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FACULTY EVALUATION:
PROCEDURES, CRITERIA, AND STANDARDS FOR ANNUAL MERIT EVALUATION,
PROMOTION, TENURE, AND MID-TENURE REVIEW, AND PROFESSORIAL AWARDS

Department of Plant Pathology
Kansas State University

First Ratified September 24, 2004, by faculty vote, and modified and approved by faculty vote on October 24, 2008.

I. INTRODUCTION: Each December, the faculty prepares documentation for each member's Annual Performance Evaluation. This document includes an Annual Faculty Progress Report, a set of goals for the coming calendar year, and a negotiated (with the Department Head) tenths assignment for the areas of Teaching, Research, and Extension. A fourth category is Service. Each member of the faculty is expected to provide Service, which is evaluated as part of the Department Head's evaluation. The intent of the process is to provide both documentation and quantification of the performance of each faculty member and an assessment of the quality and contribution of the performance of the faculty member to the Department, University, and discipline, national and international, of each faculty member. The Annual Progress Report is composed of specific information relative to faculty activities in Teaching, Research, Extension, and Service. The evaluation is composed of two components. The first component is the summation of quantifiable contributions in the three areas, Teaching, Research and Extension. The second component is the evaluation by the Department Head. Each component accounts for 50% of the final Annual Performance Evaluation. All performance ratings are adjusted to a scale of 1 to 5. Each area of performance provides an Overall score. The Overall Scores for the performance areas are adjusted according to the tenths of time negotiated with the Department Head to give the Weighted Score for Teaching, Research, and Extension. The Weighted Score is added to the Head Evaluation Score and divided by two to give the Ranking Score. More details are provided below.

II. PERFORMANCE RATINGS: Accomplishments in each category within each evaluated area of assignment is based upon the following five-point performance scale:
1 = Unsatisfactory  2 = Improvement Needed  3 = Satisfactory  4 = Very Good  5 = Excellent

III. PROPORTIONALITY: Each faculty member has tenths assignment (negotiated with the Head) for Teaching, Research, and Extension. To equalize differences, activities are weighted according to the tenths assigned in each area of responsibility. Proportionally less productivity is expected for faculty with less than 10 tenths assignment in a given area. Differences will be adjusted by dividing an individual's productivity by the decimal equivalent of the assignment of that individual in the category being evaluated. As an example, someone with 10 tenths research may have a publication output of 10 per year and receive a rating of 5 (Excellent). Someone with 5 tenths research who obtains a publication output of 5 per year would have an adjusted score of 5 ÷ 0.5 (assignment) = 10 and also receive a rating of 5.

IV. SUBJECTIVITY: In addition to the objective standards listed under each area of evaluation (Teaching, Research, Extension), subjective elements are included in Teaching and Department Head Evaluation. Faculty members have the responsibility to document to the Head (in the Annual Faculty Progress Report) any activities they have performed during the past three years to be considered in evaluating the subjective elements. Service activities are included in the subjective elements. The Head evaluation score for Teaching is a subjective score assigned by the Department Head after evaluation of the course material and classroom observation.

V. MULTIPLE-YEAR AVERAGES: Total yearly performance output is based on a three-year rolling average for the Research, Extension, and Service areas. For the Teaching area, evaluations are based on the last two times a faculty member taught a course, whether or not it was the same course, if a person has a one-tenth teaching assignment, or on the last four times a person taught a course if the teaching assignment is two tenths or more. In this context, a course is defined as a "traditional" course offered for two credits or more with an enrollment...
equivalent to six or more undergraduate students or three or more graduate students and excludes such courses as seminar, research, and most problems-type courses.

VI. WEIGHTING AND CALCULATIONS: Performance ratings within each rated area of assignment (Teaching, Research, Extension) are obtained by multiplying the rating score (0 thru 5) of a category within an area by the decimal representation of its weight. These weighted scores are added together for all categories within an area to obtain an Overall Score for the area. As an example for the Teaching area: Overall Score = (Student evaluation rating × 0.50) + (Peer evaluation rating × 0.50). The Overall Score is weighted by the negotiated tenths assignment. As an example: assume a faculty member who has a 10% Teaching, 70% Research assignment (Service implied at 20%) received the following Overall Scores for the two evaluated areas; 3.85 and 3.60, respectively. Because only Teaching and Research are evaluated, the Ranking Score is calculated by adjusting the assignment to 12.5% Teaching [(10%/10% + 70%)] and 87.5% Research [70%/10% + 70%]]. The faculty member's Ranking Score would be: (0.125 × 3.85) + (0.875 × 3.60) = 3.63. In this example, a 70% assignment was used to obtain scores when evaluating Research, but an 87.5% Research assignment was used to calculate the Ranking Score.

VII. HEAD EVALUATION: The evaluation by the Department Head will constitute 0.5 of the Final Score. This Head Evaluation Score will be based on a 5 point scale. The Head will consider subjective areas such as improvement, service, awards, and other activities that may not be quantitative. The Head Evaluation Score is added to the Ranking Score and the total is multiplied by 0.5 to give the Final Score. (Note that Teaching has an additional subjective Head evaluation component that is distinct from the Head Evaluation Score.)

VIII. EVALUATION SUMMARIES AND ANNUAL MERIT SALARY ADJUSTMENTS: Activities for each faculty member are reviewed and summarized by the Department Head, and individual Performance Evaluation Summaries are arranged and conducted in January. The Summary includes numerical ratings describing faculty performance in relevant categories and areas of assignment. A summary narrative also is prepared by the Department Head, describing the overall performance, strengths, and deficiencies in the performance in each area of assignment. The Performance Evaluation Summary is presented in draft form to the faculty member for examination. Each faculty member has the opportunity to meet with the Department Head to discuss their performance and impediments, if any exist, that have prevented them from obtaining their goals. These meetings are mandatory for Assistant and Associate Professors. Faculty are encouraged to discuss concerns or possible corrections to their Summary during these meetings. The faculty member and Department Head sign the final document indicating they have seen the document, which is then forwarded to the Dean.

The Final Score for a faculty member is used to determine the level of performance. The performance levels of the different faculty will be placed into the following groups: “Fails to Meet Expectations”, “Below Expectations”, “Meets Expectations”, “Exceeds Expectations” and “Greatly Exceeds Expectations”. The distribution of faculty amongst the groups and the final ranking of faculty within the groups, if any, is determined by the Head. The percentage salary increases recommended for persons in the Greatly Exceeds Expectations category will be higher than those for the Exceeds Expectations category, which in turn shall exceed those in the Meets Expectations category, which will exceed those in the Below Expectations category. Those in the “Fails to Meet Expectations” will generally not receive a salary increase of greater than 1%.

ASSIGNMENT OF TEACHING TENTHS.

All faculty with appointments containing Teaching tenths are expected to teach a minimum of two courses in a four-year period. An individual with a one tenth Teaching appointment will teach, on the average, three credit hours of courses (or more) per two-year period. In this context, a course is defined as a "traditional" course offered for two credits or more with an enrollment equivalent to six or more undergraduate students or three or more graduate students and excludes such courses as Research, and most Problems-type courses.
## Categories and Standards for Evaluating Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight (%)</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Student evaluations. (TEVAL(^1); average of the scores for questions numbered 1 &amp; 14). If a TEVAL score is not submitted, then a value of 2.0 will be inferred as a default.</td>
<td>TEVAL score taken directly as standard.</td>
<td>( \times 0.50 ) =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Head evaluation of teaching. Based on one or more of the following; but, not limited to these items:</td>
<td>Subjective</td>
<td>( \times 0.50 ) =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Class syllabus, handouts &amp; exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Peer review of classroom teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• TA and GRA Student Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teaching improvement activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Undergraduate student advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teaching publications and presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extramural Teaching funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teaching awards and honors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Guest lectures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Adjusted TEVAL scores will be used which have corrections for student motivation and class size.
CATEGORIES AND STANDARDS FOR EVALUATING RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight (%)</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Standards (for 100% Research)</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td><strong>Publications.</strong> (refereed article⁴ = 1, germplasm = 1, book = 3, book chapter or editor = 1, computer program = 1, F &amp; N and B &amp; C Tests = 0.25, non-refereed article = 0.1; adjusted for tenths research assignment)</td>
<td>Highest value set equal to 5; others taken as proportion of that.</td>
<td>× 0.60 =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td><strong>Extramural funding.</strong> (grant dollars received; adjusted for tenths research assignment)</td>
<td>Highest value set equal to 5; others taken as proportion of that.</td>
<td>× 0.30 =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>Presentations of research information.</strong> (number of symposia, seminars, abstracts; adjusted for tenths research assignment)</td>
<td>Highest value set equal to 5; others taken as proportion of that.</td>
<td>× 0.10 =</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


CATEGORIES AND STANDARDS FOR EVALUATING EXTENSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Standards (for 100% Extension)</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td><strong>Publications/educational materials</strong>⁵ (numbered Extension publications and videos) = 1.0; popular articles (minor = 0.2, major = 1.0); major reports = 1.0; speaker at Extension meetings = 0.2; computer programs/web pages = 2.0; unnumbered fact sheets = 0.1, radio/TV interviews = 0.05; newsletter articles = 0.25</td>
<td>Highest value set equal to 5; others taken as a proportion of that.</td>
<td>× 0.6 =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td><strong>Peer evaluations by agents and specialists</strong> (perceived quality/effect)</td>
<td>1-5 scale</td>
<td>× 0.4 =</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁵Items tabulated for consideration in the subjective evaluation by the Department Head include number of samples diagnosed, site visits made, e-mail contacts, phone contacts, field surveys.
PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

These guidelines are not intended to supersede or replace the requirements listed in the Faculty Handbook.

1. Expectations of faculty for tenure, promotion, and beyond will depend upon the specific assignment.

General expectations for faculty are listed below; these are to be considered guidelines, not as contractual.

a. All faculty are expected to:
   1) contribute regularly to the teaching program;
   2) develop and publish scholarly materials in an appropriate forum on a regular basis; and
   3) be "good citizens" of the department.

b. All faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor and above are expected to:
   1) contribute to graduate training;
   2) guide graduate students as major professor and serve on other graduate student committees; and
   3) obtain extra-mural funding to partially support their programs.

2. Minimum expectations of faculty

Faculty in Plant Pathology have determined that selected key indicators can be used to measure expectations of their programs. For research, external grant funding and publications in refereed journals fairly summarizes the quality, quantity, and reputation of their work. For teaching, student evaluations, as measured by the TEVAL score, indicates quality of instruction, and numbers of courses taught measures quantity. For Extension, County Agents are most familiar with the quality, quantity, and reputation of their work and can evaluate those parameters. Specifically:

For all faculty, set the minimum research expectation as:
- significant extramural grant funding, i.e. from outside KSU or KAES, as a P.I. or co-P.I. to support their research program or at least annual applications to an appropriate agency for such funding.
- total number of refereed journal articles published over the past 4 years, modifying for teaching and Extension responsibilities:
  6 refereed journal articles if 0 courses taught;
  5 refereed journal articles if 1 course taught;
  4 refereed journal articles if 2 or 3 courses taught;
  3 refereed journal articles if 4 or 5 courses taught, or if Research is 36-50% of appointment;
  2 refereed journal articles if 6 or 7 courses taught, or if Research is 21-35% of appointment;
  1 refereed journal article if 8 or more courses taught, or if Research is \leq 20% of appointment.

For faculty with a 50% or larger Extension appointment), set the minimum extension expectation at an average score of 3.0 (on a scale of 1-5, with 5 as best) on the annual County Agent evaluation of their performance.

For primarily-research faculty, set the minimum teaching expectation as one 2-3 credit course taught every other year (with 1 additional course every two years for each tenth teaching appointment beyond 0.1), with TEVAL scores averaging 3.0 (on a scale of 1-5, with 5 as best). Classes that do not fill for reasons beyond the control of the teacher will be given special consideration. The 5-6 article publication expectations outlined above will apply if the faculty member misses teaching a course or two, even for circumstances beyond his/her control. "Courses taught" refers to formal courses of at least 2 credit hours; it does not include seminar, problems, or research, but may include courses taught as topics.

In keeping with the intent of the Board of Regents, we add the statement that failure to meet minimum expectations in any one category of the appointment constitutes failure to meet the requirements of the position and may be considered a basis for review that may lead to dismissal of the tenured faculty member.

3. Annual reappointments during probationary period.

Each tenure-track, non-tenured faculty member will be evaluated each year, usually in August, by the tenured faculty in the Department to determine the progress being made towards promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. Research, Teaching, and Extension outputs will be reviewed, depending upon assignment. Items to be considered
may include publications, grants, courses taught/initiated, student evaluations, agent evaluations, presentations to various groups, etc. No external reference letters will be solicited for these reviews.

Following a discussion, with time for reflection (at least one day after the discussion), each tenured faculty member will be asked to vote by ballot on reappointment, and to provide written comments. The results of the vote will be transmitted to the Dean along with a separate recommendation from the Department Head.

Following the vote of the tenured faculty, the Department Head will meet with the faculty member and review the faculty discussion, the vote, and the recommendation to the Dean (with appropriate safeguards for confidentiality). The Head will follow this discussion with a letter to the faculty member that summarizes these same points, and is copied to all Associate Professors and Professors and to the Dean.

4. Mid-Tenure Review.
During the third year of appointment, each tenure-track, non-tenured faculty member will be reviewed in the same format as used for tenure consideration, at the same time as tenure decisions are made (usually in October-November). Outside references for this review will be obtained at the discretion of the Department Head following consultation with Associate Professors and Professors in the department. Based on this documentation, the faculty will recommend by ballot non-reappointment or reappointment based on satisfactory progress toward tenure. Research, teaching and extension outputs and the results of the faculty evaluation will be submitted to the Dean for consideration. A review will be prepared by the Department Head for the faculty member that will provide substantive feedback from faculty colleagues and administrators regarding his or her accomplishments relative to departmental tenure criteria.

5. Tenure review.
a. Review for tenure will most commonly occur during the sixth year of appointment.
b. In addition to the evaluation materials required by the University guidelines, the candidate will provide a list of ten names of potential referees from outside the university. From these names, the head will solicit at least five written tenure evaluations. Using College and University guidelines, the candidate will be evaluated in the Department by all tenured faculty. Tenured faculty will discuss the evaluation materials with the head, and will conduct a written vote and provide written comments on whether they recommend tenure for the candidate. The head will summarize the vote and the discussion in a written evaluation to the dean, which will include his/her own recommendation.

6. Promotion to Associate Professor.
a. Based on current policy, it is expected that a recommendation for tenure will be accompanied by a recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor. At the level of the Dean and Provost, faculty who are considered to be not qualified for concurrent promotion to Associate Professor usually will be considered to not be qualified for tenure. Unusual circumstances will be handled on an individual basis, such as might occur when a person being considered for tenure was hired at the level of Associate Professor.
b. Areas and criteria (as applicable to appointment) used to evaluate faculty for this promotion are:
   1) Demonstrated satisfactory ability in Teaching including: student and peer evaluations; development and/or improvement of course material (syllabi, handouts, exams, etc.); and other Teaching-related activities (such as Teaching improvement activities, training TA's, Teaching publications, extramural Teaching funds, Teaching awards, guest lectures, etc.).
   2) Demonstrated satisfactory ability in Research including: publication history; obtaining extramural funds; making presentations; and other Research-related efforts (such as number of proposals prepared, significance of Research findings, training of visiting scientists/postdoctoral researchers, Research-improvement activities, awards and honors, and participation on graduate student committees).
   3) Demonstrated satisfactory ability in Extension including: quantitative output of Extension training materials; quality/effort as rated by peer evaluation; and other Extension-related efforts (such as improvement activities, extramural funds for Extension, awards and honors, cooperation, creativity,
impact assessment, breadth, Research relevant to Extension duties, Extension lectures, guest lectures).

4) Demonstrated satisfactory ability in Service including: committee and/or review efforts; and other Service-related activities (such as involvement in professional and scientific organizations; international activities; departmental leadership, cooperation, initiative, enthusiasm; and extra Service to the department).

7. Promotion to Professor.

a. Review for promotion to Professor will most commonly occur during the sixth year in rank as an Associate Professor. As with Assistant Professors, each Associate Professor will be evaluated each year, usually in August, by the Professors in the Department to determine the progress being made towards promotion to Professor. Research, Teaching, and Extension outputs will be reviewed, depending upon assignment. Items to be considered may include publications, grants, courses taught/initiated, student evaluations, agent evaluations, presentations to various groups, etc. No external reference letters will be solicited for these reviews. Following the faculty discussion, the head will prepare a letter to the faculty member that summarizes the discussion, and is copied to all Professors and to the Dean.

b. Promotion to Professor usually means that the faculty member has obtained national or international recognition in their discipline or, such as in the case of Teaching or Extension, has had a demonstrated, significant impact on their students or clientele.

c. Areas and criteria (as applicable to appointment) used to evaluate faculty for this promotion are:

1) Demonstrated ability above satisfactory in Teaching including: student evaluations; development and/or improvement of course material (syllabi, handouts, exams, etc.); and other Teaching-related activities (such as Teaching improvement activities, training TA's, Teaching publications, extramural Teaching funds, Teaching awards, guest lectures, etc.).

2) Demonstrated ability above satisfactory in Research including: publication history; obtaining extramural funds; making presentations; and other Research-related efforts (such as number of proposals prepared, significance of Research findings, training of visiting scientists/postdoctoral researchers, Research-improvement activities, awards and honors, and participation on graduate student committees).

3) Demonstrated ability above satisfactory in Extension including: quantitative output of Extension training materials; quality/effort as rated by peer evaluation; and other Extension-related efforts (such as improvement activities, extramural funds for Extension, awards and honors, cooperation, creativity, impact assessment, breadth, Research relevant to Extension duties, Extension lectures, guest lectures).

4) Demonstrated ability above satisfactory in Service including: committee and/or review efforts and other Service-related activities (such as involvement in professional and scientific organizations; international activities; departmental leadership, cooperation, initiative, enthusiasm; and extra Service to the department).


The intent of this award is to recognize excellence and sustained performance of full professors; it is not a promotion that all professors will receive after six years in rank.

a. Eligibility for a Professorial Performance Award will begin after six years in rank of full professor.
b. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity every year for at least the last six years.
c. The candidate must show productivity and performance comparable to that required above for promotion to Professor. In the annual evaluation, the candidate must have received either “Exceeds” or “Greatly Exceeds” expectations in the current and at least one of the five preceding annual evaluations. The candidate may not have received any ratings of “Below Expectations” or “Fails to Meet Expectations” in any of the five preceding annual evaluations.
Consideration for the award will occur during departmental annual evaluations. Eligible candidates will compile and submit a file that documents his/her professional accomplishments for the previous six years according to the same criteria used in annual evaluations. Depending on the candidates’ appointment, materials will include: 1) a one-page summary of major achievements during the evaluation period, 2) a one-page summary of instructional productivity, including courses taught and thesis supervision, in addition to evidence of instructional quality such as ratings, 3) a one-page statement of research and other creative activities accompanied by a list of publications and a list of funded grants and contracts, 4) a one-page summary of extension activity providing evidence of productivity, quality, creativity, and originality, accompanied by a list of extension publications, meetings, workshops, etc. and 5) a one-page statement of service contributions, including evidence of leadership. External evaluations of the candidate are not required.

The department head will review the material, prepare a written evaluation of the candidates’ materials and make a recommendation for or against the award. A copy of the department head’s written evaluation and recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate. The candidate will have an opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the department head before it is submitted to the dean. The candidate will also have the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation to the department head or to the dean. The recommendation and supporting documentation will be forwarded to the dean at the same time as the annual evaluations. The submission will include 1) the department head’s evaluation and recommendation, 2) a copy of the candidate’s evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award, 3) documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation, and 4) any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation.

Prospective candidates are encouraged to consult with the department head to help determine if he/she meets the minimum criteria. Candidates for professorial performance awards who were denied the award the previous year are eligible to reapply in the following year.


In accordance with section C31.5 of the KSU Faculty Handbook (Chronic Low Achievement), tenured faculty who in any year fail to meet the minimum expectations in research, teaching or extension, as appropriate, specified in this document, will also fail to achieve the minimal acceptable level of productivity (see section 2 above under Promotion and Tenure). Those who fail to achieve the minimal level of productivity may be subject to the procedures and criteria in section C31.5 of the KSU Faculty Handbook. If a tenured faculty member’s performance falls below the departmental standards in any area of responsibility (research, teaching or extension) then the department Head will inform the faculty member in writing. After consultation with the faculty member the department Head will suggest, in writing, a course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member. If the faculty member fails to meet the department’s minimum expectations in two successive years or in three years of any five-year period, then “dismissal for cause” may be considered at the discretion of the Dean.

10. Promotion of Adjunct Faculty.

Adjunct faculty are affiliated with the department to help the department fulfill expectations and achieve its goals. These individuals may hold positions in government, e.g., USDA, commercial companies, or research institutes or educational institutions in the United States or elsewhere. These appointments are open to researchers at the level of Assistant Professor (or its equivalent) and above. When an individual is appointed it may be as an Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor or Adjunct Professor.

Promotion from Adjunct Assistant Professor to Adjunct Associate Professor or from Adjunct Associate Professor to Adjunct Professor must be requested by the Adjunct faculty member. The Adjunct faculty member is expected to provide the standard KSU materials for consideration to Promotion and to usually be at a rank at their home institution that is equivalent to the higher rank for which they are applying within the department. Items that may be considered in the evaluation process include all of those used in making decisions on promotion and tenure for regular faculty within the department. Outside reference letters may be solicited by the Department Head at his/her discretion.
Faculty at or above the rank to which the Adjunct Faculty member is requesting promotion evaluate the submitted materials. This evaluation is made in light of the Adjunct Faculty member’s activities and expectations in his/her regular position and their contributions to the department. Voting may be by voice vote or paper ballot, at the discretion of the Department Head. The Department Head is responsible for notifying the Adjunct faculty member of the Department’s decision. If the vote is not in favor of the promotion then the Head provides a summary of the information from the faculty meeting that resulted in the negative decision to the Adjunct faculty member and to the Professors and/or Associate Professors who participated in the decision and the Dean. Results of a favorable decision will be conveyed in writing in a letter to the Adjunct Faculty member and copied to the Dean.

11. Promotion of Research Faculty.
Research faculty, i.e., Research Assistant Professors, Research Associate Professors and Research Professors, are appointed only after the faculty at or above the desired level have had a chance to review a c.v. Faculty to whom the Research Faculty member reports is expected to make the presentation to the faculty members making the decision. Research Faculty may be elected to membership in the Graduate Faculty.

Promotion from Research Assistant Professor to Research Associate Professor or from Research Associate Professor to Research Professor must be requested by the Research faculty member and endorsed by their faculty supervisor. The Research faculty member is expected to provide the standard KSU materials for consideration for Promotion and to have been in rank at KSU for at least as long as normally expected for regular faculty members. Items that may be considered in the evaluation process include all of those used in making decisions on promotion and tenure for regular faculty within the department. Outside reference letters may be solicited by the Department Head at his/her discretion.

Faculty at or above the rank to which the Research Faculty member is requesting promotion evaluate the submitted materials. This evaluation is made in light of the Research Faculty member’s activities and expectations in his/her regular position. Voting may be by voice vote or paper ballot, at the discretion of the Department Head. The Department Head is responsible for notifying the Research Faculty member of the Department’s decision. If the vote is not in favor of the promotion then the Head provides a summary of the information from the faculty meeting that resulted in the negative decision to the Research faculty member and to the Professors and/or Associate Professors who participated in the decision and the Dean. Results of a favorable decision will be conveyed in writing in a letter to the Research Faculty member and copied to the Dean and to the Research Faculty member’s supervisor.

This document was approved by the Plant Pathology faculty in a vote October 24, 2008