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Brief Modern History
In 2004, the Department of Educational Administration and Leadership and the Department of Foundations and Adult Education were joined and renamed The Department of Educational Leadership. Selected major policy documents were reviewed and approved in September 2004. The entire Department Policy and Procedures Manual was reviewed by faculty and approved in March 2006. Modifications to undergraduate leadership reporting structures made in August 2006 were reflected in that printed version. In July 2008, the undergraduate Leadership Studies Program was removed from the Department and created as a separate school under the university's central administration. In January 2009, for reasons involving accreditation matters, evaluation policies affecting the Faculties of Adult Education and Educational Administration were clarified to require evaluation of all teaching personnel, including adjuncts and other instructors. In October 2013, the Department Policy and Procedures Manual and imbedded evaluation and performance documents were reviewed, revised, and approved as required by the university every five years. Final faculty approval of subsequent changes was given April 9, 2014.
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INTRODUCTION

Brief Complete History
The present Department of Educational Leadership has evolved through many iterations over nearly five decades at Kansas State University. Housed in the College of Education, the department now joins together faculty members from several previous departments. In 1987, the Department of Administration and Foundations was collapsed into several small faculties, from among which emerged in 1990 the Department of Educational Administration. In 1995, the department changed its name to Educational Administration and Leadership and began a new undergraduate focus called Leadership Studies and Programs. In 2004, the college merged the Department of Educational Administration and Leadership and the Department of Foundations and Adult Education to form the presently named Department of Educational Leadership (EDLEA). Under this structure, faculties and programs in educational administration (EDADL), adult and continuing education (EDACE), and leadership studies and programs (EDLST housed under EDADL’s umbrella) were joined across broad similar aims but with each program’s faculty retaining autonomy in certain matters such as tenure and promotion, curriculum, and so forth. In 2008, Leadership Studies and Programs was separated from the department and placed under central administrative control for purposes of creating a new School of Leadership Studies. In that same year, the prefix EDADL was replaced by the new prefix EDLEA. In 2009, the School of Leadership Studies was partially returned to the department for the purpose of supervising the tenure/promotion and curriculum processes of the School and its new prefix LEAD which had been created at the time of the School’s formation.

Mission
The College of Education at Kansas State University houses a variety of undergraduate and graduate academic programs. Central to the definition of a university are the roles of undergraduate preparation for a wide range of careers, and graduate training for prospective researchers and practitioners within individual disciplines and career options. The College of Education, through the Department of Educational Leadership, now exclusively carries out graduate training for persons aspiring to careers as educational leaders in a wide variety of settings. These aspirants are served by a full spectrum of degree and/or licensure options. Graduate students in the adult education emphasis (EDACE program) in this department come from a wide variety of career paths including business and industry, private/nonprofit/government sectors, higher education, and the military. Graduate students in the educational leadership emphasis (EDLEA program) in this department usually seek administrative or staff positions in public or private school systems, colleges or universities, government agencies, businesses that place emphasis on learning, or in research organizations. As a result, the mission of the department is a range of leadership training at the masters and doctoral levels.
INSTITUTIONAL AND DEPARTMENTAL STRUCTURE

Overview
The Department of Educational Leadership is governed under rules and organizational structure laid out by the university, the College of Education, and the department itself. These rules and structures also shape the department’s relationship to other units, particularly within the College of Education.

University
The University Handbook sets out the structure of the university, defining the organizational hierarchy and rules of university operation under the direction of the Kansas Board of Regents, the president, the provost, and other staff assigned to support roles for these persons.

College
The University Handbook further identifies the major administrative units of the university as the respective colleges making up the university. The College of Education is under the direction of the Dean of Education who is charged with operation and development, planning and budgeting, and personnel management and activities of the college.

Department
The University Handbook defines the basic administrative unit of the university as the academic department. Each department reports to its respective dean. The department of Educational Leadership is housed in the College of Education and is responsible to the Dean of Education. Within the umbrella department itself, the Faculty of Educational Leadership is hereby designated an autonomous unit in matters of evaluation, tenure and promotion, and program control, and the Faculty of Adult Education is designated as an autonomous unit in all identical matters as well. These intra-departmental units are herein referred to as the Faculty of Educational Leadership and the Faculty of Adult Education—collectively as the Faculties. These Faculties in turn report in all matters to the chair of the Department of Educational Leadership. Relatedly, all tenure and promotion matters and all curriculum approval matters pertaining to the semi-autonomous undergraduate School of Leadership Studies reports to the department chair, who in turn directs, interprets, recommends, and supervises those processes exclusively through the Faculty of Educational Leadership as established in memorandum from the provost dated February 12, 2009.
C
RERELATIONSHIPS
TO OTHER UNITS

Colleges and departments are subject to institution-wide rules and regulations. In addition, departments offering graduate instruction and advanced degrees are subject to rules and regulations of the Graduate School, which stands apart from other units in the university. The Department of Educational Leadership is thus significantly affected by Graduate School rules and regulations pertaining to eligibility for graduate faculty membership and doctoral certification to direct dissertations as enacted by the Graduate Council and administered by the Graduate Dean apart from individual colleges. The impact of all these rules and regulations is wide-ranging, affecting how faculty are permitted to teach, direct research, and award degrees.

Other relationships with separate academic units within the College of Education also exist through cases of collaboration, cross-disciplinary coursework, participation in college and university committees, and representation on the College of Education’s Administrative Council.
Overview
The Department of Educational Leadership is organized as a single free-standing unit within the College of Education under the leadership of a department chair in concert with full faculty participation.

Chair Definition
As intended by the Department of Educational Leadership, the position of department chair is one of collegial leadership among peers and faculty liaison to the Dean of Education’s office, wherein the chair is regarded as a faculty member with administrative responsibilities and who is answerable to the department Faculties as a whole. This stands in contrast to the traditional definition of a department head, who is usually regarded as a true administrator within a college. The distinction and adoption of chairship is deliberate and based on principles of collegiality within the department.

Appointment of Chair
Appointment of the chair of the Department of Educational Leadership shall be by election of the faculties in the total department for a term specified in the department’s Policy and Procedures Manual. Manner of election and all other matters affecting term and duties of the chair should closely follow procedures set out in the Policy and Procedures Manual.

Method of Chair Election
The chair shall be elected in a regularly scheduled open meeting of the department or by other open and faithful manner as proposed by the Dean of Education or the faculties themselves and agreed to by the faculties. Any faculty member whose appointment is in the Department of Educational Leadership shall be eligible to serve as chair.

Term of Chair
Chairs shall be elected for a three-year period. Chairs shall be eligible for coterminous terms without limit.

Duties of Chair
The Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership shall take primary leadership for the following:

- Effectively communicating the department’s expectations to the dean and other administrators;
- Making effective administrative decisions in implementing the department’s expectations;
- Providing opportunities for department input in decisionmaking;
- Taking a primary leadership role in planning and actualizing departmental goals and objectives, while encouraging individual and collective faculty initiative designed to move the department forward;
- Keeping the faculties informed of important extra-departmental events affecting the nature, scope, and direction of goals and objectives;
- Responding promptly and effectively to faculty concerns by providing proper follow-
up and confidentiality;
· Establishing a responsible fiscal plan and securing faculty agreement on budgetary principles and expenditures;
· Providing secretarial and support services that reflect competence, promptness and accuracy in an environment that promotes a professional image for the department;
· Securing and sustaining high levels of faculty confidence regarding chair performance on the traits of trustworthiness, flexibility, fairness, decisiveness, thoughtfulness, organizational effectiveness, and democratic decisionmaking.

Evaluation of Chair
College procedure mandates that chairs report directly to the Dean of Education. By custom and policy, the dean evaluates chairs at least every three years and may elect to do so more frequently. The concept of chairship, however, strongly implies accountability to the electing faculties. Chairs in the Department of Educational Leadership therefore should expect to be multiply evaluated.

The chair of the Department of Educational Leadership shall be evaluated annually by members of the department: i.e., the chair shall offer his/her merit materials for faculty review as part of the merit evaluation cycle conducted within the department, except that the chair shall not be included for salary purposes in the merit ranking data forwarded to the dean. The purpose of excluding the chair is to avoid drawing down available merit pool monies since the dean separately evaluates chairs for merit purposes. While faculty are not required to offer formal comments on chair performance, they are encouraged to do so and may submit their comments directly to the chair or to the dean. Evaluation by peers within the department shall include assessment of all areas applicable to all other similarly situated faculty (i.e., teaching, research, service) and shall additionally include comments regarding administrative performance by the chair on the duties of that office.
Overview
The Department of Educational Leadership recognizes that faculty are the essential element of a university, a college, and successful academic programs and services. Faculty are distinguished by their professional expertise and, in the case of the Department of Educational Leadership, by their participation in international, national, state and local teaching, research, and/or service contributions. As a result, the department stands on record as supporting a strong cohesive, yet independent, faculty structure that enhances the mission of the university, the college, and the disciplines represented by individual faculty.

Appointment and Assignment of Faculty
Appointment of faculty to the Department of Educational Leadership shall follow university and college requirements for standards and procedures. The Department of Educational Leadership, however, strongly asserts the appropriateness of position searches lodged at the departmental level and further independently within each academic program (EDLEA and EDACE). The department further accepts responsibility to assign faculty in keeping with department needs after consultation with the dean.

Reappointment of tenure-track faculty deserves serious attention in a university environment. In the Department of Educational Leadership, the faculty in each separate and autonomous program asserts the right to play a primary role in such decisions. In each such case, each tenured faculty member in the relevant program of the department, constrained by other university and college requirements, shall have an annual opportunity and responsibility to make recommendations concerning reemployment of each nontenured faculty member in that academic program. Guiding, but not limiting, such reappointment decision shall be the tenure and promotion standards adopted by each eligible program faculty (see Appendix C). If the chair is willing to support the majority faculty recommendation concerning the nontenured faculty member, then the chair shall convey that recommendation to the dean with justification. If the chair cannot support the majority recommendation, then the chair shall so inform the tenured faculty, who shall have the right to elect a person from faculty ranks to convey and explain the majority opinion to the dean.

Reappointment of nontenured faculty shall further conform to all university and college requirements relating to reappointment procedures, including mid-tenure review, and shall occur in conformity with dates prescribed annually by the university. The Department of Educational Leadership affirms its commitment to the spirit of mid-tenure review, which was established for the purpose of providing specific feedback on faculty progress toward satisfactory attainment of tenure status in conformity with tenure and promotion standards as adopted by each eligible program faculty (see mid-tenure process section also located in Appendix C). As presently structured, mid-tenure review requires all tenure-track faculty in the third year of service to submit materials collections and other documentation on university-prescribed forms to the chair of the department. The purpose of such submission shall be to permit the chair, the tenured voting faculty in the department, the Tenure and Promotion Committee of the college, and the dean to examine all items submitted as if the faculty member were being evaluated for tenure,
except that the mid-tenure process shall end with the dean’s review. Upon completion of
the mid-tenure review, the chair shall inform the faculty member(s) under review of the
results, including specific advice to the faculty member on expected improvements.

Occasionally persons may be appointed to adjunct positions in the Department of
Educational Leadership. It is the policy of the department that adjuncts may only be used
after: (a) consultation and agreement among the faculty regarding the appropriateness of
adjunct assignment; (b) assurance that no other qualified regular faculty are available to
fulfill the same role; and (c) the program will be well served through the adjunct’s work.
At the graduate level, under no circumstance may an adjunct serve as a major professor
for either masters or doctoral committees, although in specific cases adjuncts may
provide a useful service to the department by serving on masters and/or doctoral
committees as appropriate and as permitted under Graduate School rules and
regulations. Adjunct faculty are further subject to performance evaluation as prescribed
later in this policy manual.

Promotions in Rank
Regularly appointed ranked faculty may be considered for promotion, either by advocacy
or by personal request (see Appendix C). The chair shall determine eligibility for such
request by consulting the University Handbook. If the person is eligible, the chair shall
elicit recommendations from the eligible voting faculty holding higher rank than the
requesting person, except only that equal rank shall qualify individuals to vote in the case
of promotion to the rank of full professor. Eligible voting faculty are defined as those
faculty whose primary appointment resides in the academic program wherein such
promotion would occur if the applicant’s request were to be granted. Recommendations
from eligible voting faculty shall conform to ballot requirements. If the chair is willing to
support the majority faculty recommendation regarding promotion, then the chair shall
convey that recommendation to the appropriate levels required by tenure and promotion
procedures. If the chair cannot support the majority recommendation, then the chair shall
so inform the dean of voting results and shall further so inform the voting faculty, who
shall have the right to elect a person from faculty ranks to convey and explain the
majority opinion to the dean.
EVALUATION STRUCTURE

Overview
The Department of Educational Leadership accepts and validates the concept of accountability and performance evaluation. Each respective faculty (EDACE, EDLEA) shall be required to adopt a formal evaluation policy (see Appendix A).

Evaluation Defined
Evaluation is defined in the Department of Educational Leadership as comprising a set of activities engaged in by the department leading to assessment of the performance of individual faculty against the goals and objectives set out for each individual within the categories of teaching, research, and service as appropriate to the department’s various graduate program emphases.

Evaluation Procedure
The set of activities resulting in the act of evaluation within each program is elaborated in Appendix A. For general policy explanation purposes, evaluation procedures in the Department of Educational Leadership are as follows:

- All faculty in the department shall be evaluated annually for merit purposes.
- The evaluation period shall cover the period January through December.
- Performance contracts shall be constructed for each faculty member.
- Evaluation shall encompass only those goals and objectives drawn for each individual faculty member and included in the written performance contract.
- Evaluation shall strictly follow the timelines for performance contracts and other dates as set out in the evaluation policy in Appendix A.
- In addition to the foregoing, all other persons having teaching or student-supervisory responsibility in the department through special arrangement such as adjunct or other status (e.g., mentors, field-based practicum supervisors), shall be subject to formal evaluation. Such evaluation, however, shall be only on teaching /supervisory performance and shall be carried out only in those semesters when the adjunct/supervisor is actively assigned to a teaching role.
Overview
The Department of Educational Leadership accepts the responsibility and privilege of faculty self-determination regarding use of available resources. The department chair shall be charged with wise and resourceful administration of departmental budget matters. Faculty may expect to be provided with equal access to the department’s resources within the limitations of program priorities, benefit, and resource constraints.

General Reporting
The chair shall make the budget open to all faculty.
Overview
The Department of Educational Leadership offers a variety of programs and curricular emphases under a broad leadership umbrella.

Educational Leadership (EDLEA)
The department offers a full program of educational leadership graduate studies culminating in the M.S. and Ed.D degrees. The programmatic focus is on developing leaders in educational settings, with an emphasis on P-12 public schools. For most graduates, program focus leads to professional building or district licensure as a school principal or superintendent. The department cooperates with other parts of the college to license other school professionals such as special education directors. Program materials identify degree and/or license requirements.

Adult and Continuing Education (EDACE)
The department offers a full program of graduate studies in adult and continuing education culminating in the M.S. and Ed.D., and Ph.D degrees. Program materials identify degree requirements.
DEPARTMENTAL ADVISING

Expectation for Advisement
High quality academic advising is essential to ensuring that students achieve their degree and/or licensure objectives in a timely and efficient manner. All faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership are thus expected to provide quality advisement. Faculty shall be evaluated in meaningful part on their advising to masters and doctoral students.

Qualification for Advising and Graduate Committee Membership
All faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership shall be assigned advising duties appropriate to their program employment. All permanent faculty attached to graduate programs in the department shall be further certified by the Graduate School to serve on masters and doctoral committees. Additionally, such faculty as appropriate shall be certified to direct doctoral dissertations.

Each program, in consultation with the department chair, shall determine an efficient, effective, and equitable method of distributing advisement among all faculty.
DEPARTMENTAL GRADUATE-LEVEL EXAMINATIONS

The Department of Educational Leadership has a responsibility under rules of the Graduate School to administer final examinations to both masters and doctoral degree candidates.

Masters Comprehensive Examination
Masters examinations shall be made available to qualified students each semester at a regularly scheduled time. Examinations in the educational leadership emphasis shall be available only during the regular academic year (fall/spring).

Construction and supervision of masters exams are the responsibility of the faculty. These tasks may not be delegated except for normal secretarial assistance in typing, mailing, and so forth.

The nature of masters examinations will vary over time. Each program will consider and discuss the structure of examinations on a regularly scheduled basis. Examinations may be oral, written, or portfolio-based at the discretion of each graduate program’s faculty.

Students passing masters comprehensive examinations will be notified in writing by the department. Students failing to secure a pass vote will also be notified in writing.

For accreditation and assessment purposes, all comprehensive examinations shall be placed on file in the department office and held until there is no further need to maintain such data.

Doctoral Preliminary Examinations
Doctoral preliminary examinations shall be made available to qualified students each semester at a regularly scheduled time. Examinations in the educational leadership emphasis shall be available only during the regular academic year (fall/spring).

Construction and supervision of preliminary exams are the responsibility of the faculty. These tasks may not be delegated except for secretarial assistance in typing, mailing, and so forth.

The nature of doctoral examinations will vary over time within the constraints of Graduate School regulations. The scope of permissible preliminary examinations is wide and may follow the historic method of individual questions prepared by the supervisory committee; may take the form of a portfolio produced under the supervision of the major professor and/or doctoral committee; or may take the form of a successful dissertation proposal defense in lieu of any other written or oral examination. In effect, the nature of the preliminary examination is determined by the supervisory committee.

Students passing doctoral examinations will be notified in writing by the department. Students failing to secure a pass vote will also be notified in writing.

For accreditation and assessment purposes, all preliminary examinations (traditional written option) shall be placed on electronic file and held until there is no further need to maintain such data; for students opting for the dissertation proposal as the preliminary examination, the completed evaluation rubrics of the proposal defense from each committee member will be placed on electronic file and held until there is no further need to maintain those data.
DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Introduction
In addition to the duties assigned to the department chair in the Department Policy and Procedures Manual, other duties and responsibilities for maintenance and operation of the department may be apportioned out to individual faculty within each academic program, who will report regularly to each relevant faculty. Maintenance tasks for the department and college will be shared responsibilities of each department member. Matters of committee assignment, departmental projects, and initiation of new projects will be brought to the relevant faculties for information purposes.

Definitions
For definition purposes, maintenance and operation of the department have been classified as follows: (a) budget/resource allocation, (b) graduate studies, (c) external relations, (d) internal relations, (e) evaluation, (f) curriculum, (g) licensure, (h) secretary/aide supervision, (i) research, and (j) internship/field experiences. The department chair shall accept general oversight and leadership for all these areas and shall be responsible for coordinating all other work assignments in cooperation with the faculties as a whole.

Duties
Department members have an obligation to equitably share all responsibilities reasonably associated with the department. This includes, but is not limited to, membership on committees formed at the college and university levels. The faculty specifically shall be sensitive to equitable distribution for service on standing college committees to include Executive Committee, Student Affairs Committee, Faculty Affairs Committee, Academic Affairs Committee, Diversity Committee, Technology Committee, and Tenure and Promotion Committee. Effort shall be made to avoid long-term service by any faculty member on any one such college committee. The same spirit shall be observed in other college and university committee and service appointments as may arise on an irregular or special basis.
DEPARTMENT MEETINGS

Times
The widely diverse mission of the department and its resulting academic program structure necessitates numerous meetings centered on the unique work of the various parts of the department. The chair shall call meetings, prepare agendas and materials, and conduct meetings with the various faculties as needed, or may assign responsibility for scheduling and conducting such meetings. Each separate program’s faculty shall have the responsibility to meet regularly around its respective business and shall keep the department chair fully informed and engaged.

Conduct
Each faculty member is responsible for advance preparation and positive contribution to the meeting. Meetings will allow for open exchange of ideas. In order to foster a professional atmosphere, no personal attacks or devaluing of members will be allowed and will be countered with verbal disapproval by other members.

Records
Minutes of each meeting will be written, distributed, and kept on file. The recorder for each meeting will assume responsibility to forward minutes to all members, the department secretary for file copy, and the associate dean’s office.
The Department of Educational Leadership recognizes and accepts that other policy needs will arise over time that may not be included in this Department Policy and Procedures Manual. The department recognizes that each program has the need to create, amend, or delete its own unique policies relating to its particular programs and further recognizes that some policies and procedures are needed that apply uniformly across all programs. Nothing in this manual shall be intended to create, preserve, or deny any other rights or privileges in law or university policy, and it is specifically acknowledged that any policy of the college or university shall supersede and nullify any contrary department policy.
APPENDIX A

Faculty Evaluation Policies
ANNUAL EVALUATION FOR MERIT REVIEW AND PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT

Department of Educational Leadership
Faculty of Adult Education

First approved by departmental faculty 12/2002
Amended to reflect new department name and process 9/2004
Amended to specify adjunct teaching evaluation requirement 1/2009
Reviewed, revised, and approved 10/9/2013, finalized 4/9/2014

Following university procedures, the department chair will evaluate each faculty member for his/her contributions to teaching, student advising, scholarship, service, and academic citizenship. The department chair’s recommendations are to be based on: (1) the relative weights established each year jointly by the individual faculty member and department chair; (2) each faculty member's self-report augmented by appropriate evaluation data; and (3) the department chair's own assessment of faculty growth and productivity. This policy applies to those faculty for whom the annual salary recommendations originate from the department (ordinarily those holding more than half-time appointments in the department). It does not apply to the chair, whose salary recommendation originates with the Dean of Education.

A. AREAS OF EVALUATION
Five areas of faculty performance have been identified for evaluation. Not all faculty will necessarily have responsibilities in each area in each year. The allocation of responsibilities, and hence evaluation weights, are determined jointly by the chair and individual faculty member, within the limits prescribed below. In each case, the weights must total 100% (faculty on sabbatical leave are exempt from these limits and may establish weights appropriate to the goals established for their leave; in similar exempt fashion, adjunct faculty are to be evaluated solely on their teaching performance).

- Teaching 20% - 60%
- Student Advising 0%-20%
- Scholarship 10% - 50%
- Service (Directed and Non-Directed) 10% - 60%
- Academic Citizenship 10%

In general, faculty members holding senior rank may tend to have more responsibility in research and creative endeavors and/or non-directed service than faculty members holding junior rank. Similarly, instructors may, on average, have heavier teaching and advising responsibilities than others. At some times, most or all faculty members may have similar, or even identical, assigned responsibilities and consequential evaluation weights. At other times, department responsibilities may better be served by differential assignments. The decision is left in the hands of the department chair, who is in turn accountable for the college priorities established by the dean.

B. ANNUAL GOAL SETTING
Each faculty member will communicate with the chair during the first month of the evaluation year to establish personal goals and objectives for the upcoming evaluation year and to discuss his or her relative contribution to various departmental missions (see Attachment 1). This meeting can be initiated by either the individual faculty member or the department chair or may be by written communication if both parties agree. This process will result in the specification of the numeric weight of each faculty member's position responsibilities for the evaluation year and the identical corresponding weights for the evaluation process.
On occasion, modifications of such statements are necessary due to unanticipated changes in department circumstances, such as changes in course offerings, grants funded, research opportunities, or unusual financial circumstances. Such modifications should be made in writing and submitted no later than the date by which faculty evaluations are due each year, although it is understood that duty reassignment due to financial considerations may deviate from normal calendar procedures.

It is understood that precise specification of objectives will be neither feasible nor productive. Faculty evaluation does not ordinarily lend itself to simply checking off attainment of goals or to mere counting of points; such reductionist attempts distort performance. Evaluation requires professional judgment. Nonetheless, it is appropriate to establish each faculty member’s responsibilities and to delineate the relative importance of the areas of evaluation for the forthcoming year. The dual aims of course, are to meet the department’s missions and to capitalize upon faculty strengths/opportunities. Should the chair and the faculty member be unable to agree on goals and objectives for the new evaluation period, the dean shall resolve the matter.

Faculty responsibilities: To work collaboratively with the department chair in outlining position responsibilities for the coming year and, in a timely manner, notifying the chair of substantial changes in those responsibilities. The faculty member is solely responsible for requesting any changes in the evaluation weights at the time that faculty materials are submitted for review.

Chair responsibilities: To communicate any college-wide priorities to the department and to initiate the meetings and/or written communication to establish annual goals with individual faculty members. The department chair is solely responsible for insuring that Attachment I is completed for all faculty by the required deadline or referring individual cases to the dean for resolution.

C. CRITERIA/REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The sources of information to be used by the department chair in each of the areas of evaluation are described in the paragraphs that follow. Faculty are expected to provide the self-reports and evaluation information embedded within these criteria. Attachment 2 provides a sample structure within which evaluation materials can be organized.

1. Teaching

University rules require that an adequate system of summative evaluation of teaching will include at least three kinds of information: (a) classroom effectiveness, (b) preparation of instructional materials and syllabi, and (c) student assessment practices [http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/EFE.pdf]. Three sources of information will be required of each faculty member and can be summarized using Attachment 2.

a. Self-Report: This asks each faculty member to provide a report of teaching activities inside and outside of the classroom. Each faculty member should report, in short paragraphs, instructional work related to revision or reorganization of course content, development of a new course offering, or efforts to introduce innovations into the curriculum or into a specific course.

b. Syllabus: Each faculty member must present a course syllabus which describes the content to be covered and work required of the student.

c. Student Assessments: Collection of data about the student’s perceptions of instruction should be completed by using the TEVAL form. Faculty should solicit student feedback toward the end of each class in ways consistent with insuring the integrity of student responses. TEVAL forms should be completed when the instructor is not present. Forms should be forwarded to the Teaching and Learning Center, to be evaluated and returned to the instructor after grades have been determined. Faculty are asked to provide copies of the official feedback form and
ALL student comments. Pursuant to recent university policy, all courses must be formally evaluated.

The standard TEVAL form is to be augmented by a series of questions designed to explore behaviors more appropriate to self-directed learning and the development of critical thinking skills. These questions were approved by the (then-named) Faculty of Adult Education (FAE) faculty at its February 1995 meeting and will be evaluated for their appropriateness and modified as needed each February thereafter.

2. Student Advising
Advising is an important component of faculty work. Given the changing requirements of the state, it is vital that students be given proper advice. The advising relationship between faculty members and students is key to the student's development as a professional educator and/or researcher.

With regard to the advisement of students, each faculty member must provide an annual report of: (1) number of Masters' committees served on, number of Masters' committees chaired, and number of Masters' students completed; and (2) number of Ph.D./Ed.D. committees served on, number of Ph.D./Ed.D. committees chaired, numbers who completed proposals in the past year, and numbers who completed dissertations in the past year.

3. Scholarship
Given the professional character of the college's work, scholarship includes a broad range of products - including but not limited to publications in refereed journals. Examples of scholarly work might include product development, books, reviews, monographs, grant proposals, products of field work, articles published in peer reviewed journals, etc. Work that advances the teaching, development, research, and service missions of the university, that has the capacity to be disseminated widely to relevant publics, and that is available for peer review shall be considered scholarly work appropriate to university review. Work completed for contract that results only in materials or documents circulated within the contracting organization and/or does not appear to contribute to the larger knowledge base regarding teaching, the discipline, or effective strategies for linking university resources to the public through service will not be considered scholarly work for the purposes of merit evaluation. Some of these examples may involve effort during more than one evaluation year. In the case of work which extends over two years, faculty members may claim credit either for the year in which the work is accepted for publication or the year in which it is published. Projects that extend over more than two years may have credit distributed over two or more years. The following sources of information will be accepted:

a. Self-Report: Each faculty member should provide a brief review of scholarly work completed during the past year. This can include written work as well as oral presentations at conferences or workshops. Faculty members should include with their self-report a copy of at least one of these works.

b. Outside Reviews: Any evidence documenting the evaluation of scholarly work by peers outside the institution may be included in the materials submitted for evaluation. These could include reviews of articles or grant proposals submitted, prizes and awards for excellence of work done, reviews of books included in professional journals, etc.

4. Service
A few faculty members may have directed service responsibilities which may constitute a significant part of their work assignment. These would include specific assignments made by the department chair or dean of the college, activities funded through external grants, or major offices held in national associations. Non-directed service includes activities which contribute to the university community, the profession, or to the public. It is not expected, however, that any individual person would necessarily make significant contributions in all areas (teaching,
research, and service) in anyone year. Consequently, faculty members are expected to vary in terms of the focus of their contributions. When reporting service, the following sources of information will be used:

a. Self-Report: Each faculty member should provide a brief review of both directed and non-directed service completed during the past year.

b. Peer Reviews: Any evidence documenting the evaluation of this work by peers (either inside or outside the institution) may be included in the materials submitted for evaluation. These could include awards for service to an organization, letters documenting the contributions made through service, etc.

5. **Academic Citizenship**

All faculty are expected to engage in conduct in ways that foster goodwill, harmony, and collegiality within the department. They are expected to mentor colleagues, contribute to the pursuit of department goals, protect the self-esteem of students and colleagues, and generally avoid behaviors that disrupt the work of the department and its faculty. Examples of behaviors consistent with positive academic citizenship include:

a. regular attendance at departmental and college faculty meetings, except when professional obligations interfere.

b. willingness to accept his/her share of responsibility for departmental, college, and university committee assignments.

c. public support of decisions that reflect the consensus of the department.

d. honoring the confidence of department discussions involving personnel or other sensitive issues.

e. expressions of respect for and support of colleagues, even when disagreements arise.

f. tendency to share constructive opinions and preferences publicly at departmental meetings or to simply refrain from sharing any opinion at all.

The department chair will evaluate each faculty member in terms of academic citizenship.

**Overall Faculty responsibilities:** Faculty members are responsible for preparing and submitting individual self-reports covering each area of evaluation for which assignments have been made. Faculty may use the format provided in Attachment 2 augmented by supporting documentation or may choose to design their own format. One example might be to provide a copy of an updated vita and a written self-report covering the issues defined in the criteria.

**Overall Chair responsibilities:** Based on the materials supplied by each faculty member, the department chair will determine an overall rating. For each area of evaluation, the department chair will rate the faculty member in terms of three categories: exceeds standards, meets standards, fails to meet standards. These ratings will be weighted in terms of the percent time allocated to each category. In instances however, where one or more essential areas (i.e., teaching, research, and service) of an individual's work are found to fall below standards, the overall evaluation will be considered to fall below standards. The department chair will prepare a letter of evaluation for each faculty member, describing performance in each area for which assignments have been made, along with an overall evaluation. The individual faculty member will be provided the opportunity to review the evaluation letter prior to its submission to the dean. In the event of a disagreement between the faculty member and the department chair concerning the evaluation rating, the faculty member has the right to append his/her viewpoint to the letter of
evaluation. The evaluation letter and evaluation ratings of an individual faculty member shall be strictly confidential. As part of the annual evaluation cycle, the department chair shall identify in the summative evaluation letter to each faculty member the relative merit ranking upon which any salary increases will be recommended so that each successively higher ranking will result in a recommendation for a higher salary increase. The only exception shall be in the event of market/equity adjustments, which must be justified and documented separately and determined jointly through discussion between the department chair and the dean.

Other Evaluation Circumstances
The evaluation policy heretofore is designed and intended in letter and spirit for application to ‘regular’ full-time tenure-track and/or full-time term faculty. However, at times the department may choose to appoint other persons as adjunct faculty or to employ other highly qualified individuals in temporary instructional roles wherein the normal teaching/scholarship/service triad is essentially irrelevant.

In such cases, the requirement for formal performance evaluation shall apply only to the teaching activities of such persons. At a minimum, the method of evaluation shall be that the evaluatee will administer TEVAL or other departmentally approved standardized measurements of instructional effectiveness to each class taught in every semester in which he or she is financially compensated for a formal teaching role. The evaluatee shall then submit results of all such standardized assessments to the department chair (or the chair's designee) for performance review. Such reports shall be utilized by the chair, in consultation with appropriate faculty, to assist in program planning, curriculum planning, and improvement of instruction, and to assist in determinations of continued employment status.

For more information on evaluation, refer to the University Handbook C30.1 - C39. For more information on merit adjustment, refer to the University Handbook C40 – C48.3.

SAMPLE FORM FOR ANNUAL GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment 1</th>
<th>ANNUAL GOALS-2000</th>
<th>% Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching (list courses /semester to be offered)</td>
<td>——%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Advising</td>
<td>___%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D./Ed.D. Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D./Ed.D. Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship (list areas/expected outcomes or products)</td>
<td>___%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>___%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directed: (projects /assignments with annual goals)</td>
<td>___%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Directed: (list committees /activities)</td>
<td>___%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Citizenship</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE FORM FOR
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE CONTRACT

Attachment 2

Faculty Member __________  Date ________  Department Chair ___________ Date ______

The following is an estimate of the annual goals established jointly by the faculty member and department chair. It can be modified in response to changes in course offerings, grants funded, etc.

Forms for Merit Evaluation

Any appropriate method of reporting annual activities is acceptable. The following is suggested as one option. This report should cover your completed activities for the calendar year. Activities in progress may be reported to date.

I. Summary of Teaching
II. Summary of Student Advising
III. Summary of Scholarly Work
IV. Summary of Service
V. Other Relevant Information

A. Summary of Teaching
   (1) Teaching Assignment
      Course No. ____ Title _______________ Semester __ Credit ___ Enrollment ___
   (2) Independent Study (Other than Doctoral/Master's Research)
   (3) Other (please describe)
   (4) Attachments:  Self-Report
                     Portfolio
                     TEVAL or other Results

B. Summary of Student Advising

   (1) Master's Degree
      Number chair
      Number committees
      Coursework only
      Report
      Thesis
      Completed in last year
      Chair
      Committee

   (2) Ph.D./Ed.D
      Number chair
      Number committees
      Chair
      Committee
      Chair
      Committee

   Proposals Approved in last year
   Dissertations defended in last year
C. Scholarship

Please prepare a self-report that provides the following types of information. All faculty are asked to present a concise statement of current scholarly activity and then report work in those categories which are applicable. Faculty should attach a copy of at least one of the products listed as well as include any evaluation of scholarly work by peers outside the institution.

1. Concise statement of current scholarly activities
2. Citations for publications in refereed journals
   a. Published
   b. Accepted
3. Citations for Book Chapters, Monographs, Articles
4. Textbooks
5. Presentations at professional meetings (please add an asterisk for those presentations for which written proceedings were produced.)
6. Educational Software/Media
7. Grant Proposals
   a. Grants presently active
   b. Grants proposals submitted
8. Other Relevant Information

D. Summary of Service

1. University Service
   * List committees which you chair, describe your activities, and estimate the time involved in both meetings and preparation.
   * List committees of which you are a member, describe your activities, and estimate the time involved in both meetings and committee assignments.
2. Service to the profession
   * List professional associations in which you assume a leadership role. For each organization, describe your role or the office to which you have been elected, the activities associated with that role/office, and the time involved in providing service.
3. Service to the community
   * Describe any activities which provide service to organizations or agencies outside of the university and/or your profession. Describe your involvement and estimate the time involved in providing the service.
The Department of Educational Leadership at Kansas State University recognizes and supports the purpose and goals of evaluating the performance of faculty. The Faculty of Educational Leadership further recognizes and supports the legitimacy of the traditional evaluation areas of Research, Teaching, and Service. The Faculty of Educational Leadership further commends and supports the process of peer review under a departmental leadership structure of chairship, rather than department heads. The department therefore states its evaluation policy as follows:

GENERAL ELEMENTS

(1) Faculty of educational leadership in the Department of Educational Leadership will engage in peer review on an annual basis according to timelines set forth by the university and college. As adopted in this department, peer evaluation will encompass the period January through December.

(2) Faculty of educational leadership in the Department of Educational Leadership will base all peer review on performance contracts prepared in advance of the evaluation period. A performance contract is defined as an agreement between relevant parties outlining the goals and objectives that the evaluatee intends to accomplish during the evaluation period. Performance contracts will be individualized for each faculty member, showing the percentage of time assigned to the areas of research, teaching, and service and showing the expected performance outcomes of work in each area. Such contracts shall be collaboratively established between the department chair and the individual, after consulting with the faculty as a whole, to comprise 100% of each person's time. However, the final decision on assignment of each individual's time shall be made by the Dean of Education after taking into consideration the recommendation of the department chair and any justified circumstances, including but not limited to, unusual financial condition.

(3) The faculty of educational leadership and the chair of the Department of Educational Leadership will satisfy the evaluation tasks according to a calendar of deadlines annually published by the College of Education, to include the following: (a) performance contracts shall be prepared and forwarded to the chair (generally in March) each year for the upcoming evaluation period; (b) each faculty member will provide peer review of each other faculty member's merit materials and transmit the recommendations to the chair (generally in January) of each year; (c) the chair shall transmit evaluation letters to faculty and provide opportunity for formal discussion with each evaluatee (generally in February) of each year; and the chair shall meet all other college deadlines established by the dean's office.

(4) Faculty of educational leadership in the Department of Educational Leadership will review and pass judgment on faculty productivity in the area of Research as defined by evidence submitted by each faculty member on publications and other research activities as specified in the individual's performance contract. Those activities include, but are not limited to, published media, textbooks, refereed journal articles, grants, and so forth.
Faculty of educational leadership in the Department of Educational Leadership will review and pass judgment on faculty productivity in the area of Teaching as defined by evidence submitted by each faculty member, including student evaluations for all classes taught and data on advisement responsibilities as specified in the individual's performance contract. Those activities include, but are not limited to, submission of syllabi in which expected course and student learning outcomes are stated along with evidence of how courses/expectations are aligned with the department's mission and goal statements, evidence that courses taught conform to the college's accreditation standards, evidence of new coursework established and/or curriculum improvement activities, evidence of successful advisement activities, and so forth.

Faculty of educational leadership in the Department of Educational Leadership will review and pass judgment on faculty productivity in the area of Service as defined by evidence submitted by each faculty member on service to international, national, state and local constituencies as specified in the individual's performance contract.

PROCEDURES

1. In keeping with university and college timelines, each faculty member shall submit for peer review executive summaries (with availability of full collections of materials) addressing the areas of Research, Teaching, and Service.

2. Material collections in the area of Research shall include all such refereed and practitioner publications as the evaluatee shall choose to submit and may include non-print publications. Grant activity shall fall under the research category. Peer reviewed presentations at professional conferences and meetings may also be counted in the area of research. The evaluatee shall submit an accompanying narrative description of the relationship between any documentation supplied and his/her performance contract.

3. Material collections in the area of Teaching shall include formal assessments of teaching skills such as TEVAL, any other solicited student evaluation independently derived by the faculty member, and a record of student advisement responsibilities. Course syllabi identifying course objectives and learning outcomes which are defensibly connected to the department's mission and goals shall be included and considered evidence of teaching evaluation. The evaluatee shall submit an accompanying narrative description of the relationship between any documentation supplied and his/her performance contract.

4. Material collections in the area of Service shall include all such documentation regarding local, state, regional, national and international service as the evaluatee shall choose to submit and may include consulting activities bringing recognition to the department and/or the university. The evaluatee shall submit an accompanying narrative description of the relationship between any documentation supplied and his/her performance contract.

5. Material collections shall be reviewed by each peer, assessing documentation submitted against the individual's performance contract criteria, with written confidential evaluations of the same to be submitted to the chair. Peer evaluations must be cognizant of differential weightings attributable to percentage assignment of time per individual.

6. The chair shall take the confidential peer evaluations and condense them into a summative evaluation letter addressed to each faculty member, with said letter faithfully preserving the intent of peer review.

7. Individual faculty members' evaluation letters shall remain confidential between the chair and the evaluatee, except where the same are required to be submitted to administrators in the college and university or when otherwise compelled by force of law.
(8) This policy shall be effective as of the date first written above and shall be reviewed by the faculty as a whole not more than five years from the date of first adoption and reviewed on the same basis thereafter.

(9) All other applicable university and college policy shall be observed.

OVERALL EVALUATEE RESPONSIBILITIES
(1) Each faculty member shall be given the opportunity to meet with the faculty as a whole and the chair annually for the purpose of constructing a performance contract.

(2) Upon receipt of annual written evaluations, each evaluatee shall sign an acknowledgment indicating that an opportunity was provided to discuss and review with the chair and faculty the evaluation and any relative merit ranking. The evaluatee shall respond in writing, if desired, within seven working days regarding any disagreement with the evaluation.

OVERALL EVALUATOR RESPONSIBILITIES
(1) In keeping with the evaluation calendar published by the College of Education (generally in February), the department chair will prepare a written evaluation for each faculty member according to the procedures described above. The evaluation shall identify the basis for any numeric quantification of performance, and the evaluation shall summarize achievements on which assessment and/or quantification is based.

(2) The chair shall identify in the summative evaluation letter the relative merit ranking upon which salary increases will be recommended so that each successively higher ranking will result in a recommendation for a higher salary increase. The only exception shall be in the event of market/equity adjustments, which must be justified and documented separately and determined jointly through discussion between the department chair and the dean.

(3) The chair, in making a summative evaluation, shall take into account the percentage of time identified in each performance contract and weight the total evaluation by those same percentages so that a person’s evaluation shall be weighted by area of responsibility in direct relationship to the percentage of time assigned to each function. Likewise, the ranking shall take into consideration the professorial rank of the individual (see the department’s published Minimum Performance Standards which explicate the different expectations according to the ranks of Assistant, Associate, and Full professor). In all cases, for each area of evaluation, the department chair will rate the faculty member in terms of four categories: exceeds standards, meets standards, fails to meet standards but meets minimum standards, and fails to meet standards. In instances however, where one or more essential areas of an individual’s work (i.e., teaching, research, and service) are found to fall below standards, the overall evaluation will be considered to fall below standards (see Appendix B).

(4) The chair shall provide an opportunity for each evaluatee to discuss his/her evaluation in person, shall secure signatures indicating occurrence of the same, and shall allow for disagreement within the same seven days required by the university.

(5) The chair shall forward to the appropriate college administrator copies of the following items: (a) the evaluation policy as adopted by the faculty; (b) a written evaluation of each faculty member identical to the copy given to the evaluatee; (c) a recommendation on salary adjustment consistent with other provisions in this policy; and (d) any responses by the evaluatee to the evaluation.

Other Evaluation Circumstances
The evaluation policy heretofore is designed and intended in letter and spirit for application to ‘regular’ full-time tenure-track and/or full-time term faculty. However, at times the department may choose to appoint other persons as adjunct faculty or to employ other highly qualified
individuals in temporary instructional or student-supervisory roles (e.g., mentors, field-based practicum supervisors) wherein the normal teaching/scholarship/service triad is essentially irrelevant.

In such cases, the requirement for formal performance evaluation shall apply only to the teaching/supervisory activities of such persons. At a minimum, the method of evaluation shall be that the evaluatee will administer TEVAL or other departmentally approved standardized measurements of instructional/supervisory effectiveness to each class taught/supervised in every semester in which he or she is financially compensated for a formal teaching/supervisory role. The evaluatee shall then submit results of all such standardized assessments to the department chair (or the chair’s designee) for performance review. Such reports shall be utilized by the chair, in consultation with appropriate faculty, to assist in program planning, curriculum planning, and improvement of instruction/supervision, and to assist in determinations of continued employment status.

For more information on evaluation, refer to the University Handbook C30.1 - C39. For more information on merit adjustment, refer to the University Handbook C40 – C48.3.
APPENDIX B

MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE LEVELS OF PRODUCTIVITY
The Faculty of Adult Education will use the following scale in evaluating faculty performance:

1) Exceeds Standards (ES)
2) Meets Standards (MS)
3) Fails to Meet Standards, but Meets Minimum Standards (FMS-MMS)
4) Fails to Meet Minimum Standards (FMMS—see University Handbook C31.5 – C31.8 for Chronic Low Achievement policy applicable only to tenured faculty).

The standards which follow are divided into three functional areas: teaching, research, and service, and are presented by academic rank. As indicated above, these standards represent the minimum acceptable levels of faculty performance by rank and responsibility/function.

I. TEACHING

A) Assistant Professor
- meets all assigned classes for scheduled hours
- has current syllabus on file for all courses taught
- posts and keeps reasonable office hours
- regularly conducts department-approved evaluations of all courses taught
- uses evaluation results to improve teaching
- utilizes a variety of teaching/learning methods

B) Associate Professor
- meets all assigned classes for scheduled hours
- has current syllabus on file for all courses taught
- posts and keeps reasonable office hours
- conducts department-approved evaluations of all courses taught
- is available for and responsible with master's and doctoral-level advisees and students
- uses evaluation results to improve teaching
- utilizes a variety of teaching/learning methods
- engages in a continuous updating of course and curricular materials
- uses effective student performance assessment techniques

C) Professor
- meets all assigned classes for scheduled hours
- has current syllabus on file for all courses taught
- posts and keeps reasonable office hours
- conducts department-approved evaluations for all courses taught
- is available to and responsible with master's and doctoral-level advisees and students
- assists faculty members who are early in their career with teaching and advising
- uses evaluation results to improve teaching
- utilizes a variety of teaching/learning methods
- engages in a continuous updating of course and curriculum materials
• uses effective student performance assessment techniques
• provides leadership in curriculum development in the department and the college
• provides leadership in interdisciplinary collaboration

II. RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

Assistant Professor
• demonstrates skills and initiative in developing research and/or scholarly activity
• applies recent research in the field to course work and research activity
• assists in dissemination of current information through appropriate professional channels

B) Associate Professor
• develops, conducts, and disseminates research and/or results of other scholarly activity
• regularly participates in ongoing scholarly activity in the profession
• regularly updates research skills and dissemination techniques through active participation in professional meetings.
• participates in collaborative research and/or grant writing endeavors
• disseminates information at the national level by actively participating in conferences, journal reviews, or other activities

C) Professor
• participates in ongoing scholarly activity in the professional field
• regularly updates research skills and dissemination techniques
• participates in collaborative research, writing, and/or grant writing endeavors
• disseminates new knowledge at the national level by participating in conference organization, or other scholarly activities

III. SERVICE

A) Assistant Professor
• regularly participates in meetings and activities at the department and college levels
• provides evidence of ongoing involvement in student and/or professional organizations

B) Associate Professor
• actively participates and demonstrates leadership in the department and college
• regularly participates in state and professional organizations
• collaborates with faculty and other professional colleagues
• demonstrates increasing levels of national involvement

C) Professor
• demonstrates leadership at the department, college and university levels
• demonstrates leadership in national, state, local, and/or professional organizations
• serves as a mentor to other faculty members
• provides leadership in critical analysis of field-based and research-based issues
• demonstrates thoughtful decision making and problem solving skills at the department, college, university and professional levels

CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT
The procedures which follow are in keeping with Section C31.5-8 of the University Handbook.

A faculty member whose overall performance falls below these levels of minimum acceptability during one evaluation year will be so informed in writing, and will meet with the department chair to establish a written plan of action to bring the performance up to stated standards.
Monthly meetings will be held with the chair to monitor progress on the agreed upon plan. If the plan is not completed, resulting in a second year of below minimum performance, the faculty member and the department chair will meet with the Dean of the College of Education to outline specific remedial action. If the plan is not completed, resulting in a second year of below minimum performance, the faculty member and the department chair will meet with the Dean of the College of Education to outline specific remedial action. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which minimum standards are not met, then "dismissal for cause" will be considered at the discretion of the appropriate dean (University Handbook Section C31.5).
MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE LEVELS OF PRODUCTIVITY

Department of Educational Leadership
Faculty of Educational Leadership


DEFINITIONS OF CATEGORIES

EXCEEDS STANDARDS (ES)
This rating is available only when a faculty member demonstrates exceptional overall performance. To qualify for this rating, the department will judge the evidence and demonstrate formal support by nominating this individual for this rating. Exceptional is defined as:

- **Research:** Recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having been cited or depended on as a national authority.
- **Service:** Recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having secured significant external funding or national recognition for service to the profession.
- **Teaching:** Recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having been recognized for excellence in teaching through awards from Kansas State University, the College of Education, or nationally recognized organizations.

MEETS STANDARDS (MS)
This rating is available only when a faculty member meets and exceeds minimal standards for his or her respective academic rank. Standards will be developed annually through a peer review process for determining performance contracts and evaluating performance for merit. For purposes of definition, the rating of MS will be used when all the performance contract goals were achieved.

FAILS TO MEET STANDARDS, BUT MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS (MMS)
This rating is used to notify a faculty member that he or she has not met the terms of the annual individual performance contract, but that minimum standards have been met. The upper and lower limits of the rating of MMS are defined as follows. The upper limit shall be invoked when the individual has not met the terms of his/her annual performance contract. The lower limit shall be crossed when the individual has not met one or more of the standards on the minimum standards matrix. (See attached matrix).

FAILS TO MEET MINIMUM STANDARDS (FMS-MMS)
This rating is used to notify a faculty member that he or she has failed to satisfy one or more of the criterion on the matrix. (See matrix below). For more information on chronic low achievement, refer to the University Handbook C31.1 – C31.8.

CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT
The procedures which follow are in keeping with Section C31.5-8 of the University Handbook.

A faculty member whose overall performance falls below these levels of minimum acceptability during one evaluation year will be so informed in writing, and will meet with the department chair to establish a written plan of action to bring the performance up to stated standards. Monthly meetings will be held with the chair to monitor progress on the agreed upon plan. If the plan is not completed, resulting in a second year of below minimum performance, the faculty member and the department chair will meet with the Dean of the College of Education to outline specific remedial action. If the plan is not completed, resulting in a second year of...
below minimum performance, the faculty member and the department chair will meet with the Dean of the College of Education to outline specific remedial action. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which minimum standards are not met, then "dismissal for cause" will be considered at the discretion of the appropriate dean (University Handbook Section C31.5).

MATRIX OF CRITERIA SATISFYING THE DESIGNATION OF MEETS STANDARDS (MS)

TEACHING

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
- Posts office hours and is regularly available for advising.
- Places syllabi on file for all didactic courses.
- Utilizes TEVAL or other department-approved standardized measurements for appropriate courses.
- Demonstrates progress toward graduate faculty membership.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
- Posts office hours and is regularly available for advising.
- Places syllabi on file for all didactic courses.
- Utilizes TEVAL or other department-approved standardized measurements for appropriate courses.
- Achieves graduate faculty status.
- Serves as an effective member on doctoral committees.
- Serves as an effective advisor for masters students.

FULL PROFESSOR
- Posts office hours and is regularly available for advising.
- Places syllabi on file for all didactic courses.
- Utilizes TEVAL or other department-approved standardized measurements for appropriate courses.
- Achieves graduate faculty status.
- Serves as an effective advisor for doctoral students.
- Serves as an effective advisor for masters students.
- Provides effective supervision of internships.

RESEARCH

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
- Shows evidence of submitting research for publication.
- Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the teaching field.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
- Demonstrates ability to produce a research agenda.
- Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the teaching field.
- Provides evidence of successful involvement in scholarship and research (e.g., refereed publications, funded grants, or product development).
RESEARCH

FULL PROFESSOR
- Produces a coherent research agenda.
- Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the teaching field.
- Provides evidence of successful sustained involvement in scholarship and research (e.g., refereed publications, funded grants, or product development).

SERVICE

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
- Attends local, state, regional, national, or international meetings.
- Participates in the development of curriculum.
- Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating on college and/or university committees.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
- Provides service to local, state, national, or international constituencies.
- Participates in the development of curriculum.
- Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating on college and/or university committees.

FULL PROFESSOR
- Provides service to local, state, national, or international constituencies.
- Participates in the development of curriculum.
- Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating on college and/or university committees.
- Positively and proactively mentors junior colleagues.
APPENDIX C

STANDARDS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION
and the MID-TENURE REVIEW
The Department of Educational Leadership at Kansas State University recognizes and supports the purpose and goals of evaluating performance of faculty. The Adult Education Faculty further recognizes and supports the legitimacy of the traditional evaluation areas of Research, Teaching, and Service. However, the Faculty broadens the scope of acceptable research in line with that defined in “Scholarship Reconsidered” (Boyer, 1990).

Further, in decisions regarding the awarding of tenure, the College of Education and its departments are guided by the policies and procedures stipulated in the University Handbook. With respect to tenure, the Faculty of Adult Education in the Department of Educational Leadership is guided by the general principles of excellence and versatility in appropriate academic endeavors and in service to one or more of the university’s various missions of teaching, research, service, or extension.

Likewise, in tenure recommendations, the obligation of the Adult Education Faculty in stewardship to students, consumers of research, the community of scholars, and other university constituents is to have the best faculty possible. Thus, tenure decisions should be based on demonstrated individual excellence (merit), but also and more importantly, on the candidate’s overall contribution to the institutional mission (worth). Furthermore, the institution is best served by faculty who are both versatile and specialized. Versatility may be across the areas of teaching, research, and service; or it may be within one or more of those areas. Specialization entails both depth and breadth of knowledge in a discipline, and the application of that knowledge in teaching, research, and/or service. This process is applied to all events leading to tenure and promotion, as these same considerations apply in exact same form to annual reappointment for probationary faculty and to the mid-tenure event so that all tenure-track and tenured faculty are assessed by university calendar benchmarks and by a uniform set of standards (for details about reappointment, see page 9 above).

Evidence of Performance--Tenure
During the probationary period a candidate for tenure must receive annual departmental performance evaluations which:

- Provide evidence and capacity to consistently meet annual performance objectives and goals as developed and agreed upon by the department chair and the faculty member.
- Indicate meeting or exceeding expectations as documented in each of the annual merit documents in the years preceding the tenure decision.

Annual performance evaluations, along with department criteria for promotion and/or tenure, will be used by the department’s tenured faculty in making recommendations to the department chair regarding whether a candidate should be advanced for promotion and/or tenure—a simple majority is sufficient to advance a candidate for consideration by the department chair. Affirmation shall be by balloting of tenured faculty holding equal or higher rank; the department chair may not vote at the faculty level, as his/her vote is recorded separately as part of the department chair’s recommendation to the college/dean.

Criteria to be Considered--Tenure
At the time of the tenure recommendation the following criteria should be considered.
Teaching

- Places syllabi on file for all didactic courses
- Achieves graduate faculty status
- Attains certification to direct doctoral research and to serve as a major professor for doctoral students
- Meets all assigned classes for scheduled hours
- Has current syllabi on file with the college for all courses taught
- Posts and keeps reasonable office hours and rarely fails to be available
- Uses department-approved evaluations, TEVAL or other department-approved standardized measurements, appropriately for all courses taught
- Is available to and responsible with advisees
- Uses evaluation results to improve teaching
- Utilizes a variety of teaching/learning methods
- Engages in a continuous updating of course material
- Demonstrates effective assessment and evaluation of student performance
- Provides leadership in curriculum development for the department and college
- Provides leadership in interdisciplinary collaboration.

Research and Scholarly Activity

- Identifies a line of inquiry leading to the development of a research agenda
- Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the teaching field
- Provides evidence of successful involvement in scholarship and research (e.g., refereed publications, funded grants, or curriculum, program, or product development)

Service

- Provides leadership at the department, college, and university levels
- Participates in the development of curriculum
- Provides leadership in state, local, and/or professional organizations or with professional constituencies
- Provides leadership in critical analysis of field-based and research-based issues
- Demonstrates thoughtful decision-making and problem solving skills at the department, college, university, and professional levels
- Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating on college and/or university committees.

Assistant to Associate Professor--Promotion

Obtaining tenure in the Department of Educational Leadership—Faculty of Adult Education and advancing to the associate professor rank—are tied together.

Associate to Full Professor--Promotion

Teaching

- Meets all assigned classes for scheduled hours
- Has current syllabi on file for all courses taught
- Posts and keeps reasonable office hours and rarely fails to be available
- Uses department-approved evaluations, TEVAL or other department-approved standardized measurements, appropriately for all courses taught
- Is available to and responsible with advisees
- Uses evaluation results to improve teaching
- Utilizes a variety of teaching/learning methods
- Engages in a continuous updating of course material
- Demonstrates effective assessment and evaluation of student performance
- Provides leadership in curriculum development for the department and college
• Provides leadership in interdisciplinary collaboration.

Research and Scholarly Activity
• Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the teaching field
• Provides evidence of successful sustained involvement in scholarship and research (e.g., refereed publications, funded grants, or product development; recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having been cited or depended on as a national authority)
• Carries out a coherent sustained research agenda.

Service
• Provides leadership at the department, college, and university levels
• Provides leadership in state, local, and/or professional organizations
• Serves as a mentor to junior faculty members in research, service, teaching, and advising
• Provides leadership in critical analysis of field-based and research-based issues
• Demonstrates thoughtful decision-making and problem solving skills at the department, college, university, and professional levels
• Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating on college and/or university committees.

The Mid-Tenure Review
All processes leading to the tenure and/or promotion event as described above shall be applied in the same form to the mid-tenure review, so that candidates are assessed at the mid-tenure point as if approaching the final decision except that the mid-tenure review shall be for the purpose of measuring the candidate’s progress toward a total portfolio that will be acceptable at the final tenure/promotion time.

For more information on promotion, refer to the University Handbook C120 – C156.2. For more information on mid-tenure review, refer to the University Handbook C92.1 – C93. For more information on tenure, refer to the University Handbook C70 – C116.2.
STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

The Faculty of Educational Leadership in the Department of Educational Leadership at Kansas State University recognizes and supports the acts of measuring, evaluating, and rewarding performance of all faculty. The Faculty values a wide range of contributions to the department’s assigned mission of graduate-level teaching, scholarship, and service and asserts that annual evaluation, the award of tenure, and the award of promotion in rank are performance events that should be linearly connected to the greater institution’s advancement. The Faculty therefore concludes that quality and versatility in performance, together with meaningful contribution to the department’s mission, are the appropriate metrics for decisions about evaluation of both tenured and untenured faculty and about the actual award of tenure and/or promotion.

The Faculty declares that there can be no simple list of accomplishments that, when completed, will result in performance levels sufficiently meritorious to meet or exceed standards for annual evaluation and/or tenure/promotion purposes. Rather, the Faculty declares that the true litmus test is a careful and informed judgment by knowledgeable faculty en banc regarding a candidate’s overall performance in the total context of ‘quality’, ‘versatility’, and ‘mission’. More specifically, faculty holding expertise in the candidate’s broad field (i.e., department peers) must judge whether a candidate’s performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service advances the department’s reputation and whether the candidate’s contributions advance the department’s overall mission. In sum, a candidate will be affirmed through the evaluation process and/or recommended for tenure and/or promotion only when his/her tenured peers holding equal or higher rank affirm through the balloting process that he or she has taught well, served well, and engaged in scholarship in substantial ways that bring lasting credit and visibility to the institution.

STATEMENT OF STANDARDS

The Faculty of Educational Leadership has established a set of standards for evaluation and tenure/promotion which are conditioned upon performance by academic rank—i.e., each higher rank demands a higher level of accomplishment. More specifically, promotion to Assistant Professor reflects an acceptable level of achievement for time in rank and evidence of continuing potential for quality in teaching, scholarship, and service. Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure rests on evidence of substantial professional contributions given time in rank that reflect quality in teaching, scholarship or other creative endeavor, and service. Promotion to Professor is based on attainment of superior quality in the assigned responsibilities of the candidate, recognition of excellence by relevant external constituencies, and clear indication of continuing sustained contributions over an entire career. These same watershed expectations apply to annual evaluation as well, so that the Faculty has enacted a performance model by academic rank, with all faculty held accountable for continual quality, versatility, and contribution to overall mission. Likewise, these apply in exact same form to annual reappointment for probationary faculty and to the mid-tenure event standards (for details about reappointment, see page 9 above). so that all tenure-track and tenured faculty are assessed by university calendar benchmarks and by a uniform set of standards. For more information on promotion, refer to the University Handbook C120 – C156.2. For more information on mid-tenure review refer to C92.1 – C93 and for tenure refer to C70 – C116.2.
PERFORMANCE MATRIX
The Faculty of Educational Leadership strongly supports new and expanded models of teaching, scholarship, and service. Accordingly, the Faculty has constructed a performance matrix that values a wide range of contributions to organizational goals. In sum, faculty may expect institutional rewards for outstanding performance on the dimensions illustrated in matrix form:

EDLEA PROMOTION AND TENURE RUBRIC
A candidate will be affirmed through the evaluation process and/or recommended for tenure and/or promotion only when his/her peers affirm that he or she has taught well, served well, and engaged in scholarship in substantial ways that bring lasting credit and visibility to the institution. All candidates are expected to integrate the components of technology, diversity, and field-based partnerships, as well as to provide evidence of student performance. Affirmation shall be by balloting of tenured faculty holding equal or higher rank—a simple majority shall be sufficient to advance a candidate to consideration by the department chair; the department chair may not vote at the faculty level, as his/her vote is recorded separately as part of the department chair’s recommendation to the college/dean.

For tenure track or for promotion only to Assistant Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching and Advising</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisement</td>
<td>Does not maintain office hours or meet and/or communicate with students</td>
<td>Maintains office hours and meets students (face-to-face and/or electronically)</td>
<td>Develops regular office hours and engages in continuous communication (face to face and/or electronically)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabi</td>
<td>Uses syllabi that lack goals and objectives reflecting department/college guidelines</td>
<td>Creates course syllabi aligned to department and college mission statements and accreditation guidelines</td>
<td>Creates comprehensive teaching agenda that is aligned to course syllabi and department and college mission statements and accreditation guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department (e.g., TEVAL, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of below average rankings</td>
<td>Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department (e.g., TEVAL, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of average or above rankings</td>
<td>Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department (e.g., TEVAL, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of excellent rankings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reflection</td>
<td>Demonstrates no evidence of self-reflection activities</td>
<td>Demonstrates adequate evidence of self-reflection activities</td>
<td>Demonstrates high quality evidence of self-reflection activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Agenda</td>
<td>Demonstrates no teaching agenda, or an agenda which is poorly conceived</td>
<td>Creates a written teaching agenda</td>
<td>Creates a bold, comprehensive teaching agenda that is aligned to course syllabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and/or Scholarly Activity</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and/or Grants</td>
<td>Demonstrates no activity related to publications or grants</td>
<td>Seeks mentoring for writing and publishing articles, books, and/or grants, and generates a publication and/or grant record appropriate to time in rank</td>
<td>Publishes articles, books, or receives local, state, national or international grants aligned with research agenda and department and college missions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Agenda</td>
<td>Does not provide evidence of a written research agenda</td>
<td>Creates written research agenda, appropriate to time in rank, that focuses on attaining graduate faculty membership and certification to direct dissertations</td>
<td>Creates written research agenda that focuses on enhancing and/or expanding previous works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currency</td>
<td>Has no new publications or grants since last promotion or review</td>
<td>Provides evidence of new scholarly efforts, appropriate to time in rank, since last promotion or review</td>
<td>Provides evidence of significant and current scholarly efforts since last promotion or review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Agenda</td>
<td>Possesses no written service agenda</td>
<td>Creates and implements a written service agenda appropriate to time in rank</td>
<td>Carries out a strong service agenda at local, state, national, and/or international levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University, State, Regional, National or International Professional Organizations Participation</td>
<td>Demonstrates little or no activity in university, state, regional, or national/international professional organizations</td>
<td>Demonstrates record, appropriate to time in rank, of attending state, regional, and national/international professional meetings</td>
<td>Regularly attends and presents at professional meetings at university, state, regional, and/or national/international levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental/College/University Contributions</td>
<td>Does not engage in department, college, university committee work or curriculum development</td>
<td>Engages in department, college, university committee work, and curriculum development</td>
<td>Engages in activities at several levels of the organization (department, college or university), and contributes to positive social-emotional culture in the department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching and Advising</th>
<th>Un satisfactory</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisement</td>
<td>Does not maintain office hours or meet and/or communicate with students</td>
<td>Maintains office hours and meets students (face-to-face and/or electronically)</td>
<td>Develops regular office hours and engages in consistent, continuous communications with advisees and is appropriately available for non-advisee appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabi</td>
<td>Uses syllabi that lack goals and objectives reflecting department/college guidelines</td>
<td>Updates course syllabi aligned to department and college mission statements and accreditation guidelines</td>
<td>Implements a comprehensive teaching agenda that is aligned to course syllabi and department and college mission statements and accreditation guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department (e.g., TEVAL, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of below average rankings</td>
<td>Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department (e.g., TEVAL, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of average or above rankings</td>
<td>Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department (e.g., TEVAL, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of excellent rankings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reflection</td>
<td>Demonstrates little evidence of self-reflection activities</td>
<td>Demonstrates adequate evidence of self-reflection activities</td>
<td>Demonstrates high quality evidence of self-reflection activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Agenda</td>
<td>Demonstrates only a poorly conceived teaching agenda</td>
<td>Pursues teaching agenda with attention to currency and creativity</td>
<td>Engages in teaching practices reflecting current research and creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and/or Scholarly Activity</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and/or Grants</td>
<td>Demonstrates limited publications and/or grants</td>
<td>Publishes articles or books, or receives state or national or international grants</td>
<td>Publishes multiple articles or books and/or receives state, national, or international grants over a sustained period of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Agenda and Methodology</td>
<td>Does not pursue a written research agenda; provides no evidence of research methodology knowledge</td>
<td>Publishes articles or books and/or receives state, national or international grants; provides evidence of research methodology expertise; co-directs or directs doctoral dissertations</td>
<td>Publishes respected scholarly materials and successfully guides students through the dissertation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currency</td>
<td>Has generated no new research or publications since the last promotion or review</td>
<td>Provides evidence of publications, appropriate to time in rank, since last promotion or review</td>
<td>Provides evidence of significant multiple publications since last promotion or review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Agenda</td>
<td>Demonstrates only limited or no evidence of attending to a written service agenda</td>
<td>Attends to a service agenda appropriate to time in rank</td>
<td>Updates and pursues a comprehensive written service agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University, State, Regional, National or International Participation</td>
<td>Demonstrates little or no activity in university, state, regional, or national/international professional organizations</td>
<td>Provides a record, appropriate to time in rank, of attending state, regional, and national/international professional meetings</td>
<td>Regularly attends and presents at professional meetings at university, state, regional, and/or national/international levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental/College/University Contributions</td>
<td>Does not engage in leadership roles in department, college, university committee work and/or curriculum development</td>
<td>Engages in and assumes leadership roles in department, college and/or university committee work and/or curriculum development</td>
<td>Assumes visible leadership roles and builds relationships and contributes to positive social-emotional culture in the department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Advising</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Meets expectations</td>
<td>Exceeds expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisement</td>
<td>Does not maintain office hours or meet and/or communicate consistently with students</td>
<td>Maintains office hours and meets students (face-to-face and/or electronically) and is regularly available to students and other faculty</td>
<td>Maintains office hours, advises a full case load of students, and is available to students and faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabi</td>
<td>Uses syllabi that lack periodic updating of goals, objectives, grading, etc.</td>
<td>Updates course syllabi based on evaluations and self-reflections that are aligned to department and college mission statements and accreditation guidelines</td>
<td>Engages in innovative teaching practices reflecting attention to diversity issues, use of technology, field-based partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department (e.g., TEVAL, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of below average rankings</td>
<td>Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department (e.g., TEVAL, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of average or above rankings</td>
<td>Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department (e.g., TEVAL, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of excellent rankings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Agenda</td>
<td>Demonstrates weak or no implementation of a teaching agenda</td>
<td>Demonstrates strong implementation of a teaching agenda, with attention to currency and creativity</td>
<td>Demonstrates strong implementation of innovative teaching practices reflecting current research and creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and/or Scholarly Activity</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and/or Grants</td>
<td>Demonstrates only limited or erratic success with refereed publications and/or grants since last promotion</td>
<td>Regularly publishes multiple articles and/or books, and/or receives state, national, or international grants since last promotion</td>
<td>Publishes articles and/or books, and/or receives state, national, or international grants over a sustained period of time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Research Agenda and Research Methodology

| Does not update and adjust written research agenda according to changes in field of expertise; exhibits only a limited grasp and application of valid, rigorous research methodologies | Updates and adjusts written agenda according to changes in field of expertise; recognizes legitimacy of different methods and/or provides support to college (expertise) | Documents implementatic of a research agenda that contributes to current needs in the field and/or engages futuristic or cutting-edge lines of research; recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having been cited or depended on as a national authority; regularly successfully guides students through the completed dissertation process |

### Currency

| Has generated little research or publication since the last promotion | Provides evidence of a systematic record of publications since last promotion | Provides evidence of a record of significant and sustained publications since last promotion |

### Service

#### Service Agenda

| Exhibits only limited or no evidence of attending to a written service agenda beyond date of last promotion | Regularly updates written service agenda since date of last promotion | Regularly updates and pursues a written comprehensive service agenda that results in a state, national, and/or international reputation |

#### University, State, Regional, National or International Professional Organizations

| Exhibits limited or no participation in professional organizations at state, regional, national, or international levels since last promotion | Maintains a record of attending/presenting at state, regional, and national, and/or international professional meetings on a regular basis | Appropriately assumes leadership roles in state, regional, national, and/or international professional organizations which lead to external recognition |

#### Departmental/College/University Contributions

| Engages in only limited leadership roles in department and college committee work and/or curriculum development | Engages in and assumes appropriate leadership roles in department, college, and/or university committee work, and/or curriculum development | Demonstrates role model behavior in department, college, and/or university committee work, and/or curriculum development |

### The Mid-Tenure Review

All processes leading to the tenure and/or promotion event as described above shall be applied in the same form to the mid-tenure review, so that candidates are assessed at the mid-tenure point as if approaching the final decision except that the mid-tenure review shall be for the purpose of measuring the candidate’s progress toward a total portfolio that will be acceptable at the final tenure/promotion time.
For more information on promotion, refer to the University Handbook C120 – C156.2. For more information on mid-tenure review, refer to the University Handbook C92.1 – C93. For more information on tenure, refer to the University Handbook C70 – C116.2.

APPENDIX D

PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD
MINIMUM PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
Purpose
The policies and procedures that appear in this document govern the manner in which candidates in the Department of Educational Leadership are recommended for the Professorial Performance Award. These policies and procedures are governed by Sections C49.1 through C49.14 of the University Handbook and conform to the guidelines issued by the Office of the Provost on February 15, 2006.

Philosophy
The Faculties (EDLEA and EDACE) in the Department of Educational Leadership support the language in Section C49.1 of the University Handbook which states, "...the Professorial Performance Award is not a right accorded to every faculty member at the rank of Professor. Nor is it granted simply as a result of a candidate's routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies." [C49.1] The Faculties further support the concept that the Professorial Performance Award shall be based on "...evidence of sustained productivity... and... of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards" [C49.2] in the areas of teaching, research and service.

Award Eligibility
The foregoing statement of philosophy therefore governs the performance aspects of a candidate's initial eligibility for the Professorial Performance Award in the Department of Educational Leadership. The University Handbook imposes additional limits on eligibility. Specifically, the university requires that an eligible candidate must be a full-time faculty member [C49.2] holding the rank of Professor and must have been in rank at least six years since the last promotion or last receipt of the Professorial Performance Award; further, the eligible candidate must show sustained productivity for at least the last six years prior to review for the Professorial Performance Award [C49.2]. Using these metrics, the following statements of department-level eligibility and procedures explicate how the Department of Educational Leadership considers candidates' worthiness for this award.

Department-level Eligibility, Criteria, and Procedures
In order to be considered for the Professorial Performance Award, the Department of Educational Leadership requires that a faculty member: (1) must meet the eligibility criteria established in the University Handbook [C49.1-C49.14]; (2) must follow the procedures which are outlined in this same section of the Handbook; and (3) must adhere to any additional department requirements and procedures outlined below.

The candidate shall inform the department chair in writing of his/her intention to apply for the Professorial Performance Award and shall submit "...a file that documents her or his professional accomplishments for at least six years in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the department" (C49.5). Upon receipt of such a request and supporting documentation, the chair shall notify all eligible voting members of the Faculties (EDLEA and EDACE). For the singular purpose of the Professorial Performance Award, the Department of Educational Leadership defines eligible voting members of the Faculties as those persons who
presently hold the rank of Professor and whose full-time academic budgeted appointment is in that same department, excluding the chair should he/she hold the rank of Professor (exception: if, in any given year there are less than four full-time department faculty holding the rank of Professor after excluding the department chair, the eligible voting Faculties shall include all tenured budgeted full-time faculty members in the department holding the rank of Associate Professor). The chair shall then both make each candidate’s materials available for review and call a meeting for obtaining a vote concerning the worthiness of each candidate’s materials for the Professorial Performance Award. Such meeting may be by the most convenient majority agreeable means, including in person or by synchronous or asynchronous distance. The vote shall occur by dated individual ballots showing the signature of each voting member present indicating **Yes/ No/ Abstain**; the chair shall further make a record of any eligible faculty not voting and shall include all such results when reporting on the outcome. A simple majority affirmative vote by eligible faculty shall be sufficient to advance the candidate for consideration by the department chair.

If the department chair is willing to support the Faculties’ affirmative recommendation for the candidate, the chair shall prepare his/her own ballot for each candidate and affirmatively sign and transmit all ballots to the Dean of the College of Education. At the same time, a letter of support will also be sent by the chair to both the dean of the college and to the candidate [C49.5-C49.6]. If the chair cannot support the Faculties’ affirmative recommendation, then the chair will notify the voting Faculties and the candidate in writing [C49.5]. The voting Faculties shall have the option to elect a spokesperson to convey and explain the majority position to the dean of the college. If the eligible voting Faculties cannot recommend the candidate, the chair will inform the applicant [C49.6] in writing and the process for seeking recourse as described in the University Handbook will be followed [C49.9-C49.11].

The Department of Educational Leadership has established minimum performance standards to be used in annual merit evaluation. These standards are stated by academic rank and form the initial basis both for satisfactory annual performance review and as the minimum threshold for favorable review whenever a candidate indicates intent to seek promotion to the next highest academic rank. By logical extension, those same minimum performance standards at the full professor level have a direct linear relationship to minimum favorable consideration for the Professorial Performance Award by satisfying the spirit and requirements of Paragraph 2 of this present Professorial Performance Award policy. The criteria for favorable recommendation for the Professorial Performance Award are therefore declared to be identical to the **Exceeds Standards** category for the rank of full professor as delineated in the department’s merit evaluation systems for the respective Faculties of Educational Leadership and Adult Education. Doing so ensures that the Professorial Performance Award is objectively based on “the attainment of excellence in the assigned duties of the faculty member and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies” [University Handbook, C120.1].

For more information on the Professorial Performance Award, refer to the University Handbook C49.1 – C49.14.
APPENDIX E

PROVOST MEMORANDUM
ON SCHOOL OF LEADERSHIP STUDIES
SUPERVISION
February 12, 2009

Dean Michael Holen
College of Education
Bluemont Hall
CAMPUS

Dear Dean Holen:

Thank you for your letter dated January 28, 2009, in which you provided a number of suggestions relative to setting and implementing policies and procedures for our new School of Leadership Studies. I have carefully reviewed your proposals, and they seem to incorporate most of the elements raised by the committee on selected interdisciplinary programs, chaired by Dean Moxley, and in discussions with the faculty and the leadership of the School. I am comfortable enough with the basics of the document to encourage you to take the steps included in the plan to now approach the appropriate faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership and the tenure-track faculty otherwise associated with the School of Leadership Studies to seek their formal endorsement of its curriculum and promotion and tenure provisions. Please communicate to the faculty that I am pleased they seem willing to accept these responsibilities; committing to long-term support for the development of an emerging discipline is a clear mark of their professionalism. Naturally, if the faculty members, for whatever reasons, decide not to formally endorse these proposals, we will attempt to address their concerns or design some different approaches.

I know everyone is busy and pre-occupied with many other responsibilities, but if you could encourage relatively timely action, the School of Leadership Studies can enter the next academic year with far fewer uncertainties. Thank you for your continuing efforts on behalf of this important program.

Sincerely,

M. Duane Neihls
Provost and Senior Vice President

Ruth Dyer, Associate Provost
Mary Tolar, Interim Director, School of Leadership Studies
January 28, 2009

Duane Nellis, Provost
Kansas State University
Anderson Hall 006 Campus

Dear Provost Nellis:

Thank you for providing me the opportunity to review and comment on the alternative proposals crafted by the committee headed by Dean Moxley related to organizational matters affecting the School of Leadership Studies (SLS). The committee obviously spent considerable amounts of time and talent reviewing and analyzing the many issues to be addressed. I believe they have identified most key points and provided some sound approaches to their resolution.

As part of my consideration of these proposals, I have appreciated the opportunity to meet with you, Ruth Dyer, Susan Scott, and Mary Tolar. I also spent several hours with all of the faculty and staff of the School of Leadership Studies during their retreat on January 13, 2009. At this meeting I presented most of the following thoughts; I also solicited and received input and answered many questions.

At the risk of being repetitive with other documents, I am sharing my suggestions relative to assumptions, organizational structure, and practical implementation.

Assumptions:

- Decisions made about SLS must assure their employees the opportunity for full participation in the academic and service life of the university;
- Policies and procedures relating to SLS employees must be consistent with the provisions of the University Handbook;
- The SLS is to function as an independent university unit for budgetary and operational purposes and its Director is to report directly to the Provost of the university;
- Any organizational structure created should minimize the need for additional administrative personnel and expenditures;
Organizational structure:

The SLS should remain an independent university unit with the Director reporting directly to the Provost of the university;

- The Director should be responsible for oversight and approval of all matters related to personnel assignment, budget management and allocation, recruitment and hiring of all non-tenure-track faculty/staff, annual merit evaluation of all SLS faculty/staff (with input and consultation with the department chair of the unit in which tenured and tenure-track faculty members’ appointments reside), student affairs, externally funded projects generated through SLS, and advising the Provost of SLS-related needs;

- For purposes of curriculum and course approvals and for promotion and tenure considerations (including mid-tenure review), SLS should maintain its decade-long relationship as an academic strand of the Department of Educational Leadership in the College of Education (where both present tenure-track faculty already reside for these purposes);

All SLS curriculum and course actions should be processed following University Handbook requirements through the course and curriculum policies and processes approved for the College of Education;

- Faculty in tenure or tenure-track positions should be reviewed for progress (including mid-tenure review) and for promotion and/or tenure following University Handbook requirements through the policies and procedures of the Department of Educational Leadership and the College of Education. This approach assigns unit authority and responsibility for hiring, retention, and sponsorship of tenure-track faculty to the Department of Educational Leadership and the Dean of Education, acting with the advice of the Director of SLS;

- All faculty and staff of SLS identified as eligible under University Handbook and College of Education policies should be encouraged and supported to participate fully in both college and university level governance, generally through the Department of Educational Leadership and the College of Education, including election to Faculty Senate and to service and leadership roles on College of Education standing committees. SLS faculty and staff already participating in university governance through the nature or unit of their assignment (e.g. administrative) should continue that status.

Practical Implementation:

- The Provost should authorize and inform all relevant authorities and offices that the Director of SLS has signatory status for all approvals normally requiring approval from a college dean (e.g. Pre-awards Services, Human Resources, KSU Foundation, Registrar, Financial Aid), except in matters of curriculum and course approvals,
promotion and tenure actions, and recruitment and hiring of tenure-track faculty (reserved to the faculty and chair of the Department of Educational Leadership and the Dean of Education, acting with advice from the Director of SLS);

Course prefixes for SLS courses should be changed through present College of Education and university course and curriculum policies to identify them clearly with SLS;

The faculty and staff of the SLS should develop an annual merit evaluation document consistent with the requirements of the University Handbook, including the identification of minimal levels of performance.

* The tenured faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership should assist the two present tenure-track faculty, in consultation with all interested SLS faculty, with the construction of promotion and tenure standards; the tenure-track faculty in the department (including the SLS tenure-track faculty) should explicitly (in writing) agree that the tenured faculty will serve as the departmental reviewing and recommending body for promotion and tenure policies and practices (including mid-tenure review) following University Handbook and College of Education policies; this approach to the promotion and tenure process should be viewed as transitional, but will likely exist for an extended period, until the Leadership Studies faculty has developed a membership at all ranks which can support an independent process. The Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership will provide his/her recommendation following the department's normal practices;

* The college level Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of Education should be assigned responsibility to perform the collegiate review of tenure-track faculty in SLS and to follow the college processes to inform the Dean of the College of Education, who will recommend on and represent SLS promotion and tenure cases to the Council of Deans;

* Present SLS non-tenure-track faculty on regular appointments (budgeted), who wish to do so, should consult with the Director, initially, and subsequently the Dean of Education, about seeking tenure-track status. Converting any position to tenure-track status would require a recommendation by the Director and Dean, and approval by the Provost. Generally any such conversion would include implementing all normal university Affirmative Action procedures, including delineation of responsibilities, required and preferred qualifications, and, typically, a nationally competitive search;

* Tenured/tenure-track faculty serving a primary budgetary assignment to SLS, who, for some professionally appropriate reason, wish to be tenured in, or seek tenure in an academic department outside the College of Education should be provided the opportunity to do so, following all policies and procedures in the University Handbook and in the college in which tenure would be held or considered. Seeking tenure in an academic department outside the College of Education requires approval by the Director of the SLS. Any such faculty member should be accorded full access to participation in faculty governance and university service consistent with the policies of that college.
While annual merit salary increases should be determined by the Director of the SLS, tenured and tenure-track faculty should also submit annual merit materials for review to the chair of the department in which tenure and promotion decisions would reside (generally the Department of Educational Leadership) to permit informed input from the chair to the SLS Director.

Duane, I believe the fundamentals of this plan have the following attributes:

• Preservation of the School of Leadership Studies as an independent university unit;

• Low or little additional administrative costs;

• Adherence to present University Handbook and college policies and procedures (I believe no University Handbook changes would be required);

Protection of faculty and staff rights and interests, including participation opportunities in university governance;

• Ease of administration and removal of potential ‘conflicts of interest’ for the Provost in matters of promotion, tenure, and university governance;

• Placement of promotion, tenure, and course and curriculum matters for faculty in the School in a well-established, mature, familiar and supportive environment which emphasizes Leadership as an academic discipline.

I am certain elements of this plan need refinement; I support review of the plan by any interested parties. It is important to remember that I have advanced this plan to you for your analysis and reaction prior to initiating formal consideration by the faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership and the faculty governance groups of the College of Education. I have received inputs suggesting general support of the concepts by these entities, but need to know your disposition before approaching them.

Awaiting your reaction.

Sincerely,

Michael C. Holen
Skeen Professor and Dean of Education

cc: Ruth Dyer
Mary Tolar
Susan Scott
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POST-TENURE REVIEW STANDARDS

Post-Tenure Review Policy

Department of Educational Leadership

Faculty of Adult Education
Approved April 25, 2014

Statement of Philosophy and Purpose
The purpose of post-tenure review at Kansas State University is to enhance the continued professional development of tenured faculty. The process is intended to encourage intellectual vitality and professional proficiency for all members of the faculty throughout their careers, so they may more effectively fulfill the mission of the university. It is also designed to enhance public trust in the University by ensuring that the faculty community undertakes regular and rigorous efforts to hold all of its members accountable for high professional standards.

Kansas State University recognizes that the granting of tenure for university faculty is a vital protection of free inquiry and open intellectual debate. It is expressly recognized that nothing in this policy alters or amends the University's policies regarding removal of tenured faculty members for cause (which are stipulated in the University Handbook). This policy and any actions taken under it are separate from and have no bearing on the chronic low achievement or annual evaluation policies and processes.

The department policy on post-tenure review follows the overarching purpose, principles, objectives, and procedures in the university policy on post-tenure review (see University Handbook, Appendix W), which was approved by Faculty Senate on February 11, 2014.

Procedures
1. Post-tenure review shall be conducted for tenured faculty every six years and shall conform to the timeline associated with the annual evaluation review as outlined in the University Handbook. The six-year post-tenure review clock shall be further defined to mean that post-tenure review will be conducted for all tenured faculty either every six years, or in the sixth year following promotion or awarding of a major university performance award. More specifically, the following events shall modify and reset the post-tenure review clock:
   A. Application for promotion to full professor;
   B. Application for the Professorial Performance Award (University Handbook C49);
   C. Receipt of a substantial college, university, national or international award requiring multi-year portfolio-like documentation, such as University Distinguished Professor, University Distinguished Teaching Scholar, an endowed chair or other national/international awards (see list of Faculty Awards http://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/natlawards.html).
2. Other exceptions to post-tenure review are as follows:
   A. If the faculty member is already undergoing the review process for chronic low achievement, that process will be considered to serve in lieu of post-tenure review.
   B. Any faculty member who has formally announced retirement through a written letter to the department/unit head, or has begun phased retirement, is exempt from post-tenure review.

3. The post-tenure review clock shall operate as follows:
   A. The academic year 2014-2015 shall be the first year of post-tenure review implementation.
   B. Faculty holding the rank of full professor will be reviewed during the 2014-2015 cycle.
   C. Faculty holding the rank of associate professor will be reviewed during the 2015-2016 cycle.
   D. The review cycle will repeat in the respective academic years 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 for those faculty who have not received intervening promotions in rank or approved external awards.
   E. The department will maintain a database indicating the review year for each affected faculty member.

4. Faculty undergoing a regular post-tenure review must submit the following materials collection:
   A. The individual annual merit evaluation reviews received across each of the preceding six years.

5. In an event where a faculty submits a successful external award requiring multi-year portfolio-like documentation, it will result in the reset of his/her post-tenure review clock.

6. Faculty submitting the individual six-year collection of merit evaluation reviews shall be reviewed as follows:
   A. The faculty member submits required documents to the department head.
   B. The department head reviews the materials collection and summarizes the cumulative annual ratings in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.
   C. The department head meets with the candidate to discuss findings.
   D. If no overall annual rating across the six-year review period falls below MEETS STANDARDS, the post-tenure review process shall be declared complete and the department head shall issue a letter indicating satisfactory completion of the post-tenure review requirement. Such letter shall bear a signature line for the faculty member showing agreement or disagreement.
   E. If one or more annual ratings across the six-year review period falls below MEETS STANDARDS, the faculty member shall be required to construct and file a remediation plan to be reviewed and approved by the department head.
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