

**DEPARTMENT COUNSELING, SPECIAL EDUCATION, & STUDENT AFFAIRS**

**ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES**  
**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 11/27/2006)**

**PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**  
**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 11/27/2006)**

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES \*(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **11/2011**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES\*: **11/2011**

**Kenneth Hughey, Interim Department Head**  
**Date signed: 12/18/2006**

**Michael Holen, Dean**  
**Date signed: 12/21/2006**

**M. Duane Nellis, Provost**  
**Date signed: 1/15/2007**

\*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.

# **BYLAWS**

## **for the Department of Special Education, Counseling, and Student Affairs**

(hereinafter referred to as the Department)

Approved 11/27/06

### **1 Voting Membership of the Department**

#### **1.1 Definition**

Faculty are those persons with the rank (probationary or tenured) of instructor, assistant professor, research assistant professor, associate professor, research associate professor, professor, or research professor with some portion of their continuing full-time University appointment as a faculty member within the Department, except that only faculty who are evaluated by the departmental merit process may vote on matters directly related to the merit process.

##### **1.1.1 Term appointments**

Term appointments (e.g., adjuncts appointees; term appointees as professor, associate professor, assistant professor, research professor, research associate professor, research assistant professor and instructor; assistant instructor, extension assistant, extension associate, research assistant, research associate, graduate assistant, graduate teaching assistant, graduate research assistant) do not have voting privileges.

#### **1.2 Absentee Voting**

If a voting member of the Department or committee thereof anticipates being absent from a meeting at which a specific vote may be taken, the member may, prior to the meeting, deliver to the Chair of the body a written, signed, statement indicating how the specific vote is to be counted. In this case, the Chair shall announce that the member is casting an absentee vote and have it counted by the members who count the votes of those present.

#### **1.3 Proxies**

A voting member of the Department or committee thereof may designate in writing another member of the body as his or her proxy. Such written designation must be delivered to the Chair of the body and announced at the opening of the meeting.

### **2 Notification of Faculty Meetings**

When feasible, faculty meetings that bear on departmental policies should have five working days' notice. There will be no exception to the five-day notice requirement for selection of the nominee for Department Chair and proposals of policy change. Moreover, copies of proposed policy changes must be distributed at least five working days prior to action.

### **3 Committee Organization**

Ad hoc committees (e.g., search committees) shall be elected by the Department faculty.

### **4 Faculty Recruitment and Selection**

#### **4.1 Committee Election and Organization**

When there is a faculty vacancy to be filled, a five-member Search Committee shall be elected by the Department. One of the members shall be a student. The Department shall elect one member of the Search Committee to serve as chair. There shall be no restrictions concerning eligibility to serve on Search Committees. The Committee shall write the job description and assist the Department Chair in preparing all required Affirmative Action documents.

#### **4.2 Screening**

The Search Committee shall conduct the screening and will, in consultation with the Department Chair, recommend to the faculty the candidate(s) to be interviewed on campus. The Chair carries that recommendation to the Dean.

#### **4.3 Faculty Recommendations**

Following the interview(s), the Department Chair shall conduct a secret ballot vote of recommendation. The voting shall take place after the Search Committee has made its recommendation(s) and after a reasonable time for discussion of candidate qualifications. Although all voting members of the Department are eligible to participate in this discussion, voting is restricted to faculty who have tenure and who have a rank equal to or higher than the one to be offered. A vote shall be conducted for each candidate separately to determine his or her acceptability for employment.

If the Department Chair is willing to support the Department faculty's recommendation(s), then the Chair shall convey the recommendation(s) to the Dean. If the Chair cannot support the recommendation(s), then the Chair will so notify the Department and it shall elect a spokesperson to convey and explain its position(s) to the Dean.

### **5 Functions, Terms, and Selection of Department Chair**

#### **5.1 Functions of Chair**

Except where otherwise specified in these Bylaws, the duties and responsibilities of the Department Chair shall be those ordinarily associated with the office of Department Head at Kansas State University.

#### **5.2 Term of Chair**

The term of the Chair shall be for three years, running from July 1 through June 30.

## **5.3 Selection of Chair**

### **5.3.1 Internal Selection Procedure**

At a time no later than the April department meeting that precedes a June 30 expiration of a Chair's term, the Department shall select its nominee whose name shall be sent to the Dean.

All voting members of the Department, including the incumbent Chair, are eligible to vote and to be selected. After nominations have been made from the floor, voting will be by secret ballot. If no person receives a majority of the votes, there shall be a runoff ballot between the two persons receiving the greatest number of votes. In the event of a tie the final ballot, both names shall be sent to the Dean as nominees.

If the person(s) nominated is unacceptable to the Dean, then the selection process will be repeated to select a new nominee. If the nominee and the Dean are unable to agree on the conditions, the process will be repeated.

### **5.3.2 Open Search Procedure**

If a decision is made to have an open search to fill the office of Chair, then a search committee shall be elected as specified in 4.1.

The Search Committee shall function as specified in 4.2 and 4.3 except that its selection of candidate(s) to be interviewed will be in consultation with the Dean rather than with the Department Chair, and the Search Committee chair shall convey the Department's recommendation(s) to the Dean.

## **6 Reappointment of Nontenured Faculty**

Each tenured voting member of the Department shall have an annual opportunity and responsibility to make recommendations concerning reemployment of each nontenured member. These recommendations shall be obtained by the Department Chair on a dated, signed form which has been approved by majority vote of the tenured faculty.

If the Department Chair is willing to support the majority recommendation for a given nontenured faculty member, then the Chair shall convey the recommendation to the Dean. If the Chair cannot support the majority recommendation, then the Chair will so notify the tenured faculty and they shall, if they choose, elect a spokesperson to convey and explain the majority position to the Dean.

## **7 Promotions**

When members of the Faculty are considered for promotion, recommendations will be solicited from all voting members of the faculty holding a rank equal to or higher than the one sought. This recommendation shall be obtained by the Department Chair on a dated,

signed form which has been approved by a majority vote of associate and full professors.

If the Department Chair is willing to support the majority recommendation for a given candidate, then the Chair shall convey the recommendation to the Dean. If the Chair cannot support the majority recommendation, then the Chair will so notify the faculty eligible to recommend and they shall, if they choose, elect a spokesperson to convey and explain the majority position to the Dean.

## **8 Topics, Seminars, and Intersession Courses Approval**

New topics, seminars, problems, and intersession courses must have the prior consent of the Chair.

## **9 Annual Faculty Goal Setting Procedures**

Consistent with University timelines and procedures, each faculty member will establish individual performance goals early in each calendar year. Goals ordinarily are to be developed across the three traditional areas that define University missions and utilize interests and skills of the faculty. They are: teaching and advising; research and creative endeavors; and nondirected/directed service. Each faculty member will establish annual goals and will allocate percentage weights totaling 100% to designate the intended time and effort toward accomplishing those goals.

### **9.1 Goals and Load Allocations**

By January 31st each year, goals and load allocations for each area will be established jointly by each faculty member with the Chair. In this way faculty members may devote differential time and effort according to their skills and interests, and the Department's mission and staffing needs can be served.

The meeting will be initiated by the Chair, and the completed goals/load allocation forms will be signed by both individuals and filed in the Department office within ten days. The goals/load allocation form for each area will be submitted along with evaluation materials at the time of annual merit evaluation.

### **9.2 Renegotiation of Goals and Load Allocations**

On occasion, a faculty member may wish to establish new goals and renegotiate load percentages at some point during the year. In such a case, the proposed modification shall be made in writing to the Chair within 30 days after the faculty member's perceived need for the change. Examples of such need for modification would be notification of publication or grant funding, changes in courses or advising loads, or new research opportunities. A change of load allocation made during the year shall reflect the assignment for the entire year. For example, if a change is made late in the year of evaluation, it is to reflect a proportional change across categories in the use of total time for the year.

### **9.3 Rank and Contract Length Differentiations**

In addition to the load percentages across categories, two other factors will be considered in establishing performance goals, and consequently will have significance in merit evaluation. They are: faculty rank and type of contract(s).

It is reasonable to have qualitatively different expectations for faculty of different ranks. Senior faculty may be expected to contribute to the departmental mission through greater versatility in teaching, through more broad-based forms of service (e.g., university committees vs. departmental ones, or national associations vs. local ones), and through more fully developed research agendas.

Differences between the nine-month, nine-plus-one-month, and nine-plus-two-months contracts will be considered in evaluating relative faculty performance, particularly in the area of teaching, since summer contracts tend to be heavily, if not exclusively, contracts for teaching. A load of five courses during an academic year has been the typical departmental load for graduate faculty with graduate advisees. Summer contracts typically add one course (over one month at ten tenths or two months at five tenths) or two courses (over two months) to the total number of courses taught in the calendar year. Such quantitative differences are legitimate and require appropriate considerations in load allocation and evaluation; to ignore them would suggest that summer session teaching is unimportant and faculty need not be accountable for it.

## **10 Faculty Evaluation Procedures**

In January each faculty member who holds five-tenths time or more within the Department and whose salary recommendation originates within the Department will be evaluated on her or his performance during the prior calendar year. Faculty are required by the University to be evaluated for two purposes--annual evaluation of productivity and merit rating for salary increases. The Chair normally will not be included in faculty evaluation procedures because that merit salary recommendation originates with the Dean. However, a Chair leaving the chair role during the current evaluation year will be included in faculty evaluation.

The faculty will decide, by simple majority of those voting at the last faculty meeting of the fall semester, whether or not to engage in peer review or review by Chair only that year. Should the faculty choose not to conduct peer review, the Chair will evaluate and rate faculty without formal input from the faculty, but in accordance with the criteria, considerations, and processes included in these Bylaws.

### **10.1 Evaluation Timeline**

Evaluation materials for the previous year's accomplishments, along with goal/load allocation forms as developed for that year by the ratee with the Chair, shall be provided to the Chair during the month of January as so designated by the Chair. If

the Department has voted for peer review, the peer review process will take place in a timely manner on a schedule established by the Chair.

The Chair will transmit evaluation letters to faculty and provide opportunity for formal discussion by appointment with each ratee during February. However, this timeline may be adjusted to meet any College deadlines or central administration deadlines.

## **10.2 Description of Evaluation Categories**

In most cases faculty will be evaluated in each of the four general areas: teaching and advising; research and creative endeavors; nondirected/directed service; and academic citizenship.

The lists presented below provide examples of criteria and data sources for the evaluation categories. They are intended to reflect some of the activities that a faculty member may engage in to fulfill the criteria of each category. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to present adequate documentation of his or her accomplishments toward meeting the goals and fulfilling the load allocation commitment outlined earlier that year.

### **Areas of Evaluation**

Teaching and Advising  
Research and Creative Endeavors  
Service  
Academic Citizenship (always 5%)

### **Examples of Evidence**

#### **Teaching and Advising**

Student evaluations  
Awards/recognition  
Peer review  
Other student feedback  
Curricular innovations/new text/inclusion of technology  
Team teaching  
Advising evaluations/feedback  
Advising documentation  
International teaching  
Professional development opportunities  
Quality of theses/dissertations

#### **Research and Creative Endeavors**

Publications in refereed journals  
Publications in non-refereed journals  
Books/book chapters

Monographs  
Book reviews  
External funding/grant proposals (funded and not funded)  
Conference presentations/attendance  
Serving on editorial boards for refereed journals  
Product development  
Book revision  
Editing a journal or book  
Research awards or recognition

### **Service**

Membership on university committees  
Membership on college committees  
Chairing of committees  
Participation in the mentor project  
Participation in the honors student program  
Supporting department activities and goals  
Advising student organizations  
Recruiting efforts for department  
Service to the public/community  
Mentoring  
Faculty senate  
Service in international, national, regional, and state organizations  
Inservice or workshop presentations  
Consultations  
Membership on an accreditation team

## **Teaching and Advising**

### ***Assistant Professor***

Fulfills an individual annual performance document of goals and load allocation form  
Obtains student ratings for all regular courses  
Uses data sources to improve teaching and advising  
Selects and uses appropriate resources including technology in teaching and advising  
Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the teaching field.  
Teaches and advises to serve varied learning needs of diverse student populations  
Assesses student learning regularly and provides appropriate feedback  
Supervises practicum and internship

### ***Associate Professor***

Meets criteria expected of assistant professors  
Updates, revises, and/develops course material as appropriate for the field  
Coordinates and responsibly supervises practica/internships/field placements  
Serves responsibly as major advisor for students in advanced degree programs  
Achieves graduate faculty status

Serves as an effective member on masters and doctoral committees  
Serves as an advisor for masters and doctoral students

***Full Professor***

Meets criteria expected of assistant and associate professors  
Provides leadership in curriculum development in the College, University, and/or field

**Research and Creative Endeavors**

***Assistant Professor***

Fulfills an individual annual performance document of goals and load allocation form  
Submits and/or develops research and/or scholarly activity appropriate to the discipline for publication  
Achieves toward graduate faculty status  
Demonstrates initiative toward acquiring external funding

***Associate Professor***

Meets criteria expected of assistant professors  
Maintains graduate faculty status

***Full Professor***

Meets criteria expected of assistant and associate professors  
Contributes scholarly work disseminated to conventions, conferences, books, and journals  
Mentors professional colleagues in research and other creative endeavors.  
Provides evidence of scholarship involvement in publications, funded grants, or product development  
Provide evidence of successful involvement in scholarship and research (e.g., refereed publications, grants, or product development)

**Service**

***Assistant Professor***

Fulfills an individual annual performance document of goals and load allocation form  
Participates in professional organizations  
Participates in the development of curriculum  
Provides service to college, university, state, and/or various constituencies

***Associate Professor***

Meets criteria expected of assistant professors  
Collaborates with professional colleagues in service activities

***Full Professor***

Meets criteria expected of assistant and associate professors  
Provides leadership in sensitive areas such as grievance committees or search committees for administrative personnel  
Performs leadership roles for the profession at the state and national levels

## Academic Citizenship

### *All Ranks*

Posts office hours and is regularly available for advising  
Updates and submits vita to department and college administration  
Updates and submits syllabi to department and college administration  
Engages in ethical and professional behaviors  
Consistently responds to requests from department chair or administrators in a timely manner  
Participates on college and/or university committees

### **10.3 Evaluation Materials**

Sets of materials are to be prepared for each of the four areas to be rated: teaching and advising; research and creative endeavors; nondirected/directed service; and academic citizenship. Within each of the first three areas listed, the faculty member will prepare the appropriate cover page by listing the goals and load percentages that were negotiated with the Chair the previous January or renegotiated at a later date, and will follow that page with a summary no longer than 4 to 5 pages describing accomplishments toward the goals and load allocation. A brief summary that addresses academic citizenship is to be included with the set of materials. For any area in which 0% load has been declared, a cover page for the area is to be included, with notation to that effect. In general, if an accomplishment cuts across more than one category, faculty may cross enter if they indicate that they have done so in both categories. With regard to the category of research, one may list a journal publication in only one year. Books or ongoing research projects may be listed across successive years if percentages of the total product are spread across those years.

### **10.4 Criteria for Merit Evaluation**

The following criteria illustrate, but do not exhaust the extent of, these general standards and values within the three categories of faculty evaluation:

#### **Teaching and Advising**

- a. In-depth, versatile teaching is generally more meritorious than teaching that is ordinary, superficial, and limited in scope.
- b. Evidence of developing or revising a course to respond to contemporary issues and to incorporate advanced teaching technology generally merits more weight than presenting and teaching the same course in the same way time after time.
- c. Student ratings are more meritorious when they measure course objectives that are appropriate for the course, when class size and evaluation format do not compromise student anonymity, and when the number of student raters comprises a sizable percentage of the total class enrollment.

- d. Advisement of doctoral students and supervision of their dissertations generally merit considerably more credit than advisement of non-thesis, non-project master's students and supervision of their programs.

### **Research and Other Creative Endeavors**

- a. Sole authorship or senior authorship in national refereed journals with focus relevant to the mission of the faculty member's academic domain generally merits more credit than junior authorship and authorship in regional publications or non-refereed journals; however, it is inappropriate to deny exceptions, to stipulate how much more credit, or to imply that all articles of a given category merit equal credit. There are at least two reasons for recognizing exceptions. First, multiple authorship among members of the Department fosters collegiality. Second, authorship with graduate students benefits their careers and the Department's graduate programs. For publications with multiple authors, faculty must indicate their relative contribution to the article.
- b. Sole authorship of scholarly books published by recognized publishers of professional works generally merits considerably more weight than authorship of books of selected readings or works published by sources that publish at the author's request.
- c. Grant proposals that are relevant to the faculty member's academic domain and are accepted and funded by external agencies generally merit more credit than proposals that are not funded or are not generally related to the Department's mission.

### **Service**

- a. Service activities that relate directly to the mission of the faculty member's academic domain generally merit more credit than those having only marginal relevance.
- b. Service in professional organizations of national status generally merits more credit than corresponding service in regional, state, or local groups; however, serving in a major role within the regional, state, or local group might well outweigh only a minor contribution to national or international organizations.
- c. Consulting that involves high-level application of professional competence to novel situations generally merits more credit than consulting of a routine nature.
- d. Editorial responsibility for a refereed professional journal generally earns more credit than does preparing single article reviews for a similarly reputable publication.

- e. Serving as chair of university-wide or college-wide committees generally outweighs more minor roles in committee work.

## **10.5 Merit Rating Procedures**

Faculty selects the time allocation for each of the above, except for Academic Citizenship with an allocation of 5%. Minimums would be set to ensure involvement in all areas. The 1-5 rating discussed below is multiplied by the time allocation for each area. From this number, a rating is given to each category and then added for an overall rating. The 1-5 rating may be chair or peer driven depending on the vote of the department. If ratings are by peers, all voting faculty members whose salary originate within the Department will be invited to rate. Raters will rate in each of the four areas. The median of the ranks assigned by all raters would be calculated. Peer ratings would then serve as input to the chair.

5=Far exceeded criteria

4=Exceeded criteria

3=Met criteria

2=Did not meet criteria, but met minimum acceptable levels of productivity

1=Did not meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity

## **10.6 Rating Procedures for Peer Review**

The following procedures will be in effect during those years in which the departmental faculty elect to engage in peer review.

### **10.6.1 Rater Input to the Chair**

The ratings of the faculty raters will exist as advisory input to the Chair who ultimately makes recommendations to the Dean for merit salary increases and annual evaluation of productivity. The Chair will rate all faculty in each of the categories prior to receiving input from the raters.

### **10.6.2 Ratings Procedures**

All raters will independently rate faculty in all four categories. No individual will rate himself or herself or spouse in any of the categories. Raters will compare each ratee's performance with that of other rated members of the Department with respect to stated goals, load allocations, and rank. Raters will consider stated goals and load percentages in determining their ratings for each ratee. For each area (teaching and advising, research and creative endeavors, service, academic citizenship), the rater will rate each ratee on a five-point scale for merit in accomplishment of the ratee's goal (Far exceeded criteria=5; Exceeded criteria= 4; Met criteria=3; Did not meet criteria, but met minimum acceptable levels of productivity=2; Did not meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity=1). In addition, raters may also submit narrative comments explaining why they rated someone as they did.

### 10.6.3 Directions to the Rater

During each annual review period faculty are expected to achieve criteria as illustrated in each domain of activity for the appropriate academic rank. This includes fulfilling the goals and the load allocation specified in the individual annual performance document. As a result, the evaluation is based on both the extent to which the faculty member achieved criteria for his/her academic rank and the extent to which one achieved his/her performance goals for the evaluation period.

A faculty member who performs at expected levels on criteria the Department illustrated as standards, and who substantially fulfills his/her annual goals and load allocation developed in the annual conference with the Department Chair, would be noted as having “met criteria.” Some faculty may accomplish ambitious goals, exceeding the expected levels on criteria and/or the annual goals. This performance evaluation would be rated as having “exceeded criteria.” In exceptional cases, a faculty member might significantly exceed the criteria and the goals/load allocation. As result, the performance rating would be “far exceeded criteria.” At times, the performance of some faculty may be evaluated as not having “met criteria” for their rank and goals/load allocation, but they have “met minimum acceptable levels of productivity.” Such a performance rating would be noted as “Did not meet expectations, but met minimum acceptable levels of productivity.” A faculty member who fails to meet minimum expectations, including marginal or worse performance on annual goals and load allocation, would have his/her performance rated as “Did not meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity.” In this case, the Chair would follow the procedures for facilitating improved performance noted in the University Handbook (C31.5).

The evaluation of teaching, research and creative endeavors, service, and academic citizenship is based upon the supporting documentation submitted by the faculty. The evaluation of faculty performance should be as objective as possible; however, evaluation requires subjective judgments because all activities may not be easily quantified. When subjective evaluation is required, the Department Head must use sound, professional judgment to evaluate performance.

## Process By Which Merit Salary Increases Will Be Determined With Examples

1. Presented are examples of time allocations by area of responsibility along with the rating for each area of responsibility.

Professor	Faculty Responsibilities	Time Allocation	Annual Evaluation Rating by Category
Professor A	Research & Creative Endeavors	30%	Exceeded criteria-4
	Teaching & Advising	45%	Met criteria-3
	Service	20%	Exceeded criteria-4
	Academic Citizenship	5%	Met criteria-3
Professor B	Research & Creative Endeavors	10%	Met criteria-3
	Teaching & Advising	60%	Met criteria-3
	Service	25%	Met criteria-3
	Academic Citizenship	5%	Met criteria-3
Professor C	Research & Creative Endeavors	20%	Exceeded criteria-4
	Teaching & Advising	50%	Exceeded criteria-4
	Service	25%	Exceeded criteria-4
	Academic Citizenship	5%	Exceeded criteria-4

2. The rating values are multiplied by the time allocation for each of the areas. Then, these values are added to obtain the total for each faculty member.

	Research & Creative End.	Teaching & Advising	Service	Academic Citizenship	Total
A	.30 x 4 = 1.20	.45 x 3 = 1.35	.20 x 4 = 0.80	.05 x 3 = 0.15	3.50
B	.10 x 3 = 0.30	.60 x 3 = 1.80	.25 x 3 = 0.75	.05 x 3 = 0.15	3.00
C	.20 x 4 = 0.80	.50 x 4 = 2.00	.25 x 4 = 1.00	.05 x 4 = 0.20	4.00

3. The average rating for department faculty is determined.

A	3.50
B	3.00
C	<u>4.00</u>
	$10.50 / 3 = 3.50 = \text{Average faculty rating}$

4. Each faculty member's overall rating is divided by the department average to achieve a final rating.

- A  $3.50/3.50 = 1.00$
- B  $3.00/3.50 = 0.86$
- C  $4.00/3.50 = 1.14$

5. A 3-2-1 rolling average of present to previous years will be used for the merit evaluation. The average ratings from the two previous years will be retrieved. The current year average will be multiplied by 3, the previous year average multiplied by 2, and the year before the previous year will be multiplied by 1. The mean of the three years' products will be computed. Generally, new faculty members will be recommended for an average percentage increase in each of their first two years.

In the example, assume the ratings for the previous years were as follows:

	Previous Year	Two years ago
A	.86	.86
B	1.00	1.14
C	1.14	1.00

Rolling average computation—

- A  $[3(1.00) + 2(.86) + 1(.86)]/6 = 5.58/6 = 0.930$
- B  $[3(.86) + 2(1.00) + 1(1.14)]/6 = 5.72/6 = 0.953$
- C  $[3(1.14) + 2(1.14) + 1(1.00)]/6 = 6.70/6 = 1.117$

5. Each faculty member's final rating is multiplied by the percent merit raise allocated.

- A  $0.930 \times 3.00\% = 2.790\%$
- B  $0.953 \times 3.00\% = 2.859\%$
- C  $1.117 \times 3.00\% = 3.351\%$

#### 10.6.4 Categories of Rating

Recognizing the fixed-sum merit system, and the constraints it places on salary allocations, this information would be used as input to the chair for the purposes of placing faculty into merit categories from no fewer than two to no more than the total number of faculty being rated. These categories may be described by such terms as "Far exceeded criteria," "Exceeded Criteria," "Met criteria," "Did not meet expectations, but met minimum acceptable levels of productivity," or "Did not meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity." As specified in the Kansas State University Handbook, bases for quantitative ratings used to summarize evaluative judgments will be explained by a narrative account. This narrative account shall provide

succinct assessment of the ratee's overall or comprehensive effectiveness (University Handbook C31.8) in performing negotiated responsibilities and shall include a summary of achievement along with evidence supporting the assessment (University Handbook C46.1). The ratings then will be used to compute the merit salary increases recommended to the Dean and to determine whether minimum criteria levels have been satisfied.

### **10.7 Chronic Low Achievement by Tenured Faculty**

If a tenured faculty member's performance in any area designated as essential to the Department's mission is rated in the annual evaluation as "Did not meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity," the Department Chair shall indicate so in writing to the faculty member and also will indicate in writing a suggested course of action for improving the performance (as directed in the University Handbook C31.5). In the next annual evaluation, a faculty member who failed to "meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity" the previous year will report on the improvement activities and on any evidence of improvement. If a faculty member fails to "meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity" criteria for the year following the Chair's suggested course of action, that person's name will be forwarded to the Dean. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which an overall evaluation of "Did not meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity" is received, then "dismissal for cause" will be considered at the discretion of the Dean.

### **10.8 Review of Merit Evaluation Procedures**

The evaluation procedures outlined in these Bylaws shall be reviewed by the Department faculty every five years, or more often if deemed necessary by a majority vote of the Department faculty or at the discretion of the Chair, Dean, or Provost, and revised as needed.

## **11 Instructional Evaluation for Faculty Not Participating in Merit Evaluation**

For the purposes of enhancing instruction and student learning, all individuals teaching in the Department but not participating in the merit evaluation process shall annually present evidence to the Department Chair (or other administrator, if appropriate). A one- or two-page self-assessment of classroom performance (brief description of duties, successes/strengths, and possible areas of improvement) is to be submitted. Recommended examples of supporting documentation include course evaluations (e.g., TEVAL or IDEA reports), course syllabi, and instructional materials.

## **12 Standards for Tenure and Promotion**

In decisions regarding the awarding of tenure and promotion in rank, the Department is guided by the policies and procedures stipulated in the University Handbook and by the guidelines issued by 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."

The performance criteria in the areas of teaching, research and creative endeavors, and service for the Department faculty members are based on those described by the Department's merit evaluation system. That is, the standards or expectations for promotion and tenure represent logical, reasonable, cumulative extensions of the standards that apply in annual performance evaluations. (Perhaps the most important extension is that versatility and balance must be demonstrated before tenure is awarded, although a given year's work assignment may not provide opportunity for versatility to be demonstrated.)

Evaluation requires judgment. The faculty of the Department exercise their professional judgment in the application of those standards in annual peer review and in making tenure and promotion recommendations.

### **12.1 Tenure**

Tenure decisions should be based on demonstrated individual excellence (merit) and, more importantly, on a candidate's contribution to the institutional mission (worth). The institution is best served by faculty who are both versatile and specialized. Versatility may be exhibited across the areas of teaching, research and creative endeavor, service and/or within one or more of those areas. Obviously, specialization entails both depth and breadth of knowledge in a discipline, and, key to worth, the ability and disposition to apply that knowledge in teaching, research, and/or service.

In making tenure recommendations, the Department is guided by the general principles of excellence and versatility in teaching and in contribution to one or more of the University's other missions of research, service, and extension. In making tenure recommendations, our obligation of stewardship to students, citizens, consumers of research, the community of scholars, and other University constituents to provide the best faculty possible renders it necessary, albeit difficult, 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?"

### **12.2 Promotion**

In making promotion recommendations, the Department is guided by principles of assessing demonstrated individual merit in relation to work assignment and the University's missions. As noted in the University Handbook (sec. C120.2), promotion to associate professor should be based on "substantial professional contributions that reflect excellence." Promotion to professor should be based on "the attainment of excellence in the assigned duties of the faculty member and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies." In general, promotion to professor carries an expectation of recognition at the national level for achievement in teaching, research and creative endeavors, or service.

## 13 Professorial Performance Award

In decisions regarding the Professorial Performance Award, the Department is guided by Sections C49.1 through C49.14 of the University Handbook and by the guidelines issued by the Office of the Provost on February 15, 2006.

As noted in the University Handbook (sec. C49.1), “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.” The award should be based on “the attainment of excellence in the assigned duties of the faculty member and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies” (see C120.2).

### 13.1 Award Eligibility

The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in this rank at Kansas State University for at least six years since the last Professorial Performance Award. Professors with appointments in different departments are eligible for the award provided their appointments are equivalent to a full-time position. The candidate must show evidence of *sustained* productivity in at least the last six years since promotion to full professor or the last receipt of the Professorial Performance Award.

### 13.2 Award Criteria

The criteria for the award in the areas of teaching, research and creative endeavors, and service are based on those expected of full professors as described by the Department’s merit evaluation system. The faculty acknowledges the minimum nature of those criteria because the successful candidate for either promotion or the Professorial Performance Award will have significantly exceeded the criteria. Similar to promotion to professor, the Professorial Performance Award should be based on “the attainment of excellence in the assigned duties of the faculty member and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies” (University Handbook, C120.1).

### 13.3 Procedures

The candidate shall inform the department chair in writing of his or 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” (University Handbook, C49.5). Upon receipt of such documentation, the chair shall notify all voting members of the faculty holding the rank of full professor. The full professors, excluding the chair should he/she hold the rank of Professor, shall review the materials and hold a vote regarding the worthiness of the candidate’s achievements 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, the ballot shall bear a signature line of Yes/No/Abstain for the 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 chair supports the majority recommendation for a given candidate, then she/he shall convey the recommendation to the Dean. The chair will send a letter of support to the Dean and a copy to the candidate. If the chair cannot support the majority recommendation, then he/she will notify the voting faculty and the candidate in writing. The voting faculty shall have the option to elect a spokesperson to convey the majority position to the Dean. If the eligible voting faculty members cannot recommend a candidate, the chair will inform the candidate in writing. The candidate may choose to seek recourse as described in the University Handbook.