

Social Transformation Studies

Department

Arts and Sciences

College

Policy Statement Concerning:

Personnel Review and Evaluation Standards/Procedures

- Performance Evaluation Criteria
- Annual Evaluation
- Reappointment Evaluation for:
 - Annual Reappointment Reviews
 - Mid-Tenure Review
- Tenure
- Promotion
- Professorial Performance Award
- Chronic Low Achievement
- Post-Tenure Review
- Non-Tenure Track Faculty Titles

Approved by Faculty Vote on (12/15/21)

NEXT REVIEW DATE:

Christie Lannius
Golanda Broyles Gonzalez _____ 1/31/22
Department Head's Signature Date

Amit Chakrabarti _____ 2-7-2022
Dean's Signature Date

Chaz _____ 2/10/2022
Provost's Signature Date

Social Transformation Studies

Department Document

In the wake of the January 2021 announcement that the departments of American Ethnic Studies and Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies would be merging, members of the two units asked Dean Chakrabarti that the tenure and promotion standards and procedures contained in the current department documents be carried forward into the new unit; this request was granted. Subsequent discussion in fall 2021 resulted in the clarification that the AMETH and GWSS tenure and promotion standards and procedures would be honored through a transition period, during which time the faculty members of the Department of Social Transformation Studies would work together to draft and approve a new department document. As such, this department document consists mainly of the American Ethnic Studies department document (updated and approved in January 2020) and the Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies department document (updated and approved in June 2020).

During the transition period, the department will unify operations while retaining commitments previously made to faculty. Until a new departmental document is approved, the policies provided by the AMETH and GWSS department documents will apply to faculty coming from their respective departments, with the following exceptions:

1. Whenever possible, committee members for reappointment, tenure, and promotion cases will be drawn from Social Transformation Studies.
2. The GWSS steering committee governance structure, which is outlined in the GWSS department document, will cease to exist after the creation of Social Transformation Studies.
3. Where language in one of the department documents specifies particular duties for the Head in personnel procedures, these duties may rather be performed by the Associate Head.
4. Where language in the University Handbook assigns duties to the Head, the Head may work in collaboration with the Associate Head to fulfill these duties.
5. Starting in January 2022, the unit will begin holding monthly department meetings of the Social Transformation Studies faculty.
6. Beginning in January 2022, disciplinary sub-committees can be formed, along with committees necessary to conduct university business: curriculum, outreach, assessment, etc. Whenever possible, these departmental committees will have faculty representation from both of the major disciplinary areas of American Ethnic Studies and Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies.

We also offer these clarifications on the continued use of personnel procedures in the existing documents:

1. Annual evaluation/merit review will be conducted separately under the existing AMETH and GWSS guidelines until the new department document is approved.
2. During the transition period, review committees may continue to include members of the AMETH or GWSS affiliated faculty lists.
3. Until/unless otherwise approved by the Social Transformation faculty, P&T standards remain for their respective faculty as written in existing documents.

American Ethnic Studies Department

College Arts & Sciences

Policy Statement Concerning:

Personnel Review and Evaluation Standards/Procedures

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

Approved by Faculty Vote on (12/4/19)

NEXT REVIEW DATE: 2024



Department Head's Signature

December 12, 2019

Date



Dean's Signature

1-10-2020

Date



Provost's Signature

1/9/2020

Date

AMERICAN ETHNIC STUDIES DEPARTMENT

GUIDELINES, STANDARDS, AND PROCEDURES FOR

APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION, ANNUAL MERIT EVALUATION, AND CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS

Dates of Revision

Introduction

The following document outlines the procedures regarding appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion, annual merit and salary adjustments in the American Ethnic Studies Department (AESD). These supplement the current version of the *University Handbook* of Kansas State University and define in general terms the categories of professional responsibility required by AESD (scholarship and creative endeavors; teaching; and public, institutional, and professional service). In some instances, this department document provides examples of appropriate activities; such examples are not exhaustive.

The Department is composed of different sub-disciplines, each of which is accountable to its own professional norms. The policies and procedures outlined in this document provide the flexibility necessary to assess the professional contributions of faculty members within their disciplinary or interdisciplinary areas.

AESD faculty practice shared governance and due process built around consensus as defined by the department's by-laws available in the department website. Thus, the committees associated with merit, reappointment, tenure, and promotion process are expected to make decisions in accordance with the democratic procedures provided for in the *University Handbook* and this document.

There are times when the department may be faced with a minimal core faculty, which complicates fulfilling the procedures and policies outlined here. Accordingly, AESD may require the participation of affiliated faculty members to play a key role in implementing the department's procedures and policies by serving on search, merit, tenure, promotion, and reappointment committees. During those times, the department will request affiliated faculty members to serve in those capacities. Only AESD core tenure track faculty members are eligible to collectively decide on making changes to this document.

I. Hiring of Tenure-Track Faculty and Regular and Term Instructors

When the head is given permission to search by the dean and provost, the head will appoint the members of the search committee, which may include affiliated faculty members as need be. The head and the search committee will draft the position description and conduct the search in accordance with university's affirmative action and equal opportunity guidelines. After the campus interviews, the search committee will

gather input from those who participated in the interview process. It will then meet to discuss the attributes of each candidate and make its recommendations to the head regarding the acceptability of each candidate. The head will then make a recommendation to the dean regarding which candidate to hire based on the list of acceptable candidates provided by the search committee.

The head may hire term instructors on an “as needed” basis. The presumption is that the instructor’s services are no longer needed at the end of each contract year unless the head issues a new term contract.

On occasion, the AESD may need to fill a term instructor position for one or two years. In these cases, a search process may be abbreviated to entail only the head and the recommendations of the search committee to the dean and the provost.

II. Annual Faculty Evaluation

In August of each year, the head will announce the timing and due dates for tenure-track and instructors merit files. For purposes of planning, merit files are usually due to the head close to the beginning of fall semester. Merit files should follow the format as noted below. Evidence for effective teaching, research and service are discussed in section III.A.1. The merit evaluation period is the fiscal year from July 1 to June 30.

The head of the department will appoint a faculty evaluation committee for annual merit evaluations; this committee will also review reappointment and promotion and tenure applications. The P&T Committee shall be composed of three tenured faculty members. When it is necessary to appoint a tenured affiliated AESD faculty member to serve on the personnel committee, the head will solicit a ranked list of affiliated faculty to serve.

To minimize inequities due to variable departmental budget allocations from year to year, a rolling average of each faculty member’s annual evaluation results for three years will be used to determine salary recommendations, as needed. (See also Section C42 in the University Handbook.)

A. Annual Merit Evaluation Process

The Annual Merit Evaluation process provides the basis for salary increases. Annual written evaluations conducted for the purpose of determining merit salary increases are based on the distribution of responsibilities assigned, the relative difficulty and importance of these responsibilities, and the level of success with which each was performed. All tenure-track faculty members’ annual merit evaluations and rankings are determined by the head but with specific recommendations, including a prose narrative and final evaluation numbers, provided by the P&T Committee. The head evaluates the merit files of regularly appointed instructors.

Each tenure-track faculty member and instructor will meet annually with the head (usually at the end of an evaluation period) to establish jointly personal goals and objectives in research and other creative endeavors, teaching, extension and directed and non-directed service for the upcoming evaluation period and to discuss their relative importance within the context of the unit’s goals. At this meeting, the distribution of responsibilities in the areas of research, teaching and service will be discussed. The paragraph below provides the minimum and/or maximum percentage

distribution for each tenure-track faculty member. These percentages do not apply to term or regularly appointed instructors.

Area	Minimum or Maximum %	
Instruction	Min. 10%	Max. 50%
Research/Professional Activity	Min. 25%	Max. 50%
Department/University/Public Service	Min. 10%	Max. 25%

Administration

A tenure-track faculty member with significant departmental or university administrative responsibilities may have additional merit percentage added for administration. This time may be reallocated from any of the other three areas of merit as negotiated and approved by the department head prior to the beginning of the annual evaluation period.

The following paragraphs describe the annual distribution of faculty members' responsibilities, the election of P&T Committee members, and P&T Committee procedures.

1. Distribution of Responsibilities. The distribution of responsibilities, as percentages, is used in calculating a faculty member's merit score (as explained below). Individual faculty members and/or the head may schedule additional meetings, as needed, before submission of materials to the P&T Committee in order to adjust these percentages in light of new information or changed circumstances (a course release for exceptional service responsibilities, the attainment of a Fulbright teaching award, or the granting of sabbatical, for example).
2. P&T Committee Procedures.
 - a. The chair of the P&T Committee, appointed by the head, coordinates the evaluation process. The chair should emphasize that all information and deliberations are considered confidential. The P&T chair is responsible for making the merit files available to P&T Committee members. Fairness, privacy, and confidentiality are the three paramount values of this committee.
 - b. Each P&T Committee member reads each packet of file materials submitted by faculty for the annual merit review process, evaluating each faculty member in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service based on the information agreed to and made available in each file. In evaluating each colleague's file, the P&T Committee member assigns a rating using the following scale: Exceptional Merit (5); Exceeds Expectations (4); Meets Expectations (3); Needs Improvement (2); Fails to Meet Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity (1). "Exceptional Merit" represents superior achievement (for example, a published refereed book, a major grant, a university-wide teaching award, a national award), while little or no contribution in a given area would be rated as "Fails to Meet Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity" (for example, no publications or conference activity, TEVALs that are "Very Low" with critical student written comments, refusal to

perform departmental and/or university service). The specific criteria for the annual merit review process are found in Appendix B.

c. The P&T Committee meets as a group to compile rankings for each faculty member in each evaluation area. Ranking may not be split between categories (for example: Exceeds Expectations/Meets Expectations). Members of the P&T Committee are not present when their own files are discussed.

d. After the deliberations described in step c above are complete, the faculty member's consensus number in each area is then multiplied by the percentage distribution of responsibilities for that area. For example, if a colleague receives a 4 for teaching and allocates 40% to this area, the weighted score for teaching would be 1.6. A faculty member's overall evaluation is the sum of the weighted scores for teaching, research and service.

e. After the final merit scores for all colleagues have been determined, the P&T Committee drafts individual evaluation summaries. Quantitative ratings may be used to summarize evaluative judgments, but the basis for these judgments must be explained by a narrative account. The evaluation shall provide succinct assessments of effectiveness in performing each responsibility and these statements must include summaries of the achievements and evidence that support these assessments. The P&T Committee will forward its recommendations in written and electronic form to the head, and will meet with the head to discuss its recommendations.

f. The head will prepare, based on the P&T Committee's input, a written evaluation of each tenure-track faculty member. The head will also compute the average score for research by averaging the current score with the previous year's score. If a faculty member were given a 5 for research in the previous year, and a 4 for research in the current year, the average score would be 4.5. This average is then multiplied times the proportion of time designated for research for that faculty member the current evaluation year. If the faculty member is in their first year, the first year score is used. The head has the sole responsibility of evaluating the merit portfolios for regularly appointed instructors. All evaluations will be given to faculty members by the head at least two weeks prior to when the evaluations are due in the dean's office. This date is usually around January 31.

g. Before the head submits the written evaluations to the dean, each tenure-track faculty and instructor being evaluated must sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review and discuss the evaluation. Because the amount of funds available for merit increases is generally not known at this time, specific salary percentage increases will not normally be discussed. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, each faculty member receiving an evaluation will have the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations to the head who will forward it to the dean.

h. The head will submit the following items to the dean.

- 1) A copy of the evaluation system used to prepare the evaluations.
- 2) A written evaluation for each tenure-track faculty member and instructor employed for at least three months during the fiscal year.

3) A recommended merit salary adjustment for each faculty member or unclassified professional person that should be based directly on the person's evaluation.

4) Evidence (e.g., a statement signed by the individual evaluated) of the opportunity to examine the written evaluation and to discuss with the head the individual's resulting relative standing for the purpose of merit salary increase in the unit.

5) Any written statements of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations.

6) Any recommendations for salary adjustments on bases outside of the annual evaluation, together with evidence that supports these recommendations.

i. The head, based on the merit evaluations, will make recommendations for merit increases in salary when requested by the dean's office (usually in May). The criteria used to recommend merit increases will be based on the weighted average performance score from the scale discussed (2b) from above.

B. The Merit Evaluation Portfolio Format

1. Curriculum Vitae

A current file of all faculty members' curriculum vitae should be kept in the main office. It is the responsibility of faculty members to provide an updated curriculum vitae for the files in their evaluation portfolios. The due date for evaluation portfolios is in September, with the exact date to be set by the department head. AESD faculty members serving on the P&T Committee must submit the same evidence as all other faculty members. Term and regularly appointed instructors should fill out the components of the portfolio that apply to their appointment with the department. The evaluation period for merit is from July 1 to June 30 of each year.

2. Summary Narrative

Faculty members will summarize their achievements for the fiscal year, along with a brief list of goals for the next year in a one-page narrative. This narrative should briefly highlight their major accomplishments and special circumstances, if any applied over the fiscal year. This summary must be single-spaced and follow the following format:

- Paragraph 1: Outline percent distribution of effort in each of the major areas of activity.
- Paragraph 2: Identify classes taught and graduate committees and/or advising efforts. Highlight instructional accomplishments such as teaching awards, summary course evaluations, and other instructional activities (e.g., formal mentoring relationships).
- Paragraph 3: Summarize research activities including publications, grants awarded, and other scholarly activities. Tenure-track faculty should also very briefly identify scholarly works in progress.
- Paragraph 4: Summarize service activities including service-related awards; international, national, and regional professional and University, departmental, and program appointments and activities, as well as public service or outreach.
- Final Comment: Provide 2-3 sentences that provide self-reflection on the achievements and challenges of the review period.

3. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

The teaching portion of the portfolio should represent materials from each course taught, including syllabi, TEVALs or other measures, and students' comments. Additionally, each faculty member can choose to include any other materials that indicate efforts made to improve teaching and advising effectiveness. This section of the merit file should:

- Briefly explain the reason for any course reductions or extenuating circumstance, if applicable.
- Include the Graduate Committees on which the person served during the year. The table should indicate the graduate students' names, whether they are pursuing an MA or a PhD, the person's role on the committee (chair, member, outside chair), and indicate whether/when they completed their degree during the fiscal year.
- List the number of undergraduate students the person formally advised each semester. (Undergraduate advising is considered by our department to be part of instructional activities, not service).
- Highlight any teaching awards received
- Other evidence of teaching effectiveness

4. Evidence of Research Productivity

Faculty should include a list of all research activities conducted during the fiscal year. Research efforts may be documented by such items as publication of books, articles, book chapters, and book reviews; presentations at conventions, conferences, and similar forums; submission of grant proposals; publication of instructional resources, and work-in-progress (e.g., long-term research projects). Publications are counted in the calendar year in which the publication appears in press. To account for the uneven nature of the research process, the final annual merit evaluation score for research productivity will be a two-year average of the current year and the previous year merit scores. Below are the requirements for this section of the portfolio:

- Full citations must be listed for all publications or other scholarly works.
- Candidates are encouraged to indicate the level of involvement in all coauthored scholarly activities (including publications and grants).
- Refereed books, book chapters, and reviews should be listed the year they are actually published (released in printed form). Refereed journal articles, on the other hand, should be listed the year they are formally accepted for publication. (Identify the estimated date of publication.) Other refereed and non-refereed products should be listed the year they are formally disseminated.
- Extramural funding such as grants and contracts should be listed in full in the appropriate category (received, submitted, and not funded). Record the title, awarding organization, amount, coauthors and their affiliations, and explanation of the person's role and percent effort in the proposal preparation.
- 'Works in Progress' to identify scholarly work the person is pursuing and hopes to complete during the following year.
- Other research activities.

5. Evidence of Service Activities

Faculty should include a list of all service activities conducted during the fiscal year. Service includes service to the department/university, to the profession, and to the public (if profession-based). Service can be evidenced in the form of letters of invitation and appreciation, printed programs, committee minutes, newspaper articles, and the like.

6. Evidence of Administrative Activities

This section of the portfolio applies to only faculty members (instructors or tenure-track faculty) who have been assigned formal administrative functions by the head. The exact nature of this report will vary depending on the administrative functions, as defined by the head.

7. Support Materials. These provide evidence to support claims of merit. Each group or specific piece of evidence should be clearly labeled. Faculty members will provide student evaluations (TEVALs or other measures) for all courses taught within their load, copies of works in progress, publications, etc.

C. Minimum Acceptable Productivity Standards

The following represents the department's minimum standards for productivity in each of three areas: teaching, research, and service.

1. Teaching

As stated in the *University Handbook* Section C34.1 - 34.2, student ratings of teaching are but one indicator of teaching effectiveness, and should never be used as the only source of information about classroom teaching. We recognize that students may exhibit biases in evaluations of historically underrepresented faculty. This dynamic may be at work when a faculty member consistently receives student ratings that indicate "dissatisfaction" with learning and classroom facilitation.

There are other sources of information that can serve as evidence of student learning or teaching effectiveness. The department head and the tenured faculty members shall examine these other indicators of learning and effectiveness. These can include:

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

2. Research

Within a five-year window, including the current evaluation year, the faculty member should have at least three publications.

3. Service

The faculty member should actively serve on at least one department committee per year.

III. Reappointment

Reappointment is the process of extending a tenure-seeking faculty member's annual contract. The head will appoint a committee (hereafter the Promotion and Tenure or P&T Committee, see Section IV below) of no fewer than three tenured faculty members. All tenured members from within the department will serve on this committee, and if fewer than three, will be supplemented by tenured professors from the department's list of affiliated faculty members. The head attends the P&T Committee meeting as an observer and to answer any questions not otherwise answerable by department guidelines (such as these P&T guidelines) or by the P&T Committee chair. See Sections C50.1-C66 and Section C162.3 of the *University Handbook* for the specific procedures related to reappointment. For the Instructor reappointment process, please refer to the Procedures of Appointment, Evaluation, Reappointment, and Promotion of Teaching Faculty (Section VI).

A. Standards for Reappointment

- a. Evidence of research may include any of a variety of sole-authored or co-authored projects related to American Ethnic Studies, including grants or research awards supporting scholarly work, publication of scholarly articles in refereed journals and co-edited collections, manuscripts or synopses of work-in-progress, scholarly conferences, and/or products of creative activity. Interdisciplinary collaborations and interactions are encouraged and will be acknowledged appropriately. Overall, the tenure-seeking faculty should convey initiative towards achieving tenure requirements at or before the end of the probation period. (See Section IV regarding standards for tenure.)
- b. Evidence of effective teaching may include syllabi, examples of student work, examinations, class materials, peer evaluations, advising materials, course development materials, special contributions to teaching diverse student populations, pedagogical publications, conferences and awards, and/or contributions to particular needs of the department. Student evaluations (such as TEVALS or other measures) and representative instructional material should be included.
- c. Evidence of public, institutional, and professional service may include activities in the department, the college, the university, and in professional and public service. Examples of service activities include: community service, department committees, university committees, service in national or international organizations, advising student groups, study abroad, editorial work, professional recognition (for example, awards), open-house or career day organization, and campus talks.

B. Reappointment Process of Tenure-Track Faculty Members

Tenure-seeking faculty (hereafter referred to as a "candidate") undergo a probationary period, normally six years, during which they accumulate a file of accomplishments that will, at the end of the period, support a tenure and promotion application. The P&T Committee reviews the candidates' files and assesses whether each candidate is demonstrating normal progress towards tenure.

1. The head instructs each candidate to compile a file of cumulative career milestones and the professional accomplishments of preceding years. If the candidate is entering mid-tenure review or seeking tenure and promotion, their file should be in accordance with formats and procedures provided by the provost and dean (see <https://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/dhmanual/> under Promotion/Tenure Decisions).
2. Each candidate submits to the head a file of materials to be reviewed by the P&T Committee. Candidates should include a self-evaluation and other relevant materials as evidence of their accomplishments. Candidates should note that this file is very close in structure to an annual merit file, except the reappointment file is cumulative. The file should represent a summary of teaching, research, and service activities during the probationary period. Section III, A above defines the evidence that candidates should provide in these summaries. For candidates beyond the first year, the file should include a narrative, supporting materials, and a vita. If a candidate is unclear about what evidence to include in reappointment materials, the candidate should consult with the head.
3. The head makes available to the P&T Committee the files of each candidate being considered for reappointment. The head is responsible for making each candidate's file and departmental tenure criteria documents available at least fourteen calendar days prior to the meeting to discuss the candidate's reappointment. A cumulative record of recommendations from the reappointment and mid-probationary review meetings (if available), and any outside reviews that have been solicited by the head will also be made available to the P&T Committee. (See also Sections C35-C37 in the *University Handbook*).
4. The head will call a meeting of the P&T Committee for the purpose of discussing and voting on the reappointment of the candidate. The consensus discussion on any candidate shall be held only at that meeting. P&T Committee members unable to attend for genuinely pressing reasons may request input by other means. The P&T Committee Chair will collect ballots and any written comments from voting faculty, which will be forwarded to the head.
5. The head forwards to the dean: a) the written recommendation regarding the candidate and accompanying explanation regarding reappointment or non-reappointment, b) the candidate's complete file, and c) the P&T Committee's recommendation and all written comments of the voting faculty.

IV. Tenure, and/or Promotion, and Professorial Performance Award Standards

Faculty members are evaluated in all the areas in which they are assigned responsibility. Recommendations for the tenure and promotion of tenure-seeking faculty and the promotion of associate professors to full professors are based upon each candidate's record of accomplishment during the evaluation period. These recommendations differ from the annual evaluation for merit (See Section II A of this document). These tenure and/or promotion recommendations are based on the following standards, and they stress lasting contributions to the department, scholarly contributions to the field, consistency of performance, and versatility.

The P&T Committee will evaluate the file, provide individual written comments, and vote on the reappointment or tenure and promotion of candidates during this probationary period. Their opinions, both individually and collectively, represent one of the most important inputs into this process. The candidate will have unfiltered access to this information during their review.

A. Mid-Tenure Review

a. Consistent with university policy and procedures, a mid-tenure review will be conducted during the third year of an assistant professor's tenure clock. The candidate will be instructed to produce a file containing all of the components for promotion to associate professor, with the exception of soliciting outside reviewers. The candidate must show evidence of normal progress toward meeting the standards noted below for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Normal progress means that even though the candidate has not yet met all these standards, there is evidence that the candidate is highly likely to meet these standards by at least the beginning of the sixth year of tenure-track employment.

B. Standards for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

a. Candidates must demonstrate sustained excellence in, and commitment to research, and that there is high probability of continued research productivity after tenure and promotion. The kinds of evidence necessary to show such sustained excellence should include the regular publication or acceptance for publication of sole-authored or co-authored high-quality, original refereed articles or manuscripts, and may also include the regular presentation of conference papers; the publication of collections and/or editions; the procurement of grants and/or fellowships; and awards for and/or the reprinting of candidate's work.

b. Since no mathematical formula can determine the quality/quantity of the various kinds of research in American Ethnic Studies, the Department does not require a fixed quantity of research in any one category to recommend tenure. The department offers the following general guideline, *candidates should publish four peer-reviewed manuscripts with journals and/or presses; at least two of the publications should be sole-authored or first-authored*. University press books or commercial press books that have been peer-reviewed may count for between one article and four articles, depending on if an edited book is co-edited or sole-edited, or a book is co-authored or sole-authored, and the scholarly impact of the publishing house. Supplemental to the above, non-peer reviewed professional publications that meet the quality and standards of the discipline may also be considered. It will be the responsibility of the candidate to show how their portfolio of scholarship achieves AESD's standard of quantity, quality, and consistency. Professional publications that are not peer-reviewed may also be considered during the tenure and promotion discussion, but they must meet the quality standards of the discipline.

c. AESD will solicit four outside reviews of the candidate's research. These outside reviewers should be in the candidate's area of study, and they may be familiar with the candidate's work. However, they should not have significant professional or personal ties (for example, major professors, classmates, or co-authors) that may cause a conflict of interest. By May 1, prior to the fall semester in which the candidate plans to apply for

tenure and promotion, the candidate will provide the head six names of associate or full professors in who are active scholars with the knowledge and capacity to review the quality of the candidate's research. From this list, the head will select two. In addition to the candidate's two reviewers, the head will select two additional outside reviewers from names either on or not on the list. These reviews will be added to the candidate's file.

d. Candidates must show evidence of sustained excellence in and commitment to teaching. Such evidence may include syllabi, examples of student work, examinations, class materials, peer evaluations, advising materials, course development materials, special contributions to teaching diverse student populations, pedagogical publications, conferences and awards, evidence of subject matter mastery, and/or contributions to particular needs of the department. Student evaluations (TEVALS or other measurements), and representative instructional material must be included.

e. The successful candidate for tenure must demonstrate sustained excellence in and commitment to service. Candidates should provide evidence of service, including activities in the department, the college, the university, and in professional and public service. Examples of service activities include: community service, department committees, university committees, service in national or international organizations, AESSA or other student groups, study abroad, editorial work, professional recognition (for example, awards), library ordering, open-house or career day organization, and campus talks.

C. Standards for Promotion to Professor

The rank of professor presupposes a superior record in all areas of faculty activity. The candidate is expected to demonstrate leadership in the assigned responsibilities. The standards for promotion from associate professor to professor are substantially higher than those for promotion to associate professor.

An associate professor who seeks promotion to full professor will notify the head by no later than March 1, prior to the fall semester of the intended promotion year. When an associate professor applies for promotion to full professor, the head will appoint a Full Professor Promotion Committee of no fewer than three full professors. All full professors from within the department will serve on this committee, and if fewer than three, will be supplemented by full professors from other departments. The Full Professor Promotion Committee will evaluate and provide written comments on the file, and vote on the promotion of candidates to professor.

During the early part of the fall semester, the candidate for promotion to full professor is required to submit a complete dossier, hereafter referred to as a file, in accordance with formats and procedures provided by the provost and dean (see "Promotion / Tenure Decisions" found at: <https://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/dhmanual/>).

1. Candidates must demonstrate significant research in American Ethnic Studies since the last promotion. For promotion to professor, the candidate's sustained scholarly performance should have resulted in a national or international reputation. This can be demonstrated by discussions of, and references to, the candidate's work in the scholarly literature, invitations to give lectures or performances, presentations of papers or exhibits, contributions of articles to edited collections, requests to referee manuscripts, major grants, and the like.

The minimum expectation for publications is at least four additional peer-reviewed publications since the candidate's promotion to associate professor, most of which or at least three, are sole or first authored, in journals that are in the candidate's discipline or sub-discipline. University press books or quality commercial press books that have been peer-reviewed may count for between one article and four articles, depending on if an edited book is co-edited or sole-edited, or a book is co-authored or sole-authored, and the scholarly impact of the publishing house. Professional publications that are not peer-reviewed may not be included in the four peer-reviewed publications for promotion to full professor. It will be the responsibility of each candidate to show how their portfolio of scholarship achieves not only the department's standard of quantity, quality, and consistency, but also demonstrate development of a national or international reputation. The Full Professor Promotion Committee, outside reviewers, and head are the arbiters of the weight of any publication.

AESD will solicit four outside reviews of the candidate's research. These outside reviewers should be in the candidate's area of study and they may be familiar with the candidate's work. However, they should not have significant professional or personal ties (for example, major professors, classmates, or co-authors) that may cause a conflict of interest. By May 1, prior to the fall semester in which the candidate plans to apply for promotion, the candidate will provide the head eight names of full professors in peer universities who are active scholars with the knowledge and capacity to review the quality of the candidate's research. From this list, the head will select two. In addition to the candidate's two reviewers, the head will select two additional outside reviewers from names either on or not on the list. These reviews will be added to the candidate's file.

2. Candidates must show evidence of an ongoing record of excellence in teaching, including syllabi, examples of student work, examinations, class materials, peer evaluations, advising materials, course development materials, special contributions to teaching diverse student populations, pedagogical publications, conferences and awards, evidence of subject matter mastery, and/or contributions to particular needs of the department. Student evaluations (TEVALS), and representative instructional material must be included.

3. The successful candidate for promotion must demonstrate sustained excellence in and commitment to service. Candidates should provide evidence of service, including activities in the department, the college, the university, and in professional and public service.

D. Professorial Performance Award

The Professorial Performance Award (PPA) is a university-wide award available to faculty at the rank of full professor. As described in sections C49.1-C49.14 of the *University Handbook*, the award is designed to reward sustained performance of professional duties by providing a base salary increase beyond what is given in the annual evaluation process. Unlike the move from assistant professor to associate professor or associate professor to professor, the PPA is not a promotion. There are no faculty members of a rank higher than the candidate who deliberate in the PPA process. Moreover, it is not a right accorded to every faculty member at the rank of professor, nor is it granted simply for meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies.

1. Eligibility and Timing. An eligible candidate for a PPA must be a full-time, full professor and have been in rank at least six years since promotion to professor or since the last PPA. Eligible candidates are encouraged to discuss their candidacy in advance with the head.

2. Criteria. As explained in section C49.2 of the *University Handbook*, a candidate for the PPA must show "evidence of sustained productivity" in at least the last six years before the PPA review, and such productivity "must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards." A successful PPA candidacy will be marked by distinguished achievement in teaching, research, and service of the kind required for promotion to professor.

3. Candidate Responsibilities. A professor who applies for a PPA should compile and submit a file of professional accomplishments in teaching, research, and service in accordance with the criteria outlined above. This file should be complete and submitted to the head no later than October 1.

4. Review Procedure. The head will review the candidate's PPA file and prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials in terms of the criteria outlined above, along with a recommendation for or against the award.

Each candidate for the award will have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the head, and each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. As is the case in Annual Evaluation, within seven working days after the review and discussion each candidate will have the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding the evaluation to the head and the dean. A copy of the head's written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate.

5. Submission of the PPA Review to the Dean of Arts and Sciences. Following the review and evaluation of the candidate's file, the head will submit the following items to the Dean of Arts and Sciences:

- a. A copy of the evaluation file used to determine qualification for the award.
- b. A copy of the head's written evaluation of the candidate's qualifications for the award.
- c. Evidence of the candidate receiving the opportunity to examine the written evaluation and recommendation.
- d. Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation.
- e. The candidate's supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award.

V. Chronic Low Achievement

Following section C31.5 of the *University Handbook*, the head, in consultation with P&T Committee, will make a determination of when a tenured faculty member's overall performance falls below the minimum-acceptable level. A faculty member is considered in jeopardy of chronic low achievement if a rating of "Fails to Meet Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity" is assessed in any one of the major areas (research, instruction, service, or overall) during the annual merit evaluation process for a three-year period. The head will indicate this, in writing, to the faculty member. The head will also

provide to the faculty member a suggested Corrective Action Plan for the improvement of the performance of the faculty member. This plan will be developed with the advice and input of the P&T Committee. The head and the faculty member will meet together to assure that the faculty member understands and agrees with the Corrective Action Plan. Minor modifications in the Corrective Action Plan can be made at this time with the agreement of the head and the faculty member. In subsequent evaluations, the faculty member will report (in writing) on activities aimed at improving performance as stipulated in the Corrective Action Plan and provide any evidence of improvement.

VI. Post-Tenure Review Policy

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 American Ethnic Studies 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.

A. Review Procedures:

Materials compiled for Post-Tenure Review will be as follows:

1. Six previous annual evaluation letters drawn from the faculty member's personnel file.
2. A brief synopsis, compiled by the department head, of the statistical averages drawn directly from the six evaluation letters of the scores received in the evaluation categories of teaching, research, and service.
3. A reflective statement by the faculty member (not to exceed three pages) giving a summary of their activities and accomplishments over the previous six-year time frame.
4. A one-page statement that outlines the faculty member's short and long-term goals.

B: Review Oversight

The department head oversees the review and meets with the faculty member to review the materials submitted.

C. Outcomes

If all six annual reviews meet or exceed expectations in the three areas of evaluation, the Post-Tenure Review meeting can be waived as this indicates that the faculty member is making an "appropriate contribution to the university." If there are areas of

evaluation where there are concerns, the head will indicate these in writing, in advance of the meeting, and the faculty member and head will discuss specific ways to address these concerns. The head and faculty member will meet at the end of the following semester to review progress on the concerns.

All materials compiled for Post-Tenure Review will be included in the faculty member's personnel file. In the event that a Post-Tenure Review leads to the development of a formal *Plan of Improvement*, this outcome would be reported to the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences.

VII. Procedures for Appointment, Evaluation, Reappointment, and Promotion of Teaching Faculty

Teaching faculty hold the ranks of teaching assistant professor, teaching associate professor, and teaching professor as defined in [Section C12.4](#) of the [University Handbook](#). They are senior educators working in the American Ethnic Studies Department. The primary responsibility for persons on these appointments will be instruction. Persons appointed to these positions will hold a doctoral degree in American Ethnic Studies or a related field. The teaching faculty members play an important role in teaching undergraduate courses. They will also serve to mentor undergraduate and graduate teaching assistants. Teaching faculty may contribute in many other ways to the performance of the department, for example, by serving on departmental committees, assisting with undergraduate recruitment, or participating in the Open House. They may also serve on University committees when service on these committees is consistent with their expertise as teaching faculty. Individuals in these appointments are not eligible for tenure and are not eligible to vote on matters of tenure or promotion for tenure-track faculty. Service in these positions is not credited toward tenure.

The Department of American Ethnic Studies regularly evaluates its teaching faculty in order to:

- help the Department Head provide feedback, commendations and constructive criticism to these teaching faculty in an ongoing effort to enhance the overall quality of the Department's efforts,
- provide information to the Department Head to help in the approval of annual salary adjustments for teaching faculty, and
- determine if a teaching faculty member has earned the right of promotion to Associate Teaching Professor or Teaching Professor.

A. Characteristics Of An Effective Teaching Faculty Member

All teaching faculty are expected to contribute to scholarly activities and service to the professional and university community. The scholarly activities consist of two broad categories defined as *teaching* and *mentoring*. The nature of these two efforts cannot always be distinguished from the area of service and professional activities. The

allocation of time to the various activities shall be established by the Department Head in consultation with the teaching faculty member.

1. Scholarly Activities: Teaching and Mentoring

Teaching in American Ethnic Studies is a complex activity which can involve many different components. The components which can be part of an effective teaching effort include:

- teaching at the undergraduate level in an effective manner,
- mentoring less experienced teaching assistants and instructors by helping them understand and execute the role, responsibilities, and strategies of effective American Ethnic Studies teachers,
- designing or modifying equipment for classroom demonstrations, designing or re-designing service courses, and other related activities,
- designing large service courses,
- providing support and consultation to other members of the Department, and
- other activities which support the Departmental teaching effort.

The complex nature of teaching and the number of different types of items listed above makes it unlikely that every teaching faculty member will contribute equally to all of the areas listed and, thus, it is not the Department's expectation that teaching faculty do so.

However, each faculty member is expected to show a strong teaching effort. Typically, colleagues will cite a teaching faculty member as providing important contributions to our goal of teaching American Ethnic Studies at a consistently high level.

2. Service and Professional Activities

Teaching faculty may be expected to assist with the Department's efforts to recruit undergraduate American Ethnic Studies majors. Teaching Faculty may also be expected to provide academic advice to American Ethnic Studies majors while they are earning their baccalaureate degrees. Teaching faculty may serve in a significant capacity in the management of large service courses. These duties may include resolving student enrollment issues, teaching assistant assignments, and other essential components. Teaching faculty members may engage in service and professional activities which are consistent with the goals of their teaching efforts.

B. Criteria For And Conditions Of Initial Appointment

A teaching faculty member will usually be expected to teach at the undergraduate level, mentor teaching assistants, and advise American Ethnic Studies majors approximately as effectively as a tenured or tenure-track member of the faculty. Thus, a teaching faculty member will:

- Have earned an advanced degree in an appropriate area of American Ethnic Studies or another closely related field. Persons appointed to these positions will hold a doctoral degree in American Ethnic Studies or a related field,

- Have demonstrated teaching experience;
- Have demonstrated teaching accomplishments;
- Be able to mentor undergraduate and graduate teaching assistants;
- Have an interest in advising undergraduate students; and
- Be able to collaborate effectively.

Teaching faculty will be appointed on one of the following contracts (as stated in the [University Handbook Section C12.4](#)).

1. Teaching assistant professor; teaching associate professor; teaching professor—term appointment. This appointment may be full-time or part-time. A term appointment carries no expectation of continued employment beyond the period stated in the contract. The Standards for Notice of Non-reappointment do not apply.
2. Teaching assistant professor; teaching associate professor; teaching professor—regular appointment. This appointment may be full-time or part-time. A teaching professor at any rank on a regular appointment is a member of the general faculty and is afforded all perquisites accorded to the general faculty. Regular appointees are entitled to Notice of Non-reappointment (See C160, *et seq.*, University Handbook).

Teaching assistant professor positions will be awarded as one-year, regular or term contracts. Teaching associate professor and teaching professor positions may be awarded as one-year regular appointments or as one-two-or three-year term appointments.

C. Criteria For Reappointment And Promotion

The University's criteria for reappointment and promotion of teaching faculty are given in the [University Handbook Section C12.4](#). In addition to these general criteria the Department of American Ethnic Studies by action of its faculty has established procedures and criteria to be considered in reappointment and promotion.

1. Reappointment of Teaching Assistant Professor, Teaching Associate Professor and Teaching Professor

Teaching faculty are reappointed by the Department Head on an annual basis. Reappointment should be based on the teaching faculty member demonstrating reasonable progress in the areas mentioned in section VIII B below. Reappointment of a teaching faculty member is also contingent upon available funds. Any teaching faculty member who will not be reappointed must be notified as early as possible and in a manner that is consistent with the policies stated in the [University Handbook, C160 and Appendix A](#).

2. Promotion to Teaching Associate Professor

Typically, consideration for promotion from teaching assistant professor to teaching associate professor can occur after a five-year period as a teaching assistant professor. Department heads are expected to notify faculty members regarding their progress toward or readiness for promotion review. The criteria for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor are:

a. Scholarly Activities: Teaching and Mentoring

The candidate for promotion should have demonstrated, as a teaching assistant professor, meritorious teaching accomplishments in some of the teaching and mentoring capacities, which are described in Section II B of this document; effective teaching at the undergraduate level will generally be expected. The judgment of this potential will be made by the tenured faculty with the advice from teaching faculty of a higher rank.

b. Service

The candidate for promotion should demonstrate an ability to serve in the capacities, which are described in Section II.B of this document. This may include service as an effective member of Departmental committees which have direct impact on the candidate's teaching, mentoring, recruiting, and advising responsibilities.

The quality of the candidate's work in teaching American Ethnic Studies should be reflected by observation of the candidate's teaching and other responsibilities by the faculty, by student feedback, and by the candidate's self-evaluations. The teaching quality of the candidate should be, at least, similar to that of other teaching faculty who are or were at a similar state in their careers. In making these comparisons the faculty will use its own judgments and may seek advice other knowledgeable parties, such as teaching faculty of a higher rank.

3. Promotion to Teaching Professor

The promotion from Associate Teaching Professor to the rank of Teaching Professor is based on demonstrated distinction in teaching and mentoring, and in service and professional activities. Considerations for promotion to the rank of Teaching Professor are:

a. Scholarly Activities: Teaching, Mentoring, and Service

The candidate for promotion should have established a record of teaching and mentoring that merits promotion. Achievements that will help to demonstrate this record may include teaching awards, or a substantial history of exemplary teaching. The candidate should also have developed new curriculum materials, course design, or teaching strategies, and the presentation of scholarship to a professional organization.

b. Service Activities

The candidate should meet other service capacities described in Section VII, A, 2 of this document.

The quality of the candidate's work in teaching American Ethnic Studies should be reflected by observation of the candidate's teaching and other responsibilities by the faculty, by student feedback, and by the candidate's self-evaluations. The teaching

quality of the candidate should be, at least, similar to that of other teaching faculty who are or were at a similar state in their careers. In making these comparisons the faculty will use its own judgments and may seek advice other knowledgeable parties, such as teaching faculty of a higher rank.

VIII. PROCEDURES CONCERNING APPOINTMENT & REAPPOINTMENT

A. Procedures for Initial Appointment

The usual situation will be that the Department Head will appoint the person at the rank of Teaching Assistant Professor. For appointment at a higher rank, both the recommending faculty member and the candidate will need to provide evidence supporting such an appointment. That evidence must address the appropriate criteria listed in Section VII, B.

The University Handbook distinguishes between term and regular appointments. The Department Head will decide on the nature of the appointment with input from the search committee.

B. Procedures for Annual Reappointment

Candidate's Responsibility

The teaching faculty member will present to the Department Head a completed evaluation form given in Appendix A. This form is due at the same time as files for annual review of tenured and tenure-track faculty. This documentation will be posted by the Department Head on Canvas in the same manner as other faculty documentation is posted.

C. Procedures for Promotion

A person who has been a Teaching Assistant Professor at Kansas State University for at least four years or has a total of six or more years teaching experience beyond the terminal degree is eligible for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor, if they have demonstrated accomplishments as a teaching Assistant Professor as described in Section VII, C.

A person who has been a Teaching Associate Professor for at least four years at Kansas State University or has a total of at least ten years teaching experience beyond the terminal degree is eligible for promotion to Teaching Professor if they have demonstrated accomplishments as a Teaching Assistant Professor as described in Section VII,C, 2.

A teaching assistant professor can apply for promotion to teaching associate professor and a teaching associate professor can apply for promotion to Teaching Professor. The candidate must provide a written statement concerning the candidate's qualifications for promotion.

In cases of extraordinary accomplishment the time in rank may be waived by a vote of the faculty.

1. Candidate's Responsibilities

- a. Present to the American Ethnic Studies Department Head a vita outlining their contributions to the teaching and mentoring missions of the American Ethnic Studies Department. The vita shall consist of a list of courses taught, names of students mentored and faculty assisted with teaching, teaching achievements, and future plans for teaching and mentoring.
- b. Provide names of two references who are members of KSU American Ethnic Studies faculty and who have knowledge of the professional contributions of the candidate, and
- c. Demonstrate their teaching practices to the faculty either by being observed in a classroom session by a selection of faculty who are qualified to vote on the matter or by a giving a special teaching presentation to the faculty.

2. Department's Responsibilities

Upon receiving a written nomination from a tenured faculty member, the Department Head will request the list of two potential internal evaluators from the candidate. With the advice of the faculty, the Department Head will choose the name of one evaluator from the list, and solicit a written evaluation. Once that evaluation has been received and reviewed, the Department Head will bring the nomination for promotion to the faculty for discussion and vote.

3. Faculty Vote

The faculty who are qualified to vote are all tenured American Ethnic Studies faculty. Within five business days subsequent to the faculty's discussion of the candidate, each qualified member of the faculty will submit a recommendation/ballot to the Department Head. A faculty member may abstain in this ballot; in this case that vote will not count. The results of the faculty vote and the Department Head's recommendation and justification for the recommendation will be transmitted to the candidate and the faculty.

4. Report of the Department Head

The Department Head will review the candidate's promotion file, the recommendations of the faculty and the internal letter. The department head will make an independent recommendation to the Dean supporting or failing to support promotion of the candidate. On the same date the Department Head will explain their recommendation in writing to the candidate and the faculty. The Department Head will report any new information or decisions concerning the candidate's status to the candidate as soon as it becomes available.

5. Appeal Procedures

If the candidate should wish to appeal the recommendation of the faculty or the Department Head, the request for reconsideration must be made in writing by the candidate within three normal working days after the candidate's notification of the recommendations. The candidate must present in writing the arguments for reconsideration and provide at that time to the Department Head any additional evidence that supports the candidate's position.

If the candidate requests reconsideration of the faculty's recommendation, the Department Head will convene a meeting of the qualified faculty to consider the candidate's written arguments and additional evidence. Within three business days of the conclusion of the meeting, each qualified faculty member will submit a second, written recommendation to the Department Head. Participation in a reconsideration vote will be restricted to members of the qualified faculty, and will be conducted in the same manner as the original vote. The recommendations of the faculty and the Department Head will be transmitted in writing to the candidate and to qualified faculty.

6. Forwarding Procedures

After the candidate has studied the recommendations, the candidate can decide to withdraw candidacy for promotion. If the candidate wishes to continue the process, then the promotion documentation will be forwarded to the Dean. The Department Head will include the results of the secret ballot, the faculty's justifications, including verbatim comments from the ballots, and the head's written recommendation.

APPENDIX A

Template for Annual Report of Teaching Faculty Activities for the Calendar Year 20xx

Please submit your evaluation information as both PDF and Word (or equivalent) files.

Name:

TEACHING AND INSTRUCTOR-MENTORING

- A. Teaching and Training Activities
 - 1. If your syllabus is not linked on these Web sites, attach it to this file.
 - 2. List any teaching and/or training activities which are in addition to regular teaching assignments.
 - 3. List any outreach activities which are not formal teaching. (e.g. Lectures given in high school, at civic organizations, etc.; , work with school teachers,...)
- B. If you have undergraduate academic advising responsibilities, list them.
- C. List and briefly describe any mentoring and/or training activities.
- D. Special recognitions for your mentoring and training
- E. List and briefly describe any advising

SERVICE

- A. Presentations to professional societies
- B. Departmental committee assignments
- C. Service awards or special recognitions
- D. Any other information (including professional service to the broader community, within and beyond the university.)

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES (if any)

- A. Concise Statement (no more than 400 words) of Current Research Activities written so that a senior American Ethnic Studies major can understand it. (This information may be used to describe your research

to the administration or potential donors *and* on the Departmental Web pages for recruiting proposes.)

B. Publications in refereed journals, include links to on-line versions when available.

C. Papers accepted for publication in refereed journals, include links to online versions when available.

D. Presentations given at professional meetings, include links to proceedings, abstracts, etc.

- i. Invited presentations
- ii. Contributed *and refereed*
- iii. Contributed but not refereed

E. Colloquia and Seminars

F. Patents or copyrights applied for or received during the past year. (Do not include copyrights on published papers which are listed above.)

G. Collaborations with scholars outside KSU

H. Research awards or special recognitions

OTHER

Provide any additional information which you would like to have included in your annual evaluation.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF OTHER FACULTY

In a separate document or e-mail, please credit faculty members who have contributed to your professional development during the last year by writing a concise paragraph concerning these contributions. This information will be kept confidential.

APPENDIX B

AESD Annual faculty evaluation scores

Research and Scholarly activity

In the area of research and scholarly activity, the following standards will apply:

5: Exceptional Merit : publication of a solo-authored scholarly book* or textbook, or publication of two or more peer-reviewed articles.

4: Exceeds Expectations: publication of one peer-reviewed article (in addition to at least one of the following: research travel, conference presentations, keynote address, plenary address, research awards, research grants, etc.)

3: Meets Expectations acceptance of one peer-reviewed article and/or documented evidence of research progress (in addition to at least one of the following: research travel, conference presentations, keynote address, plenary address, research awards, research grants, etc.)

2: Needs Improvement: Report of ongoing research without documentation

1: Fails to Meet Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity.

*To receive ongoing credit for progress on a solo authored book the faculty member must include the following: The name of the project, the number of years for which credit has been claimed. This will allow the Promotion & Tenure Committee to track on-going progress for books. Clear and concrete evidence of progress, such as completed book chapters is required before credit can be allotted. Once the book is published, an additional three consecutive years of Exceptional Merit (4) will be awarded. The faculty member must indicate the number of years for which credit has already been claimed. The faculty member can enhance that rating through evidence of other scholarly activity.

Service

Although contributions in service may be considered for evaluation at several levels (departmental, university, professional, and community) departmental service should have priority over other forms of service.

5: Exceptional Merit: Outstanding contributions to department in addition to contribution to one or more additional areas (university, profession, or community).

4: Exceeds Expectations: Outstanding contributions to department (for example, chairing department committees, advising a DSO, representing the department at university events

3: Meets Expectations: Acceptable contributions to the department (for example, attendance at meetings, department functions, and fulfill assigned service responsibilities)

2 Needs Improvement: Minimal contributions to the department

1 Below 1.0 Fails to Meet Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Service.

Teaching

There is a wide range of teaching evidence that can serve to evaluate teaching, including:

TEVALS

Tests or other course materials

Student papers, student portfolios, and student presentations

Information on awards won by students

MA theses or PhD theses supervised during evaluation year

Statement of teaching philosophy

Peer course observations and evaluations

An explanation in case of a disagreement with the student evaluation of the course

Reference to recent developments in the field which were utilized

Materials accounting for the supervision of an independent study and/or other mentoring (e.g. developing scholars program)

Funding letter for grants related to teaching and learning

Nomination and/or receipt of a teaching award

5: Exceptional Merit: exceptional teaching as established by various criteria described above, Plus at least two of the following: innovative assignments, new course preparation, creative use of technology, participatory action research.

4: Exceeds Expectations: very good teaching as established by various criteria described above, plus one of the following: innovative assignments, new course preparation, creative use of technology, participatory action research.

3 Meets Expectations : good teaching as established by various criteria described above, and reflections based on feedback. However, no evidence of innovative assignments, new course preparation, no creative use of technology, no participatory action research, or other creative forms of pedagogy.

2 Needs Improvement: as established by various criteria described above. The above categories of evidence used to evaluate teaching reveal a need for improvement in two different ways.

1 Fails to Meet Minimum-Acceptable Teaching levels as established by various criteria described above. The above categories of evidence used to evaluate teaching reveal a need for improvement in three or more categories.

Gender, Women, & Sexuality Studies
Department

Arts & Sciences
College

Policy Statement Concerning:

Personnel Review and Evaluation Standards/Procedures

- Performance Evaluation Criteria
- Annual Evaluation
- Reappointment Evaluation for:
 - Annual Reappointment Reviews
 - Mid-Tenure Review
- Tenure
- Promotion
- Professorial Performance Award
- Chronic Low Achievement
- Post-Tenure Review
- Non-Tenure Track Faculty Titles

Approved by Faculty Vote on (02/24/20)

NEXT REVIEW DATE:

Christie Rannius

Department Head's Signature

6/2/20

Date

Amit Chavrabh.

Dean's Signature

6-3-2020

Date

Chaz

Provost's Signature

6/3/2020

Date

II. Introduction

Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies is an interdisciplinary field dedicated to the analysis of personal experiences and social institutions as they shape and are shaped by the intersections of gender, sex, sexuality, race, ethnicity, citizenship status, class, (dis)ability, as well as colonialism, imperialism, and globalization. This analysis enables both understandings of oppression as well as visions of social equity and justice.

The mission of the department is to foster campus, community, state, national, global and transnational examinations of diversity, focused on but not limited to gender, women and sexuality; to provide students with feminist, queer, and trans frameworks to examine themselves and their society and to prepare them for further study and careers in a variety of disciplines and professions; and to promote excellence in interdisciplinary research that applies intersectional understandings of power, knowledge, and identity.

This document describes the procedures, standards, and criteria for reappointment, mid-tenure review, and review for tenure and promotion of tenure-track faculty, reappointment and promotion for regular faculty in non-tenure earning ranks, and annual review of part- and full-time temporary, visiting and regular, tenured, and tenure-track faculty in Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies (GWSS).

III. Faculty Identity

The Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies Department includes a number of positions and ranks. These include tenure-track and tenured, as well as non-tenure-track faculty. Non-tenure track positions include:

- Teaching Assistant Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, and Teaching Professor
- Instructor, Advanced Instructor, and Senior Instructor

Non-tenure-track faculty members with primary responsibilities in teaching and advising students may be recruited, hired, and appointed into regular or term positions. Initial appointment rank and subsequent promotions in rank are based on advanced degree(s) held, experience, performance, and achievements over time at a given rank. Note: Candidates for all of the Teaching Professor ranks must hold a terminal degree.

Voting members of the Department shall be the steering committee, comprised of:

- a. Core faculty, defined as those holding an appointment in GWSS that is presumed to extend for more than a year: Regularized Instructors, Teaching Professors, Visiting Professors, Tenure-Track, and Tenured faculty.
- b. Elected members of the affiliated faculty.

Steering Committee

Membership: The committee will consist of the GWSS core faculty, along with three elected representatives from the affiliated faculty. Preference will be given to having one of the three elected members be un-tenured, with the goal of having multiple constituencies and perspectives represented. The department Head will serve as the chair of the committee.

Responsibilities: The Steering Committee, in conjunction with the Head, shall set policy on matters of curriculum, programs, recruitment, assessment, fiscal matters, fund raising, and long-range planning. The Steering Committee also plays a role in personnel matters. Members of the Steering Committee at the appropriate rank review the files of regularized instructors and teaching professors undergoing reappointment and/or seeking promotion before making a recommendation to the Head. In addition, members of the Steering Committee at the appropriate rank will consider the recommendations of a candidate's promotion and tenure committee before voting on reappointment and promotion and tenure cases and making a recommendation to the Head, in the cases of those seeking tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate professor. The Steering Committee ordinarily meets four times a semester.

Election to the Steering Committee

Each spring, the Department Head will circulate a call for nominations to the core and affiliated faculty. Faculty may nominate themselves or other affiliated faculty members; after confirming that those nominated accept the nomination, the core faculty will vote. Elected members' terms will begin the following fall semester.

Elected members of the steering committee, drawn from the affiliated faculty, will serve 3-year terms. Effort will be made to stagger the terms so that there is overlap between new and returning committee members.

Committee members may be nominated to serve a second term. Any committee members who serve two consecutive 3-year terms may be nominated to serve again two years after rotating off of the committee.

If a member of the steering committee needs to step down temporarily, another affiliated faculty member may replace them during their absence, following approval of the core faculty. If a member of the steering committee needs to step down permanently, another affiliated faculty member may replace them for the duration of their elected term, following approval of the core faculty.

Note: ALL affiliated faculty are invited and encouraged to attend and participate in meetings of the steering committee, but only members will vote.

IV. Annual Merit Evaluation Process

- a. The evaluation committee will be the core faculty, functioning as the merit evaluation committee.
- b. Early in each evaluation period, the head will meet with each faculty member and review their individual goals in the three areas of teaching, research, and service.
- c. Once goals are set and on file, they can be modified midway through the evaluation period. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ask the head to consider the modifications.

- d. Each year, all faculty members are required to submit a vita and an annual Activity Report (following a template provided by the Head), and other supporting documentation requested by the Head or included by the faculty member.
- e. Faculty who are on sabbatical for any part of the evaluation period have the option of filing an Activity Report for that period or accepting the average merit evaluation from the most recent three evaluation periods.
- f. These documents are reviewed by the merit evaluation committee, in consultation with the Head, and a recommendation is made by the committee to the Head in which faculty are assigned an evaluation for each of their assigned areas (at least teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service) and an overall evaluation, using the following scale: Exceptional Merit; Exceeds Expectations; Meets Expectations; Needs Improvement; Fails to Meet Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity.
- g. The Head, based on the recommendation of the committee, prepares a written evaluation of each faculty member. The Head converts the evaluation to a numeric value (Exceptional Merit = 5; Exceeds Expectations = 4, etc.), and creates a 3-year average based on the current year's evaluation and the previous two years.
- h. The Head gives a written copy of the annual merit evaluation to each faculty member.
- i. Each faculty member makes an appointment with the Head at which the evaluation is discussed (and possibly modified by mutual agreement). In the event of a disagreement between the faculty member and the Head concerning the letter of evaluation or the rating, the faculty member has the right to append their viewpoint within seven working days of receiving the letter of evaluation, by submitting a written addendum to the Head.
- j. Each faculty member signs the evaluation, indicating that they had the opportunity to review it and discuss it with the Head.
- k. The Head signs and forwards the evaluation to the Dean of Arts & Sciences.
- l. Criteria for distribution of merit increases: in accordance with the University Handbook, section C46.2: The unit head will recommend a salary adjustment for each person evaluated. The recommended percentage increases based on the annual evaluation for persons with higher levels of accomplishment shall exceed those for persons with lower levels of accomplishment. The percentage recommended for persons in the first category will be higher than that for the second category, which in turn shall exceed those for level of accomplishment in the third category, etc.
- m. Note: the annual merit evaluation process also provides the opportunity for non-tenure track faculty members to receive feedback regarding their progress toward promotion, as outlined in V.a.vi. through V.a.x.

V. Standards and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, Professorial Performance Awards, and out-of-load course assessment of GWSS tenured/tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty and instructors

Tenure and Promotion Committee Review and Report

The Head shall appoint a Tenure and Promotion Committee for each tenure-track candidate composed of three tenured faculty members; members of this committee can come from the core GWSS faculty as well as affiliated faculty. This committee shall study-all relevant materials and prepare a report and recommendation. Relevant

materials include the documentation assembled by the candidate, the responses of the outside evaluators (in the case of tenure and promotion), and records of any earlier evaluations. The committee may request any other information it needs from the candidate. Before distributing its report to the Steering Committee, members of the Tenure and Promotion committee will share it with the candidate and give them a chance to ask questions; the committee will also consider any changes the candidate may wish to suggest.

Non-Tenure-Track Promotion Committee and Report

The Head shall appoint a non-tenure-track promotion committee for each non-tenure-track faculty member seeking promotion. This committee shall consist of 3 full-time faculty members in the GWSS Department at or above the rank of the candidate seeking promotion (e.g. Associate Professor, Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, Teaching Professor, Advanced Instructor, and Senior Instructor for those seeking promotion from Assistant to Associate Teaching Professor or from Instructor to Advanced Instructor), with the expectation that all members of the committee will have a proven record of teaching excellence. This committee shall thoroughly review the file of the candidate seeking promotion and write a report containing their recommendations. Before providing its report to the Steering Committee, the promotion committee will share it with the candidate and give them a chance to ask questions; the committee will also consider any changes the candidate may wish to suggest.

- a. Standards for Reappointment, Mid-tenure Review, Tenure, Promotion, Professorial Performance Award, and Out-of-Load Evaluation
 - i. Standards for tenure-track reappointment in First and Second Year
 1. Candidates must show evidence of effective teaching that contributes to the mission of the department, including syllabi, examples of student work, examinations, student (required) and/or peer evaluations, reflective self-evaluation, and a summary of any revisions based on experience and input and the outcomes of those revisions. Some measures of successful teaching might include the intellectual rigor of their courses, special awards, pedagogical innovations, and similar considerations.
 2. Evidence of research/scholarship/creative activity may include any of a variety of projects related to Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies, including grants or research awards supporting scholarly work, publication of scholarly articles in refereed journals, manuscripts products of creative activity, and the like.
 3. Publications (articles, presentations, and the like) in other disciplines will also fulfill Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies publication requirements if they treat issues of gender, women, or sexuality.
 4. Evidence of service may include activities in the Department, the college, the university, and in professional and public service.

5. Evidence of interdisciplinarity may include any of a variety of forms in either scholarship or teaching, through such activities as interdisciplinary Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies colloquia, courses, and seminars; presentations at conferences and regional or national professional associations focusing on gender, women, or sexuality; or equivalent contact with the literature (editorial board of a Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies journal or newsletter); community service and applied research and collaborative projects/grant work with faculty from various disciplines; and ongoing contact with scholars in Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies beyond the boundaries of any single field.
- ii. Standards for Mid-tenure review (in the third year)
 1. Candidates must show evidence of an ongoing record of excellence in teaching that contributes to the mission of the department, including syllabi, examples of student work, examinations, student (required) and/or peer evaluations, reflective self-evaluation, and a summary of any revisions based on experience and input and the outcomes of those revisions. Some measures of successful teaching might include the intellectual rigor of their courses, special awards, pedagogical innovations, and similar considerations.
 2. Candidates should have at least one refereed article accepted for publication. (Publication of one article is a minimum standard for acceptance to the university's graduate faculty). In addition, any of the various kinds of evidence of research/scholarship/creative activity used for reappointment may also be considered.
 3. Candidates should provide evidence of service, including activities in the department, the college, the university, and in professional and public service.
 4. Candidates should provide evidence of interdisciplinarity that may include any of a variety of forms in either scholarship or teaching, through such activities as interdisciplinary Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies colloquia, courses, and seminars; presentations at conferences and regional or national professional associations focusing on women, gender, and sexuality; or equivalent contact with the literature (editorial board of a Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies journal or newsletter), community service and applied research and collaborative projects/grant work with faculty from various disciplines, and ongoing contact with scholars in Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies beyond the boundaries of any single field.
 - iii. Standards for Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure (before or during sixth year)
 1. Candidates must demonstrate clear, sustained scholarly performance that indicates a high probability of continued research productivity, with some, though not necessarily all,

in a Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies area. Publications (articles, presentations, and the like) in other disciplines will also fulfill Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies publication requirements if they relate to women, gender, and sexuality. Candidates should have at least four (4) articles in refereed journals or collections or the equivalent.

2. Candidates must show evidence of an ongoing record of excellence in teaching that contributes to the mission of the department, including syllabi, examples of student work, examinations, student (required) and/or peer evaluations, reflective self-evaluation, and a summary of any revisions based on experience and input and the outcomes of those revisions. Some measures of successful teaching might include the intellectual rigor of their courses, special awards, pedagogical innovations, and similar considerations.
3. Candidates must show evidence of significant and ongoing service contributions that include activities within at least two of the following areas: department or program, college, university, and professional and public service.

iv. Standards for Promotion to Professor

1. The rank of professor presupposes a superior record in all areas of faculty activity. Candidates are expected to demonstrate leadership in their assigned responsibilities. The standards for promotion to full professor are substantially higher than those for promotion to associate professor.
2. Candidates must demonstrate significant research/scholarship/creative activity since the last promotion. It is expected that the candidate's sustained scholarly performance has resulted in a national or international reputation in some area of Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies. This can be demonstrated by discussions of and references to their work in the scholarly literature, invitations to give lectures or performances, presentations of papers or exhibits, contributions of articles to edited collections, requests to referee manuscripts, and the like. The minimum expectations since the last promotion are either: (1) a book; or (2) five peer-reviewed articles; or (3) a reasonable equivalent thereof. Accomplishments in other disciplines will also fulfill Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies requirements if they treat issues of gender, women, and/or sexuality.
3. Candidates must show evidence of an ongoing record of excellence in teaching that contributes to the mission of the department, including syllabi, examples of student work, examinations, student (required) and/or peer evaluations, reflective self-evaluation, and a summary of any revisions based on experience and input and the outcomes of those

revisions. Some measures of successful teaching might include the intellectual rigor of their courses, special awards, pedagogical innovations, student evaluations, and similar considerations.

4. Candidates must show evidence of significant and ongoing service contributions that include activities within at least two of the following areas: department or Department, college, university, and professional and public service. The candidate will be expected to show that she or he has regularly and willingly accepted service assignments and has successfully performed their duties since the last promotion.
- v. Standards for Professorial Performance Award
1. The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at Kansas State at least six years since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award;
 2. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review;
 3. The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards.
- vi. Standards for annual reappointment of regular non-tenure-track faculty (Instructors and Teaching Professors)
1. Candidates must show evidence of an ongoing record of excellence in teaching that contributes to the mission of the department, including syllabi, examples of student work, examinations, student (required) and/or peer evaluations, reflective self-evaluation, and a summary of any revisions based on experience and input and the outcomes of those revisions. Some measures of successful teaching might include the intellectual rigor of their courses, special awards, pedagogical innovations, and similar considerations.
 2. Evidence of research/scholarship/creative activity may include any of a variety of projects related to Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies, including Scholarship of Teaching and Learning projects, publication in forums (journals, refereed blogs, etc.) devoted to publishing work about teaching and student learning, conference presentations about teaching and student learning, publication of scholarly articles in refereed journals, manuscripts products of creative activity, and the like.
 3. Candidates should provide evidence of service in the department. Candidates may also include any service performed for the college, the university, and/or professional and public service.
 4. Note: Specific standards for reappointment in non-tenure-track positions will be dependent on candidates' assignment,

i.e. what percentage of their appointment is devoted to teaching, service, and research (if any).

vii. Standards for promotion from Teaching Assistant Professor to Teaching Associate Professor

1. Candidates must show evidence of an ongoing record of excellence in teaching that contributes to the mission of the department, including syllabi, examples of student work, examinations, student (required) and/or peer evaluations, reflective self-evaluation, and a summary of any revisions based on experience and input and the outcomes of those revisions. Some measures of successful teaching might include the intellectual rigor of their courses, special awards, pedagogical innovations, and similar considerations.
2. Candidates must show evidence of significant and ongoing service contributions to the department. Candidates may also include any service performed for the college, the university, and/or professional and public service.
3. Evidence of research/scholarship/creative activity may include any of a variety of projects related to Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies, including Scholarship of Teaching and Learning projects, publication in forums (journals, refereed blogs, etc.) devoted to publishing work about teaching and student learning, conference presentations about teaching and student learning, publication of scholarly articles in refereed journals, manuscripts, products of creative activity, and the like.
4. Note: specific standards for research/scholarship/creative activity, e.g. number and kinds of publications, will be dependent on candidates' assignment, i.e. what percentage of their appointment is devoted to this area.

viii. Standards for promotion from Teaching Associate Professor to Teaching Professor

1. Candidates must show evidence of an ongoing record of excellence in teaching that contributes to the mission of the department, including syllabi, examples of student work, examinations, student (required) and/or peer evaluations, reflective self-evaluation, and a summary of any revisions based on experience and input and the outcomes of those revisions. Some measures of successful teaching might include the intellectual rigor of their courses, special awards, pedagogical innovations, and similar considerations.
2. Candidates must show evidence of significant and ongoing service contributions to the department. Candidates may also include any service performed for the college, the university, and/or professional and public service. The candidate will be expected to show that they have regularly and willingly

- accepted service assignments and have successfully performed their duties since the last promotion.
3. Candidates must demonstrate significant research/scholarship/creative activity since the last promotion. It is expected that the candidate will have achieved national recognition and visibility as a scholar in some area of Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies and/or the scholarship of teaching and learning. This can be demonstrated by discussions of and references to their work in the scholarly literature, invitations to give teaching workshops, presentations of papers or exhibits, contributions of articles to edited collections, requests to referee manuscripts, and the like.
 4. Note: specific standards for research/scholarship/creative activity, e.g. number and kinds of publications, will be dependent on candidates' assignment, i.e. what percentage of their appointment is devoted to this area.
- ix. Standards for promotion from Instructor to Advanced Instructor
1. Candidates must show evidence of an ongoing record of effective teaching, including syllabi, examples of student work, examinations, student (required) and/or peer evaluations, reflective self-evaluation, and a summary of any revisions based on experience and input and the outcomes of those revisions.
 2. Candidates should provide evidence of service in the department. Candidates may also include any service performed for the college, the university, and/or professional and public service.
- x. Standards for promotion from Advanced Instructor to Senior Instructor
1. Candidates must show evidence of an ongoing record of excellence in teaching that contributes to the mission of the department, including syllabi, examples of student work, examinations, student (required) and/or peer evaluations, reflective self-evaluation, and a summary of any revisions based on experience and input and the outcomes of those revisions. Some measures of successful teaching might include the intellectual rigor of their courses, special awards, pedagogical innovations, and similar considerations.
 2. Candidates should provide evidence of service in the department. Candidates may also include any service performed for the college, the university, and/or professional and public service. The candidate will be expected to show that they have regularly and willingly accepted service assignments and have successfully performed their duties since the last promotion.
- xi. Standards for Assessment of Out-of-Load Courses

1. Instructors of courses taught outside of the regular load for full-time faculty (for example, courses taught by GTAs, temporary and visiting faculty members, regular faculty teaching out-of-load or over-load, or others teaching classes for Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies through Global Campus or summer school) will be required to demonstrate that the course satisfied departmental expectations for its level.
- b. Procedures for Annual Reappointment, Mid-Tenure Review, Tenure and Promotion, Professorial Performance Award, and Out-of-Load Evaluation
- i. Tenure-track reappointment evaluation
 1. Dates and timelines for reappointment are established by the university. Pre-tenure faculty are considered for reappointment during the spring semester of their first year (for year two), once during the fall (for year three) and again during the spring of their second year (for year four), and during the spring semester in subsequent years until tenure, in accordance with university deadlines.
 2. Early in each evaluation period, the Head will meet with each non-tenured faculty member and review their individual goals in the three areas of teaching, research/ scholarship/creative activity, and service.
 3. Once goals are set and on file, they can be modified midway through the evaluation period. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ask the Head to consider the modifications.
 4. At the appropriate time, the faculty member is requested to submit a reappointment narrative using the template for submission of the tenure document for review by the Tenure and Promotion Committee and, subsequently, tenured members of the Steering Committee
 5. The Tenure and Promotion Committee will review the materials and evaluate the faculty member's materials for compliance with the unit's criteria and standards.
 6. Following its review, the committee will prepare a written evaluative report, which will accompany the committee's recommendations.
 7. Before providing its report to the Steering Committee, the Tenure and Promotion committee will share it with the candidate and give them a chance to ask questions; the committee will also consider any changes the candidate may wish to suggest.
 8. Within seven days following the meeting between the committee and the faculty member, the Head will request tenured members of the Steering Committee to review the materials and submit a written recommendation to the Head concerning the reappointment.

9. The Head, after receiving the recommendations, will forward a recommendation to the Dean of Arts & Sciences by letter, with unedited comments from the faculty recommendations enclosed.
 10. The Head will communicate, both in writing and orally, the substance of the recommendation to both the faculty member and the Steering Committee.
- ii. Procedures for Mid-Tenure Review
1. During the third year, probationary faculty undergo a mid-tenure review.
 2. The faculty member is responsible for compiling a file and submitting it to the head at least two weeks prior to the scheduled meeting of the Tenure and Promotion Committee.
 3. The file should, in general, include the following items and information:
 - a. documentation of instructional activity: list of courses taught; course syllabi; examinations; information on curriculum and/or course development activities; listing of advisees; listing of thesis and dissertation committees (indicating chairship where appropriate); student ratings from all course; and other relevant documentation of effective teaching;
 - b. documentation of research/scholarship/creative activity: copies of manuscripts published, accepted for publication (including letter from editor), or under review; grant proposals submitted (indicating disposition); documents related to research grants in progress; and other evidence of research/scholarship/creative efforts;
 - c. documentation of service activity: list of institutional, professional, and public service activities, with notation of specific contribution.
 4. The Tenure and Promotion Committee will review the materials and evaluate the faculty member's materials for compliance with the standards for mid-tenure review.
 5. Following its review, the committee will prepare a written report, which will accompany the committee's recommendations.
 6. Before providing its report to the Steering Committee, the Tenure and Promotion committee will share it with the candidate and give them a chance to ask questions; the committee will also consider any changes the candidate may wish to suggest.
 7. Within seven days following the meeting between the committee and the faculty member, the Head will request tenured members of the Steering Committee to review the

materials and submit a written recommendation to the Head concerning the reappointment.

8. The Head, after receiving the recommendations, will forward a recommendation to the Dean of Arts & Sciences by letter, with unedited comments from the Steering Committee appended.
9. The Head will communicate, both in writing and orally, the substance of the recommendation to both the faculty member and the Steering Committee.

iii. Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

1. During or before the sixth year, probationary faculty will undergo a review for tenure and promotion.
2. The Head will provide the candidate with the description of their responsibilities during the review period and this description will accompany the file throughout the review process.
3. The candidate is responsible for compiling a file and submitting it with a current vita and the university "Tenure and Promotion Documentation" form to the Head in early summer. The candidate must also submit a list of up to six potential outside reviewers. The list should consist of the names of highly regarded professionals in the faculty person's discipline and research specialty. In the vita, the faculty member should distinguish refereed from non-refereed publications and the exact citations for published work should be provided (including the original order in which authors are listed).
4. The Department Head will select at least three outside reviewers who will be asked to evaluate the candidate's accomplishments in research/scholarship/creative activity. The Department Head will make a good faith effort to secure letters from at least two of the people on the list provided by the candidate. The Head will provide the outside reviewers with the candidate's vita, samples of published work, a description of the candidate's responsibilities during the review period and assurance that it is our policy that the identity of reviewers are held in confidence. The candidate should expect that peer evaluations will not be available to them. These letters will become part of the file that is reviewed by the Tenure and Promotion Committee.
5. See V. a. iii "Standards for Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure" for information about what the candidate's file should contain.
6. The Tenure and Promotion Committee will review the materials and evaluate the candidate's materials' compliance with the standards for tenure and promotion review.

7. Following its review, the committee will prepare a written report, which will accompany the committee's recommendations.
8. Before providing its report to the Steering Committee, the Tenure and Promotion committee will share it with the candidate and give them a chance to ask questions; the committee will also consider any changes the candidate may wish to suggest.
9. Within seven days following the meeting between the committee and the candidate, the Head will request tenured members of the Steering Committee to review the materials and submit a written recommendation to the Head concerning the granting of tenure and promotion.
10. The Head, after receiving the recommendations, will forward a recommendation to the Dean of Arts & Sciences, by letter, with the numerical vote of the tenured members of the Steering Committee and their unedited comments appended.
11. The Head will communicate, both in writing and orally, the substance of the recommendation to both the candidate and the tenured faculty.

iv. Procedures for Promotion to Professor

1. In consultation with the Head, tenured Associate Professors may apply for promotion to Professor.
2. The Head will provide the candidate with the description of their responsibilities during the review period and this description will accompany the file throughout the review process.
3. The candidate is responsible for compiling a file and submitting it with a current vita and the university "Tenure and Promotion Documentation" form to the Head in early summer. The candidate must also submit a list of up to six potential outside reviewers. The list should consist of the names of highly regarded professionals in the faculty person's discipline and research specialty.
4. See V. a. iv "Standards for Promotion to Professor" for information about what the candidate's file should contain.
5. The Department Head will select at least three outside reviewers who will be asked to evaluate the candidate's accomplishments in research/scholarship/creative activity. The Department Head will make a good faith effort to secure letters from at least two of the people on the list provided by the candidate. The Head will provide the outside reviewers with the candidate's vita, samples of published work, a description of the candidate's responsibilities during the review period and assurance that it is our policy that the identity of reviewers are held in confidence. The candidate

should expect that peer evaluations will not be available to them. These letters will become part of the file that is reviewed by the Promotion Committee.

6. The Head will appoint a Promotion Committee. All members of the GWSS core faculty at the rank of Professor will serve; if there are fewer than five, the Head will choose from among the affiliated faculty at the rank of Professor. Note: If no members of the GWSS core faculty are at the rank of Professor, the committee will be comprised solely of affiliated faculty members at the rank of Professor.
7. The members of the promotion committee will evaluate the candidate's file and prepare a written report and recommendation.
8. The Promotion committee will share the report with the candidate and give them a chance to ask questions; the committee will also consider any changes the candidate may wish to suggest.
9. The Head, after receiving the promotion committee's recommendation, will forward a recommendation to the Dean of Arts and Sciences, by letter, with the numerical vote of the committee and their unedited comments appended.
10. If the Head is the candidate seeking promotion to Professor, a member of the affiliated GWSS faculty at the rank of Professor who is not serving on the Promotion committee will perform the function of the Head.

v. Procedures for the Professorial Performance Award

1. Recommendations for the Professorial Performance Award will follow the timeline associated with the annual evaluation (Merit) review.
2. Eligible candidates for review compile and submit a file that documents her or his professional accomplishments for at least the previous six years. The department Head will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials in terms of the criteria, standards, and guidelines established, along with a recommendation for or against the award.
3. Each candidate for the award will have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the department head, and each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, each candidate has the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation to the department head and to the dean. A copy of the department head's written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate.

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

- vi. Procedures for annual reappointment of non-tenure-track faculty (Teaching Professors and Instructors)
 1. Faculty members on regular non-tenure-track appointments are evaluated annually to determine whether or not they will be reappointed for another year (see C60-C66 of the University Handbook).
 2. Early in each evaluation period, the Head will meet with each non-tenure-track faculty member and review their individual goals in the three areas of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service.
 3. Once goals are set and on file, they can be modified midway through the evaluation period. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ask the Head to consider the modifications.
 4. At the appropriate time, the candidate compiles and submits documentation of their professional accomplishments in accordance with the standards outlined above in V.a.vi.
 5. The Department Head makes the candidate's file available to eligible members of the department's Steering Committee. Eligible members of the steering committee will include those at a rank higher than the candidate (including both tenured faculty members and non-tenure-track members).
 6. Members of the Steering Committee will review the candidate's materials and evaluate them for compliance with the unit's standards.
 7. Following its review, the committee will prepare a written evaluative report, which will accompany the committee's recommendations.
 8. Before providing its report to the Steering Committee, the Tenure and Promotion committee will share it with the candidate and give them a chance to ask questions; the committee will also consider any changes the candidate may wish to suggest.
 9. The Head, after receiving the report and recommendations of the Steering Committee, will forward a recommendation to

- the Dean of Arts & Sciences by letter, with unedited comments from the faculty recommendations enclosed.
10. The Head will communicate, both in writing and orally, the substance of the recommendation to both the faculty member and the Steering Committee.
- vii. Procedures for Promotion for non-tenure-track faculty (Teaching Professors and Instructors)
1. The procedures for promotion in the non-tenure track Instructor and Teaching Professor ranks are similar to the processes for promotion of tenure-track/tenured faculty in the University Handbook (see sections C110-C116.2 and c150-C156.2).
 2. The average time in rank interval prior to consideration for promotion is expected to be 5 years, although shorter and longer intervals are possible.
 3. The Head will solicit a file from each candidate seeking promotion that documents activities and achievements in instruction, service, and research.
 4. The candidate should include in the file a listing of goals and objectives that will guide professional activities for the next five years.
 5. The file will be provided to the non-tenure-track promotion committee for their evaluation.
 6. Following their evaluation, the committee will prepare a written report, which will accompany their recommendations.
 7. Before providing its report to the Steering Committee, the Tenure and Promotion committee will share it with the candidate and give them a chance to ask questions; the committee will also consider any changes the candidate may wish to suggest.
 8. Within seven days following the meeting between the committee and the faculty member, the Head will request that the Steering Committee review the file and submit a written recommendation to the Head concerning the promotion.
 9. The Head, after receiving the recommendations, will forward the candidate's file, along with a recommendation to the Dean of Arts & Sciences, with a record of the votes, as well as the unedited comments from the Steering Committee's recommendations appended.
 10. The Head will communicate the substance of the recommendation to both the faculty member and the Steering Committee.
- viii. Procedures for Evaluation of Courses taught by GTAs, temporary, and visiting faculty members, and out-of-load courses taught by faculty members:

1. All courses taught outside a full-time faculty member's regular, salaried teaching load (for example, courses taught by GTAs, temporary and visiting faculty members, regular faculty teaching out-of-load, or others teaching classes for Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies through Global Campus or summer school) will be reviewed separately, by the merit evaluation committee, during the same calendar period in which that committee reviews merit materials.
2. Teachers of such classes will be asked, upon conclusion of the relevant course to submit to the department the following materials:
 - a. the course syllabus
 - b. official student evaluations from all students
 - c. a self-reflection narrative about the course
 - d. any other materials they wish (sample lesson plans, paper assignments, exams, grading rubrics, sample responses to student work, etc.)
3. If the pertinent course is taught by a salaried faculty member, the materials may be submitted at the same time as merit review/reappointment materials, rather than upon conclusion of the specific course; but they should be provided separately and labeled as "Out-of-Load" teaching.
4. The merit committee will examine these materials in order to ascertain either:
 - a. the course satisfied departmental expectations for its level
 - b. the course did not satisfy departmental expectations for its level, for the following reasons: (list)
5. The Merit Committee will submit to the Head a short form for each course. This information will be used in overall Department oversight, and in making decisions regarding repeat offering of the course or re-hiring of the teacher, as applicable.
6. This procedure is separate from assessment that may be conducted in particular courses as part of the departmental rotation of assessing our Department's SLOs.

VI. Chronic Low Achievement

Guidelines for Identifying and Handling Cases of Tenured Faculty Who Fail to Meet Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity

Following section C31.5 of the University Handbook, the Merit Evaluation Committee will make a determination of when a tenured faculty member's overall performance falls below the minimum-acceptable level, and it will advise the Department Head accordingly. (This would normally happen as part of the annual merit evaluation

process when a tenured faculty member receives a rating of “Fails to Meet Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity,” but could potentially take place outside of that process.) The Head will indicate this, in writing, to the faculty member. The Head will also provide to the faculty member a suggested course of action for the improvement of performance. This document will be developed with the advice and consent of the Merit Evaluation Committee. The Head and the faculty member will meet together to ensure that the faculty member understands and agrees with the course of action. Minor modifications in the course of action can be made at this time with the agreement of the Head and the faculty member. In subsequent evaluations, the faculty member will report, in writing, on activities aimed at improving performance as stipulated in the course of action and provide any evidence of improvement. If the Merit Evaluation Committee determines that the faculty member has fallen below minimum standards in the subsequent year or three times within a five-year period, unless the faculty member does not wish it, a meeting of the Department’s tenured faculty will be held in order to review the Merit Evaluation Committee’s decision. After reviewing the Merit Evaluation Committee documents and any other relevant information, with the faculty member permitted to be present, members of the tenured faculty will vote to reject or accept the evaluation of “Fails to Meet Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity.” Voting will be by signed ballot, as in the tenure and promotion process. To accept, two-thirds of the tenured faculty members present (including proxies) must vote to concur with the evaluation. (The Head will not participate in the voting.) Any number short of two-thirds will indicate rejection of the evaluation. The Head will take this vote under advisement in rendering a final decision. In the event that the faculty member decides not to have the tenured faculty review their case, the Head will decide whether or not to accept the evaluation. In reaching this decision, the Head may seek the advice of the Merit Evaluation Committee and the tenured faculty. If accepted, the name of the faculty member will be forwarded to the Dean.

Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity in Teaching, Service, and Research for Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies

Yearly expectations will be decided on an individual basis in accordance with the provost’s policy for each faculty member to set their own yearly goals depending on their individual assignment. General guidelines and procedures for minimal standards are as follows:

Teaching

1. All faculty will provide instruction appropriate to fulfill the mission of the Department.
2. All faculty will provide students with the following for each course they teach:
 - a. what the aims or purposes of the course are;
 - b. how the course will be organized; and
 - c. how the students will be evaluated.
3. All faculty will meet regularly scheduled classes except for:
 - a. illness, accident, or attendance at professional meetings;
 - b. occasional times where other forms of instruction are scheduled during, or in lieu of, class time such as individual conferences, a film too long to be shown during class, a work day for students to use the library.
4. All faculty will hold regularly scheduled office hours.
5. All faculty will arrange for student evaluations of teaching according to university regulations.
6. Faculty shall advise students conscientiously.

Research and Scholarship

Depending on one's individual assignment or rank, faculty will participate in any of the following:

1. researching, writing, editing, and/or publishing scholarly, critical, creative, or pedagogical work;
2. presenting such work at local, state, regional, national, or international meetings;
3. integrating the results of research or scholarship into teaching or service;
4. integrating new knowledge learned at professional meetings into teaching or service.

Service

All faculty will participate in Department, college, university, professional or community service, which may include, but is not necessarily limited to, any of the following:

1. attending departmental faculty meetings
2. attending departmental and university events including Open House, Majors Fair, and lectures
3. participating on any of the Department's standing or ad hoc committees;
4. taking on any special assignment arranged with the Head;
5. participating, as an office on boards, or in other ways, in professional organizations, or publishers;
6. providing professionally-related community service

VII. Post-tenure review

Purpose:

The purpose of post-tenure review at Kansas State University is to enhance the continued professional development of tenured faculty. The process is intended to encourage intellectual vitality and professional proficiency for all members of the faculty throughout their careers, so they may more effectively fill the mission of the university. It is also designed to enhance public trust in the University by ensuring that the faculty community regularly 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 action undertaken 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.

Process:

1. Timing:

This review process will occur for each faculty member every six years following the granting of tenure, unless one of the following occurs:

- Promotion to full professor
- Receipt of Professorial Performance Award
- Promotion to University Distinguished Professor

Any of these shall restart the clock for the post-tenure review process outlined here, so that this review would take place 6 years after the accomplishment listed above (which contains its own review process).

2. Process:

STEP ONE: The faculty member will turn in the following materials to the department head:

- Copies of the annual evaluation reviews from the previous 6 years
- A cv
- ½ to 1 page of goals for the next 6 years

STEP TWO: The faculty member and the department head will discuss these materials as part of the annual professional development conversations between faculty members and head.

STEP THREE: Following that annual professional development conversation, the department head and faculty member will sign the Post-Tenure Review form.

Documentation:

The faculty member will keep one copy of the signed Post-Tenure Review form and one copy will be kept in the Personnel File of the faculty member, along with the materials submitted in Step One.

POST-TENURE REVIEW FORM

The signatures below confirm that:

I. Previous 6 annual merit reviews' overall assessment are all "meeting expectations" or higher and faculty member has continuing professional development goals.

-- or --

Previous 6 annual merit reviews' overall assessment are not all "meeting expectations" or higher, and a plan has been developed to address areas of concern and continue general professional development.

II. A professional development conversation has taken place between the faculty member and the department head.

III. The materials provided for this review, and this form, are kept in the personnel file of the faculty member.

Department Head, signature

date

Department Head, printed name

Faculty member, signature

date

Faculty member, printed name