

DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES (Approved by Faculty Vote on May 6, 2011)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES (Approved by Faculty Vote on May 6, 2011)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **May 2016**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **May 2016**

**Chwen Sheu, Department Head
Date signed: 5/13/2011**

**Yar Ebadi, Dean
Date signed: 5/19/2011**

**April C. Mason, Provost and Senior Vice President
Date signed: 11/20/2011**

*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.

**DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION**

POLICY STATEMENT CONCERNING:

Annual Evaluations

**(Including Professorial Performance Award Criteria and
Standards, and Chronic Low Achievement Standards)**

Approved by Faculty Vote on May 6, 2011

Promotion, Tenure, Mid-Tenure Review and Reappointment

Approved by Faculty Vote on May 6, 2011

Department Head's Signature

Date

Dean's Signature

Date

Provost's Signature

Date

INTRODUCTION

The mission of the Department of Management is to provide instruction, research, and service in the areas of strategic management and the management of human, information, and production resources. The Department should facilitate and encourage all faculty members (including tenured, tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty) to participate in a broad spectrum of professional activities in accordance with this mission. This document outlines the policies and procedures of the Department for evaluations regarding annual performance and salary adjustments, including chronic low achievement, the Professorial Performance Award, and decisions concerning promotion, tenure, mid-probationary review, and reappointment. This document serves as a supplement to the policies and procedures stated in the Kansas State University *University Handbook* (Sections C and D; Appendices A, C, and Q; and other related sections).

I. ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

(Includes Professorial Performance Award and Chronic Low Achievement)

I.A. Evaluations for Annual Performance and Merit Increases

1. Procedures/Guidelines

The following procedures adhere to the provisions in Sections C40 – C48.3 of the *University Handbook*.

- (1) At the end of each calendar year, faculty members with a formal assignment of five-tenths or more will provide the Department Head with an activity report summarizing their professional responsibilities and accomplishments. Specifically, these activity reports should include documentation of the faculty members' performance in the categories of teaching, research, and service during the evaluation period. For non-tenure track instructors, evaluations will be based primarily on the teaching category (or other categories specified in the individual's contract).

Faculty members may attach relevant supporting material to the report, including such things as article reprints, acceptance letters, teaching materials and evaluations, professional development activities, and other documentation of their activities and accomplishments. Evaluation of research should be based on a moving average concept that considers activities over a three-year period. (Appendix 1 contains the required format, which faculty members must follow in preparing their annual activity reports. Appendix 2 provides a list of examples of various activities that can be included in this report. Appendix 3 presents a suggested timetable for this process.)

- (2) As a part of the activity report each faculty member should also identify his or her expected activities and goals for the coming year. These goals should include the specific weights that the faculty member wishes to assign to each performance area. The goals are included to be performance targets for the coming year and should not be confused with performance expectations. The goal-setting process is designed to provide the Department Head with information about expected activities of the faculty member in the upcoming year.
- (3) Faculty members shall submit their activity reports to the Department Head by the end of the first week of the spring semester.

- (4) The Department Head will prepare a preliminary written evaluation of each faculty member. The preliminary evaluation will describe the overall performance of the faculty member and will note specific strengths or weaknesses within each category of evaluation.
- (5) The Department Head will schedule a meeting with each faculty member to discuss his or her evaluation of the individual's performance. At this meeting, the faculty member will have the opportunity to provide his or her input regarding the performance appraisal, which may lead to a revision of the written evaluation. At this meeting, the Department Head should also discuss the faculty member's goals for the upcoming year. This discussion should focus on how the individual's goals fit within the needs and requirements of the Department, how the goals compare to departmental performance expectations, and what the Department can do to help the faculty member accomplish his or her goals.
- (6) After meeting with the faculty member, the Department Head will write a final evaluation of each individual. The faculty member and Department Head will each sign the final evaluation, which will then be forwarded to the Dean as the basis for any merit salary increase. If the faculty member disagrees with the evaluation he or she receives, the faculty member may request a meeting with the Dean to resolve the disagreement.

2. Criteria and Standards

(1) Assignment of Weights to Each Performance Category

In the activity report, each faculty member shall outline goals and assign weights to each performance category for the upcoming year. This process acknowledges that the roles and responsibilities of faculty members in the Department may be different, and such differences should be reflected in the evaluation process. In particular, there may be differences based upon the faculty member's rank. For example, the typical combinations for tenure-track faculty would likely be different from those for tenured associate or full professors. In general, the weights for tenure-track and tenured professors should fall within the following ranges. All weights must add up to 100%.

	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
<i>Teaching</i>	35%	60%
<i>Research</i>	20%	60%
<i>Service</i>	5%	20%

Notes:

1. For untenured faculty, the minimum research percentage is 40%.
2. For tenured faculty, the minimum service percentage is 10%.
3. For faculty teaching a nonstandard load (other than 2-2 for tenured and tenure-track faculty), the teaching percentage is 10-15% per course (e.g., 20-30% for someone teaching a two-course per year load). In such instances, there will be a corresponding increase in the research and/or service percentage, which may raise those numbers beyond the noted maximums. For faculty where the agreed percentage in a given category exceeds the noted maximums, a higher level of performance is expected for that category. In such instances, the goals

established early in the year will be an important vehicle for reaching an agreement with the Department Head on how standards (percentages) will be adjusted for these unique cases.

4. These percentages are formally established during the annual evaluation process. If circumstances change later in the year (e.g. significant unforeseen service, course development, etc.), then it is necessary for the faculty member to communicate these changed circumstances to the Department Head. If the Department Head agrees, then the initial percentages may be adjusted by mutual agreement at the time the opportunity arises. For faculty on a standard teaching load, the minimums and maximums noted above still apply.

It is understood that the primary activity of non-tenure track instructors is teaching. As such, the weights for each full-time instructor should be negotiated with the Department Head. In addition, the Department Head should acknowledge instructors' performance of service or research activities. Specifically, for meritorious contributions in service or research, the Department Head has the discretion to increase the performance appraisal of the instructor.

Professionally qualified faculty, according to AACSB, will also have to average 20 hours of professional development per year in order to maintain their professional qualifications. Descriptions of the activities associated with these hours and related requirements are listed in the College's Standards for Faculty Classification for AACSB Accreditation Purposes document.

(2) Numerical Rating Scale and Merit Salary Adjustments

The Department will use a numerical scale for assessing performance within the categories of teaching, research, and service. In each category, the faculty member will be evaluated on a 0 to 4 scale. The numerical value assigned will indicate the following general levels of performance:

- 4 = Significantly exceeds expectations
- 3 = Exceeds expectations
- 2 = Meets expectations
- 1 = Fails to meet expectations (i.e., needs improvement)
- 0 = Fails to meet expectations by a significant degree (i.e., unsatisfactory)

Performance "expectations" are independent of individual faculty member's goals. "Expectations" should be left to the discretion of the Department Head. It is the responsibility of the Department Head to clarify expectations in each performance category when discussing goals with faculty.

The following table may be used for summary purposes:

	Rating	Weight	Rating × Weight
Teaching			
Research			
Service			
Weighted Average Performance Score:			

The merit increase recommendation from the Department Head will be based on the weighted average performance score (from the above table). The weighted average score will be normalized for the Department and that figure will be used to determine the faculty member's share of the Department's merit increase pool. For example, if one has a 3.0 weighted average and the Department's collective average is 3.0 and the salary pool increase for merit raises for the Department

is 3.5%, then that faculty member would get a 3.5% ($3.0/3.0 \times 3.5$) merit increase recommendation from the Department Head. If the weighted average performance score had been 3.3, then the percentage merit increase recommendation would be 3.85% ($3.3/3.0 \times 3.5$).

I.B. Professorial Performance Award

The following section refers to the departmental procedures and criteria regarding the Professorial Performance Awards, approved by the university in spring of 2006. This award is intended to recognize excellent and sustained performance of full professors.

In order to qualify for this award, the candidate must be a full-time full professor and have been in rank at K-State at least six years since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years, according to the criteria shown below. The general guidelines and procedures for this award follow sections C49.1 to C49.14 in the *University Handbook*. The Department procedures are shown below, as well as the criteria developed by the Department.

1. Procedures

The general procedures follow those for annual evaluation more closely than those for promotions, in that the nomination process is a self-nominated process and will have a deadline in January rather than the fall semester.

Full professors who are eligible for the award will compile and submit a file that documents their professional accomplishments for the previous six years in accordance with the criteria and standards established by the Department. This file is submitted to the Department Head in January, at the time of annual evaluations. The Department Head 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.

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. The department head must submit the following items to the appropriate dean:

- a. A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award,
- b. Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation,
- c. Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation,
- d. The candidate's supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award.

2. Criteria and Standards

The general criteria and standards are similar to those developed for eligibility for promotion to full professor. Candidates for the Professorial Performance Award are not eligible until six years have passed since their most recent promotion to full professor or their last Professorial Performance

Award, whereas the promotion to full professor is not based on a specific time frame. Furthermore, only years in the Management Department at K-State will be used in determining eligibility and evaluating a candidate for the Professorial Performance Award.

(1) Teaching

The component of the portfolio dealing with teaching should provide evidence of continued teaching excellence and development. This level will be reflected in teaching evaluations, course syllabi and other instructional materials, teaching awards and other recognition of teaching excellence, and other instructional activity. (See more examples provided in Appendix 2, Table A.)

(2) Research

The component of the portfolio dealing with research activities should provide solid evidence that the candidate has enhanced his or her national or international reputation within an area related to his or her field of appointment and that the candidate has assumed a leadership role in significant research activities. In general, single-authored or first-authored works are strong evidence of the ability to lead research efforts. In addition, invited articles, research awards at the national or international level, professional recognition of scholarship, fellowships awarded from external entities, invitations to reprint articles, citation lists, and other scholarly activity will be considered as evidence of national or international reputation. (See more examples provided in Appendix 2, Table B.) The candidate must demonstrate a pattern of productivity (both quantity and quality) that is consistent with the Department's expectations imposed for the promotion to full professor. Candidates are also expected to have made efforts to garner extramural support for their research efforts. Submitting proposals and gaining external funds that contribute to the goals of the Department and College of Business Administration will be positively weighted.

(3) Service

The component of the portfolio dealing with service and professional activity should provide evidence that the candidate has a consistent record of providing service and leadership on departmental, college, and university committees, and service to external professional entities. The need for shared governance and continuous improvement in our collective teaching and research efforts depends heavily on senior faculty. Candidates for the Professorial Performance Award need to demonstrate that they will continue to contribute to requisite institution-building efforts. Effective interaction with and mentoring of junior faculty will also be considered part of the service component. (See more examples provided in Appendix 2, Table C.)

Note on Collegiality

In addition to the research, teaching and service components of the portfolio, collegiality will be explicitly considered in making all promotion decisions. Minor interpersonal style issues that do not affect mission-related contributions will not be considered, nor will professional or philosophical differences enter into this decision. The Department of Management encourages a wide set of perspectives on various academic issues and encourages free thought, vigorous debate and expression of these views in a professional manner. Relevant collegiality factors include interpersonal integrity, adherence to professional ethics, effective management of disagreement and conflict, cooperation, generosity in intellectual resources, and mutual respect. Collegiality is fundamentally important to shared governance and the requirement for all faculty members to contribute in building a better institution and helping the Department and CBA collectively reach increasingly challenging goals and requirements.

I.C. Chronic Low Achievement

The following procedures and guidelines adhere to the provisions of Section C31.5 - C31.8 of the *University Handbook* regarding chronic low achievement standards as well as the procedures for enforcing these requirements.

1. Procedures/Guidelines

- (1) Section C31.5 of the *University Handbook* will be invoked if a tenured faculty member is rated "unsatisfactory" in any one of the three areas under annual evaluation (research, teaching, and service) in one evaluation period. It should be noted that there may be special or extenuating circumstances for such performance deficiencies (e.g., illness, leave of absence, special assignment). These should be fully examined and discussed prior to invoking the chronic low achievement policy.
- (2) The Department Head will provide written notification to the tenured faculty member at this time.
- (3) The Department Head and the faculty member will jointly develop a corrective action plan designed to improve the alleged deficiencies. The plan must include specific expectations that are to be met and indicate what assistance (if any) will be offered in order to help remedy performance problems. The purpose of the corrective action plan is to identify the means by which the faculty member will be able to exceed the minimum level of acceptable performance.
- (4) In cases where disagreements arise as to the magnitude of the performance deficiency or the appropriate course of action that needs to be taken to improve performance, the tenured faculty of the Department will determine the appropriate resolution and finalize the corrective action plan.
- (5) In the subsequent evaluation period (unless the faculty member under evaluation specifically requests otherwise), the Department Head will call a meeting of the tenured faculty for the purpose of assessing the faculty member's progress towards an acceptable level of performance in each category. Based on the results of this meeting, the Department Head shall prepare a written report that provides an assessment of the faculty member's success in meeting minimum acceptable standards of performance. At the Department Head's discretion, the report may note acceptable progress towards meeting minimum standards even if those standards have not yet been achieved.
- (6) The Department Head will provide a copy of the assessment to the faculty member and will explain any further actions suggested by the tenured faculty.
- (7) If the faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in a 5-year period in which the minimum standards are not met, then dismissal for cause will be considered at the discretion of the Dean. The Department Head will notify the Dean of the faculty member's performance relative to minimum standards each year.

2. Minimum Acceptable Productivity Standards

The following represent the Department's chronic low achievement standards for productivity in each of three areas: teaching, research, and service.

(1) Teaching

As stated in the *University Handbook* Section C34.1 - 34.2, student ratings of teaching are but one indicator of teaching effectiveness, and should never be used as the only source of information about classroom teaching. We believe, however, that when a faculty member consistently receives student ratings that indicate "dissatisfaction" with learning and classroom facilitation, there may be problems that are not being addressed. TEVAL ratings below a 2.5 would indicate a strong level of dissatisfaction among students. Thus, as one indicator of low achievement, the Department believes that the minimum acceptable adjusted TEVAL score should be 2.5. This score is calculated by averaging the scores obtained for "overall teacher effectiveness" and "amount learned" across all the courses taught by the faculty member in a given year.

There may be other sources of information that suggest evidence of student learning or teaching effectiveness. In the event that the minimum acceptable TEVAL average is not obtained, the Department Head and the tenured faculty members shall examine other indicators of learning and effectiveness, as well as non-TEVAL indicators to determine whether they might have negatively affected this average. These indicators include:

- (a) Class characteristics such as size of class and type of class (lecture versus case oriented; required versus elective; etc.)
- (b) New course preparation for the faculty member
- (c) Grade distributions
- (d) Overall quality of course materials: syllabi, exams, course notes, etc.
- (e) Others issues such as participation in curriculum development, non-TEVAL student feedback, and, if deemed necessary, peer evaluation of the faculty member's instructional quality

(2) Research

Within a five-year window, including the current evaluation year, the faculty member should have at least two counts from any of the following:

- (a) Refereed journal articles
- (b) Submission of extramural research funding
- (c) Refereed conference presentations or proceedings
- (d) Scholarly books
- (e) Book chapters, cases, or pedagogical materials included in a published book
- (f) Other scholarly works as denoted in Appendix 2 Table B.

(3) Service

The faculty member should serve on at least one committee per year, with satisfactory performance to be determined by the committee chair.

II. DECISIONS CONCERNING PROMOTION, TENURE, MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW, AND REAPPOINTMENT

General university-wide guidelines for the promotion and tenure process are provided in Sections C70-C158.3 of the *University Handbook*. This section provides additional guidelines and criteria to facilitate these procedures within the Department. This section also provides guidelines for decisions regarding mid-probationary review and reappointment.

II.A. Promotion and Tenure Decisions

1. Procedures/Guidelines

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with Tenure

- (1) Following an appropriate probationary period (as discussed in Section C73 of the *University Handbook*), during which time annual evaluations in the areas of teaching, research, and service meet or exceed departmental expectations, an assistant professor may be invited by the Department Head or may choose to submit a portfolio providing evidence of appropriate contribution to merit tenure and promotion. The Department Head will make this invitation in the first week of the fall semester and provide a due date for the portfolio in early October. The timetable for this process is presented in Appendix 3.
- (2) On or before the specified date, the candidate will provide a portfolio consisting of the standard documentation required for the promotion and tenure decision. (See Tables A-C in Appendix 2 for examples of appropriate material.) The candidate should also consult tenured faculty and the Department Head to determine what to include in the portfolio. A candidate should be encouraged to review previous tenure portfolios on file.
- (3) In the third week of October, the candidate's materials will be made available to all tenured faculty members for review. A specific completion date for this activity will be provided by the Department Head. If desired, any member of the tenured faculty may request a meeting with the candidate to clarify the evidence of achievement submitted by the candidate.
- (4) Consistent with Sections C36.1 and C112.2 of the *University Handbook*, outside reviewers may be asked to evaluate the candidate's package. If the candidate selects to have outside reviewers, he or she should make such request in the first week of fall semester. If this request is made, an equal number of objective outside reviewers will be selected by the candidate and the Department Head. These reviewers must be tenured and may not be co-authors, major professor or graduate school classmates of the candidate.
- (5) During the last week of October, the Department Head will schedule a meeting of tenured faculty to discuss and vote on the candidate's application for promotion and tenure. The vote on any candidate shall be taken by secret ballot. Tenured faculty who are unable to attend may request an absentee ballot.
- (6) The Department Head will forward a written recommendation to the Dean, accompanied by an explanation of her or his judgment. All recommendations and unedited written comments of the Department's tenured faculty members and the candidate's complete file will also be forwarded to the Dean. A copy of the Department Head's written recommendation alone will be forwarded to the candidate.

- (7) The remaining steps in the tenure process occur outside the Department of Management and are discussed in Sections C113-C115 of the *University Handbook*.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

- (1) Consistent with Section C140, associate professors who have demonstrated superior professional accomplishment and excellence in the performance of their assigned duties may be invited by a full professor or may choose to submit a portfolio providing evidence of continued contribution to department, college, university, and national concerns within their area of appointment. (See *University Handbook* Sections C150, C151, and C152.2.) This decision/invitation will come in the first week of the fall semester, and the candidate's portfolio will be due in early October.
- (2) On or before the specified date, the candidate will provide a portfolio of materials providing evidence to support his or her promotion from associate professor to full professor. The information provided should include the standard forms used for promotion decisions and other material as specified in the *University Handbook*. (See Tables A-C in Appendix 2 for examples of appropriate material.)
- (3) In the third week of October, the candidate's materials will be made available to all tenured full professors in the Department. A specific completion date for this activity will be provided by the Department Head. If desired, any tenured full professor may request a meeting with the candidate to clarify the evidence of achievement submitted by the candidate.
- (4) Those seeking promotions to full professor must have their research reviewed by external experts. During the first week of the fall semester the candidate must submit a research portfolio that will be used for external evaluation.
- (5) During the last week of October, the Department Head will schedule a meeting of tenured full professors to discuss and vote on the candidate's application for promotion. The vote on any candidate shall be taken by secret ballot. Tenured full professors who are unable to attend may request an absentee ballot.
- (6) The Department Head will forward a written recommendation to the Dean, accompanied by an explanation of her or his judgment. All recommendations and unedited written comments of the Department's tenured full professors and the candidate's complete file will also be forwarded to the Dean. A copy of the Department Head's written recommendation alone will be forwarded to the candidate.
- (7) The remaining steps in the promotion process occur outside the Department of Management and are discussed in Sections C153.1-155 of the *University Handbook*.

2. Criteria/Standards

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with Tenure

(1) Teaching

The component of the portfolio dealing with teaching should provide evidence that the candidate has attained a sufficient level of teaching proficiency within the area of his or her appointment. Evidence of this proficiency may be obtained from student evaluations, written student comments, correspondence from graduated students, course syllabi, instructional material

developed by the individual, and other items that increase students' understanding of present industry practice. (See more examples provided in Appendix 2, Table A.)

(2) Research

The component of the portfolio dealing with research activities should provide solid evidence that the candidate has the potential of acquiring a national reputation within an area related to his or her field of appointment. The primary evidence for this potential should be reflected in a well-defined research path, high-quality publications, and other items (as described in Appendix 2, Table B) showing progress along this path. Extramural research funding is increasingly important to the Department and efforts on this front, while not required, will be positively weighted in the evaluation process. The candidate needs to show evidence that he or she is able to lead a research effort (e.g., single-authored or first-authored works). Both research quantity and quality will be assessed. (The Department Head and tenured faculty members should hold regular discussions with junior faculty members to explain and clarify research expectations.) Quality of research may be evaluated using national ranking reports, the *Department of Management High Quality Journal List* (available from the Department), Department Head journal quality assessment process, national recognition of scholarship, citation counts, research awards, tenured faculty opinions of research significance, and other criteria. Research activity conducted prior to the individual's appointment at K-State will be considered.

(3) Service

Service refers to all other activities (outside of teaching and research) that contribute to the mission of the Department, college, or university. The component of the portfolio dealing with service and professional activity should provide evidence that the candidate is a conscientious member of departmental and/or college committees. In addition, the candidate should have demonstrated that he or she has the potential to provide university-wide and national service within an area related to his or her appointment. Specific examples of ways to fulfill service expectations are described in Appendix 2, Table C.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

(1) Teaching

The component of the portfolio dealing with teaching should provide evidence of continued teaching excellence and development. This level will be reflected in teaching evaluations, course syllabi and other instructional materials, teaching awards and other recognition of teaching excellence, and other instructional activity. (See more examples provided in Appendix 2, Table A.)

(2) Research

The component of the portfolio dealing with research activities should provide solid evidence that the candidate has acquired a national or international reputation within an area related to his - her field of appointment and that the candidate has assumed a leadership role in significant research activities. In particular, a pattern of consistent productive behavior will be expected with an emphasis on the last six years or since the last promotion, whichever is shorter. In general, single-authored or first-authored works are strong evidence of the ability to lead research efforts.

In addition, invited articles, research awards at the national or international level, professional recognition of scholarship, fellowships awarded from external entities, invitations to reprint articles, citation lists, and other scholarly activity will be considered as evidence of national or international reputation. (See more examples provided in Appendix 2, Table B.) The primary consideration shall be evidence of activity since the most recent promotion. The candidate must demonstrate a pattern of productivity (both quantity and quality) that is at a minimum consistent with the Department's expectations imposed for the associate professor promotion. Candidates are also expected to have made efforts to garner extramural support for their research efforts. Submitting proposals and gaining external funds that contribute to the goals of the Department and CBA will be positively weighted.

Those seeking promotions to full professor must have their research reviewed by external experts. During the first week of the fall semester the candidate must submit a research portfolio that will be used for external evaluation. Additionally, the candidate is required to identify at least two external reviewers who are in a position to assess the impact of his or her research. The Department Head is required to use at least one of these referees in the external review process. The Department Head must also independently identify and solicit feedback from at least one additional external referee. At a minimum, external reviews will be requested from two experts that are in a position to evaluate the candidate's research record of accomplishment. All external reviewers must be tenured full professors and may not be co-authors, major professor, or graduate school classmates of the candidate.

(3) Service

The component of the portfolio dealing with service and professional activity should provide evidence that the candidate has a consistent record of providing service and leadership on departmental, college, and university committees, and service to external professional entities. The need for shared governance and continuous improvement in our collective teaching and research efforts depends heavily on senior faculty. Candidates for full professor need to demonstrate that they will continue to contribute to requisite institution-building efforts. Effective interaction with and mentoring of junior faculty members will also be considered. (See more examples provided in Appendix 2, Table C.)

Note on Collegiality

In addition to the research, teaching and service components of the portfolio, collegiality will be explicitly considered in making all promotion decisions. Minor interpersonal style issues that do not affect mission-related contributions will not be considered, nor will professional or philosophical differences enter into this decision. The Department of Management encourages a wide set of perspectives on various academic issues and encourages free thought, vigorous debate and expression of these views in a professional manner. Relevant collegiality factors include interpersonal integrity, adherence to professional ethics, effective management of disagreement and conflict, cooperation, generosity in intellectual resources and mutual respect. Collegiality is fundamentally important to shared governance and the requirement for all faculty members to contribute in building a better institution and helping the Department and CBA collectively reach increasingly challenging goals and requirements.

II.B. Mid-Probationary Review

1. Procedures/Guidelines

The following procedures adhere to the provisions of Sections C92.1-C92.4 of the *University Handbook*.

- (1) Unless otherwise stated in the candidate's contract, the mid-probationary review is to occur during the third year of appointment. The Department will conduct the mid-probationary review as an aspect of its reappointment decision for that year.

In accordance with the *University Handbook*, the mid-probationary review is intended to provide the faculty member with substantive feedback regarding his or her accomplishments relative to the Department's tenure criteria. A positive mid-probationary review does not ensure that tenure will be granted in the future. Likewise, a negative review does not necessarily mean that tenure will be denied.

- (2) In the first week of fall semester, the Department Head will notify the candidate for reappointment of the date by which he or she should submit documentation of his or her professional achievements during the evaluation period. The documentation provided should be similar to that provided for tenure and/or promotion decisions.
- (3) The Department Head will make the candidate's file available to all tenured faculty members for review. Prior to the vote any member of the tenured faculty may request that the candidate meet with the tenured faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the evidence of achievement submitted by the candidate.
- (4) The Department Head will call a meeting of tenured faculty for the purpose of discussing and voting on whether the candidate has made acceptable progress towards tenure. The vote on any candidate shall be taken by secret ballot. Faculty unable to attend may request an absentee ballot.
- (5) The Department Head will report the vote of the tenured faculty to the candidate and explain in general terms both the major points under discussion and any matters the faculty want forwarded to the candidate.
- (6) On or before the date specified by the Dean, the Department Head will present to the Dean the standard materials that accompany a reappointment decision, plus the substantive input of tenured faculty as regards the candidate's promise for tenure. The candidate's mid-probationary review file and the Department's criteria standards will be forwarded to the college advisory committee. Once the college advisory committee has made its recommendation, the Dean will provide a letter of assessment to the candidate. In cases where the mid-probationary review is unfavorable and a decision not to reappoint the candidate is made, the faculty member must be informed in writing of a decision not to renew his or her appointment in accordance with the "Standards of Notice of Non-Reappointment," Appendix A in the *University Handbook*.

2. Criteria and Standards

The criteria for evaluation in the mid-probationary review are the same as those assessed in tenure and/or promotion decisions. Taking all relevant factors into consideration, an assessment should be made as to whether the candidate has made acceptable progress towards tenure and the likelihood that the candidate will be able to accomplish enough to secure tenure within the timeframe specified in his

or her contract. In addition to published works, candidates are encouraged to report all relevant efforts including work-in-process and currently unfunded grant proposals.

II.C. Reappointment

Reappointment is the process of extending a tenure-track (but untenured) faculty member's contract. It involves an evaluation process carried out by the Department Head and tenured faculty. See Sections C50.1-C56 and Section C162.3 of the *University Handbook* for the specific procedures related to reappointment. (See Sections C60-C66 of the *University Handbook* for procedures related to non-tenure track instructors.) The criteria for reappointment of untenured faculty members and non-tenure track instructors should be consistent with the criteria associated with annual evaluation. This is an important opportunity for senior faculty to become familiar with the feedback provided to junior faculty candidates by the Department Head concerning their progress. Differences of opinion can be discussed and, hopefully, resolved at this point rather than coming up for the first time in promotion and tenure meetings.

APPENDIX 1: Forms for Presenting Summaries of Activities for Annual Evaluation and Goals/Plans for the Upcoming Year

This report should cover your completed activities for the calendar year 20__ and goals/plans for the upcoming year. Activities currently in progress may be reported as well. Please disregard those categories that do not apply to you.

I. TEACHING

I.A. Accomplishments

- (a) Provide a summary of courses taught (by title and semester) and a summary of the students' evaluation of your teaching effectiveness for each course taught. Specifically, provide TEVAL scores related to the items of "Teacher Effectiveness" and "Amount Learned" for each course taught. Include a copy of the TEVAL summary sheet with this report. The use of electronically (online) collected and processed TEVALS (e-TEVALS) is encouraged for consistency. They are located at <https://teval.ksu.edu/Teval/>. Whichever form of TEVAL is used, electronic or in-class, they should be collected with careful adherence to *University Handbook* policy C34.1 and the procedure suggested by the Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (currently <http://www.k-state.edu/catl/ratings/teval/tevrat.htm>). Following the same policies in the *University Handbook*, the IDEA form may be used in addition to the TEVAL. In this case, both the IDEA form and the TEVAL would be provided for use in evaluating teaching performance.

The Department Head should use TEVAL information as only one component when assessing instructional performance and should be aware that TEVAL ratings are sometimes influenced by the level or nature of the course or other factors outside the instructor's control.

- (b) While it is not mandatory, faculty members can choose to submit students' written comments from the evaluation forms as well.
- (c) Teaching awards and/or any other special recognition.
- (d) Any professional development activities relevant to teaching responsibilities.
- (e) Teaching portfolio that includes course syllabi, exams, samples of graded assignments, etc.
- (f) Teaching-related proposals for and receipt of extramural funding.
- (g) Other sources as described in Appendix 2, Table A.

I.B. Goals/Plans for the Upcoming Year

- (a) Weight
- (b) Goals and plans

II. RESEARCH

II.A. Accomplishments

- (a) Published refereed articles. Enclose a cover page of the reprint or an acceptance letter for the paper.
- (b) Refereed conference presentations and proceedings.
- (c) Proposals for extramural research funding and funding received. List title and amount of funding. Identify source, performance period, and your role in the project.
- (d) Research awards and/or any scholarly recognition.
- (e) Working papers that have been submitted to refereed journals.
- (f) Other scholarly activities as described in Appendix 2, Table B.

II.B. Goals/Plans for the Upcoming Year

- (a) Weight
- (b) Goals and plans

III. SERVICE

III.A. Accomplishments

University, College, and Department

Membership on departmental, college, and university boards and committees. Evidence of leadership, which could be demonstrated by chairing a committee, work performed, impact made, and significance of the committee, will be assessed.

Outside of University

Service provided to professional organizations, journals, communities, industries and the like. Other sources as described in Appendix 2, Table C.

III.B. Goals/Plans for the Upcoming Year

- (a) Weight
- (b) Goals and plans

NOTE: According to the faculty evaluation procedures adopted by the Department, the information supplied by each faculty member may be designated as private information to be viewed by the Department Head (or other senior administrators) only (Section C35).

APPENDIX 2. Areas of Teaching, Research, and Service

(The following list of teaching, research, and service activities should not be considered exhaustive. Other types of activities included in these categories may be found in the University Handbook.)

Table A: Evidence of Teaching Excellence

Items for Consideration	Evidence of Merit
Student Evaluations*	High TEVAL scores (> 4.2); unsolicited graduated student opinions
Published Instructional Material (distance learning course development; instructor manuals; video recordings; cases; test banks; online curriculum support material; SmartForce material)	Textbooks; invited contributions; national recognition for contribution
Unpublished Instructional Material (documentation of classroom activity; syllabi; course outlines; sample material)	Adoption of material by other instructors; national or regional recognition
Instructional Technology Use (Internet- based teaching, computer software use)	Adoption of material at other institutions; national or regional recognition
Curriculum Development (Departmental documents; course descriptions; new courses)	Adoption of material at other institutions; national or regional recognition
Pedagogical Research and Extramural Funding	Pedagogical articles published; funded pedagogical studies, funded proposals for curriculum development/enhancement
Continual Improvement (course revisions, participation in workshops/teaching seminars)	Certification for training received

* Various factors (e.g. class size, new course preparation, grade distribution, etc.) shall be examined to determine whether they might have negatively affected the TEVAL scores.

Table B: Evidence of Research Productivity

Items for Consideration	Evidence of Merit
Refereed Journal Publications (field centered or interdisciplinary research)	Publications in highly-ranked journals; citation lists; invited articles; lead author on articles; single-authored articles
Refereed Conference Proceedings	Best paper proceedings; invited articles
Extramural Funding (submitted proposals)	Funded proposals (prestige of granting institution, magnitude of grant, benefits to the Department)
Other Intellectual Products (research books, book chapters, book reviews, trade journals, newspapers, practitioner, Internet-based journals, computer software)	Inventions/patents; commercialized products/software
Presentations (oral presentations, industry workshops, poster sessions, interviews)	Invited speaker
Current Research (papers under revision/review)	Manuscripts under revision/review

Table C: Evidence of Service and Professional Activity

Items for Consideration	Evidence of Merit
Committee Assignments (service on departmental, college, university, dissertation committees and student organizations during period under consideration)	Leadership roles; special recognition by college or university
Service to the Profession (service at regional or national conferences; article reviews; student trips; community involvement related to profession)	Editorships; editorial board membership; recognition by peers outside K-State; conference boards
Leadership, Cooperation, Initiative, Enthusiasm (mentoring; supporting departmental activities; supporting visiting organizations)	Chairing committees; leadership in professional organizations; gaining extramural support that aids others' teaching and research efforts.
International Activities (promote scholarly and teaching collaborations with international universities)	Arrange student/faculty exchange, participate in study abroad program

APPENDIX 3. Timetables

(The exact dates are determined subject to the university and college calendars)

A. Annual Evaluations

Date for Completion	Action
First week of Spring Semester	Faculty members provide activity reports to the Department Head
No later than the third week of February	Department Head (1) reports the results of the review to the faculty member and (2) consults and discusses individual faculty's goals and plans for the upcoming year

B. Promotion and Tenure Decisions

Date for Completion	Action
First week of Fall Semester*	Department Head invites candidates who are in final year of the probationary period of their appointment to apply for tenure; Department Head informs candidates who are in the third year of their probationary appointment of the date when they should submit mid-probationary review documentation; a faculty member may also choose to apply for tenure; associate professor informs Department Head of decision to apply for full professorship (or is invited by Department Head)
Early October	Candidate prepares material in support of promotion/tenure or mid-probationary review
Third week in October	Candidate materials made available to eligible tenured faculty
Last Monday in October	Eligible tenured faculty members meet to discuss candidate. Faculty votes on tenure candidate's application
Second Monday in November	Department Head sends materials and summary sheet for candidate to Dean and reports to tenure candidate and faculty; mid-probationary reviews are presented to candidates
Second week in December	Dean sends material and summary sheet for each tenure candidate to the Dean's Council for review
January	Review of tenure candidate by Council of Academic Deans
Second week of Spring Semester	Annual evaluation and goals to be submitted to Department Head
Third week in February	Dean forwards tenure recommendations to the Provost
March	Dean mails formal letter which informs tenure candidate of the decision
March	Preparation of Regents' minutes
March 31	Submission to the Regents

* Candidates requesting external reviewers should supply the required nominations to the Department Head by mid-August. The package for external review should be ready by early to mid-September.