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1. Introduction

The purpose of post tenure review at Kansas State University is to enhance the continued professional development of tenured faculty. The process is intended to encourage intellectual vitality and professional proficiency for all members of the faculty throughout their careers, so they may more effectively fulfill the mission of the university. It is also designed to enhance public trust in the university by ensuring that the faculty community undertakes regular and rigorous efforts to hold all its members accountable for high professional standards.

Kansas State University recognizes that the granting of tenure for university faculty is a vital protection of free inquiry and open intellectual debate. It is expressly recognized that nothing in this policy alters or amends the University’s policies regarding removal of tenured faculty members for cause (which are stipulated in the University Handbook). This policy and any actions taken under it are separate from and have no bearing on the chronic low achievement or annual evaluation policies and processes.

The department policy on post tenure review follows the overarching purpose, principles, objectives, and procedures in the university policy on post tenure review (see University Handbook, Appendix W), which was approved by Faculty Senate on February 11, 2014.

2. Procedures

a. The tenured faculty member’s six previous annual evaluations will be utilized for the review process. The promotion process will commence in the sixth year following granting of tenure, and at each six-year interval throughout the remainder of the faculty member’s career. If an individual is promoted from assistant professor to associate professor, associate professor to professor, recognized as a distinguished professor, or receives a Professorial Performance Award, the six-year period will start over.

b. The department head will review the faculty member’s evaluations and provide a recommendation.

c. The current level of professional development undertaken by the faculty member over the past six years will be considered sufficient if all six annual evaluations meet or exceed expectations.

d. If the determination of the review suggests that a plan for additional professional development should be identified, a face-to-face meeting to discuss options and develop a plan is required. The development plan should be utilized in future annual evaluations and post-tenure reviews to review progress toward any goals set in the plan.