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*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.
This document describes the procedures, standards, and criteria for reappointment, mid-tenure review, and review for tenure and promotion of tenure-track faculty with full- or part-time appointments in Women’s Studies (WOMST). Throughout this policy document, unless otherwise specified, “Faculty” refers to the full Women’s Studies Faculty, that is: both those with appointments in Women’s Studies and also affiliated faculty from other Kansas State University units (including other departments within the College of Arts and Sciences and other Colleges within the university).

Members of the departmental faculty eligible to vote in non-personnel matters (that is, curriculum, programming, etc) are: core faculty and affiliated faculty. “Core” faculty is defined as those holding an appointment in Women’s Studies that is presumed to extend for more than a year: Regularized Instructors, Tenure-Track, and Tenured faculty. (GTA’s and temporary instructors are not included in this definition of “core”).

I. STANDARDS and PROCEDURES for REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, PROMOTION, PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARDS, and OUT-OF-LOAD COURSE ASSESSMENT of WOMEN’S STUDIES TENURED/TENURE-TRACK FACULTY and INSTRUCTORS

The Personnel Committee

The committee is charged to consider and recommend on all matters of evaluation, salary, and reappointment. The Personnel Committee shall be elected each spring to serve for the following academic year. The committee shall be elected by vote of all members of the Women’s Studies core and affiliated faculty who hold full-time appointments. The committee shall consist of three members of the faculty who hold full-time appointments, no more than two of whom shall be of the same rank, and no more than one of whom shall be an assistant professor. One shall be a core Women’s Studies faculty member. All core faculty members elected to the committee must serve unless, in case of extenuating circumstances, the Program Director excuses them from service. Other elected members are strongly urged to serve, to inform their department heads of their election, and to ask for this service to be included in their service for the year. The program will reelect one member of each year’s Personnel Committee to serve a subsequent year. With this exception, no person must serve on the committee during the two years following a term of service. Those serving a second year due to reelection will have the right to decline for the two years following their service. The committee shall elect its own chairperson.

In September of each year, the committee will produce a calendar that sets the deadlines for upcoming reappointment, mid-tenure, tenure, and promotion procedures. These deadlines will be set far enough in advance so that the candidates have the option to discuss with the committee about its recommendation letters before these letters are distributed to the program and director.
Tenure and Promotion Committee Review and Report

The Director shall appoint a Tenure and Promotion Committee for each candidate composed of three tenured faculty members, including one tenured member of the Personnel Committee. This committee shall study any materials relevant to the candidate’s tenure and promotion and prepare a report and recommendation. Relevant materials include the documentation assembled by the candidate, the responses of the outside evaluators, and records of earlier evaluations. The committee may request any other information it needs from the candidate. Before distributing its report, the committee shall meet with the candidate to answer questions about the report and to consider any changes the candidate may wish to suggest. In the case of a candidate seeking tenure, all core and affiliated tenured members of the program are eligible to vote. In the case of a candidate seeking promotion to full professor, the eligible voting faculty are those members of the program “who hold a rank equal to or higher than the rank sought by the candidate.”(C152.1 in the University Handbook)

A. Standards for Reappointment, Mid-tenure Review, Tenure, Promotion, Professorial Performance Award, and Out-of-Load Evaluation

1) Standards for Reappointment in First and Second Year

   a. Evidence of effective teaching may include syllabi, examples of student work, examinations, student (required) and/or peer evaluations, reflective self-evaluation, and a summary of revisions based on experience and input.

   b. Evidence of research/scholarship/creative activity may include any of a variety of projects related to women’s studies, including grants or research awards supporting scholarly work, publication of scholarly articles in refereed journals, manuscripts or synopses of work-in-progress, products of creative activity, and the like.

   c. Publications (articles, presentations, and the like) in other disciplines will also fulfill Women’s Studies publication requirements if they treat issues of gender.

   d. Evidence of service may include activities in the program, the college, the university, and in professional and public service.

   e. Evidence of interdisciplinarity may include any of a variety of forms in either scholarship or teaching, through such activities as interdisciplinary women’s studies colloquia, courses, and seminars; presentations at conferences and regional or national professional associations focusing on women/gender, or equivalent contact with the literature (editorial board of a women’s studies journal or newsletter), community service and applied research and collaborative projects/grant work with faculty from various disciplines, and ongoing contact with scholars in women’s studies beyond the boundaries of any single field.
2) Standards for Mid-tenure Review (third year)

a. Candidates must show evidence of effective teaching, including syllabi, examples of student work, examinations, student and/or peer evaluations, reflective self-evaluation, and a summary of revisions based on experience and input and the outcomes of those revisions.

b. Candidates should have at least one refereed article accepted for publication. (Publication of one article is a minimum standard for acceptance to the university’s graduate faculty). In addition, any of the various kinds of evidence of research/scholarship/creative activity used for reappointment may also be considered.

c. Candidates should provide evidence of service, including activities in the department or program, the college, the university, and in professional and public service.

d. Candidates should provide evidence of interdisciplinarity that may include any of a variety of forms in either scholarship or teaching, through such activities as interdisciplinary women’s studies colloquia, courses, and seminars; presentations at conferences and regional or national professional associations focusing on women/gender, or equivalent contact with the literature (editorial board of a women’s studies journal or newsletter), community service and applied research and collaborative projects/grant work with faculty from various disciplines, and ongoing contact with scholars in women’s studies beyond the boundaries of any single field.

3) Standards for Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure (before or during sixth year)

a. Candidates must demonstrate clear, sustained scholarly performance beyond the minimum for mid-tenure review that indicates a high probability of continued research productivity, with some, though not necessarily all, in a Women’s Studies area. Publications (articles, presentations, and the like) in other disciplines will also fulfill Women’s Studies publication requirements if they treat issues of gender. Candidates should have at least four (4) articles in refereed journals or collections or the equivalent.

b. Candidates must show evidence of an ongoing record of effective teaching, including syllabi, examples of student work, examinations, student (required) and/or peer evaluations, reflective self-evaluation, and a summary of revisions based on experience and input and the outcomes of those revisions.

c. Candidates must show evidence of significant and ongoing service contributions that include activities within at least two of the following areas: department or program, college, university, and professional and public service.
4) Standards for Promotion to Professor

a. The rank of professor presupposes a superior record in all areas of faculty activity. Candidates are expected to demonstrate leadership in their assigned responsibilities. The standards for promotion to full professor are substantially higher than those for promotion to associate professor.

b. Candidates must demonstrate significant research/scholarship/creative activity since the last promotion. It is expected that the candidate’s sustained scholarly performance has resulted in a national or international reputation in some area of Women’s Studies. This can be demonstrated by discussions of and references to her/his work in the scholarly literature, invitations to give lectures or performances, presentations of papers or exhibits, contributions of articles to edited collections, requests to referee manuscripts, and the like. The minimum expectations since the last promotion are either: (1) a book; or (2) five peer-reviewed articles; or (3) a reasonable equivalent thereof. Accomplishments in other disciplines will also fulfill Women’s Studies requirements if they treat issues of gender.

c. Candidates must show evidence of an ongoing record of excellence in teaching, including syllabi, examples of student work, examinations, student (required) and/or peer evaluations, reflective self-evaluation, and a summary of revisions based on experience and input and the outcomes of those revisions. Successful teaching is measured by student evaluations, the extent to which the candidate has contributed to the teaching mission of the program, the intellectual rigor of her/his courses, special awards, pedagogical innovations, and similar considerations.

d. Candidates must show evidence of significant and ongoing service contributions that include activities within at least two of the following areas: department or program, college, university, and professional and public service. The candidate will be expected to show that she or he has regularly and willingly accepted service assignments and has successfully performed her/his duties since the last promotion.

5) Standards for Professorial Performance Award

a. The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at Kansas State at least six years since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award;

b. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review;

c. The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards.
6) Standards for Assessment of Out-of-Load Courses

a. Instructors of courses taught outside of the regular load for full-time faculty (for example, courses taught by GTA’s, temporary instructors, regular faculty teaching out-of-load or over-load, or others teaching WOMST classes for Women’s Studies through DCE or summer school) will be required to demonstrate that the course satisfied departmental expectations for its level.

B. Procedures for Annual Reappointment, Mid-Tenure Review, Tenure, Promotion, Professorial Performance Award, and Out-of-Load Evaluation

1) Procedures for Annual Reappointment

a. Dates and timelines for reappointment are established by the university. Pre-tenure faculty are considered for reappointment during the spring semester of their first year (for year two), once during the fall (for year three) and again during the spring of their second year (for year four), and during the spring semester in subsequent years until tenure, in accordance with university deadlines.

b. Early in each evaluation period, the Director will meet with each non-tenured faculty member and review her/his individual goals in the three areas of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service.

c. Once goals are set and on file, they can be modified midway through the evaluation period. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ask the Director to consider the modifications.

d. At the appropriate time (see 1)a above), the faculty member is requested to submit an “Activity Report” according to a template provided by the Director for review by the Personnel Committee and, subsequently, the tenured Women’s Studies faculty and the Director. Though teaching evaluations cannot be the sole criterion under consideration, teaching evaluations must be included from each of the faculty member’s Women’s Studies classes. Other evidence of teaching proficiency may include, but is not restricted to, any of the following: syllabi, examples of student work, examinations, student and/or peer evaluations, reflective self-evaluation, and a summary of revisions based on experience and input and the outcomes of those revisions.

e. The Personnel Committee will review the materials and evaluate the faculty member’s materials for compliance with the unit’s criteria and standards.

f. Following its review, the committee will prepare a written evaluative report, which will accompany the committee’s recommendations.
g. The committee will meet individually with the faculty member to answer questions about the report and to consider any requests for changes that the faculty member may make.

h. Within seven days following the meeting between the committee and the faculty member, the Director will request all tenured faculty to review the materials and submit a written recommendation to the Director concerning the reappointment.

i. The Director, after receiving the recommendations, will forward a recommendation to the Dean of Arts & Sciences by letter, with unedited comments from the faculty recommendations enclosed.

j. The Director will communicate, both in writing and orally, the substance of the recommendation to both the faculty member and the tenured faculty.

2) Procedures for Mid-Tenure Review

a. During the third year, probationary faculty undergo a mid-tenure review.

b. The faculty member is responsible for compiling a file and submitting it to the director at least two weeks prior to the scheduled meeting of the Personnel Committee.

c. The file should, in general, include the following items and information:

   1. documentation of instructional activity: list of courses taught; course syllabi; examinations; information on curriculum and/or course development activities; listing of advisees; listing of thesis and dissertation committees (indicating chairship where appropriate); student ratings from all course; and other relevant documentation of effective teaching;

   2. documentation of research/scholarship/creative activity: copies of manuscripts published, accepted for publication (including letter from editor), or under review; drafts; research papers presented; grant proposals submitted (indicating disposition); documents related to research grants in progress; and other evidence of research/scholarship/creative efforts;

   3. documentation of service activity: list of institutional, professional, and public service activities, with notation of specific contribution.

d. The Personnel Committee will review the materials and evaluate the faculty member’s materials for compliance with the standards for mid-tenure review.

e. Following its review, the committee will prepare a written report, which will accompany the committee’s recommendations.
f. The committee will meet individually with the faculty member to answer questions about the report and to consider any requests for changes that the faculty member may make.

g. Within seven days following the meeting between the committee and the faculty member, the Director will request all tenured faculty to review the materials and submit a written recommendation to the Director concerning the reappointment.

h. The Director, after receiving the recommendations, will forward a recommendation to the Dean of Arts & Sciences by letter, with unedited comments from the faculty recommendations appended.

i. The Director will communicate, both in writing and orally, the substance of the recommendation to both the faculty member and the tenured faculty.

3) Procedures for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

a. During or before the sixth year, probationary faculty will undergo a review for tenure and promotion.

b. The Director will provide the candidate with the description of her/his responsibilities during the review period and this description will accompany the file throughout the review process.

c. The candidate is responsible for compiling a file and submitting it with a current vita* and the university “Tenure and Promotion Documentation” form found at http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/promotion.html to the Director in early summer. The candidate must also submit a list of up to six potential outside reviewers. The list should consist of the names of highly regarded professionals in the faculty person’s discipline and research specialty.

* In the vita, the faculty member should distinguish refereed from non-refereed publications and the exact citations for published work should be provided (including the original order in which authors are listed).

d. The Program Director will select at least three outside reviewers who will be asked to evaluate the candidate’s accomplishments in research/scholarship/creative activity. At least two of the names will be chosen from the list submitted by the candidate. The Director 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 reviewers are held in confidence. The candidate should expect that peer evaluations will not be available to her/him. These letters
will become part of the file that is reviewed by the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

e. The candidate’s file should, in general, include the following items and information:

1. documentation of instructional activity: list of courses taught; course syllabi; examinations; information on curriculum and/or course development activities; listing of advisees; listing of thesis and dissertation committees (indicating chairship where appropriate); student ratings from all courses; and other relevant documentation of effective teaching;

2. documentation of research/scholarship/creative activity: copies of manuscripts – published, accepted for publication (including letter from editor), or under review; drafts; research papers presented; grant proposals submitted (indicating disposition); documents related to research grants in progress; and other evidence of research/scholarship/creative efforts;

3. documentation of service activity: list of institutional, professional, and public service activities, with notation of specific contribution.

f. The Tenure and Promotion Committee will review the materials and evaluate the candidate’s materials’ compliance with the standards for tenure and promotion review.

g. Following its review, the committee will prepare a written report, which will accompany the committee’s recommendations.

h. The committee will meet individually with the candidate to answer questions about the report and to consider any requests for change that the candidate may make.

i. Within seven days following the meeting between the committee and the candidate, the Director will request all tenured faculty to review the materials and submit a written recommendation to the Director concerning the granting of tenure and promotion.

j. The Director, after receiving the recommendations, will forward a recommendation to the Dean of Arts & Sciences, by letter, with the numerical vote of the tenured faculty and their unedited comments appended.

k. The Director will communicate, both in writing and orally, the substance of the recommendation to both the candidate and the tenured faculty.
4) Procedures for Promotion to Professor

a. In consultation with the Director, tenured Associate Professors may apply for promotion to Professor.

b. The faculty member should submit the same sort of materials as indicated above in items c. through e. for tenure and promotion. Procedures are similar, however, a committee is not involved in making a recommendation to the director. Instead, members of the core and affiliated Women’s Studies faculty at the rank of professor will review, meet to discuss, and vote, based on review of the candidate’s file, including letters of external review.

c. If the Program Director is not a full professor, she or he will, in consultation with the Dean of Arts & Sciences, appoint a full professor who is a member of the Women’s Studies faculty (or from another department in the college if there is not a full professor on the Women’s Studies faculty) who will fulfill the functions of the Director in the process. If there are no full professors on the Women’s Studies faculty, then the promotion application will go directly to the Arts & Sciences Dean’s Advisory Committee without a recommendation from Women’s Studies faculty.

5) Procedures for the Professorial Performance Award

a. Recommendations for the Professorial Performance Award will follow the timeline associated with the annual evaluation (Merit) review (see section II).

b. Eligible candidates for review compile and submit a file that documents her or his professional accomplishments for at least the previous six years. The department head, in conjunction with the Personnel Committee, will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials in terms of the criteria, standards, and guidelines established, along with a recommendation for or against the award.

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

d. The department head will submit the following items to the dean:

1. A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award.

2. Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation.

3. Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation.
4. The candidate's supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award.

6) Procedures for Evaluation of Out-of-Load Courses:

a. All courses taught outside a full-time faculty member’s regular, salaried teaching load (for example, courses taught by GTA’s, temporary instructors, regular faculty teaching out-of-load, or others teaching WOMST classes for Women’s Studies through DCE or summer school) will be reviewed separately, by the personnel committee, during the same calendar period in which that committee reviews merit and reappointment materials.

b. Teachers of such classes will be asked, upon conclusion of the relevant course,* to submit to the department the following materials:

1. the course syllabus
2. official student evaluations from all students
3. a self-reflection narrative about the course
4. any other materials they wish (sample lesson plans, paper assignments, exams, grading rubrics, sample responses to student work, etc)

* If the pertinent course is taught by a salaried faculty member, the materials may be submitted at the same time as merit review/reappointment materials, rather than upon conclusion of the specific course; but they should be provided separately and labeled as “Out-of-Load” teaching.

c. The personnel committee will examine these materials in order to ascertain either:

1. the course satisfied departmental expectations for its level
   or
2. the course did not satisfy departmental expectations for its level, for the following reasons: (list)

d. The Personnel Committee will submit to the Director a short form for each course, addressing 5)c. This information will be used in overall program oversight, and in making decisions regarding repeat offering of the course or re-hiring of the teacher, as applicable.

e. This procedure is separate from assessment that may be conducted in particular courses as part of the departmental rotation of assessing our program’s SLO’s.
II. PROCEDURES
for ANNUAL MERIT EVALUATION
of WOMEN’S STUDIES TENURED/TENURE-TRACK FACULTY and
INSTRUCTORS

1) The evaluation committee will be the Faculty Performance Evaluation Committee (Personnel Committee).

2) Early in each evaluation period, the director will meet with each faculty member and review her/his individual goals in the three areas of teaching, research, and service.

3) Once goals are set and on file, they can be modified midway through the evaluation period. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ask the Director to consider the modifications.

4) Each year, all faculty members are required to submit a vita and an annual Activity Report (following a template provided by the Director), and other supporting documentation requested by the Director or included by the faculty member.

(Faculty who are on sabbatical for any part of the evaluation period have the option of filing an Activity Report for that period or accepting the average merit evaluation from the most recent three evaluation periods.)

5) These documents are reviewed by the Personnel Committee, in consultation with the Director, and a recommendation is made by the Personnel Committee to the Director in which faculty are assigned an evaluation for each of their assigned areas (at least teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service) and an overall evaluation, using the following scale: Exceptional Merit; Exceeds Expectations; Meets Expectations; Needs Improvement; Fails to Meet Minimum-Accetable Levels of Productivity.

6) The Director, based on the recommendation of the Personnel Committee, prepares a written evaluation of each faculty member. The Director converts the evaluation to a numeric value (Exceptional Merit = 5; Exceeds Expectations = 4, etc), and creates a 3 year average based on the current year’s evaluation and the previous two years.

7) The Director gives a written copy of the annual merit evaluation to each faculty member.

8) Each faculty member makes an appointment with the Director at which the evaluation is discussed (and possibly modified by mutual agreement). In the event of a disagreement between the faculty member and the Director concerning the letter of evaluation or the rating, the faculty member has the right to append her/his viewpoint within seven working days of receiving the letter of evaluation, by submitting a written addendum to the Director.

9) Each faculty member signs the evaluation, indicating that she or he had the opportunity to review it and discuss it with the Director.
10) The Director signs and forwards the evaluation to the Dean of Arts & Sciences.

11) Criteria for distribution of merit increases: In accordance with the University Handbook, section C46.2: The unit head will recommend a salary adjustment for each person evaluated. The recommended percentage increases based on the annual evaluation for persons with higher levels of accomplishment shall exceed those for persons with lower levels of accomplishment. The percentage recommended for persons in the first category will be higher than those for the second category, which in turn shall exceed those for level of accomplishment in the third category, etc.
Appendix A

Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity in Teaching, Service, and Research for Women’s Studies

Yearly expectations will be decided on an individual basis in accordance with the provost’s policy for each faculty member to set her/his own yearly goals depending on her/his individual assignment. General guidelines and procedures for minimal standards are as follows:

Teaching

1. All faculty will provide instruction appropriate to fulfill the mission of the program.

2. All faculty will provide students with the following for each course they teach:
   a. what the aims or purposes of the course are;
   b. how the course will be organized; and
   c. how the students will be evaluated.

3. All faculty will meet regularly scheduled classes except for:
   a. illness, accident, or attendance at professional meetings;
   b. occasional times where other forms of instruction are scheduled during, or in lieu of, class time such as individual conferences, a film too long to be shown during class, a workday for students to use the library.

4. All faculty will hold regularly scheduled office hours.

5. All faculty will arrange for student evaluations of teaching according to university regulations.

Research and Scholarship

Depending on one’s individual assignment or rank, faculty will participate in any of the following:

a. researching, writing, editing, and/or publishing scholarly, critical, creative, or pedagogical work;

b. presenting such work at local, state, regional, national, or international meetings;

c. integrating the results of research or scholarship into teaching or service;

d. integrating new knowledge learned at professional meetings into teaching or service.
Service

All faculty will participate in program, college, university, professional or community service, which may include, but is not necessarily limited to, any of the following:

a. participating on any of the program’s standing or ad hoc committees;

b. taking on any special assignment arranged with the Director, such as advising;

c. participating, as an officer on boards, or in other ways, in professional organizations, or publishers;

d. providing professionally related community service.
Appendix B

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

Following section C31.5 of the University Handbook, the Personnel Committee will make a determination of when a tenured faculty member’s overall performance falls below the minimum-acceptable level, and it will advise the Program Director accordingly. (This would normally happen as part of the annual merit evaluation process when a tenured faculty member receives a rating of “Fails to Meet Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity,” but could potentially take place outside of that process.) The Director will indicate this, in writing, to the faculty member. The Director will also provide to the faculty member a suggested course of action for the improvement of performance. This document will be developed with the advice and consent of the Personnel Committee. The Director and the faculty member will meet together to ensure 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 Director 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. If the Personnel Committee determines that the faculty member has fallen below minimum standards in the subsequent year or three times within a five-year period, unless the faculty member does not wish it, a meeting of the program’s tenured faculty will be held in order to review the Personnel Committee’s decision. After reviewing the Personnel Committee documents and any other relevant information, with the faculty member permitted to be present, members of the tenured faculty will vote to reject or accept the evaluation of “Fails to Meet Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity.” Voting will be by signed ballot, as in the tenure and promotion process. To accept, two-thirds of the tenured faculty members present (including proxies) must vote to concur with the evaluation. (The Director will not participate in the voting.) Any number short of two-thirds will indicate rejection of the evaluation. The Director will take this vote under advisement in rendering a final decision. In the event that the faculty member decides not to have the tenured faculty review her/his case, the Director will decide whether or not to accept the evaluation. In reaching this decision, the Director may seek the advice of the Personnel Committee and the tenured faculty. If accepted, the name of the faculty member will be forwarded to the Dean.