**Template for Organizing Academic Department Documents**

**Personnel Review and Evaluation Standards and Procedures**

*Office of the Provost*

1. **Approval Cover Page**  
   The cover page indicates when the document was approved by faculty vote and by the unit leader, dean and provost; it also states the date for its next mandatory five-year review. See UHB C31.2, see also C41.3. Please note that because the document reviews are being done as a whole instead of in parts, a single vote will cover the whole document.   
     
   Any changes or additions mid-cycle will require a special addendum approval sheet, but at the next scheduled review, the whole document will be once again incorporated as one.
2. **Introduction** (Optional)   
   This section introduces the unit’s mission, vision, values and summarizes the document’s purpose and uses.
3. **Faculty Identity**This section will be particularly important when the unit has various kinds of faculty, i.e. tenured/tenure-track, as well as the regular and term non-tenure-track professional titles, including instructors, research professor, clinical professor, professor of practice, teaching professor, and extension professor.
4. **Performance Evaluations**This section covers the purpose of performance evaluations (formative and summative), the different types of evaluations (annual merit, reappointment, mid-tenure, tenure and promotion, professorial performance award), and distinguishes them from the post tenure reviews.  
     
   If the unit will apply the same performance standards to all types of evaluations, i.e. has the same criteria for determining the different levels of performance in teaching, research/scholarship, service, and extension, this section could include those standards. The standards must be consistent with the university’s and college’s expectations for the unit (UHB C31.3). The standards should also indicate what level of performance, outcomes and evidence will merit each of the unit’s ratings of performance, such as Significantly Exceeds Expectations (SEE), Exceeds Expectations (EE), Meets Expectations (ME), Below Expectations (BE), Fails to Meet Minimum Acceptable Levels of Productivity (FMALP). Some units use numerical scores and they should also indicate what level of performance will merit what score.  
     
   When setting the unit’s criteria for each area of faculty activity, it is important to state what will be considered as acceptable evidence of performance, but also indicate what will not be considered in each area. For example, state how or whether non-refereed, open-access, online publications would be counted for promotion purposes; whether student advising will be considered under teaching or service; whether the unit has a distinction between directed and non-directed service; is there a list or any other guidance regarding the weight of each indicator of performance? And so on.  
     
   This section must be very thoughtfully and carefully written, because it will set the unit’s parameters for performance and represent to the world its level of academic rigor in conjunction with the unit’s 2025 Vision Plan. This will also be the section that is most critical in administrative reviews, grievances and appeals of academic personnel decisions. We recommend discussions with colleagues in similar disciplines and review of other similar-discipline units’ documents. Determination of minimum acceptable levels of productivity, or MALP’s is critical because it sets the bar below which a person may not perform in that unit at K-State.
5. **Annual Evaluation Process**Annual evaluations are the responsibility of the unit leader and will be used as a guide to determine how the faculty member performed during the unit’s established evaluation cycle (UHB C31.1 & C42). They offer an opportunity for feedback and counsel, and to interactively determine whether any adjustments need to be made in the faculty member’s distribution of effort. This is the *formative* aspect of the annual evaluation.   
     
   The unit leader is also responsible for distributing any merit-based salary adjustments available for employees for the evaluation cycle in question. For that reason, the evaluation criteria should be applied as the basis for the merit salary adjustment recommendations in a manner that is consistent with UHB C46.2. This is the *summative* aspect of the annual evaluation.  
     
   This section should indicate what the unit’s annual evaluation cycle is (per UHB C42, usually the preceding calendar year); when and what should be submitted to the unit leader. Include the timeline for the process and state that performance will be measured against each unit member’s previous year’s goals. Indicate that this is the time when the unit leader and the unit member will establish mutually agreeable goals for the following evaluation cycle, how unresolved differences will be treated, how recommendations for merit salary adjustments will be determined, and any other details unique to the unit.   
     
   Some larger units have a personnel committee review annual evaluation packets and advise the unit leader regarding their colleagues’ performance. In these cases, the document should state how the personnel committee will be formed, who is eligible to serve, terms of service and whether this personnel committee is the same as the unit’s promotion and tenure advisory committee.  
     
   We also recommend communicating here that a faculty member’s signature indicating the opportunity to review the unit leader’s evaluation report does not mean the faculty member agrees with the report, or even that the faculty member must have a meeting with the unit leader. The faculty member is only asked to ***sign an acknowledgment that the unit leader provided the opportunity for the meeting***.
6. **Reappointment Evaluation** (UHB C50.1-C66) It is helpful to distinguish between annual and reappointment evaluations by indicating that annual evaluations consider only the unit member’s performance as of the stated cycle (notwithstanding the fact that some units take into consideration rolling averages of more than one year’s output in some areas) and reappointment evaluations take into consideration the unit member’s cumulative body of work leading to consideration for tenure and promotion: “to provide opportunity to assess a candidate's ability to contribute to the expertise and the versatility expected of the faculty at Kansas State University” (UHBC91).   
     
   The distinction may become blurred when units use a personnel committee, which could also be the Tenure and Promotion (T/P) committee; that is why we recommend making the distinction clear in the document.  
     
   There are three types of reappointment evaluation, (1) the reappointment evaluation that takes place the first two, the fourth and the fifth probationary years (UHB C50.1-C56); (2) the reappointment evaluation that occurs during the third probationary year, which is the mid-tenure review (UHB C92.1-C92.4); and (3) the final reappointment evaluation to confer tenure (UHB C50.2 & C70-C116).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reappointment | Reappointment | Mid-Tenure | Reappointment | Reappointment | T/P Review |

Ideally, the document will clearly explain why sometimes a poor annual evaluation may occur the same year as a unanimous, positive reappointment evaluation (the unit member had a low-performing year, but is on track for tenure and promotion given the accumulated body of work), and vice-versa.  
  
Other than that, the T/P committee should be defined, indicating clearly who is eligible to vote; the timeline for each step in the process should be included and also state what materials should be submitted and to whom; and when and how the vote will take place.   
  
Some units require tenure track faculty to begin assembling what will eventually become their T/P packets from the first reappointment review year. This is a best practice that we recommend adopting.  
  
Points to consider are whether the C53.1 ballots will be submitted on paper at the end of the T/P meeting, or whether emailed ballots will be allowed within a certain period of time after the meeting; in what unique circumstances will an eligible faculty member be excused from voting either by abstention or by being absent (the Provost believes it is the duty of tenured faculty members to vote even in cases when it is very difficult to determine whether the candidate met the unit’s criteria for T/P, and perhaps more so in those cases). It is also important to keep in mind the duty of confidentiality of peer evaluations (UHB C35).

1. **Promotion and Tenure** (Procedures at UHB110-116.2)   
   Tenure  
   The last reappointment review for tenure-track faculty is the reappointment review to confer tenure. Procedures for this evaluation are similar to the procedures for the previous reappointment reviews and include the review of the candidate’s complete portfolio and body of work during the probationary period. This section should state or restate who are the faculty members who are eligible to vote for tenure.  
     
   The decision to grant tenure is based on the assessment of the tenured faculty that the candidate has made *outstanding* contributions in appropriate academic endeavors relative to the unit’s tenure criteria. UHB C100.1-C100.4.  
     
   The unit’s performance criteria and standards for tenure are the same as those used for annual, reappointment evaluations. UHB C30-C30. This section spells out the level of performance required to be granted tenure, considering that tenure is not a right accorded to every faculty member and is not granted simply as a result of a candidate’s routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies. UHB C100.3.  
     
   Include in this section a detailed procedural description of the tenure review, including the timeline, materials to be submitted and how the unit goes about reviewing candidates’ T/P packets. Make sure to include the time a candidate must provide the list of potential external evaluators (see UHB C36.1), and indicate whether the unit will solicit comments from other individuals, including students (UHB C112.2).  
     
   Tenure and promotion procedures for unit leaders are established by the colleges, but the criteria and standards used are those established by the unit for all its faculty members. UHB C38.  
     
   Promotion in Rank  
   Promotion in rank usually occurs at the same time as the tenure evaluation for assistant professors. Probationary faculty hired at a rank above assistant professor will be considered for tenure only, at the end of their probationary period. (UHB C82.3).  
     
   This section should detail what achievements must be accomplished for promotion to associate professor and, separately, what additional achievements must be accomplished for promotion to full professor. (See UHB C120.2).  
     
   The University Handbook establishes that, “The assessment of a faculty member's performance upon which a recommendation regarding promotion will be based must reflect the professional expectations conveyed during annual evaluation.” UHB C140. That is why it is so important to state in the document that annual evaluations after-tenure are just as important as pre-tenure. See also Post-Tenure Evaluation section below.  
     
   Other procedural information: State when candidates may request consideration for promotion and what documents must be included in the candidate’s promotion dossier.   
     
   State who is eligible to vote, voting procedures and restate eligible unit members’ responsibility to participate in this important departmental process. UHB C152.1. Consider including a statement that the college will receive a copy of all the promotion materials, including all recommendations and unedited written comments of the voting-eligible faculty and the candidate’s complete file, while candidates will receive a copy of the unit leader’s recommendation alone. UHB C152.5.  
     
   If the unit has interdisciplinary faculty, indicate how it will comply with UHB C156.1. That is, unit members tenured in your department will be evaluated for tenure by the faculty in your department with, input from the leader and faculty of the other unit(s), if the majority of the candidate’s appointment is in your department.

**Probationary Period Scenarios**  
The following table has examples of probationary period timelines using various scenarios.

**P&T Timeline Scenarios**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scenarios** | **Timeline** | | | | | | | |
| New PhD is hired to begin next academic year | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3  Mid-Tenure Review | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6  Passed Tenure & Promotion Review | Year 7  Tenured Associate Professor |  |
| New PhD is hired to begin next academic year |  |  |  |  |  | Year 6  Failed Tenure Review | Year 7  Terminal Year |  |
| New PhD is hired to begin October 15  (Or Jan 1)  (C84) | “Year 0” | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3  Mid-Tenure Review | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6  Passed Tenure & Promotion Review | Year 7  Tenured Associate Professor |
| Pre-Mid-Tenure Delay in the tenure clock (C83) | Year 1 | Year 2 | Tenure Delay Year | Year 3  Mid-Tenure Review | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6  Passed Tenure & Promotion Review | Year 7  Tenured Associate Professor |
| Post-Mid-Tenure Delay in the tenure clock (C83) | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3  Mid-Tenure Review | Year 4 | Year 5 | Tenure Delay Year | Year 6  Passed Tenure & Promotion Review | Year 7  Tenured Associate Professor |
| New PhD is hired to begin next academic year (C113.4) | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3  Mid-Tenure Review | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6  Withdraws and Resigns | Year 7  Last T-T year on Terminal Contract |  |
| Associate Professor hired without tenure (C82.3) | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 Passed Tenure Review | Year 6  Tenured Associate Professor |  |  |
| Associate Professor hired without tenure (C82.3) | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5  Failed Tenure Review | Year 6  Terminal  Contract Year |  |  |
| New Star PhD is hired to begin next acad. year (C82.4) | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3  Mid-Tenure Review | Year 4  Passed Early Tenure & Promotion Review | Year 5  Tenured Associate Professor |  |  |  |
| New Dean  Hired as Full Professor | Home Tenure Faculty Vote after Offer is Accepted | Dean Begins Appointment as Full Professor with Tenure in Home Department |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Professorial Performance Award**This section establishes the eligibility criteria for PPA’s in the unit. Some units restate the eligibility criteria and significance of the award policy (UHB C491 & C41.2) to distinguish the PPA from faculty members who are simply doing their job well. In general, the candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards.   
     
   Some units simply require the submission of the last six annual performance evaluations which must all be at the highest or second highest level of performance, i.e. above or significantly above meets expectations.  
     
   Indicate precisely what materials the candidates must submit and describe the procedure review including the timeline. Please note that UHB C49.7 prescribes what materials must be forwarded to the dean and consider including this information in your unit’s document.   
     
   You might consider repeating here the statement that a faculty member’s signature indicating the opportunity to review the unit leader’s evaluation report does not mean the faculty member agrees with the report, or even that the faculty member must have a meeting with the unit leader.
2. **Chronic Low Achievement** (UHB C31.5)   
   We recommend including a separate section on Chronic Low Achievement (CLA) because CLA could lead to termination of ***tenured faculty*** for professional incompetence. Here, the document should restate what the MALP’s are, how faculty members will be notified in writing that they are failing to meet MALP’s, and how the unit will determine when a tenured faculty member may be referred to the dean (two successive FMALP ratings, or three in five years, under C31.5)
3. **Post-Tenure Review**See Appendix W and the template for Post Tenure Review section. The most important point to understand here is that the post tenure review is not an evaluation that will result in personnel changes (no salary increases, no promotions, and no terminations) and for that reason units must desist their desire to include appeal processes in their post tenure review process. The Provost will not approve inclusion of a post tenure review process appeal procedure that goes beyond the college. Units must understand that there are already sufficient checks and balances in place for faculty to be heard in the annual evaluation process regarding disagreements with their unit leaders.
4. **Appendices/Addenda/Attachments**Here the unit may include templates, forms, rubrics, tables, lists of acceptable journals or venues for scholarship presentations, articles regarding scholarship standards, disciplinary professional responsibility rules, or any other relevant materials to their department document.
5. **Collegiality/Civility/Respect/Department Citizenship**  
   We recommend considering the addition of a statement (this could be done in the introduction) regarding interpersonal interactions in the department. The expectation of professionalism, civility and collaborative work should be reflected in the departmental document, if this is a value the unit holds.  
     
   Some documents will actually include an overall rating of citizenship or collegiality—as the unit defines the concept of collegiality—in each of the three main areas of performance, so they will have points added for collegiality in teaching, in research and service. Other units simply add a fourth category of department citizenship—as the units define it—that is also rated and counted toward the overall evaluation score.   
     
   Whether a unit chooses to add this area to the unit’s departmental document, deans, department heads and all unit member should be aware that the University Handbook includes rules about interpersonal interactions in sections D4 and D12 (endorsing the [Principles of Community](http://www.k-state.edu/about/community.html), and UHB C46.1 makes it a ***responsibility of evaluators*** to consider in their evaluations and include in the written reports each unit member’s overall contribution or detriment to the department/unit, which includes citizenship and other personal conduct affecting the workplace.