

History

**Department**

Arts and Sciences

**College**

**Policy Statement Concerning:**

**Personnel Review and Evaluation Standards/Procedures**

- **Performance Evaluation Criteria**
  - **Annual Evaluation**
- **Reappointment Evaluation for:**
  - o **Annual Reappointment Reviews**
    - o **Mid-Tenure Review**
      - **Tenure**
      - **Promotion**
- **Professorial Performance Award**
  - **Chronic Low Achievement**
  - **Post-Tenure Review**

Approved by Faculty Vote on April 12, 2019

**NEXT REVIEW DATE: 2024**



May 14, 2019

Department Head's Signature

Date



5-20-2019

Dean's Signature

Date



7/20/2019

Provost's Signature

Date

**DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY  
PERSONNEL GUIDELINES REVISED  
April 2019**

**I. Performance Evaluations**

A. Statement of Responsibilities

Annually the chair shall furnish each faculty member with a statement of responsibilities for the current academic year. The responsibilities shall be determined through mutual agreement between the chair and the faculty member.

In conformance with the University Handbook, C45.1, as soon as possible after the evaluation procedure, each faculty member will meet with the chair to establish jointly goals and objectives, and the relative weight to be given to each, for each faculty member for the upcoming academic year. Such things as the faculty member's role in the department's teaching and possible committee assignments will be discussed. Faculty members are encouraged at that time to present their research projects and expectations for the year. Individual faculty members, however, may opt out of this meeting with the chair. The individual statements of responsibilities will be provided to the Personnel Committee at the same time each faculty submits his/her annual statement of accomplishments to assist the Personnel Committee's work in making annual merit evaluation recommendations to the chair.

Individual faculty members and/or the chair may schedule, as needed, additional meetings, at any time prior to submission of materials to the Personnel Committee, to adjust goals and objectives in light of new information or changed circumstances. A faculty member's goals and objectives must be in accord with the department's standards of expectation, and will be considered during the annual evaluation process.

B. The Personnel Committee: Election and Composition

The Personnel Committee shall be elected each spring to serve for the following academic year. The committee shall be elected by vote of all members of the History Department faculty who hold full-time tenured or tenure-track appointments. The committee shall consist of three members of the faculty who hold full-time appointments, no more than two of whom shall be of the same rank, and no more than one of whom shall be an assistant professor. All persons elected to the committee must serve unless, in case of extenuating circumstances, the department chairperson excuses them from service. The department will reelect one member of each year's Personnel Committee to serve a subsequent year. With this exception, no person must serve on the committee during the two years following a term of service. Those serving a second year due to reelection will have the right to decline for the two years following their service. The committee shall elect its own chairperson. The department will also elect a fourth "alternate" member of the committee, who will participate in the evaluations of sitting members who must be recused from evaluating themselves or other faculty members in which there is a conflict of interest. If an election results in the sitting of

two faculty members who are spouses or otherwise have a relationship that could be deemed a conflict of interest during an evaluation, a fifth alternate member can be elected to ensure three faculty members contribute to each faculty member's evaluation. Alternate members are not entitled to a two-year exemption from future elections and cannot serve as the continuing member.

#### C. Responsibilities of the Personnel Committee

The committee is charged to consider and recommend on all matters of promotion, salary, tenure, and reappointment. The committee's recommendation will be forwarded to the Chair, who is responsible for submitting the final departmental recommendation to the Dean of the College. The committee will also serve as the Departmental Committee on Planning (DCoP) as required in the university's Financial Exigency Plan. In the event a member of the Personnel Committee is non-tenured, the department will elect a tenured replacement when it is necessary for the Personnel Committee to function as described in the Financial Exigency Plan.

In September of each year, the committee will produce a calendar that sets the deadlines for upcoming reappointment, mid-probationary, tenure, and promotion procedures. These deadlines will be set far enough in advance so that the candidates have the option to discuss the committee's recommendation reports before these reports are distributed to the department faculty and chair.

#### D. Conflicts of Interest

The following steps shall be taken to avoid a conflict of interest:

At the time of the election of the Personnel Committee, the department shall select an alternate to the Personnel Committee. The alternate will participate in deliberations related to the annual evaluation, reappointment, and mid-tenure review of any Personnel Committee member and the spouse or partner of any member of the Personnel Committee.

In all circumstances where the department chairperson is the spouse or partner of a faculty member who is being evaluated for salary adjustment, reappointment, mid-tenure review, promotion, and/or tenure, the Personnel Committee, in consultation with the reviewee, will designate an alternate tenured faculty member to write the official departmental assessment. The Personnel Committee will submit any reports, evaluations, or recommendations to the alternate faculty member. That faculty member will ensure the completion of the evaluation process without the direct involvement of the department chairperson and shall write and submit any letters and put forward any recommendations that would otherwise have been the responsibility of the department chairperson.

#### E. Grievances

Faculty members with grievances relating to personnel questions should communicate them directly to the chair of the History department.

## II. Annual Evaluation Process and Salary Adjustment

### A. Overview of evaluation procedure and evaluation of individual categories of achievement:

During each fall semester, the department chair, with the help of the Personnel Committee, shall review the teaching and service accomplishments of the faculty during the previous academic year, and the research and publication accomplishments for the last five calendar years (including the year in which the report is submitted). In the event that actual publication occurs in the short period of time between the submission of a faculty member's self-evaluation and the end of that calendar year, the faculty member may ask the department chair to include that publication as part of the evaluation report and ranking that the chair submits to the dean. Otherwise, it will be included as part of the following year's annual evaluation and the next four that follow. All faculty will have their in-print or otherwise published peer-reviewed publications acknowledged in their annual review of accomplishments in research and publication for five successive years. Along with the "Statement of Responsibilities" as outlined in Section VI of this document, each faculty member shall provide the committee with a résumé of his or her accomplishments during the evaluation period in the general areas of teaching, research and publication, and service, which shall serve as the basis for the committee's evaluation of each individual. (An outline indicating the sorts of accomplishments to be included under each category of evaluation is attached to this Guide as Appendix B.) Any faculty member may supplement his or her written résumé with a personal interview with the Personnel Committee. Anyone wishing an interview should submit a request in writing to the chairperson of the committee. Annual merit evaluations are not an evaluation of progress toward tenure (or even a partial evaluation). Feedback on progress toward tenure and promotion is offered during the separate annual reappointment process.

After due deliberation the committee shall submit a report to the chair for the purposes of salary adjustment. In making its report the committee shall adhere to the following procedures:

Guided by the department's "Evaluation Criteria" (Appendix A), the committee shall evaluate the achievements of the faculty for each of the main categories of responsibility: teaching, research and publication, and service. In evaluating each category, the committee shall place each faculty member into one of the five groups: excellent (5); exceeds departmental expectations (4); meets departmental expectations (3); fallen below expectations but meets minimum acceptable levels of productivity (2); or unsatisfactory (1) (*eff* C31.8). Each faculty member shall be judged solely on the merits of his or her performance, and there is no requirement that the Personnel Committee evenly distribute or seek to proportionately balance the number of faculty that are placed in each group.

Typically, teaching and research contribute 40% each toward the overall evaluation and service contributes 20%. Percentages applied to evaluation are not intended to be indicative of a strict division of time spent fulfilling each area of responsibility, but rather underscore their importance to the overall mission of the department and each individual's evaluation.

In certain circumstances such as leave of absence, sabbatical, or work on a grant-funded project, faculty members may negotiate with the chair a revised set of responsibilities, for example by altering the typical percentages allocated to teaching, research, and service. The

Personnel Committee and the chair shall take this into consideration at the time of evaluation.

## B. Procedures and Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching, Research, and Service

### 1. **Teaching** (typically contributes 40% toward overall evaluation).

a. Procedure: Every faculty member is required to submit information from a variety of sources (see appendix B). Of special note, faculty often teach introductory courses that are populated by students who take a history course to satisfy degree requirements in the College of Arts and Sciences. Therefore, the Personnel Committee should take into consideration in the evaluation process the fact that courses with one hundred or more students usually take more time and effort. The Personnel Committee shall also take into consideration substantial participation on graduate committees as well as pedagogical publications.

- 1) Each instructor, every semester, must provide an opportunity for students in his or her classes to express themselves as to the quality of the courses and instruction. The forms should contain directions that indicate how the information is used and the forms should be administered and collected under controlled conditions that assure students' anonymity." (C34.1) Instructors shall not see the results of student evaluations until after they turn in their grades for the semester. The Personnel Committee will give full weight to online TEVALs and other online means of evaluation only if they produce reasonable rates of response. Faculty may also use their own evaluation form. All faculty who use their own evaluation forms will include on these forms the following questions: "How do you rank this course: very high, high, medium, medium low, low?"; "How do you rank the teaching in this course: very high, high, medium, medium low, low?" Each instructor will be requested to tabulate student responses to the questions he or she has chosen to enter on the student evaluation forms. All faculty are required to make available to the Personnel Committee the results of evaluations of all classes taught in the previous year. It is understood that student responses do not by themselves define good teaching.
- 2) At the end of every evaluation year, each instructor shall write for the committee a narrative statement evaluating his or her teaching for the previous calendar year. The instructor should comment on the goals and outcomes of each course, the kinds of resources and assignments used in each course, and the strengths and weaknesses identified by student evaluations. In addition to their discussion of classes taught during the regular semester, instructors should feel free to include in their narrative statements comments on novel or innovative efforts they may have undertaken. Professors who join the Department of History in the Fall semester will have until January 15 following their first semester of work to submit a self-evaluation. That self-evaluation will report on teaching, research and service activities during their first semester of employment.
- 3) Instructors are required to submit syllabi of the courses they taught during the previous academic year.
- 4) The committee may, if it desires, examine the material upon which the instructor's self-

evaluation is based.

- 5) Any faculty member may request a written evaluation of his or her teaching by a faculty member of his or her choice. Typically, such an evaluation would be based in part on in-class observation of the colleague's teaching.

**b. Criteria for Judgment:** The department expects its faculty will meet minimal standards of professional behavior, including that classes are met regularly, the instructor is available to students and holds regular office hours, and that examinations and papers are graded and returned to students in a reasonable time. In differentiating between rankings for teaching, the Personnel Committee can take into account the factors identified in Appendix C, Section I.

## 2. **Research and Publication** (typically contributes 40% toward overall evaluation)

**a. Procedures:** In each annual report submitted for evaluation, in addition to citing relevant publications that fall within the five-year review period, faculty should also identify

- 1) the specific goals for research and publication they set for the previous academic year
- 2) progress made on achieving those goals during that academic year
- 3) the goals set for the subsequent academic year
- 4) how these goals and progress toward them fit into an overall five-year research and publication plan.

**b. Criteria for judgment:** In evaluating the research achievement of an individual, the Personnel Committee shall consider that individual's scholarly productivity during the preceding five years as well as his or her present projects and plans. Publications shall be considered during the calendar year of their actual publication and for four calendar years thereafter, unless the exception identified in IV.A above is invoked, in which case a publication shall be considered during the five years following the actual year of publication. However, the committee shall also consider the individual's previous career pattern.

- 1) Concrete description of significant work in progress must be made available at the time of evaluation. Progress short of publication is demonstrable by satisfying the criteria identified in Appendix C, Section II.
- 2) The department typically considers five peer-reviewed articles and/or book chapters, or their equivalent in other refereed publications the equivalent of an original monograph. The Department of History recognizes peer-reviewed publications from recognized university or commercial presses that appear either in print or digitally.
- 3) The publication of a peer-reviewed scholarly book will typically warrant the highest possible evaluation score on the first evaluation conducted after it appears in print and for the next four annual evaluations. The publication of five peer-reviewed articles and/or chapters can also warrant the highest possible evaluation score during the time in which at least five articles have been published within the five-year evaluation period. The Personnel Committee ultimately makes the recommendation to the chair as to whether the quality of a publication or publications based on the reviews received and/or the venues of publication will warrant the highest possible score.

- 4) Textbooks ordinarily will be considered as contributions to teaching, but may be considered on the same basis as scholarly books only if the author can document that a significant component of the work is based on original research and/or unique analysis and interpretation which advances the historiography of the subject matter.
- 5) If any published work is co-authored, the collaborators shall document the percentage of their contribution to allow the Personnel Committee to determine how their publication is to be evaluated.
- 6) If any published work is comprised of previously-authored manuscripts, the faculty member shall document the percentage of original scholarship to allow the Personnel Committee to determine its equivalency in terms of articles and/or books. Scholarship in this category can include new editions of the faculty member's previously published work, as well as translations of historically important texts, document collections, or other externally authored materials that contain newly developed interpretative scholarship authored by the faculty member
- 7) The Department of History recognizes that in some cases significant projects of public history or other forms of expressing the results of a research-based scholarly project may be considered the equivalent of a conventional peer-reviewed publication or publications if, in the Department's opinion, they bring about a significant reimagining of some aspect of the candidate's field. To count as the equivalent of conventional scholarship, such alternative forms of scholarly work must be of high quality. The outcome should be substantial and innovative enough to have a significant impact on the relevant field. Consistent with the American Historical Association's guidelines for evaluating such scholarship,<sup>1</sup> a faculty member wishing to pursue such a project and have it considered as the equivalent of a conventional peer reviewed publication or publications is responsible for securing approval and confirmation of its equivalency prior to initiating such a project. The faculty member shall present the proposed project to the tenured and tenure-track faculty for consideration. This presentation should include an explanation of the peer review process that will be applied to the project and how that process can be considered the equivalent of peer review of conventional scholarship. Two-thirds of the tenured and tenure-track faculty can then vote to affirm that the project should be considered as an equivalent to a conventional peer-reviewed publication or publications, and thereafter be treated as such according to the criteria for such publications stipulated by departmental guidelines pertaining to annual review, tenure, and promotion. A record of this decision and its rationale shall be recorded in the faculty meeting minutes, a copy of which will also be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. It is the faculty member's subsequent responsibility to demonstrate that his or her accomplishments are equivalent in quality, quantity, and impact to the conventional book and/or article standards upon which equivalency was determined. Throughout the course of the project, the faculty member should be prepared to explain and document its development, progress, and contribution to scholarship. As per the AHA's guidelines of evaluation of such scholarship, progress on the project and any peer reviews received should be discussed with the chair and the Personnel Committee throughout its duration to ensure that all parties continue to operate with the same expectations.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.historians.org/teaching-and-learning/digital-history-resources/evaluation-of-digital-scholarship-in-history/guidelines-for-the-professional-evaluation-of-digital-scholarship-by-historians>

- 8) In addition to the measures demonstrating research progress identified above, the Personnel Committee can also consider for the purposes of the annual evaluation research-related activities that do not satisfy departmental criteria to receive tenure and/or promotion or a Professorial Performance Award as identified in Appendix C, Section II.D.

3. **Service** (typically contributes 20% toward overall evaluation)

a. Procedures: The committee shall consider service of a professional nature to the department, the College of Arts and Sciences, the university, the professional community, and the nonprofessional community. Excellence in service outside the department may not come at the expense of service within the department.

b. Criteria for Judgement: In evaluating the service contributions of a faculty member, the committee may take into account the following types of service:

- 1) Service to the Department
- 2) Service to the College of Arts and Sciences and/or University
- 3) Service to the historical profession
- 4) Service to the nonprofessional community

(See Appendix C, Section III for examples of each type of service)

C. Overall evaluation

1. On the basis of its evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments in each of the three main categories described above, the committee shall arrive at an overall summary evaluation. The Personnel Committee will circulate among the faculty the working guidelines they employed in the evaluation process. In arriving at this judgment the committee will weigh the categories of teaching, research, and service in accord with the faculty member's annual letter of responsibilities (typically 40%, 40%, and 20% respectively.) In recording its overall evaluation the committee shall place each faculty member into one of five groups: excellent (5), exceeds departmental expectations (4), meets departmental expectations (3), fallen below expectations but meets minimum acceptable levels of productivity (2), or unsatisfactory (1) (See Appendix B). Each faculty member shall be judged solely on the merits of his or her performance, and there is no requirement that the Personnel Committee evenly distribute or seek to proportionately balance the number of faculty that are placed in each group.
2. Typically, salary adjustments allotted from the annual merit evaluation salary pool shall be assigned according to a weighted numerical average of each individual's rating in each of the three general categories (the numerical "overall" rating). Persons with the same weighted numerical average will receive the same percentage raise. But the chair, in consultation with the Personnel Committee, shall be able to single out one or more faculty members for a "special" merit increase if the dean or other administrators have funds for such increases.

3. The Personnel Committee shall report its rating directly to the chair.
4. In order to establish a degree of continuity to the evaluation process, the department will elect one member of each year's Personnel Committee to serve for the subsequent year.
5. The annual reports that faculty members submit to the committee shall be made available to any full-time member of the History Department faculty who wishes to see them. A faculty member who wishes to see another faculty member's report may request a copy of it from the History Department's Administrative Specialist.
6. The committee and chair shall take into consideration the fact that raises granted by the legislature vary from year to year and the annual rating system therefore creates possible inequities. The evaluation procedure should allow for periodic rectification of these inequities.
7. Before the department chair drafts letters of evaluation for department members and sends them to the dean, he or she shall report to the Personnel Committee any instance in which his/her rating of a faculty member differs from the committee's rating.
8. After receiving the report from the committee for annual merit salary increases, the chair shall draft a letter of evaluation for each faculty member for transmission to the dean. In these letters of evaluation to the dean, the chair shall report a faculty member's rating in each category of responsibility, as well as his or her overall standing. The chair shall also include a personal and concrete evaluation of the faculty member's contributions. Faculty shall be given an opportunity to discuss and respond to their respective letters, and each shall sign the original copy to indicate that he or she has seen it, understood it, and received a copy.

### **III. Reappointment Evaluation Procedures and Standards (See Appendix A), (cf. University Handbook, c50.1-53.3, C60-C66)**

#### **A. Reappointment Evaluation**

The Personnel Committee shall review all persons due for reappointment. It shall collect and evaluate the required information regarding each candidate. It shall prepare a written report on each candidate and include a recommendation with the report. The meeting to consider this committee report shall not take place less than seven days following distribution of the report to the eligible voting faculty. "Eligible voting faculty" includes all tenured and tenure-track faculty whose academic tenure home is in History (with a .5 or greater appointment in the Department of History) and who have already been reappointed for the year to which a candidate is being reappointed. Prior to the issuance of this report to the eligible faculty, the candidate shall have the opportunity to read the report and offer comments concerning it to the Personnel Committee and/or any faculty member/s.

The Personnel Committee shall rely on the candidate's materials submitted for annual review as the primary basis of its evaluation and recommendation for reappointment. In addition, the Personnel Committee shall ask the faculty member eligible for reappointment if

they wish to submit any additional materials or information pertaining to that reappointment.

#### B. Mid-Probationary Review Procedures

A formal review of a probationary faculty member is conducted midway through the probationary period, usually in the third year of a non-tenured faculty member's service. This review provides the faculty member with substantive feedback from faculty colleagues and administrators with special reference to the key issues that must be considered in connection with tenure and promotion proceedings. The Personnel Committee serves as the Mid-Probationary Review Committee.

“Procedures for the mid-probationary review are similar to procedures for the tenure review and are established by the departmental faculty in consultation with the department head/chair and the dean. The department head/chair is responsible for making the candidate's mid-probationary review file available to the tenured faculty members in the department at least fourteen calendar days prior to a meeting to discuss the candidate's progress. A cumulative record of written recommendations and accompanying explanations forwarded to the candidate from previous reappointment meetings, and any comments from individuals outside the department relevant to the assessment of the candidate's performance will also be made available to the eligible tenured faculty. The department head/chair may discuss the review and assessment of the tenured faculty members in the department with the dean, and shall provide a letter of assessment to the candidate, including a summary of faculty comments and suggestions. (See C35 regarding confidentiality of peer evaluations). This letter of assessment and the faculty report will become a part of the candidate's reappointment and mid-probationary review file. The department head/chair will discuss the review and assessment with the candidate. After receiving the assessment, the candidate has the right to submit a written response for the file.” (University Handbook C92.2)

The Personnel Committee shall collect and evaluate the information required regarding each candidate. The candidate shall submit their materials for mid probationary review to the department chair and the Personnel Committee no later than March 1.<sup>2</sup> The committee shall receive a short description by the department chair of the faculty member's responsibilities during the evaluation period including the average distribution of assignments between research, instruction, and other activities. The candidate shall provide the committee a mid-probationary review packet organized according to the Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Mid-Tenure Review Documentation that may be accessed from the Department Head Manual website. Letters from outside reviewers are not needed, but additional input from students and faculty members is admissible. These materials shall be available for review by the departmental faculty eligible to vote in this matter. The Personnel Committee shall make available its recommendation report to the faculty at least fourteen-days before the faculty are required to vote. Prior to the issuance of this recommendation report, the candidate shall have had an opportunity to read the report and offer comments concerning it to the Personnel Committee and/or to any faculty member/s.

The eligible voting faculty shall be asked to provide written input concerning the

---

<sup>2</sup> Candidates going through mid-probationary review can download the required form here: <https://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/dhmanual/>

candidate's progress toward tenure.

“The department chair will forward a written recommendation and accompanying explanations to the dean, along with the candidate’s complete file, the majority recommendation and unedited written comments of each of the department’s tenured faculty members. The chair will also meet with the candidate to discuss the separate issue of the candidate’s progress toward tenure. The chair’s written recommendation and accompanying explanations alone will be made available to the candidate and will become part of the candidate’s reappointment file.” (University Handbook C53.3)

#### **IV. Tenure and Promotion Procedures** (University Handbook, C70-C116.2 ,C120- C152.5)

##### A. Nomination:

In May of each year, the newly elected Personnel Committee will request nominations for tenure and for promotion at any rank from all faculty members holding the rank of assistant professor and above. Faculty members may nominate themselves. All nominations shall be submitted to the Personnel Committee by May 15. After the deadline, the Personnel Committee shall meet with the chair to review the nominations, making certain that all appropriate faculty have been consulted, and that no person meriting consideration has been overlooked.

##### B. Notification and request for materials:

The chair shall inform all those nominated for tenure and/or promotion. Nominees may decline to be considered, except for faculty in their last probationary year. The nominee who wishes to become a candidate for tenure or promotion “compiles and submits a file that documents her or his professional accomplishments in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the department.” (C151). (For criteria, see appendix A below.) This file should be prepared in accordance with the Provost’s guidelines for the organization and format of documentation for tenure and promotion. [Those guidelines along with the required forms are available at <https://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/dhmanual/promotion/promotio.html>].<sup>3</sup> The file should include copies of publications and relevant materials that show teaching effectiveness including student evaluations.

No later than June 1, the candidate and the chair shall decide upon the list of external reviewers according to the criteria in IV.C below. The candidate shall submit to the chair no later than July 1 her/his updated CV and electronic files of articles and chapters that the candidate is including as part of the application for promotion and/or tenure. The candidate shall also complete and submit to the chair by July 1 the following sections of the tenure and promotion dossier: Section III-B (Statement of Five-Year Goals), Section V-A (Research and Other Creative Activities), Section V-B (List of Research and Other Creative Activities). The chair is responsible for sending those materials to the external reviewers. The department will purchase and distribute to external reviewers any book(s) that pertain to the application for promotion and/or tenure. It is the chair’s responsibility to ensure external reviewers receive that book and all relevant materials. The candidate shall submit

---

<sup>3</sup> The required tenure and promotion document that the candidate completes can be downloaded from <https://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/dhmanual/>

an electronic file of the completed tenure and promotion dossier in its entirety to the department chair by September 1.

C. Selection of outside reviewers:

1. The chair will ask the candidate for a list of at least five names of potential outside reviewers who are recognized leaders in the candidate's scholarly field. An equal number of potential outside reviewers are "usually selected by the candidate and the department head/chair." (C152.2). From that combined list, the chair will obtain at least three outside reviews (see Appendix D). The number of potential reviewers solicited from the chair's list shall not exceed the number of reviewers selected from the candidate's list. The candidate's former mentors are specifically excluded as possible reviewers. The Chair will inform the candidate of the names of all potential reviewers and provide her/him with an opportunity to comment on them. (Cf. C112.2 & C152.2)
2. The chair shall then write the outside reviewers requesting a letter of evaluation regarding the nominee. The chair shall include with this letter a copy of the nominee's curriculum vitae, "a written description of the candidate's responsibilities during the period being evaluated, and pertinent materials from the candidates file" (C36.1). Included among those pertinent materials will be copies of all publications that fall within the review period. The letters received from the outside referees will be available along with the candidate's other materials for review by the tenured faculty who are qualified to vote (Cf. C112.1). In the case of those nominees whom the department recommends to the dean for promotion, copies of the letters of evaluation will be forwarded to the dean along with the recommendation and other supporting materials.

D. Tenure and Promotion Committee review and report:

For each candidate seeking tenure and promotion, the chair shall appoint a Tenure and Promotion Committee comprised of three tenured faculty, including one tenured member of the Personnel Committee. The chair may appoint a tenured alternate member of the Personnel Committee to a Tenure and Promotion Committee if all tenured members of the committee have a conflict of interest preventing them from participating in the process. If conflicts of interest prevent the appointment of a tenured member of the Personnel Committee to serve on a tenure and promotion committee and the alternate member of the Personnel Committee is not tenured, the Chair shall select another tenured faculty member to serve on the tenure and promotion committee in place of a representative from the Personnel Committee. This committee shall study any materials relevant to the candidate's tenure and promotion and prepare a report and recommendation to the chair. Relevant materials include the documentation assembled by the candidate, the responses of the outside reviewers, and records of earlier evaluations. The committee may request any other information it needs from the candidate. The committee shall direct its report to the department's "Evaluation Criteria" (Appendix A). Before distributing its report, the committee shall meet with the candidate to answer questions about the report and consider the candidate's input. In the case of a candidate seeking tenure, all tenured members of the department are eligible to vote. Eligible voting faculty are those members of the department "who hold a rank equal to or higher than the rank sought by the candidate." (C152.1)

E. Availability of documentation for review by eligible faculty:

The committee will present its report to the chair, who “At least fourteen calendar days prior to the scheduled meeting date to discuss the candidate’s petition,” (C112.1) shall distribute copies of the candidates curriculum vitae to the members of the department eligible to vote and make available to them the candidate’s file and the department criteria for tenure and promotion. “A cumulative record of recommendations from the reappointment and mid-probationary review meetings, and any outside reviews that have been solicited by the department chair . . . will also be made available to the eligible . . . faculty.”(C112.1) “Eligible . . . faculty members will individually review the candidate’s file, considering the department’s criteria, standards, and guidelines for tenure and promotion to associate professor, or promotion to full professor, and will then meet to discuss the candidate’s petition.”(C112.3)

F. Meeting of eligible faculty to discuss the committee’s report and recommendation:

After at least fourteen (14) calendar days have passed from when the chair distributed the Tenure and Promotion Committee’s report and recommendation, the eligible faculty shall meet to discuss the candidate’s qualifications. “Any member of the eligible faculty may . . . request that the candidate meet with the eligible . . . faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate.”(C112.4, C152.4)

G. Written consultation:

Following the meeting, the chair shall distribute to the eligible faculty forms for written consultation regarding the candidate’s tenure or promotion. Each eligible faculty member shall complete the form, providing written recommendations and comments, sign it, and return it to the chair. The chair shall retain evidence of this consultation before the forms are forwarded to the dean.

H. Chair’s report:

The chair “will provide a letter which includes his/her recommendation, the rationale for the recommendation, redacted comments to protect anonymity, and the faculty vote to the candidate. The letter will become part of the candidate’s reappointment file. This letter along with, all recommendations and non-redacted written comments of the department's eligible tenured faculty members and the candidate's complete file are also forwarded to the dean.” (C112.5 and C152.5)

I. Promotion to Full Professor

The procedures for a tenured associate professor applying for promotion to full professor are the same as for a candidate applying for tenure and promotion, except that in lieu of a Tenure and Promotion Committee, the chair shall appoint a Promotion Committee comprised of three full professors, including one representative from the Personnel Committee. If a conflict of interest prevents the Personnel Committee from contributing a qualified representative or no committee member holds the rank of full professor, the chair may select the alternate member of the Personnel Committee if that alternate member holds the rank of full professor and holds no conflict of interest. If that alternate member of the Personnel Committee is also not eligible to serve on the Promotion Committee, the chair may appoint another full professor to serve as the Personnel Committee’s representative. If there are an insufficient number of full professors within the department to comprise a three-person Promotion Committee, the chair shall work with the tenured history faculty and the Dean of

the College of Arts and Sciences to identify faculty in other programs whose rank and expertise make them suitable to serve on a History Department Promotion Committee.

#### **V. Professorial Performance Awards for Full Professors:**

Full professors who have been in rank for six years or more are eligible to apply for a performance award. A full professor may apply again for a performance award every six years after receiving a performance award. A full professor is eligible for consideration if he or she has worked continually over the years to produce solid scholarship, to advance the department's teaching mission on and off campus, and to provide quality teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The quality of scholarship should be what the department expects for an associate professor to be promoted to a full professor. The candidate must have earned a merit evaluation of "meets expectations (3)" or above for at least four of the previous six years in each category of evaluation.

- A. Nomination: Near the end of each spring semester the outgoing Personnel Committee shall notify all professors who may be eligible for a Professional Performance Award in the following academic year. A full professor may nominate him/herself. After May 1<sup>st</sup> the Personnel Committee shall meet with the chair to review the nominations, making certain that all appropriate faculty have been consulted and that no person meriting consideration for nomination has been overlooked.
- B. Notification and request for materials: The chair shall inform all those eligible for a Professional Performance Award. Nominees may decline to be considered. The chair shall ask each nominee who wishes to apply to compile and submit a file that documents her or his professional accomplishments. The file should include copies of publications and materials showing teaching effectiveness including student evaluations (See Appendix B).
- C. Personnel Committee review and report: In its deliberation, the Personnel Committee shall examine the candidate's assembled documentation file; the Committee may request further supporting materials from the candidate. Before distribution of its report, the committee shall meet with the candidate to answer questions about the report and to consider any changes the candidate may wish to suggest. After said consultation, the Committee shall deliver its report, the documentation file, and a copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae to the chair. The candidate will be advised when the report of the Personnel Committee has been submitted to the chair.
- D. Chair's report: The chair, "will forward a written recommendation which includes an explanation of her or his judgment to the dean. Before doing so, the chair will schedule a meeting with the candidate to discuss the written recommendation, and at that time the candidate may respond to the recommendation. Copies of all recommendations and unedited written comments of the Personnel Committee and the candidate's complete file are also forwarded to the dean. A copy of the department chair's/head's written recommendation alone is forwarded to the candidate." (Department bylaw, passed May 3, 2006).

## **VI. Chronic Low Achievement Criteria and Procedures Applicable to Tenured Faculty**

When a tenured faculty member's overall performance falls below the minimum-acceptable level, as indicated by the annual evaluation, the chair shall indicate this in writing to the faculty member. In consultation with the faculty member, the chair will also indicate, in writing, a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member and monitor the faculty member's progress in the following years. Should the faculty member decline to participate in developing an improvement plan, the chair will develop a plan without consultation. With the agreement of the faculty member, a mentor or mentoring team may be employed to advise the chair on the faculty member's progress on improving performance. In subsequent annual evaluations, the faculty member will report on activities aimed at improving performance and provide any evidence of improvement.

### A. Minimum acceptable levels of performance

1. Teaching: Fulfills assigned teaching duties by meeting classes regularly, being available to students and holding regular office hours. Examinations and papers are graded and returned to students in a reasonable time.
2. Research and Publication: Demonstrates progress by publishing at least one peer-reviewed article within five years, or presenting one paper based on original research at a professional meeting or other recognized scholarly seminar within three years, or submitting a grant proposal for external funding within three years. Exceptions to the above criteria can be made for: faculty members working on a longer-range project who show substantive evidence of progress (a book or other research project); faculty members engaged in some other scholarly pursuit that is expected to enhance the overall reputation of the department, college, or university (i.e., editing a professional journal or chairing a professional association); submission to a scholarly journal or other publication that have particularly long notification times; faculty who have past exemplary records and/or may be developing new research interests and can show evidence of progress in the new field; faculty members who are engaged in significant administrative duties.
3. Service: a) Carries share of department, college, and university duties in any given year; b) Participates in the profession; c) Responds to requests for service from off campus.

### B. Procedures

Each year at the time of annual evaluation, the Personnel Committee shall inform the chair when in its professional judgment any member of the faculty falls into a state of chronic low achievement. An individual's overall performance shall be determined on the basis of his/her totals in the three categories of evaluation (teaching, research and publication, and service) in the proportions assigned in his/her letter of responsibilities. Similarly, the chair shall review annually the performance of tenured members to determine whether they fall below the minimum standard.

The names of faculty members who fail to meet minimum standards for the year

following the chair's suggested course of action will be forwarded to the dean. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which the minimum standards are not met, then "dismissal for cause" will be considered at the discretion of the dean.

The granting of tenure involves consultation with the entire tenured faculty of the department and the same should be true in a case that could result in dismissal of tenured faculty. Therefore, before the chair reports to the dean that a faculty member has failed to meet the minimum standards for two successive years or for three years in a five-year period, the chair shall appoint a committee of three tenured faculty members, one of whom shall be a member of the Personnel Committee. The chair may appoint the alternate member of the Personnel Committee if that alternate member is tenured and there are no other tenured members on that committee who do not have conflicts of interest preventing their service. If the alternate faculty member is not eligible to serve, either by rank or due to conflict of interest, the chair can select another tenured faculty member in lieu of a Personnel Committee representative. This committee shall review the individual's performance and prepare a report to the tenured faculty of the department. The report should be distributed to the tenured faculty within thirty days of the committee's appointment. The report shall be read at a meeting of the tenured faculty in the presence of the chair, the subject of the report being given an opportunity to respond. The meeting to consider the committee's report shall take place not earlier than seven days following the distribution of the report to the tenured faculty. After discussion of the report, the tenured faculty shall consult individually with the chair providing a signed form that they have done so. When the chair informs the dean that the individual has failed to meet the minimum standards, the chair shall also convey to the dean in writing the results of the consultation with the tenured faculty, indicating that the dean should consider these results in determining whether to initiate proceedings for dismissal for cause.

The faculty member whose performance has fallen below the minimum-acceptable level may elect to dispense with the involvement of the tenured faculty in the review procedure. This request must be made in writing.

When the Personnel Committee reports that a regular faculty member's performance is satisfactory overall, but falls below the minimum-acceptable level in any one category (teaching, research, and/or service), the chair shall indicate this in writing to the faculty member. In consultation with the faculty member, the chair will develop a course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member in the category in which there is deficiency. Should the faculty member decline to participate in developing an improvement plan, the chair will develop a plan without consultation. The chair will put the planned course of action into writing, will monitor the faculty member's progress in the following year. With the agreement of the faculty member, a mentor or mentoring team may be employed to advise the chair on the faculty member's progress on improving performance. In the next annual evaluation, the faculty member will report on activities aimed at improving performance and provide evidence of improvement.

Even if the faculty member's overall performance may be deemed as acceptable, this does not mean that poor performance in a substantial area of responsibility can be

allowed to continue. The Department of History considers teaching and research/publication essential to its mission. It is the position of the College of Arts and Sciences that failure to reach minimal acceptable levels of performance in an area deemed essential to the department's mission, even after corrective measures have been prescribed will constitute unacceptable overall performance causing Section C31.5 through C31.8 to be invoked.

## **VII. Post Tenure Review**

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

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

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

The department will use the following procedures for conducting post tenure reviews: A tenured faculty member will submit to the chair copies of the six previous annual evaluations. The chair will review the materials and provide recommendations. A tenured faculty member will have demonstrated appropriate contributions to the university when the chair has determined that that all six annual evaluations have met or exceeded expectations.

## **VIII. Departmental Administrative Appointment Procedures**

**History Department Chair:** The History Department operates according to a Department Chair system that seeks to include faculty consultation on major decisions and the development of departmental priorities and policies. The University Handbook provides a general outline of the procedures for the selection and reappointment of a departmental administrator in Sections B 120 - B 125. The Personnel Committee, serving as an intermediary between the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences and the History Department faculty, shall act as the search committee and reappointment advisory committee referred to in these sections of the University Handbook.

Appointment and reappointment authority for the Chair rests with the Dean, but the History Department notes the following guidelines that have worked well in the past. The

standard term for a Chair is three years and can be renewed repeatedly. In the final semester of the Chair's term, the Chair shall inform the Dean if she/he will seek an additional term. The Personnel Committee will convene a faculty meeting to discuss the performance of the Chair, and the faculty will vote on the reappointment of the Chair. The Personnel Committee will forward the results of the vote and a summary of faculty comments to the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences for consideration. The Dean has the authority to appoint the Chair.

When the Chair does not wish to seek an additional term, the Chair will inform the Dean early in the spring semester. The Personnel Committee will work with the Dean to solicit nominations for the position of Chair. Candidates will prepare a written statement about their qualifications for the position and future plans for the department. The Personnel Committee will convene a faculty meeting for candidate presentations. After all candidates have made their presentations, the faculty will vote on the selection of a Chair, and the Personnel Committee will forward the results of the vote to the Dean for consideration.

## **Appendix A – Evaluation Criteria**

### **I. Reappointment**

Teaching: Fulfills assigned teaching duties

Research and Publication: Progress shown, as is consistent with progress towards tenure for those who are pre-tenure, or as articulated in the minimum requirements listed in Section VII.A.2 above.

Department and University Service: Carries share of duties.

Off Campus Services for Professional Community: Participates actively in profession - includes all activities not considered elsewhere.

Off campus services for Non-Professional Community: Responds to request for service from off campus.

### **II. Salary Adjustment**

Teaching: Shows creativity and above average ability such as in developing new courses or having demonstrable positive impact on students.

Research and Publication: Progress shown, evidence of publication and recognition for publication.

Department and University Service: Active in Department & University Committees, etc.

Off Campus Services for Professional Community: Participates actively in profession and in a field of specialization; knows and is known among specialists - includes all activities not considered elsewhere.

Off campus services for Non-Professional Community: Contributes to enlargement of knowledge through activities off campus in a manner that brings positive recognition to the Department.

### **III. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

Teaching: Teaching outcomes are of a specifically high order; enjoys recognition of peers as well as students; may include institutional and national professional honors.

Research and Publication: The associate professor of History must have published an original peer-reviewed scholarly book published by a recognized university or commercial press or its equivalent in peer-reviewed journal articles and/or book chapters that reflect a coherent program of research. As a general guideline, the Department of History considers five peer-reviewed articles and/or book chapters as the equivalent of a

peer-reviewed scholarly book. The department may also consider other types of research outputs as equivalent to these forms of conventional historical scholarship according to the stipulations of Section V.B.2.7 of this document. However, because “there can be no simple list of accomplishments that, when achieved, guarantee that a faculty member will obtain tenure” (C101.1) each tenure case should be weighed individually to determine whether the overall scholarly contribution of peer-reviewed chapters and articles offered in place of a peer-reviewed scholarly book is fully equivalent to such a book. Faculty often join the History program with a range of accomplishments that predate their time at Kansas State University. The department will give a new hire a clear indication of the scholarly productivity that is expected prior to a nomination for tenure within the agreed-upon tenure clock. For example, a candidate who arrives with a book could be expected to demonstrate further scholarly progress on a major project, as evidenced by the delivery of scholarly papers and/or publication of articles or book chapters, but the expectation would not be for another book during the probationary period. Publications that appeared prior to joining the tenure-track faculty at Kansas State University can be counted toward tenure and promotion by prior agreement with the department chair, in consultation with department faculty, at the time of hiring. Such agreements will be documented in the faculty member’s signed offer letter. Works that are confirmed by the press as accepted for publication (for which all the author’s substantive academic contributions are submitted and accepted) may be acceptable to support tenure and promotion to associate professor. The Department of History prioritizes the quality of scholarship in making its determinations on tenure and promotion, not merely meeting or exceeding the minimum quantitative threshold necessary to be considered for tenure and promotion.

Department and University Service: Active in Department & University Committees, etc.

Off Campus Services for Professional Community: Participates actively in profession and in a field of specialization; knows and is known among specialists - includes all activities not considered elsewhere.

Off campus services for Non-Professional Community: Contributes to enlargement of knowledge through activities off campus in a manner that brings positive recognition to the Department.

#### **IV. Promotion to Professor**

Teaching: Shows creativity and above average ability such as in developing new courses or having demonstrable positive impact on students.

Research and Publication: Candidates for promotion to professor who earned tenure and promotion to associate professor based on the publication of a peer-reviewed scholarly book will be eligible for promotion following the publication of a second peer-reviewed scholarly book by a recognized university or commercial press, or its equivalent of at least five peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters that reflect a coherent program of research. The department may also consider other types of research outputs as equivalent to these forms of conventional historical scholarship according to stipulations of Section V.B.2.7 of this document. The candidate for promotion to professor who earned tenure and promotion to associate professor based on the publication of at least

five peer-reviewed articles and/or book chapters must publish a peer-reviewed scholarly book to be eligible for promotion to full professor. No candidate will be eligible for promotion to full professor based on an overall publication record that lacks a peer-reviewed scholarly book published by a recognized university or commercial press. All publications must be in print for them to be counted as part of the nomination for promotion to professor. The Department of History prioritizes the quality of scholarship in making its determinations for promotion to full professor, not merely meeting or exceeding the minimum quantitative threshold necessary to be considered for promotion.

Department and University Service: Active in Department & University Committees, etc.

Off Campus Services for Professional Community: Participates actively in profession and in a field of specialization; knows and is known among specialists - includes all activities not considered elsewhere.

Off campus services for Non-Professional Community: Contributes to enlargement of knowledge through activities off campus in a manner that brings positive recognition to the Department.

## **Appendix B: Outline of Materials to be Presented to the Personnel Committee for Purposes of Salary Adjustment.**

The following outline indicates the sorts of accomplishments to be included under each category of evaluation. Faculty members who have noteworthy accomplishments of types not mentioned in this outline should insert them wherever they seem most appropriate. For the sake of comparability and to assist the Personnel Committee and the Department Chair in arriving at a fair and accurate assessment of faculty members' performance, faculty should organize their annual evaluation reports and present pertinent information in the following manner:

### **I. Teaching (typically contributes 40% to overall evaluation)**

A. Classes taught: list classes taught during the regular semesters, including the number of students in each class and the amount of assistance--GT A's, grades, etc.--provided by the department. Also indicate here or in the narrative statement any courses involving new preparations. Attach syllabi and any other supporting materials.

B. Narrative statement: See GUIDE, Sec. IV.B.1 (Annual Evaluation and Salary Adjustment, Procedures and Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Research and Service, Teaching) for information to be included.

C. Graduate advising.

D. As major professor.

E. As member of committee.

1. For students in History.

2. For students in other departments (service as the Graduate School's representative on an examining committee should be listed under University Service below).

F. Other activity: List here such things as individual instruction (either graduate or undergraduate), guest lectures within the department or outside, etc.

G. Recognition: Awards for outstanding teaching, special lectureships, etc.

### **II. Research and Publication (typically contributes 40% to overall evaluation)**

- 1) A. Research activity: a brief narrative statement of work in progress. This narrative should include statements identifying 1) the specific goals for research and publication that had been set for the current academic year; 2) progress made on achieving those goals during the evaluation period; 3) the goals set for the next evaluation period; 4) how

these overall goals and progress toward achieving them fit into an overall five-year research and publication plan.

#### B. Publication

1. Works actually published within the past five years. For books, faculty members will submit a complete file of reviews of their work.
2. Works accepted for publication (within the past five years).
3. Works submitted for publication.

C. Papers presented to professional meetings (within the past five years).

D. Recognition: Book or article prizes, research grants, travel grants for research-related activities, etc. (within the past five years).

### **III. Service (typically contributes 20% to overall evaluation)**

A. Departmental service: committees, personal assignments, etc.

B. University service (including for the College of Arts and Sciences and other Colleges).

C. Off-campus service to the professional community.

D. Off-campus service (of a professional nature) for the non-professional community.

E. Recognition: awards or commendations for outstanding service of a professional nature.

F. In reporting on service activities, faculty members are invited to indicate those activities they believe entailed significant time and effort.

## **Appendix C: Examples of activities and accomplishments in Teaching, Research and Publication, and Service**

The following outline offers a non-exhaustive list of examples faculty can cite to demonstrate their activities and accomplishments in Teaching, Research and Publication, and Service, and which the Personnel Committee can use to help differentiate between rankings.

### **I. Teaching**

1. Incorporation of new material into lectures or discussions to remain attuned to current events, recent scholarly trends and/or changing historical interpretations.
2. Attempting new means of engaging students by using new technologies, group projects, or other novel approaches.
3. Maintaining high expectations of and respect for students.
4. Maintaining regular office hours and is generally available for student consultation via email.
5. Intellectual content and rigor, as evidenced by reading lists, examinations, assignments, and rigor in grading.
6. Making use of feedback on his or her teaching performance, including peer review and student teaching evaluations (the Personnel Committee shall also recognize that student responses do not by themselves define good teaching. However, ratings on student evaluations will be one factor in faculty ranking).
7. Maintaining an interest in program and course development.
8. Serving on graduate advisory committees, comprehensive exam committees, and as the director of theses/dissertations.
9. Work with undergraduate or graduate students that leads to outstanding student performance, including winning scholarships, fellowships, and special awards.
10. Special recognition or awards for excellence in teaching from outside the department.
11. The teaching of large, introductory courses. e.g. service to the graduate program, including graduate instruction.
12. The authoring of a textbook or other pedagogically-focused scholarship.
13. Teaching of departmental service courses, which include the introductory surveys, freshman seminar, and advanced seminar required by undergraduate majors, as well as graduate courses needed by students in the History and Security Studies graduate programs.

## II. Research

A. Highest level of accomplishment that can warrant highest annual review rating in research and publishing, and can satisfy research and publishing requirements for tenure and promotion to associate professor, promotion to full professor, and the Professorial Performance Reward.

1. publication of a peer-reviewed book by a recognized university or commercial press within a five-year period.
2. publication of the equivalent of a peer-reviewed scholarly book in the form of peer-reviewed articles or chapters (typically five) in recognized scholarly journals and/or a recognized university or commercial press within a five-year period.

B. Other major accomplishments that do not necessarily warrant the highest annual evaluation rating by themselves, but nonetheless can demonstrate substantive progress toward completing long-term scholarly goals in include:

1. Publication of a peer-reviewed article or chapter in recognized scholarly journal, or a recognized university or commercial press within the five-year review period.
2. The acquisition of a major peer-reviewed grant or fellowship to support scholarly research.

C. Other accomplishments that can demonstrate progress toward completing long-term scholarly goal, and therefore should be included in all reviews include:

1. the initial submission of article or book manuscript for publication consideration.
2. the re-submission of an article or book manuscript after completing requesting revisions.
3. the delivering of scholarly papers or presentations of current research at professional meetings.
4. preparing and submitting grant proposals to support research and writing.
5. the acquisition of small grants to conduct research and/or writing, including grants internal to Kansas State University.

The Personnel Committee will recognize that the above accomplishments are especially important to junior faculty working toward tenure and promotion.

D. Accomplishments in research and publication that will not singularly satisfy or directly contribute to the satisfaction of departmental requirements to receive tenure and/or promotion, or a Professorial Performance Award, but that the Personnel Committee can also favorably consider in the evaluation of research-related activities include:

1. editing a peer-reviewed volume that does not include original scholarship by the editor.
2. authoring or producing government reports and/or project papers.
3. research-related visual presentations, collections, and/or exhibitions (unless such

a project's equivalency to conventional scholarship has been affirmed according to the stipulations of Section V.B.2.7).

4. preparing and submitting grant proposals for collaborative projects.
5. edited collections of archival material and/or primary sources that do not include original scholarship by the editor.
6. published bibliographies.
7. attendance at seminars, workshop, or other programs that provide advanced or specialized research training in an area relevant to the historical discipline.

### III. Service

#### A. Examples of Service to the Department include:

1. Service on departmental committees.
2. Providing administrative services to the department, such as by chairing departmental committees, serving as Director of Graduate Studies, Director of Graduate Awards and Admissions, Director of the Institute for Military History, editor of the *Kansas History* journal, and/or as Director/Associate Director of Security Studies.
3. Development of special materials such as brochures, handbooks, fliers, bibliographies, and catalogs.
4. Involvement in program and curriculum development.
5. Organizing and/or coordinating colloquia and other departmentally-sponsored seminars.
6. Service of as adviser to Phi Alpha Theta/History Club.

#### B. Examples of Service to the College of Arts and Sciences and/or University include:

1. Chairing or serving on any committees for the College of Arts and Sciences, other Colleges, and/or University.
2. Serving as affiliated faculty and contributing to other academic programs.
3. Service on Faculty Senate.
4. Serving as the Graduate school representative for other program's Ph.D. exams.
5. Service on any other extra-departmental ad-hoc committees or initiatives at the behest of the College of Arts and Sciences, other Colleges, or the University.

#### A. Examples of Service to the historical profession include:

1. Editing scholarly journals or book series.
2. Office holding and committee membership in professional organizations within the discipline.
3. Management of online discussion groups (i.e., H-Net).
4. Peer review evaluation for grants, fellowships, or promotion/tenure at other institutions.
5. Authoring book reviews for professional journals.
6. Promotion of the profession, such as through activity connected with Phi Alpha Theta, or other local, state, regional, national, and international history groups.

7. Giving speeches, addresses and talks not specifically based on current research projects at professional meetings.
  8. Reviewing manuscripts for scholarly presses and academic journals.
  9. Organizing or chairing panels at professional meetings.
- D. Examples of service to the nonprofessional community include:
1. Providing consultation services to groups outside of the academy for which you are not remunerated beyond a token honorarium, such as community organizations, historical societies, government agencies, historic preservation groups, business and corporations, primary and secondary school teachers, legal firms, and archives.
  2. Service to non-academic agencies performed specifically in the area of one's expertise.
  3. Authoring book reviews for non-scholarly outlets.
  4. Professional activities in a public program, including presentations to community groups, schools, and civic organizations.
  5. Participation in university off-campus, non-credit programs.
  6. Development and direction of special education programs for the public
  7. Membership on committees and commissions at the international, national, state, and local levels in a professional capacity.
  8. Creation of partnerships with cultural and historical institutions.

**Appendix D: Template for sample letter sent to outside reviewers in tenure and/or promotion applications**

Date

Dear Professor XXXXXX

Thank you for agreeing to evaluate the dossier of \_\_\_\_\_, who is applying for [ {tenure and promotion to associate professor} or {promotion to full professor} ] in the Department of History at Kansas State University. I have attached a copy of our program's requirements for [ {tenure and promotion to associate professor} or {promotion to full professor} ] to help you evaluate the scholarly merits of the relevant publications. The Department of History prioritizes the quality of peer-reviewed scholarship in making its determinations on [ {tenure and promotion} or {promotion} ], not merely meeting or exceeding the minimum quantitative threshold necessary to be considered for [ {tenure and promotion} or {promotion} ]. Toward that end, in addition to your overall assessment of the scholarly merits of the overall application, we would appreciate an effort to characterize the various publications that are a part of this dossier according to the following criteria:

- Outstanding scholarship and deserving of wide recognition
- Very good scholarship and deserving of wide recognition
- Good scholarship and especially valuable in the candidate's field
- Average scholarship primarily relevant to candidate's specialty
- Below average scholarship of limited scholarly value
- Not to be counted as a publication and/or lacking peer review
- Special publication to which the above categorizations are not applicable.

On behalf of the entire Department of History, I want to thank you for helping us go through this important process. Your participation is sincerely appreciated. If you have any additional questions, do not hesitate to ask.

Respectfully,

Chairperson  
Department of History