

SCHOOL OF FAMILY STUDIES AND HUMAN SERVICES

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 5/05/06)

W.H. Meredith, Department Head

Date signed: 5/05/06

Virginia Moxley, Interim Dean

Date signed: 5/05/06

M. Duane Nellis, Provost

Date signed: 6/27/06

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 12/09/05)

W.H. Meredith, Department Head

Date signed: 12/16/05

Virginia Moxley, Interim Dean

Date signed: 12/16/05

M. Duane Nellis, Provost

Date signed: 1/17/06

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

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: 12/2010

***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.**

SCHOOL OF FAMILY STUDIES AND HUMAN SERVICES

College of Human Ecology
Kansas State University

Last Edited: 5/5/2006

***DOCUMENTATION GUIDE FOR
ANNUAL EVALUATION AND PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT***

Approval Date _____

School Director _____

Dean _____

Provost _____

Date for Revision _____

School of Family Studies and Human Services
College of Human Ecology
Kansas State University

Review of this evaluation system *must occur at least once every five years* or more frequently if it is determined to be necessary by the majority of the unclassified personnel in the School or the School Director or the Dean of the College of Human Ecology.
(*Kansas State University Faculty Handbook 1999-2000, August, 1999.*)

School of Family Studies and Human Services
College of Human Ecology
Kansas State University

Annual Evaluation for Merit Review/Performance Improvement

The School of Family Studies and Human Services is committed to the overarching goal of enhancing the quality of life for individuals and families across regional, national, and international arenas. To serve this pursuit, the unclassified personnel (faculty and staff) of the School have established the following procedures to assist its members in establishing goals for their professional accomplishment and evaluating the attainment of those goals.

Consistent with University guidelines, the School Director will conduct “annual written evaluations...for the purpose of determining merit salary increases...based on the distribution of responsibilities assigned, the relative difficulty and importance of these responsibilities, and the level of success with which each was performed” (*Kansas State University Faculty Handbook*, C40). Responsibilities may occur in the areas of teaching, research and creative endeavor, extension, and service. The recommendations of the School Director are to be based on: (1) the relative proportion of time and effort devoted to each area jointly established each year by the individual faculty member and the School Director (see Attachment 1); (2) each unclassified member’s self-report accompanied by appropriate evaluation data (see Attachments 2-5); and (3) the School Director’s own assessment of faculty growth and productivity. This policy applies to those unclassified personnel (faculty or staff) whose annual salary recommendations originate from the School with regular appointments of half-time or greater.

Eligibility for Annual Evaluation

Consistent with University policy, “those appointed to *regular* part-time positions must be evaluated” but “evaluations are not required for an individual on a term appointment,” even if that appointment will be renewed for another year (*Kansas State University Handbook*, C46.1). A term appointment may be full-time or part-time, is normally supported by finite funding, usually for a specified term not longer than one year, and carries no expectation of continued employment beyond the period stated in the contract (*Kansas State University Handbook*, C11: See section C11 for specific designations of term appointments).

Definition of Evaluation Period

The evaluation period will be the same for all individuals in the School, with the possible exception of first year appointees and those who have been on leave for all or a part of the year (see below). Currently, the School’s evaluation system is based on performance during the 12-month evaluation period ending December 31st (though on the basis of a majority vote, the School may choose any other 12-month period for evaluation).

The School’s evaluation system may include accomplishments that have occurred over a period of time longer than one year. In order to minimize inequities due to variable legislative actions

from year to year and to reflect work on long-term projects such as preparation of a book, a faculty member may request that his or her work be evaluated using a three-year perspective. (A three-year perspective is different from a three-year rolling average, which is used in some departments, in that no averages are calculated.) When selected, the three-year perspective is to be used for all elements of the faculty member's load, and not just for selected elements.

The faculty member notifies the School Director by December 1 that he or she would like to be evaluated using a three-year perspective for the preceding three years. In doing so, the faculty member agrees that he or she will be evaluated this way for at least two consecutive years. To assist the School Director in viewing the three-year period, the faculty member presents the accomplishments from the previous three years, including the current evaluation year, in tabular form (see Attachment 6) with accompanying narrative.

Special Rules: First-Year Appointees, Faculty in Phased Retirement, and Faculty on Leave

Evaluation options for first-year appointees, faculty in phased retirement, and faculty on leave are designated in the Faculty Handbook and are to be determined by the majority of the personnel in the School of Family Studies and Human Services in consultation with the School Director. At present, the School policy allows the appropriate option to be selected by the School Head in negotiation with the appointee or faculty member on a case-by-case basis. These options (*Kansas State University Handbook, C43*) are: (1) an increase based on the individual's evaluation (adjusted proportionally to encompass the entire year); (2) an average increase, or; (3) the larger of the above, since the length of time for evaluating was limited. Such individuals are also eligible for salary adjustments on bases outside the annual evaluation (e.g., market, equity.)

Areas of Evaluation

The School Director must prepare, by January 31, a written annual evaluation for each full or part-time regularly appointed unclassified person (*Kansas State University Handbook, C46*). (This is distinct from the written annual goals summary that is prepared by the School Director at a later date specified by the Director.) Evaluation may occur across different areas of professional activity. Currently, these areas are:

Teaching (*Classroom Instruction, Non-classroom Instruction, Clinical Instruction, Curriculum-related Activity, Instructional Innovation, Specific Participation in Graduate Faculty Activities, and Academic Advising Activities*)

Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Endeavors (*Publications or Juried Competitions, Research Projects, Grants, and Contracts; Research Presentations and Scholarly or Creative Contributions; Recognition for Research, Scholarship, or Other Creative Endeavors*)

Extension (*Program Planning, Program Preparation, Program Implementation, Program Evaluation, Program Dissemination*)

Service (*Directed and Non-directed--Professional, Institutional, and Public*)

Not all School personnel will necessarily carry responsibilities in each area each year. The faculty member's load, that is, the allocation of responsibilities and the associated evaluation weights, is determined jointly by the School Director and individual School personnel. In each case, the weights must total 100%. In assigning faculty loads, the Director of the School is expected to take into account issues related to equity, to appointment status, to the needs and opportunities of the School and the College, and to the faculty member's preferences, where possible. Junior faculty should carry loads that permit them to accomplish the requirements for tenure and promotion.

Annual Goal Setting

Each School member will meet annually with the School Director to establish personal goals and objectives in the major areas of professional activity and to discuss their relative importance within the context of the goals of the specific unit of the School member and those of the School. According to the *Kansas State University Handbook, C45.1*, these goals and objectives "should reflect the relative percentages of time and effort the person plans to allocate to the appropriate areas in the upcoming period. It is expected that the previous year's statement will be considered during the annual evaluation and goal setting process.

This process will result in joint agreement as to the faculty load (proportion of time spent in a major area of professional activity) as evidenced by completion by the form identified in this document as Attachment 1. Normally, these faculty loads comprise the evaluation weights for these areas. Completed forms are to be on file in the School office by a date established and announced by the School Director. If the School Director and the School member be are unable to agree on goals and objectives for the new evaluation period, the Dean of the College shall resolve the matter following discussions with each of the above parties.

On occasion, modifications to statements of objectives are necessary due to unanticipated changes in School circumstances, such as changes in course offerings, funding of grants, or research opportunities. Such modifications should be made in writing and submitted within one month of the change. However, no modifications to the agreement can be made after November 1 of the evaluation year.

Responsibilities of School Personnel: The School member will work collaboratively with the School Director in outlining position responsibilities for the coming year and, in a timely manner, notify the School Director of any substantial change in those responsibilities. The School member is responsible for developing a written description of the agreed-upon activities associated with his/her current position using Attachment 1 and submitting it to the School Director for review and approval along with the annual review materials for the previous year or along with materials for a three-year perspective. The formal statement will contain a description of the basic activities associated with each area of activity (see the *Documentation Guide for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment* for guidance here). This description also will outline the negotiated goals in the relevant areas for the upcoming year and will be used to guide the annual evaluation of professional activities for School personnel.

Responsibilities of the School Director: The School Director will communicate any College-wide priorities regarding the funding environment and resources to School personnel and initiate the meetings to establish annual goals with the individual faculty members. Ideally, the Director and the faculty can discuss the goals outlined in this document in the same meeting at which the Director discusses his or her evaluation of the faculty member's performance for the previous year, or for the previous three years, if the three-year perspective has been chosen.

The Annual Goals document, written by the School member (see above), must be reviewed by the School Director and co-signed by both the School Director and the School member, who will keep a personal copy. If necessary, discrepancies in expectations in the written description will be resolved in another meeting between the School Director and the School member. If the annual goals document is not completed by the designated date, or is otherwise unsatisfactory, the Director may refer individual cases to the Dean of the College for resolution.

Evaluation Process

Responsibilities of the School Director: Based on the materials provided by each member of the School, the School Head will determine an overall rating. For each area of evaluation, the Head will rate the faculty member as having *exceeded expectations*, *met expectations*, *fallen below expectations but meeting the minimally acceptable level of productivity*, or *fallen below the minimally acceptable level of productivity* in the individual goals set for each category. Standards for the minimally acceptable level of performance are listed at the end of this document. The Director of the School is strongly encouraged to develop rubrics for the evaluation of each area of performance and to share these with the faculty prior to or in the early part of the year that is under consideration.

Faculty who have met or exceeded goals in all areas will participate fully in the merit increase provided to the College. Those who have not met goals in one or more categories will be counseled by the Director on ways to rectify that situation (e.g., consider steps to improve performance and/or reallocation of the faculty member's responsibilities), and will receive merit increases at a lower percentage than the first group. The School Director will request a plan of action from the faculty member to address the faculty member's performance (See *Kansas State University Handbook*, C30.3, for potential resources for faculty improvement.) Those who have failed to meet goals in *every* area will not receive a merit pay increase. This may apply to those who have *fallen below expectations but meet minimally acceptable levels of productivity*, as well as to those who have *fallen below minimally acceptable levels of productivity*.

Responsibilities of School Personnel: School faculty members are responsible for preparing and submitting the materials pertinent to annual merit evaluations. All materials must be submitted to the School Director by the first day of the Spring Semester of each evaluation year. This includes Attachments 2-5 and supporting materials as needed. The faculty member is expected to make the case for an evaluation at a particular level and to provide supporting materials.

Chronic Low Achievement: Failure to meet minimally acceptable levels of performance is discussed in the *Kansas State University Handbook*, C31.5, as follows:

Chronic failure of a tenured faculty member to perform his or her professional duties, as defined in the respective unit, shall contribute evidence of ‘professional incompetence’ and warrant consideration for ‘dismissal for cause’ under existing university policies. If the School Director rates the performance of the School member’s *overall* productivity as “below the minimally acceptable level of productivity” for two consecutive years or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period, in keeping with regular procedures in matters of tenure, a peer review panel will be asked to review the member’s work load, performance ratings, other pertinent evidence, and procedural documentation unless the faculty member wishes to waive review by such a panel. The panel will submit a written recommendation to the School Director regarding the results of its review. The Director will then forward the written recommendation as well as his or her own written recommendation to the Dean of the College of Human Ecology, and the Dean in turn will make a written recommendation to the Provost.

Judgments of failure to meet minimally acceptable levels of productivity are limited to significant or critical areas of professional activity of the School member. In accordance with the options afforded by the *KSU Faculty Handbook* (C31.8b), such judgments may occur only when the area of professional activity – in predetermined agreements with the faculty member – (1) comprises 30% or more of one’s total responsibilities AND (2) occurs in two or more substantial areas of professional responsibility. These judgments must always occur in a context that considers the degree to which weaknesses are balanced by strengths. For example, a faculty member may have 20% of responsibilities in the area of Research and 15% in Service. Failure to meet minimum-acceptable levels of productivity in either area alone would not constitute an instance credited toward chronic low achievement; however, failure to meet these standards in both areas (35%) would constitute such an instance.

The review panel, if any, will be comprised of three faculty members, including two members at the rank of the faculty member being reviewed (associate professor, full professor), and one from the other level. In order to select the panel, the Director initially nominates four faculty members who are at the same rank as the reviewee and two faculty at the other rank. The reviewee can then strike three names, provided that the composition of the panel remains as specified above. The Director then appoints one of the three panelists to be the chair of the panel.

The review panel will meet within three weeks of its appointment. It will review all the materials that were made available to the Director, as well as any additional materials provided by the faculty member being reviewed or by the Director. These materials should be made available to the panel as soon as it is appointed. Either the panel or the reviewee can request that the reviewee appear before it in person. The panel will submit its report, including any minority reports, to the Director and to the reviewee. The reviewee has one week to respond to the report by writing to the Director. After the Director has written his or her assessment, a copy is furnished to the reviewee, who has one week to respond in writing to the Director’s report. All of these documents are sent forward to the Dean of the College.

Criteria/Reporting Requirements for Annual Evaluation

The sources of information to be used by the School Director in each of the areas of evaluation are described in the sections below. School personnel are expected to provide the self-reports and evaluation information described below in the formats provided in Attachments 2-5 **and in Attachment 6 for the three-year perspective**. Faculty must submit evaluation materials to the School Director by the first day of classes of the Spring semester of each evaluation year.

1. TEACHING

The faculty of the School of Family Studies and Human Services engage in a number of different types of teaching beyond what is traditionally called classroom teaching. Consequently, this section on TEACHING has many applications. It would be inappropriate to try to evaluate all types of instruction in the same way.

Faculty are referred to the School's *Documentation Guide for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment* for a complete overview of the many facets of instruction in FSHS, and to see the kind of documentation considered relevant. Furthermore, the faculty member has the obligation to demonstrate and document a desired level of performance, e.g. "exceeds expectation." For example, a faculty member who has developed an innovative classroom approach should present this information along with student responses as part of his or her portfolio. Similarly, a faculty member with clinical instructional duties should document innovative clinical approaches or exceptional clinical services, preferably with information about outcomes.

A. Classroom Instruction

Classroom instruction includes traditional instruction of students in the physical classroom on campus as well as courses taught on-line or in a distance format or through the Division of Continuing Education. It also includes courses taught as an overload so long as the course designation itself carries a School prefix. The School requires that faculty members involved in classroom instruction submit at least three kinds of information about their teaching each year as part of their faculty evaluation. The annual evaluation is considered to be both a summative and a formative evaluation, and it must include information pertaining to: (a) instructional effectiveness, (b) preparation of instructional material and syllabi, and (c) student assessment practices.

The faculty member's teaching portfolio should include:

- **A Self-Report of Classroom Teaching.** Each faculty member is asked to provide a report of teaching activities inside and outside of the classroom. The report should discuss, in two pages or less, instructional work related to revision or reorganization of course content, collaboration with other faculty members on course content or strategies, development of a new course offering, or efforts to introduce innovations into the curriculum or into a specific course. The self-report should also include a description of the way in which the faculty member obtains feedback from students about the instruction of each course.
- **Instructional Materials.** The faculty member should provide a copy of the syllabus and final grade sheet for each course, as well as examples of instructional materials used or developed by the faculty member. The syllabus must include the unit's Undergraduate Student Outcomes that are relevant for the course being taught. Other requirements for the syllabus are mentioned in the FSHS *Policy Handbook*, which is available on the W: drive of the College computer network. Additional instructional materials could also include copies of special handouts, copies of tests, and information about use of the Internet or the Web for the course. Because faculty at all ranks are encouraged to

participate in peer consultation programs to improve instruction, faculty who do so have the option of submitting the resulting portfolio, so long as it includes the syllabus, grade sheet, and results of student assessments.

- **Results of Student Assessments.** The School requires faculty to collect data about students' perceptions of instruction using the TEVAL or the IDEA system or using another suitable procedure as approved by the Director. Non-tenured faculty are required to submit these results for each section of each course that they teach each semester. Tenured faculty are required to submit these data for one section of each course that they teach each year. Faculty should solicit student feedback toward the end of each course in ways that will maintain the integrity and confidentiality of student responses. For example, evaluations should be completed when the instructor is not present. Faculty may request that students respond to additional questions (beyond the TEVAL or IDEA). TEVAL and IDEA forms should be forwarded to the Center for Advancement of Teaching and Learning to be scored and returned to the instructor after grades have been assigned. Faculty should provide copies of the official summary forms and of all student comments.

Instructors of labs, practica, and certain graduate classes, e.g. a course in qualitative procedures, may choose to have the students evaluate the experience using questionnaires or other procedures rather than the TEVAL or IDEA. If there is any doubt about the adequacy of the alternative procedures, the faculty member should consult with the Director. Confidentiality and integrity of student responses must still be maintained.

The materials submitted will be evaluated by the School Director using questions similar to those used for classroom teaching in the School's *Documentation Guide for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment*, Appendix D.

B. Non-Classroom Instructional and Curriculum-Related Activity

Faculty who arrange, supervise, and evaluate student practica and internships should submit a self-report for these duties. The self-report should be no longer than one page and should include information about the number of students placed, a report of the duties involved in maintaining liaison with sites, and comments about the timeliness and appropriateness of placements.

Faculty who engage in supervision of honors projects or independent study courses, who assist others in their instructional duties, or who develop new courses or instructional programs should provide a self-report of these activities, together with copies of any products or outcomes generated.

The materials submitted will be evaluated by the School Director using questions similar to those used for non-classroom teaching in the School's Tenure and Promotion document, Appendix D.

C. Clinical Instruction

Faculty who engage in clinical instruction should provide a portfolio that includes a self-report indicating the number of students supervised. If student feedback about their clinical instruction is available, that should also be provided. (Some units hold the evaluation forms until there are enough that the students' responses have a degree of confidentiality.)

If the faculty member's unit has a peer review process for clinical instruction, the resulting summary statement should be included in the portfolio. If the faculty member's unit does not have a peer evaluation process, then the faculty member should include information and materials relating to the quality of the clinical instruction that s/he provides.

The materials submitted will be evaluated by the School Director using questions similar to those used for clinical instruction in the School's *Documentation Guide for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment*, Appendix D.

D. Academic Supervision and Student Advisory Activities

Much of the undergraduate advising for the School occurs in the FSHS Advising Center. Some units advise their own majors, in which case all the faculty are involved in advising of undergraduates. Faculty who do such advising should describe their involvement in undergraduate advising, including the number of advisees they have and how they do that advising. If there have been complaints to the Director about that advisor that the Director may take into account, the Director should so notify the faculty member.

Faculty members who serve as a major professor for graduate students may have three types of duties. The first type of duty is traditional advising with respect to the student's program of study. The second type of duty is participation in advising committees and preparation and evaluation of comprehensive examinations. The third type of duty is research mentoring by supervising a thesis, master's report, or dissertation. These types of advising are difficult to evaluate, especially if multiple sources of information are desired. However, faculty should report on the quantity and quality of their efforts in this area in terms of the number of students they serve in each area, and the numbers of students who have completed exams, reports, theses, and/or dissertations under their supervision. The faculty could also submit the students' final products.

To evaluate advising, the Director of the School may use information about the number of students currently enrolled or completing programs (numbers of exams, reports, theses, dissertations completed), review of completed reports, theses, or dissertations, information from unit or School surveys on the quality of advising or advising outcomes, student awareness of program requirements and time lines, and other information to support evaluation in this area (e.g., peer evaluations regarding advising from other members of one's unit and results of exit interviews.) Anecdotal evidence should be avoided. Any information used to evaluate the quality of advising other than that submitted by the faculty member should be shared with the faculty member prior to the submission of the annual evaluation portfolio.

The materials submitted will be evaluated by the School Director using questions similar to those used for academic advising and supervision in the School's *Documentation Guide for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment*, Appendix D.

2. RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND OTHER CREATIVE ENDEAVORS

Traditionally, scholarship and creative activity include a broad range of products, including publications in refereed journals, book chapters, books, monographs, opinions pieces, educational product development, reviews, grant proposals, editorial responsibilities, and other creative – and frequently collaborative – activities. Work that advances the teaching, development, research, and service missions of the University that has the capacity to be disseminated widely to relevant audiences and that is available for peer review is considered appropriate for this review. The *Documentation Guide for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment* provides many examples of such products of research, scholarship and creativity. The evaluation process must remain flexible enough to accommodate less traditional models of research and scholarship as well. Such activity frequently involves effort during more than one evaluation year. In the case of work that extends over multiple years, faculty members may request that the Director use a three-year perspective.

As a general policy, faculty are expected to maintain a coherent program of research or scholarship with clearly defined theoretical, empirical, and/or intervention-oriented goals, as opposed to unorganized and scattered efforts in numerous unrelated research directions. Of course, faculty may, out of necessity, engage in research with colleagues and/or students that represent a diverse range of topics reflective of their diverse interests. Also, faculty may change the focus of their research or scholarship from time to time. Such efforts should generally be rewarded and not penalized. However, consistent with the policy articulated in the School *Documentation Guide for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment*, it is expected that over time, the personal research program of the faculty member should reflect sustained efforts necessary for defining systematic progress and for achieving national and international recognition in a selected area of research. It is the responsibility of the School Director and the School member to mutually monitor the spirit and letter of this expectation during each annual merit evaluation.

Accomplishments and progress in the area of research, scholarship, and other creative endeavors may be demonstrated by copies of all materials “in press” or published during the relevant period; a narrative statement of the number, complexity, and quality of current research projects or programs, including others involved; a summary description of proposals submitted to granting agencies during the relevant period; the source and amount of funding of research projects obtained during the relevant period; a list of professional presentations, targeted audiences, and content summary (including specific role played in the presentation); awards for research or creative endeavors; evidence of citation of work; evidence of professional consultations with colleagues, including solicited or unsolicited letters of support from colleagues involved in interdisciplinary work; awards for research and/or scholarship; and any other relevant evidence relevant to annual evaluation suggested in the School of FSHS *Documentation Guide for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment*.

A submission to a research journal that is in press or is published during the evaluation period must be accompanied by the journal’s ranking in the journal tiers established by the School. The School’s tiers may be found in Appendix 7. The faculty member should see the *Documentation Guide for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment* for information about how to deal with journals that are not ranked.

The materials submitted will be evaluated by the School Director using questions similar to those used for Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Endeavors in the School's *Documentation Guide for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment, Appendix D*.

3. **EXTENSION** (Program Planning, Program Preparation, Program Implementation, Program Evaluation, Program Dissemination)

Extension work includes the planning, preparation, delivery, evaluation, and dissemination of educational programs developed for audiences of Kansas State Research and Extension. An Extension program is defined as a planned series of integrated educational experiences (e.g., activities, events, and/or materials) designed to change the attitudes, knowledge, skills, or behaviors of a targeted audience.

Extension work is based on sound scholarship, continued intellectual growth, and the ability to communicate and teach in informal educational settings. It includes keeping abreast of the latest research and technology, identifying and helping solve clientele problems, and exhibiting sensitivity to informational needs of a diverse population.

Extension programs can differ widely in terms of the types of resources created and delivery methods that are integrated into a teaching strategy. Some programs qualify as Gold Standard programs. Gold Standard programs are special because of their investment of the specialist's resources of time and operating budget, and because Gold Standard publications are expected to be evaluated and published nationally.

The evaluation of Extension programs will be based on the following categories:

- Program planning,
- Program preparation,
- Program implementation,
- Program evaluation, and
- Program dissemination.

Evidence of Extension activity should support the specific area of Extension programming conducted during the period covered by the annual evaluation (Attachment 4) or by the three-year perspective (Attachment 6). Indicators include the following:

- Program Planning shows participation in interdisciplinary work, participation in formal and informal planning process, effective needs assessment, planning of evaluation and reporting procedures, and obtaining funding to support program efforts and research needs.
- Program Preparation demonstrates use of appropriate educational materials and teaching methods based on clientele needs; up-to-date material residing within scholarly knowledge base, logically-framed program grounded in theory and research base; and well-targeted material (consideration of defined audience, appropriate depth and breadth), marketing and promotion efforts.
- Program Implementation includes in-service training to local agents and/or other professionals that is comprehensive and targeted to experience levels; implementation of the program as planned; delivery methods that are appropriate for the target audience; use of innovative adoption methods; responsiveness to questions, concerns, and needs of local agents and clientele groups; preparation of newsletters or other tools or resources to support local program work; delivery of electronic media programs; and administration of special projects that have internal or external funding.

- *Program Evaluation* includes a narrative description of program implementation and accomplishments (including volunteers, cooperators, and/or funding partners); explanation of evaluation and extent that goals and objectives were met, including participants' gain in knowledge, skills, behavior changes, resulting outputs and outcomes; audience/clientele contacts; peer and leader evaluations; and evidence of program reputation, and audience impact.
- *Program Dissemination* describes the potential for replication as well as evidence that county, state and national leaders were introduced to program material.

More detailed types of evidence for the various components of program development are suggested in the *FSSHS Documentation Guide for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment*. Evaluation of the materials by the School Director will be made using questions similar to those in the domains of activity in Extension listed in the *Documentation Guide for Promotion and Tenure, Appendix D*.

3. SERVICE

Individual faculty members may have directed service responsibilities that constitute a significant part of their work assignment. These may include:

1. Non-directed service
 - to the profession,
 - institutional service to the School, the College, or the university, and
 - professionally-related service to the public
2. Directed service, including clinic administrator, program administrator (e.g., Early Childhood Education Program Director), unit coordinator, Extension State Leader, and direct service to clients. It is expected that the focus of service contributions among School faculty will vary.

There are numerous forms of evidence that may be submitted (Attachment 5) to support annual activities in these service spheres. The types of supporting evidence that might be presented for each area of responsibility include:

1. For service to the profession, evidence supporting editorial or peer review functions with journals or newsletters, professional consultant activities, attendance at professional meetings, and offices held in professional societies or organizations.
2. For institutional service, documentation supporting leadership or member roles in School, College, or university committees, letters from university leadership evaluating one's effectiveness in these roles, and activities as tenure mentor.
3. For professional service to the public, involvement in community-related projects workshops, including one's role as a resource to public forums.
4. For directed service, effectiveness of client-related work, including client ratings' documentation of activities as Unit Head, including effectiveness of leadership; documentation of role as Extension State Leader, including supportive evidence from key colleagues (e.g., Assistant Director for FCS)).

In addition, the faculty member may report awards or special recognition for any type of service activities. More specific indicators of service accomplishments are listed in the *FSHS Documentation Guide for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment*.

The School Director will evaluate annual accomplishments in the relevant areas of service using questions similar to those listed in the *Documentation Guide for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment, Appendix D*.

5. THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD

The Professorial Performance Award is intended recognize excellent and sustained performance of full professors (see the *Kansas State University Handbook*, sections C49.1-49.14 for complete information about this award). The award carries with it an increase to the faculty member's base salary. The criteria associated with this award are as follows:

- The candidate must be a full professor and must have been in rank at least six years since the last promotion or professorial award.
- The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in the six years immediately preceding the performance review.
- The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards.

The School of Family Studies and Human Services recognizes that full professors do not all have the same load distribution. In particular, some may have only teaching and service responsibilities. Nevertheless, the School's policy is that all full professors are eligible for the award. In the case of faculty who have teaching as a high proportion of the load, evidence of the scholarship of teaching should be presented along with the other forms of evidence that support a strong record of teaching.

The Performance Review

The candidate submits a written request for consideration for the Professorial Performance Award to the School Director by November 15 to be considered during the following January. The Director consults with the candidate and the unit about appropriate external reviewers, following the same process as is used for promotion to professor. The Director solicits those external letters, as well as any relevant letters from internal sources, using the notification process followed for promotion and tenure. After that point, the performance review follows the timeline for the annual review process. By the first day of the spring semester, the candidate must submit a portfolio that is organized like the portfolio presented for promotion and tenure (see the *Documentation Guide for Promotion and Tenure*). The Director of the School appoints a committee of the School's full professors to serve as the performance review panel. If there are fewer than three full professors other than the candidate who are able to serve, the Director appoints one or more associate professors so that there are at least three members of the review panel. The Director also appoints one of the panel members as chair.

The chair convenes the review panel within two weeks of the beginning of the spring semester. If the candidate or the panel so requests, the candidate may come to the meeting and make comments on his or her own behalf to the review panel. The review panel will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials in terms of the criteria outlined above and in terms of the criteria established for promotion to full professor. This document is sent to the Director. According to the *Kansas State University Handbook*, sections C49.6 and C49.7, the subsequent timeline is as follows:

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

The department head must submit the following items to the appropriate dean:

- a. A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award,
- b. Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation,
- c. Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation,
- d. The candidate's supporting materials that served as the basis for adjudicating eligibility for the award.

(Kansas State University Handbook, C49.6-49.7)

5. STANDARDS FOR MINIMALLY ACCEPTABLE PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE

The minimally acceptable standards of performance for each area of assigned duties are delineated below.

A. Teaching

- Meets all assigned classes for scheduled periods and is prepared for instruction
- Prepares up-to-date syllabus for each assigned course and places it on file with the School
- If part of the faculty member's load, is regularly available and accessible for supervision of practica and internships
- If part of the faculty member's load, supervises student clinicians in accord with accepted professional and ethical standards
- Posts and keeps office hours
- Conducts standard University evaluation of teaching for each assigned course, or uses other methods of evaluation approved by the Director, e.g. for labs or for courses with very small enrollments
- Assigns grades equitably and turns in grades in a timely manner
- If part of the faculty member's load, is available and responsive to assigned student advisees
- Is available to serve on student committees and responsive to requests to do so, and when a member of such committees, attends and prepares for them

B. Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Endeavors

- Provides evidence of continuous scholarly or creative involvement. On a typical .30 research appointment, this effort should result in a product submitted to a publisher within a two to three-year period, depending on the nature of the product

C. Extension

- Participates in program development (planning, preparation, implementation, evaluation, dissemination) for at least one educational program. This may be active participation on a project team as well as individual work.
- Prepares and updates educational materials in a timely way
- Is available and responsive to agent requests within limitations of available time and other resources

D. Service

- Non-directed Service
 - Attends School and Unit meetings
 - Serves on School, College, and University committees as demonstrated by participation in meetings
 - Attends professional meetings
- Directed Service, if a part of the faculty member's load
 - Facilitates identification and evaluation of unit goals and objectives
 - Provides for maintenance of program records
 - Communicates with clients, parents, donors, and/or staff
 - Addresses areas of concern identified by clients, parents, donors, and/or staff

**School of Family Studies and Human Services
College of Human Ecology
Annual Faculty Goals**

TEACHING

% time

Classroom Instruction

Non-classroom Instructional and Curriculum-related Activity

Clinical Instruction

Academic Supervision and Advisory Activities

RESEARCH AND OTHER CREATIVE ENDEAVORS

% time

(List Expected Outcomes or Products)

EXTENSION

(For each major project or program)

% time

Program Planning

Program Preparation

Program Implementation

Program Evaluation

Program Dissemination

SERVICE

% time

Non-directed Service:

- *Professional Service*
- *Institutional Service (to Program Unit, School, College, and/or University)*
- *Public Service*

Directed Service

Faculty Member

Date

School Director

**School of Family Studies and Human Services
College of Human Ecology
Summary of Teaching**

Classroom Instruction (Attach Syllabi, Student Assessment Results, Narrative of Teaching Activities)

<i>Course #</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Semester</i>	<i>Credit Hours</i>	<i>Course Enrollment</i>
-----------------	--------------	-----------------	---------------------	--------------------------

Non-classroom Instructional and Curriculum-related Activity

Clinical Instruction

Academic Supervision and Advisory Activities

Undergraduate Advisees

Number:

Comments:

Master's Students

Chair: (List Names of Students)

Number:

Comments:

Committee Member: (List Names of Students)

Number:

Comments:

Doctoral Students

Chair: (List Names of Students)

Number:

Comments:

Committee Member: (List Names of Students)

Number:

Comments:

Outside Chair: (List Students and Departmental Affiliation)

Comments:

Other:

**School of Family Studies and Human Services
College of Human Ecology**

Summary of Research and Creative Endeavors

Please use this page to summarize products and activities.

**School of Family Studies and Human Services
College of Human Ecology**

**Summary of Extension Activity
(For each Gold Standard Program)**

(Describe progress on that portion of the Gold Standard program completed for this year.)

Program Planning

Program Preparation

Program Implementation

Program Evaluation

Program Dissemination

(Document evidence of effectiveness for other Extension programs and activities.)

**School of Family Studies and Human Services
College of Human Ecology**

Summary of Service

Non-directed Service--

- *Professional Service:*

- *Institutional Service*

- *Public Service:*

Directed Service

**School of Family Studies and Human Services
College of Human Ecology
Annual Faculty Goals—Three-year Perspective**

Faculty Activity	Year 1 (20__) <i>% time</i> <i>Activity relevant this year?</i>	Year 2 (20__) <i>% time</i> <i>Activity relevant this year?</i>	Year 3 (20__) <i>% time</i> <i>Activity relevant this year?</i>
<p>TEACHING (<i>List Expected Courses, and other Teaching</i>)</p> <p><i>Classroom Instruction(list)</i></p> <p><i>Non-classroom Instructional and Curriculum-related Activity</i></p> <p><i>Clinical Instruction</i></p> <p><i>Academic Supervision and Advisory Activities</i></p>	__% time	__% time	__% time
<p>RESEARCH AND OTHER CREATIVE ENDEAVORS (<i>List Expected Outcomes or Products</i>)</p>	__% time	__% time	__% time
<p>EXTENSION (For each major project or program)</p> <p><i>Program Planning</i></p> <p><i>Program Preparation</i></p> <p><i>Program Implementation</i></p> <p><i>Program Evaluation</i></p> <p><i>Program Dissemination</i></p>	__% time	__% time	__% time

Annual Goals, Three-year Perspective, page 2

SERVICE (<i>List Expected Activities</i>)	___% time	___% time	___% time
<p><i>Non-directed Service—</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Professional Service</i> ▪ <i>Institutional Service(to Program Unit, School, College, and/or University)</i> ▪ <i>Public Service</i> <p><i>Directed Service</i></p>			

Faculty Member

Date

School Director

Format for the Three-year Perspective—Classroom Teaching

<i>Course Taught</i>			
<i>Number of students</i>	Year 1 (20__)	Year 2 (20__)	Year 3 (20__)
<i>Student responses to TEVAL or IDEA Summary Questions (see Director’s Rubric for guidance)</i>	Please attach the typed student comments, clearly identified by course and year.	Please attach the typed student comments, clearly identified by course and year.	Please attach the typed student comments, clearly identified by course and year.
<i>Faculty member’s brief comments (innovations, issues, etc.)</i>			
Please attach teaching portfolio materials, clearly identified by course and year.			
1.			
N =			
IDEA/TEVAL Summary Q:			
IDEA/TEVAL Summary Q:			
Comments			
2.			
N =			
IDEA/TEVAL Summary Q:			
IDEA/TEVAL Summary Q:			
Comments			
3.			
N =			
IDEA/TEVAL Summary Q:			
IDEA/TEVAL Summary Q:			
Comments			

Format for the Three-year Perspective—Non-Classroom Teaching, including honors projects, and independent studies

<i>Course Taught</i>			
<i>Number of students</i>	Year 1 (20__)	Year 2 (20__)	Year 3 (20__)
<i>Student response to evaluation instrument</i>	Please attach the typescript of any student comments, clearly identified by course and year.	Please attach the typescript of any student comments, clearly identified by course and year.	Please attach the typescript of any student comments, clearly identified by course and year.
<i>Faculty member's brief comments (e.g. about innovations, issues, special circumstances)</i>			
Please attach teaching portfolio materials, clearly identified by course and year.			
1.			
N =			
Student response to evaluation			
Comments			
2.			
N =			
Student response to evaluation			
Comments			
3.			
N =			
Student response to evaluation			
Comments			

Format for the Three-year Perspective—Clinical Teaching

<p>Course Taught</p> <p><i>Number of students (separated by evaluation and intervention, if relevant)</i></p> <p><i>Student response to evaluation instrument</i></p> <p><i>Faculty member's brief comments (e.g. about innovations, issues, special circumstances)</i></p> <p>Please attach the unit's review of clinical teaching, if available, and/or the clinical teaching portfolio</p>	<p>Year 1 (20__)</p> <p>Please attach the typescript of any student comments, clearly identified by course and year.</p>	<p>Year 2 (20__)</p> <p>Please attach the typescript of any student comments, clearly identified by course and year.</p>	<p>Year 3 (20__)</p> <p>Please attach the typescript of any student comments, clearly identified by course and year.</p>
1.			
N =			
Student response to evaluation			
Comments			
2.			
N =			
Student response to evaluation			
Comments			

**Format for the Three-year Perspective—Advising and Supervision, including UG and GR,
as well as thesis and dissertation supervision**

Type of Advising	Year 1 (20__)	Year 2 (20__)	Year 3 (20__)
<i>Number of students</i>			
<i>Faculty member's brief comments (e.g. about innovations, issues, special circumstances)</i>			
Undergraduate advising			
N =			
Comments			
Major professor, Master's			
N =			
Comments			
Committee membership, Master's			
N =			
Comments			
Major professor, Ph.D.			
N =			
Comments			
Committee membership, Ph.D.			
N =			
Comments			

Format for the Three-year Perspective—Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Activity

<p><i>Description of project or product</i></p> <p><i>Relevant information, e.g. estimated time to completion</i></p> <p>Please attach any relevant materials, labeled by year</p>	<p>Year 1 (20__)</p> <p>Status of project (e.g. in process, submitted, in press)</p>	<p>Year 2 (20__)</p> <p>Status of project (e.g. in process, submitted, in press)</p>	<p>Year 3 (20__)</p> <p>Status of project (e.g. in process, submitted, in press)</p>

Format for the Three-year Perspective—Extension

<i>Description of project or product</i> <i>Relevant information</i> Please attach any relevant materials, labeled by year	Year 1 (20__) Status of project	Year 2 (20__) Status of project	Year 3 (20__) Status of project

Format for the Three-year Perspective—Service

<p>Description of Activity</p> <p><i>Non-directed Service—</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Professional Service</i> ▪ <i>Institutional Service(to Program Unit, School, College, and/or University)</i> ▪ <i>Public Service</i> <p><i>Directed Service</i></p> <p><i>Relevant information</i></p> <p>Please attach any relevant materials, labeled by year</p>	<p>Year 1 (20__)</p> <p>Status</p>	<p>Year 2 (20__)</p> <p>Status</p>	<p>Year 3 (20__)</p> <p>Status</p>

FSHS Faculty Evaluation Rubric: TEACHING

Faculty Member _____ Evaluation _____ %FTE _____

Exceeds Expectations

The faculty member receives “High” student evaluations ***

- Student comments indicate a high degree of student learning.
- Student comments indicate a faculty member who is helpful.
- Student comments indicate a faculty member who is readily available (office hours, telephone, email, etc).
- Syllabi indicate highly innovative classes relative to technology, assignments, and quality teaching methods.
- Syllabi include information expected under “meets expectations”
- Students make positive comments about the quality of advising they receive and as reported on the University advising survey.
- Graduate students report that the faculty member provides them with quality mentoring relative to their courses as well as on their graduate reports, theses, and dissertations.
- The faculty member works with students to publish their theses and dissertations.
- Faculty member works as a mentor to Honors students, Developing Scholars, Bridges students, etc.
- The faculty member leads the unit assessment plans.

Meets Expectations

The faculty member receives “Middle” student evaluations.***

- Student comments indicate acceptable levels of learning.
- Student comments indicate an acceptable level of access to faculty (office hours, phone, email).
- The faculty member responds in a timely fashion to College, School, and faculty requests.
- Syllabi include program outcomes and appropriate university policy statements (honors code, disability accommodation, etc.)
- The faculty member takes an active role in undergraduate advising when expected by the unit.
- the faculty member serves as a major professor for masters and doctoral students depending on their level of certification and based on the numbers of graduate students in their unit.
- Faculty grading is reflective of student accomplishments.
- The faculty member completes the unit assessment plans.
- The faculty member maintains appropriate certifications in her/his speciality areas.

Below Expectations

The faculty member receives “Low” student evaluations.***

- Student comments indicate limited learning.
- Student comments indicate a lack of access to faculty members (office hours, phone, email).
- Syllabi include limited information expected in syllabi under “meets expectations.”
- Course content does not appear to be current.
- There is little indication of attempts to include creative teaching methods.
- Grading does not distinguish among students.
- The faculty member does not follow the assessment plan for their unit.
- The faculty member does not lead or serve on graduate student committees when it is an expected part of his/her load.
- The faculty member is not involved in advising when an expected part of her/his load.

***Student evaluations are based on IDEA questions 3 and 4 and TEVAL questions 1, 11, and 14.

Exceeds Expectations	4.2 and higher
Meets Expectations	3.4 to 4.1
Below Expectations	Below 3.3

FSHS Faculty Evaluation Rubric: RESEARCH (.30 FTE)

Faculty member _____ **Evaluation** _____ **% FTE** _____

Exceeds Expectations

The faculty member has two or more articles or book chapters published, one in press, one submitted, and one in process.

- The faculty member's articles are on the School's list of impact journals, particularly in the "prestige" and "solid" categories. Book chapters should be in books published by major publishing houses that provide a review process. Self-published books do not meet this criteria.
- The faculty member seeks/receives external grants that include monies for graduate assistants and School and College overhead.
- The faculty member presents two or more papers or posters at international, national or regional professional meetings.

Meets Expectations

The faculty member has one article or book chapter published and one in press or submitted.

- The faculty member seeks/receives internal grants.
- The faculty member presents one paper or poster at a national, regional, or state professional meeting.

Below Expectations

The faculty member has no articles or book chapters published, and shows no evidence of scholarly activity.

- The faculty member presents no papers or posters at professional meetings.

FSHS Faculty Evaluation Rubric: SERVICE

Faculty member _____ Evaluation _____ %FTE _____

Exceeds Expectations

- **Professional Service**
 - ▶ The faculty member holds leadership positions in professional organizations (including interest groups).
 - ▶ The faculty member serves on professional organization committees.
 - ▶ The faculty member serves on professional accrediting bodies and serves as a site visitor.
 - ▶ The faculty member represents the profession in public forums.
 - ▶ The faculty member serves as a peer reviewer for manuscripts, conference proposals, and grant proposals.
 - ▶ The faculty member serves as an editor, associate editor, or editorial board member for a professional journal.

- **Public Service**
 - ▶ The faculty member serves as an office holder for a community organization related to the faculty member's expertise.

- **Institutional Service**
 - ▶ The faculty member serves on and participates in School, College, and University Committees. Some of this service is in leadership roles.
 - ▶ The faculty member actively serves as an advisor for a student organization.
 - ▶ The faculty member serves as a faculty tenure mentor.
 - ▶ The faculty member takes on long term projects for the School.
 - ▶ The faculty member demonstrates good School citizenship doing work not normally expected as a part of their position.
 - ▶ The faculty member writes articles for the popular press, does media interviews for articles, and gives talks and lectures for public groups.

Meets Expectations

- **Professional Service**
 - ▶ The faculty member belongs to professional organizations and attends professional meetings.

- **Public Service**
 - ▶ The faculty member serves as a member of a community organization or board member related to the faculty member's professional expertise.
 - ▶ The faculty member conducts volunteer work for organizations that utilize the faculty member's professional expertise.

- **Institutional Service**
 - ▶ The faculty member serves on and participates in School, College, and University committees.
 - ▶ The faculty member attends School and College faculty meetings.
 - ▶ The faculty member supports School and College activities (attends commencement, works on Open House, attends Scholarship events).

Below Expectations

- **Professional Service**
 - ▶ The faculty member does not participate in or belong to professional organizations
- **Professionally Related Public Service**
 - ▶ The faculty member provides no community service.
- **Institutional Service**
 - ▶ The faculty member does not serve on School, College, and University committees.
 - ▶ The faculty member does not attend School and College meetings.
 - ▶ The faculty member does not take part in School and College activities.

School of Family Studies and Human Services

Core Journals

Prestige Journals

American Journal of Health Promotion
American Journal of Speech-Language
Pathology
Aphasiology
Applied Psycholinguistics
Augmentative and Alternative
Communication
Child Abuse and Neglect
Child Development
Developmental Psychology
Discourse Processes
Dysphagia
Early Childhood Research Quarterly
Exceptional Children
Family Process
Family Relations
Financial Analysts Journal
Financial Counseling and Planning
Financial Services Review
Future of Children
Health Psychology
Human Development
Infant and Child Development
Infant Behavior and Development
Infant Mental Health Journal
Journal of Adolescent Health

Journal of the American Dietetic
Association
Journal of Communication Disorders
Journal of Early Adolescence
Journal of Evaluation
Journal of Food Science
Journals of Gerontology; Series B
Psychological Sciences and Social
Sciences
Journal of Marriage and Family
Journal of Marriage and Family Therapy
Journal of Orthopsychiatry
Journal of Pragmatics
Journal of Research in Adolescence
Journal of Risk and Uncertainty
Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy
Journal of Speech, Language, Hearing
Research
Journal of Traumatic Stress
Journal of Voice
Language, Speech and Hearing Services
in the Schools
Psycholinguistic Research
Psychology and Aging
The Gerontologist

Solid Journals

Adolescence
American Journal of Health Behavior
American Journal of Family Therapy
Communication Disorders Quarterly
Conflict Management and Peace Science
Educational and Psychological Measurement
Family and Community Health
Family and Consumer Sciences Research
Journal
International Journal of Behavioral
Development
International Journal of Consumer Studies
International Journal of Financial Services
Management
Journal of Adolescence
Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy
Journal of Aging Studies
Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology
Journal of Applied Gerontology
Journal of Behavioral Finance
Journal of Business and Psychology
Journal of Child Language
Journal of Comparative Family Studies
Journal of Consumer Affairs
Journal of Divorce and Remarriage
Journal of Economic Psychology
Journal of Educational Gerontology
Journal of Employment Counseling
Journal of Extension
Journal of Family and Economic Issues
Journal of Family Issues
Journal of Family Therapy
Journal of Family Violence
Journal of Financial Planning
Journal of Financial Services Professionals
Journal of Investing
Journal of Peace Research
Journal of Personal Finance
Journal of Investment Management
Journal of Medical Speech-Language Pathology
Journal of School Health
Journal of Youth and Adolescence
Military Psychology
Marriage and Family Review
Reading Teacher
Remedial and Special Education
Research on Aging
Sex Roles
Social Indicators Research
Topics in Early Childhood Special Education

Acceptable Journals

American Journal of Psychology
Child and Family Behavioral Therapy
Cognitive Rehabilitation
Contemporary Family Therapy
Early Childhood Development and Care
Early Childhood Educational Journal
Early Education and Development
Families in Society
Forum for Family and Consumer Issues
Generations
Infants and Young Children
International Journal of Technology
and Aging
International Journal of Aging
and Human Development
Intervention in School and Clinic
Journal of Adult Development
Journal of Aging and Ethnicity
Journal of Aging and Health
Journal of Aging and Physical Activities
Journal of Aging and Social Policy
Journal of Community Practice
Journal of Consumer Education
Journal of Elder Abuse and Neglect
Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences
Journal of Family and Consumer
Science Education
Journal of Family History
Journal of Family Peace
Journal of Genetic Psychology
Journal of Aging and Identity
Journal of Family Psychotherapy
Journal of Long-Term Care Administration
Journal of Loss and Trauma
Journal of Mental Health and Aging
Journal of Minority Aging
Journal of Nutrition and the Elderly
Journal of Psychology
Journal of Systemic Therapy
Journal of Youth Development
Journal of Women and Aging
Omega: Journal of Death and Dying
Peace and Conflict
Perceptual and Motor Skills
Psychological Reports
Reading Online
Sociological Quarterly
Teaching Sociology
Undergraduate Research Journal for the
Human Sciences
Women and Therapy
Young Children

Supporting Journals

Prestige Journals

Ageing: Clinical and Experimental Research
American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry
American Journal of Psychiatry
American Journal of Sociology
American Psychologist
American Sociological Review
Applied Psychology
Behavioral and Brain Sciences
Brain and Language
Clinical Linguistics and Phonetics
Cognitive Development
Developmental Review
Developmental Brain Research
Developmental Science
Development and Psychopathology
Human Communication Research
Journal of the Acoustical Society
of America

Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology
Journal of Family Psychology
Journal of Finance
Journal of Fluency Disorders
Journal of Health and Social Behavior
Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology
Journal of Phonetics
Journal of Portfolio Management
Journal of Risk and Insurance
Media Psychology
Personal and Social Psychology Bulletin
Psychological Bulletin
Psychological Review
Psychological Science
Science
Topics in Language Disorders

Solid Journals

Aging and Society
Aging, Neuropsychology, and Cognition
Aggression and Violent Behavior
American Behavioral Scientist
American Journal of Community Psychology
Annual Review of Anthropology
Applied Psychological Measurement
Basic and Applied Social Psychology
Benefits Quarterly
Bests Review
Child: Care, Health and Development
Child and Adolescent Mental Health
College Student Journal
Compensation and Benefits Review
Contemporary Long-Term Care
CPA Journal
Current Directions in Psychological Science
Death Studies
International Journal of Consumer Studies
Journal of Accountancy
Journal of Applied Developmental Science
Journal of Asset Management
Journal of Child and Adolescent Mental Health
Journal of Child and Adolescent Substance Abuse
Journal of child and Adolescent Trauma
Journal of Child and Family Studies
Journal of Cognition and Development
Journal of Environmental Psychology
Journal of Compensation and Benefits
Journal of Consumer Policy
Journal of Deferred Compensation
Journal of Fixed Income
Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry
Journal of Health Psychology
Journal of Human Resources
Journal of Indexes
Journal of Insurance Issues
Journal of Multilingual Communication Disorders
Journal of Pension Economics and Finance
Military Medicine
National Tax Journal
Sociological Review
Social Work Research
Youth and Society

Acceptable

Aging and Cognition
Aging and Human Development
Aging and Leisure Living
Aging and Mental Health
Alzheimer's Disease and Associated Disorders
Annals of Long Term Care
Anxiety, Stress and Coping
Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics
Attachment and Human Development
Australian Journal on Ageing
Behavior, Health and Aging
Brain and Development
Canadian Journal on Aging
Child Study Journal
Contemporary Gerontology
Clinical Gerontologist
College Student Journal
Cognitive Psychology
Early Human Development
Early Years
Education and Ageing
Environment and Behavior
European Journal of Ageing
Family Economics and Nutritional Review
Family Economics and Resource Management

Biennial

Financial Planning
Gifted Child Quarterly
Home Health Care Services Quarterly
Hospice Journal
Indian Journal of Gerontology
International Journal of Human Ecology
International Social Science Journal
Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders
Journal of Ethics, Law, and Aging
Journal of Family History
Journal of Gerontological Nursing
Journal of Gerontological Social Work
Journal of Intergenerational Relationships
Journal of Religion, Spirituality, and Aging
Journal of Religious Gerontology
Journal of Rural Health
Investment Advisor
Military Review
National Underwriter: Life and Health
Registered Representative
Review of Economics of Households
Social Science Journal
Social Science Quarterly
Trusts and Estates
War and Society

SCHOOL OF FAMILY STUDIES AND HUMAN SERVICES

College of Human Ecology

Kansas State University

Core Purpose of the School:

The School of Family Studies and Human Services provides high quality educational programs, training, and services; increases knowledge and skills through multi-disciplinary research, teaching, and scholarship; and contributes professional leadership; in order to enhance the quality of life for individuals and families in Kansas, the nation, and abroad.

Last Edited: 12-09-05

***DOCUMENTATION GUIDE FOR PROMOTION, TENURE,
AND REAPPOINTMENT***

Approval Date _____

School Director _____

Dean _____

Provost _____

Date for Revision: _____

School of Family Studies and Human Services
College of Human Ecology
Kansas State University

Documentation Guide for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment

Guide to Contents

Introduction	5
Responsibilities of an Effective Faculty Member	6
Responsibilities of the School Director with Respect to Probationary Faculty	6
Annual Evaluation for Probationary Tenure Track Faculty	7
Mid-probationary Review	7
Procedures for Promotion and Tenure	9
Letters from External Evaluators	9
Responsibility of the Candidate	11
Faculty Eligible to Vote	11
Responsibilities of the School of Family Studies and Human Services and the College of Human Ecology	11
Appeal Procedures	12
Activities to be Documented for Tenure and Promotion	13
I. Teaching	14
A. Mission Relevance	14
B. Expectations	14
C. Suggested Indicators of Teaching Activities	14
Classroom Instruction at the Undergraduate and Graduate Levels	14
Non-classroom Instructional and Curriculum-Related Activity at the Undergraduate and Graduate Levels	15

Clinical Instruction	16
Academic Supervision and Advisory Activities	16
D. Documentation of Classroom and Non-classroom Teaching at the Undergraduate and Graduate Levels	17
E. Documentation of Clinical Instruction	17
II. Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Endeavors	19
A. Mission Relevance	19
B. Expectations	20
C. Suggested Indicators of Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Endeavors	21
Publications or Juried Competitions	21
Research Projects, Grants, and Contracts	22
Research Presentations or Creative Contributions	22
Recognition for Research and Other Creative Endeavors	22
D. Documentation of Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Endeavors	22
III. Extension	24
A. Mission Relevance	24
B. Expectations	25
C. Examples of Activity	25
Program Planning	26
Program Preparation	26
Program Delivery	26
Program Evaluation/Accountability	26
D. Documentation of Extension Programming	27
IV. Service	29
A. Mission Relevance	29
B. Expectations	29
C. Suggested Indicators of Service	30
Professional Service	30
Institutional Service	30

Service to the School of Family Studies and Human Services	30
Service to the College of Human Ecology	31
Service to the University	31
Professionally-Related Service to the Public	31
Directed Service	32
Unit Coordinator	32
Clinical Service	32
Extension State Leader	33
D. Documentation of Service	33
V. Appendices	34
A. Responsibilities of a Tenure Mentor	34
B. Contents of Portfolio for Mid-probationary Review	34
C. Ranking of Journals in Which Unit Faculty publish—Sample Unit Ranking	35
D. Representative Questions Asked by the School Faculty When Assessing the Candidate's Performance	36
In the Domains of Teaching	36
With Respect to Clinical Instruction	36
Client Population	36
Student Population	37
Clinical Unit	37
In the Domains of Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Endeavors	37
In the Domain of Extension	38
In the Domains of Service	38

DOCUMENTATION GUIDE FOR PROMOTION, TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT

INTRODUCTION

The School must evaluate the performance of its members regularly in order to:

- help the School Director provide feedback, commendations, and constructive criticism to its members;
- help in the determination of annual salary adjustments;
- provide information to nontenured faculty during the probationary period;
- determine if a faculty member has earned the rights both to be tenured and to be promoted at Kansas State University. Note: Decisions about tenure and about promotion may be separate actions under some circumstances.

This document is a statement of the policies, procedures, and criteria used by the School of Family Studies and Human Services for reaching decisions on these important and complex issues of promotion, tenure, and reappointment. This document is based on information from the Kansas State University *Handbook*, the University's *The Handbook for Annual Evaluation of Unclassified Personnel* (1990), the University's *Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustments, Tenure, and Promotion* (1992), and the *College of Human Ecology Documentation Guide for Tenure and Promotion* (1991). The *Faculty Handbook* and *The Handbook for Annual Evaluation of Unclassified Personnel* are online at <http://www.ksu.edu/uau/>. The updated yearly timetable for any action relevant to any evaluation process is available on-line at the Webpage for Academic Services.

Awarding of tenure and promotion progression through the academic ranks depends upon a sustained record of high competence and performance. Tenure and promotion are independent considerations in the School of Family Studies and Human Services. According to the Kansas State University Handbook:

“Tenure may be granted to those on full-time probationary appointments at the rank of associate professor or above. Tenure may be granted simultaneously with promotion to the rank of associate professor. Instructors may not be accorded tenure. Assistant professors may not be accorded tenure except in special circumstances approved by the provost. Years of appointment as a probationary instructor (see C12) may be credited as part of a probationary period for gaining tenure if stipulated in the individual's contract. Service in a term appointment at the rank of assistant professor or above may count as part of a probationary period for gaining tenure” (Kansas State University Handbook, C81).

Though unusual, it is possible that a faculty member may be awarded tenure but denied immediate promotion to the rank of associate professor. Conversely, it is possible that a faculty member may be hired on a probationary appointment (without tenure) at a rank higher than

assistant professor. Tenure and promotion are based on accomplishments and demonstrated excellence in the performance of assigned duties, which may include several of the following: teaching, research, extension, advising, professional activity, and service. The burden of evidence is on each faculty member to document the quality and quantity of his/her contributions. (See also the Responsibilities of the School and of the College in this document.) In addition, the faculty member will be evaluated on other factors, such as meeting School needs and objectives and promoting cooperative working relationships.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF AN EFFECTIVE FACULTY MEMBER

As assignments and areas of expertise vary, the faculty of the School of Family Studies and Human Services contribute to its overall mission in diverse ways. Because this diversity makes it difficult to establish one format for the reporting of faculty accomplishments, it is the responsibility of each faculty member to substantiate his/her particular expertise and accomplishments in assigned responsibilities. Faculty members are expected to contribute to the mission of the School, the College, and the University through teaching, research, extension, and service as stipulated in their assignments.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SCHOOL DIRECTOR WITH RESPECT TO PROBATIONARY FACULTY

The Director of the School of Family Studies and Human Services is responsible for informing the candidate of the processes and criteria involved in tenure and/or promotion. Each candidate must be given a copy of the Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion. In addition, the Director is responsible for the general mentoring of each candidate over time. This will include evaluating the competence of the candidate via annual evaluations, as well as aiding the candidate in the preparation of a multiple-year portfolio containing evidence of activities to be evaluated at midprobationary review and at tenure and/or promotion reviews.

In the case of probationary faculty, the School Director must recommend to the candidate those faculty members who may serve, should they consent to do so, as the primary tenure mentor. Ordinarily, the primary tenure mentor should be a faculty member from the primary unit of the candidate. If desired (or when the primary unit is too small), the candidate may seek mentoring advice from faculty outside of the primary unit, electing to form a mentoring committee consisting of no more than three tenured faculty members. Responsibilities of the Tenure Mentor are described in Appendix A.

ANNUAL EVALUATION FOR PROBATIONARY TENURE TRACK FACULTY

Prior to being considered for tenure at Kansas State University, the faculty member enters a probationary period during which the candidate's ability to contribute to the University's mission and to meet criteria for tenure specified by the School of Family Studies and Human Services is evaluated. The precise terms and conditions of every appointment should be stated in writing and be in the possession of both the institution and the faculty member before the appointment is finalized. The probationary period typically should not exceed seven years. [See *Kansas State University Handbook* C73 Section B for faculty with prior service at another academic institution.] The duration of the probationary period relative to tenure varies with rank and experience. For persons appointed at the rank of assistant professor, the maximum probationary period for gaining tenure and promotion to associate professor rank consists of six (6) regular appointments at Kansas State University at a probationary rank. Candidates not approved for tenure during the sixth year of service will be notified by the Dean of the College that the seventh year of service will constitute the terminal year of appointment (C82.2).

Under certain circumstances, the tenure clock may be delayed by one year. Sections C82.5-82.9 in the *Kansas State University Handbook* specify the conditions under which delay of the tenure clock may be considered and the procedures for making such a request.

During the probationary period the faculty member has the same academic freedom as all other members of the faculty. A formal annual review of the portfolio of a probationary faculty on regular appointment is conducted by the faculty through the probationary period starting in November of the second year. This review is convened by the School Director, who then provides the faculty member with substantive feedback in writing regarding his/her accomplishments relative to School tenure criteria. Annual reviews of probationary faculty are intended to aid their professional development. These reviews should be constructive and candid. The review process is a means to be supportive and helpful as well as a means to candidly and clearly communicate aspects of performance. A positive review does not mean that tenure will be granted in the future nor does a negative review mean that tenure will be denied. Faculty members must be explicitly informed in writing of a decision not to renew their annual appointments in accordance with The Standards of Notice of Nonreappointment (Appendix A of the *Kansas State University Handbook*).

MIDPROBATIONARY REVIEW

Portfolios of probationary faculty will be reviewed for progress toward tenure midway through the probationary period by the Director and eligible faculty in the School of Family Studies and Human Services. For F.S.H.S. faculty on a seven year tenure track, the mid-probationary review is in November of the third year at Kansas State. For faculty whose tenure clock at Kansas State is other than seven years, timing of the mid-probationary review will be determined in consultation with the School Director at the time of appointment. The midprobationary review is

intended to be formative in nature and will consist of an evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of the evidence in the candidate's portfolio and include recommendations for continued growth. No formal vote will be taken.

The School Director will convene the meeting of eligible tenured faculty and will be present throughout the discussion. The School Director is responsible for making the candidate's midprobationary portfolio (see Appendix B) available to the tenured faculty members in the School at least 14 calendar days prior to a meeting to discuss the candidate's progress. A cumulative record of written recommendations and accompanying explanations forwarded to the candidate from previous reappointment meetings will also be made available to the eligible tenured faculty. Outside letters of evaluation are not required.

The faculty member serving as the tenure mentor to the candidate (if one has been chosen) may be asked to provide an oral summary of the candidate's accomplishments. If there is no tenure mentor, then the candidate selects a tenured faculty member to present the information. If the candidate does not select a presenter, then the School Director appoints a senior faculty member to present the material. If the candidate or the faculty reviewers so request, the candidate may make comments on his or her own behalf to the faculty gathered for the review. In this case, the candidate leaves the meeting after making a statement and answering questions.

During the midprobationary review, if there are instances when the tenured faculty and the School Director are in conflict with respect to the performance of a probationary faculty, the Director and the tenured faculty, including (if one has been chosen) the candidate's tenure mentor, will meet to resolve the differences. This is to insure that probationary faculty members do not receive conflicting messages regarding their development as faculty members. In cases where differences cannot be resolved, the candidate should be informed of the differences.

The School Director may discuss the results of the midprobationary review with the Dean of the College and will provide a letter of assessment to the candidate, including a summary of faculty comments and suggestions. This letter of assessment will become a part of the candidate's reappointment and midprobationary review file. Before forwarding the candidate's file to the Dean of the College of Human Ecology, the School Director will discuss the review and assessment with the candidate within one week after the review by the eligible tenured faculty. The candidate will receive a copy of the Director's letter of assessment. After receiving the assessment, the candidate has the right to submit a written response that henceforth becomes a permanent addition to the candidate's file.

PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

A candidate normally will be considered for tenure during the sixth year of the seven-year probationary period, with application for tenure made at the beginning of the sixth year. If tenure is denied, a candidate has one additional year available for employment at Kansas State University. For faculty members appointed at the ranks of associate professor and professor, the maximum probationary period for gaining tenure consists of five (5) regular annual appointments at Kansas State University. Tenure may be granted to those on full-time probationary appointments at the rank of associate professor or above. Unless they resign, faculty members in the final year of probation will be automatically reviewed for tenure. In exceptional cases, a candidate with outstanding records in research, teaching, and service may be considered for tenure in an earlier year. Early tenure requires evidence of outstanding and exemplary performance of professional duties. A request for an early tenure decision may be made either by the candidate submitting a written request to the School Director or by a tenured faculty member, with concurrence of the candidate, submitting a written nomination to the School Director.

Written requests for consideration of tenure and/or promotion (including those seeking early tenure or those nominating such candidates) must be submitted to the School Director by September 15. The School Director will inform the faculty of candidates being considered for promotion and/or tenure by September 20 and will meet with the eligible faculty from the primary unit to which the candidate belongs to prepare a list of external evaluators. In the event the primary unit is too small to generate a suitable list, the School Director may seek names of potential external evaluators from faculty outside of the unit and/or outside of the School.

After the expiration of a probationary period, faculty should have continuous tenure, and their services should be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the cases of retirement, chronic low achievement, program or unit discontinuance, or in extraordinary circumstances, because of financial exigency. (See *Kansas State University Handbook* sections, C31.5 to C31.7, C160.1 to C162.5 and Appendixes B, C, and K.)

LETTERS FROM EXTERNAL EVALUATORS

Persons outside the university who are recognized for excellence in the candidate's discipline or profession will be asked to participate as reviewers in evaluations for tenure and promotion (*Kansas State University Handbook*, C36.1). The candidate for promotion and/or tenure provides the School with the names and addresses of 4 to 6 potential external evaluators by September 15, and the members of the candidate's unit provide the Director with a similar number of external evaluators. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion have the right to submit to the School Directors the names of potential outside reviewers whom they believe may *not* be able to provide a fair and unbiased evaluation of the candidate's materials, specifying the reasons for this claim. The School Director retains the final authority for determining the composition of

the list of outside reviewers. The School of Family Studies and Human Services requires a minimum of three letters from external reviewers for promotion both to associate professor and to full professor ranks.

Each external reviewer should be provided a written description of the candidate's responsibilities during the period being evaluated, and copies of relevant sections of the School's tenure guidelines (e.g. the *Activities* and *Expectations* sections), as well as pertinent materials from the candidate's file. External reviewers will be asked to consider the candidate's entire portfolio (see below). Reviewers should be assured that the letters of evaluation will remain confidential except as required by court order and will not be seen by the candidate. Reviewers should also be informed that specific words or phrases used in their letters may be part of a written recommendation prepared by the Director of the School; however, any material that might reveal the identity of the external evaluators will be removed.

The value of outside reviews depends on the appropriate choice of objective reviewers. Candidates and units are urged to avoid listing as external reviewers persons who have had a personal or professional relationship with the candidate, such as the candidate's former major professor, postdoctoral mentor, graduate school classmates, or graduated students.

External reviewers will be sent evidence of performance in *all* assigned domains (i.e., teaching, research, extension, service) of professional work and informed of the proportion of time devoted by the candidate to each domain during each year of the evaluation period. In the event that an external reviewer fails to respond to the request for evaluation of the candidate's materials, whenever possible, the School Director will select another qualified external reviewer to replace the nonresponsive reviewer.

External reviews will not be sought by anyone other than the School Director. It is inappropriate for persons at other administrative levels (i.e., College Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Dean of Human Ecology, the Council of Deans, and the Provost) to solicit additional external reviews beyond those sought by the School Director. However, following notification to the candidate, the School Director may solicit comments from students, other faculty members, and administrative heads in the College or the University, as well as from faculty members and professionals in the field with whom the candidate has collaborated, if relevant. Such comments are not required; however, all such comments become a part of the candidate's record once they are obtained, although the name and affiliation of each person who comments will be kept confidential.

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CANDIDATE

The responsibility for collecting the information that demonstrates the candidate's accomplishments will be borne principally by the candidate. The candidate is encouraged, however, to consult with the School Director and senior tenured members of the faculty concerning the preparation and content of the promotion/tenure document.

FACULTY ELIGIBLE TO VOTE

Faculty eligible to vote on matters of promotion and midprobationary review are all School faculty holding a rank equal to or higher than the rank being considered. Faculty holding tenure, regardless of rank, are expected to participate in the midprobationary review and vote on questions involving the awarding of promotion and tenure. If an eligible faculty member cannot be present during the voting period, the faculty member may leave her/his ballot and any statement s/he may want incorporated into the discussion summary with the School Director prior to the week of voting.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SCHOOL OF FAMILY STUDIES AND HUMAN SERVICES AND THE COLLEGE OF HUMAN ECOLOGY

When the candidate for tenure and/or promotion submits pertinent materials for documentation to the School Director by the date specified by the Dean of the College of Human Ecology, the School Director will make these materials available to the eligible voting faculty by the last week of October. (See definition of faculty *voting eligibility* in this document.) Eligible faculty members will review the candidate's file, considering the School's criteria, standards, and guidelines for tenure and/or promotion. During the second week of November eligible faculty members will meet as a group to discuss the candidate's application. The School Director will appoint a senior faculty member to chair the discussion. The candidate's tenure mentor, if any, presents the candidate's materials. If there is no tenure mentor, then the School director appoints a senior faculty member other than the session chair to present the materials. As was the case with mid-probationary review, if the candidate or the faculty reviewers so request, the candidate may make comments on his or her own behalf to the faculty gathered for the review. In this case, the candidate leaves the meeting after making a statement and answering questions. Within five working days from that date, each eligible faculty member will submit a written ballot and any written comments to the School Director. At the close of the voting period, the School Director will open the ballots and record the vote.

The School Director will review the promotion/tenure document used to guide the candidate, the entire probationary portfolio of the candidate, the recommendations of the eligible faculty, and the vote of the eligible faculty. Following this review, the School Director will formulate an independent recommendation either supporting or failing to support tenure and/or promotion of

the candidate and forward a recommendation to the Dean of the College of Human Ecology along with the results of the vote of the eligible faculty. The results of the faculty vote and a written summary of the written recommendations and comments will be transmitted to both the candidate and the eligible faculty. The identities of faculty members submitting verbatim written comments or recommendations will remain confidential and will not be shared with the candidate or with School faculty members.

The tenure and/or promotion file of the candidate will be forwarded by the Dean of the College to the Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee of the College of Human Ecology. This Committee, in advising the Dean (in accordance with the *Kansas State University Handbook* section C153.2), has three charges: to review the documentation submitted by the candidate and the Director, to assure that applicable procedures have been followed, and to provide a written recommendation and vote to the Dean as to whether all applicable procedures have been followed. (See the College Handbook for further information.)

The Dean of the College of Human Ecology, after consulting with the School Director and the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee, will submit a written recommendation to the Council of Deans no sooner than seven calendar days following notification to the candidate of the Dean's recommendation and the report of the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. Both the dean's recommendation and the recommendation of the college advisory committee will be copied to the School Director and the candidate. The Dean's recommendation will be accompanied by the recommendation and unedited written comments of: 1) the School Director, 2) the School's eligible voting faculty, and 3) the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. A copy of the promotion and tenure document used to guide the candidate will be included also.

After receiving written notification of the Dean's recommendation and the report of the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee, the candidate may withdraw from further consideration for tenure and/or promotion. A written request for withdrawal from consideration must be submitted by the candidate to the Dean of Human Ecology within seven calendar days following notification of the Dean's recommendation.

APPEAL PROCEDURES

If the finding of the Council of Deans differs from those of the School and/or the Dean of Human Ecology, written justification from the Council of Deans must be provided as to how the candidate's credentials meet or fail to meet the criteria set forth in the School's Documentation Guide for Promotion and Tenure. This justification must be sent to the candidate, the Dean of the College of Human Ecology, and the Director of the School of Family Studies and Human Services.

If the finding of the Council of Deans is not to grant tenure and/or promotion, the candidate may appeal this decision to the Provost within a period of 14 days following notification. If the Provost concurs with the finding of the Council of Deans, the candidate has the option of filing a grievance with the General Faculty Grievance Board.

The process for registering and hearing grievances is found in Appendix G of the *Kansas State University Handbook of Unclassified Affairs and University Compliance*. An ombudsperson may be available for advice, counseling, and, perhaps mediation during appeal procedures.

ACTIVITIES TO BE DOCUMENTED FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

Faculty members, as distinguished from other personnel employed by the university, are members of the unclassified staff who have the professional expertise and the responsibility for the university endeavors of teaching, research and other creative activity, extension, directed service, and nondirected service (*Section C1 of the Kansas State University Handbook*). Evaluation decisions related to tenure, promotion, reappointment, chronic underachiever policy, and merit compensation express how well both tenured and nontenured faculty perform across these areas relevant to their assigned duties.

There may be instances where faculty are *not* expected to participate in a specific area of professional activity (e.g., Extension faculty may not be expected to engage in regular classroom instruction). Further, evaluation of faculty on any of the areas listed in this section *must* take into account the *amount of time assigned* to each. It is essential that faculty evaluation be based on *multiple sources* of data for each area evaluated in order to provide various perspectives, compensate for rating errors unique to each method of evaluation, and to avoid a concentration on narrow performance objectives (*Section C33 of the Kansas State University Handbook*).

The faculty and administrators who will evaluate the evidence presented by the candidate will have certain overarching principles in mind while performing that evaluation. One of those principles is that a candidate for tenure and/or promotion must either maintain excellence or demonstrate growth and improvement over the probationary period. Another principle is that at all levels, the pattern of performance should engender a high degree of confidence that the candidate will continue to develop professionally. Still another principle is that it is important that each faculty member promote positive working relationships with others in the performance of his/her duties. Evaluation decisions related to tenure and promotion will be based upon the criteria and guidelines outlined below for each area of responsibility that may apply.

I. *Teaching.*

A. *Mission Relevance:* The *Kansas State University Department Heads' Manual*, Chapter 2, has this to say about teaching:

“Teaching includes communicating knowledge to students and developing the intellectual foundation necessary to prepare students to continue learning for themselves. Teaching also involves preparing students for entry into the professional and scholarly disciplines. Effective teaching is based upon sound scholarship and continued intellectual growth. The excellent teacher arouses students to discover new ideas. The excellent teacher exhibits enthusiasm and commitment which in turn promotes student desire for learning. Faculty members should be able to arouse curiosity, stimulate creativity, develop and organize intellectual materials, and assess student achievement. Excellence in teaching is a primary criterion by which some important constituents (e.g., students and parents) judge the stature of a university.”

Evaluation of teaching may occur with respect to the following *areas of activity*: Classroom instruction, nonclassroom instruction, clinical instruction, curriculum-related activity, instructional innovation, specific participation in graduate faculty activities, and academic advising activities.

B. *Expectations:* The Candidate for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure must demonstrate active engagement and high commitment to teaching. She or he must demonstrate a record of effective instruction (as defined by the components below). The Candidate for promotion to Professor must demonstrate a sustained record of excellence in teaching and serve as an effective role model for colleagues, students, and clientele. An effective role model leads or guides others in pursuit of teaching excellence.

Some faculty members who have attained associate professor status may have an assigned effort level for teaching of 90%. If faculty members with this load wish to be promoted to full professor, they are expected not only to engage in excellent teaching, but also to engage in sustained scholarship of instruction. The scholarship of instruction may be demonstrated by publications in appropriate venues, presentations at or organization of conferences on teaching, writing grants that promote teaching, development of teaching materials, including books, and/or attendance at leadership conferences. At least a few of these efforts should include scholarship that is published in national refereed journals or other reputable sources with national or international stature.

C. *Suggested Indicators of Teaching Activities.*

Classroom Instruction at the Undergraduate and Graduate Levels. Effective classroom teaching may include the following:

1. Demonstrates depth, breadth, and currency of subject matter mastery
2. Prepares and uses clear, well-organized, appropriate, and up-to-date

- instructional materials and syllabi
3. Establishes an appropriate level of intellectual demand for students
 4. Evaluates student performance using timely, diverse, and relevant assessment practices
 5. Seeks systematically-gathered formative and summative feedback from students regarding teaching effectiveness
 6. Participates in professional activities related to enhancement of teaching effectiveness (e.g., faculty development seminars)
 7. Demonstrates instructional innovation (e.g., develops new learning materials and/or provides new learning experiences; incorporates new technologies with instruction)
 8. Provides evidence of successful performance of teaching responsibilities that are unusually demanding or require special expertise or preparation (e.g., teaching distance education courses; teaching a course for the first time)
 9. Publishes professional materials targeted specifically for student audiences (e.g., textbooks, published lectures, workbooks, instructional guides, audiovisual or computerized instructional materials)
 10. Presents and/or publishes materials specifically *about* teaching
 11. Receives honors recognizing excellence in teaching (e.g., teaching award; invited presentations at conferences or workshops on teaching; membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants or contracts; membership on accreditation teams and special commissions; selection for special teaching activities outside of the University)
 12. Adheres to university policies regarding teaching (e.g., final exam policy)
 13. Demonstrates effective course administration (e.g., maintains office hours, is punctual in performing teaching-related activities such as filing text orders, filing syllabi, and reporting grades in a timely fashion)

Nonclassroom Instructional and Curriculum-Related Activity at the Undergraduate and Graduate Levels. Effective teaching of these types may include the following:

1. Effectively plans, supervises, and evaluates problems, readings, honors, and independent study courses
2. Aids colleagues and students in instructional activities
3. Presents guest lectures, shares materials, or provides consultation for other courses
4. Effectively assists students in preparing papers or projects for competition, conference presentations, or publication
5. Contributes to curriculum development and revision within units and across the School Develops a new course
6. Contributes to the development and/or administration of new instructional programs or cutting edge curriculum development projects (e.g., distance education or continuing education projects)

7. Effectively arranges, supervises, and/or evaluates student practica and internships
8. Writes and receives funding for grant proposals to promote, aid, or study instruction.
9. Makes presentations at conferences or sessions on teaching.
10. Publishes work on the scholarship of instruction.

Clinical Instruction. Clinical instruction is the teaching of clinical skills and knowledge to students. In FSHS, both tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty are involved in clinical instruction. Their work is evaluated by their students and by their peers. Effective clinical teaching may include the following:

1. Observing students (directly and indirectly) conducting evaluation and treatment sessions and providing appropriate and effective feedback. (The nature and the amount of observation must conform to various standards.)
2. Conducting individual and group meetings with students to discuss their clients/cases, their personal goals for clinical learning, their plans for those clients, their performance with those clients, and other relevant clinical issues
3. Reviewing students' plans, reports, and session notes, and providing appropriate and effective feedback
4. Meeting with students, clients, and relevant others (e.g., I.E.P. meetings and consultations)
5. Effectively carrying out case management responsibilities
6. Overseeing and maintaining client files to meet standards for licensing and accreditation
7. Reporting to families, other professionals, and external agencies in a manner that meets professional and accreditation standards
8. Participating in reviews of students
9. Participating in consensus grading
10. Demonstrating exemplary practice (when students serve as cotherapist with the faculty member)
11. Providing clinical services during periods when students are not available, such as semester breaks
12. Substituting in a class when a teacher is absent (relevant to ECL)
13. Maintaining a client load if required by accrediting or certifying agencies.

Academic Supervision and Advisory Activities. Effective supervisory and advisory teaching may include the following:

1. Serving as Major Professor for M.S. and/or Ph.D. students (e.g., advising, supervising graduate research for report, thesis, or dissertation, participates in examination and defense process)
2. Serving on supervisory committees for M.S. and/or Ph.D. students
3. Participating in group advising sessions with other faculty, if relevant
4. Depending on the unit, effectively advising undergraduate students.

5. Being accessible to undergraduate students for assistance and advice
6. Providing informal mentoring to students and prospective students

D. *Documentation of Classroom and Nonclassroom Teaching at the Undergraduate and Graduate Levels.* The following list identifies forms of evidence that may be used to document competence in the classroom:

1. Description and documentation of percentage of time assigned to teaching, listing of all courses taught, including numbers of students in each course.
2. Summary sheets from a valid and reliable assessment of student evaluations (required for each course taught and for at least one semester/session for courses taught more than once a year)
3. Copies of all student comments on evaluation forms
4. Teaching evaluations by peers based on review of teaching portfolio and/or classroom observation
5. Course materials (e.g., syllabi, project assignments, exams)
6. Examples of students' work, with names removed
7. Letters from students, peers, and others observing teaching of candidate
8. Nominations and awards for teaching
9. Documentation and evaluation of guest lectures
10. Evidence of use of candidate's teaching materials beyond own class (e.g., adoptions of texts, inclusion in texts, requests for use by other faculty)
11. Evidence of new or innovative teaching strategies, material, or media
12. Materials related to the development of a new course
13. Contributions to curriculum development and revision
14. Evidence of teaching resulting in scholarship (e.g., publications with or by students arising from class discussion)
15. Description and documentation of supervisory and advising activities (including number of students supervised and advised and the percentage of time assigned to advising)
16. Evidence of effectiveness of supervisory and advising activities (e.g., completed reports, theses, and dissertations; evaluation of undergraduate and graduate advising efforts)

E. *Documentation of Clinical Instruction:* The following list identifies forms of evidence that may be used to document competence in clinical instruction.

1. Percent time devoted to clinical instruction, along with documentation of live supervision provided (percentage of time or hours)
2. Anonymous student evaluations of the instructor that are summarized and tabulated on a calendar-year basis. Alternatively, the unit may elect to have student evaluations reviewed by faculty who then provide a summary to the instructor to submit with the evaluation materials.

3. Results of a review of a clinical instruction portfolio by a committee from the unit. Review by the unit rather than the tenured faculty is necessary because of issues related to client confidentiality and to knowledge of accreditation standards. The clinical instruction portfolio may include such evidence as: documentation of live supervision provided (percentage of time or hours), end-of-semester feedback letters to students, observation feedback forms used in live supervision, sample supervisory log, creative materials used in group supervision, corrected drafts of student reports, client files containing reports, correspondence, session notes, and contact logs. The unit develops guidelines for the content of the portfolio. The unit also determines the composition of its committee. Ideally, the committee should include at least one faculty member at or above the academic rank being sought. That member would chair the committee and draft the review, which is signed by all the committee members. If there is no senior faculty member, then the unit coordinator assigns a faculty member to serve as chair.

II. *Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Endeavors.*

A. *Mission Relevance:* The *Kansas State University Department Heads' Manual*, Chapter 2, has this definition of research and other creative endeavors:

“Research and other creative endeavors encompass a broad spectrum of scholarship and other activities that require critical analysis, investigation, or experimentation. These endeavors are directed toward discovery, interpretation, or application of knowledge and ideas”. More specifically, research may be defined as the generation of theoretically relevant data, the analysis or synthesis of existing knowledge, and the application of knowledge to practical problems.

“The results of research, scholarship, and other creative activity should be shared with others through publication, performance, or other media appropriate to the discipline. Excellence in research and other creative endeavors is a primary criterion by which . . . important constituents (e.g., the national and international scholarly community) judge the stature” of a department, school, or university.

There should be convincing evidence that the candidate has continuously been engaged in research, scholarship, or other creative activity of high quality and significance. Much of this work will be generated by the individual candidate as part of his or her own ongoing research program. Where appropriate and possible, multidisciplinary projects are encouraged and represent a highly desirable endeavor. When evaluating a candidate’s collaborative work, evaluators must carefully establish the candidate’s role and contribution to the joint effort. When appropriate or required, judgments from eligible faculty members at other institutions and from professionals in the field should be used to supplement those of faculty members at Kansas State University (see *Letters from External Evaluators* above).

To aid in evaluating research productivity, each unit in the School must develop a ranking of journals in which the unit members publish. This ranking should be done in consultation with the School Director, and it should be revised periodically. It should have at least three tiers, based on factors such as acceptance rate, circulation, rankings in published indices, and appropriateness. Whenever possible, journals devoted primarily to teaching in the professional area should be included in the ranking. This ranking will be on file in the office of the School Director. Appendix C contains some possible categories in such a ranking system.

In the case of a manuscript published in journals or venues that are not mentioned in the unit’s ranking system, the faculty member should propose and document a ranking, based on such indicators as:

- Journal rankings established in the ISI Web of Science, or
- The ranking of that journal in another unit that does rank that journal

In the case of a probationary faculty member, the tenure mentor, if any, and candidate’s unit should assist in documenting the proposed ranking of each unranked journal or venue in which

the candidate's work appears. The proposed ranking will be reviewed by the School faculty as part of the annual probationary review, at which time the sense of the faculty about the appropriateness of the proposed ranking should be obtained. The sense of the faculty should be stated explicitly in the summary letter to the candidate that is written by the School Director.

B. Expectations: The candidate for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure must demonstrate excellence as a researcher and scholar, with evidence of potential to contribute to the knowledge base of the chosen discipline at a national and/or international level. The candidate for promotion to Professor must demonstrate a sustained record of research, scholarship, and other creative endeavor that is recognized nationally or internationally. In addition, the candidate must provide evidence of serving as a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. In both cases, the faculty member is expected to maintain a coherent program of research and scholarship with clearly defined theoretical, empirical, and/or intervention-oriented goals. If appropriate, the candidate is expected to play a significant and clearly-defined role in developing and/or maintaining a multi-disciplinary research program (on a local, national, or international scale).

If a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor has realistically and consistently had a research effort allocation of .30 during the probationary period, then the expectation would be for an average of about one research article in publication or in press, or the equivalent of one article, per year, as well as several research presentations during the probationary period. At least a few of the publications should be in the medium to high-quality journals in the journal ranking list developed by the candidate's unit. If the candidate has had a larger or smaller average research effort allocation than .30, then prorating must be used.

Other products of scholarship that require collection of data, synthesis of data, or interpretation of data may substitute for articles. Together with the tenure mentor and with assistance from the candidate's unit, the candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor should make the case for the equivalence of each product of scholarship that is not a traditional article. The proposed equivalences will be reviewed by the School faculty as part of the annual probationary reviews, at which point the sense of the faculty about the appropriateness of the proposed equivalence should be obtained. Again, the sense of the faculty should be stated explicitly in the summary letter to the candidate that is written by the School Director.

Factors that should guide all parties when scholarly work is reviewed for its equivalence to one or more research articles include these:

- The primary consideration is quality of the scholarly product.
- Authored books, edited books, book chapters, funded grant proposals, and similar products may all be considered for equivalence to one or more research articles. In the case of publications, the reputation of the publisher will be considered in these decisions.
- On occasion, an unfunded grant proposal that is of demonstrably high quality (e.g., it was ranked in a national competition) may be accepted as equivalent to one or more articles.

However, no faculty member can expect to achieve tenure and/or promotion solely on the basis of high quality but unfunded proposals.

- The faculty will distinguish among grant proposals that (a) have the prospect of advancing a line of research, (b) primarily relate to instruction, and (c) support service activities. Instructional and service-related proposals are important to the School financially, and they should be considered under the appropriate section of this document (Teaching and/or Service).
- In general, presentations at professional venues provide evidence of a sustained program of research, but they do not substitute for publication. Similarly, unfunded grant proposals, other than those for which equivalence to an article is established, are seen as providing evidence of a sustained program of research.

In the case of a candidate for promotion to the rank of professor, the evaluating faculty will look for recent evidence of a sustained and high quality program of research with national or international impact. If the candidate has been at the associate professor level for much longer than the minimum number of years before one is allowed to apply for promotion, the evaluating faculty will also look for recent evidence of productive research effort. Although the criteria indicated above for probationary faculty to achieve promotion will undoubtedly influence the faculty's evaluation of candidates for the rank of professor, this decision is inherently more holistic in nature because of the requirement of national or international impact.

If a candidate for promotion to professor has devoted 90% of effort to teaching and 10% to service in the period following the achievement of tenure and associate professorship, then the candidate is expected to demonstrate the scholarship of teaching. Similarly, a candidate who has an assignment of 90% Extension and 10% service is expected to demonstrate scholarship related to the work for Extension. These issues will be discussed under the Teaching and Extension sections of this document.

C. Suggested Indicators of Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Endeavors

Publications or Juried Competitions:

1. Publishes in a refereed journal or authors a refereed extension publication or extension media materials on a regular basis
2. Publishes in nonrefereed but well-regarded sources (e.g., research monographs, textbook chapters, books, lay publications, trade publications, and media material)
3. Wins a juried regional or national competition
4. Provides evidence of manuscript "in press" (accepted but not yet published)
5. Develops products or patents

Research Projects, Grants, and Contracts:

1. Receives extramural funding for research project, extension project, or other creative endeavor
2. Receives university funding for a project, including Agricultural Experiment Station funding
3. Administers grant-funded research or program
4. Writes and submits research and grant proposals
5. Supervises and trains students and support staff in research
6. Mentors students, research associates, and junior faculty in research
7. Provides research support and consultation to other members of the School

Research Presentations and Scholarly or Creative Contributions:

1. Writes and presents research paper at a professional conference (as part of symposium, paper presentation, or poster session)
2. Presents at workshop or round-table discussion at a professional conference
3. Serves as an invited discussant on a symposium
4. Serves as organizer of symposium or paper session at a professional conference
5. Develops computer software or other technology
6. Develops assessment instruments that are published nationally

Recognition for Research, Scholarship, or Other Creative Endeavors:

1. Demonstrates that work is cited by other researchers (e.g., Social Science Citation Index or ISI Web of Science, if relevant)
2. Receives awards for research/scholarship
3. Attains and/or retains membership on graduate faculty
4. Shows other evidence of high quality research (solicited or unsolicited letters by other professionals)

D. Documentation of Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Endeavors. The following forms of evidence may be used to document competence in this domain:

1. Description and documentation of percentage of time assigned to research, scholarship, or other creative endeavor
2. Number, complexity, and quality of current research projects or programs, including others involved
3. Source and amount of funding of research projects
4. Copies of all materials “in press” or published during relevant period (Each journal citation must include the ranking of the journal in the unit’s scale, or the author’s suggested ranking and accompanying rationale)
5. School-solicited or letters of support from experts in the discipline

6. Unsolicited letters of support from experts in the discipline
7. List of presentations, targeted audiences, and content summary
8. Awards for research or creative endeavors
5. Evidence of citations of work (e.g., copies of materials citing work, Social Science Citation Index or ISI Web of Science index)

III. *Extension*

A. *Mission Relevance.* The success of extension specialists depends on sound scholarship, continued intellectual growth, and the ability to communicate and teach in informal educational settings. Although specialists respond to a variety of questions related to their subject matter, their primary responsibility involves program development that improves the lives of Kansans. Programs are determined by the needs of Kansas citizens. These needs may not show up in federal funding priorities. Fads and issues receiving media attention may not reflect these needs. Specialists have the responsibility to taxpayers to leverage their scarce resources to create programs that make a real difference in the lives of targeted audiences.

In Extension, professional activities involve considerable scholarship as well as certain types of publication that are typical for work in that area. In addition to these types of expectations, there is an expectation that some of the candidate's publications will be more substantial and more in line with standard research expectations. As is the case for other units in the School, Extension specialists in the School will develop a ranking of journals in which the unit members publish.

Extension programs can take many forms depending on the nature of the subject and the audience and the intended outcomes. Regardless of the range of program designs, they all share a common core:

- A research base that provides the foundation for the program
- A resource for program leaders that articulates goals, outcomes, program activities, research opportunities, and a design for accountability
- Resources for distribution to the target audience
- A peer review by experienced specialists and agents in Kansas or other states familiar with the program or content area
- Research data produced by the piloting of the program
- A summary report of research on program impacts

Some programs are elevated to a *Gold Standard* of quality. These programs are special because of their investment of specialist resources of time and operating budget. *Gold Standard* publications are expected to be evaluated and published nationally. In addition to the common core above, they demonstrate the following criteria:

- They reflect an established need (from surveys, demographic data, feedback from consumers, agents, other professionals, and requests from other agencies)
- They begin with an initial program prototype
- A search for funding opportunities for the program is attempted
- Initial feedback from agents, KSU specialist colleagues, and the administrators for FSHS, Extension Family and Consumer Sciences, and other administrative units related to the program is obtained
- The program prototype and production of working draft is revised
- The prototype is implemented and research data is collected

- The prototype is revised into its final form
- Program resources are reproduced, distributed, and promoted to state and national audiences
- A monograph that documents program development and impact accountability is written and disseminated

B. *Expectations:* Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure will depend on the development of a portfolio of accomplishment that includes:

1. A major program that has achieved the Gold Standard
2. A reputation of excellence among local extension agents as documented by evaluations of those who have used or contributed to the specialist's work
3. A positive review by leaders or other knowledgeable people implementing the Gold Standard program
4. A record of excellence in collaboration with FSHS faculty and/or graduate students
5. A monograph distributed nationally that documents the impact of the Gold Standard program
6. Two nationally refereed articles or chapters in books published by reputable publishers

Promotion to Professor will depend on the development of a portfolio of accomplishment that includes:

1. At least two *Gold Standard* programs (if at least .8 FTE Extension)
2. A sustained record of excellence in Extension programming recognized by professionals throughout the United States
3. The reputation as a role model among professionals in the specialist area of expertise who work with the target audiences of the candidate
4. A record of sustained scholarly work published in national refereed or other reputable sources.

C. *Examples of activity*

Whether the result of extension specialist's activity is a Gold Standard program or one that is more temporary and responsive to local needs, the specialist should show evidence of some combination of the following examples of activity.

Program Planning

1. Participates in formal planning process
2. Coordinates with local agents, area specialists, state specialists and other professionals to identify and document needs for education programs
3. Reviews appropriate state and national data to assess needs
4. Considers views of specialists in other states and individuals in other organizations.
5. Participates in interdisciplinary program planning
6. Pursues potential grant opportunities
7. Obtains funding to support program efforts and research needs (e.g., internal Extension funds, federal Extension grants, private foundation funding, internal University grants, federal and state grants, professional organization grants and awards)

Program Preparation

1. Prepares new educational resources using methods based on clientele needs
2. Adapts materials from other states to meet client needs in Kansas
3. Contributes to materials developed by an interdisciplinary team

Program Delivery

1. Delivers in-service training to local agents and/or other professionals who then train volunteers and/or teach intended audiences
2. Delivers programs directly to clientele groups
3. Responds to questions and needs of local agents and clientele groups through phone, electronic, face-to-face consultation, and dissemination of appropriate support resources
4. Prepares information tools (e.g., newsletters, articles, web pages, research or information briefs) to support local program work and to strengthen capabilities of local agents and Extension personnel and consumer groups
5. Develops, delivers, and evaluates electronic programs, including the use of the media
6. Administers special projects that have internal or external funding support

Program Evaluation/Accountability

1. Integrates an evaluation component into overall program design
2. Conducts program evaluation in cooperation with local Extension agents, colleagues, or other clientele groups
3. Prepares federal, state, and other reports, as required
4. Communicates program results to decision makers and others as appropriate
5. Presents or publishes relevant information or findings pertaining to Extension programs

D. *Documentation of Extension Programming.*

The following are suggested as forms of evidence that may be used to document the effectiveness of Extension programs.

1. Description and documentation of percentage of time assigned to Extension
2. List of programs planned and delivered (includes target audience, funding source if appropriate, and collaborators)
3. Copies or descriptions of educational materials developed, including such items as:
 - Fact Sheets
 - Bulletins
 - Curricula and/or teaching guides
 - Notebooks/resource manuals
 - Newspaper and newsletter articles
 - Educational games
 - Home study courses
 - Distance education non-credit courses/mediated instruction
 - Computer programs/simulations/data bases
 - Web sites
 - Radio and TV spots
 - Videotapes/DVDs
 - Audio cassettes
 - Dramatic materials (song, play, skit, etc.)
 - Judging material
 - Projects
4. Evidence of program effectiveness. One or more of the following indicators must be used as a measure of program effectiveness. The exact mix depends on the nature of the program. Appropriate evaluations for two different programs may vary significantly. Evaluation should examine the effort (numbers, process), effect (impact outcomes), and efficiency (cost/benefit and sustainability).
 - a. Audience/clientele contacts: A summary of audience reached including such items as the number of resources distributed, the geographical distribution of resources, the size of the media market, and the number of leaders trained and other measures of program effort
 - b. Peer and leader evaluations: Data summarizing the reactions to leader training; solicited and unsolicited letters from peers (other state specialists and experienced professionals) and Extension colleagues
 - c. Program reputation: Presentations at professional conferences; keynote speeches and out-of-state workshops; publications in professional journals and resources (e.g., websites, articles, newsletters; publication in the national media related to

target audience for the program; special awards and recognitions.

- d. Audience impact: A summary of short- or long-term consequences of program participation; letters of confirmation by professionals in contact with the audience; case studies; self-reports, and evaluative research. Simply, measures of program impact
- e. Program efficiency: evidence of cost-benefit, likelihood of sustainability, and the effect of inspiring new innovations among colleagues and consumers

IV. Service

A. *Mission Relevance.* Excellence in service is reflected through contributing one's expertise and knowledge to the profession, to units within the University, and to the larger community in appropriate and effective ways. These activities encompass the categories described in the *Kansas State University Handbook* (C32.5 and C32.6) as directed and nondirected service.

In the School of Family Studies and Human Services, *Directed Service* includes activities performed for the School, the University, or the public at large, "is explicitly delineated in a faculty member's position description, requires academic credentials and/or skills, and is often routinely and explicitly scheduled in terms of time and place. This service furthers the mission and is central to the goals and objectives of the unit" (*Kansas State University Department Heads' Manual*, Chapter 2). Illustrative responsibilities include provision of direct services to clients (e.g., speech therapy, marriage and family therapy, family financial counseling, preschool childcare provision, and after-school childcare provision), coordination of the units within the School, and Extension State Leader responsibilities.

In the School of Family Studies and Human Services, *Nondirected Service* is made up of three components: Professional service, institutional service, and public service that is distinct from the activities described in other professional domains. These components are defined as follows:

- *Professional service* encompasses contributions to the academic profession beyond campus. This includes contributions to professional societies and consulting with civic and governmental entities, and with industry.
- *Institutional service* includes contributions to the program unit, to the School, to the College of Human Ecology, and to the University as a whole. This may include activities related to University governance, those essential to the operation of the University (e.g., contributions to the formulation of academic policy and programs and services on the Faculty Senate and committees of the councils of the University).
- *Public service* includes both the sharing of information and knowledge and the application of knowledge to solving problems as rendered to individuals, communities, organizations, and public agencies. Such activity may take the form of serving as an expert witness or writing position papers. This activity is distinct from directed service and from Extension, and from civic and personal service (*Kansas State University Department Heads' Manual*, Chapter 2)

B. *Expectations:* The candidate for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure must demonstrate effective involvement in the domains of service to the profession as well as to the public and can be reasonably expected to continue a program of effective service relevant to the mission of the School of Family Studies and Human Services. Institutional service is expected to be concentrated at the unit level. The candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor must provide convincing evidence of a sustained record of effective involvement in the domains of service to the profession and to the public.

C. Suggested Indicators of Service

Professional Service:

1. Holds an elected or appointed office in a state or national academic or professional association.
2. Serves as a journal editor, editorial board member, or review committee member of a professional organization, university, government licensing, accreditation, certification body, or agency
3. Serves as committee member for a professional or academic association at the local, state, regional, national, or international level
4. Serves as a peer reviewer of articles, manuscripts submitted to refereed journals, book publishers
5. Serves as a peer reviewer of proposals submitted to public/private funding sources
6. Serves as a peer reviewer of papers/abstracts for inclusion in proceedings and/or presentation at a professional meeting
7. Serves as an organizer of workshops, panels, or meetings in areas of professional competence
8. Provides professional service for colleagues and profession (e.g., writing or presenting position papers)
9. Serves as a professional consultant to public or private organization; collaborate in efforts with outside agencies
10. Represents the profession in public forums (e.g., expert testimony)
11. Maintains professional competence through professional development activities related to teaching, research, extension, and administration
12. Attends professional meetings
13. Serves as outside reviewer of candidates for tenure and promotion
14. Serves on a professional accrediting body

Institutional Service

Service to the School of Family Studies and Human Services

1. Serves as Chair of School committees
2. Serves as a Tenure Mentor
3. Serves as member of School committees
4. Advises/supports Student Interest Group or other student organizations in School.
5. Assists or participates in School-sponsored activities (e.g., brown-bag seminars, School career fairs; K.S.U. Open House)
6. Cultivates productive relations with outside agencies (e.g., university-town consortia; contacts with businesses/industries/organizations/individuals)
7. Attends and participates in School faculty meetings
8. Actively participates in recruitment/retention of students and new faculty (e.g.,

- prepares information for recruitment brochures)
9. Participates in fund-raising activities unrelated to grants and contracts on behalf of the unit or School
 10. Takes on time-consuming, long-term projects for the good of the unit or the School.
 11. Writes and receives funding for grant proposals that support service activities in the unit or the School.

Service to the College of Human Ecology

1. Serves as member or chair of Human Ecology Faculty Council
2. Serves as member or chair of a standing college committee or a task force
3. Attends college faculty meetings
4. Serves on Open House committee
5. Advises/supports student activity/organization (e.g., Omicron Nu)
6. Participates in College recruitment activities (e.g., Careers Day/counseling prospective students)
7. Participates in alumni activities (e.g., annual alumni meeting)
8. Participates in fund-raising for college (e.g., Telefund)
9. Supports College activities (e.g., attend commencement, scholarship receptions)
10. Takes on time-consuming, long-term projects for the good of the College.

Service to the University

1. Holds a major university office (e.g., faculty senate president)
2. Serves as chair of major university committee (e.g., Presidential search committee; academic affairs committee)
3. Serves as member of a time-consuming, standing, or long-term university committee and/or task force (e.g., Institutional Review Board)
4. Serves on Faculty Senate
5. Serves as member of Graduate Council
6. Serves as chair or member of Extension committee or task force not directly related to educational programming (e.g. an Annual Conference committee in Extension; a Diversity Task Force).

Professionally-Related Service to the Public

1. Serves actively as a member or office-holder of a community organization or service club (e.g., member of board of directors)
2. Implements a project to enhance community
3. Gives talks/lectures/workshops to public
4. Provides expert witness or position papers for public or service entities
5. Represents community interests in public forums
6. Writes articles for popular publications

7. Serves as resource (e.g., give interviews, appears or discusses for media)

Directed Service to the School

A. *Unit Coordinator*. This form of directed service will be formally evaluated only if the candidate has tenths assigned to unit coordination. Typical activities associated with the responsibilities of Unit Coordinator include:

1. Provides leadership to the unit with respect to:
 - a. Responsibility for accreditation issues (where relevant)
 - b. Oversight of curriculum and, where appropriate, budget
 - c. Oversight of admissions & screening of graduate students
 - d. Convening of unit meetings
 - e. Preparing self-study documents, if required
 - f. Identifying future directions of the unit
 - g. Assistance in recruitment and office management issues (although some may be handled by clinic director)
 - h. Maintaining student files and their documentation to external units such as credentialing agencies
 - i. Providing assistance to doctoral students as they seek internship placements with approved supervisors
 - j. Setting up procedures to track employment and career path data of graduates
 - k. Writes and receives funding for grant proposals that support service activities of the unit.
2. Provides representation and information to other entities, for example:
 - a. Represents the unit to the School, College, and University
 - b. Responds to inquiries from other universities
 - c. Responds to requests for information about the program
 - d. Responds to research questionnaires
 - e. Provides articulation with state and national credentialing agencies
 - f. Has troubleshooting duties, e.g., dealing with student complaints, client relations
 - g. Deals with public relations issues
 - h. Represents the unit at national forums

B. *Clinical Service*, that is, direct clinical service to clients in the following types of settings:

1. Speech and Hearing Center
2. Family Center
3. Family financial counseling
4. Preschool childcare provision
5. After-school childcare provision

C. Extension State Leader. Typical activities associated with the role of Extension State Leader include:

1. Working with Assistant Director for Family and Consumer Sciences to plan, organize, and give direction to program planning
2. Helping the assistant director plan monthly extension Family and Consumer Sciences faculty meetings
3. Attending program council and other general planning meetings
4. Distributing information to other specialists
5. Organizing parts of new agent orientation, usually giving one or more presentations
6. Participating in spring planning conferences (may be two or more in different locations); may give presentation as State Leader, in addition to program or project areas
7. Promoting communication among specialists and others regarding office policies, budget information, reports, equipment needs and requests, etc.
8. Participating in other administrative meetings as required
9. Serving as Extension representative on various committees

D. Documentation of Service. The following forms of evidence may be used to document professional activity in the service domains:

1. Description and documentation of percentage of time assigned to (directed and nondirected) service and related professional activities
2. Listing of professional memberships, committee assignments, offices held
3. Listing of review activities (e.g., journal reviews, peer reviews of grant proposals)
4. Descriptive/evaluative letters from coworkers, committee chairs, or organizations delivering or receiving services
5. Documentation of presentations (e.g., target audience, topic, outline of content)
6. Documentation of special recognition (prizes/awards) for service activities
7. Media publicity regarding substance of service/presentations (e.g., newspaper, newsletter, radio, or television summary)
8. In the case of unit coordinators, feedback from faculty for whom the unit coordinator provides leadership, based on a survey by the tenure mentor, if any, or by the Director of the School

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. Responsibilities of a Tenure Mentor

The tenure mentor is a faculty member who serves as an advisor to, and advocate for, the probationary candidate. Probationary faculty are *strongly encouraged, but not required*, to select a tenure mentor. The tenure mentor is typically a member of the candidate's primary unit and may be recommended to the candidate by the School Director. The primary decision regarding who will serve as primary tenure mentor is made by the candidate, assuming the recommended faculty member is willing and able to assume this responsibility.

No faculty member will be required to serve as a tenure mentor, as this responsibility involves a thoughtful commitment of time and energy that may not be possible for all who are eligible. Tenured faculty members should not be nor feel pressured into accepting this role. However, the tenure mentor role is extremely important and the performance of the tenure mentor(s) is recognized among the service activities in annual evaluations and, if relevant, promotional considerations.

The general responsibilities of the tenure mentor include:

1. Informing the candidate of the professional expectations and level of performance required by the primary unit and by the School, including the development and maintenance of a multiple-year portfolio
2. Advising the candidate regarding use of time and the development of professional priorities with respect to assigned duties
3. Serving as an advocate of the candidate during midprobationary review and final tenure review meetings, and
4. Serving as a professional confidante for questions or concerns raised by the candidate about the operations of the unit, the School, the College, and/or the university.

Appendix D contains representative questions that faculty might ask in evaluating a candidate for tenure and promotion. The mentor and candidate may find it helpful to review these questions.

APPENDIX B: Contents of Portfolio for Midprobationary Review

The probationary faculty member will compile evidence of his or her progress toward tenure in a professional portfolio. The portfolio is compiled in consultation with the mentor. The candidate should refer to the "Documentation" portions in the Promotion and Tenure sections of this Guide for examples of supportive evidence to document progress in teaching, research, service, extension, and clinical instruction. In addition, the Website for the Kansas State University Office of Academic Affairs has forms for use in the midprobationary review. These forms can be downloaded.

APPENDIX C. Ranking of Journals in Which Unit Faculty Publish—Sample Unit Ranking from Texas Tech University

Ranking of 5: Outstanding recognition in the field; highly prestigious; refereed

- Journal 1
- Journal 2
-

Ranking of 4: Highly respected in the field; refereed

- Journal 1
- Journal 2
-

Ranking of 3: Good reputation; selective in publication; refereed

- Journal 1
- Journal 2
-

Ranking of 2: Average; fairly easy to publish in; typically refereed

- Journal 1
- Journal 2
-

Ranking of 1: Below average publication; not discriminating with respect to articles published

- Journal 1
- Journal 2
-

Ranking of 0: Not to be counted as a scholarly publication

- Journal 1
- Journal 2
-

Appendix D. Representative Questions Asked by the School Faculty When Assessing the Candidate's Performance

A. *Representative questions Asked by the School Faculty When Assessing the Candidate's Performance in the Domains of Teaching.* The following questions, along with others, help reviewers evaluate the teaching performance of the candidate.

1. To what degree does the candidate demonstrate command of the subject and continuous growth in the subject matter knowledge?
2. How well does the candidate demonstrate the ability to develop and organize instructional material?
3. How well does the candidate demonstrate the ability to present instructional material in a clear and coherent manner?
4. To what degree does the candidate demonstrate the ability to bring an audience to a high level of understanding and to an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge and application?
5. To what extent does the candidate demonstrate the creativity, spirit, and enthusiasm that vitalize learning?
6. What evidence shows that the candidate adapts the subject matter to the level and needs of students and clientele?
7. At what level does the candidate demonstrate skill in preparing material for diverse audiences?
8. How does the candidate contribute to course, curriculum, and program development?
9. How well does the candidate demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between the area of specialization and the overall departmental curriculum?
10. To what extent does the candidate present evidence of competent advising?
11. How does the candidate demonstrate effective guidance, mentoring, and advising of students?
12. To what extent does the candidate engage in activities related to the scholarship of teaching (e.g., publishing materials designed to enhance the learning of students and faculty, such as workbooks, curriculum handbooks, or study guides; attendance at leadership conferences)?
13. To what extent does the candidate engage in grant writing to support instruction?

B. *Representative questions Asked by the School Faculty Specific to Clinical Instruction.*

The unit's clinical faculty will provide information to the reviewing faculty about the level of the candidate's performance in the following areas of instruction and service.

Client Population.

1. How appropriate are the services provided?
2. How timely and appropriate are referrals?

3. What attempts are made to inform/include/collaborate with relevant professionals, family members, and caregivers?
4. How do clients and/or client family members view services received, if such information is available?
5. Are services adequately documented and is required paperwork completed such as current release of information forms, reports of intervention, progress notes?
6. How well does documentation conform to currently accepted standards?

Student population.

1. How appropriate are the services provided?
2. How timely and appropriate are referrals?
3. What attempts are made to inform/include/collaborate with relevant professionals, family members, and caregivers?
4. How do clients and/or client family members view services received, if such information is available?
5. Are services adequately documented and is required paperwork completed such as current release of information forms, reports of intervention, progress notes?
6. How well does documentation conform to currently accepted standards?
7. To what degree do student ratings reflect reasonable clinical supervision (in terms of consultation time, amount of observation, appropriateness, helpfulness, timeliness)?
8. To what degree does the amount of observation time conform to generally accepted standards for the discipline?

Clinical Unit.

1. To what extent does the supervisor participate in student reviews?
2. To what extent does the supervisor consult with other members of the unit when appropriate?

C. Representative Questions Asked by the School Faculty When Assessing Candidate's Performance in Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Endeavors:

1. Is the work of the candidate in these domains relevant to the mission of the School?
2. Does the work exhibit high quality and significance?
3. Is the quantity of research output consistent with the percentage of time allotted to research?
4. Has the candidate sought out and/or received funding for the research or other creative activity?
5. Has the work earned a regional, national, or international reputation?
6. Is there consistency or continuity in the field of endeavor?
7. Does the work show adequate development or progress over time?
8. Does the work afford an opportunity for the training and mentoring of graduate students?
9. If feasible, does the work show collaborative effort with other faculty?
10. Does the work demonstrate that the candidate has the potential to do high quality research, scholarship, or other creative activity in the future?

11. Is the work of the candidate displayed in visible journals and forums?
12. Does the publication record of the candidate balance quantity of output with quality of output?

D. *Representative Questions Asked by the School Faculty When Assessing Candidate's Performance in the Domains of Extension:*

1. Is the work of the candidate in these domains relevant to the mission of the School and the overall goals of K-State Research and Extension?
2. Does the candidate produce quality resources that are appropriate for the target audience?
3. Does the candidate develop programs that contain up-to-date information supported by research in the field?
4. Does the candidate use appropriate and innovative delivery methods?
5. Does the candidate carry out appropriate program evaluation?
6. Does the candidate show a strong collaborative effort with other faculty, Extension colleagues, and external partners?
7. When appropriate, do the candidate's Extension programs have a regional, national or international reputation?
8. Does the candidate receive special awards or recognition?
9. Does the candidate have a successful gold standard program?
10. Does the candidate have a record of refereed articles or book chapters?
11. Does the candidate share his programs and their rationale for success nationally with peers through research monographs?

E. *Representative Questions Asked by the School Faculty When Assessing Candidate's Performance in the Domains of Service:*

1. Are the candidate's activities relevant to the mission of the School, College, and University?
2. Are the candidate's activities bringing national prominence to the School?
3. What offices or committee leadership responsibilities has the candidate held?
4. Is there evidence supporting the professional development of the candidate?
5. Is there evidence that the candidate has received special recognition?
6. Has the candidate been invited to testify regarding research and/or public policy?
7. Has the candidate actively supported the School, the College, and the University?
8. Does the candidate show evidence of positive communication with other professional and public audiences?

For *Unit Coordinator* who has tenths assigned to that service, the following questions are also relevant:

1. To what extent does the Unit Coordinator provide good leadership to the unit, as assessed by the School Director and the unit faculty?

2. In units that are accredited, is the program's accreditation in good standing?
3. Has the candidate written grant proposals that further the service mission of the unit or the School?