

## **DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY, ANTHROPOLOGY, AND SOCIAL WORK**

### **ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

(Approved by Faculty Vote on) 2/21/97

### **CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT PROCEDURES**

(Approved by Faculty Vote) 3/5/99

### **PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

(Approved by Faculty Vote on) 2/21/97

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES \*(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT): 2/2002

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES\*: 2/2002

Department Head

Date signed: 3/10/99

Peter Nicholls, Dean

Date signed: 3/26/99

James R. Coffman, Provost

Date signed:

\*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.

## **Tenure, Promotion, and Mid-Probationary Review Procedures,**

### **Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work**

**Approved by faculty vote 10-17-93**

#### Rationale

Promotion and tenure are granted to faculty who are recognized by their peers as having demonstrated excellence in the accomplishments of their responsibilities and shown promise of continued professional growth. Each higher rank demands a higher level of accomplishment. Tenure is awarded to faculty members who have demonstrated excellence in teaching and research, whose activities in these areas indicate a high probability of continued research productivity and teaching excellence, and who have competently fulfilled their service activities within the university and the profession. The purpose of the mid-probationary review is to provide faculty with substantive feedback from faculty colleagues and administrators regarding his or her accomplishments relative to departmental tenure criteria (Faculty Handbook, C92.1). Promotion to Associate Professor rests on substantial achievements in the individual's field, such as publications in the leading journals of the field or at least a regional or subdisciplinary reputation among peers. Promotion to Professor is based upon achievement of a national (or international) reputation among peers and demonstration of continued productivity and accomplishments since the time of last promotion.

#### Procedures

1. Tenure track faculty will undergo a mid-probationary review in their third year of employment. This will be a more thorough review than their annual evaluation for reappointment. This review should provide tenure-track faculty members with helpful substantive feedback from departmental colleagues, the department head, and the dean regarding the individual's accomplishments relative to the institution's objectives. The faculty member being evaluated is responsible for assembling a file, such as the one described below (3), documenting her/his accomplishments in the areas of responsibility (i.e., teaching, research, and service). The department head is responsible for making this file available to tenured faculty members in the department and is advised by them regarding the person's progress and the department's needs. Input may also be sought from students, from other faculty in the University and from outside reviewers. The department head discusses the review with the dean of the college and then provides the candidate with a letter of assessment. Finally, the department head discusses the review and assessment with the faculty member.

2. Assistant Professors must become candidates for tenure before or during the sixth year of probationary service in a full-time, tenure-track position. Consideration for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor is expected to occur with the tenure decision (C82.2). For faculty appointed at ranks higher than Assistant Professor the maximum probationary period for gaining tenure consists of five regular annual appointments at Kansas State University. Promotion to Professor normally occurs when a faculty member has demonstrated a national or international reputation in his or her field through productivity since promotion

to the rank of Associate Professor. In consultation with the Department Head, individuals may nominate themselves for promotion and/or tenure consideration. A person may also be nominated by another department member. In either case the nomination will be made to the Department Head no later than October 10. In the case that the person is nominated by someone else, the Department Head will confer with the nominee to determine if s/he wishes to be so considered. Once the nominee agrees to be considered for promotion the Department Head will set a date for a meeting of the tenured faculty of appropriate rank to discuss and vote on the nominee's tenure or promotion. The Head will provide the candidate with the description of the candidate's responsibilities during the review period, and this description will accompany the nominee's file throughout the review process.

3. It is the candidate's responsibility to submit a current curriculum vitae or resume, to submit a list of up to six potential outside reviewers (see below), and to prepare a file documenting her/his accomplishments in the areas of responsibility (i.e., teaching, research, and service). The vitae should list instructional, research, and service activities. On the vitae, the candidate should distinguish refereed from non-refereed publications, and the exact citations for published work should be provided (including the original order in which authors were listed). The list of outside reviewers should consist of the names of highly regarded professionals in the candidate's discipline and research specialty. The candidate may prepare the documentation file in consultation with the Department Head and members of the tenured faculty. The file should contain evidence of teaching excellence, scholarly productivity, and service to the department,

college, university, community, or profession. This file will be submitted, with the application for tenure or promotion, to the Department Head. In general, the file should include the following items and information.

- a. Documentation of instructional activity: List of courses taught; course syllabi; examinations; information on curriculum development activities; listing of advisees; listing of thesis and dissertation committees, indicating chairship where appropriate; student ratings from at least three different courses over the past three years; and any other relevant documentation of excellence in teaching.
- b. Documentation of research activity: Copies of published manuscripts; manuscripts accepted for publication (including letter from editor); manuscripts under review; draft manuscripts; research papers presented; grant proposals submitted (indicating disposition); documents related to research grants in progress.
- c. Documentation of service activity: List of institutional service and professional service activities. "Institutional services involve activities essential to the operation of the university, such as contributions in the formulation of academic policy and programs and service on Faculty Senate and committees and councils of the University" (Faculty Handbook C-45). Professional activity includes consulting, civic governmental or

industrial service or meaningful participation in the activities of professional societies" (Faculty Handbook, C-46).

These materials will be provided to the Department Head by at least two weeks prior to the scheduled meeting of the departmental tenure or promotion committee (see 2, above).

4. It is the Department Head's responsibility to select at least three outside reviewers who will be asked to evaluate the candidate's scholarly accomplishments. At least two of the names will be chosen from the list of names the candidate has suggested. The Head will provide the outside reviewers with the candidate's vita, samples of published work, a description of the candidate's responsibilities during the review period, and assurance that it is our policy that the identity of authors of letters of evaluation will be held in confidence.

Candidates for tenure or promotion should expect that peer evaluations will not be available to them. When the outside evaluations have been returned to the Head, they will be placed with the candidate's other application materials. At least one week before the scheduled meeting of the departmental tenure or promotion committee, the Department Head will then make these materials available to departmental faculty who are eligible to advise on the tenure or promotion decision (see below).

5. The department head is advised of the candidate's qualifications for tenure or promotion by faculty members in the department after reviewing the candidate's file. All tenured faculty members of the department serve as the tenure committee for purposes of advising the head in this matter (C112.1). Promotion committees are composed of departmental faculty in ranks equal to or above that for which the candidate is seeking promotion (C152.1). Thus Associate Professors and Professors advise on promotion to Associate Professor, and Professors advise on promotion to Professor.

Guidelines for Identifying and Handling Cases of Tenured Faculty  
Who Fail to Meet Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity

### **Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work As Revised by Faculty Vote, March 5, 1999**

The Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work is a complex unit, housing five separate degree programs, each with somewhat different needs and, thus, implying different faculty responsibilities. Nevertheless, it is possible to articulate minimum standards for the department as a whole. In general, all faculty members must 1) provide a competent level of instruction, 2) maintain a productive research program, and 3) perform service responsibilities. Clearly the notion of minimum standards is violated when a faculty member chronically and repeatedly fails to meet his or her obligations in assigned areas of responsibility.

Criteria

Teaching. Achieving and maintaining a high quality of instruction is a priority in each of the department's degree programs. Faculty whose obligations include teaching are expected to maintain an up-to-date knowledge of their subjects, meet with their classes as scheduled, teach the class in a manner that stimulates students' interest in and appreciation for a field of study, and seriously and

carefully evaluate student performance in the class. Teaching responsibilities may also include advising students and facilitating student learning outside the classroom. Faculty who frequently do not meet with their classes are not meeting minimum acceptable standards of productivity; the same is true of faculty who are chronically unprepared for class and of faculty who do not work to seriously evaluate student performance.

Research. Faculty in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work are expected to be scholars as well as teachers. That is, not only are they expected to effectively communicate knowledge in the classroom in their respective fields, but, as is commensurate with research universities, they are expected to be producing some of the knowledge that becomes part of those fields by communicating with their peers in their disciplines. A faculty member demonstrates that he or she has met minimum acceptable levels of productivity in research when he or she maintains a continuous program of research and other, equivalent professional activities. Minimum acceptable levels are not met in research when a faculty member's efforts do not include research and professional activities *such as* presenting papers at professional meetings, submitting papers to refereed journals and having some of them published there, publishing scholarly books and chapters in such books, and writing research proposals for external funding.

Service. Departmental, university, and professional service are important aspects of faculty members' obligations. Most faculty are involved in service at various of these levels. However, minimally, faculty members should show a willingness to participate in departmental service in activities that further the department's mission. Of course we recognize that service at other levels (e.g., faculty senate, university committees, professional service) may fulfill service obligations in the absence of departmental service.

#### Procedures

Following section C31.5 of the Faculty Handbook, the evaluation committee (see the department's Procedures for Annual Evaluation) will make a determination of when a

faculty member's overall performance falls below the minimum-acceptable level, and it will advise the Department Head accordingly. The Department Head will indicate this, 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. This document will be developed with the advice and consent of the Evaluation Committee. The Department Head and faculty member will meet together in order to assure that the faculty member understands and agrees with the Course of Action. Minor modifications in the course of action can be made at this time with the agreement of the Department Head and the faculty member. In subsequent evaluations the faculty member will report (in writing) on activities aimed at improving performance as stipulated in the Course of Action and provide any evidence of improvement, and this will become part of the documentation for subsequent evaluations. If the Evaluation Committee determines that the faculty member has fallen below minimum standards in the

subsequent year's evaluation or in the third such evaluation within a five year period, then, unless the concerned faculty

member does not wish it, a meeting of the department's Tenure Committee (i.e., all tenured faculty) will be held in order to review the Evaluation Committee's decision. An ombudsperson will be assigned by the Tenure Committee from among its members to advise the faculty member in preparation for this review. After reviewing the evaluation documents and any other relevant information, with the concerned faculty member permitted to be present, members of the Tenure Committee will vote to reject or accept the evaluation of "fails to meet minimum standards." (Voting will be by signed ballot, as in the tenure and promotion process.) To accept, two thirds of the Tenure Committee members present (including proxies) must vote to concur with the evaluation. Any number short of two thirds will indicate rejection of the evaluation by the tenured faculty. The Department Head will take this vote under advisement in rendering a final decision. The Department Head will not participate in the voting, unless that vote would constitute a two-thirds majority of the Tenure Committee's vote. In the event that the faculty member decides not to have the Tenure Committee review his/her case, then the Department Head will decide whether to accept or reject the evaluation. In reaching this decision, the Department Head may seek the advice of the Evaluation Committee and members of the Tenure Committee. If accepted, the name of the faculty member will be forwarded to the dean.

Procedures for Annual Evaluation of Unclassified Personnel Dept. of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work

Revised and approved by faculty vote February 21, 1997

1. At the beginning of each Fall Semester the Head of the Department appoints three faculty to replace the three members who have completed the second year of their two-year term on the six-member Faculty Evaluation Committee. One is appointed from each of the three distinct programs in the Department, and they are selected with the advice and consent of the faculty in their respective programs. The function of this committee is to review and assess faculty performance and, accordingly, to make recommendations to the Head as to the relative level of performance, including identifying faculty whose performance is viewed as having fallen below the minimum-acceptable level. (See Faculty Handbook, C31.5 and the department's Guidelines and Procedures Relative to Chronic Low Achievement).

2. Each tenure-track faculty member submits a summary of activities for the calendar year. This summary is guided by an outline provided by the Department (see attachment A, i.e. the Activity Report form). The three basic areas of teaching, research, and service are specifically addressed. The Activity Report form identifies specific and general information that each faculty member is to report for the evaluation committee to consider in its deliberations. Each faculty member also must submit summaries of student evaluations of teaching, and a current vita. Evaluation summaries must be submitted for all courses taught as part of the regular, assigned teaching load during the calendar year. The Activity

Report, teaching evaluation summaries, vita, and any appended supporting materials must be submitted to the office at least six weeks before evaluations are due in the dean's office, as indicated by the department Head. These materials are made available to the committee as soon as they are submitted and, if necessary, copies are made.

3. By the end of at least three weeks before evaluations are due in the dean's office, the Faculty Evaluation Committee reviews and assesses the materials provided by the

faculty, meets with the Department Head, and makes recommendations to the Department Head with respect to the evaluation of the faculty for annual merit increases and statements to the faculty concerning their performance and recommendations for improvements. The committee's assessment will take into account the distribution of responsibilities to each faculty being evaluated (see 4 and 6, below), the relative difficulty and importance of these responsibilities, and the level of success with which each was performed.

4. The Department Head, after considering the recommendations of the Faculty Evaluation Committee, prepares and sends to each tenure-track faculty member before at least two weeks before the evaluations are due in the dean's office a copy of their annual merit evaluation. This includes a relative ranking for overall performance and for each of three areas: teaching, research, and service as well as a written discussion of faculty performance over the previous calendar year. The evaluation of overall performance is based upon consideration of each of the three areas. The relative contribution of performance in each area is based upon proportion of effort each faculty member devoted to each area, as established at the beginning of the evaluation period (see 7, below).

5. There are four ranked categories of merit used in the annual evaluation for each of the areas and the overall performance rating: exceptional merit (EM), satisfactory, needs improvement, and unsatisfactory. These are relative rankings only and are not equal interval scales. The rank of satisfactory identifies a fully satisfactory level of performance in a position appropriate to a competent professional at a given level of experience and rank. Exceptional merit refers to outstanding performance in specific areas. Needs improvement refers to specific deficiencies in given areas of performance. Unsatisfactory applies to a substantial or persistent deficiency or demonstrated lack of competence in a performance area. Different rankings within the satisfactory level can also be given. 1

6. After each faculty member has had the opportunity to review their annual merit evaluation, her or she will make an appointment to discuss it with the Department Head. In addition to discussing the evaluation, this meeting will also serve to establish plans for the next evaluation period, including an agreement, to be used as a basis for the next merit evaluation, about the proportionate effort that will be devoted to each of the three major evaluation areas. It is understood that in the course of the evaluation period circumstances may arise that warrant changing

these plans (e.g., new involvement in externally funded research may shift effort away from teaching into research), but any such change will involve an explicit agreement between the Head and the individual faculty member.

7. After the meetings between the Head and each faculty member, the evaluations are sent to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences on or before the dean's deadline.