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EVALUATION PROCEDURES
Annual Evaluation Timeline

December/January:

Faculty members submit a file summarizing their activities for the preceding calendar year to the department head. The file must include an annual summary of significant effort in the categories of Teaching, Research, and Service (including administrative duties if applicable, see “Workload Distribution” on page 6); along with updated curriculum vita, workload summary, and one- and five-year plans.

January:

The members of the Merit Salary Committee¹ and the department head read the files and make individual assessments on each faculty. The committee members meet with the department head and report their assessments.

January/February:

After consulting with the Merit Salary Committee, the department head assigns numerical evaluations of faculty members in each of the three areas (Teaching, Research, and Service) using a scale of 1-4, 4 being the highest. Summary letters are submitted to the faculty. The letter includes a statement addressing the perception of whether the faculty member has:

1 = Fallen below minimum acceptable levels of productivity (“Below expectations”)
2 = Met the minimum acceptable levels of productivity (“Meets expectations”)
3 = Exceeded the expectations of the department (“Above expectations”)
4 = Far exceeded the expectations of the department (“Well above expectations”)

Evaluations are primarily decided by the department head in consultation with the Merit Salary Committee. Specifically, each faculty member will be rated on each of the three categories (Teaching, Research, and Service) according to the standard shown above. Written justification will be provided for each rating. The annual evaluation meeting will be scheduled to review the evaluation and the one- and five-year plans. During the meeting, the department head will inform each faculty member about how that individual might improve their rating for the following year.

Faculty members receive the original evaluation, sign the original (indicating that it has been reviewed), and return it to the department head. The faculty member receives a copy for their records. The original document is submitted to the dean and a copy of that evaluation is kept in the department personnel file for each faculty member.

Faculty members may rebut the evaluation. Rebuttals must be submitted in writing directly to the department head. If rebuttals remain unresolved, the faculty member may articulate their position, in written form, with supporting documentation and the department head will forward the documentation to the dean. For any unresolved differences, procedures will be followed according to the University Handbook.

¹ The Merit Salary Committee will be chosen by the department head and will consist of two full-time faculty members, one of whom must be tenured. The committee members will be evaluated for merit salary increases by the department head.
May/July:

Actual merit salary amounts are determined once the monetary amounts are allocated to the university by the state government in the spring. Faculty appointment contracts are usually sent out between May and July.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty Evaluation

All non-tenure track faculty (e.g., Instructors, Research Assistants) submit evaluation materials documenting their departmental activities by following the same timelines as tenured and tenure-track faculty. According to the workload assigned, the documentation may include the submission of a vita, yearly activities, workload summary, and one- and five-year plans. The department head includes evaluation letters on non-tenure track faculty activities and recommendations, as appropriate, to the dean at the same time all other evaluation letters for tenured and tenure-track faculty members are submitted.
EVALUATION PROCEDURES
Merit Salary

1) Prior to the evaluation, faculty members are asked to submit their updated curriculum vita and a file summarizing their activities for the preceding calendar year to the department head. The file must include an annual summary of significant effort in the categories of Teaching, Research, and Service (including administrative duties if applicable); a workload summary; and a portfolio consisting of supporting materials for each of the three categories.

A one- and five-year projection of professional goals is also requested from each faculty member. Since these projections are annually updated, changes may be expected to occur. The focus and content of the goals are an important line of communication between the faculty member and the department head to consider both personal and departmental needs. Progress toward the successful completion of the stated goals is considered in the evaluation process.

2) The department head will appoint two members to the Merit Salary Committee. One person will serve a two-year term, and the other person a one-year term. No faculty member can serve for more than two consecutive years. Only tenured members can serve as chair. Untenured members can serve on the committee, but only in one year, non-consecutive terms. This committee reviews submitted materials and makes recommendations on all areas of faculty assignment: Teaching, Research, and Service (including administrative duties if applicable). The chair of the committee will produce a one-page draft evaluation letter for each person under review (excluding her/himself). This draft will be shared with the department head electronically prior to when the department head meets with the committee. The department head can use this draft as the starting point for her/his written evaluation. After the Merit Salary Committee meeting, members of this committee will be directed to provide to the department head all written and electronic materials they used to develop their evaluations. The department head will store these materials in case of an appeal.

3) This process includes university sanctioned student evaluations. All faculty members must submit student evaluations of their courses each semester. The Merit Salary Committee, in conducting its review process, will utilize student evaluations as well as the faculty member’s portfolio to evaluate teaching effectiveness.

4) The department head and each member of the Merit Salary Committee will independently assign a numerical evaluation using a scale of 1 to 4 (with 4 being the highest) to each of the three areas (Teaching, Research, and Service). Then, the ratings for each of these areas will be weighted based on the relative percentages assigned to Teaching, Research, and Service. These weighted ratings from each area (Teaching, Research and Service) will then be combined to produce a single score per evaluator. Each evaluator’s score will be weighted and combined to produce a final score. The department head’s score will count for 50% of the final score, while the scores of each committee member will count for 25% of the final score. Adjustments to the final score for annual evaluation can be made by the department head in consultation with the Merit Salary Committee on the basis of collegiality (see “Statement of Collegiality” on page 14).

---

2 The relative weights assigned to Teaching, Research, and Service (including administrative duties) for each faculty member will be determined in consultation with the department head one year in advance of the final evaluation. Any changes in the weights should be made in consultation with the department head. The weights must sum to 100% across all categories.
5) A letter is then written to each faculty member that includes concerns as well as positive statements regarding the individual’s performance. The wording of the department head’s evaluation letter will clearly state the department head’s scores (1-4) for that review year.

6) Faculty members sign a copy of the evaluation letter stating that it has been reviewed. If there is disagreement, faculty members have the opportunity to articulate their position in written form with any supporting documentation to the department head and the department head will forward the documentation to the dean. For any unresolved differences, procedures will be followed according to the University Handbook. Then, a meeting is held with the individual faculty members and the department head.
EVALUATION PROCEDURES
Workload Distribution and Load Adjustments

Workload Distribution

Faculty members at the rank of Instructor are expected to carry a twenty-four credit hour teaching load per year (8 courses/year), and this will be considered 85-90% of their load. Instructors are also expected to assume service responsibilities, and this will constitute 10-15% of their load. Coaching assignments will be treated as a percentage of the teaching responsibility and will not exceed 50% of the teaching distribution.

Faculty at each of the three professorial ranks are expected to carry a fifteen hour teaching load per academic year (5 courses/year) that includes advising graduate students, producing scholarly research, and involvement in service. Faculty must contribute annually in these three areas. The following percentages are given as an indication of the general expectations of the department concerning the importance of each area of performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Minimum or Maximum %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Minimum 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Minimum 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Minimum 10% &amp; Maximum 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Maximum 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A faculty member with significant departmental or university administrative responsibilities may allocate up to 20% of merit for administration (i.e., Director of Basic Course, Director of Graduate Program). This time may be reallocated from any of the other three areas of merit as negotiated and approved by the department head prior to the beginning of the annual evaluation period. The minimum percentages for the other three areas of merit do not apply to those with administrative responsibilities. The merit evaluation associated with the activities of each director will be reported and evaluated under the area of administration.

All weights must add up to 100%. Faculty members may negotiate the distribution percentages during their annual evaluation with the department head if so desired.

Load Adjustments

Reductions of load will be negotiated with the department head during the evaluation meeting. Decisions will be based on the needs of the department and program. Load reductions involve administering a major program of the Department (e.g., serving as Director of Graduate Program, Director of Public Speaking, Director of Forensics, Director of Debate).
1. Curriculum Vitae

A current file of all faculty members’ curriculum vitae should be kept in the main office. It is the responsibility of faculty members to provide an updated curriculum vita for the files in their evaluation portfolios. The due date for evaluation portfolios will be in December/January, with the exact date to be set by the department head. Faculty members on the Merit Salary Committee must submit the same evidence as all other faculty members.

2. Reflective Statement

Each faculty member should submit a reflective statement addressing a summary of significant effort in the categories of Teaching, Research, and Service (maximum length of one single-spaced page per each area). The reflective statement serves two purposes: a) to give a narrative context to the materials submitted in the portfolio, in relationship to the evaluation criteria described below and b) to give faculty an opportunity to reflect on the previous year’s experiences and discuss how they’ve grown.

The reflective statement should include, at minimum, discussion of the successes, challenges, and growth related to the categories of Teaching, Research, and Service (including administrative duties if applicable). Faculty may also use the reflective statement to make the case for inclusion of certain items in the portfolio (e.g., why a particular activity should count as service, why a long-term research project should count toward one’s research). A description of each class, research, or service activity may also be helpful to the committee.

3. One- and Five-Year Plans

Each faculty member should submit one-year plan (one single-spaced page) organized into Teaching, Research, and Service and five-year plan (one single-spaced page) organized into Teaching, Research, and Service.

4. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

The teaching portion of the portfolio should represent materials from each course taught, including syllabi, TEVALs, and students’ comments. Additionally, each faculty member can choose to include any other materials that indicate efforts made to improve teaching and advising effectiveness (see “The Teaching Portfolio” on page 9 for suggested materials).

5. Evidence of Research Productivity

Faculty should include a list of all research activities conducted during the calendar year. Research efforts may be documented by such items as publication of books, articles, book chapters, and book reviews; presentations at conventions, conferences, and similar forums; submission of grant proposals; publication of instructional resources, and work-in-progress (e.g., long-term research projects). Research may be included in one’s evaluation materials in the year it was accepted, or the year it was presented or published, but not both.

Faculty engaged in long-term research projects (e.g., book or multi-year grant) must negotiate with the department head regarding the project, and submit a copy of the work and a report that discusses the year’s progress.
6. Evidence of Service Activities

Faculty should include a list of all service activities conducted during the calendar year. Service includes service to the department/university, to the profession, and to the public (if profession-based). Service can be evidenced in the form of letters of invitation and appreciation, printed programs, committee minutes, newspaper articles, and the like.

7. Summary Sheet

Faculty should include a one-page summary sheet that highlights, from the faculty member’s perspective, the major accomplishments in Teaching, Research, and Service (including administrative duties if applicable).
Suggested List of Materials:

Materials for Classroom Teaching

1) A syllabus for each course taught which includes, at a minimum,
   • Course goals/objectives
   • Program Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) met by the course
   • Course reading list
   • Evaluation and grading procedures
   • Schedule of readings, assignments, graded projects, exams
   • Office hours, address, phone numbers, e-mail
   • Mandatory university syllabi statements concerning academic honesty, academic accommodations for students with disabilities, and student conduct. (http://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/teaching/course.html)

   Evidence of student learning/response: Faculty should offer evidence of student learning in the context of those student learning outcomes (SLOs) identified in the course syllabus. It is incumbent upon the faculty to provide the Merit Salary Committee appropriate evidence of student learning. At a minimum, each faculty member must submit formal student evaluations (e.g., TEVALs) for each course taught. Faculty members can also choose to submit examples of assessment tools such as exams, special projects, and assignments (with student responses and instructor feedback when applicable).

Materials for Teaching Enhancement

2) Evidence of teaching enhancement: Any ongoing efforts to improve one’s teaching should be included in the portfolio. Faculty must make the case in the reflective statement for why activities should be considered teaching enhancement, by how each activity has improved one’s teaching or has been incorporated into a particular course(s). Teaching enhancement may include:
   • Attending conventions, workshops, seminars on pedagogy
   • Developing and gaining approval for new curriculum/courses
   • Participating in teaching circles/partnerships/mentoring
   • Leading seminars/workshops on teaching issues
   • Researching/studying pedagogical materials
   • Conducting peer evaluation of teaching
   • Guest lecturing in courses in/outside the department

Materials for Coaching Effectiveness

3) Coaching forensics and debate can be evidenced by letters from external reviewers and official notification of national qualifications, rankings, championships, etc. Other indicators of forensics and debate teaching effectiveness can be obtained from student achievements (e.g., trophies, medals, certificates). These data must be evaluated in the context of the amount of support given to the program and the goals of the program.

Materials for Advising

4) Graduate student advising: Supervision of M.A. thesis/report can be evidenced by a list of advisees, project titles, and the quality of final product as judged by department head and Merit Salary Committee.
5) Serving on M.A. committee: Serving as a committee member on M.A. thesis/report/comprehensive exams can be evidenced by a list of graduate students.
6) Undergraduate advising: This can be evidenced by a list of all undergraduate advisees.
EVALUATION PROCEDURES
Criteria for Teaching Effectiveness

Quality teaching is a high priority for our department. Teaching includes lecturing in the classroom, preparing new or revised course materials, conducting seminars, advising undergraduate and graduate students, supervising master’s theses/reports, overseeing independent study courses, mentoring students outside the classroom, and coaching debate and forensics. Some may focus their efforts more on undergraduate education while others carry a larger responsibility for graduate instruction.

At a minimum, faculty members are expected to:

- Carry normal teaching loads
- Maintain an up-to-date knowledge in each subject taught
- Provide a clear and coherent style of presentation
- Provide a supportive learning environment that stimulates students’ interest and an appreciation for our discipline
- Intellectually challenge students
- Hold students accountable to reasonable standards of performance
- Meet students’ academic advising needs
- Be accessible to students during posted office hours
- Meet with classes on a regular basis or provide an alternative learning experience
- Provide evidence of satisfactory teaching competence using a combination of student evaluations syllabi, and other teaching materials

In addition, all graduate faculty members are expected to serve as major advisors and members on graduate student committees.

Teaching effectiveness is evaluated as follows:

- ‘Well above expectations’ if the faculty member demonstrates exemplary teaching with respect to the expectations outlined above.
- ‘Above expectations’ if the faculty member demonstrates teaching that exceeds the expectations outlined above.
- ‘Meets expectations’ if the faculty member meets the expectations outlined above.
- ‘Below expectations’ if the faculty member fails to meet the expectations outlined above.

It is expected that faculty members who coach a competitive team (debate or individual events) are continuously engaged in forensic activity and committed to make progress towards a successful debate and individual events program. At a minimal level, a forensics faculty member is expected to:

- Travel to six tournaments a year
- Have six debaters or twelve individual events participants on the team per year
- Spend three contact hours coaching participants per week
- Have two squad meetings per month
- Operate within budget, unless an exception is made by the department head

Coaching effectiveness is evaluated as follows:

- ‘Well above expectations’ if rigor is evidenced in the program (e.g., frequent practice rounds, frequent coach/student contact), the team is large or growing, and:
  - The Debate Team has a national ranking of the top 10 percent, qualifies two teams to the National Debate Tournament or has a team qualify for a first round at-large bid to, or reach
elimination rounds of the National Debate Tournament, or clears 3 teams at the CEDA National tournament, or places a team in the top 4 at the CEDA national tournament.

- **‘Above expectations’** if rigor is evidenced in the program, the team is large or growing, and:
  - The Debate Team has a national ranking of the top 11-20 percent or qualifies a team to the National Debate Tournament, or clears 2 teams at the CEDA National tournament.
  - The Individual Events Team has 30+ entries at the AFA-NIET or has regionally placed in the top three in sweepstakes for 45 to 59 percent of the year's tournaments, not including Districts or Nationals; or placed in the top 15 at Nationals.

- **‘Meets expectations’** if rigor is evidenced in the program, the team is large or growing, and:
  - The Debate Team has a national team ranking between 21 and 40 percent, or clears 1 team at CEDA.
  - The Individual Events Team has 20+ entries at the AFA-NIET or has regionally placed in the top three in sweepstakes for 30 to 44 percent of the year's tournaments, not including Districts or Nationals; or placed in the top 20 at Nationals.

- **‘Below expectations’** if rigor is lacking in the program, the team is small or declining, or:
  - The Debate Team has a national team ranking between 41 and 60 percent.
  - The Individual Events Team has under 20 entries at the AFA-NIET or has regionally placed in the top three in sweepstakes for 15 to 29 percent of the year's tournaments, not including Districts or Nationals or hasn’t placed in the top 20 at Nationals.

Coaches are expected to perform additional duties as part of their coaching assignment. These duties may include: recruiting students, arranging the logistics of travel, accounting for expenditures and budgeting, making decisions about program activities, supervising and coordinating graduate assistants within a program, scheduling student activities, preparing annual reports, running tournaments, and/or building a long-term sustainable version of the team (e.g. increasing scholarships/endowments). The department head may also consider performance of these duties when performing a coaching evaluation. The department head will take into consideration the teams’ budget when evaluating the coaches. Coaching shall constitute 30-50% of the teaching load. Percentages will be negotiated with the department head prior to the evaluation period.

The evaluation of the director of the debate or individual events team will include all of the above criteria in addition to an evaluation by the assistant director as to whether the director’s work for the program has been well above expectations, ‘above expectations,’ ‘meets expectations,’ or ‘below expectations.’ At minimum, the evaluation will assess the following areas: management of the team’s resources, effectiveness in carrying out the responsibilities of the director of the team, effectiveness related to interactions with the members of the team and the assistant director, and quality of the coaching provided by the director. The evaluation will use agreed upon criteria between the assistant director, the department head and the director.

The evaluation of the assistant director of the debate or individual events team will include all of the above criteria in addition to an evaluation by the director as to whether the assistant director’s work for the program has been well above expectations, ‘above expectations,’ ‘meets expectations,’ or ‘below expectations.’ The evaluation will use agreed upon criteria between the assistant director, the department head and the director. At minimum, the evaluation will assess the following areas: effectiveness in assisting the director, carrying out responsibilities assigned by the director, effectiveness related to interactions with the members of the team and the director, and quality of the coaching provided by the assistant director.
Assistant professors are expected to provide a steady flow of research to establish their ability as productive scholars. Associate and full professors should engage in long-term projects, which establish or maintain national reputations. The primary evidence that a faculty member is maintaining an active research agenda during an annual evaluation period is to meet the following expectation.

All faculty members are expected to engage in one or more of the following activities:

- Present a peer reviewed paper at a professional conference
- Work on one or more scholarly studies (e.g., a book length manuscript(s), an externally funded research proposal)
- Publish one or more scholarly works in appropriate outlets (e.g., journals, edited books, university/commercial presses)
- Secure external research funding

All faculty, however, experience substantial time commitments when they design, conduct, and publish/or present research; write book chapters or books; and prepare, submit, and revise proposals for extramural financial support. Consequently, research will be evaluated on the basis of a three-year “rolling average” (i.e., year one = 50% of research evaluation; year two = 30% of research evaluation; year three = 20% of research evaluation). Research may be included in one’s evaluation materials in the year it was accepted, or the year it was presented or published, but not both.

Research productivity is evaluated as follows:

- ‘Well above expectations’ if the faculty member has published an article-length paper in a refereed, discipline sponsored journal, or some equivalent thereof, e.g. published a book (which may be carried over two years of evaluation) or had a major off-campus grant proposal accepted (which may be carried over for each year of external funding). Major grants include overhead charges.
- ‘Above expectations’ if the faculty member has published an article-length paper in a refereed journal that is not sponsored by an academic discipline, published a competitive chapter in a book; submitted a major off-campus grant proposal as a Principal or Co-Principal Investigator; had an off-campus grant funded that did not include overhead dollars; or some equivalent thereof.
- ‘Meets expectations’ if the faculty member has presented a research paper at a conference or some equivalent thereof, e.g., published an invited book chapter or demonstrated substantial progress on a research project.
- ‘Below expectations’ if the faculty member has not published or presented a paper (or the equivalent) for a given calendar year of evaluation, or cannot demonstrate progress on a research project.

The final evaluation earned by a faculty member in the area of research depends on the volume of research activities, the quality of these research activities, and the extent to which these research activities match the goals of the university’s visionary plan.
EVALUATION PROCEDURES
Criteria for Service Activities

All faculty members are expected to contribute to the department/university, the profession, and the public (if profession-based).

- Department/University service includes serving on departmental and university committees, recruiting activities, assisting student organizations, undertaking special assignments, and engaging in other services rendered to the department or university.
- Professional service includes holding office in a professional organization, organizing conferences or sessions, or responding to or chairing sessions; editorial or refereed activities undertaken in the context of work done by professional organizations or by other academic institutions; and other service to the profession.
- Public service involves engagement activities in partnerships with the community; consulting work that benefits the university or the discipline; community outreach; community-based service learning projects that are not listed under the teaching section.

While service outside the department is encouraged and rewarded by the current faculty evaluation system, satisfactory service at the departmental level is required to meet the minimal performance standard.

At a minimum, faculty members are expected to:
- Contribute positively to the department through attending faculty meetings,
- Accept appropriate committee assignments, and
- Assist with appropriate outreach activities of the department, including recruiting new students through Majors Fair, Open House, and student clubs.

Service activities are evaluated as follows:
- ‘Well above expectations’ if the faculty member has performed extraordinary service to the department, university, external public, and/or discipline.
- ‘Above expectations’ if the faculty member has performed significant service to the department, university, external public, and/or discipline.
- ‘Meets expectations’ if the faculty member has performed the minimal expectation for service to the department, university, external public, and/or discipline (see above).
- ‘Below expectations’ if the faculty member has (1) not performed an average amount of service to the department, university, external public, and/or discipline or (2) has engaged in behaviors that work to undermine the morale and/or constructive relationships within the department.
STATEMENT OF COLLEGIALITY

All faculty members are expected to conduct themselves in ways that foster goodwill, harmony, and collegiality within the department. They are expected to contribute to the pursuit of departmental goals, protect the self-esteem of students and colleagues, mentor colleagues, and generally contribute to creating a congenial academic environment for the department and its faculty. Examples consistent with positive academic citizenship include:

- Maintains professional rapport with colleagues, staff, and students.
- Contributes to common goals of the department.
- Honors the confidence of departmental discussions involving personnel or other sensitive issues.
- Expresses respect for and support of colleagues, even when disagreements arise.
- Supports an atmosphere of academic freedom, inquiry, and respect for the academic rights of others.

Failure to exhibit such civility can affect a faculty member’s overall evaluation, at the discretion of the department head in consultation with the Merit Salary Committee.

All faculty members are expected to follow the standards of professional conduct described in the University Handbook, Section D12.
REAPPOINTMENT

To be reappointed on an annual basis non-tenured, tenure track faculty should be making adequate progress toward tenure and promotion as described in “Tenure and Promotion” (page 20). Faculty members on a tenure-track appointment must go through the reappointment process until they are granted tenure. In this process, probationary faculty will submit evaluation materials to the department head who distributes these materials to all tenured faculty members. The tenured faculty then vote on reappointment and the department head will make recommendation to the dean.

Notice of non-reappointment

- First year faculty members receive notice of non-reappointment three months prior to the end of the academic year during their first full year of employment.
- Faculty members in the second year of their employment receive notice of non-reappointment six months prior to the end of the academic year.
- After their second full year of employment faculty members receive notice of non-reappointment one full year in advance of termination.
MID-TENURE REVIEW
Procedures for Mid-Tenure Review

The mid-tenure review (MTR) will be conducted at the latest during the second semester of the probationary faculty member's third full year at Kansas State University. This review is intended to provide tenure-track faculty members with assessments of their performance by the tenured faculty in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service; for the tenured faculty to comment on the probationary faculty member's long-range plans for research, and other scholarly activities; to determine if the accomplishments and goals of the probationary faculty member are consistent with the missions and expectations of the Department.

At the beginning of the academic year in which the review is to occur the department head will inform the candidate of the review and of his/her responsibilities concerning the review.

The candidate should access “Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Mid-Tenure Review Documentation” located at the Office of Academic Personnel website (http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/) and complete the MTR documentation packet no later than January 15th. Outside letters of evaluation will not be sought.

The MTR documentation packet, along with the department head’s description of the faculty member’s responsibilities and a current vita, is made available for review by the tenured faculty. The tenured faculty members make recommendations regarding the strengths and/or weaknesses of the candidate’s materials to the department head.

The department head will review the candidate’s document, the recommendations of the faculty and make an independent recommendation supporting or failing to support appointment of the candidate to the fifth year of service. The department head will explain her/his recommendation to the candidate and to the faculty.

If tenured faculty should recommend that the probationary faculty member should not be reappointed, then the appeal procedure that is used in the case of denial of promotion and/or tenure may be used by the probationary faculty member. All appeals must follow the procedures found in the University Handbook, C45.3.

The MTR document, the faculty vote and summary of comments, and the department head's recommendation will be forwarded to the dean of the college by the first week of March.
MID-TENURE REVIEW
Standards for Mid-Tenure Review

Standard

It is expected that the faculty member being reviewed should be able to demonstrate an ability to teach a variety of courses at both undergraduate and graduate levels and to be an effective advisor. They should also have a research agenda and record of publications submitted or accepted that will indicate a potential for meeting the standard for tenure and promotion in at least three years. They should be participating in and contributing to the committees and affairs of this department.

Criteria

The criteria used for this review are the same as for tenure and promotion adjusted for the time in rank.
TENURE AND PROMOTION
Procedures for Tenure and Promotion

Candidates will normally be considered for tenure during the final year of the maximum probationary period, although, in exceptional cases, candidates with outstanding records in Teaching, Research, and Service may be considered for tenure at an earlier date. In all cases of tenure as well as promotion, a written request should be submitted to the department head by the end of the first week in September, by the candidate.

1. Dossier

The candidate for tenure and/or promotion is requested to submit a complete dossier, in accordance with formats and procedures provided by the provost and dean (see “Guidelines for the Organization and Format Tenure and Promotion Documentation” found at: http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/).

2. External Evaluation

In order to evaluate the quality of the candidate’s work, the department will obtain three external reviews. The department head will request the candidate and members of the qualified faculty3 to provide a list of potential external reviewers. The list should be submitted to the department head by September 15. The candidate’s former advisors and co-authors are specifically excluded as possible evaluators. The department head will inform the candidate of the names of all potential evaluators and provide her/him with an opportunity to comment on them. The candidate may request the department head to exclude certain individuals as external evaluators. The department head will choose the names of three evaluators to perform the external reviews. If one or more of the initially chosen external evaluators should be unable or should decline to review the candidate, then the department head should make a reasonable attempt in her/his selection of alternate external evaluators. The department head will write the external evaluators and provide them with (1) a copy of the candidate’s curriculum vitae, (2) a copy of the candidate's statement, and (3) a copy of up to five of the candidate's publications (including manuscripts “accepted” and “submitted”).

Each external reviewer will be requested to: (1) evaluate the candidate's research work and accomplishments, and (2) compare the candidate with others in the same general area of research who are at a comparable career level. These letters must be mailed to the external reviewers by the last week of September. When the letters from external reviews return, they are added to the candidate’s promotion/tenure document. The completed external reviews will be accompanied by a copy of the letter that was sent to the external evaluator. All solicited letters of evaluation concerning the candidate that are received must be included in the promotion/tenure document.

3. Faculty Review

By the last week in October, qualified members of the faculty and the department head will meet to discuss the case for promotion and/or tenure of the candidate. At that meeting, the department head will summarize the external letters for the qualified faculty. The qualified faculty may review the external letters upon request.

---

3 Qualified faculty are those faculty already holding the position or rank the candidate is seeking. For example, the qualified faculty to vote on tenure decisions are those faculty already tenured. The qualified faculty to vote on promotion to full professor are those already at the rank of full professor.
Within five business days subsequent to the faculty member’s discussion of the candidate, each qualified member of the faculty will submit a written recommendation/ballot to the department head. Justifications of individual votes may or may not be provided by the faculty. At the close of the voting period, the department head will record the vote.

4. Department Recommendation

The department head will review the candidate’s promotion/tenure document, the external reviews, and the recommendations of the faculty and make an independent recommendation by the first week of November supporting or failing to support promotion/tenure of the candidate. On the same date the department head will explain his/her recommendation to the candidate and the faculty members.

5. Appeal Procedure

If the candidate should wish to appeal the recommendation of either the faculty or the department head, the request for reconsideration must be made in writing by the candidate within three normal working days of the candidate’s notification of the recommendations. The candidate must present in writing the arguments for reconsideration and provide at that time to the department head any additional evidence that supports the candidate’s position.

If the candidate requests reconsideration of the faculty’s recommendation, the department head will convene a meeting of the qualified faculty at least one week before recommendations must be sent to the dean to consider the candidate’s written arguments and additional evidence. Within one business day of the conclusion of the meeting, each qualified faculty member will submit a second, written recommendation to the department head. Participation in a reconsideration vote will be restricted to members of the qualified faculty, and will be conducted in the same manner as in the original vote. The final recommendations of the faculty and the department head will be transmitted in writing to the candidate and to qualified faculty.

6. Forwarding Procedures

After the candidate has studied the recommendations, the candidate decides whether or not to withdraw her/his application. If the candidate wishes to continue the process, then the promotion/tenure document is forwarded to the dean. The department head will include the results of the secret ballot, the summary of the faculty’s justifications, including verbatim comments from the ballots, and her/his written recommendation.
TENURE AND PROMOTION
Standards for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

The successful candidate for promotion and tenure is expected to show excellence and maturity in Teaching and Research. Service to the department, the university, and the larger academic/professional community also is expected. A faculty member will not be tenured or promoted on the basis of outstanding contribution to Research, Teaching, or Service alone. All three areas will be considered for tenure and promotion.

Research
The successful candidate for promotion and tenure is expected to show maturity in his/her research program. The candidate must establish a regional reputation and demonstrate the potential to acquire a national and/or international reputation in his/her sub-discipline. The following are the Department’s expectations for a candidate’s publication record at the time of the promotion and tenure decision.

At least five peer-reviewed articles in quality academic journals with significant contribution are expected.

- A peer-reviewed book published by a university or commercial press can count for as many as three peer-reviewed articles depending on the quality of the press and the author rank (i.e., first, second, third author).
- A peer-reviewed edited book published by a university or commercial press can count as one or two peer-reviewed articles depending on the scope of the scholarship, the quality of the press, and author rank (i.e., first, second, third author).
- A peer-reviewed edited book chapter may count as one peer-reviewed article up to a maximum of two of these types of publications (including an edited book) depending on the scope of the scholarship, the quality of the press, and author rank (i.e., first, second, third author).
- Successful extramural funding can count as one or two peer-reviewed articles depending on the scope and the nature of the grant, prestige of the granting agency, and whether the candidate is the PI, co-PI, or an investigator.

To apply towards tenure, books, articles, chapters, etc., must be formally accepted by the publisher. Evidence of such acceptance should be submitted.

Teaching
Teaching excellence is essential for promotion and tenure in this department. To be considered for promotion and tenure, the candidate must demonstrate his/her ability to teach effectively at both the undergraduate and graduate level of instruction. Teaching effectiveness may be measured by the quality of instruction, scholarly content of the courses taught, and interactions with students as an instructor and advisor.

Evidence of good teaching includes student evaluations, peer reviews, thesis supervision, student accomplishments under supervision of the faculty member, teaching awards, evaluation of student advisement, letters of appreciation from former students, and any other evidence of instructional productivity.

Service
While a candidate is expected to participate in and contribute to departmental affairs and committees where possible, s/he should also contribute professionally beyond the Department.
TENURE AND PROMOTION
Standards for Promotion to Full Professor

To be considered for promotion to full professor, a faculty member must maintain or exceed the level of performance required of the Associate Professor in all three categories (i.e., Teaching, Research, and Service). To be promoted to full professor, the candidate should establish a national or international reputation in the discipline or within his or her sub-discipline. The candidate should also have a distinguished record in teaching and service to the university.

Research
The publication standards for promotion to full professor are six peer-review journal articles or their equivalents (as noted in standards for promotion to associate), a majority of which should be sole or first-authored, and all of which should be appear in high impact publication outlets. Some of the publications should feature collaboration with graduate students or assistant professors. A textbook publication may count for one or two peer-review journal articles depending on how much original research is involved in its publication, sole or first-authorship, and the quality of the publication house. The candidate is expected to be involved in and show evidence of efforts to apply for extramural funding. The candidate should also present a research plan to cover the next five years.

Teaching
Candidates are expected to teach effectively at all levels and to advise both undergraduate and graduate students as part of their teaching responsibilities. The candidate should demonstrate a willingness to meet with students, write letters of recommendation and mentor them in their careers. Candidates should have evidence of supervision of graduate students.

To evaluate the quality of the candidate’s teaching, the Department will review student evaluations and solicit copies of the candidate’s syllabi and other relevant course materials developed over the period since tenure.

Service
A candidate for full professor should demonstrate involvement in areas of university and community service related to his or her expertise.

Professional Standing
The candidate is expected to demonstrate his or her involvement in the discipline at a significant level. Evidence of such noteworthy involvement at the national/international level may include participation in panels at professional meetings, participation in governance of professional associations, service on editorial boards of journals, frequency of citation by other scholars in the field, and service as a peer reviewer for journals and book publishers.
CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT POLICY

All tenured faculty members must: 1) provide a competent level of instruction, 2) maintain a research program, and 3) perform service responsibilities. Each of these three areas is essential to the mission of the department. If the following minimal standards are not met on overall performance evaluation, “dismissal for cause” proceedings will follow (see University Handbook, Section C31.5-31.8).

Teaching
At a minimum, faculty are expected to:
- Carry normal teaching loads
- Serve as a major advisor and members on graduate student committees
- Maintain an up-to-date knowledge in each subject taught
- Provide a clear and coherent style of presentation
- Provide a supportive learning environment that stimulates students’ interest and an appreciation for our discipline
- Intellectually challenge students
- Hold students accountable to reasonable standards of performance
- Meet students’ academic advising needs
- Be accessible to students during posted office hours
- Meet with classes on a regular basis or provide an alternative learning experience
- Provide evidence of satisfactory teaching competence using a combination of student evaluations syllabi, and other teaching materials

Research
At a minimum, faculty are expected to receive a three-year moving average score of “met expectations” or higher for merit in the area of research.

Service
Minimum standards will be met if the faculty member serves in a satisfactory manner at the departmental, university or disciplinary levels.

Administrative Action for Chronic Low Achievement

The Department will follow Sections C31.5-31.8 of the University Handbook concerning administrative actions to be taken upon the identification of chronic low achievement.

“When a tenured faculty member’s overall performance falls below the minimum-acceptable level, as indicated by the annual evaluation, the department or unit head shall indicate so in writing to the faculty member. The department head will also indicate, in writing, a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member. In subsequent annual evaluations, the faculty member will report on activities aimed at improving performance and any evidence of improvement. The names of faculty members who fail to meet minimum standards for the year following the department head’s suggested course of action will be forwarded to the appropriate dean. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which minimum standards are not met, then ‘dismissal for cause’ will be considered at the discretion of the appropriate dean.” (University Handbook)

The department head’s assessment of whether or not a faculty member’s performance is at least minimally acceptable will be based on the expectations listed above. The relationship between a person’s minimal performance expectations and their professional goals in Teaching, Research, and Service are
discussed each year as part of the formal annual evaluation process. The department head will suggest any corrective measures which can be taken to improve a faculty member’s performance once he/she is falls under chronic low achievement.
PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD GUIDELINES

General Orientations

The Professorial Performance Award (PPA) is available to faculty at the rank of full Professor. The PPA is designed to reward faculty for “strong performance” of professional duties by providing a base salary increase beyond what is available through the department’s annual evaluation process. The PPA is not a right accorded to every faculty member at the rank of professor, nor is it granted for routinely meeting assigned duties. It is, rather, awarded for distinguished performance in Teaching, Research, and Service at the (full) professorial level. The PPA is not a promotion. It does not confer “seniority” over other faculty at the rank of Professor. A full description of the PPA is provided in the University Handbook, section C49.1-C49.14.

Eligibility

An eligible candidate for the PPA must be a full-time Professor and have been in rank for at least six years since his/her promotion from Associate Professor, or since last receiving a PPA. The candidate should compile a portfolio that documents his/her professional activities in Teaching, Research, and Service during the eligibility period in accordance with the criteria listed below. This file should be submitted to the department head no later than October 1.

Selection Criteria

In order to earn the PPA, a candidate must meet the criteria below, as specified in the University Handbook, C49.2:

- The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at Kansas State for at least six years since the last promotion or Professional Performance Award.
- The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review.
- The candidate’s productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to full professor according to the current approved departmental guidelines.

Process

In consultation with the department’s Merit Salary Committee, the department head will review the candidate’s file and prepare a written evaluation of his/her materials with respect to the criteria outlined above. The department head will also include a favorable or unfavorable recommendation of the candidate’s PPA application. A copy of the department head’s written evaluation/recommendation will be provided to the candidate and s/he will have an opportunity to discuss the head’s evaluation before it is forwarded to the dean. Both parties will sign a statement acknowledging that they have met and discussed the evaluation. If there remain unresolved differences between the two, the candidate will be afforded the opportunity to submit a written response to his/her PPA evaluation to the department head and dean.

Materials to be forwarded

The department head will forward the following materials to the Dean of Arts & Sciences:

- A copy of those portions of the annual evaluation document used to determine the candidate’s qualifications for the award.
- The candidate’s PPA portfolio.
• A copy of the department head’s written evaluation of the candidate’s PPA portfolio and recommendation to the dean.
• Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the department head’s evaluation/recommendation and to discuss those in person.
• A written statement regarding any unresolved differences concerning the evaluation (prepared by the candidate).