



Standard 3 Matching Operations with the Mission: Faculty Performance

Standard 3.1 Faculty Qualifications: The program's faculty members will be academically or professionally qualified to pursue the program's mission.

Self-Study Instructions:

The purpose of this section is to answer the question "Does the program demonstrate quality through its decisions to hire appropriately trained and credentialed faculty that are both current and qualified? While the use of practitioners with significant experience may be warranted, the extent of their use within the program must be mission driven. This section also addresses how faculty qualifications match coverage of core and program competencies and, by extension, program courses.

3.1.1 In the Add/ View a Faculty Member Tab: "Provide information on 5 of your Nucleus Faculty who have provided instruction in the program for the self-study year and the year prior to the self-study.



3.1.2

Provide your program's policy for academically and professionally qualified faculty and the mission based rationale for the extent of use of professionally qualified faculty in your program. If you have any faculty members who are neither academically nor professionally qualified, please justify their extent of use in your program. Please see the glossary for definitions of academically and professionally qualified. (Limit 500 words)

Because all program faculty must be tenured or tenure track in the Department of Political Science, Kansas State University's MPA program only hires faculty who are considered "academically qualified". This policy goes a long way towards developing faculty expertise in the skills and knowledge needed to teach course and publish research valuable to 21st century public administrators. The MPA Program defines academically qualified faculty as follows:

Academically qualified (AQ) faculty members must have a PhD in Political Science or Public Administration. Faculty preparation must involve a subfield specifically related to the curriculum they teach. The faculty member must demonstrate expertise in their particular field so that they are able to teach classes related to that subject. If the faculty member earned their degree more than five years prior to the self-study, they need to show currency in the field in at least one of the following ways: 1.) publish peer-reviewed research relevant to teaching area within the last five years; 2.) use class syllabi that demonstrate recent knowledge/skills; or, 3.) relevant professional or community service [paraphrased from Facer, White paper]



3.1.3

Provide the percentage of courses in each category that are taught by nucleus and full-time faculty in the self-study year. Please upload a separate table for each location and modality, if appropriate. The total across all rows and columns will not add to 100%.

3.1.3	N =	Nucleus Faculty	Full Time Faculty	Academically Qualified
All Courses	12	92	100	100
Courses	8	100	100	100

delivering required Competencies

 Hide 3.1.4

Describe the steps and strategies the program uses to support faculty in their efforts to remain current in the field. (Limit 500 words)

All members of the faculty are expected to be active and productive researchers and the Department has various strategies in place to ensure faculty remain current and successful in their field.

- Newly hired faculty
 - o Reduced course load in year 1, three instead of normal load of four course per year.
 - o Mentor assigned.
 - o Computing startup package.
 - o Additional startup package of at least \$1500 for research support.

- Junior faculty
 - o Reduced service on departmental and university committees to the fullest extent possible to protect their time.
 - o Preference on summer school classes.
 - o Reduced course load [3 courses instead of 4] in the year following a successful mid-tenure review.
 - o Competitive research awards especially targeted for junior faculty. As an example, the college has Faculty Enhancement Grants designated for faculty in their first three years that provide up to \$10,000 during one summer to advance a research project.
 - o Priority on GTA support.
 - o Preference on travel funding and more travel funding than tenured faculty. Junior faculty receive \$1250 annually while tenured faculty receive \$850.
 - o Priority on summer courses.

- All faculty
 - o Performance feedback provided annually via merit review process.
 - o Research productivity is criteria for salary increment, promotion and tenure.
 - o Library services and general computer support.
 - o Travel to professional meetings encouraged, and funded at some level. Usually requires paper presentation.
 - o Workshops on classroom instruction, etc.
 - o Professional development for teaching problems.
 - o Staff support for development of online courses, and online teaching materials and Canvas system.
 - o Funding for computer hardware and software. All necessary statistical and other software packages provided.
 - o Small research grants of up to \$5000 with priority given to social science and humanities faculty.
 - o International travel grants of up to \$3500 given to support participation in international conferences and research abroad.
 - o College program provides undergraduate research assistants to faculty. Student are given \$1000 toward their tuition.
 - o Developmental Reserve Account (DRA) funds (typically generated in association with overload instructional activities) and other overhead sources that are earmarked for individual faculty.

o Faculty members with administrative responsibilities receive reduced class workloads to allow sufficient time to manage departmental matters.

Hide **Standard 3.2**

Standard 3.2 Faculty Diversity: The Program will promote diversity and a climate of inclusiveness through its recruitment and retention of faculty members.

Self-Study Instructions

The purpose of this section is to demonstrate that the program is modeling public service values as they relate to faculty diversity. Programs should be able to demonstrate that they understand the importance of providing students access to faculty with diverse views and experience so they are better able to understand and serve their clients and citizens.

Programs should be able to demonstrate how they "promote diversity and a climate of inclusiveness" in accordance with a strategic diversity plan, developed with respect to a program's unique mission and environment. The Commission seeks substantial evidence regarding programmatic efforts to promote diversity and a climate of inclusiveness, specifically demonstrable evidence of good practice, a framework for evaluating diversity efforts, and the connection to the program's mission and objectives. The program should upload its diversity planning document on the Self Study Appendices page.

Upload your program's diversity plan as a Self Study appendix.

Hide **3.2.1**

Complete the faculty diversity table for all faculty teaching in the program (with respect to the legal and institutional context in which the program operates):

Please check one: US Based Program

Legal and institutional context of program precludes collection of diversity data. No

Hide **3.2.1a**

U.S. Based

3.2.1a Faculty Diversity	Full Time Male	Full Time Female	Part Time Male	Part Time Female	Total
White, non-Hispanic/Latino	2	2			4
Nonresident alien	1				1
Total	3	2			
Disabled					5

Hide **3.2.2**

Describe how your current faculty diversity efforts support the program mission. How are you assuring that the faculty bring diverse perspectives to the curriculum? Describe demonstrable program strategies, developed with respect to the program's unique mission and environment, for how the program promotes diversity and a climate of inclusiveness.

In our mission statement, we commit to training students so that they can "think critically, apply knowledge and seek practical solutions to real world problems." Further, we pledge to "instill in our students the ethics of public service and professional management that are critical to the diverse and changing modern workplace." We believe that in order to serve the public, students must be introduced and committed to diversity along multiple dimensions.

As is detailed in our uploaded Diversity and Inclusion Plan, some of the ways in which we strive to prepare students for a diverse work environment include the following:

o When a position is open, our department recruits from a diverse pool of candidates so that our students may be introduced to diverse perspectives. To do so, we use standard advertising methods/statements to promote diversity following department and university requirements. Further, we advertise all position openings to sections that serve underrepresented groups within the American Society for Public Administration such as the Conference of Minority Public Administrators, Section for Women in Public Administration, and the LGBT Advocacy Alliance Section. In the future, we are committed to developing contacts with directors of doctoral programs that produce diverse graduates. We will also use networking opportunities at conferences to identify potential candidates from underrepresented populations.

o Discussion of topics related to "diversity" and "inclusion" are included in our core courses. For example, students are introduced to the challenges inequality poses to public administrators, especially in personnel decisions in Public Personnel Administration. Furthermore, this class, as well as courses on Public Administration and Society and Public Organizational Theory introduce students to the theoretical importance and practical benefits that organizations can achieve when they value the many dimensions of diversity including race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion, and disability status.

o We include class exercises that require students to work in teams/groups that span differences among students within the classroom. We believe that part of preparing students for a career in public service is providing them opportunities to hone skills related to communication and teamwork.

o We also supplement classroom learning with practitioner panels. Because our faculty currently lacks real racial diversity, we have made a proactive effort to supplement our potentially limited perspectives by reaching out to diverse guest speakers as part of our practitioner's panel series. Specifically, during the fall of 2016, our program organized a practitioner's panel dedicated to the topic of "diversity and inclusion in the workplace." This panel gave our MPA students the opportunity to discuss how diversity management and a commitment to inclusivity in the public sector help to improve social equity and organizational effectiveness. We are committed to continuing use our practitioner panels to bring in speakers representing marginalized groups and promoting discussion on topics related to diversity and inclusion.

o Our faculty are encouraged to conduct research on topics related to diversity and inclusion, broadly defined. Peer-reviewed research on these topics count towards tenure and merit evaluations. Our current faculty have published on these topics in a number of outlets, including, but not limited to Journal of Policy Practice, State Politics and Policy Quarterly, Public Administration Quarterly, and State and Local Government Review. To support faculty research, in general, the department commits financial resources to cover the costs of attending 1-2 conferences per year, per faculty member.

Hide 3.2.3

3.2.3

Describe how the diversity of the faculty has changed in the past 5 years. (Limit 250 words)

The MPA program has hired two new faculty over the course of the past five years. These two new hires were both at the assistant rank. These hires added one woman, Josephine Schafer, and one nonresident alien man, Zhiwei Zhang, to our core faculty. Both of these faculty members began their time at Kansas State University in fall of 2012. Prior to these two new hires, the diversity statistics for our core faculty members included:

2 full-time male, white, non-Hispanic/Latino
 1 full-time male, Nonresident alien
 1 full-time female, white, non-Hispanic/Latino
 1 full-time female, Nonresident alien

 Hide Standard 3.3 Research, Scholarship, and Service

Standard 3.3 Research, Scholarship and Service: Program faculty members will produce scholarship and engage in professional and community service activities outside of the university appropriate to the program's mission, stage of their careers, and the expectations of their university.

Self Study Instructions

In this section, the program must demonstrate that the nucleus faculty members are making contributions to the field and community consistent with the program mission. The object is not to detail every activity of individual faculty, rather to highlight for each nucleus faculty member **one** exemplary activity that has occurred in the last five academic years (this could be research, scholarship, community service or some other contribution to the field).

 Hide 3.3.1

Provide **ONE** exemplary activity for 5 of your nucleus faculty member's (and any additional faculty members you may wish to highlight) contribution to the field in at least one of the following categories: research or scholarship, community service and efforts to engage students in the last 5 years. (In this section you should provide either a brief description of the contribution or a citation if it is a published work).

ALL FACULTY INFORMATION (including the question above) on individual faculty members should be added using the "Add a Faculty Member" tab found above, and can be edited at any time. Please remember to indicate whether an individual faculty member is considered part of the faculty nucleus, as additional questions apply if so.

 Hide 3.3.2

List some significant outcomes related to these exemplary efforts.

Provide some overall significant outcomes or impacts on public administration and policy related to these exemplary efforts. (Limit 500 words)

Research and Scholarship

Since Kansas State is a Research 1 university, our faculty are required to have an active research agenda that involves publications in highly rated venues. For details regarding the Department's specific expectations in the areas of teaching, research and service, see the Annual Evaluation, Reappointment and Promotion Guidelines attached as an appendix to this standard.

The coauthored scholarship involving Dr. Schafer and Dr. Zhang deals with the critical role that stakeholders play in municipal decisions to contract out government services. It represents a new collaboration between junior faculty in our program which supports the development of new knowledge in public administration. Dr. Bernick's research earned the 2016 Jewell Limar Prestage paper award which recognizes the best paper on the intersection of gender, race, ethnicity, and political behavior presented at the Annual Meeting of Southwestern Political Science Association. Dr. Heidbreder's published research which focuses upon the topic of "leadership credibility" advances the field of public administration's understanding of how city managers assess their own performance.

Community Service

Also required of our faculty are professional and community service activity. Our personnel evaluation guidelines recognize a wide variety of activities that serve the university, the community of Manhattan, the state of Kansas and the nation, as well as the profession of political science and the broader public administration and policy community.

Service to public stakeholders in the Manhattan community is best illustrated by the activity of Dr. Schafer. She has directed the community survey for the city of Manhattan since 2015. This involves developing the survey in consultation with city staff, executing the survey, analyzing the results and making presentations to city staff and to the city governing body. Other members of our faculty are likewise involved in the local community. Dr. Heidbreder has been a guest speaker at meetings of the local chapter of the League of Women Voters as well as before Kappa Alpha Theta. Dr. Bernick recently shared his expertise as a course instructor at the KSU Merit Badge Conference of the Boy Scouts of America.

Another stakeholder with which our faculty is very involved is NASPAA itself. Dr. Franke has attended the annual national NASPAA meeting since 2013. Dr. Heidbreder has joined him at the two most recent meetings. Besides involvement in panel presentations, both faculty have participated in the re-accreditation workshops associated with these meetings. Upon return, they have communicated what they have learned to the rest of our faculty. As a result, the information and training that these national meetings provide has found its way into both our program development and our classrooms.

Especially our more senior faculty are active in service to the department and university. Drs. Bernick, Franke and Heidbreder were all members of the recruitment committees that resulted in the hiring of Drs. Schafer and Zhang. Dr. Bernick has been a member of the Arts and Sciences Committee on Planning and is currently a member of the Arts and Sciences College Committee on Diversity. Dr. Franke in his capacity as the program director represents the program in a variety of ways at the college and university levels.

Service to the profession is also highly valued by our department. Dr. Heidbreder is currently the editor of the Reviews and Essays Section of State and Local Government Review. She also is a reviewer for several journals of interest to the wide public administration community including

Administration and Society, State and Local Government Review, and the International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior. Dr. Bernick likewise reviews for a number of journals including Public Administration Review and State Politics and Policy Quarterly. Dr. Zhang reviews for Public Administration Review and for State and Local Government Review. Finally, Dr. Franke is a reviewer for the Review of Politics.

Student Engagement

In a number of ways, our faculty encourages students to be engaged in the program and other service options outside the classroom. Dr. Franke has been instrumental in two such efforts. First, he developed our practitioner panel series that features practitioners and potential employers discussing real world administration and topics of particular interest to future administrators. Second, in order to engage our students more directly in all aspects of the MPA community here at K-State, Dr. Franke initiated the Student Stakeholders Committee. This committee formalizes student input into all manner of program issues.

Not only do we talk with our students about the importance of service and model such behavior, but we also provide opportunities for such service. Dr. Schafer is especially active in connecting her students with local and state agencies for the purpose of conducting applied research projects. Dr. Heidbreder was involved in developing and promoting one of this year's practitioner panels that focused upon the topic of "Diversity and Inclusion in the Public Sector" which provided a unique opportunity for our students to learn from and engage three leaders in the public sector on these important topics. Dr. Bernick has worked with a number of our students on research projects thereby allowing them to learn how the process works and to allow our students to have a first-hand look at how theory and practice come together. Finally, by inviting the finance director of the city of Manhattan into his budgeting class each year, our students are able to see how what they have learned in this class informs organizational financial activities.

Standard 3 Appendices

Annual Evaluation, Reappointment and Promotion Guidelines2
Diversity and Inclusion Plan22

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

ANNUAL EVALUATION, REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES

**ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on 12/12/2014)**

**PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on 12/12/2014)**

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **5/2020**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **5/2020**

**Jeffrey Pickering, Department Head
Date signed:**

**Peter K. Dorhout, Dean
Date signed:**

**April C. Mason, Provost and Senior Vice President
Date signed:**

**Each academic department is required by University Handbook policy to develop department documents containing criteria, standards, and guidelines for promotion, tenure, reappointment, annual evaluation and merit salary allocation. These documents must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty members in the department, by the department head or chair, by the dean concerned, and by the provost. In accordance with University Handbook policy, provision must be made to review these documents at least once every five years, or more frequently, if it is determined to be necessary. Dates of revision (or the vote to continue without revision) must appear on the first page of the document.*

Annual Faculty Evaluations¹

Introduction

This statement provides a summary of current departmental practices regarding the various forms of faculty evaluation. The practices and procedures noted in this document apply to intra-departmental personnel processes. All of these practices and procedures fall within spirit of the University Handbook.² It is anticipated that modifications may be made in these practices and procedures as a result of departmental planning and review and/or changes in the University Handbook.

Annual Merit Evaluation

1. Annual merit evaluations of faculty performance are designed both to provide feedback to faculty and to provide a fair and objective basis for the allocation of merit salary increases.
2. The primary source of evidence for the evaluation is the information provided by the faculty members being evaluated in mid-September of each year, the faculty are requested to submit information concerning their instructional activities (including teaching, advising, and participation on graduate committees), research, and service for the previous academic year (August to July). University policy mandates that faculty submit all teaching evaluations and TEVAL summaries for each of the courses they have taught during the year. In addition, syllabi, tests, unsolicited student comments, and other evidence of instructional performance are welcomed. Copies of publications, professional papers, and other evidence of scholarly performance should also be submitted. Faculty members are required to state explicitly in the summary and/or spreadsheet which year an accepted manuscript should be counted. If an accepted manuscript is counted toward your research evaluation prior to its appearance in print, it cannot also count in the year it is printed/published. Given the various hurdles between accepted book contracts, which are typically based upon brief proposals, and the actual publication of books or monographs, this type of research product will only be counted when it is published. Appendix D provides a sample copy of the request for information and the format of submissions.
2. Faculty members will submit materials that will be initially reviewed by a three member faculty evaluation committee.
3. The Faculty Evaluation Committee, whose recommendations are advisory to the department head, is chosen annually on a rotating basis. Whenever possible the committee should include a

¹ Revised Evaluation and Tenure and Promotion Procedures accepted by the department on December 12, 2014. The department accepted previous versions of this document in 1992, 1995, 2003, 2007, and 2010. Faculty in tenure earning positions in the department when new criteria are established may choose to use either 1) the criteria in place when they were hired into the tenure track line in the department or 2) the newly established criteria for promotion to either associate or full professor.

² Personnel files made available by faculty to the department for the purposes of evaluation are assumed to be confidential. Likewise, conversations in committees regarding all personnel files are considered confidential. Documents that are already publicly available, like vitas, course syllabi, publications, committee assignments, are not considered confidential. Finally, the University Handbook specifies other faculty rights, appeals and grievance procedures, which are beyond the scope of this document. Copies of the most recent version of the University Handbook can be found on K-State's web site.

full professor, an associate professor, and an assistant professor.³ Usually, one member is carried over from the previous year to serve as chair of the committee and is joined by two new additional members. Although faculty may opt not to serve, all faculty members are encouraged to serve when selected. The FEC members may confer with one another, but submit separate evaluations to the chair of the committee who summarizes their evaluations to the department head, in each case excluding herself or himself. The FEC committee will complete its review by mid-November for submission to the department head). The FEC is to evaluate each faculty member based on a rating scale of outstanding, exceeds departmental expectations, meets departmental expectations, fails to meet departmental expectations (i.e., needs improvement, but exceeds minimum expectations outlined on pages 14 and 15 of this document) and unsatisfactory (i.e., does not meet minimum departmental expectations). This rating excludes any combination of two different ratings such as outstanding/exceeded expectations. In the instance of a faculty member who cannot be evaluated by the department head, the committee members report their assessments directly to the Dean of Arts and Sciences or to the person designated by the dean to serve in that evaluative capacity.

4. **Review and Rating by Department Head:** After the head independently reviews the faculty evaluations and considers the recommendation of the FEC members, the department head determines faculty ratings based on a scale of outstanding, exceeds departmental expectations, meets departmental expectations, fails to meet departmental expectations (i.e., needs improvement, but exceeds minimum expectations outlined on pages 14 and 15 of this document) and unsatisfactory (i.e., does not meet minimum departmental expectations). This rating excludes any combination of two different ratings such as outstanding/exceeded expectations. Each component of performance (instruction, research, service) is rated independently and a composite rating is also given. The allocation of an individual faculty member's rating is entirely independent of the ratings of other faculty members. In other words, it is theoretically possible for all faculty to be outstanding or, conversely, for all to be unacceptable, or for any other distribution to occur between these two polar possibilities.
5. **Communications between the FEC and the Department Head:** Prior to the head's presenting his/her written evaluation statement to each faculty member, the head and FEC will share and discuss their initial evaluations of each faculty member. Based on the FEC's additional input, the head may choose to revise his/her initial evaluation of a faculty member.
6. **Draft Statements and Consultation with Faculty:** The department head prepares a draft statement for each faculty member. The statement summarizes the year's activities and includes the ratings assigned. These statements are shared with the faculty individually and corrections and comments are invited. Faculty are requested to discuss the evaluation with the department head. After such opportunities for consultation the evaluation statements are finalized. Faculty initial or sign one copy to acknowledge receipt. If there is disagreement with the statement, a dissenting statement may be submitted. The full set of statements is then submitted to the dean with a cover letter from the department head.
7. **Nominees for Special Honors (Teaching and Advising):** The department head must consult with the FEC concerning nominees for teaching awards or other honors which might be related to faculty evaluation. Candidates for special awards should have taught at least three total courses

³Assistant professors serving on the committee should, at a minimum, be in their second year of appointment.

over the past year. Criteria for nominations are included in the department's *Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion: Procedures, Standards and Criteria*.

8. Recommendations for Merit Salary Increases: When salary recommendations are invited by the Dean of Arts and Sciences, the department head distributes increases in relationship to faculty ratings. All faculty who have done a satisfactory job are provided at least a minimal salary increase.
9. Recommendations for Equity Adjustments: When equity adjustment funds are available, the department head recommends one or more individuals for equity adjustment increases based on both merit and peer universities' salaries. The head informs all faculty and invites them to submit statements indicating why they should be considered for equity increases. The department head consults the FEC in his equity calculations and makes final recommendations.

Evaluation Guidelines

Department of Political Science

To assist the department head in arriving at a fair and accurate assessment of faculty members' performance, the Faculty Evaluation Committee will request information pertaining to each faculty member's instructional activities and load, research and professional activities, department and university service and public service.

For the sake of comparability, this information, which will be used to determine merit salary adjustments and promotions, should be presented in the following manner:

- 1 Your name and rank
- 2 An updated vita
- 3 Instruction: Instruction encompasses classroom instruction, undergraduate student supervision, and graduate student supervision. All three are important in the evaluation process. Information relevant to performance in this area must include the following items:
 - a. Classroom Instruction:
 - i. **Course Load:** Please list in-load courses taught (number, course title, and approximate number of students in each) over the past academic year (fall, spring, and summer semesters). Overload courses (i.e., those beyond the individual faculty member's standard annual teaching load, typically 2-2) must be submitted to the FEC for review, but since they exceed contracted duties they will not be included in annual merit evaluation for instruction. The FEC will review overload courses for quality and to provide constructive feedback.
 - ii. **Teaching Performance:** Please attach the results of all individual and summary TEVAL course evaluations for each in-load class taught over the past academic year (fall, spring and summer semesters). Also attach additional evidence of teaching performance, which may include past student surveys, additional student surveys taken, syllabi, or anything else you feel sheds light on your teaching. See the university's Effective Faculty Evaluation on-line manual for suggestions.
 - b. Undergraduate Student Supervision: Identify the number of undergraduate students you supervise and specify the nature of your relationship with them, such as direct reading, mentoring, undergraduate research, and so forth. Please specify if they come in once a semester, or are you in more frequent contact with them. What percentage of your time is devoted to undergraduate supervision?
 - c. Graduate Student Supervision:
 - i. List the graduate students who have completed their M.A., M.P.A., or Ph.D. under your direction this academic year.
 - ii. List the graduate students currently enrolled under your guidance.
 - iii. List service on M.A., M.P.A., or Ph.D. committees where you are/were not the principal advisor in this and other departments. List names and departments; specify M.A., M.P.A., or Ph.D.

- 4 Research/Professional Service: This includes material published during the academic year or accepted for publication, work in progress or part of a large project, papers before professional societies, panel member, chairperson or panel, journal reviewer, member of professional board, etc. Appendices A and B provide information on departmental research expectations and the department’s approach to different types of research contributions.
 - a. Publications During Academic Year (August 1 - July 31): Please list publications and indicate whether they are in a professional journal (J), monograph (M), popular article (P), book (B), book review (BR), or other (O), and whether they are single, co- or multi-authored. Please provide some details about these publications, for example, whether the articles were refereed, and something of the nature of the journal/magazine, if it is not one of the common professional ones. Please make certain that copies of these publications are included in your departmental open file (publications and vita).
 - b. Work in Progress: Identify work in progress and indicate how it fits into ongoing projects. Please include copies of papers written, book chapters, tables of contents, and the like.
 - c. Professional Activities: List all professional activities carried out during the academic year: papers given, panel member or chair, board member, books or manuscripts reviewed.

- 5 Department/University Service: This includes service on departmental and university committees, special assignments undertaken, and other services rendered to the department or university.
 - a. Please list university and departmental committees on which you have served during this academic year. Please also list contribution to various departmental events and activities.
 - b. List other services performed for the university community.

- 6 Public Service: This involves services to the larger community reflecting not only professional expertise but service to the community as well.

- 7 Additional Considerations: Please indicate any additional information you feel is relevant to the proper assessment of your overall performance. This may include providing information about past projects, those about to come to fruition, long-term projects, such as administrative roles and phased retirement or extenuating circumstances.

- 8 The following percentages are given as an indication of the general expectations of the department concerning the distribution of efforts for each area of performance:

<u>Area</u>	<u>Minimum or Maximum %</u>	
Instruction	Minimum	35%
Research/Professional Activity	Minimum	40%
Service (Department/University/Public Service)	Minimum	10%
	Maximum	20%, within which no more than one half (or 10%) can be designated to public service
Administration	Maximum	20%

Administration: A faculty member with significant departmental or university administrative responsibilities, such as serving as director of undergraduate studies or graduate studies, or as an

administrator in an affiliated program, may allocate up to 20% of distribution of effort for administration. This time may be reallocated from any of the other three areas of distribution of effort as negotiated and approved by the department head prior to the beginning of the annual evaluation period. The minimum percentages for the other three areas of distribution of effort thus do not apply to those with administrative responsibilities. The distribution of effort associated with the activities of each director will be reported and evaluated under the area of administration.

Each faculty member is reminded to make an appointment with the department head each year to jointly establish personal goals and objectives for the upcoming evaluation period and to discuss their relative importance within the context of the department's goals. This meeting should be scheduled as soon as possible after the faculty member receives this year's evaluation from the department head and may coincide with the consultation concerning this year's evaluation with the department head. It is expected that the previous year's statement will be considered during the annual evaluation and goal setting process (See UHB C-45.1).

- 9 Differential loads / areas of responsibility: Tenured faculty who wish to shift their focus to teaching scholarship should discuss the possibility of teaching additional courses beyond the four per academic year (fall/spring semesters) that is typical. The department head may accept such an arrangement if it will benefit the aggregate research output and teaching performance of the department and will negotiate higher teaching loads up to but not exceeding eight courses per academic year. For each additional course taught beyond four per academic year, the faculty member can reduce the minimum percentage assigned to research/professional activity in annual merit evaluations by 7.5 percentage points. Such arrangements may provide the opportunity for other faculty members to earn course releases. Appendix C provides guidelines for the allocation of course releases for tenure-track faculty.
- 10 Previous Year Materials: Materials which were credited in the previous year should not be presented in the current year for recognition. Annual evaluation is designed to give feedback to the faculty and to provide a fair and objective basis for the allocation of annual salary increases, therefore it is based on the faculty's current annual performance. As noted above, faculty members must state explicitly in the submitted summary spreadsheet which year an accepted journal manuscript should be counted.

**Annual Reappointment, Mid-Tenure Review
Tenure and Promotion Procedures**

Annual Reappointment:

1. **Dates Established by University:** Non-Tenured faculty are considered for reappointment during the spring semester of their first year (for year 2), once during the fall and again during the spring of their second year (for years 3 and 4), and during the spring semester in subsequent years until tenure reappointment. The dates for these evaluations are established by the university in accordance with Appendix A of the University Handbook.
2. **Candidate Invited to Submit Dossier:** The candidate for reappointment is invited to compile a complete dossier, including vita, publications and teaching evaluations, and to make it available in the departmental office or on a secure web platform for review by tenured faculty.
3. **Faculty Recommendations:** The tenured faculty are invited by letter to submit written recommendations to the department head concerning the reappointment. Faculty are also welcome to comment on the record and performance of the colleague being considered for recommendation.
4. **Discussion Session:** A meeting of the eligible faculty is scheduled at least 14 days after the release of the candidate materials (see Section 53.1 of University Handbook), and prior to the deadline for the tenured faculty recommendations, during which the performance of the candidate for reappointment is discussed. The meeting is designed to provide an opportunity for a sharing of perspectives. No votes are taken at this meeting. Subsequent to this meeting there will be a ballot of the eligible faculty on reappointment of the candidate.
5. **Letter of Recommendation to Dean:** The department head, having received recommendations from participating tenured faculty, decides on a reappointment recommendation, which is then communicated to the Dean of Arts and Sciences in a letter. The letter includes a report of the level of faculty support for the recommendation, including arguments for or against the reappointment.
6. **Letter to Candidate:** The department head subsequently reports the substance of the recommendation to the candidate, along with any relevant comments on performance.
7. **Letter to Faculty:** The department head also notifies the tenured faculty concerning the reappointment recommendation.
8. **Tenure Clock:** Provisions for stopping the tenure clock of untenured faculty members are outlined in the KSU Faculty Handbook, sections C82.1 to C82.9. Consistent with the KSU Faculty Handbook, a candidate may seek tenure before the sixth year (C82.4).

Mid-Tenure Review

1. Time-Frame: The policy of conducting a mid-tenure review (MTR) for non-tenured faculty was established in April 1992. Faculty will normally go through the MTR process halfway through their tenure period (e.g., in the third year of appointment for an assistant professor without credit for prior teaching experience). This is consistent with C.92.1 of the Faculty Handbook.
2. Procedures: The department head will plan to follow the procedures used for tenure review, but will not request external evaluations.

Tenure/Promotion

1. Dossier: The candidate for tenure and/or promotion is requested to submit a complete dossier, in accordance with the Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation (<http://www.kstate.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/promotionguidelinesfororganization.pdf>)
2. External Evaluation: Upon request from the department head, the candidate will provide a list of up to ten references as possible reviewers of the candidate's work. Three of the candidate's references and three more not listed by the candidate will be chosen by the department head in consultation with the Rank and Tenure Committee⁵ and other tenured faculty. The total number of referees will be six. Outside references should be familiar with the candidate's work but not in so close a relationship as to compromise objectivity (e.g., former professor, etc.). The candidate reserves the right to request that one name not be included in the potential referee pool, but will not have access to the names of those referees selected by the department. The department head will request the participation of the selected referees, send them copies of the candidate's publications and other records of appropriate accomplishment, and then collect their letters of reference. These letters will then be made available for review by all tenured faculty members.
3. Faculty Review: Tenured faculty and/or faculty at rank(s) above that to which promotion is being considered review documents and make written recommendation to the department head.
4. Discussion Session: As with reappointment, a non-voting discussion session without the candidate present is held prior to the deadline for faculty recommendations in order to provide full scope for consideration of strengths and weaknesses of the candidate.
5. Department Recommendation: After reviewing written faculty recommendations, the department head prepares a recommendation letter to the Dean of Arts and Sciences and submits it with the forms and supporting materials prepared by the candidate. The department head's letter includes an indication of the degree of support from faculty, including relevant arguments for and/or against promotion or tenure.
6. Notification: The department head notifies the candidate and the participating faculty of his/her recommendation. Subsequently, the candidate will be notified by the recommendation of the Dean.

Note on Appeals:

A faculty member who disagrees or is not satisfied with the final decision made upon her/his reappointment, tenure, promotion, or merit salary may use the appeal process as provided in the KSU University Handbook, Section C and Appendix G.

⁵ The Rank and Tenure Committee is appointed annually by the head.

Standards for Mid Tenure Review

Standard

It is expected that the faculty member being reviewed should be able to demonstrate an ability to teach a variety of courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels and to be an effective student supervisor. They should also have a research agenda and record of publications submitted or accepted that will indicate a potential for meeting the standard for tenure and promotion in at least three years. They should be participating in and contributing to the committees and affairs of this department.

Criteria

The criteria used for this review are the same as for tenure and promotion adjusted for the time in rank.

Standard for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Promotion to associate professor rests on substantial professional contributions that reflect excellence in teaching and research. Service to the political science department, the university, and the larger academic/ professional community and society is expected.

Satisfaction of the minimum quantitative publication requirements does not alone constitute sufficient to support a successful tenure or promotion review; teaching and department and university service are also relevant. At the same time, in extraordinary cases, the scope and exceptional quality of individual publications may justify an exception to the minimum number (see University Handbook C100.1).

Criteria

In making a recommendation for tenure and promotion the department is saying that the candidate has excellent credentials for advancement and also has demonstrated versatility and talent, consistent with the current and anticipated needs of the department.

Teaching: Teaching excellence is essential for promotion and tenure in this department. Convincing evidence of effective teaching includes an ability to teach well a variety of courses at both the introductory and advanced levels. The candidate is also expected to advise students and provide them with letters of reference when appropriate.

Persuasive evidence of good teaching includes student evaluations, syllabi, tests, teaching awards, student accomplishments under supervision of the faculty member and letters of appreciation from former students. These examples are not meant to be exhaustive but are some of the suggestions from the University's Effective Faculty Evaluation manual.

Research: The following are the department's expectations for a candidate's publication record at the time of the tenure decision.

At least **six** peer reviewed⁶ articles in academic journals are expected. Candidate should provide

⁶ Here and elsewhere in this document "peer review" refers to the process by which a publisher/editor obtains evaluation of the candidate's research from anonymous academic peer (i.e., political scientists or faculty in public administration, or other experts in appropriate disciplines), not chosen by the candidate, and upon whose

evidence of journal and peer review process. Prominent social science journals are expected to be among the mix of publications.⁷ In order to demonstrate intellectual independence, at least two single-authored publications must also be in the mix of publications.

A peer reviewed book published by a university or commercial press can count for two to three articles.⁸ Peer-reviewed edited books, published by a university or commercial press, can count for one article. The editor can also receive an additional credit (an article) if they have a chapter in the peer-reviewed edited volume. A chapter in a peer-reviewed book will count as one article in a journal. Candidates should submit evidence of peer review when submitting reviewed publications for consideration. Candidates for tenure who publish their dissertations as a book need to publish the equivalent of an additional four peer reviewed articles/chapters.

To apply towards tenure, books, articles, chapters, etc., must be formally accepted by the publisher and, except for minor typographical and formatting changes be, in their final form. Evidence of such acceptance should be submitted.

A research agenda for the future including a 5 year research plan is required. The submission of grant applications for university and external funding is expected. In this regard, a research grant that meets the equivalent of criteria 1, 2 and 3 on page 17 of this document (on evaluating grants) may count for one article. One grant may be counted as an article toward tenure.

In order to evaluate the quality of the publications submitted by the candidate six outside reviewers will be utilized. The candidate will provide a list of up to ten reviewers, from which three will be selected, while the department will choose three others not listed by the candidate. For more details of the outside review procedure, see point 2 under Tenure and Promotion.

Note on publications prior to joining the department:

For faculty who have yet to hold a tenure track position, up to two articles or one book published before joining the department faculty can be counted toward promotion to associate professor with tenure. The department head will have discretion with regard to the evaluation of work published before an individual joins the ranks of departmental faculty. When a faculty member joining our department is moving from a tenure track position, service time, publications, and other aspects of previous service will be negotiated with the Head.

Candidates in the tenure track at the time this document goes into effect have the choice of referencing and adhering to the previous document (2010) when assembling their tenure packet.

Service: While a candidate will be expected to participate in and contribute to departmental affairs and committees, where possible he or she should also contribute professionally beyond the department.

judgment rests the publication or rejection of the candidate's research. For reference on this process, consult the process of anonymous peer review practiced by the American Political Science Review and other major political science journals.

⁷Faculty members should provide affirmative evidence for journal importance and impact. For information and guidance on journal quality, the following sources can be consulted: the list of top 50 journals from the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) on the Web of Knowledge based on a 5 year impact factor, PS & Politics articles ranking political science and subfield specific journals, and similar lists of major journals in public administration (such as Krueger and Bernick 2010) and multidisciplinary area studies.

⁸For guidance on press quality, faculty members can consult rankings of presses in PS & Politics and similar publications.

Standards and Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Standards for Promotion.

To be promoted to full professor, an individual should have a national or international reputation in the discipline of political science or within his or her sub-discipline. He or she should also have a distinguished record in teaching and service to the university.

Procedures

In making a decision regarding the promotion of an individual to the rank of full professor, all full professors in the Department will review the professional record of the individual concerned. They will meet to discuss the candidate's application and then forward their opinions individually to the department head who will forward their opinions and his or her own recommendation to the dean. (See Faculty Handbook C150-C152.5).

Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

Publications. The minimum expectations for a candidate for promotion to the rank of full professor will be at least seven peer reviewed articles since promotion to the rank of associate professor or a combination of books and articles equivalent to seven peer reviewed articles. To apply toward promotion, books must be peer-reviewed. As stated in the previous sub-section, a peer reviewed book published by a university or commercial press can count for two to three articles. A peer-reviewed edited book can count for one article. In all cases, the candidate should submit evidence of the peer review process and any other evidence of the work's quality, such as reviews of the book after publication. Prominent political science journals and/or book publishers should be in the mix of publications.

The candidate is also expected to be involved in applying for grants. In this regard, a research grant that meets the equivalent of criteria 1, 2 and 3 on page 17 of this document (on evaluating grants) may count for one article. Candidates must also present a research plan to cover the next five years.

In order to evaluate the quality of the publications submitted by the candidate, six external reviews will be obtained by the department. The candidate will provide a list of up to ten reviewers from which three will be selected. The head in consultation with the faculty will choose three others not from the candidate's list. For more details of the outside review procedure, see point 2 under Tenure and Promotion.

Teaching: To evaluate the quality of the candidate's teaching, the Department will review student evaluations and solicit copies of the candidate's syllabi and other relevant course materials developed over the period since tenure. The candidate is encouraged to review the Effective Faculty Evaluation manual for other evidence he or she may wish to submit regarding teaching effectiveness.

Candidates are expected to teach effectively at all levels and to advise both undergraduate and graduate students as part of their teaching responsibilities. The candidate should demonstrate a willingness to meet with students, write letters of recommendation and mentor them in their careers. Candidates should have evidence of supervision of graduate students.

Service: A candidate for full professor should demonstrate involvement in areas of university and community service related to his or her expertise.

Professional Standing: The candidate is expected to demonstrate his or her involvement in the discipline at an appropriate level. Evidence of such involvement may include participation in governance of professional associations, service on editorial boards of journals, frequency of citation by other scholars in the field, and service as a peer reviewer for journals and book publishers.

Professorial Performance Award⁹

To qualify to be recommended to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences for a professorial performance award, the faculty member must be a full-time, full professor, in rank for at least six years, who has demonstrated sustained level productivity in the area of scholarship for the last six years. In essence, the faculty must produce, within a six-year time frame, a level of scholarship that is equivalent to what the department expects for an associate professor to be promoted to a full professor.

Minimum Criteria

- A candidate must have earned a merit evaluation of “meets expectations” or above in the area of scholarship in most of these six years, with at least two years being rated as outstanding; and received a merit evaluation of at least “meets expectations” for instruction and service for most of these six years.
- A candidate must have produced a level of scholarship that is equivalent to what the department expects for an associate professor to be promoted to a full professor during these six years (see “Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor, Publications”).
- By university rule, the six-year time frame must include the most recent performance review.
- A candidate may be awarded a performance award no more than once every six years.

Process

Any candidate, who meets these minimum criteria, may apply for a performance award. To apply, a candidate must assemble a performance award file that documents her/his scholarly accomplishments over the past six years. A candidate’s file should include all the elements of a typical promotion file, but unlike a promotion file, should include only summary information regarding instruction and service.

The candidate will submit her/his file to the Rank and Tenure committee which will review the file and make a written recommendation to the Head. Outside, peer-reviews of each candidate’s file are not required. Using input from the Rank and Tenure committee, the Head will make a decision regarding whether to forward the file to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences with a positive or negative recommendation. The Head’s recommendation will be shared with the candidate. The ultimate decision of whether a candidate is awarded a performance award is made by the Provost.

The timelines for this process will be established each year by the Provost’s office, but candidates should know that this process will begin sometime in January of each year. Prospective candidates are encouraged to consult with the department head and the chair of the Rank and Tenure committee to help determine if they meet the minimum criteria.

⁹Standards developed and approved by faculty in May 2006 and reapproved on May 7, 2010 and December 12, 2014.

Department of Political Science
Minimal Acceptable Levels for Faculty Performance¹⁰

These standards were developed by and apply to members of the political science faculty at Kansas State University. Failure to meet these standards may have consequences for tenure-track faculty and tenured faculty. Tenure-track faculty members falling below these standards may be notified of non-reappointment. There are additional potential grounds for non-reappointment, including inadequate progress toward tenure/promotion. Tenure-track faculty members must be explicitly informed by the Dean in writing of a decision not to renew their appointments in accordance with The Standards of Notice of Non-Reappointment (See University Handbook, C162.3 and Appendix A.) Tenured faculty failing to meet these standards may be subjected to dismissal for cause if their performance falls under Chronic Low Achievement (University Handbook, Sections C31.5-C31.8).

The decision to invoke C31.5 must take into account a faculty member's overall performance including areas of responsibility with the weighted importance (%) of each area, weaknesses not balanced by strengths and/or predetermined agreements between the faculty member and department head about the relative distribution of effort of different areas of responsibility. Action may be taken to initiate "dismissal for cause" as provided for in Section C31.5 of the University Handbook. As with any policy, allowances should be made for health and family circumstances that affect a faculty member's work performance. The following standards do not in any way affect departmental expectations for annual merit evaluations, promotion and/or tenure already approved by the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Provost. However, one additional category will be added to annual evaluations, viz. "unsatisfactory", which indicates that a faculty member has fallen below minimal acceptable levels of productivity.

A. Research

1. Minimal standards. The department expects all faculty to meet at least one of the following requirements.
 - a. One recent research paper submitted or revised and resubmitted for publication within the past two years, or
 - b. Presentation of one recent research paper at a professional meeting within the past two years, or
 - c. Submission of a major grant proposal for external funding within the past two years.
2. Exceptions.
 - a. The faculty member develops a new course or substantially revises an existing course equivalent to a new course. Examples might include development of new distance courses or revisions involved in shifting a course from one curriculum category to another.
 - b. The faculty member is working on a longer range project and shows evidence of progress (e.g. a book or other research project).
 - c. The faculty member is engaged in some other scholarly pursuit that is expected to enhance the overall reputation of the department, college or university (e.g. editing a professional journal or chairing a professional association).
 - d. New faculty who are working on their degrees or who have received the Ph.D. within the last year may receive a one year extension on these requirements. Note: this does not affect departmental expectations for granting of tenure.
 - e. Submission to scholarly journals or other publication fora that have particularly long notification times.
 - f. Where faculty have past exemplary records and/or may be developing new research interests and can show evidence of progress in the new field.
 - g. When faculty members are engaged in significant administrative duties.

¹⁰ Originally approved February 1977. Revised version approved December 12, 2014.

h. Special understandings exist between the faculty member and department head regarding items a - f, or other circumstances such as sabbatical leave.

B. Teaching

1. Minimum Standards. The department expects all faculty will meet each of the following requirements:

- a. Carry normal teaching loads.
- b. Show evidence of up to date teaching materials (syllabi, handouts, tests, etc.).
- c. Provide evidence of satisfactory teaching competence using a combination of student evaluations, syllabi, and other teaching materials. Other sources of teaching evaluations such as peer review may also be used with the faculty member's consent.
- d. Meet classes, hold office hours and advise students.

2. Exceptions

- a. Faculty member is on sabbatical or other leave
- b. Variations in teaching loads on agreement with the department head.

C. Service. Minimum standards will be met if the faculty member serves in a satisfactory manner on a normal number of departmental committees.

SPECIAL APPEALS REGARDING MINIMUM STANDARDS

Faculty members may appeal to the department head to accept alternatives to the performance criteria outlined. It will be the responsibility of the faculty member to prove that suggested alternatives are adequate substitutions. Should this procedure prove unsatisfactory to the faculty member, they may appeal to the full tenured department faculty members.

DEPARTMENTAL PROCESS

A. The department head will follow procedures specified in the University Handbook Sections C31.5-31.8.

B. 1. Should those procedures and attempts to improve performance fail, the department head will bring the case to a meeting of the department's tenured faculty with a recommendation. The department head and the faculty member must each document their side of the case in writing and all materials prepared and submitted to the full tenured faculty must be available to each other as well. Any relevant documentation may be submitted by either party.

2. The full tenured faculty will select a chair among themselves who is not the department head. The tenured faculty will then hear the arguments from the head and faculty member. Members of the faculty may ask questions pertaining to the case of either party.

3. After hearing both sides and questioning them, the tenured faculty may discuss the case and will vote on whether to accept the department head's recommendation to the Dean to invoke dismissal for cause procedures. The number of "yes" votes, "no" votes, and abstentions will be recorded by the chair. The total votes along with any recommendations the faculty wish to make will be forwarded by the chair to the faculty member, department head and Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. As with tenure and promotion decisions, confidentiality of individual votes and comments will be protected.

C. This process in no way prevents a faculty member from pursuing a formal grievance using the process outlined in the University Handbook should the faculty member not agree with the final resolution.

Post Tenure Review¹²

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 the Faculty Senate on February 11, 2014.

Post tenure review will be conducted by the department head, following the procedure below. Given the presence of non-tenured faculty members on the faculty evaluation committee, the FEC will not participate in post-tenure review processes.

Procedure:

- Exceptions to the review: tenured faculty members who have applied for promotion to full professor, applied for a professorial performance award (University Handbook C49), or have been recognized with a notable university, national, or international award requiring multi-year portfolio-like documentation, within the last six years are subjected to reset of post-tenure review clock. University teaching, advising and other awards fall under this rubric.
- Materials for the review: faculty members should submit copies of his/her six previous annual merit evaluations to the department head, as stated in university policy. The faculty member should also provide the head with a self-evaluation statement of no more than one page which lists accomplishments over the previous six years and goals for the next five years.
- Criteria for successful contributions to the university. If the faculty's six previous annual merit evaluations rest at or exceed the designation "meets expectations," the individual will be deemed to be continuing to make a successful, ongoing contribution to the university. If one or more of these annual merit evaluations fall below the "meets expectations" designation, the faculty member will work with the department head to develop a plan to continue to provide lasting and meaningful contributions to the university.
- Confidentiality. Per university policy, post tenure review outcomes are confidential and confined to the appropriate university personnel and bodies.

¹² Standards developed in summer 2014 and approved December 12, 2014.

APPENDIX A

Guidelines for Ranking Research Contributions

Publications

The following ranking of research contributions will be used as a guideline in the evaluation process:

1. Peer reviewed books, peer reviewed edited books, and peer reviewed articles in prominent political science and public administration journals. For guidance on journal quality, please refer to footnote 10.
2. Peer reviewed articles in journals in related disciplines, in specialized journals, in monographs and as chapters in edited books.
3. Peer reviewed research notes
4. Non peer reviewed books and articles, textbooks, readers and annotated bibliographies, and chapters in specialized journals and in books.
5. Non peer reviewed research notes.
6. Encyclopedia articles
7. Book reviews.

*Note: The department encourages co-authorship with students (graduate or undergraduate), and such articles will not be considered less valuable than any other publication of its quality.

Guidelines for Evaluating Grants and Contracts

The department values the receipt of external grants and contracts. Receipt of extramural grants and contracts are important indicators of research activity and academic reputation, and these awards benefit the department directly through financial resources to support GRAs/GTAs and so forth. The weight given for grants and contracts during merit review is based on the nature of the awarding process, the magnitude of the award, and the benefit to the department.

The greatest weight will be given to external grants or contracts¹³ that 1) are awarded through a peer reviewed process, 2) where the magnitude of the award or contract generates research overhead money for the department and/or salary savings that revert to the department, and 3) where part of the award is used to finance at least one GRA/GTA for at least two semesters. During this two semester period (where the summer can be considered one semester), multiple external contracts or grants may be added together to meet these three criteria.

Following these criteria, a research grant can count for up to one article in the faculty member's annual merit evaluation for research. Also, a teaching related grant will result in at least a one-step rise in the faculty member's annual merit evaluation for teaching, and an administration focused grant will produce a similar one-step rise in the faculty member's annual administrative or department/university service

¹³Contracts must include the provision that researchers will be able to use any data derived from the research and to publish any work resulting from the research after 6 months to a maximum of 1 year from when the contracted research is complete.

evaluation. If a faculty member's evaluation in the particular area is already at the "outstanding" level, the faculty evaluation committee and the head may offer credit for the grant in other areas of responsibility at their discretion. The faculty member can also request that the grant be allocated to the next year's evaluation period.

APPENDIX B

Expectations of Professional Research Activities

The following guidelines reflect the department’s expectations for scholarly activity. To receive a rating above “unsatisfactory” for the area of research during merit evaluation, faculty members should maintain research activity. The primary evidence that a faculty member is maintaining an active research agenda during an annual evaluation period is:

1. Presenting a paper at a professional conference, or working on one or more scholarly studies, or working on a book length manuscript(s), or working on an externally funded research proposal
or
2. Attempting to publish one or more scholarly works in appropriate outlets (journals, edited books, university/commercial presses) or submitting grant proposal(s) to an external funding agency.

Because the process of publication can be lengthy, faculty members may claim in their merit files studies initiated/presented in previous years provided they show evidence of meaningful progress toward the revision and/or publication of these works.

In addition to these minimal expectations, faculty members are encouraged to apply for small university research and travel grants, serve as panel discussants and/or panel chairs at professional conferences, review manuscripts for journals and presses, publish book reviews, sit on editorial boards, etc. While all of these professional research activities enhance each faculty member’s research agenda and merit evaluation, by themselves, these supplemental activities do not constitute evidence of an active research agenda.

Because publication and funding opportunities do not always follow a academic year, faculty members’ evaluation in the area of research will reflect a three year moving average (current year plus the two previous merit evaluation years).

In general, faculty members who receive an evaluation of “meets departmental expectations” or higher for the area of research for an annual evaluation period may have:

1. Published¹⁴ one book.
or
2. Published at least one article or book chapter.
or
3. Obtained external funding for a research proposal.

The final evaluation earned by a faculty member in the area of research depends on the volume of research activities, the quality of these research activities, and the extent to which these research activities match the department’s priorities for publication or external funding (See Appendix A).

¹⁴ Only completed books that have been published within the period of evaluation shall be considered.

APPENDIX C

Guidelines for allocating course releases for tenure-track faculty

Department, college, and university strategic goals emphasize that the department should continue to increase the volume and quality of our collective research output. One way to meet this goal is to use teaching load reductions to promote research activity as long as such reductions do not hurt the quality of instruction in the department.

Course reductions will tend to be possible when some faculty in the department choose reduced research responsibilities (see paragraph on differential loads on page 7). If course reductions are available to tenure track faculty, the first priority in their allocation is to ensure that, over a period of several years, all faculty members actively contributing to the department's research goals are provided roughly equivalent time for research. The department head can consider any of the following factors when allocating course reductions:

1. At a minimum, faculty members considered for course reductions must have earned "meets departmental expectations" for research/professional activity on their most recent annual merit evaluations. Consistent annual merit evaluations of "Outstanding" in the category of research/professional activity will contribute to decisions about granting course reductions.
2. Previous course reductions allocated to the same faculty member.
3. Heavy graduate student advising loads that involve supervision of multiple MA theses or PhD dissertations simultaneously.
4. Award of a major grant (see criteria on page 17) in which the faculty member is the Principle Investigator (PI or co-PI).
5. Professional service as a journal or book series editor or associate editor.
6. Serving in leadership positions in professional organizations such as conference chair or section head/president for a social science conference.
7. Other uncompensated professional service in the faculty member's area of expertise.

APPENDIX D

Sample Request for Materials

Department of Political Science
M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Faculty

FROM: Head

DATE:

RE:Request for Evaluation Materials

Please prepare your materials for our annual merit evaluation process. These should include a current vita, a completed spreadsheet responding to the attached **EVALUATION GUIDELINES**, and appropriate supporting materials. You are encouraged to also submit a narrative providing further explanation of your teaching, research, and service activities over the course of the past year. I will be unable to recommend a merit increase/equity increase for anyone choosing not to submit these requested materials.

Your materials may be submitted to the secretary. The Faculty Evaluation Committee has requested that files be completed by_____. The new deadline will permit completion of the processing of student evaluations before materials are due. Please be certain to have student evaluations completed before the end of the semester.

Remember to make an appointment with me to discuss your goals and objectives for next year as soon as possible after you have received this year's final merit evaluation.

**Kansas State University
Master of Public Administration**

Diversity and Inclusion Plan
(July 2017)

INTRODUCTION

This plan provides a strategy for Kansas State University's Master of Public Administration (MPA) program to further develop and sustain an inclusive and diverse environment. Our paramount goals include:

- Improve the representativeness of our program by striving to achieve a diverse student body, staff, and faculty that respects the many dimensions of diversity including race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion, and disability status.
- Prepare students to understand and appreciate working in a diverse and changing modern workplace.
- Support and promote research on policy topics related to equity and diversity.

MISSION, VISION, and VALUES

Mission Statement

The Master of Public Administration (MPA) degree at Kansas State University prepares both mid and pre-career students to serve the public interest and establish themselves as civic leaders. The program emphasizes a theoretically informed and research driven skills based approach to learning designed to insure that our students develop specific competencies that prepare them for the challenges of work in the public and non-profit sectors immediately upon graduation. Our faculty's approach to education begins with a broad exposure to policy systems, political environments, administrative principals and research methods. Additionally, our students are required to think critically, apply knowledge and seek practical solutions to real world problems. Our low faculty to student ratio contributes to a student-centered learning environment in which we are able to instill in our students the ethics of public service and professional management that are critical to the diverse and changing modern workplace.

Vision and Values

The K-State MPA program adheres to Kansas State University's "Principles of Community."

Kansas State University is a land-grant, public research university committed to teaching and learning, research, and service to the people of Kansas, the nation, and the world. Our collective mission is best accomplished when every member of the university community acknowledges and practices the following principles:

We affirm the inherent dignity and value of every person and strive to maintain an atmosphere of justice based on respect for each other.

We affirm the value of human diversity for community.

We affirm the right of each person to freely express thoughts and opinions in a spirit of civility and decency. We believe that diversity of views enriches our learning environment, and we promote open expression within a climate of courtesy, sensitivity, and mutual respect.

We affirm the value of honesty and integrity. We will operate with honesty in all professional endeavors and expect the same from our colleagues.

We acknowledge that we are a part of multiple communities, and we have an obligation to be engaged in a positive way with our civic partners.

We recognize our individual obligations to the university community and to the principles that sustain it. We will each strive to contribute to a positive spirit that affirms learning and growth for all members of the community (<http://www.k-state.edu/about/community.html>).

The MPA program adopts a broad definitional framework for diversity and inclusion. We define diversity to include historically underrepresented persons/groups in the areas of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, veteran status and ability status. Furthermore, we believe the inclusion of dimensions related to nationality, religion, socioeconomic status, and diverse experiences/backgrounds enriches the employment and learning environments of our faculty, staff, and students.

ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT STATE OF DIVERSITY

Faculty and Staff

Table 1 displays gender and racial diversity by faculty rank for the K-State MPA program. Among the six core MPA faculty members, two are female (one at the Associate Professor level and one at the Assistant Professor level) and three are male. Four of these faculty members were hired since 2008 (two males and two females). The MPA program is supported by two full time political science staff members, both of whom are women.

Table 1. MPA Full Time Faculty and Staff Diversity

Faculty Rank and/or Title	Race & Ethnicity	Gender
Graduate Director/Associate Professor	White	Male
Associate Professor	White	Male
Associate Professor	White	Female
Assistant Professor	White	Female
Assistant Professor	Asian (International)	Male
Senior Administrative Specialist	White	Female
Senior Administrative Assistant	White	Female

Students

The MPA program follows all Kansas State University policies and procedures regarding the admission of a diverse student body. *Table 2* shows the fall enrollment by gender for 2014, 2015 and 2016. In 2014 and 2015 respectively, 58% and 52% of our enrolled students were women. In 2016, that number was 53%. According to data maintained by Kansas State University, women made up 55% of the student body enrolled in undergraduate programs within the College of Arts and Sciences, which houses the MPA program and Department of Political Science, in 2014. At the Masters-level, women made up 54% of the student body in the College. Therefore, the gender make-up up of our student body is similar to the College's.

Table 2. Fall Enrollment by Gender

	2014	2015	2016
Male	10 (42%)	10 (48%)	9 (47%)
Female	14 (58%)	11 (52%)	10 (53%)
Total Students	24	21	19

Table 3 displays the MPA program's fall enrollment by ethnicity and ethnic minority group for 2014, 2015, and 2016. In all three years, the majority of our enrolled students were white. Minority students made up between 5% and 10% of our student body during this time and, on average, international students made up 14% of our enrollment. In 2014, the College of Arts and Sciences reported that approximately 74% of their enrolled students were white, 6% were black, and 8% were Hispanic. Further, approximately 4% of enrolled undergraduate students identified as multi-racial, 1.4% as Asian, and 5.3% as non-resident alien. The remaining students did not identify their race/ethnicity or identified as a race/ethnic minority that did not reach a 1% threshold. At the Masters level, the College reported that approximately 73% of their enrolled students were white, 7% were Hispanic, 2% were black, 1.7% were multi-racial, and 1.5% were Asian. Nearly 12% of enrolled Masters students in the College of Arts and Sciences identified as non-resident alien. The remaining students did not identify their race/ethnicity or identified as a race/ethnic minority that did not reach a 1% threshold.

Table 3. Fall Enrollment by Ethnicity and Ethnic Minority Group

	2014	2015	2016
All Minority	1 (4%)	1 (5%)	2 (10%)
<i>Asian</i>	0	0	0
<i>Black</i>	0	0	1 (5%)
<i>Hispanic</i>	1 (4%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)
<i>American Indian</i>	0	0	0
White	20 (83%)	17 (81%)	15 (80%)
International (Non-Resident Alien)	3 (13%)	3 (14%)	3 (15%)
Unknown	0	0	0
Total	24	21	20

While we have consistently attracted international students to apply for and enroll in our MPA program, statistics demonstrate that we do not attract many domestic born minority applicants, compared to the College overall. Our program needs to do more to encourage a diverse group of students to apply.

Student Attrition

Between the fall of 2014 and the fall of 2016, we had one student drop out of the program before completion. This student was a white male.

Teaching, Research, and Service

In April of 2016, each MPA faculty member was asked to summarize teaching, research, and service activities that promote diversity or equity. Specifically, faculty members provided information regarding topics and/or activities covered in their classes that advance diversity, equity, and/or inclusion. Further, the program collected information related to faculty research that advances the literature on diversity and equity, as well as professional activities that could be viewed as advancing diversity or equity.

Table 4 provides a complete list of published faculty research in the last five years that advances the topics of diversity and/or equity. *Table 5* provides a complete list of working papers and/or conference papers that address these topics. Because the MPA program is part of the Department of Political Science, some of the listed research lies at the intersection of Public Administration and Political Science. Two of our MPA faculty members have been active in conducting research that touches on issues related to diversity and inclusion. Specifically, this research has examined the impact of gender on organizational leadership, agenda-setting, civic engagement, and representation. The faculty research has also explored state healthcare and social welfare policies, which can have a pronounced impact on marginalized groups in society.

Table 6 provides evidence of our program’s commitment to the promotion of diversity and inclusion in our core courses. Overall, MPA core courses explicitly raise the issues of diversity and inclusion in a variety of contexts. The challenges inequality poses to public administrators, especially in personnel decisions is a key theme in Public Personnel Administration. Furthermore, this class, as well as courses on Public Administration and Society and Public Organizational Theory introduce students to the theoretical importance and practical benefits that organizations can achieve when they value the many dimensions of diversity including race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion, and disability status. The MPA program’s commitment to diversity can be seen in both the topics covered in classroom discussion, as well as the assignments students must complete.

The elective courses offered by program faculty offer more opportunities for students to learn about diversity and inclusion. These courses include Strategic Management of Public Organizations, Administrative Law, Administrative Ethics, Urban Politics, and Gender and Politics.

Furthermore, during the fall of 2016, our program organized a practitioner’s panel dedicated to the topic of “diversity and inclusion in the workplace.” The speakers at this panel were the Mirta Chavez, the Director of Multicultural Programs and Services for the Office of Diversity at Kansas State University, Aaron Sauerwein, the Associate Director of the Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance at Kansas State University, and Cathy Harmes, the Director of Human Resources for the City of Manhattan, KS. This panel gave our MPA students the opportunity to discuss how diversity management and a commitment to inclusivity in the public sector help to improve social equity and organizational effectiveness.

Our faculty also engage in service related to the topics of diversity, inclusion, and equality. One of our faculty members, Dr. Ethan Bernick, is currently serving on the College of Arts and Sciences Diversity Committee. Furthermore, two of our faculty members, Dr. Ethan Bernick and Dr. Brianne Heidbreder, have participated in workshops on the topics of “Implicit Bias” and “Difficult Conversations in the Workplace” over the course of the last year.

Table 4. Faculty Research on the Topics of Diversity and Equity, Publications.

Citation	Abstract
<p>Grasse, Nathan, Brianne Heidbreder, and Douglas Ihrke. 2014. "City Managers' Leadership Credibility: Explaining the Variations of Self-Other Assessments." <i>Public Administration Quarterly</i> 38(4): 544-572.</p>	<p>Leadership skills are clearly important for city managers. Credible leaders have the potential to have a positive impact on employee attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors, as well as organizational outcomes. Despite the importance of leadership and the credibility of leaders, we have little understanding of how city managers assess their own leadership credibility. In order to improve our understanding, this research explores factors that influence managers' awareness of their credibility as leaders. Using data from Michigan municipalities, we find that both individual and organizational characteristics are correlated with a city manager's ability to accurately assess their leadership skills when compared to their subordinates' assessments.</p> <p>Key Finding: Female leaders are more likely to underestimate their leadership skills when compared to male leaders.</p>
<p>Heidbreder, Brianne and Katherine Scheurer. 2013. "Gender and the Gubernatorial Agenda." <i>State and Local Government Review</i>. 45:3-13.</p>	<p>Although the number of female governors has more than doubled over the past 30 years, few studies examine whether gender influences the policy interests of governors. To address this gap in the literature, we analyze whether gender affects the policy agendas of governors. Conducting a content analysis of state of the state speeches between 2006 and 2008, we examine whether gender influences the presence of social welfare policies on the policy agendas of governors. Even after controlling for political and situational factors, our results suggest that female governors devote significantly more agenda attention to social welfare policy than their male colleagues.</p>
<p>Bernick, Ethan M. 2011. "Population Diversity and Policy Diversity: Explaining State Choices in Medicaid Managed Care." <i>Journal of Policy Practice</i> 10: 307-325.</p>	<p>Research on U.S. state policy making finds contradictory results that indicate that the diversity of a state will lead to policies that are either liberal or conservative. I hypothesize that in many instances states with greater diversity will in fact be more willing to adopt and implement programs that are less polarizing. To test this assumption this research examines the decisions that policy makers have made when developing and implementing state-level Medicaid managed care programs. The results suggest that states with greater socioeconomic and cultural diversity do not experience greater program diversity, while states with</p>

	greater party competition and moderate ideology do implement managed care programs with greater diversity.
<p>Barrilleaux, Charles, and Ethan Bernick. 2013. "Deservingness, discretion, and the state politics of welfare spending, 1990–96." <i>State Politics & Policy Quarterly</i> 3: 1-22.</p>	<p>Are the politics of welfare policy for the “deserving” and “undeserving” poor the same? We use pooled cross-sectional time-series analyses of state government discretionary welfare spending on general assistance (GA) and Supplemental Security Income supplements (SSI-S) to address this question. We find that efforts to assist the GA population decline as electoral competition increases while efforts to assist the SSI-S population increase, providing evidence that only the deserving poor are favored by heightened political competition. We also find that SSI-S benefits rise with ideological liberalism, electoral competition, and the percentage of African Americans in a state. When considered in light of the negative effect of larger African American populations on states' SSI-S efforts, this suggests targeting of particular groups. Finally, we find that SSI-S enrollments are reduced, but the per-recipient payments are increased under state administration, suggesting that state administrators are more likely to provide more services to existing clientele than to expand their client base.</p>
<p>Ciftci, Sabri, and Ethan M. Bernick. 2015. "Utilitarian and modern: clientelism, citizen empowerment, and civic engagement in the Arab world." <i>Democratization</i> 22: 1161-1182.</p>	<p>In this article, we examine the patterns of civic engagement in non-democratic and democratizing polities of the Arab world. The theoretical argument incorporates two perspectives: modernization theory and utilitarianism. Specifically, we use wasta-seeking behaviour and indicators of human capital and citizen empowerment to explain the micro-level foundations of civic engagement. We build on the implications of these approaches to explain the civic gender gap and women's status in Arab societies. The results of a series of multivariate estimations using the first wave of the Arab Barometer Survey show that clientelistic behaviour along with higher levels of education and employment status explain citizens' involvement in various forms of civic activities. We argue that the former helps sustain traditional authoritarian structures and the latter may help democratization by strengthening civil society. We also detect a civic gender gap and find that citizen empowerment and modernization may narrow this gap in accordance with the democratic norms whereas utilitarian behaviour may generate a similar effect to indirectly undermine the status of women. These findings provide new insights about the complex interdependence of human development,</p>

	clientelistic networks, women's status, and democratization in the aftermath of the Arab Spring.
--	--

Note. Kansas State faculty names are in **bold**.

Table 5. Faculty Research on the Topics of Diversity and Equity, Working Papers and Conference Presentations.

Citation	Abstract
Grasse, Nathan, Brianne Heidbreder , and Sharon Kukla-Acevedo. "Gender and the Compensation of Nonprofit Executive Directors and Chief Financial Officers." (Under Review)	This research examines the influence of gender on executive compensation in nonprofit organizations by exploring the pay of both executive directors and chief financial officers. The results suggest that gender influences compensation, with females paid less than their male counterparts. The consistency of this effect in the nonprofit sector is striking, particularly when controlling for other factors such as organizational size, market, subsector, organizational type, staffing level, and organizational performance. The models utilize data on the population of nonprofit organizations required to file Form 990 returns with the Internal Revenue Service in 2003 in order to broadly examine the effect of gender on executive compensation.
Bernick, Ethan and Brianne Heidbreder . "Disproportionately Represented: Women in Local Elected Offices." Paper presented at the Southwest Social Science Annual Conference. Las Vegas, NV. March 2016.	In this research, we examine the presence of men serving in the female-dominated position of county clerk. Using data collected from the National Association of Counties (NACo) and the U.S. Census Bureau, we estimate the correlation between the county clerk's sex and county level demographic, social, and political factors with maximum likelihood logit estimates. We find that men are more likely to serve as county clerks in large, as measured using population estimates, and liberal counties. Our research suggests there are structural opportunities that propel men into female dominated professions and sanctions that have kept men out of "female" positions.
Bernick, Ethan , Sabri Ciftci, and Chardie Baird. "How Cultural Beliefs About Women's Role in the World Shape Women's Civic Engagement." Paper Presented at the Annual Meetings of the Southwest Social Science Association, Las Vegas, NV. March 2016*	In this paper we argue that the non-traditional gender beliefs that individuals, especially women, hold are important factors in explaining why someone may participate. But the individual beliefs and values are not sufficient, as their importance is conditioned in large part by the strength of societal and cultural expectations. In this paper we test this argument by focusing on a women's level of civic engagement globally.

<p>*This paper won the Jewell Limar Prestage paper award. The Prestage Award recognizes the best paper on the intersection of gender, race, ethnicity, and political behavior presented at the Annual Meeting of Southwestern Political Science Association.</p>	<p>Using data from the World Values Survey we develop and test a model of women participation in the civic world. In this model we take into account for the potential for competing forces of individual gender beliefs and the societal level values that shape a decision to participate.</p>
<p>Heidbreder, Brianne and Katherine Scheurer. "Gubernatorial Policy Agendas: Assessing the Influence of Gender." Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Midwest Political Science Association. Chicago, IL. April 2014.</p>	<p>This research examines whether a critical mass environment of women in a governor's administration influences the ideological content of male and female governors' healthcare and social welfare policy agendas. To measure agenda-setting, we conduct a content analysis of state of the state speeches between the years of 2004 and 2008, across the 50 U.S. states. Our findings indicate that a critical mass environment does not significantly influence the policy agendas of female governors. However, male governors do, in fact devote more attention to liberal social welfare and healthcare policies when there is a critical mass of women in executive positions.</p>
<p>Ciftci, Sabri and Ethan Bernick. "Democracy, Gender Gap and Civic Engagement in the Arab World." Paper Presented at the Annual Meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois. April 2012</p>	<p>In this paper, we examine the patterns of civic engagement in non-democratic and democratizing polities of the Arab world. The theoretical argument incorporates two perspectives: modernization theory and utilitarianism. Specifically, we use wasta-seeking behaviour and indicators of human capital and citizen empowerment to explain the micro-level foundations of civic engagement. We build on the implications of these approaches to explain the civic gender gap and women's status in Arab societies. The results of a series of multivariate estimations using the first wave of the Arab Barometer Survey show that clientelistic behaviour along with higher levels of education and employment status explain citizens' involvement in various forms of civic activities. We argue that the former helps sustain traditional authoritarian structures and the latter may help democratization by strengthening civil society. We also detect a civic gender gap and find that citizen empowerment and modernization may narrow this gap in accordance with the democratic norms whereas utilitarian behaviour may generate a similar effect to indirectly undermine the status of women. These findings provide new insights about the complex interdependence of human development, clientelistic networks, women's status, and democratization in the aftermath of the Arab Spring.</p>

<p>Heidbreder, Brianne and Katherine Scheurer. "Gender and the Ideological Policy Agendas of Male and Female Governors." Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Midwest Political Science Association. Chicago, IL. April 2012.</p>	<p>Women have become major players in state politics and their representation among the states as government officials has surpassed their representation at the federal level (Conway 2004). Since the 1970s the number of female governors has more than doubled and currently, there are 6 female governors. The rise in state power along with the rise in the number of female executives has not necessarily been met with an equally impressive rise in the study of gender in gubernatorial decision-making and leadership (Barth and Ferguson 2002). This study is an attempt to fill this gap in the literature by examining whether gender influences the policy agendas of governors. Conducting a content analysis of state of the state speeches between the years of 2004 and 2007, across the 50 U.S. states, we examine whether gender influences the social welfare and healthcare policy agendas of governors</p>
---	--

Note. Kansas State faculty names are in **bold**.

Table 6 Coursework that Advances Diversity, Equity, and/or Inclusion

Course	Topic and/or Activity Advancing Diversity, Equity, and/or Inclusion
<p>POLSC 702: Public Administration and Society (Bernick)</p>	<p><i>Topics:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Neutrality and Objectivity in Public Administration: In this section we focus on one school of thought, Gender and Race, that highlights the potential lack of neutrality and objectivity in public administration. Students are asked to read several academic articles on the impact of race and gender. 2. Students discuss the importance of race and gender in the context of public service throughout the course. <p><i>Activities:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students are assigned readings related to race, gender, and bureaucracy. 2. Students completed group research projects. The instructor assigned students to groups to achieve some gender and ethnic diversity. These projects required students to work with others that were different from them.
<p>POLSC 708: Public Personnel Administration (Heidbreder)</p>	<p><i>Topics:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Employee Rights and Responsibilities: Includes discussion of due process of law, the Americans with Disabilities Act (1990), sexual harassment 2. Equal Employment Opportunity 3. Affirmative Action 4. Managing Diversity Programs 5. Recruitment and Selection: Includes discussion of need to appeal to a diverse applicant pool, appropriate and/or inappropriate application and interview question, as well as equal employment law 6. Compensation/Pay: Includes discussion of Equal Pay Act (1963), Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act (2009), comparable worth, use of discretionary benefits in recruitment of diverse workforce 7. Performance Appraisal: Includes discussion of appraisal bias that can arise from perceived differences (race, gender, among others) <p><i>Activities:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students were asked to write a memo to a City Manager detailing at least three ideas that they had to improve the organization’s ability to recruit qualified employees from a <i>diverse</i> applicant pool in a twenty-first century environment.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Students completed a written assignment where they discussed the advantages and disadvantages in implementing family friendly policies in the workforce. 3. Students completed group projects exploring a challenge that public personnel managers must address in their organizations. The instructor assigned students to groups to achieve some gender and ethnic diversity. These projects required students to work to work with others that were different from them.
<p>POLSC 735: Public Organizational Theory (Schafer)</p>	<p><i>Topics:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Local Government Management: Includes a discussion of the impact of gender on management. 2. Policy Implementation: Includes a discussion of racial profiling and policing. <p><i>Activities:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students complete a case study as part of their final exam where they must describe their approach to management in the following scenario: “You are the superintendent of a mid-size school district in the South. You have been asked to provide your opinion about a very costly program to provide additional tutoring and mentorship to minority high school students. The School Board is currently split in their views about if this is a good program or not. Several parents have written letters to the editor of the local newspaper saying this program is unfair and ‘reverse discrimination’ ...what would you do?”

Student Assessment of Program

The MPA program asks all graduating students to evaluate various components of their learning experience and environment as an exit survey exercise. Several of the questions included in the exit survey can be used to assess the current state of the MPA program in living up to its goal of preparing students to understand and appreciate working in a diverse and changing modern workplace. In total, eight graduating students completed the exit survey during the 2015 calendar year. *Table 7* displays the exit survey data related to the impact that the MPA Program had on student knowledge/understanding of issues related to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Table 7. Exit Survey Assessment of MPA Program Impact

MPA Program Impact on Your Knowledge/Understanding	1	2	3	4
<i>Working in diverse cultural and socio-economic environments</i>	0	1 (12.5%)	4 (50%)	3 (37.5%)
<i>Sensitivity to the viewpoints of others</i>	0	0	1 (12.5%)	7 (87.5%)
<i>Effective equal opportunity practices and the development of diverse workforces</i>	0	0	3 (37.5%)	5 (62.5%)
<i>Total Students</i>	8	8	8	8

1 = Did not contribute at all

2 = Contributed very little

3 = Contributed some

4 = Contributed a great deal

The graduating students were also asked to assess the faculty's performance in exposing students to a variety of ideas. Six students (75%) indicated that the faculty did an excellent job exposing students to a variety of ideas, while two students (25%) indicated that faculty did a fair job.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Kansas State University's MPA program is committed to the university's "Principles of Community," which emphasize the importance of creating a diverse and inclusive environment for our faculty, staff, and students.

Goal 1: Representativeness

The first goal of our Diversity Plan is to “improve the representativeness of our program by striving to achieve a diverse student body, staff, and faculty that respects the many dimensions of diversity including race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion, and disability status.” In order to achieve this goal, we have developed an action plan that will be followed and evaluated annually at an MPA faculty meeting. One major step that we have taken as a program is to create a new position, “Diversity Point Person.” The Diversity Point Person will coordinate all of our efforts in the areas of student and faculty diversity and inclusion. Therefore, they will be an integral part in making sure all action steps are followed and evaluated. The first Diversity Point Person, Dr. Ethan Bernick, has taught and researched topics related to diversity, equality, and inclusion. He currently serves on the College of Arts and Sciences Diversity Committee.

Objective 1: A representative and inclusive student body

Action Steps: Representativeness

1. Improve diversity of applicant pool by expanding outreach to minority undergraduates through multicultural student organizations at Kansas State University. These organizations include, but are not limited to, the Black Student Union, the Hispanic American Leadership Organization, the Native American Student Association, and the Asian American Student Union.
2. Establish a relationship with the Multicultural Student Organization (MSO) office.
3. Develop a connection with the Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies Department on campus to advertise to their undergraduate majors, as well as encourage their graduate certificate students to consider the MPA program.
4. Expand marketing outreach performed by advisors and graduate assistants to more diverse communities in Kansas including Junction City, Wichita, and Kansas City.
5. Monitor enrollment, retention, and graduation of MPA students by race and gender.
6. Continue strong retention performance by expanding programs of student mentoring and advising that include student-led and faculty efforts and initiatives, which will support students throughout their progression in the program.

Action Steps: Inclusivity

1. Promote a culture of respect with and among students. This includes efforts by our faculty to promote the importance of diversity and inclusion in the classroom and outside.
2. Promote use of teams/groups that span differences among students within the classroom.
3. Increase the use of outside speakers in MPA courses and practitioners panels to expose students to different views and diverse topics. The program will continue to build on the efforts of the last year, which included the organizing of a panel of diverse speakers to discuss the topic of “Diversity and Inclusion in the Workplace” with our students.
4. Provide mentoring opportunities for students.

Objective 2: A representative and inclusive faculty

Action Steps: Representativeness

1. Make effort to recruit from a diverse applicant pool when positions are open.
2. Use standard advertising methods/statements to promote diversity following department and university requirements.
3. Promote position openings to sections that serve underrepresented groups within the American Society for Public Administration such as the Conference of Minority Public Administrators, Section for Women in Public Administration, and the LGBT Advocacy Alliance Section.
4. Develop contacts with directors of doctoral programs that produce diverse graduates.
5. Network at professional conferences to identify potential candidates.

Action Steps: Retention and Inclusivity

1. Provide mentoring relationships between senior and junior faculty within the program, or outside of the program where appropriate.

2. Sustain a welcoming, inclusive faculty environment that welcomes diversity of people and opinions.
3. Continue to provide clear guidance for faculty within the program and department related to career advancement and merit evaluation.
 - a. Connect evaluations to plans of action for faculty success
4. Work within the university's policies to ensure the program provides faculty members flexibility in establishing and maintaining a work-life balance.
5. Continue to financially support travel to professional conferences within the constraints of the department and program's budgets.
 - a. Financial support for travel should be weighted in favor of junior faculty.
6. Make use of opportunities provided by the department and university to financially support junior faculty members that wish to invite senior scholars in their field to visit Kansas State, resulting in the development of professional networks.
 - a. For example, the K-State Office for the Advancement of Women in Science and Engineering (KAWSE) has already provided two female MPA faculty members the financial support necessary to bring in senior women scholars for the purpose of presenting their research and mentoring the junior women faculty.

Objective 3: A representative and inclusive staff

Action Steps: Representativeness

1. Ensure that staff are recruited from a diverse applicant pool.
 - a. This is primarily a responsibility for the university within their shared services framework.
2. Continue to commit to awarding graduate teaching assistantships, when available, to a diverse groups of students

Action Steps: Inclusivity

1. Follow all university policies related to personnel rights and responsibilities.

2. Ensure that staff are aware of their rights as employees, as well as support services available through the University.
3. Provide a safe and formalized path for staff members and graduate assistants to offer complaints and/or suggestions to the department and MPA program.

GOAL 2: Preparation of Students

The second goal of the MPA program's diversity plan is to "prepare students to understand and appreciate working in a diverse and changing modern workplace." Our program faculty are encouraged to follow several action steps to ensure that students are adequately prepared for their service careers. The actions steps we recommend will be implemented and evaluated annually at an MPA faculty meeting. One major step that we have taken as a program is to create a new position, "Diversity Point Person." The Diversity Point Person will coordinate all of our efforts in the areas of student and faculty diversity and inclusion. Therefore, they will be an integral part in making sure all action steps are followed and evaluated.

Objective 1: Promote diversity within the classroom

Actions Steps

1. Include topics related to diversity, equality, and inclusion in course syllabi.
 - a. Faculty responsible for core courses that are already including these topics should be encouraged to continue doing so.
 - b. Faculty responsible for core courses, which do not currently have systematic inclusion of these topics should develop a plan of action to do so in the near future.
2. Recruit guest speakers to attend class and engage students in discussions related to the importance of diversity and inclusion in the public and non-profit sectors.
3. Provide opportunities for students to work with one another in group projects that span differences among them.
4. Encourage faculty to build diversity and inclusion components into their course-level assessments (assignments, exams, etc).

Objective 2: Promote diversity outside of the classroom

Actions Steps

1. Recruit a diverse group of speakers to participate in the program's practitioner panels.
2. Regularly organize practitioner panels dedicated to the topics of diversity, equality, and inclusion. This process was started in the fall of 2016.
3. Encourage students to seek out internship opportunities where they will be exposed to the importance of serving a diverse constituency.
4. Ensure that program-level assessments respect the importance of diversity and inclusion to public service.

Goal 3: Diversity and Inclusion Research

The third goal of the MPA program's Diversity Plan is to "support and promote research on policy topics related to equity and diversity." In order to achieve this goal, we have developed an action plan that will be followed and evaluated annually at an MPA faculty meeting. One major step that we have taken as a program is to create a new position, "Diversity Point Person." The Diversity Point Person will coordinate all of our efforts in the areas of student and faculty diversity and inclusion. Therefore, they will be an integral part in making sure all action steps are followed and evaluated.

Objective 1: Support faculty research on topics related to diversity, equity, and inclusion

Action Steps

1. Protect academic freedom to conduct research that advances our understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusion.
2. Within the constraints of the Department's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, encourage applied policy and advocacy research on these topics.
3. Continue to financially support travel to professional conferences within the constraints of the department and program's budgets.
 - a. Financial support for travel should be weighted in favor of junior faculty.

4. Promote publication of research in appropriate outlets that target diversity and social policy.
5.
 - a. Work with department colleagues to make sure these publications count towards tenure and merit.
6. Promote collaborations with faculty from other disciplines and universities.

Objective 2: Promote faculty research on topics related to diversity, equity, and inclusion

Action Steps

1. Promote faculty research related to diversity, equity, and inclusion on the Department of Political Science and program's websites.
2. Promote faculty research related to diversity, equity, and inclusion to the University community.
 - a. Submit information regarding research for K-State news releases.
 - b. Submit information regarding research for inclusion in college and university newsletters and communications.
3. Encourage faculty to engage in community outreach opportunities including, but not limited to attending professional meetings, giving invited lectures, and supporting research conducted by public and non-profit organizations.