Head and each instructor during the annual goal planning process in January.

Name	Teaching (List Year Time Allocation) X Rating	Professional Service (List Year Time Allocation) X Rating	Professional Development (List Year Time Allocation) X Rating	Overall Rating
Instructor A	$(.80) \times 4.0$ 3.2	$(.15) \times 3.0$ + .45	$(.05) \times 3.0$ + .15	= 3.80
Instructor B	$(.80) \times 3.0$ 2.4	$(.15) \times 3.0$ + .45	$(.05) \times 3.0$ + .15	= 3.0
Instructor C	$(.80) \times 4.0$ 3.2	$(.15) \times 4.0$ + .60	$(.05) \times 4.0$ + .20	= 4.0

4. Each instructor's individual overall rating is divided by the average score for the instructors in the Department. The average Departmental score is computed by adding the overall ratings for the instructors and dividing by the number of instructors rated.

Name	Overall Annual Rating
Instructor A	3.80
Instructor B	3.0
Instructor C	4.00
	<hr/> 10.80
	Sum of ratings
	÷ 3
	<hr/> 3.60
	Number of instructors
	Average instructor rating for the Department for (List Year)

5. Each instructor's individual overall annual rating for the Department is divided by the average instructor rating for **(List Year)** to achieve a final rating for **(List Year)**.

Name	Overall Annual Rating		Average Instructor Rating for Department	=	Final Rating for (List Year)
Instructor A	3.80	÷	3.60	=	1.05
Instructor B	3.00	÷	3.60	=	.83
Instructor C	4.00	÷	3.60	=	1.11

6. Each instructor's final rating is multiplied by the percent merit raise allocated to the Department by the State, University, and Dean of the College of Business Administration.

Name	Final Rating for (List Year)	X	State Merit Percent Increase	=	Recommended Annual Merit Percent Increase
Instructor A	1.05	X	3.15%	=	3.30%
Instructor B	.83	X	3.15%	=	2.61%
Instructor C	1.11	X	3.15%	=	3.49%

7. This final merit salary recommendation for instructors for **(List Year)** is based upon the numerical calculations presented below in which the recommended annual merit percent increase is multiplied by the nine month salary:

Name	Recommended Annual Merit Percent Increase	+	9 Month Salary	=	(List Following Year) Recommended Salary
Instructor A	3.30%	+	30,000	=	30,990
Instructor B	2.61%	+	30,000	=	30,783
Instructor C	3.49%	+	30,000	=	31,047

EXAMPLE SALARY CHANGE FORM FOR PROFESSORS

This form will be presented to each faculty member by the Department Head.

Your salary increase for next year has two components: (1) a merit-based adjustment, and (2) market-equity adjustments.

1. The merit-based adjustments are mathematical extrapolations of the annual review rating process. We had 3.15% available for distribution. The following formula was used:

Your Overall Annual Merit Rating/Department Average Rating (3.31) = Final Rating X 3.15%

This resulted in a merit increase of _____ for you.

2. The market-equity adjustments utilized the remaining (1.4%) from the State allotment. Your increase from this source is _____ for a total increase of _____.

You may have heard about a 4.9% increase amount. This is the amount that was allocated to the University. A .35% amount was held back for adjustments at the University level and the Dean kept 1.4% for market-equity adjustments at his level. This left 3.15% for distribution by departments for merit salary adjustments. The Dean may decide to adjust this figure up or down.

EXAMPLE SALARY CHANGE FORM FOR INSTRUCTORS

This form will be presented to each faculty member by the Department Head.

Your salary increase for next year has two components: (1) a merit-based adjustment, and (2) market-equity adjustments.

1. The merit-based adjustments are mathematical extrapolations of the annual review rating process. We had 3.15% available for distribution. The following formula was used:

Your Overall Annual Merit Rating/Department Average Rating (3.60) = Final Rating X
3.15%

This resulted in a merit increase of _____ for you.

2. The market-equity adjustments utilized the remaining (1.4%) from the State allotment. Your increase from this source is _____ for a total increase of _____.

You may have heard about a 4.9% increase amount. This is the amount that was allocated to the university. A .35% amount was held back for adjustments at the University level and the Dean kept 1.4% for market-equity adjustments at his level. This left 3.15% for distribution by departments for merit salary adjustments. The Dean may decide to adjust this figure up or down.