

## **DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

### **ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

***Including the Professorial Performance Award criteria and standards***

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 3/06/06)

### **CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT PROCEDURES**

(Approved by Faculty Vote 3/06/06)

### **PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 3/06/06)

**REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES \*(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT): March 2011**

**REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES\*: March 2011**

**David Thompson, Department Head**

**Date signed: 3/03/06**

**Mike Holen, Dean**

**Date signed: 3/06/06**

**M. Duane Nellis, Provost**

**Date signed: 3/14/06**

\*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.

**DEPARTMENT OF**

**EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

**Kansas State University  
College of Education**

**March 6, 2006\***

**\* In 2004, the Department of Educational Administration and Leadership and the Department of Foundations and Adult Education were joined and renamed Department of Educational Leadership. Major policy documents were reviewed and approved in September 2004. The present revision represents the policies and procedures as currently practiced and approved by faculty on March 6, 2006.**

# **Faculty Evaluation Policies**

# **ANNUAL EVALUATION FOR MERIT REVIEW AND PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT**

## **Department of Educational Leadership Faculty of Adult Education**

First approved by departmental faculty 12/02  
Amended to reflect new department name and process 9/04

Following University procedures, the department chair will evaluate each faculty member for his/her contributions to teaching, student advising, scholarship, service, and academic citizenship. The department chair's recommendations are to be based on: (1) the relative weights established each year jointly by the individual faculty member and department chair; (2) each faculty member's self-report augmented by appropriate evaluation data; and (3) the department chair's own assessment of faculty growth and productivity. This policy applies to those faculty for whom the annual salary recommendations originate from the department (ordinarily those holding more than half-time appointments in the department). It does not apply to the chair, whose salary recommendation originates with the dean.

### **A. AREAS OF EVALUATION**

Five areas of faculty performance have been identified for evaluation. Not all faculty will necessarily have responsibilities in each area in each year. The allocation of responsibilities, and hence evaluation weights, are determined jointly by the chair and individual faculty member, within the limits prescribed below. In each case, the weights must total 100%. Faculty on sabbatical leave are exempt from these limits and may establish weights appropriate to the goals established for their leave.

- Teaching 20% - 60%
- Student Advising (Graduate & Undergraduate) 0%-20%
- Scholarship 10% - 50%
- Service (Directed and Non-Directed) 10% - 60%
- Academic Citizenship 10%

In general, faculty members holding senior rank may tend to have more responsibility in research and creative endeavors and/or non-directed service than faculty members holding junior rank. Similarly, instructors may, on average, have heavier teaching and advising responsibilities than others. At some times, most or all faculty members may have similar, or even identical, assigned responsibilities and consequential evaluation weights. At other times, departmental responsibilities may better be served by differential assignments. The decision is left in the hands of the department chair, who is in turn accountable for the college priorities established by the dean.

### **B. ANNUAL GOAL SETTING**

Each faculty member will meet with the chair during the first month of the evaluation year to establish personal goals and objectives for the upcoming evaluation year and to discuss his or her relative contribution to various departmental missions. (see Attachment 1.) This meeting can be initiated by either the individual faculty member or the department chair or may be by written communication if both parties agree. This process will result in the specification of the numeric weight of each faculty member's position responsibilities for the evaluation year and the identical corresponding weights for the evaluation process.

On occasion, modifications of such statements are necessary due to unanticipated changes in departmental circumstances, such as changes in course offerings, grants funded, or research

opportunities. Such modifications should be made in writing and submitted no later than the date by which faculty evaluations are due each year.

It is understood that precise specification of objectives will be neither feasible nor productive. Faculty evaluation does not ordinarily lend itself to simply checking off attainment of goals or to mere counting of points; such reductionist attempts distort performance. Evaluation requires professional judgment. Nonetheless, it is appropriate to establish each faculty member's responsibilities and to delineate the relative importance of the areas of evaluation for the forthcoming year. The dual aims of course, are to meet the department's missions and to capitalize upon faculty strengths/opportunities. Should the chair and the faculty member be unable to agree on goals and objectives for the new evaluation period, the dean shall resolve the matter.

**Faculty responsibilities:** To work collaboratively with the department chair in outlining position responsibilities for the coming year and, in a timely manner, notifying the chair of substantial changes in those responsibilities. The faculty member is solely responsible for requesting any changes in the evaluation weights at the time that faculty materials are submitted for review.

**Chair responsibilities:** To communicate any college-wide priorities to the department and to initiate the meetings and/or written communication to establish annual goals with individual faculty members. The department chair is solely responsible for insuring that Attachment 1 is completed for all faculty by the required deadline or referring individual cases to the dean for resolution.

### **C. CRITERIA/REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

The sources of information to be used by the departmental chair in each of the areas of evaluation are described in the paragraphs that follow. Faculty are expected to provide the self-reports and evaluation information embedded within these criteria. Attachment 2 provides a sample structure within which evaluation materials can be organized.

#### **1. Teaching**

University rules require that "an adequate system of summative evaluation of teaching will include at least three kinds of information: (a) classroom effectiveness, (b) preparation of instructional materials and syllabi, and (c) student assessment practices." Three sources of information will be required of each faculty member and can be summarized using Attachment 2.

- a. **Self-Report:** This asks each faculty member to provide a report of teaching activities inside and outside of the classroom. Each faculty member should report, in short paragraphs, instructional work related to revision or reorganization of course content, development of a new course offering, or efforts to introduce innovations into the curriculum or into a specific course.
- b. **Syllabus:** Each faculty member must present a course syllabus which describes the content to be covered and work required of the student.
- c. **Student Assessments:** Collection of data about the student's perceptions of instruction should be completed by using the TEVAL form. Faculty should solicit student feedback toward the end of each class in ways consistent with insuring the integrity of student responses. TEVAL forms should be completed when the instructor is not present. Forms should be forwarded to the Office for Instructional Advancement, to be evaluated and returned to the instructor after grades have been determined. Faculty are asked to provide copies of the official feedback form and ALL student comments.

For those who teach graduate-level courses, the standard TEVAL form is to be augmented by a series of questions designed to explore behaviors more appropriate to self-directed learning and

the development of critical thinking skills. These questions were approved by the (then-named) FAE faculty at its February 1995 meeting and will be evaluated for their appropriateness and modified as needed each February thereafter.

## **2. Student Advising**

Advising is an important component of faculty work. Given the changing requirements of the state, it is vital that undergraduate students be given proper advice. The advising relationship between faculty members and graduate students is key to the graduate student's development as a professional educator and/or researcher.

Self-Report: With regard to the advisement of undergraduate students, each faculty member will be asked to provide a report of the number of students advised during the Spring, Summer, and Fall Semesters. With regard to the advisement of graduate students, each faculty member must provide an annual report of: (1) number of Masters' committees served on, number of Masters' committees chaired, and number of Masters' students completed; and (2) number of Ph.D./Ed.D. committees served on, number of Ph.D./Ed.D. committees chaired, numbers who completed proposals in the past year, and numbers who completed dissertations in the past year.

## **3. Scholarship**

Given the professional character of the college's work, scholarship includes a broad range of products - including but not limited to publications in refereed journals. Examples of scholarly work might include product development, books, reviews, monographs, grant proposals, products of field work, articles published in peer reviewed journals, etc. It is important here to distinguish between work done for contractual purposes and work done to advance the University mission. Work that advances the teaching, development, research, and service missions of the University, that has the capacity to be disseminated widely to relevant publics, and that is available for peer review shall be considered scholarly work appropriate to University review. Work completed for contract that results only in materials or documents circulated within the contracting organization and/or does not appear to contribute to the larger knowledge base regarding teaching, the discipline, or effective strategies for linking University resources to the public through service will not be considered scholarly work for the purposes of merit evaluation. Some of these examples may involve effort during more than one evaluation year. In the case of work which extends over two years, faculty members may claim credit either for the year in which the work is accepted for publication or the year in which it is published. Projects that extend over more than two years may have credit distributed over two or more years. The following sources of information will be accepted:

- a. Self-Report: Each faculty member should provide a brief review of scholarly work completed during the past year. This can include written work as well as oral presentations at conferences or workshops. Faculty members should include with their self-report a copy of at least one of these works.
- b. Outside Reviews: Any evidence documenting the evaluation of scholarly work by peers outside the institution may be included in the materials submitted for evaluation. These could include reviews of articles or grant proposals submitted, prizes and awards for excellence of work done, reviews of books included in professional journals, etc.

## **4. Service**

A few faculty members have directed service responsibilities which may constitute a significant part of their work assignment. These would include specific assignments made by the department chair or dean of the college, activities funded through external grants, or major offices held in national associations. Non-directed service includes activities which contribute to the University community, the profession, or to the public. It is not expected, however, that any individual person would necessarily make significant contributions in all areas in anyone year.

Consequently, faculty members are expected to vary in terms of the focus of their service contributions. The following sources of information will be used:

- a. Self-Report: Each faculty member should provide a brief review of both directed and non-directed service completed during the past year.
- b. Peer Reviews: Any evidence documenting the evaluation of this work by peers (either inside or outside the institution) may be included in the materials submitted for evaluation. These could include awards for service to an organization, letters documenting the contributions made through service, etc.

### **5. Academic Citizenship**

All faculty are expected to behave in ways that foster goodwill, harmony, and collegiality within the department. They are expected to mentor colleagues, contribute to the pursuit of departmental goals, protect the self-esteem of students and colleagues, and generally avoid behaviors that disrupt the work of the department and its faculty. Examples of behaviors consistent with positive academic citizenship include:

- a. regular attendance at departmental and college faculty meetings, except when professional obligations interfere.
- b. willingness to accept his/her share of responsibility for departmental, college, and university committee assignments.
- c. public support of decisions that reflect the consensus of the department.
- d. honoring the confidence of department discussions involving personnel or other sensitive issues.
- e. expressions of respect for and support of colleagues, even when disagreements arise.
- f. tendency to share opinions and preferences publicly at departmental meetings or to simply refrain from sharing any opinion at all.

The department chair will evaluate each faculty member in terms of academic citizenship.

**Faculty responsibilities:** Faculty members are responsible for preparing and submitting individual self-reports covering each area of evaluation for which assignments have been made. Faculty may use the format provided in Attachment 2 augmented by supporting documentation or may choose to design their own format. One example might be to provide a copy of an updated vita and a written self-report covering the issues defined in the criteria.

**Chair responsibilities:** Based on the materials supplied by each faculty member, the department chair will determine an overall rating. For each area of evaluation, the department chair will rate the faculty member in terms of three categories: met expectations, exceeded expectations, failed to meet expectations. These ratings will be weighted in terms of the percent time allocated to each category. In instances however, where one or more essential areas of an individual's work are found to fall below expectations, the overall evaluation will be considered to fall below expectations. The department chair will prepare a letter of evaluation for each faculty member, describing performance in each area for which assignments have been made, along with an overall evaluation. The individual faculty member will be provided the opportunity to review the evaluation letter prior to its submission to the dean. In the event of a disagreement between the faculty member and the department chair concerning the evaluation rating, the faculty member has the right to append his/her viewpoint to the letter of evaluation. The evaluation letter and evaluation ratings of an individual faculty member shall be strictly confidential.

**SAMPLE FORM**

<b>Attachment 1</b>	<b>ANNUAL GOALS-2000</b>	<b>% Time</b>
Teaching (list courses /semester to be offered)		___%
Student Advising		___%
Undergraduate:		
Graduate:		
M.S.		
Ph.D./Ed.D. Committee		
Ph.D./Ed.D. Chair		
Scholarship (list areas/expected outcomes or products)		___%
Service		___%
Directed: (projects /assignments with annual goals)		___%
Non-Directed: (list committees /activities)		___%
Academic Citizenship		10%
TOTAL		100%



C. Scholarship

Faculty Name

Please prepare a self-report that provides the following types of information. All faculty are asked to present a concise statement of current scholarly activity and then report work in those categories which are applicable. Faculty should attach a copy of at least one of the products listed as well as include any evaluation of scholarly work by peers outside the institution.

- (1) Concise statement of current scholarly activities
- (2) Citations for publications in refereed journals
  - (a) Published
  - (b) Accepted
- (3) Citations for Book Chapters, Monographs, Articles
- (4) Textbooks
- (5) Presentations at professional meetings (please add an asterisk for those presentations for which written proceedings were produced.)
- (6) Educational Software/Media
- (7) Grant Proposals
  - (a) Grants presently active
  - (b) Grants proposals submitted
- (8) Other Relevant Information

D. Summary of Service

Faculty Name

- (1) University Service  
List committees which you chair, describe your activities, and estimate the time involved in both meetings and preparation.  
List committees of which you are a member, describe your activities, and estimate the time involved in both meetings and committee assignments.
- (2) Service to the profession  
List professional associations in which you assume a leadership role. For each organization, describe your role or the office to which you have been elected, the activities associated with that role/office, and the time involved in providing service.
- (3) Service to the community  
Describe any activities which provide service to organizations or agencies outside of the University and/or your profession. Describe your involvement and estimate the time involved in providing the service.

**FACULTY EVALUATION POLICY**  
**Department of Educational Leadership**  
**Faculty of Educational Administration**

First adopted by the department 8/95  
Amended to reflect new department name and process 2/05

The Department of Educational Leadership at Kansas State University recognizes and supports the purpose and goals of evaluating the performance of faculty. The faculty further recognize and support the legitimacy of the traditional evaluation areas of *Research, Teaching, and Service*. The faculty of educational administration further commend and support the process of peer review under a departmental leadership structure of chairship, rather than department heads. The department therefore states its evaluation policy as follows:

**GENERAL ELEMENTS**

- (1) Faculty of Educational Administration in the Department of Educational Leadership will engage in peer review on an annual basis according to timelines set forth by the university and college. As adopted in this department, peer evaluation will encompass the period January through December.
- (2) Faculty of Educational Administration in the Department of Educational Leadership will base all peer review on performance contracts prepared in advance of the evaluation period. A performance contract is defined as an agreement between relevant parties outlining the goals and objectives that the evaluatee intends to accomplish during the evaluation period. Performance contracts will be individualized for each faculty member, showing the percentage of time assigned to the areas of research, teaching, and service and showing the expected performance outcomes of work in each area. Such contracts shall be collaboratively established between the faculty as a whole and the individual, and the individual and the chair to comprise 100% of each person's time. However, the final decision on assignment of each individual's time shall be made by the dean of education after taking into consideration the recommendation of the faculty and department chair.
- (3) The faculty of educational administration and chair of the Department of Educational Leadership will satisfy the evaluation tasks according to a calendar of deadlines annually published by the College of Education, to include the following: (a) performance contracts shall be prepared and forwarded to the chair (generally in March) each year for the upcoming evaluation period; (b) each faculty member will provide peer review of each other faculty member's merit materials and transmit the results to the chair (generally in January) of each year; (c) the chair shall transmit evaluation letters to faculty and provide opportunity for formal discussion with each evaluatee (generally in February) of each year; and the chair shall meet all other college deadlines established by the dean's office.
- (4) Faculty of Educational Administration in the Department of Educational Leadership will review and pass judgment on faculty productivity in the area of Research as defined by evidence submitted by each faculty member on publications and other research activities as specified in the individual's performance contract. Those activities include, but are not limited to, published media, textbooks, refereed journal articles, grants, and so forth. Actual materials to be submitted shall be identified in individual performance contracts.
- (5) Faculty of Educational Administration in the Department of Educational Leadership will review and pass judgment on faculty productivity in the area of Teaching as defined by evidence submitted by each faculty member, including student evaluations for classes taught and data on advisement responsibilities as specified in the individual's performance contract.

Those activities include, but are not limited to, submission of syllabi in which expected course and student learning outcomes are stated along with evidence of how courses/expectations are aligned with the department's mission and goal statements, evidence that courses taught conform to the college's accreditation standards, evidence of new coursework established and/or curriculum improvement activities, evidence of successful advisement activities, and so forth. Actual materials to be submitted shall be identified in individual performance contracts.

- (6) Faculty of Educational Administration in the Department of Educational Leadership will review and pass judgment on faculty productivity in the area of Service as defined by evidence submitted by each faculty member on service to international, national, state and local constituencies as specified in the individual's performance contract. Actual materials to be submitted shall be identified in individual performance contracts.

## **PROCEDURES**

- (1) In keeping with university and college timelines, each faculty member shall submit for peer review executive summaries (with availability of full collections of materials) addressing the areas of Research, Teaching, and Service.
- (2) Material collections in the area of Research shall include all such refereed and practitioner publications as the evaluatee shall choose to submit and may include nonprint publications. Grant activity shall fall under this category. Peer reviewed presentations at professional conferences and meeting may also be counted in the area of research. Actual materials to be submitted shall be identified in individual performance contracts. The evaluatee shall submit an accompanying narrative description of the relationship between any documentation supplied and his/her performance contract.
- (3) Material collections in the area of Teaching shall include formal assessments of teaching skills such as IDEA or TEVAL, any other solicited student evaluation independently derived by the faculty member, and a record of student advisement responsibilities. Course syllabi identifying course objectives and learning outcomes which are defensibly connected to the department's mission and goals shall be included and considered evidence of teaching evaluation. Actual materials to be submitted shall be identified in individual performance contracts. The evaluatee shall submit an accompanying narrative description of the relationship between any documentation supplied and his/her performance contract.
- (4) Material collections in the area of Service shall include all such documentation regarding local, state, regional, national and international service as the evaluatee shall choose to submit and may include consulting activities bringing recognition to the department and/or the university. Actual materials to be submitted shall be identified in individual performance contracts. The evaluatee shall submit an accompanying narrative description of the relationship between any documentation supplied and his/her performance contract.
- (5) Material collections shall be reviewed by each peer, assessing documentation submitted against the individual's performance contract criteria, with written confidential evaluations of the same to be submitted to the chair. Peer evaluations must be cognizant of differential weightings attributable to percentage assignment of time per individual.
- (6) The chair shall take the confidential peer evaluations and condense them into a summative evaluation letter addressed to each faculty member, with said letter faithfully preserving the intent of peer review.
- (7) Individual faculty members' evaluation letters shall remain confidential between the chair and the evaluatee, except where the same are required to be submitted to administrators in the college and university or when otherwise compelled by force of law.

- (8) This policy shall be effective as of the date first written below and shall be reviewed by the faculty as a whole not more than five years from the date of first adoption and reviewed on the same basis thereafter.
- (9) All other applicable university and college policy shall be observed.

#### **EVALUATEE RESPONSIBILITIES**

- (1) Each faculty member shall be given the opportunity to meet with the faculty as a whole and the chair annually for the purpose of constructing a performance contract.
- (2) Upon receipt of annual written evaluations, each evaluatee shall sign an acknowledgment indicating that an opportunity was provided to discuss and review with the chair and faculty the evaluation and any relative merit ranking. The evaluatee shall respond in writing, if desired, within seven working days regarding any disagreement with the evaluation.

#### **EVALUATOR RESPONSIBILITIES**

- (1) In keeping with the evaluation calendar published by the College of Education (generally in February), the department chair will prepare a written evaluation for each faculty member according to the procedures described above. The evaluation shall identify the basis for any numeric quantification of performance, and the evaluation shall summarize achievements on which assessment and/or quantification is based.
- (2) The chair shall identify in the summative evaluation letter the relative merit ranking upon which salary increases will be recommended so that each successively higher ranking will result in a recommendation for a higher salary increase. The only exception shall be in the event of market/equity adjustments, which must be justified and documented separately and determined jointly through discussion between the department chair and the dean.
- (3) The chair, in making a summative evaluation, shall take into account the percentage of time identified in each performance contract and weight the total evaluation by those same percentages so that a person's evaluation shall be weighted by area of responsibility in direct relationship to the percentage of time assigned to each function. Likewise, the ranking shall take into consideration the professorial rank of the individual (see the department's published *Minimum Performance Standards* which explicate the different expectations according to the ranks of assistant, associate, and full professor).
- (4) The chair shall provide an opportunity for each evaluatee to discuss his/her evaluation in person, shall secure signatures indicating occurrence of the same, and shall allow for disagreement within the same seven days required by the university.
- (5) The chair shall forward to the appropriate college administrator copies of the following items: (a) the evaluation policy as adopted by the faculty; (b) a written evaluation of each faculty member identical to the copy given to the evaluatee; (c) a recommendation on salary adjustment consistent with other provisions in this policy; and (d) any responses by the evaluatee to the evaluation.

**EVALUATION POLICY**  
**Department of Educational Leadership**  
**Faculty of Leadership Studies and Programs**

Previous evaluations were under EDADL first approved 8/95  
New departmental configuration 8/04 first evaluations 2/05

**GENERAL ELEMENTS**

- (1) Faculty of Leadership Studies and Programs will engage in faculty performance review on an annual basis according to timelines set forth by the university and college. As adopted in this department, evaluation will encompass the period January through December.
- (2) Faculty of Leadership Studies and Programs will base all review on performance contracts prepared in advance of the evaluation period. A performance contract is defined as an agreement between relevant parties outlining the goals and objectives that the evaluatee intends to accomplish during the evaluation period. Performance contracts will be individualized for each faculty member, showing the percentage of time assigned to the areas of research, teaching, and service and showing the expected performance outcomes of work in each area. Such contracts shall be collaboratively established between the director of leadership studies, the department chair, and the individual to comprise 100% of each person's time. However, the final decision on assignment of each individual's time shall be made by the dean of education after taking into consideration the recommendation of the faculty and department chair.
- (3) The Faculty of Leadership Studies and Programs and the chair of the Department of Educational Leadership will satisfy the evaluation tasks according to a calendar of deadlines annually published by the College of Education, to include the following: (a) performance contracts shall be prepared and forwarded to the chair (generally in March) each year for the upcoming evaluation period; (b) evaluation shall take the form of a written letter to each faculty member prepared by the director of leadership studies and programs, with review, approval, and signature by the department chair; (c) the director of leadership studies shall transmit evaluation letters to faculty and provide opportunity for formal discussion with each evaluatee (generally in February) of each year; and the chair shall meet all other college deadlines established by the dean's office.
- (4) Faculty of Leadership Studies and Programs will be evaluated in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service in proper relationship to their individual performance contracts.

**PROCEDURES**

- (1) In keeping with university and college timelines, each faculty member shall submit for review to the director of leadership studies a materials collection addressing the areas of responsibility as identified in their individual performance contracts. In the category of teaching, the material collections shall include formal assessments of teaching skills such as IDEA or TEVAL, any other solicited student evaluation independently derived by the faculty member, and a record of student advisement responsibilities. Course syllabi identifying course objectives and learning outcomes shall be included and considered evidence of teaching evaluation. In all other areas, the materials collection shall be agreed upon by the director of leadership studies and the individual faculty member.

- (2) Material collections shall be reviewed by the director of leadership studies, in consultation with the department chair, for the purpose of assessing documentation submitted against the individual's performance contract criteria, with written confidential evaluations of the same.
- (3) Individual faculty members' evaluation letters shall remain confidential between the director of leadership studies, the department chair, and the evaluatee, except where the same are required to be submitted to administrators in the college and university or when otherwise compelled by force of law.
- (4) All other applicable university and college policy shall be observed.

#### **EVALUATEE RESPONSIBILITIES**

- (1) Each faculty member shall be given the opportunity to meet with the director of leadership studies annually for the purpose of constructing a performance contract.
- (2) Upon receipt of annual written evaluations, each evaluatee shall sign an acknowledgment indicating that an opportunity was provided to discuss and review with the director of leadership studies and the department chair the evaluation and any relative merit ranking. The evaluatee shall respond in writing, if desired, within seven working days regarding any disagreement with the evaluation.

#### **EVALUATOR RESPONSIBILITIES**

- (1) In keeping with the evaluation calendar published by the College of Education (generally in February), the director of leadership studies, in consultation with the department chair, will prepare a written evaluation for each faculty member according to the procedures described above. The evaluation shall summarize achievements on which assessment and/or quantification is based.
- (2) The director of leadership studies and the department chair, in making a summative evaluation, shall take into account the percentage of time identified in each performance contract and weight the total evaluation by those same percentages so that a person's evaluation shall be weighted by area of responsibility in direct relationship to the percentage of time assigned to each function.
- (3) The director of leadership studies and the department chair shall provide an opportunity for each evaluatee to discuss his/her evaluation in person, shall secure signatures indicating occurrence of the same, and shall allow for disagreement within the same seven days required by the university.
- (5) The department chair shall forward to the appropriate college administrator copies of the following items: (a) the evaluation policy as adopted by the faculty; (b) a written evaluation of each faculty member identical to the copy given to the evaluatee; (c) a recommendation on salary adjustment consistent with other provisions in this policy; and (d) any responses by the evaluatee to the evaluation.

**APPENDIX C**

**MINIMUM PERFORMANCE STANDARDS**

**Department of Educational Leadership**  
**Faculty of Adult Education**  
**College of Education**  
**Kansas State University**  
**MINIMUM FACULTY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS**

First approved 12/02; amended to reflect new department name 9/04  
reviewed 3/06

The Faculty of Adult Education will use the following scale in evaluating faculty performance:

- 1) Exceeds Expectations (EE)
- 2) Meets Expectations (ME)
- 3) Fails to Meet Expectations, but Meets Minimum Standards
- 4) (FME-MMS)
- 5) Fails to Meet Minimum Standards (FMMS)

The standards which follow are divided into three functional areas: teaching, research, and service, and are presented by academic rank. As indicated above, these standards represent the minimum acceptable levels of faculty performance by rank and responsibility/function.

**I. TEACHING**

**A) Assistant Professor**

- meets all assigned classes for scheduled hours
- has current syllabus on file for all courses taught
- posts and keeps reasonable office hours
- regularly conducts departmentally approved evaluations of all courses taught
- uses evaluation results to improve teaching
- utilizes a variety of teaching/learning methods

**B) Associate Professor**

- meets all assigned classes for scheduled hours
- has current syllabus on file for all courses taught
- posts and keeps reasonable office hours
- conducts departmentally approved evaluations of all courses taught
- is available for and responsible with master's and doctoral-level advisees and students
- uses evaluation results to improve teaching
- utilizes a variety of teaching/learning methods
- engages in a continuous updating of course and curricular materials
- uses effective student performance assessment techniques

**C) Professor**

- meets all assigned classes for scheduled hours
- has current syllabus on file for all courses taught
- posts and keeps reasonable office hours
- conducts departmentally approved evaluations for all courses taught
- is available to and responsible with master's and doctoral-level advisees and students
- assists faculty members who are early in their career with teaching and advising
- uses evaluation results to improve teaching
- utilizes a variety of teaching/learning methods
- engages in a continuous updating of course and curriculum materials
- uses effective student performance assessment techniques
- provides leadership in curriculum development in the department and the college
- provides leadership in interdisciplinary collaboration

## **II. RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY**

### **Assistant Professor**

- demonstrates skills and initiative in developing research and/or scholarly activity
- applies recent research in the field to course work and research activity
- assists in the dissemination of current information through appropriate professional channels

### **B) Associate Professor**

- develops, conducts, and disseminates research and/or results of other scholarly activity
- regularly participates in ongoing scholarly activity in the profession
- regularly updates research skills and dissemination techniques through active participation in professional meetings.
- participates in collaborative research and/or grant writing endeavors
- disseminates information at the national level by actively participating in conferences, journal reviews, or other activities

### **C) Professor**

- participates in ongoing scholarly activity in the professional field
- regularly updates research skills and dissemination techniques
- participates in collaborative research, writing, and/or grant writing endeavors
- disseminates new knowledge at the national level by participating in conference organization, or other scholarly activities

## **III. SERVICE**

### **A) Assistant Professor**

- regularly participates in expected meetings and activities at the departmental and college levels
- provides evidence of ongoing involvement in student and/or professional organizations

### **B) Associate Professor**

- actively participates and demonstrates leadership in the department and college
- regularly participates in state and professional organizations
- collaborates with faculty and other professional colleagues
- demonstrates increasing levels of national involvement

### **C). Professor**

- demonstrates leadership at the department, college and university level
- demonstrates leadership in state, local, and/or professional organizations
- serves as a mentor to other faculty members
- provides leadership in critical analysis of field-based and research-based issues
- demonstrates thoughtful decision making and problem solving skills at the department, college, university and professional levels

## **IV. PROCEDURES**

The procedures which follow are in keeping with Section C31.5-8 of the Faculty Handbook.

A faculty member whose overall performance falls below these levels of minimum acceptability during one evaluation year will be so informed in writing, and will meet with the Department Chair to establish a written plan of action to bring the performance up to stated standards. Monthly meetings will be held with the Chair to monitor progress on the agreed upon plan. If the plan is not completed, resulting in a second year of below minimum performance, the faculty member and the Department Chair will meet with the Dean of the College of Education to outline specific remedial action.

## MINIMUM PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

### Department of Educational Leadership Faculty of Educational Administration

First approved 12/02; amended to reflect new department name 9/04;  
reviewed 3/06

### DEFINITIONS OF CATEGORIES

#### **EXCEEDS STANDARDS (ES)**

This rating is available only when a faculty member demonstrates exceptional overall performance. To qualify for this rating, the department will judge the evidence and demonstrate formal support by nominating this individual for this rating. Exceptional is defined as:

- *Research:* Recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having been cited or depended on as a national authority.
- *Service:* Recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having secured significant external funding or national recognition for service to the profession.
- *Teaching:* Recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having been recognized for excellence in teaching through awards from Kansas State University, the College of Education, or nationally recognized organizations.

#### **MEETS STANDARDS (MS)**

This rating is available only when a faculty member meets and exceeds minimal standards for his or her respective academic rank. Standards will be developed annually through a peer review process for determining performance contracts and evaluating performance for merit. For purposes of definition, the rating of MS is synonymous with the provisions of the annual individual performance contract.

#### **FAILS TO MEET STANDARDS, BUT MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS (MMS)**

This rating is used to notify a faculty member that he or she has not met the terms of the annual individual performance contract, but that minimum standards have been met. The upper and lower limits of the rating of MMS are defined as follows. The upper limit shall be invoked when the individual has not met the terms of his/her annual performance contract. The lower limit shall be crossed when the individual has not met one or more of the standards on the minimum standards matrix. (See attached matrix).

#### **FAILS TO MEET MINIMUM STANDARDS (FMS)**

This rating is used to notify a faculty member that he or she has failed to satisfy one or more of the criterion on the matrix. (See attached matrix).

#### **PROCEDURES FOR FMS**

1. If a faculty member receives a ranking of **FMS** in one evaluation year, the person will be notified in writing and will be required to meet with the department chair to establish a written plan of action to bring performance up to stated standards. Monthly meetings will be held with the chair to monitor progress on the plan.

2. If the plan is not completed and if the faculty member receives an overall ranking of **FMS** in a second consecutive evaluation year, the person will be notified in writing and will meet with the department chair and the Dean of Education to outline specific remedial action.
3. Failure to meet the plan constructed at that time will result in consideration of "dismissal for cause" at the discretion of the Dean of Education.
4. Any professor whose evaluation indicates failure to meet minimum levels of performance in a critical area of responsibility will participate in the above procedures.

**MATRIX OF CRITERIA SATISFYING THE DESIGNATION OF  
MEETS STANDARDS (MS)**

**TEACHING**

**ASSISTANT PROFESSOR**

- Posts office hours and is regularly available for advising.
- Places syllabus on file for all didactic courses.
- Utilizes TEVAL or IDEA for appropriate courses.
- Demonstrates progress toward graduate faculty membership.

**TEACHING**

**ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

- Posts office hours and is regularly available for advising.
- Places syllabus on file for all didactic courses.
- Utilizes TEVAL or IDEA for appropriate courses.
- Achieves graduate faculty status.
- Serves as an effective member on doctoral committees.
- Serves as an effective advisor for masters students.

**TEACHING**

**FULL PROFESSOR**

- Posts office hours and is regularly available for advising.
- Places syllabus on file for all didactic courses.
- Utilizes TEVAL or IDEA for appropriate courses.
- Achieves graduate faculty status.
- Serves as an effective advisor for doctoral students.
- Serves as an effective advisor for masters students.
- Provides effective supervision of internships.

**RESEARCH**

**ASSISTANT PROFESSOR**

- Shows evidence of submitting research for publication.
- Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the teaching field.

**RESEARCH**

**ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

- Demonstrates ability to produce a research agenda.
- Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the teaching field.
- Provides evidence of successful involvement in scholarship and research (e.g., refereed publications, funded grants, or product development).

## **RESEARCH**

### **FULL PROFESSOR**

- Produces a coherent research agenda.
- Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the teaching field.
- Provides evidence of successful involvement in scholarship and research (e.g., refereed publications, funded grants, or product development).

## **SERVICE**

### **ASSISTANT PROFESSOR**

- Attends local, state, regional, national, or international meetings.
- Participates in the development of curriculum.
- Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating on college and/or university committees.

## **SERVICE**

### **ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

- Provides service to local, state, national, or international constituencies.
- Participates in the development of curriculum.
- Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating on college and/or university committees.

## **SERVICE**

### **FULL PROFESSOR**

- Provides service to local, state, national, or international constituencies.
- Participates in the development of curriculum.
- Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating on college and/or university committees.
- Positively and proactively mentors junior colleagues.

# **APPENDIX D**

## **STANDARDS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION**

## STANDARDS FOR TENURE IN THE DEPARTMENT EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

### Faculty of Adult Education Reviewed 9/04; reviewed 3/06

The Department of Educational Leadership at Kansas State University recognizes and supports the purpose and goals of evaluating performance of faculty. The Adult Education faculty further recognizes and supports the legitimacy of the traditional evaluation areas of Research, Teaching, and Service. However, the faculty broadens the scope of acceptable research in line with that defined in "Scholarship Reconsidered" (Boyer, 1990).

Further, in decisions regarding the awarding of tenure, the College of Education and its departments are guided by the policies and procedures stipulated in the Faculty Handbook and by the guidelines of the Office of the Provost as found in the document entitled Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustments, Tenure, and Promotion commonly known as "The Blue Book." With respect to tenure, the Faculty of Adult Education in the Department of Educational Leadership is guided by the general principles of excellence and versatility in appropriate academic endeavors and in service to one or more of the University's various missions of teaching, research, service, or extension.

Likewise, in tenure recommendations, the obligation of the Adult Education faculty of stewardship to students, consumers of research, the community of scholars, and other University constituents is to have the best faculty possible. Thus, tenure decisions should be based on demonstrated individual excellence (merit), but also and more importantly, on the candidates' contribution to the institutional mission (worth). Furthermore, the institution is best served by faculty who are both versatile and specialized. Versatility may be across the areas of teaching, research, service; or it may be within one or more of those areas. Specialization, perhaps obviously, entails both depth and breadth of knowledge in a discipline, and the application of that knowledge in teaching, research, and/or service.

#### **Evidence of Performance--Tenure**

A candidate for **tenure** must, during the probation period, receive performance evaluations which:

- Provide evidence and capacity to consistently meet performance objectives and goals as developed and agreed upon by the department chair/and or faculty.
- Indicate meeting or exceeding expectations as documented in the annual merit document.

#### **Criteria to be Considered--Tenure**

At the time of the tenure recommendation the following criteria should be considered.

##### Teaching

- Places syllabus on file for all didactic courses
- Utilizes TEVAL or IDEA for appropriate courses
- Achieves graduate faculty status
- Serves as an effective member on masters, doctoral committees
- Serves as an effective advisor for masters students and major professor for doctoral students.

##### Research

- Demonstrates the ability to produce a research agenda
- Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the teaching field.

- Provides evidence of successful involvement in scholarship and research (e.g., refereed publications, funded grants, or product development).

#### Service

- Provides service to local, state, national, or international constituencies
- Participates in the development of curriculum
- Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating on college or university committees

#### Teaching

- Meets all assigned classes for scheduled hours
- Has current syllabus on file with the department for all courses taught
- Posts and keeps reasonable office hours and rarely fails to be available
- Conducts departmentally approved evaluations for all courses taught
- Is available to and responsible with master's and doctoral level advisees
- Mentors early career faculty as requested in teaching and advising
- Uses evaluation results to improve teaching
- Utilizes a variety of teaching/learning methods
- Engages in a continuous updating of course material
- Demonstrates effective assessment and evaluation of student performance
- Provides leadership in curriculum development for the department and college
- Provides leadership in interdisciplinary collaboration

#### Research and Scholarly Activity

- Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the teaching field
- Provides evidence of successful involvement in scholarship and research (e.g., refereed publications, funded grants, or product development)
- Produces a coherent research agenda

#### Service

- Provides leadership at the department, college, and university level
- Provides leadership in state, local, and/or professional organizations
- Serves as a mentor to junior faculty members in research, service, teaching, and advising
- Provides leadership in critical analysis of field-based and research-based issues
- Demonstrates thoughtful decision-making and problem solving skills at the department, college, university, and professional levels
- Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating on college and/or university committees.

### **Assistant to Associate Professor--Promotion**

Obtaining tenure in the Department of Educational Leadership—Faculty of Adult Education and advancing to the associate professor rank are tied together.

### **Associate to Full Professor--Promotion**

#### Teaching

- Meets all assigned classes for scheduled hours
- Has current syllabus on file with the department for all courses taught
- Posts and keeps reasonable office hours and rarely fails to be available
- Conducts departmentally approved evaluations for all courses taught
- Is available to and responsible with master's and doctoral level advisees
- Mentors early career faculty as requested in teaching and advising
- Uses evaluation results to improve teaching

- Utilizes a variety of teaching/learning methods
- Engages in a continuous updating of course material
- Demonstrates effective assessment and evaluation of student performance
- Provides leadership in curriculum development for the department and college
- Provides leadership in interdisciplinary collaboration

#### Research and Scholarly Activity

- Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the teaching field
- Provides evidence of successful involvement in scholarship and research (e.g., refereed publications, funded grants, or product development)
- Produces a coherent research agenda

#### Service

- Provides leadership at the department, college, and university level
- Provides leadership in state, local, and/or professional organizations
- Serves as a mentor to junior faculty members in research, service, teaching, and advising
- Provides leadership in critical analysis of field-based and research-based issues
- Demonstrates thoughtful decision-making and problem solving skills at the department, college, university, and professional levels
- Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating on college and/or university committees.

## STANDARDS FOR TENURE IN THE DEPARTMENT EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Faculty of Educational Administration  
reviewed 9/04; reviewed 3/06

### INTRODUCTION

The Department of Educational Leadership at Kansas State University recognizes and supports the purpose and goals of evaluating performance of faculty. The faculty further recognizes and supports the legitimacy of the traditional evaluation areas of Research, Teaching, and Service. However, the faculty broadens the scope of acceptable research in line with that defined in 1990 by Boyer in "Scholarship Reconsidered."

This department acknowledges that faculty are motivated to do things that are rewarded. This concept is summarized in an article written by Kerr in 1975 titled, "On the Folly of Rewarding A, While Hoping for B." The department is committed to the concept that faculty members will strive for excellence and will enhance productivity through a three-step process of: (1) faculty goal setting, (2) collective evaluating of performance, and (3) rewarding performance.

In its efforts to create and maintain a quality department and to motivate faculty members to be more effective teachers; more productive scholars; more committed to department goals, including service to the state, region, and nation; and more willing to accept their share of departmental work, that is, to serve on committees and advise students, the department is guided by the policies and procedures stipulated in the *Faculty Handbook* and by the guidelines of the Office of the Provost as found in the document entitled *Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustments, Tenure, and Promotion* found at <http://www.k-state.edu/provost/>

With respect to tenure, we are guided by the general principles of excellence and versatility in appropriate academic endeavors and in service to one or more of the University's various missions of teaching, research, and service. Given the importance of the tenure decision, it is reasonable to expect additional criteria, hence the application of the principles of excellence and versatility. In tenure recommendations, our obligation of stewardship to students, consumers of research, the community of scholars, and other University constituents is to have the best faculty possible. It is appropriate to ask, "Would the University likely do better if it denied tenure to this person and tried to get a better person for the job?" Tenure decisions are based on demonstrated individual excellence (merit), and on the candidate's contribution to the institutional mission (worth). We agree that the institution is best served by faculty who are both versatile and specialized. Versatility may be across the areas of teaching, research, and service; or it may be within one or more of those areas. Specialization entails both depth and breadth of knowledge in a discipline, and the application of that knowledge in teaching, research, and/or service.

### GENERAL ISSUES OF FACULTY EVALUATIONS

The purpose of faculty evaluation is to serve the dual function of: (1) enabling the department, college and University to make personnel decisions concerning annual merit salary, reappointment, tenure, and promotion, and (2) aiding faculty development.

A fundamental function of assessments of faculty performance is to produce judgments on the effectiveness of the performance and to help assure that personnel decisions are both reasonable and defensible.

It also is clearly understood that faculty renewal, development, and improvement are of critical importance to the University in its pursuit of excellence.

## **COMMITMENT TO ACCOUNTABILITY AND PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

The Department of Educational Leadership accepts and validates the concept of accountability and performance evaluation. A revised policy on evaluation procedures was first adopted on August 29, 1995 pursuant to University and college directives to bring the institution as a whole into compliance with the Faculty Handbook and was last revised on January 28, 2003.

Evaluation is defined in the Department of Educational Leadership as comprising a set of activities engaged in by the department leading to assessment of the performance of individual faculty against the goals and objectives set out for each individual within the categories of teaching, research, and service. Evaluation in this department is accomplished by peer review.

### **Evaluation Procedure**

The evaluation procedures in the Department of Educational Leadership are as follows:

- All faculty in the department shall be evaluated annually for merit purposes.
- The evaluation period shall cover the period January through December.
- Evaluation shall be by peer review as set out in principle above.
- Performance contracts shall be negotiated between each faculty member and the department as a whole.
- Evaluation shall encompass only those goals and objectives drawn for each individual faculty member and included in the written performance contract.
- Evaluation shall strictly follow the time lines for performance contracts and other dates as set out in the evaluation policy.
- Each faculty member shall review the materials collection submitted by each other faculty member and provide written comment to the chair, addressing all three areas of research, teaching, and service. Each written assessment shall include a ranking of all faculty in the pool according to the following criteria: *exceeds standards (ES)*; *meets standards (MS)*; *fails to meet standards, but meets minimum standards (FMMS)*; and *fails to meet minimum standards (FMS)*.
- The chair will take the confidential statements and rankings and combine them into a merit letter addressed to the individual faculty member. Each individual's final merit rating will be based on the faculty member's performance contract which sets out the amount of time each person has devoted to approved projects.
- The chair will then secure agreement of each faculty member that the results of merit rankings have been communicated, with appropriate documentation indicating neither agreement nor disagreement of the evaluatee with the contents of the evaluation, and convey the same to the dean for merit pay purposes.

## **STANDARDS FOR TENURE**

The following criteria, standards, and guidelines have been mutually approved by the faculty members in the Department of Educational Administration and Leadership.

### **Criteria for Tenure**

This department recognizes that tenure is not a right accorded to every faculty member, nor is it granted simply as a result of a candidate's routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies.

However, because there can be no simple list of accomplishments that, when achieved, guarantees that a faculty member will obtain tenure, this department has established the following guidelines to ensure that any candidate recommended for promotion or tenure has demonstrated that he or she has made outstanding contributions appropriate to the needs of this department.

Excellence, department mission, and versatility are the three cornerstones of this department's

criteria. Excellence is measured against the accepted standards of the profession; the department mission has been determined by the faculty and published as a mission statement; and versatility is the ability to function well across the three major areas of work (e.g., teaching, research/other creative endeavors, and service) as well as in a variety of settings within one or more areas.

A faculty member will be recommended for tenure only when he or she has met or exceeded standards for his or her respective academic rank. Standards will be developed annually through a peer review process for determining performance contracts and evaluating performance for merit. For purposes of definition, the rating of meets standards is synonymous with the provisions of the annual individual performance contract.

### **Evidence of Performance**

A candidate for tenure must, during the probationary period, receive performance evaluations which:

- Provide evidence and capacity of carrying a full load as reflected by consistently meeting performance objectives and goals as developed and agreed upon by the department chair and/or faculty.
- Indicate meeting or exceeding expectations as documented in the annual merit document.

### **STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION**

Faculty members may expect to advance through the academic ranks on the basis of demonstrated individual merit in relation to their association with the University's mission and with their own disciplines. Each higher rank demands a higher level of accomplishment.

Promotion is based upon an individual's achievements related to the specific criteria, standards, and guidelines developed by departmental faculty members in consultation with the department chair and the appropriate dean.

Promotion to *assistant professor* reflects an acceptable level of achievement and potential for excellence. Promotion to *associate professor* rests on substantial professional contributions that reflect excellence in teaching, research and other creative endeavor, or directed service. Promotion to *professor* is based on attainment of excellence in the assigned responsibilities of the faculty member and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies.

Successful candidates for promotion will demonstrate superior professional accomplishment and excellence in the performance of their assigned duties. Assessment of a faculty member's performance upon which a recommendation regarding promotion will be based must reflect the professional expectations conveyed during annual evaluations.

### **Criteria to be Considered in Making Promotion Recommendations**

At the time of the promotion recommendation, the following criteria should be considered:

#### **PROMOTION TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR**

##### **Teaching**

- Posts office hours and is regularly available for advising.
- Places syllabi on file for all didactic courses.
- Utilizes TEVAL or IDEA for appropriate courses.
- Demonstrates progress toward graduate faculty membership.

##### **Research**

- Shows evidence of developing a research agenda for publication that is consistent with the mission statement of the department.
- Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the teaching field.

#### **Service**

- Attends local, state, regional, national, or international meetings.
- Participates in the development of curriculum.
- Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating on college and/or university committees.

### **PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

#### **Teaching**

- Posts office hours and is regularly available for advising.
- Places syllabi on file for all didactic courses.
- Utilizes TEVAL or IDEA for appropriate courses.
- Achieves graduate faculty status.
- Serves as an effective member on doctoral committees.
- Serves as an effective advisor for masters students.

#### **Research**

- Demonstrates progress toward the accomplishment of the goals of a research agenda.
- Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the teaching field.
- Provides evidence of successful involvement in scholarship and research (e.g., refereed publications, funded grants, or product development).

#### **Service**

- Provides service to local, state, national, or international constituencies.
- Participates in the development of curriculum.
- Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating on college and/or university committees.

### **PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR**

#### **Teaching**

- Posts office hours and is regularly available for advising.
- Places syllabi on file for all didactic courses.
- Utilizes TEVAL or IDEA for appropriate courses.
- Achieves graduate faculty status.
- Serves as an effective advisor for doctoral students.
- Serves as an effective advisor for masters students.
- Provides effective supervision of internships

#### **Research**

- Demonstrates evidence of a mature and coherent research agenda.
- Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the teaching field.
- Provides evidence of successful involvement in scholarship and research (e.g., refereed publications, funded grants, or product development).

#### **Service**

- Provides service to local, state, national, or international constituencies.
- Participates in the development of curriculum.
- Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating on college and/or university committees.

- Positively and proactively mentors junior colleagues.

**First adopted 10/6/98**

## **APPENDIX E**

### **Professorial Performance Award Minimum Performance Standards**

# PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD MINIMUM PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

Department of Educational Leadership  
College of Education  
Kansas State University

## Purpose

The policies and procedures that appear in this document govern the manner in which candidates in the Department of Educational Leadership are recommended for the Professorial Performance Award. These policies and procedures are governed by Sections C49.1 through C49.14 of the University Handbook and conform to the guidelines issued by the Office of the Provost on February 15, 2006.

## Philosophy

The faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership support the language in Section C49.1 of the University Handbook which states, "...the Professorial Performance Award is not a right accorded to every faculty member at the rank of Professor. Nor is it granted simply as a result of a candidate's routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies." [C49.1] The faculty further support the concept that the Professorial Performance Award shall be based on "...evidence of sustained productivity...and...of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards" [C49.2] in the areas of teaching, research and service.

## Award Eligibility

The foregoing statement of philosophy governs the performance aspects of a candidate's eligibility for the Professorial Performance Award in the Department of Educational Leadership. The University Handbook imposes additional limits on eligibility. Specifically, an eligible candidate must be a full-time professor [C49.2] holding the rank of Professor and must have been in rank at least six years since the last promotion or last receipt of the professorial performance award. The eligible candidate must show sustained productivity for at least the last six years prior to review for the Professorial Performance Award. [C49.2]

## Procedures

In order to be considered for the Professorial Performance Award, a faculty member in the Department of Educational Leadership must: (1) meet the eligibility criteria established in the University Handbook [C49.1-C49.14]; (2) follow the procedures which are outlined in this same section of the Handbook; and (3) adhere to any additional departmental procedures which appear in the remainder of this section of this document.

The candidate shall inform the department chair in writing of his/her intention to apply for the Professorial Performance Award and shall submit "...a file that documents her or his professional accomplishments for at least six years in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the department." (C49.5). Upon receipt of such a request and supporting documentation, the Chair shall notify all eligible voting members of the faculty. For the purposes of the Professorial Performance Award, the Department of Educational Leadership defines eligible voting members of the faculty as those persons who presently hold the rank of Professor and whose full-time academic appointment is in that same department, excluding the Chair should he/she hold the rank of Professor. The Chair shall then both make the candidate's materials available for review and call a meeting for obtaining a vote concerning the worthiness of the candidate's materials for the Professorial Performance Award. The vote shall occur by dated

ballot showing the signature of each voting member present indicating **Yes/No/Abstain**. Additionally it shall bear a signature line for **Yes/No** for the department chair's recommendation. The chair may not abstain. A simple majority affirmative vote by eligible faculty shall be sufficient to advance the candidate for consideration by the department chair.

If the department chair is willing to support the faculty's affirmative recommendation for the candidate, the chair shall affirmatively sign and transmit the ballot to the Dean of the College of Education. At the same time a letter of support will also be sent by the chair to both the Dean of the College and to the candidate. [C49.5-C49.6] If the chair cannot support the faculty's affirmative recommendation, then the chair will notify the voting faculty and the candidate in writing. [C49.5] The voting faculty shall have the option to elect a spokesperson to convey and explain the majority position to the Dean of the College. If the eligible voting faculty cannot recommend the candidate, the chair will inform the applicant [C49.6] in writing and the process for seeking recourse as described in the University Handbook will be followed. [C49.9-C49.11]

### **Statement of Minimum Performance Standards**

The Department of Educational Leadership has established minimum performance standards to be used in annual merit evaluation. These standards are stated by academic rank and form the initial basis both for satisfactory annual performance review and for a favorable review whenever a candidate indicates intent to seek promotion to the next highest academic rank. By logical extension, those same minimum performance standards have a direct linear relationship to favorable consideration for the Professorial Performance Award by satisfying the spirit and requirements of Paragraph 2 of this present document.

The minimum standards for eligibility for the Professorial Performance Award appearing below are drawn directly from the existing merit evaluation policies relating to minimum performance standards for the rank of full professor currently in force and approved by the Faculty of Adult Education and the Faculty of Educational Administration within the Department of Educational Leadership (no full professor lines presently exist in the Faculty of Leadership Studies and Programs). The eligible faculties hereby affirm that these standards sufficient to consideration for promotion in rank shall likewise define the basic performance parameters of a candidate's eligibility for the Professorial Performance Award. The faculties acknowledge the minimum nature of these standards as in most cases a successful candidate for either promotion or professorial performance award will have significantly exceeded the criteria.

### **FULL PROFESSOR: TEACHING**

- achieves full graduate faculty status
- posts office hours and is regularly available for advising
- has current syllabus on file for all courses taught
- meets all assigned classes for scheduled hours
- utilizes a variety of teaching/learning methods
- utilizes TEVAL or IDEA for appropriate courses
- engages in a continuous updating of course and curriculum materials
- provides leadership in curriculum development in the department and the college
- serves as an effective advisor for masters students
- serves as an effective advisor for doctoral students
- provides effective supervision of internships

### **FULL PROFESSOR: RESEARCH**

- produces a coherent research agenda
- provides evidence of successful involvement in scholarship and research (e.g., refereed publications, funded grants, or product development)
- disseminates new knowledge at the national level by participating in conference organization or

other scholarly activities

- regularly updates research skills and dissemination techniques
- provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the teaching field

**FULL PROFESSOR: SERVICE**

- provides service to local, state, national, or international constituencies
- demonstrates leadership at the department, college, and university levels
- demonstrates thoughtful decision-making and problem-solving skills at the department, college, university and professional levels
- participates in the development of curriculum
- positively and proactively mentors junior colleagues.

Page 3 of 3