

1. Merit Evaluation Process	4
1.1 Distribution of Responsibilities	4
1.2 Submission of Materials to the PAC	4
1.3 General Guidelines for Preparing PAC Materials	5
1.4 Election of Personnel Advisory Committee	8
1.5 The PAC Evaluation Process	8
1.6 Chronic Low Achievement	10
1.7 Appeals of Evaluations	11
1.8 Evaluation of Faculty on Sabbatical or Leave	12
1.9 Professorial Performance Award	13
2. Reappointment Process	14
2.1 Timing	14
2.2 For Tenure-Track Faculty Members	14
2.3 For Regularized Instructors	15
2.4 Reappointment Criteria	16
3. Promotion and Tenure	18
3.1 Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure	18
3.2 Standards for Promotion and Tenure	19
3.3 Procedures for Promotion and Tenure	22
3.4 Mid-Probationary Review	23

3.5 Promotion of Instructors 24

4. Policy for Overload Teaching 27

1. Merit Evaluation Process

This section describes the annual merit review process.

All 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 English Department's Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC). The following paragraphs describe the annual distribution of each individual faculty member's responsibilities, the election of PAC members, and PAC procedures.

1.1 Distribution of Responsibilities

The standard workload for faculty at each of the three professorial ranks may include: teaching (five courses per academic year, advising, serving on masters and doctoral committees) for 60% of the workload; research, scholarship, and creative activity for 30% of the workload; and service for 10% of the workload. Faculty with administrative appointments have their workloads adjusted to accommodate these additional responsibilities.

This standard workload may be adjusted, in conversation with the Head, according to the following minimum and maximum percentages:

	<u>Teaching</u>	<u>RSCA</u>	<u>Service</u>
Max	60	50	20
Min	40	30	5

The standard workload for faculty at the rank of Instructor will include teaching for 100% of their load. In conversation with the Head, this standard workload may be adjusted to include teaching for 80-95% of the workload. In such cases, service and/or research, scholarship, and creative activity would include 5-20% of the workload.

Each faculty member will meet with the Head to jointly establish goals, objectives, and distribution of responsibilities for the upcoming evaluation period. This meeting is generally held toward the end of the spring semester to discuss the next academic year's assignments. This distribution of responsibilities, as percentages, is used to calculate a faculty member's merit (as explained below). Individual faculty members or the Head may schedule, as needed, meetings at any time prior to submission of materials to the PAC, to adjust goals, objectives, and minimum/maximum percentages in light of new information or changed circumstances (attainment of an external grant or sabbatical, for example).

1.2 Submission of Materials to be Reviewed by Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC)

PAC materials are intended to summarize faculty performance in the assigned areas of responsibilities for the period from August to August, beginning with the first day of class. Any work published previous to employment at Kansas State does not carry forward for credit towards merit evaluation at Kansas State. (See the *University Handbook*, sections C30 to C48.3, for general issues of faculty evaluation and annual merit salary evaluations.)

The PAC will expect each faculty member's file of review materials to contain the following:

- Faculty Activity Sheet (FAS). When you turn in your PAC materials, your FAS for the reporting year and the previous year should be included. Copies of the FAS are kept on file in the main office for your colleagues to consult.
- Up-to-date *Vitae*. When reporting publications, faculty should use standard MLA format.
- One-page synopsis ("roadmap") of the materials submitted to the PAC. This synopsis should key each item to both the self-evaluation and to the support materials so that the PAC can quickly see the relationship between materials submitted and their relationship to the claims made in the narrative.
- Self-evaluation narrative. The narrative provides explanation of the materials as well as any claims for merit in any areas of responsibility. Clearly state why an activity is meritorious; failure to provide a clear case may cause some reviewers to not fully appreciate the accomplishments. A minimal approach to the rhetoric of the narrative is welcome. Suggested maximum length: 2,000 words (approximately four typed, single-spaced pages).
- Support Materials. Evidence to support the claims for merit.

1.3 General Guidelines for Preparing PAC Materials

For the FAS, Synopsis, and *Vitae*

- Remember the rhetorical situation. Several people need to review the materials. Faculty are responsible for making those materials easily accessible and understandable. Reviewers rightly expect that the Faculty Activity Sheet, narrative, and one-page synopsis will provide a key to the materials, allowing reviewers to find the evidence they seek quickly and efficiently. To avoid potential misfiling or inability to return materials to the appropriate file, clearly label each of the items included.
- Include items that cover only achievements in the last August-to-August period.

- More is not always better. The PAC invites the faculty to take a minimalist approach to providing evidence in support of their narrative. Faculty need not supply copies of every test, paper assignment, etc. A syllabus – in addition to student evaluations, which are mandatory – might suffice. However, the PAC reserves the right to request supporting materials as it deems necessary. The narrative, the *Vitae*, and the faculty activity sheet should be seen at the core of the merit evaluation file.

- Provide an up-to-date *Vitae*. The *Vitae* alone should allow a reviewer to see at a glance a faculty member’s achievements and when they were achieved. The *Vitae* should observe the rules of logical classification and avoid such obfuscations as representing publications, works submitted, and oral presentations in one list under one heading.

For Teaching

- In keeping with the importance of assessing teaching, the PAC committee would like to see evidence for some combination of the following:

- Intellectual rigor of the courses taught
- Mastery of subject matter
- Clear statements of student learning outcomes
- Clear methods of helping students achieve these outcomes
- Effective, accurate methods of evaluating how well students achieve these outcomes
- The incorporation of scholarship and research into teaching
- Pedagogical professional development, including attendance at workshops, conventions, presentations, and publications.
- Awards and/or recognition for excellence in teaching and advising

- Indicate the classes taught in the reporting period. Supply course titles in addition to course numbers as well as the number of students enrolled. When titles do not in themselves sufficiently indicate the course’s content, include a brief description. Include syllabi along with other items as needed.

- Every faculty member must include unedited student evaluations as well as the summary sheet which accompanies that set of evaluations; a faculty member must not remove unfavorable or less-than-favorable evaluations from the group. (See the *University Handbook*, section C34.1.) Though student evaluations cannot be and should not be the only source for evaluating teaching, the PAC may give lower numbers in teaching to those faculty who do not turn in complete packets of student evaluations for each class. As the *University Handbook* notes, such materials will be considered “incomplete and presumed inadequate.”

- Undergraduate advising should be reported as instruction. Indicate the number of advisees and the types of assistance provided to them.

- Graduate advising and supervision of M.A. final writing projects, M.A. theses, M.F.A. projects and theses, and Ph.D. dissertations should be reported as instruction. Indicate the student supervised and the graduation date of the student.

For Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

- Publications are reported in the year of their publication. All credit for a publication is awarded in the year a faculty member first reports a publication with the exception of a book.

The publication of a single-authored or co-authored book published in a peer-reviewed or professionally respected venue receives a 10 out of 10 for three consecutive years from the year of first report. The publication of an edited or co-edited book published in a peer-reviewed or professionally respected venue receives a 10 out of 10 for two consecutive years from the year of first report.

Faculty may choose to defer by one year from the date of publication the start of the two- or three-consecutive-year period.

Other kinds of significant scholarly achievement (such as critical editions or digital archives) may receive the 10 out of 10 for two or three consecutive years from the year of first report.

- When reporting any publication, indicate the type of publication: book, refereed article, review, short story, poem, essay, and so on. If reporting a book, indicate which year of credit you are requesting (Year 1, Year 2, or Year 3). For work in progress, include a brief description of the project and its status during the reporting period.
- When presenting evidence of collaborative work, faculty should indicate the scope of individual contributions to the collaboration.
- Presentations should be reported in the year they are given; all credit for presentations is awarded at that time. Along with the title of the presentation, indicate the venue and date. Include a written version of the remarks.
- Faculty should report any grants awarded, as well as grants applied for but not received, during the reporting period.
- Faculty should report any awards or distinctions earned during the year for research or creative endeavor.
- Because all credit for a publication or presentation is given at the time of first reporting, faculty should not report previously claimed publications or presentations unless each is in fact a new achievement of some sort. Some examples of “new” achievements related to previously reported work include newly accepted articles that were previously reported as presentations; the same (or slightly revised) presentation given in a new forum; reprints of articles, stories, poems (though reprints do not count as much as newly accepted work, reprints are considered a mark of both quality and continued influence).

For Service

- Include brief descriptions of any relevant service to the department, college, university, community, state, or other relevant entity.
- Include departmental, college, and university committee assignments as well as any ad hoc committee work in the reporting period.
- Include service to the profession such as work for literary societies, professional organizations, and so on.

1.4 Election of Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC)

The Personnel Advisory Committee consists of four members, one from each rank within the department. At least one male and one female must be on each year's PAC. PAC members are elected to evaluate their colleagues for the previous year. No faculty member may serve more than two years on the PAC in any five-year period.

1.5 The Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC) Evaluation Process

- The highest ranking member of the PAC serves as the Chair. The PAC Chair coordinates the evaluation process.
- Each PAC member reads each file of materials submitted by faculty for the annual merit review process, evaluating each faculty member in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service based on the information made available in each file. Instructors may be evaluated, depending upon their job description and workload, on teaching alone or a combination of teaching, research/creative activity, and service. In evaluating each colleague's file, the PAC member assigns a number from one to ten in each of the appropriate areas of responsibility. A "one" represents little or no contribution in a given area, and a "ten" represents superior achievement (for example, a published refereed book, a university-wide teaching award).
- The PAC meets as a group to compare individual members' numbers for each faculty member in each area in which that colleague is evaluated. In all cases, the PAC attempts to reach a consensus regarding the merit score for each faculty member in all areas in which that person is evaluated. If no consensus can be reached in a given category of endeavor, the four scores of the individual PAC members are averaged. Members of the PAC are not present when their own files are discussed.
- After the deliberations described above are complete, the faculty member's number in each area is then multiplied by his or her distribution of responsibilities percentage for that area. For example, a colleague receiving a 4 for teaching and having teaching count

as 70% would receive a 2.8 in teaching for the current evaluation period. These calculations for each area in which the colleague is evaluated also appear on his/her annual evaluation.

- After the final merit scores for all colleagues have been determined, the PAC drafts individual evaluation summaries. After all summaries are written, at a meeting the summaries are read and discussed and finally edited by the group. In this way the narrative for each faculty member reflects the consensus judgment of the group.
- The PAC then ranks faculty from highest to lowest total merit score. The PAC then reconsiders each individual colleague's overall merit score to be sure it reflects the consensus judgment of the group. The final consensus number is reported to the Head, along with recommendations for college, university, and external awards.
- The Head is responsible for determining final rankings, for assigning faculty to the corresponding merit category (highest merit, high merit, or merit), and for making merit recommendations to the Dean. If the Head changes the PAC's ranking of a colleague, this change should be reported, in writing, to the PAC and also, in the event of a grievance, to the colleague.
- Tenured faculty whose overall performance falls below the minimum accepted level of performance as defined below shall be placed in the "unsatisfactory" category. When a tenured faculty member is placed in the unsatisfactory category, the Head will indicate so in writing to the faculty member and also indicate in writing a suggested course of action to improve the performance of that faculty member. In subsequent annual evaluations the faculty member will include in his or her materials submitted for merit review a report on activities aimed at improving performance and any evidence of improvement.
- Any faculty member who fails to meet minimum standards the year following the Head's suggested course of action will be reported to the Dean, and the faculty member will be so notified. In subsequent evaluations of the faculty member by the Head, the faculty member will submit a report to the Head on activities aimed at improving performance and any evidence of improvement. Should the Head determine that for two successive evaluations or three evaluations during a five-year period minimum standards are not met, the Head will follow the administrative procedures concerning "chronic low achievement" detailed in C31.5 in the *University Handbook*. It should be noted that the outcome of following these procedures may be "dismissal for cause."
- The Head calculates the rolling averages for each faculty member to arrive at a final numerical ranking for all faculty members. Rolling averages are calculated so that the present year's number counts 50%, the previous year's number counts 30%, and the number from two years ago counts 20%. A particular faculty member's rolling average for the year, then, is determined by feeding into the above formula the appropriate numbers. The rolling average is also reported to the faculty member on his/her annual evaluation.

- Each faculty member receives his/her merit evaluation for the year and is asked to return a signed copy to the Head. The signature indicates that the faculty member has seen the evaluation and has been given the opportunity to discuss it with the Head; it does not necessarily indicate the faculty member's agreement with the conclusions.
- All faculty are given the opportunity to review and discuss their written evaluations. In cases where a colleague feels that his or her particular evaluation does not fairly represent his or her accomplishments and wishes a formal review by the PAC, the Head conveys a written request with substantiating materials to the PAC (see section 1.7 "Appeals of Merit Evaluation" below).
- All evaluations (with faculty signatures), along with a description of the evaluation process and a list of faculty by merit category, are sent to the Dean.

1.6 Chronic Low Achievement

Minimum acceptable levels of productivity in teaching; research, scholarship, and creative activity; and service are defined as follows:

Minimum Acceptable Levels for Teaching

- Faculty will provide instruction appropriate to fulfill the mission of the department.
- Faculty will provide students with the following information, in writing, for each course they teach:
 - the aims or learning outcomes of the course
 - how the course will be organized
 - how the students will be evaluated
 - assessment of student performance in a timely manner
- Faculty will meet regularly scheduled classes except for:
 - illness, accident, or attendance at professional meetings
 - occasional times where other forms of instruction are scheduled during, or in lieu of, class time; for example individual conferences, a film too long to be viewed during class, a workday for students to use the library
- Faculty will hold regularly scheduled office hours.
- Faculty will arrange for student evaluations of teaching according to departmental and university regulations.

Minimum Acceptable Levels for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

- Faculty will actively pursue scholarship, which may include any of the following:

- researching, writing, editing, and/or publishing scholarly, critical, creative, or pedagogical work, or
- presenting such work at local, state, regional, national, or international meetings.

Minimum Acceptable Levels for Service

• Throughout their careers, faculty will engage in departmental, college, university, and professional service. Untenured faculty will engage in departmental service. Tenured faculty will engage in a combination of department and extra-departmental service which may include any of the following:

- participating on departmental standing and ad hoc committees, working in a departmental administrative position, or participating in other service capacities as may be arranged with the Head of the department
- participating on college standing and ad hoc committees, working in a college administrative position, or participating in other service capacities as may be arranged with the Dean of the college
- participating on university standing and ad hoc committees, serving in the Faculty Senate, working in a university administrative position, or participating in other service capacities as may be arranged with the Provost and/or other university administrators
- participating as an officer, on boards, or in other ways for professional organizations, publications, or publishers
- providing professionally related community service

1.7 Appeals of Merit Evaluation

A faculty member who wishes to question a merit evaluation should meet with the Head to review and discuss the evaluation. This review and discussion should take place within seven working days from the time the faculty member receives the annual evaluation from the Head. If, following this discussion, the faculty member wishes the PAC to reconsider the evaluation, the faculty member should submit to the Head a formal written request for a review. This written request should be received by the Head within seven working days of the Head's previous discussion with the faculty member. The faculty member's written request for PAC reconsideration of the evaluation should specify the exact nature of the reasons for appeal. Along with the review request, the faculty member should also provide any supporting documents he or she wishes the PAC to consider in addition to the faculty member's previous PAC materials, which should still be on file with the PAC.

The Head is responsible for bringing all formal appeals and supporting materials provided by the faculty member to the PAC, who will reconvene and consider each specific appeal. A written response from the PAC will be forwarded to the Head regarding each appeal. When changes in the narrative, merit numbers, or ranking are recommended, the PAC will draft a revised version of the faculty member's evaluation.

The Head will convey in writing any changes made in a faculty member's evaluation as a result of an appeal.

If a faculty member feels the appealed version of his or her evaluation is acceptable, the new version is signed by the faculty member and is forwarded to the next administrative level, the Dean of Arts and Sciences. If a faculty member is dissatisfied with the appealed version of the evaluation and wishes to continue the appeal, he or she should submit to the Head statements of unresolved differences. These statements should be received by the Head within seven working days after the colleague has received the PAC's report on the appeal. All documents and supporting materials involving the appeal, plus a cover letter from the Head, are then forwarded to the Dean of Arts and Sciences.

1.8 Evaluation of Faculty on Sabbatical or Leave Without Pay (LWOP)

During the year of a sabbatical or LWOP, faculty may choose between:

- Submitting materials for evaluation of the preceding year's work according to the department's deadline, i.e. following the normal process along with all other faculty members.
- Choosing not to turn in evaluation materials during their leave. Individuals choosing this option will receive the rolling average from their preceding three years. Individuals choosing this option but who have not been with the department for three full years will receive the averaged score for the years served to date.

During the year following a sabbatical or LWOP, the PAC will, following section C44 of the *University Handbook*, evaluate faculty as follows:

- For faculty on sabbatical or leave for a portion of the year, evaluations are normally based on their performance during the period they were engaged in university assignments, adjusted proportionally to encompass the entire year. Thus, faculty taking a semester's sabbatical or leave will normally turn in materials covering the semester during which they were not on leave.
- For faculty on sabbatical or leave for the entire year:
 - In the case where the faculty member has submitted materials for review the previous year, the rolling average evaluation for the previous three years will be the merit score for the year the faculty was on sabbatical or leave. Individuals who have not been with the department for three full years will receive the rolling average score for the years served to date.
 - In the case where the faculty member did not submit materials for review the previous year, he/she will submit materials for evaluation of the preceding two

year's work (the leave year and the year preceding) according to the department's deadline, i.e. following the normal process along with all other faculty members.

- If extraordinary circumstances prevail in the submission of evaluation material surrounding a leave, the faculty member may request the Head to override the above procedures with a timetable acceptable to both parties.

1.9 Professional Performance Award

The Professional Performance Award (PPA) is a university-wide program available to faculty at the rank of Professor. As described in sections C49.1-C49.14 of the *University Handbook*, the award is designed to reward “strong 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.

Eligibility and Timing. An eligible candidate for a PPA must be a full-time 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.

Criteria. As explained in section CP49.2 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 in the Department of English will be marked by distinguished achievement in teaching, research, and service of the kind required for promotion to Professor (see section 3.2 “Standards for Promotion and Tenure” of this document for details).

Candidate Responsibilities. A Professor who applies for a PPA review should compile and submit a file that documents his or her professional accomplishments in teaching, research, and service in accordance with the criteria outlined above. This file should be complete and submitted to the Head by the date specified by the College.

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 his or her evaluation to the Head and to the Dean. A copy of the Head's written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate.

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 copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award.
- A copy of the Head's written evaluation of the candidate's qualification for the award.
- Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation.
- Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation.
- The candidate's supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award.

2. Reappointment Process

This section describes the timing, procedures, and criteria for reappointment in the Department of English. All non-tenured faculty in the Department of English are evaluated annually for reappointment.

2.1 Timing

The time frame for reappointment varies depending upon years of service:

- Non-tenured faculty in their first year at KSU are evaluated for reappointment in the spring of their first year; notice of non-reappointment must be given by the date specified by the College.
- Non-tenured faculty in their second year at KSU are evaluated for reappointment in the fall and spring of their second year; notice of non-reappointment must be given by the date specified by the College.
- Non-tenured faculty with more than two years of service are evaluated in the spring of each year; notice of non-reappointment must be given by the date specified by the College.
- Reappointment of tenure-track faculty in their third year also serves as the mid-probationary review (see section 3.4).

2.2 Reappointment Procedures for Tenure-Track faculty members

Tenure-track faculty members undergo a probationary period, normally six years, during which they document their accomplishments that will, at the end of the period, serve as a record towards tenure. Each year, the candidate's file is reviewed by the tenured faculty and assessed in terms of whether or not it demonstrates cumulative progress towards tenure.

- The Head requests each candidate for reappointment to compile and submit documentation of his or her professional accomplishments.
- The candidate submits to the Head a file of materials to be reviewed by the department's tenured faculty members. Candidates should submit a self-evaluation and other relevant materials as evidence of their accomplishments. While assembling the file, candidates are expected to consult their mentor, the Head, and the relevant sections of the *University Handbook*.
- The Head makes available to all the eligible faculty members the files of each non-tenured faculty member being considered for reappointment. Though the Head may seek input from any faculty member, votes of only tenured faculty in the department are reported to the Dean. Any member of the tenured faculty may, prior to the submissions of any recommendations to the Head, request that a candidate meet with the eligible faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate.
- Eligible faculty members submit to the Head their written recommendations for reappointment or non-reappointment of each non-tenured faculty member.
- The Head forwards to the Dean his or her written recommendation and accompanying explanation regarding reappointment or non-reappointment, including input from the eligible faculty members and providing the vote. As requested by the Dean, the Head includes additional supporting materials.
- Candidates should consult the relevant sections of the *University Handbook* for the extra-departmental procedure for reappointment. Non-tenured faculty members must be explicitly informed in writing of a decision not to renew their appointments in accordance with the Standards of Notice of Non-Reappointment.

2.3 Reappointment Procedures for Regularized Instructors

Annual reappointment for regularized instructors takes place in an institutional context that warrants a procedure distinct from that of reappointing tenure-track faculty during the probationary period. These instructors are reappointed annually for as long as they are employed at this rank, and may therefore be subject to reappointment while having

considerable seniority. Because these faculty members do not have research obligations, their file is not cumulative as is the case for tenure-track faculty; a file concerning a single year of an instructor's appointment, identical to the file considered for merit allocation, is generally sufficient to document the basis for reappointment in a given year. Therefore, the Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC) that advises the Head on annual merit will also function as a Personnel Advisory Committee for instructor reappointment.

- After completing annual evaluation of all faculty and instructors eligible for merit, the PAC will reconsider the files for instructors for the purposes of reappointment. The committee members will submit ballots to the Head indicating their votes and comments. The Instructor member of the committee will not participate in judging his or her own file for this purpose; for this person, only three ballots will be submitted to the Head.
- When PAC is finished with the reappointment files of all instructors, these files will be made available to all faculty members eligible to comment for a period of two weeks. Eligible faculty include other instructors subject to reappointment and untenured tenure-track faculty. As is the case with the reappointment of tenure-track faculty, all faculty members eligible to vote on instructor reappointment may request a meeting with the candidate. Abstention from voting in the case of instructors is considered to be a null vote, neither negative nor positive.
- The Head may call a meeting on the reappointment of a given instructor if there are questions to be resolved concerning reappointment. The Head will not recommend non-reappointment without meeting with the faculty eligible to vote in order to discuss the reappointment case.
- The Head will recommend reappointment or non-reappointment to the Dean, including input from the Department and providing the vote.
- Candidates should consult the relevant sections of the *University Handbook* for the extra-departmental procedure for reappointment. Regularized instructors must be explicitly informed in writing of a decision not to renew their appointments in accordance with the Standards of Notice of Non-Reappointment.

2.4 Reappointment Criteria

Tenure-track faculty and regularized instructors are evaluated for reappointment in the areas in which they are assigned responsibility according to their letter of hire and in consultation with the Head. Reappointment recommendations are based on the faculty member's designated period of service as outlined in sections 2.2 and 2.3. Reappointment evaluations differ from the annual evaluations for merit salary purposes in their stress on lasting contributions, consistency of performance, and versatility.

- Published Research, Scholarship, and/or Creativity Activity

When research, scholarship, or creative activity is part of the candidate's assigned responsibility, the candidate for reappointment should demonstrate commitment to and excellence in research, scholarship, or creative activity. Such commitment and excellence are evidenced by the regular publication or acceptance for publication of high-quality, original manuscripts, whether authored or co-authored, and may further include the following: the regular presentation of high-quality work (such as at readings and/or conferences); the publication of collections and/or editions; serving as editor or co-editor for a journal; the application for and/or procurement of grants and/or fellowships; and awards for and/or the reprinting of one's work. When presenting evidence of collaborative work, the candidate should indicate the scope of individual contributions to the collaboration. When assessing digital scholarship, the department usually follows the recommendations of the MLA as set forth in "Guidelines for Evaluating Work in Digital Humanities and Digital Media." When preparing their reappointment files, candidates should review the relevant sections of the *University Handbook* for its description of evidence of accomplishment in research, scholarship, and creative activity.

Although the department does not require a fixed quantity of scholarship and/or creativity in any one category before a candidate can be reappointed, the department requires adequate progress towards tenure for its tenure-track faculty.

- Teaching

The candidate for reappointment should demonstrate sustained excellence in and commitment to teaching by some combination of the following:

- Intellectual rigor of the courses taught
- Mastery of subject matter
- Clear statements of student learning outcomes
- Clear methods of helping students achieve these outcomes
- Effective, accurate methods of evaluating how well students achieve these outcomes
- The incorporation of scholarship and research into teaching
- Pedagogical professional development, including attendance at workshops, conventions, presentations, and publications.
- Awards and/or recognition for excellence in teaching and advising

The kinds of evidence necessary to show such sustained excellence and commitment must include regular student evaluations. Faculty members are expected to administer student evaluations in the classroom setting before the final examination period unless otherwise approved by the Head. Every faculty member must include unedited student evaluations as well as the summary sheet which accompanies that set of evaluations; a faculty member must not remove unfavorable or less-than-favorable evaluations from the group. See the *University Handbook*, section C34.1.

Summary evaluations of teaching should include information regarding teaching effectiveness, preparation of instructional materials and syllabi, and student assessment. Other evidence may include peer evaluations, advising/mentoring, directing programs of independent study and/or Honors projects, directing or participating in Master's Projects, special contributions to teaching diverse student populations, and contributions to particular needs of the department. Faculty should provide evidence in all these areas in their reappointment materials. No single source of information should form the basis for the evaluation. When preparing their reappointment files, candidates should review the relevant sections of the *University Handbook* for its description of evidence of accomplishment in teaching.

- Service

When service is part of a candidate's assigned responsibility, the candidate for reappointment should demonstrate excellence in and commitment to service. The kinds of evidence necessary to show such excellence and commitment may include regularly accepting committee assignments and successfully performing one's duties on those committees; performing administrative assignments; organizing, directing, and/or participating in special events; and advising student organizations. Service beyond the department may include faculty leadership; chairing and/or organizing conferences and/or conference sessions; and participating in professionally-related service for the university, the community, other academic institutions, publishers, and/or national organizations. When preparing their reappointment files, candidates should review the relevant sections of the *University Handbook* for its description of evidence of accomplishment in service.

3. Promotion and Tenure

This section describes the guidelines, standards, and procedures for promotion, tenure, and mid-tenure review.

3.1 Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

The following guidelines mirror those outlined in the *University Handbook*.

- Tenure should be granted only to those who demonstrate individual excellence and whose expertise corresponds to the present and anticipated continuing needs of the university. Thus, tenure decisions are based mainly on candidates' contribution to institutional mission. Tenure evaluation is not merely the sum of the annual merit evaluations.
- Because institutional excellence is enhanced by faculty versatility, a faculty member who can perform outside a narrow specialty is of greater value to the institution. External

reviewers and department faculty should therefore consider a candidate's ability to function across major areas of work (teaching, research, scholarship, and other creative endeavors), as well as directed and non-directed service.

- As stated in the *University Handbook*, "The beginning faculty member is serving a kind of internship . . . and . . . he/she may not always be the best judge of his/her own effectiveness. An occasional word of caution, advice, or encouragement from experienced colleagues can therefore be very salutary. If the time comes that the department, division, and administration conclude that his/her connections with the institution should be severed, the responsible officials of the institution should feel completely free to explain to him/her the basis of their decision. However, if reasons are given for non-reappointment, the institution does not assume the burden of demonstrating the validity of its reasons. To be sure, the faculty member may question whatever reasons are given him/her. But unlike the tenured teacher, he/she does not as a probationer have what can be considered a claim to his/her position, and it would thus seem unreasonable to compel the institution to account for this exercise of its prerogative, much less carry the burden of justifying its decision." A junior faculty member will not, however, be given notice of non-reappointment for reasons which violate his or her academic freedom.

- Tenure should be awarded to those who are excellent overall and who are at least adequate in every significant aspect of job performance. Behaviors that adversely affect collegiality or are chronically disruptive influence tenure decisions.

- Because no probationary time is transferred into Kansas State University, candidates may request that they be considered for tenure and promotion at any time during the probationary period.

- Promotion to Associate Professor. Because promotion to Associate Professor must confer tenure and because tenure is not given to Assistant Professors at Kansas State University, a positive decision of promotion to Associate Professor is also a positive decision for tenure. For persons appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor, the maximum probationary period for gaining promotion and tenure consists of six regular annual appointments (unless otherwise negotiated with the Head according to the exceptions outlined in the *University Handbook*, section C83). Candidates not approved for tenure during the sixth year of service will be notified by the Dean that the seventh year of appointment will constitute the terminal year of appointment.

- Promotion to Professor is based on attainment of national or international recognition in the candidate's academic field, as determined by peers within the discipline of English language and literature.

3.2 Standards for Promotion and Tenure

Candidates for tenure will be evaluated on research, scholarship, and/or creative activity; teaching; and service. While the department recognizes that some overlap exists among these categories, for the sake of simplicity each will be considered separately below. While assembling the requisite portfolio of materials, candidates are expected to consult their mentor, the Head, and the relevant sections of the *University Handbook*.

• Published Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

The candidate must demonstrate sustained excellence in and commitment to research, scholarship, and/or creative activity. The kinds of evidence necessary to show such sustained excellence should include the regular publication or acceptance for publication of high-quality, original manuscripts, whether authored or co-authored, and may also include the following: the regular presentation of high-quality work (such as at readings and/or conferences); the publication of collections and/or editions; serving as editor or co-editor for a journal; the application for and/or procurement of grants and/or fellowships; and awards for and/or the reprinting of one's work. When presenting evidence of collaborative work, the candidate should indicate the scope of individual contributions to the collaboration. When assessing digital scholarship, the department usually follows the recommendations of the MLA as set forth in "Guidelines for Evaluating Work in Digital Humanities and Digital Media."

The field of English is composed of numerous disciplines and sub-disciplines, each of which has its own expectations and norms, so there can be no fixed quantity of research, scholarship, and creative activity required in any one category before a candidate can be recommended for tenure.

At the same time, however, the department believes that scholars should usually be able to accomplish research and publication equivalent to four manuscripts with peer-reviewed or professionally respected journals and/or presses before the tenure-review process begins.

For creative writers in the department, the range of length and type of creative work is wider, including poems, novellas, short stories, short-shorts, essays, and books, as well as scholarship regarding pedagogy or contemporary literature, so in many cases a mathematical formula cannot equate creative with scholarly publication.

In all sub-disciplines, it will be the responsibility of each candidate to show how his or her portfolio of work, published in peer-reviewed or professionally respected venues, evinces some combination of the following:

- Intellectual rigor
- Creative risk-taking
- Sustained publication
- Breadth of publication
- Awards and recognition
- Original contribution to the profession
- Impact on the profession

It will be the candidate's responsibility to show that his or her record of research, scholarship, and/or creative activity achieves the department's standards of excellence and consistency.

• Teaching

The successful candidate for tenure should demonstrate sustained excellence in and commitment to teaching by showing evidence for some combination of the following:

- Intellectual rigor of the courses taught
- Mastery of subject matter
- Clear statements of student learning outcomes
- Clear methods of helping students achieve these outcomes
- Effective, accurate methods of evaluating how well students achieve these outcomes
- The incorporation of scholarship and research into teaching
- Pedagogical professional development, including attendance at workshops, conventions, presentations, and publications.
- Awards and/or recognition for excellence in teaching and advising

The kinds of evidence necessary to show such sustained excellence and commitment must include regular student evaluations. Faculty members are expected to administer student evaluations in the classroom setting before the final examination period unless otherwise approved by the Head. Summary evaluations of teaching should include information regarding teaching effectiveness, preparation of instructional materials and syllabi, and student assessment. Other evidence may include peer evaluations, advising/mentoring, directing programs of independent study and/or Honors projects, directing or participating in Master's Projects, special contributions to teaching diverse student populations, and contributions to particular needs of the department. The department does not require a fixed quantity of excellence in any one category before a candidate can be recommended for tenure; it will be the candidate's responsibility to show that his or her record of teaching achieves the department's standards of excellence and consistency.

• Service

The successful candidate for tenure must demonstrate sustained excellence in and commitment to departmental service. Evidence for such service may include regularly accepting committee assignments and successfully performing one's duties on those committees; performing administrative assignments; organizing, directing, and/or participating in special events; and advising student organizations. Service beyond the department may include faculty leadership; chairing and/or organizing conferences and/or conference sessions; and participating in professionally-related service for the university, the community, other academic institutions, publishers, and/or national organizations. The department does not require a fixed quantity of excellence in any one category before a candidate can be recommended for tenure review; it will be the

candidate's responsibility to show that his or her record of service achieves the department's standards of excellence and consistency.

- The successful candidate for promotion to Professor must show continued professional development and distinguished achievement since the last promotion in research, scholarship, or creative activity; in teaching; and in service since the last promotion.

Distinguished achievement in research, scholarship, or creative activity consists of significant accomplishment beyond the credentials submitted for promotion to Associate Professor. Such work should have demonstrably attained national or international reputation and usually includes peer-reviewed or professionally respected publication or acceptance of a single-authored book or its equivalent. Distinguished achievement in teaching consists of demonstrated excellence in the classroom, as well as pedagogical or curricular innovation or creativity since the last promotion. Distinguished achievement in service consists of a record demonstrating serious commitment to the institution and the profession.

3.3 Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

The following steps in evaluating candidates for promotion and tenure follow suggestions found in the *University Handbook*. For promotion to Professor, the procedures are the same as for Associate Professor except that only Professors examine the candidate's file and only Professors' votes are counted.

- When candidates wish to be considered for tenure and/or promotion, they compile and submit a file documenting their professional accomplishments. For Assistant Professors, the file should clearly indicate their fulfillment of assigned responsibilities, according to their letter of hire and in consultation with the Head. For Associate Professors, it should clearly indicate their professional activities subsequent to their last promotion and may include new directions of research, scholarship, and creative activity. For all faculty, as indicated in the *University Handbook*, the file must demonstrate superior professional accomplishment and excellence in the performance of their assigned duties. The Head is responsible for making the candidate's file available in a timely manner.
- The Head will arrange for the candidate to be assessed by three external reviewers who are recognized and respected professionals in the candidate's field. These external peer reviewers will be asked to assess the candidate's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion at Kansas State University. The Head will provide each reviewer the pertinent materials from the candidate's file and a written description of the candidate's responsibilities during the period being evaluated. Because external reviewers are most likely to be familiar with and able to judge a candidate's research and other creative endeavors and are likely to review only that area of performance, external reviews will be weighted accordingly.

The Head will ask faculty, including the candidate for tenure and/or promotion, for a list of names of external peer reviewers. The final selection of external reviewers is, however, the Head's responsibility, and the Head will seek an equal number recommended by the candidate and by the faculty (see the *University Handbook*, section C112.2). External reviewers should be objective; therefore, comments from a candidate's major professor or graduate school classmates may be regarded as less persuasive and should be avoided. The external reviewers' responses will be made available to the voting faculty members to consider in making their recommendations regarding tenure and/or promotion.

- For Assistant Professors the Head calls a meeting of the tenured faculty to discuss each candidate's case. Any tenured faculty member may request that a candidate meet with the tenured faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate. For Associate Professors the Head calls a meeting of the Professors to discuss the candidate's case. Any Professor may request that a candidate meet with the Professors to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate.
- After the voting faculty has met, the Head requests completed ballots with explanatory comments from each voting faculty member. The faculty should be aware that ballots and unedited comments, along with the candidate's complete file, are forwarded to the Dean.
- The Head forwards a written recommendation to the Dean, accompanied by the explanation of her or his judgment, as well as the vote of the appropriate faculty. The Head also forwards to the Dean all ballots and unedited comments of the voting faculty members, along with the candidate's complete file.

3.4 Mid-Probationary Review

A review more formal than annual reappointment reviews is conducted of probationary faculty members during their third year of employment (unless otherwise negotiated with the Head according to the exceptions outlined in the *University Handbook*, section C83). The procedures for this review are the same as for the tenure review except that outside peer reviewers are not consulted. Faculty should include in their comments to the Head indications of whether or not they believe the candidate is on track for a positive tenure decision. The Head forwards a written recommendation to the Dean, accompanied by the explanation of her or his judgment, as well as the vote of the appropriate faculty. The Head also forwards to the Dean all ballots and unedited comments of the voting faculty members, along with the candidate's complete file.

3.5 Promotion of Instructors

The following guidelines mirror those outlined in the *University Handbook*.

Eligibility

- After a five-year period at the rank of Instructor, faculty members holding a regular appointment at that rank are eligible for promotion to the rank of Advanced Instructor.
- After a three-year period at the rank of Advanced Instructor, faculty members holding a regular appointment at that rank are eligible for promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor.

Standards for Promotion

- As stated in the *University Handbook*, “Persons appointed to these ranks may expect to be promoted on the basis of demonstrated individual merit in relationship to their association with the university’s mission and within their discipline.” Further, “Each higher rank demands a higher level of accomplishment consistent with the expectations based on specific criteria, standards, and guidelines developed by departmental faculty in consultation with the department head or chair and the appropriate dean. Department heads/chairs are expected to notify faculty members regarding their progress toward or readiness for promotion review.”
- Candidates for promotion to the rank of Advanced Instructor and Senior Instructor will be evaluated according to their assigned workload and responsibilities. As noted in section 1.1, the standard workload for faculty holding a regular appointment as Instructor will include teaching for 100% of their load. In conversation with the Head, this standard workload may be adjusted to include teaching for 80-95% of the workload. In such cases, service and/or research, scholarship, and creative activity would include 5-20% of the workload.

• Teaching

The successful candidate for promotion should demonstrate sustained excellence in and commitment to teaching by showing evidence for some combination of the following:

- Intellectual rigor of the courses taught
- Mastery of subject matter
- Clear statements of student learning outcomes
- Clear methods of helping students achieve these outcomes
- Effective, accurate methods of evaluating how well students achieve these outcomes
- The incorporation of scholarship and research into teaching
- Pedagogical professional development, including attendance at workshops, conventions, presentations, and publications
- Awards and/or recognition for excellence in teaching and advising

The kinds of evidence necessary to show such sustained excellence and commitment must include regular student evaluations. Faculty members are expected to administer student evaluations in the classroom setting before the final examination period unless otherwise approved by the Head. Summary evaluations of teaching should include information regarding teaching effectiveness, preparation of instructional materials and syllabi, and student assessment. Other evidence may include peer evaluations, advising/mentoring, directing programs of independent study and/or Honors projects, directing or participating in Master's Projects, special contributions to teaching diverse student populations, and contributions to particular needs of the department. For promotion of instructors, the department does not require a fixed quantity of excellence in any one category before a candidate can be recommended for promotion; it will be the candidate's responsibility to show that his or her record of teaching achieves the department's standards of excellence and consistency.

- Service (as assigned)

The successful candidate for promotion must demonstrate excellence in and commitment to departmental service. Evidence for such service may include regularly accepting committee assignments and successfully performing one's duties on those committees; performing administrative assignments; organizing, directing, and/or participating in special events; and advising student organizations. Service beyond the department may include faculty leadership; chairing and/or organizing conferences and/or conference sessions; and participating in professionally-related service for the university, the community, other academic institutions, publishers, and/or national organizations. For the promotion of instructors, the department does not require a fixed quantity of excellence in any one category before a candidate can be recommended for promotion; it will be the candidate's responsibility to show that his or her record of service achieves the department's standards of excellence and consistency.

- Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (as assigned)

The successful candidate for promotion must demonstrate excellence in and commitment to research, scholarship, and/or creative activity. The kinds of evidence necessary to show such excellence may include the publication or acceptance for publication of high-quality, original manuscripts. It may also include the following: the regular presentation of high-quality work (such as at readings and/or conferences); the publication of collections and/or editions; serving as editor or co-editor for a journal; the application for and/or procurement of grants and/or fellowships; and awards for and/or the reprinting of one's work. When presenting evidence of collaborative work, the candidate should indicate the scope of individual contributions to the collaboration. When assessing digital scholarship, the department usually follows the recommendations of the MLA as set forth in "Guidelines for Evaluating Work in Digital Humanities and Digital Media."

The field of English is composed of numerous disciplines and sub-disciplines, each of which has its own expectations and norms, so there can be no fixed quantity of research, scholarship, and creative activity required in any one category.

For creative writers in the department, the range of length and type of creative work is wider, including poems, novellas, short stories, short-shorts, essays, and books, as well as scholarship regarding pedagogy or contemporary literature, so in many cases a mathematical formula cannot equate creative with scholarly publication.

In all sub-disciplines, it will be the responsibility of each candidate to show how his or her portfolio of work evinces some combination of the following:

- Intellectual rigor
- Creative risk-taking
- Sustained publication
- Breadth of publication
- Awards and recognition
- Original contribution to the profession
- Impact on the profession

For promotion of instructors, the department does not require a fixed quantity of excellence in any one category before a candidate can be recommended for promotion; it will be the candidate's responsibility to show that his or her record of research, scholarship, and/or creative activity achieves the department's standards of excellence and consistency.

• The successful candidate for promotion to Senior Instructor must show continued professional development and meritorious achievement in the areas of appointment since promotion to Advanced Instructor. The higher level of accomplishment expected for promotion to Senior Instructor consists of continued professional development and meritorious achievement since the previous promotion. Three years at the rank of Advanced Instructor are required before application for the next promotion may take place.

Procedures for Promotion

The following steps in evaluating candidates for promotion follow suggestions found in the *University Handbook*. For promotion to Senior Instructor, the procedures are the same as for Advanced Instructor.

• When candidates wish to be considered for promotion, they compile and submit a file documenting their professional accomplishments. This file should include the candidate's PAC evaluations since appointment or the last promotion, a C.V., and a one-page letter of application for promotion. For Instructors, the file should clearly indicate their fulfillment of assigned responsibilities, according to their letter of hire and in consultation with the Head. For Advanced Instructors, it should clearly indicate their professional activities

subsequent to their last promotion. For all instructors, as indicated in the *University Handbook*, the file must show “demonstrated individual merit in relationship to their association with the university’s mission and within their discipline.”

- The Head is responsible for making the candidate’s file available in a timely manner to all faculty members eligible to comment for a period of two weeks. Eligible faculty members include regularized instructors, untenured tenure-track faculty, and tenured faculty.
- The Head calls a meeting of the tenured faculty and instructors above the candidate’s rank, who will constitute the voting faculty, to discuss each candidate’s case. Any voting faculty member may request that a candidate meet with the voting faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate.
- After the voting faculty has met, the Head requests completed ballots with explanatory comments. The voting faculty should be aware that ballots and unedited comments, along with the candidate’s complete file, are forwarded to the Dean.
- The Head forwards a written recommendation to the Dean, accompanied by the explanation of her or his judgment, as well as the vote of the appropriate faculty. The Head also forwards to the Dean all ballots and unedited comments of the voting faculty members, along with the candidate’s complete file.

4. Policy on Overload Teaching

Faculty members in the Department of English may develop and teach overload courses at Kansas State University. These courses include classes offered through Global Campus, Evening College, Study Abroad, and Intersession during the fall, winter, spring, and summer terms.

These courses are assigned as a voluntary overload in addition to a faculty member’s regular contracted duties. Faculty members, both full-time and term (adjunct), are eligible to teach overload courses following consultation with the Head, Associate Head, and, when applicable, the Director of Undergraduate Studies and Director of Graduate Studies, and according to the following guidelines:

Eligibility. The Head extends the opportunity to teach overload courses only to those faculty members who demonstrate a satisfactory record in all areas of their appointment.

Frequency. The department limits the teaching of overload courses to three deliveries per faculty member per year as follows: one course in the fall semester, one course in the spring semester, one course during Intersession (January or May), and one course in summer. These three deliveries cannot be concurrent.

Type of course. The course offered must enhance rather than compromise existing course offerings at the undergraduate and graduate levels in terms of enrollment and course content.

Enrollment cap. The enrollment cap for the course offered is set by the Head in consultation with the Associate Head and the instructor. The enrollment cap must be comparable to or lower than the enrollment cap established for traditional offerings.

Course approval. Requests to teach a course should be submitted to the appropriate advisory committee – the Undergraduate Advisory Committee or the Graduate Advisory Committee – for review and recommendation to the Associate Head and Head, with whom final approval resides.

Faculty workload. Probationary faculty on the tenure-track are discouraged from pursuing overload teaching unless doing so will enhance their progress towards tenure.

Compensation. Except for a course offered through Study Abroad, maximum compensation for teaching an overload class will be determined as follows:

Courses at 400-level and below: \$3,000

Courses at 500-level and above: \$4,000

These salary monies may be taken in the form of salary (taxed) or in the form of professional development funds. The balance of monies generated by the course will come to the department to be used, as determined by the Head, for the benefit of the department overall. The compensation per course may be adjusted by the Head, as circumstances warrant; any adjustment would be determined in advance of open enrollment.