

GUIDELINES FOR THE ORGANIZATION AND FORMAT OF TENURE AND PROMOTION DOCUMENTATION

Kansas State University

Purpose and Scope

These guidelines establish a common organizational framework for tenure and/or promotion documentation at Kansas State University. They do not define evaluative standards, criteria, or thresholds for tenure or promotion. Such standards are defined in approved departmental documents, which govern expectations for evidence, quality, and performance. These guidelines function within the framework established by the University Handbook ([Section C](#) and [Appendix Q](#)), Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) policy, and approved departmental and college criteria. Departments and Colleges retain authority to define standards of excellence appropriate to their disciplines and missions, and may establish additional requirements, templates, rubrics, or processes consistent with University policy. In the event of any conflict, the KBOR policy and applicable University policies shall govern.

Roles and Responsibilities

The roles and responsibilities in the evaluation process should be guided by trust and shared responsibility rather than secrecy. The dossier is developed through open communication, with clear expectations and contributions from all involved parties. All evaluative input occurs within established procedures and designated review roles, ensuring consistency and fairness. This approach reinforces a collaborative process in which candidates are informed participants, and all contributors understand and uphold their respective responsibilities.

Candidates are responsible for providing accurate, complete, and clearly organized documentation of accomplishments for review. Because documentation requirements vary by appointment type and are defined in approved departmental documents, candidates are expected to consult early with their Department Head and review applicable departmental (and, where relevant, College) guidelines.

Department Heads are responsible for documenting candidate responsibilities, coordinating the external review process, submitting the final dossier to the college committee, summarizing unit-level deliberations, and providing an independent evaluative recommendation.

Department-level committees are responsible for reviewing materials in accordance with Department and/or College policy and providing evaluative recommendations as applicable.

College-level committees, where applicable, review dossiers in accordance with College policy, ensure applicable procedures are followed, and provide evaluative recommendations to the Dean.

Deans are responsible for providing an independent recommendation to the Provost, informed by but not limited to Department and College committee recommendations.

Organization of the Tenure and Promotion Dossier

Sections I–IX of the dossier provide a structured summary of the candidate's qualifications, accomplishments, and rationale for tenure and/or promotion. These sections are intended to present narratives and contextual information used in the evaluation of the dossier. **Sections I – IX** of the dossier are completed by the candidate with the exception of **Section II Description of Responsibilities During the Evaluation Period**, which is to be completed by the Department Head.

Section II documents the candidate's assigned areas of professional responsibility (e.g., instruction, research, service/engagement, extension) during the evaluation period in alignment with KBOR's faculty workload policy and documented in annual workload agreements and Faculty Annual Performance Reviews. This section must

be completed and shared with the candidate prior to the preparation of the dossier to ensure that materials are developed within the appropriate evaluative context.

Any Department or College-specific requirements that are not otherwise addressed within **Sections I–VIII** should be included in **Section IX – Other Summary Information Requested by the Department or College**. Documentation elements that are not required by a candidate’s Department or College may be omitted.

Supporting documentation will be submitted through the faculty electronic evaluation system and uploaded within the appropriate sections of the dossier. A separate, consolidated section of supporting documentation is no longer included.

Unless otherwise specified, each dossier section applies as applicable, based on the candidate’s assigned responsibilities as documented in Section II and the expectations defined in the approved departmental document. Candidates should consult their departmental documents to determine which sections apply and what evidence is required.

SECTION I – Cover Material

Candidate responsibility.

This section consists of two components:

- Faculty information, including requested promotion. (The cover sheet will no longer be a separate sheet and will be built into the faculty electronic evaluation system.)
- Current Curriculum Vita prepared in accordance with disciplinary norms and applicable content standards.

SECTION II –Description of Responsibilities During Evaluation Period

Department head responsibility.

Description and Purpose

Section II, to be completed by the Department Head, documents the candidate’s assigned areas of professional responsibility during the evaluation period. Assigned responsibilities are defined in accordance with K-State’s faculty workload policy and documented in annual faculty workload agreements. This section establishes the evaluative context for the dossier and must be completed and shared with the candidate prior to the preparation of dossier materials.

During the evaluation period, the candidate’s assigned distribution of effort each year, and the average across the period, shall be documented and shared with the faculty member in a table format (example below) consistent with approved workload agreements:

Assigned Responsibility	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Average
Instruction (including teaching, advising, mentoring, and clinical instruction, including supervision of clinical services where student learning is the primary objective)						
Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity, if applicable						
Service/Engagement (including directed service, non-directed service, clinical practice, hospital-based or laboratory service, not primarily instructional in nature)						
Cooperative Extension, if applicable						

Administration, if applicable						
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

For disciplines with significant clinical or practice-based instructional roles, classification of effort should reflect the instructional nature of activities, consistent with approved workload agreements.

SECTION III – Statements by the Candidate

Candidate responsibility.

Description and Purpose

Section III provides the candidate with an opportunity to present a concise, integrative narrative of accomplishments and professional trajectory in relation to the responsibilities of the appointment and the standards for tenure and/or promotion. This section is a critical component of the dossier, as it allows the candidate to contextualize achievements, explain significance and impact, and articulate how their work collectively meets or exceeds applicable expectations.

The Statement by the Candidate is intended to support fair and informed evaluation by ensuring that reviewers at all levels understand the scope, focus, and coherence of the candidate's contributions in teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity, service/engagement, and cooperative extension (as applicable). Rather than duplicating material presented elsewhere in the dossier, this section should synthesize key accomplishments, highlight patterns of productivity and impact, and situate the candidate's work within relevant disciplinary, professional, or institutional contexts.

This section consists of two components:

(a) a statement of accomplishments during the evaluation period (the document must be a minimum of one page and may not exceed three pages)

(b) a statement of five-year goals (not to exceed one page)

III.a. Candidate's Statement of Accomplishments

The candidate shall clearly articulate, in no more than three pages, the primary achievements that form the basis for the request for tenure and/or promotion. The statement should emphasize quality, significance, and impact, rather than serving as a comprehensive inventory of activities. Because evaluative expectations and forms of evidence vary across disciplines and appointment types, this statement plays an essential role in promoting equitable review by helping readers understand how the candidate's record should be interpreted within the appropriate context.

This narrative allows the candidate to:

- Highlight major contributions and outcomes across areas of responsibility
- Explain the significance of scholarly, creative, professional, or extension work using discipline appropriate standards
- Describe progress toward establishing a sustained and coherent program of work
- Address the relationship between assigned responsibilities and demonstrated accomplishments

III.b. Statement of Five-Year Goals

The candidate shall provide, in no more than one page, a forward-looking perspective on their anticipated professional development and scholarly direction following promotion and/or tenure. This statement is not evaluated as a contractual obligation, but rather as an indicator of planning, intellectual trajectory, and alignment with the mission of the Department, College, and University. Goals should be realistic, flexible, and appropriate to the candidate's rank, discipline, and appointment, recognizing that professional trajectories evolve and that institutional and disciplinary contexts may change over time.

SECTION IV. Instructional Contribution

Candidate responsibility.

This section applies, as appropriate, to the candidate's assigned instructional responsibilities and the expectations defined in the approved departmental document.

When the candidate's assigned responsibilities indicate that instruction is primarily carried out through directed service (e.g., clinical instruction, supervision, or student-facing roles), it should be included in this **Section IV – Instructional Contribution**. When it reflects professional practice, clinical service, laboratory operations, or other assigned responsibilities not primarily instructional in nature, it should be included in **Section VI – Service/Engagement Contributions**. Candidates should align the placement of directed service with their assigned responsibilities as documented in departmental documents, ensuring clarity and avoiding duplication. **For K-State Libraries faculty**, instruction is primarily carried out through directed service (e.g., research support, scholarly communication services, collection stewardship, digital initiatives, liaison and engagement work, or other role-based responsibilities), and these contributions should be documented using the **Directed Service sub-option (IV.d–IV.f) in place of IV.a–IV.c**.

Description and Purpose

Section IV documents the candidate's contributions to instruction (including, but not limited to, teaching, advising, mentoring, and clinical instruction, as applicable) during the evaluation period and provides evidence of instructional effectiveness, development, and impact. Instructional contribution encompasses not only instruction, but also student advising and/or mentoring, curricular design, instructional innovation, and other activities that support all student learning and success.

This section is structured to distinguish among instructional activities, evidence of instructional quality, and other evidence of scholarship and creativity in instruction, allowing reviewers to evaluate teaching holistically while recognizing that forms of evidence and emphasis may vary by discipline, appointment type, and instructional context.

Candidates are encouraged to present summarized evidence accompanied by a reflective narrative, focusing on effectiveness, growth, and alignment with assigned responsibilities, rather than exhaustive documentation.

This section consists of three components:

a) a statement of instructional activities (not to exceed one page)

b) evidence of instructional quality (not to exceed one page)

c) a statement of scholarship and creativity in instruction (not to exceed one page)

IV.a. Statement of Instructional Activities

The candidate shall summarize, in no more than one page, the scope and nature of their instructional responsibilities and contributions during the evaluation period. The statement should present a concise narrative, supported by evidence (e.g., tables, lists) addressing instructional activities. The reflective narrative may explain workload, instructional context, or changes over time. The goal of this section is to establish the breadth, scope, and consistency of instructional engagement during the review period.

Evidence of instructional activities should follow approved departmental documents. Items may include, but are not limited, to the following:

- Courses taught (including modality, level, and role)
- Student advising and mentoring (either formal or informal), including graduate students (serving as major professor, committee member, supervision of GTAs, etc.)
- Thesis, dissertation, or capstone supervision
- Curriculum or course development and revision
- Instruction related leadership or coordination roles
- Clinical instruction (when applicable), such as supervision of student clinicians in clinical or diagnostic settings, observation of student evaluation/treatment sessions (directly or via recording) and feedback, case management instruction, review of student documentation, and participation in student performance reviews or consensus grading
- Clinical teaching embedded in service delivery (e.g., VDL diagnostic training, counseling supervision)
- Other instructional responsibilities appropriate to the discipline and appointment

IV.b. Evidence of Instructional Quality

The candidate shall summarize, in no more than one page, the quality and effectiveness of their instruction accompanied by a reflective narrative that addresses instructional effectiveness, development, and improvement over time. Candidates may use the reflective narrative to contextualize the evidence, explain trends or patterns, and describe instructional development efforts.

Evidence of instructional quality should follow approved departmental documents and may include, but are not limited, to the following:

- Summarized student ratings of instruction (e.g., tables across courses and terms)
- Peer evaluations of teaching
- Evaluation of advising or mentoring effectiveness
- Outcomes of instructional innovations or reforms
- Teaching awards or recognitions
- Evidence of responsiveness to feedback and continuous improvement
- When including student comments, follow approved departmental/college documents
- Clinical instruction evidence (when applicable), such as summarized student clinician evaluations of supervision, documentation of live supervision provided (hours/percent time), sample observation feedback forms or end-of-semester feedback letters (de-identified), summaries of peer review of clinical teaching/supervision, and evidence of compliance with accreditation/licensure standards in supervision practices
- Other evidence of instructional quality appropriate to the discipline and appointment

IV.c. Scholarship and Creativity in Instruction

The candidate shall include a narrative, in no more than one page, that highlights scholarly, creative, or innovative activities that contribute to excellence in instruction and student learning. This section captures work that enhances instruction beyond routine teaching responsibilities. When appropriate, candidates may describe how scholarly or creative work informs instructional design or how instructional innovation contributes to broader educational or disciplinary impact.

Scholarship and Creativity in Instruction should follow approved departmental documents. Items may include, but are not limited, to the following:

- Instruction related scholarship (e.g., scholarship of teaching and learning)
- Development of innovative instructional methods or materials
- Multimedia or technology enhanced instruction
- Experiential learning approaches (i.e., Applied Learning Experiences)
- Instruction focused publications, presentations, or workshops
- Professional development in teaching that has informed practice
- Clinical instruction innovation and dissemination (when applicable), such as development of supervision models, competency-based clinical skill rubrics, simulation/standardized-client activities, inter-professional training modules, or evidence-based feedback tools; assessment of learner outcomes in clinical settings; presentations or publications on clinical education/supervision; and contributions to accreditation-related curriculum or supervision standards
- Other scholarship and creativity in instruction activities appropriate to the discipline and appointment

IV.d–IV.f. Directed Service Sub-Option for Instruction (K-State Libraries Faculty only)

This section documents K-State Libraries faculty contributions in directed service during the evaluation period and provides evidence of effectiveness, impact, and professional growth in service activities that are assigned as part of the K-State Libraries faculty member's position responsibilities. For K-State Libraries faculty, directed service typically includes professional practice and programmatic work that advances the Libraries' mission and the university's teaching, research, and service goals (e.g., liaison and engagement work; research consultations; collection stewardship; scholarly communication and data services; digital initiatives; archives/special collections work; instructional or curricular support delivered through services; and other role-based library faculty responsibilities).

Directed Service sub-option for Instruction (for K-State Libraries) section consists of three components:

d) evidence of directed service activities (not to exceed one page)

e) evidence of directed service quality and impact (not to exceed one page)

f) evidence of scholarship and creativity in directed service (not to exceed one page)

IV.d. Statement of Directed Service Activities (K-State Libraries Faculty Only)

The candidate shall list, in no more than one page, the scope and nature of their directed service responsibilities and contributions during the evaluation period. The list may be supported by summarized evidence (e.g., tables, project lists, timelines) sufficient to establish the breadth, scope, and consistency of directed service work and to clarify the candidate's roles and level of responsibility.

Evidence of directed service activities should follow approved departmental documents. Items may include, but are not limited, to the following:

- Major assigned responsibilities and functional areas (e.g., liaison work, research support, scholarly communication, data services, instruction support delivered through services, collections, digital initiatives, archives/special collections, access services)
- Key projects, initiatives, or programs led or contributed to
- Service models implemented or improved (workflows, tools, policies, training, service redesign)
- Partnerships and collaborations (campus, consortial, community, professional)

- Significant deliverables (guides, datasets, digital collections, metadata work, exhibits, documentation, reports, new or revised services)

IV.e. Evidence of Directed Service Quality and Impact (K-State Libraries Faculty Only)

The candidate shall list, in no more than one page, evidence that demonstrates the quality, effectiveness, and impact of directed service contributions.

Evidence of directed service quality and impact should follow approved departmental documents. Items may include, but are not limited, to the following:

- Outcomes, outputs, and use measures appropriate to the service (e.g., consultation counts, service transactions, program participation, turnaround times, adoption/usage metrics, workflow efficiencies)
- Assessment results (surveys, feedback, learning/outcome measures where relevant, user studies)
- Evidence of campus or community impact (integration into courses/programs, research support outcomes, compliance or policy outcomes, sustained partnerships)
- Peer or supervisor evaluation of professional practice, project leadership, or service contributions
- Recognition of service contributions (awards, invitations, testimonials, documented stakeholder feedback)

IV.f. Scholarship and Creativity in Directed Service (K-State Libraries Faculty Only)

The candidate shall include a list, in no more than one page, highlighting scholarly, creative, or innovative activities that enhance the candidate's directed service contributions and extend their impact beyond routine role expectations. This section captures work such as the development of new approaches, tools, programs, or models; dissemination of professional practice; and contributions that influence practice within or beyond the Libraries.

Scholarship and creativity in directed service should follow approved departmental documents. Items may include, but are not limited, to the following:

- Development of scalable services, tools, frameworks, or documented best practices adopted by others
- Assessment, evaluation, or applied research that improves service design and delivery
- Presentations, workshops, publications, or posters that disseminate service innovations or professional practice
- Grant-funded or externally supported projects tied to service initiatives
- Leadership in consortial, regional, or national initiatives directly connected to directed service responsibilities

SECTION V. Research, Scholarly, Creativity and/or Discovery Achievements

Candidate responsibility.

This section applies as applicable, based on the candidate's assigned responsibilities and the expectations defined in the approved departmental document.

Description and Purpose

Section V documents the candidate's achievements in research, scholarship, creativity, and/or discovery activities during the evaluation period. This section is intended to demonstrate the quality, impact, coherence, and trajectory of the candidate's contributions in relation to the responsibilities of the appointment and the standards for tenure and/or promotion. Candidates are encouraged to present summarized evidence accompanied by integrative narrative, emphasizing significance and contribution rather than exhaustive documentation.

Recognizing the diversity of disciplinary norms across the University, this section is structured to accommodate discipline appropriate forms of scholarship, including basic, applied, creative, professional, and extension focused work. Colleges and departments define how peer review, dissemination, impact, and significance are demonstrated within their fields, consistent with University policy.

This section consists of three components:

a) a statement of research and other creative achievements (not to exceed one page)

b) a list of research publications and/or creative achievements

c) a list of grants and contracts

V.a. Statement of Research, Scholarly, Creative, and/or Discovery Achievements

The candidate shall provide a concise narrative, in no more than one page, that summarizes research, scholarly, creative, design, and/or discovery activities during the evaluation period. This statement should articulate the focus, direction, and significance of the candidate's work and how individual activities contribute to a coherent body of scholarly effort. Rather than duplicating lists or supporting materials, this narrative should provide context and interpretation of the research and other creative endeavors.

The statement may address:

- The intellectual or creative agenda guiding the work
- Major accomplishments and their significance or impact
- The role of peer review, professional recognition, or external validation
- Contributions to the discipline, profession, or broader community
- Progress toward establishing a sustained and independent program of scholarship or creative activity

V.b. List of Research Publications and Creative Achievements

Candidates shall provide a list of research publications and/or creative achievements completed during the evaluation period. The list should be organized clearly and presented in a manner consistent with disciplinary norms. Candidates may identify authorship roles, review processes, dissemination venues, or other contextual information as needed to clarify the nature and significance of the work. Candidates should refer to departmental expectations for this section.

Items should follow approved departmental documents. Items may include, but are not limited, to the following:

- Peer reviewed articles, book chapters, exhibition catalogues, or other scholarly/creative outputs
- Scholarly or professional books
- Creative works (e.g., exhibitions, performances, designs, built works, etc.)
- Refereed or externally reviewed works
- Juried or invited professional presentations and posters
- Design or implementation of evidence-based programs
- Engagement in interdisciplinary teams and community/university partnerships
- Patents or other intellectual property resulting from scholarly and/or creative activity
- Exhibitions of creative scholarship in juried international, national, and regional exhibitions, conferences/meetings
- Other scholarly or creative outputs appropriate to the discipline and appointment

V.c. List of Grants and Contracts

The candidate shall provide a list that documents submissions for externally funded and internally supported grants and contracts relevant to the candidate's research, scholarly, creative, design, and discovery activities during the evaluation period. Where relevant, candidates may include brief contextual information to clarify the scope or competitiveness of funding opportunities.

For each grant or contract, candidates should include:

- Investigators
- Funding agency or sponsor
- Title of the project
- Funding amount and duration
- Role of the candidate (e.g., principal investigator, co-principal investigator)
- Status (e.g., submitted, not funded, awarded, active, completed)

SECTION VI – Service/Engagement Contributions

Candidate responsibility

This section applies as applicable, based on the candidate's assigned responsibilities and the expectations defined in the approved departmental document.

Description and Purpose

Section VI documents the candidate's service/engagement contributions during the evaluation period and provides evidence of engagement with the Department, College, University, profession, and broader community, as appropriate to the individual's appointment and discipline. Service/engagement is recognized as an essential component of faculty responsibility and institutional citizenship, supporting governance, shared leadership, professional advancement, and public engagement.

Service/engagement contributions may vary substantially by discipline, rank, appointment type, and career stage. Accordingly, this section is intended to allow candidates to demonstrate the scope, significance, and impact of their service in ways that reflect assigned responsibilities and expectations.

For faculty whose appointments include directed service responsibilities (e.g., clinical practice, laboratory-based service, or other assigned professional service roles), these activities should be documented within this Section VI when they primarily represent service/engagement contributions rather than instructional activity. In cases where directed service is integrally tied to instruction (e.g., clinical teaching or supervision), such activities should instead be documented within Section IV, consistent with departmental documents.

This section consists of two components:

a) a statement of service contributions (not to exceed two pages)

b) evidence of service (not to exceed one page)

VI.a. Statement of Service Contributions

The candidate shall provide a narrative summary, in no more than two pages, of service activities undertaken during the evaluation period. While service expectations may evolve over time, candidates should focus on service that is substantive, sustained, and relevant to institutional and professional missions. This statement should describe the nature, level, and impact of service and may be organized by the following categories, as applicable to the faculty appointment and departmental documents:

- Institution-based service (i.e. University, College, and/or Departmental level service and committees)
- Professional or disciplinary-based service

- Public-based professional service related to professional expertise
- Directed service (applicable to CVM and CSD faculty, i.e. assigned clinical practice, hospital-based and/or laboratory service, as applicable)
- Independent clinical, diagnostic, or laboratory services that do not include a primary instructional component
- Non-directed service (i.e. institution, profession, and public-based)
- Other service contributions appropriate to the discipline and appointment

The narrative may address:

- Leadership roles and responsibilities
- Time intensive or high impact service
- Contributions to institutional initiatives
- The relationship between service activities and the candidate's expertise or appointment
- Demonstration of engagement (refer to Continuum of Engaged Scholarship)

VI.b. Supporting Evidence of Service/Engagement

Candidates shall include summarized documentation of service contributions, in no more than one page, that may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Lists of committees or roles held
- Evidence of leadership or coordination responsibilities
- Outcomes or products resulting from service (e.g., reports, initiatives, events)
- Recognition or awards related to service
- Evidence of effective engagement
- Other service/engagement evidence appropriate to the discipline and appointment

SECTION VII – Cooperative Extension (If Applicable)

Candidate responsibility

This section applies to faculty with extension responsibilities and is not required for candidates whose appointments do not include Cooperative Extension expectations.

Description and Purpose

Section VII documents the candidate's contributions to Cooperative Extension and engagement-based outreach, where such activities are part of the individual's appointment. Cooperative Extension contributions reflect the University's mission to translate research and scholarly expertise into public value through education, technical assistance, community partnership, and applied problem solving. These activities may be interdisciplinary, community-based, and outcome-oriented, with impact measured through reach, adoption, and societal benefit.

This section consists of two components:

a) a statement of cooperative extensive contributions (no more than two pages)

b) a list of extension activities for the review period (no page limit)

VII.a. Statement of Cooperative Extension Contributions

Candidates with cooperative extension responsibilities shall provide a statement summarizing their extension and outreach activities during the evaluation period, not to exceed two pages unless otherwise defined in approved departmental documents. This statement should include the focus, audience, methods, and impact

of extension work, and how extension activities align with their scholarly expertise, departmental mission, and institutional priorities.

Activities may include, as appropriate, and may reflect planning, preparation, delivery, and evaluation/accountability processes:

- Planning (e.g., participation in formal program planning; coordination with local agents and other professionals to identify and document educational needs; review of relevant state and national data; interdisciplinary program planning; pursuit of grant opportunities; obtaining internal or external funding to support Extension work)
- Preparation (e.g., development of new educational resources; translation/adaptation of evidence-based strategies, programs, or products to meet client needs; contributions to materials developed by interdisciplinary teams or state/regional/national initiatives)
- Delivery (e.g., in-service training for local agents and other professionals; direct delivery of programs and technical assistance to clientele; consultations via phone/electronic/face-to-face methods; development and dissemination of information tools such as newsletters, articles, web pages, briefs, white papers, infographics, blog posts, podcasts, or media interviews; mixed-media strategies and campaigns; administration of special projects)
- Evaluation/Impact/Accountability (e.g., integration of evaluation components into program design; conducting evaluation with agents/colleagues/clientele; preparation of required federal, state, or other reports; communication of results to stakeholders and decision makers; presentation or publication of findings relevant to Extension)

VII.b. List of Cooperative Extension Activities

Candidates shall provide a list of cooperative extension activities and evidence of contributions completed during the evaluation period, that may include:

- Audience/clientele contacts and reach (e.g., number of contacts/participants, resources distributed, geographic distribution, size of media market, leaders trained, measures of effort)
- Program outcomes and impact (e.g., evidence of adoption or behavior/practice change; short- and long-term consequences; case studies; self-reports; evaluative research; letters of confirmation from knowledgeable colleagues or stakeholders)
- Peer, leader, and stakeholder evaluations (e.g., evaluation data; solicited or unsolicited letters from peers/partners familiar with the candidate's Extension leadership or expertise)
- Reputation and dissemination (e.g., invited presentations, keynote speeches, out-of-state workshops; publications and Extension resources; media coverage; awards and recognitions)
- Efficiency and sustainability (e.g., cost-benefit evidence; consumer utilization; likelihood of sustainability; evidence that work inspired new innovations among colleagues and clientele)
- Survey data (e.g., grower data, audience surveys, etc.)
- Extension publications and educational articles (e.g., publications, newsletters, blogs, trade articles)
- Presentations, field days, plot tours, and hands-on educational activities
- Online and media outreach (e.g., websites, social media, radio, newspaper, and TV interviews)
- Diagnostic, technical, and consulting support
- Reports and presentations to stakeholder groups and professional partners
- Other outreach and engagement activities that disseminate research-based information to stakeholders and the public
- Other evidence appropriate to the discipline and appointment

SECTION VIII – External Evaluation

Department head responsibility.

Description and Purpose

External evaluation provides an independent assessment of the quality, impact, and trajectory of a candidate's scholarly, creative, professional, or extension activities in relation to disciplinary norms and expectations. It is a critical component of the promotion and tenure review process and are intended to supplement internal evaluations by offering professional judgment from experts external to the University. External evaluations are used to help reviewers understand how the candidate's work is viewed within the broader disciplinary, professional, or scholarly community, particularly with respect to recognition, influence, and standing relative to peers at a similar career stage.

As part of an effort to promote consistency, rigor, and equitable evaluation across candidates, Department heads are required to solicit a minimum of three (3) external evaluations for candidates. Departments or Colleges may require additional evaluations consistent with approved unit-level policies. Departments shall establish the format for the external review, which may include a written letter, a combination of quantitative ratings (e.g., scaled or categorical responses) and brief qualitative comments, supplemented by optional narrative remarks, as long as the format is consistently applied for all faculty going up for promotion and aligned with approved departmental criteria and University policy is maintained.

External reviewers shall return a formal review of the dossier materials, evaluated against the departmental criteria, in the format requested by the department. The external reviewer shall also return a brief CV, not more than 2 pages, indicating their qualifications in the field for the external review. These CVs shall precede the formal external reviews within the dossier.

Reviewer Qualifications

Only reviewers external to Kansas State University, including any of its campuses or other formal affiliations, may provide confidential evaluations for inclusion in the external evaluation section of the dossier.

External reviewers are defined as external to Kansas State University, including any of its campuses or other formal affiliations. External reviewers are typically recognized experts in the candidate's field or professional area and capable of providing an independent, objective assessment of the candidate's contributions. Reviewers shall hold a rank equal to or higher than that sought by the candidate or possess comparable professional standing, expertise, or leadership appropriate to the discipline or field of practice as defined in departmental documents. Reviewers should be able to evaluate the quality, significance, and impact of the candidate's work using the departmental documents for the position.

Reviewers should not have conflicts of interest that would compromise the objectivity of the evaluation. Selection procedures should be designed to ensure fairness, transparency, and independence while maintaining disciplinary relevance. Conflicts of interest may include close personal or familial relationships; current or recent collaborative, supervisory, or mentoring relationships; current or recent publications or grant opportunities; financial interests; or other professional or personal associations that might call a reviewer's impartiality into question.

Selection Process

At least three (3) external reviewers must be solicited, and a minimum of three (3) external evaluations must be included in the dossier. Colleges/Departments shall establish procedures to identify and review potential conflicts for both candidate and department-nominated reviewers. Final selection of reviewers must ensure independence while maintaining appropriate disciplinary expertise.

Procedures for identifying potential external reviewers should include:

- Candidate nominated reviewers
- Department nominated reviewers
- Review of potential conflicts of interest

The Department Head or Dean is responsible for the final selection and solicitation of external reviewers. Selection procedures must ensure the avoidance of actual or perceived conflicts of interest and be designed to promote fairness, transparency, and independence while maintaining appropriate disciplinary relevance.

Specific timelines for soliciting and selecting reviewers are determined at the Department level in accordance with University policy.

Materials Provided to External Reviewers

Materials and requests should be designed to facilitate efficient and focused review, minimizing unnecessary burden while ensuring sufficient information for a rigorous and informed assessment. To promote clarity, fairness, and informed evaluation, external reviewers shall be provided, at a minimum, with the following materials:

- A description of the candidate's faculty appointment, including assigned areas of responsibility and workload distribution
- The approved departmental promotion and tenure document(s) that define standards and expectations for the candidate's appointment
- Relevant portions of the candidate's dossier, which may include the full dossier or specified sections (e.g., research, creative, professional, or extension activities), consistent with departmental practice

When reviewers are asked to evaluate only selected sections of the dossier, sufficient contextual information must be provided to allow reviewers to understand the candidate's appointment type and evaluative context.

Questions to Reviewers

To promote equity, consistency, and clarity in evaluation, external reviewers shall be asked to respond to standardized or semi-structured questions aligned with the approved departmental promotion and tenure document(s). Departments and Colleges may implement structured response formats (e.g., survey instruments, rating forms, or hybrid templates combining structured responses and narrative comments) to promote consistency while reducing reviewer burden. These questions may ask reviewers to address the quality, originality, impact, visibility, and trajectory of the candidate's work within the field, using their professional expertise. Standardization of questions does not limit disciplinary judgment but rather helps ensure that external evaluations provide comparable and relevant information for review at all levels. The questions should directly align with the expectations laid out in the approved, departmental document. Departments may adapt or supplement questions as appropriate to disciplinary context and appointment type. The following examples are provided for guidance and illustration and are not intended to be exhaustive or prescriptive. At a minimum, external evaluations should address the following core domains: 1) Quality and significance of contributions 2) Impact and visibility within the field 3) Evidence of independence and trajectory 4) Standing relative to peers at a similar career stage, and 5) Alignment with departmental promotion and tenure criteria.

Examples of questions that may be posed to external reviewers include:

- Based on your review of the materials provided, how would you assess the quality, originality, and significance of the candidate's scholarly, creative, professional, and/or extension contributions?
- How is the candidate's work regarded within the discipline or professional field, and how does it compare with that of peers at a similar career stage at comparable institutions?
- To what extent does the candidate demonstrate evidence of a coherent, sustained, and independent program of work appropriate to their appointment and rank?
- What evidence do you see of the impact, visibility, or influence of the candidate's work (e.g., disciplinary, professional, institutional, or public impact), as appropriate to the field?
- Based on your understanding of the departmental standards and expectations provided, does the candidate's record meet the criteria for tenure and/or promotion at the requested rank? Please explain your assessment.

- Are there particular strengths, distinguishing contributions, or contextual factors that reviewers should consider in evaluating this record?

Departments may also invite reviewers to provide any additional comments they believe would be helpful in understanding the candidate's accomplishments, trajectory, or standing within the field.

Confidentiality and Use of External Letters

External letters of evaluation are considered confidential evaluative materials. They are used in the promotion and tenure review process in accordance with University policy and applicable regulations. Access to these letters and their appropriate use are governed by institutional policy and procedures. External letters are intended solely for evaluative purposes and are handled as part of the official review record.

SECTION IX – Other Summary Information Considered Pertinent by the College

Department head responsibility (may require candidate input or materials).

Description and Purpose

Section IX provides a limited, structured space for Colleges or Departments to request or include additional summary level narrative information that is not otherwise addressed in Sections I–VIII of the dossier but is considered relevant to the evaluation of the candidate.

This section is intended to:

- Accommodate College or discipline specific summary materials
- Preserve flexibility for unusual appointments, interdisciplinary roles, or evolving practices
- Avoid forcing material into ill-fitting sections elsewhere in the dossier

Section IX should be used sparingly and should focus on interpretive or contextual summary information, not the duplication of materials already presented in earlier sections or in Supporting Documentation.

Examples of appropriate use may include:

- Integrative summaries required by the College
- Required narratives related to special appointment types
- Contextual statements related to nonstandard career trajectories
- College specific summary documents referenced by earlier sections
- Internal reviewer statements (K-State Libraries): *Departments and Colleges may not solicit confidential or anonymous evaluative statements from internal faculty or staff who are not members of the authorized departmental, college, or administrative review bodies. Internal evaluative input must occur through the established review steps and recommendation letters identified in University, College, and Department procedures. Candidates must be informed, and should have input into, any additional internal reviewer selections.*

Recommendations/Review Steps

- *Department faculty review*
- *Department head review*
- *College committee review*
- *College dean review*
- *Dean's Council review*
- *Provost review and final decision*
- *President confirmation*

Recommendation by the Department Head Form [to be Adapted to Faculty Electronic Evaluation System]

Department/unit:

A. Name of

Candidate: _____

B. For tenure: Yes ☐ No ☐ If already tenured, date: _____

C. For promotion: Yes ☐ No ☐ To rank of: _____

D. Current rank: _____ Year & Month Received _____

E. Average workload distribution of assignment

F. Highest degree: _____ Date
degree was received: _____; Institution: _____

G. Years of professional experience prior to: KSU _____; at KSU

H. Years of prior service credited toward tenure consideration: _____

I have reviewed the documents contained herein and it contains all of the materials I wish to submit.

Candidate's Signature

To be completed by the Department Head after departmental review

Faculty Recommendation:

	Tenure	Promotion
Number voting yes		
Number voting no		
Number abstaining		
Number absent and not voting		

Department/Unit Head recommendation: Yes ☐ No ☐

Department Head's Signature