

Educational Leadership Department

College of Education

Policy Statement Concerning:

Personnel Review and Evaluation Standards/Procedures

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

Titles Approved by Faculty Vote on: January 12, 2026

NEXT REVIEW DATE:

Department Chair's Signature *Royce Ann Collins*

Date January 12, 2026

Dean's Signature

DMercer

Date: January 12, 2026

Provost's Signature

WBB

Date: 7/9/2026

POLICY AND PROCEDURES MANUAL

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

**Kansas State University
College of Education**

**Revisions approved by Ed Leadership, Adult Learning and Leadership, and Community College Leadership
Faculties September 2025**

Brief Modern History

In 2004, the Department of Educational Administration and Leadership and the Department of Foundations and Adult Education were joined and renamed The Department of Educational Leadership. Selected major policy documents were reviewed and approved in September 2004. The entire Department *Policy and Procedures Manual* was reviewed by all faculty and approved in March 2006. Changes to undergraduate Leadership Studies and Programs reporting structures made in August 2006 were reflected in that printed version. In July 2008, Leadership Studies was removed from the Department and created as a separate School under the Provost's Office, with continued reporting to the College of Education and the Department of Educational Leadership for course and curriculum and tenure and promotion matters. In January 2009, for reasons involving accreditation matters, evaluation policies affecting the Faculties of Adult Education and Educational Leadership were clarified to require evaluation of all teaching personnel, including adjuncts and instructors. In October 2013, the Department *Policy and Procedures Manual* and embedded evaluation and performance documents were reviewed, revised, and approved as required by the University every five years and again updated in December 2015 to reflect changing faculty demographics having to do with tenure and promotion self-governance and the University's authorization of new professional titles for non-tenure track faculty. The October 2017 revision contains the mandated five-year review of tenure and promotion standards for the Staley School of Leadership Studies, collapses select sections governing EDLEA and EDACE into joint policies and also provides a full review and update of the entire *Policy and Procedures Manual* for all EDLEA and EDACE programs. The April 2025 revisions contain the addition of the Community College Leadership program and the COE Faculty Workload Policy. Further in August 2025, the promotion and tenure process/home was transitioned to the Staley School for tenured/tenure-track leadership studies faculty as approved by the Provost office and all references to the Staley School were removed from this document.

Table of Contents

SECTION 3

A	5
INTRODUCTION	5
Brief Complete History	5
Mission	5
SECTION B	7
INSTITUTIONAL AND DEPARTMENTAL STRUCTURE.....	7
Overview	7
University.....	7
College	7
Department.....	7
SECTION C	8
RELATIONSHIPS TO OTHER UNITS.....	8
SECTION D	9
DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE	9
Overview	9
Department Chair Definition	9
Appointment and Term of Department Chair	9
Duties of Department Chair	9
Evaluation of Department Chair	9
SECTION E	11
FACULTY STRUCTURE	11
Overview	11
Appointment and Assignment of Faculty	11
Promotions in Rank	12
SECTION F	13
EVALUATION STRUCTURE	13
Overview	13
Evaluation Defined	13
Evaluation Procedure	13
SECTION G	14
DEPARTMENT BUDGET	14
Overview	14
General Reporting.....	14
SECTION H	15
DEPARTMENTAL PROGRAMS.....	15
Overview	15
Educational Leadership (EDLEA).....	15
Adult Learning and Leadership (EDACE)	15
Community College Leadership Program (EDACE)	15
SECTION I.....	16
DEPARTMENTAL ADVISING	16
Expectation for Advisement	16
Qualification for Advising and Graduate Committee Membership.....	16
SECTION J	17
DEPARTMENTAL GRADUATE-LEVEL	17
Master's Comprehensive Examination	17
Doctoral Preliminary Examinations.....	17
SECTION K	18
DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES.....	18
Introduction.....	18
Definitions.....	18
Duties	18
SECTION L	19

DEPARTMENT MEETINGS	19
Times.....	19
Conduct.....	19
Records	19
SECTION M.....	20
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR REVISION.....	20
APPENDIXES.....	21
APPENDIX A: Faculty Evaluation Policies.....	22
Joint Policy of the Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership, Community College Leadership, and Educational Leadership.....	23
APPENDIX B: Minimum Acceptable Levels of Productivity	27
Joint Policy of the Faculties of Adult Learning and Leadership, Community College Leadership, and Educational Leadership.....	28
APPENDIX C: Standards for Tenure and Promotion and the Mid-Tenure Review	32
Joint Policy of the Faculties of Adult Learning and Leadership, Community College Leadership, and Educational Leadership.....	33
APPENDIX D: Professorial Performance Award.....	40
Joint Policy of the Faculties of Adult Learning and Leadership, Community College Leadership, and Educational Leadership.....	41
APPENDIX E: Post-Tenure Review Standards	44
Joint Policy of the Faculties of Adult Learning and Leadership, Community College Leadership, and Educational Leadership.....	45
APPENDIX F: Professional Positions Titles for Non-Tenure Track Faculty.....	48
Joint Policy of the Faculties of Adult Learning and Leadership, Community College Leadership, and Educational Leadership.....	49

POLICY AND PROCEDURES MANUAL

Department of Educational Leadership

A

INTRODUCTION

Brief Complete History

The [Department of Educational Leadership](#) has evolved through many iterations over nearly six decades at [Kansas State University](#). Housed in the [College of Education](#), the Department now joins together academic faculty and programs from several previous departments. In 1987, the Department of Administration and Foundations was collapsed into several small academic units, from among which emerged the Department of Educational Administration (EDADM) and the Department of Foundations and Adult Education (FAE). In 1995, EDADM changed its name to Educational Administration and Leadership (EDADL) and began a new undergraduate interdisciplinary minor under the title Leadership Studies and Programs (EDLST). In 2004, the College merged the Department of Educational Administration and Leadership and the Department of Foundations and Adult Education, renaming it the Department of Educational Leadership (EDLEA). Under this structure, faculty and programs in educational administration, adult and continuing education, and leadership studies and programs were joined across broad similar aims, with each program's faculty retaining autonomy in certain matters such as tenure and promotion, curriculum, and more. In 2008, Leadership Studies and Programs was completely severed from the Department and placed under the Provost's control for purposes of creating a new School of Leadership Studies. In 2009, the School of Leadership Studies was partially returned to the Department for the purpose of supervising the tenure/promotion and curriculum processes of the School. In 2010 the School was renamed as the [Staley School of Leadership Studies](#) in honor of donors who provided a new permanent campus building to house the program. In 2017, the School broadened its scope to include both undergraduate and graduate programming. In 2025, the Staley School faculty reached sufficient membership at all ranks and the promotion and tenure process was transitioned to the school and out of the Department of Educational Leadership. Also in 2017, degree names in adult and continuing education (AOCNT) were changed to adult learning and leadership (ALRLD), and the Department subsumed the College's graduate certificate in social justice education into the adult learning and leadership curriculum. In the summer of 2019, the Community College Leadership doctoral program (CCLP) was added under the Department of Educational Leadership.

Mission

The College of Education houses a variety of undergraduate and graduate academic programs. Central to the definition of a true university are the roles of undergraduate preparation for a wide range of careers, and graduate training for prospective researchers and practitioners within individual disciplines and career options. The College of Education, through the Department of Educational Leadership, carries out undergraduate and graduate education for persons aspiring to obtain careers as leaders in a wide variety of settings. These aspirants are served by a full spectrum of degree and/or professional license options. Graduate students in the adult learning and leadership emphasis come from a wide variety of career paths including business and industry, private/nonprofit/government sectors, higher education, the military, and more. Graduate students in the educational leadership emphasis usually seek administrative or staff positions in public or private school systems, colleges or universities, federal/state/tribal governments and agencies, businesses that place emphasis on learning, or in research organizations. Doctoral students in the community college leadership program seek executive leadership positions at U.S. community colleges. As a result, the mission of the Department is to provide leadership education tailored to a range of career pathways at the master's and doctoral levels.

B

INSTITUTIONAL AND DEPARTMENTAL STRUCTURE

Overview

The Department of Educational Leadership is governed under rules and organizational structure laid out by the University, the College of Education, and the Department itself. These rules and structures also shape the Department's relationship to other units, particularly within the College of Education.

University

The [*University Handbook*](#) sets out the structure of the University, defining the organizational hierarchy and rules of University operation under the direction of the Kansas Board of Regents, the University's President, the Provost, and other staff assigned to support roles for these persons.

College

The *University Handbook* further identifies the major administrative units of the University as the respective Colleges making up the University. The College of Education is under the direction of the Dean of Education who is charged with operation and development, planning and budgeting, and personnel management and activities of the College.

Department

The *University Handbook* defines the basic administrative unit of the University as the academic department. Each department reports to its respective dean. The Department of Educational Leadership is housed in the College of Education and is responsible to the Dean of Education.

Within the umbrella Department itself, the Faculty of Educational Leadership is hereby designated an internally autonomous unit in matters of performance evaluation, tenure and promotion, and academic program control, and the Faculties of Adult Education and Leadership and Community College Leadership are internally autonomous units in all identical matters as well.

C

RELATIONSHIPS TO OTHER UNITS

Colleges and departments are subject to University-wide rules and regulations. In addition, departments offering graduate instruction and advanced degrees are subject to rules and regulations of the [Graduate School](#), which stands apart from other units in the University. The Department of Educational Leadership is thus significantly affected by Graduate School rules and regulations pertaining to eligibility for graduate faculty membership and doctoral certification to direct dissertations as enacted by the Graduate Council and administered by the Graduate Dean apart from individual Colleges. The impact of all these rules and regulations is wide-ranging, affecting how faculty are permitted to teach, direct research, and award degrees. Effectively, the Department of Educational Leadership is subject to two dual reporting and administrative governance channels.

Other relationships with separate academic units within the College of Education also exist through cases of collaboration, cross-disciplinary coursework, participation in College and University committees, and representation on the College of Education's Administrative Council.

D

DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

Overview

The Department of Educational Leadership is organized as a single free-standing unit within the College of Education under the leadership of the Department Chair in concert with full faculty participation.

Department Chair Definition

As intended by the Department of Educational Leadership, the position of Department Chair is one of collegial leadership among peers and faculty liaison to the Dean of Education, wherein the Chair is regarded as a faculty member with administrative responsibilities and who is answerable to the Department Faculties collectively. This stands in contrast to the traditional definition of a department head, who is usually regarded as a true administrator within a college. The distinction and adoption of chairship is deliberate and based on principles of collegiality within the Department.

Appointment and Term of Department Chair

Chairs shall serve for a five-year period. Chairs shall be eligible for coterminous terms without limit. The Chair shall be recommended in an open meeting of the Department or by other manner as approved by the Dean of Education. Any faculty member whose appointment is in the Department of Educational Leadership shall be eligible to serve. The Chair serves at the pleasure of the Dean who by policy may opt for an internal or external search as vacancies arise.

Duties of Department Chair

The Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership shall take primary leadership for the following:

- Effectively communicating the Department's expectations to the Dean and other administrators;
- Making effective administrative decisions in implementing the Department's expectations;
- Providing opportunities for Department input in decision-making;
- Taking a primary leadership role in planning and actualizing Department goals and objectives, while encouraging individual and collective faculty initiative designed to move the Department forward;
- Keeping the Faculties informed of important extra-departmental events affecting the nature, scope, and direction of goals and objectives;
- Responding promptly and effectively to faculty concerns by providing proper follow-up and confidentiality;
- Establishing a responsible fiscal plan and securing faculty agreement on budgetary principles and expenditures;
- Providing administrative and support services that reflect competence, promptness and accuracy in an environment that promotes a professional image for the Department;
- Securing and sustaining high levels of faculty confidence regarding Chair performance on the traits of trustworthiness, flexibility, fairness, decisiveness, thoughtfulness, organizational effectiveness, and democratic decision-making.

Evaluation of Department Chair

College procedure mandates that Chairs report directly to the Dean of Education. By custom and policy, the Dean evaluates Chairs at least every three years and historically has elected to do so annually. The concept of chairship, however, strongly implies accountability to the Faculties.

Chairs in the Department of Educational Leadership therefore should expect to be multiply evaluated.

The Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership shall be evaluated annually by members of the Department: i.e., the Chair shall offer their merit materials for faculty review as part of the merit evaluation cycle conducted within the Department, except that the Chair shall not be included in the merit ranking data forwarded to the Dean. The purpose of excluding the Chair is to avoid drawing down available merit pool monies since the Dean separately evaluates Chairs for merit purposes. While faculty are not required to offer formal comments on Chair performance, they are encouraged to do so and may submit their comments directly to the Chair or to the Dean. Evaluation by peers within the Department shall include assessment of all areas applicable to all other similarly situated faculty (i.e., teaching, research, service) and shall additionally include comments regarding administrative performance by the Chair on the duties of that office.

E

FACULTY STRUCTURE

Overview

The Department of Educational Leadership recognizes that faculty are the essential element of a university, a college, and successful academic programs and services. Faculty are distinguished by their professional expertise and, in the case of the Department of Educational Leadership, by their participation in international, national, state and local teaching, research, and/or service contributions. As a result, the Department stands on record as supporting a strong cohesive, yet independent, faculty structure that enhances the mission of the University, the College, and the disciplines represented by individual faculty and the collective named Faculties.

Appointment and Assignment of Faculty

Appointment of faculty to the Department of Educational Leadership shall follow University and College requirements for standards and procedures. The Department of Educational Leadership, however, strongly asserts the appropriateness of position searches lodged at the Department level and further independently within each academic program area (EDLEA, EDACE, and CCLP). The Department adopts the College of Education Faculty Workload Policy. Department further accepts responsibility to assign faculty in keeping with Department needs after consultation with the Dean.

Reappointment of tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty on regular appointments deserves serious attention in a university environment. In the Department of Educational Leadership, the faculty in each separate and autonomous program area assert the right to play a primary role in such decisions. In each such case, each tenured faculty member in the relevant program of the Department, constrained by other University and College requirements, shall have an annual opportunity and responsibility to make recommendations concerning reemployment of each nontenured faculty member in that academic program. Guiding, but not limiting, such reappointment decision shall be the tenure and promotion standards adopted by each eligible program faculty (see Appendix C) or other applicable formally adopted standards. If the Chair is willing to support the majority faculty recommendation concerning the nontenured faculty member, then the Chair shall convey that recommendation to the Dean with justification. If the Chair cannot support the majority recommendation, then the Chair shall so inform the tenured faculty members, who shall have the right to select a person from faculty ranks to convey and explain the majority opinion to the Dean.

Reappointment of tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty on regular appointments shall further conform to all University and College requirements relating to reappointment procedures, including mid-tenure review, if applicable, and shall occur in conformity with dates prescribed annually by the University. The Department of Educational Leadership affirms its commitment to the spirit of mid-tenure review, which was established for the purpose of providing specific feedback on faculty progress toward satisfactory attainment of tenure status in conformity with tenure and promotion standards as adopted by each eligible program faculty (see mid-tenure process section also located in Appendix C). As presently structured, mid-tenure review requires all tenure track faculty in the third year of service to submit the collection of materials and other documentation on University-prescribed forms to the Chair of the Department. The purpose of such submission shall be to permit the Chair, the tenured voting faculty in the Department, the Tenure and Promotion Committee of the College, and the Dean to examine all items submitted as if the faculty member were being evaluated for tenure, except that the mid-tenure process shall end with the Dean's review. Upon completion of the mid-tenure review, the Chair and the Dean shall inform the faculty member(s) under review of the results, including specific advice to the faculty member on expected improvement.

Occasionally persons may be appointed to adjunct positions in the Department of Educational Leadership. It is the policy of the Department that adjuncts may only be used after: (a) consultation and agreement among the affected faculty regarding the appropriateness of adjunct assignment; (b) assurance that no other qualified regular faculty members are available to fulfill the same role; and (c) the program will be well served through the adjunct's work.

At the graduate level, under no circumstance may an adjunct serve as a major professor for either master's or doctoral committees, although in specific cases adjuncts may provide a useful service to the Department by serving on master's and/or doctoral committees as appropriate and as permitted under Graduate School rules and regulations. Adjunct faculty are further subject to performance evaluation as prescribed later in this *Policy and Procedures Manual*.

Promotions in Rank

Regularly appointed ranked faculty may be considered for promotion, either by advocacy or by personal request (see Appendix C). The Chair shall determine eligibility for such request by consulting the *University Handbook*. If the person is eligible, the Chair shall elicit recommendations from the eligible voting faculty holding equal or higher rank than the requested new rank, except that only equal rank shall qualify individuals to vote in the case of promotion to the rank of full professor. For promotion to Associate or Full Professor, eligible voting faculty are defined as those tenured faculty whose primary appointment resides in the academic program wherein such promotion would occur if the applicant's request were to be granted. For promotion within any of the term or regularly appointed non-tenure track professional positions, eligible voting faculty are defined as tenured and tenure-track faculty of the Department.

Recommendations from eligible voting faculty shall conform to ballot requirements. If the Chair is willing to support the majority faculty recommendation regarding promotion, then the Chair shall convey that recommendation to the appropriate levels required by tenure and promotion procedures. If the Chair cannot support the majority recommendation, then the Chair shall so inform the Dean of voting results and shall further so inform the voting faculty members, who shall have the right to select a person from faculty ranks to convey and explain the majority opinion to the Dean.

The history of the Department of Educational Leadership favoring autonomous Faculties in EDLEA and EDACE has long worked to the benefit of all programs and groups. All Faculties, recognizing a desire to continue such autonomy in perpetuity, also recognize that foreseeable and unforeseeable events may at times render impractical the conduct of complete self-direction. This reality arises most predictably when retirements or resignations reduce mid-level and senior voting ranks to such levels within a single program area so as to cause too few eligible voting faculty to defensibly conduct business as described throughout this *Policy and Procedures Manual*. Therefore, if and only when such voting rights imbalance occurs, it is the policy of the Department to combine EDLEA and EDACE voting Faculties in order to obtain a reasonable number of eligible votes in matters of curriculum conduct and/or especially in matters of carrying out promotion and tenure responsibilities. By definition, therefore, whenever there are fewer than three eligible members of a given Faculty (i.e., EDLEA or EDACE) entitled to vote on any tenure and/or promotion or course and curriculum matter, the other Faculties shall be asked to vote. Once a program's faculty numbers and ranks are restored, however, each Faculty shall return to its autonomous state.

F

EVALUATION STRUCTURE

Overview

The Department of Educational Leadership accepts and validates the concept of accountability and performance evaluation. Each respective Faculty (EDACE (incorporating CCLP) and EDLEA) shall be required to adopt a formal evaluation policy (see Appendix A).

Evaluation Defined

Evaluation is defined in the Department of Educational Leadership as comprising a set of activities engaged in by the Department leading to assessment of the performance of individual faculty against the goals and objectives set out for each individual within the categories of teaching, research, and service as appropriate to the Department's various program emphases.

Evaluation Procedure

The set of activities resulting in the act of evaluation within each program area is elaborated in Appendix A. For general policy explanation purposes, evaluation procedures in the Department of Educational Leadership are as follows:

- All faculty in the Department shall be evaluated annually for merit purposes.
- The evaluation period shall cover the timeframe of January through December.
- Performance contracts shall be constructed for each faculty member.
- Evaluation shall encompass only those goals and objectives drawn for each individual faculty member and included in the written performance contract.
- Evaluation shall strictly follow the timelines for performance contracts and other dates as set out in the evaluation policy in Appendix A.
- In addition to the foregoing, all other persons having teaching or student-supervisory responsibility in the Department through special arrangement such as adjunct or other status (.e.g., mentors, field-based practicum supervisors), shall be subject to formal evaluation. Such evaluation, however, shall be only on teaching /supervisory performance and shall be carried out only in those semesters when the adjunct/supervisor is actively assigned to a teaching role.
- The procedure outlined here applies in its entirety to EDLEA and EDACE.

G

DEPARTMENT BUDGET

Overview

The Department of Educational Leadership accepts the responsibility and privilege of faculty self-determination regarding use of available resources. The Department Chair shall be charged with wise and resourceful administration of Department budget matters. Faculty may expect to be provided with equal access to the Department's resources within the limitations of program priorities, benefit, and resource constraints.

General Reporting

The Chair shall make the budget open to all faculty members of the Department.

H

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRAMS

Overview

The Department of Educational Leadership offers a variety of programs and curricular emphases under a broad leadership umbrella.

Educational Leadership (EDLEA)

The Department offers a full program of educational leadership graduate studies culminating in the M.S. and Ed.D degrees. The programmatic focus is on developing leaders in educational settings, with emphasis on P-12 public schools. For most graduates, program focus leads to professional building or district leadership licensure as a school principal or superintendent. The Department cooperates with other parts of the College to license other school professionals such as special education directors. Program materials identify degree and/or license requirements on the [Educational Leadership website](#), [Building Licensure website](#), and [District Licensure website](#).

Adult Learning and Leadership (EDACE)

The Department offers a full program of graduate studies in adult learning and leadership, culminating in the M.S. and Ed.D., and Ph.D degrees. Program materials identify degree requirements on the [Adult Learning and Leadership website](#).

Community College Leadership Program (EDACE)

The Department offers a doctoral program in community college leadership culminating in the Ed.D. degree. Program materials identify degree requirements on the [Community College Leadership website](#).

I

DEPARTMENTAL ADVISING

Expectation for Advisement

High quality academic advising is essential to ensuring that students achieve their degree and/or professional license objectives in a timely and efficient manner. All faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership are thus expected to provide responsive, high-quality advisement. Faculty shall be evaluated in meaningful part on their advising to students at all degree levels.

Qualification for Advising and Graduate Committee Membership

All faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership shall be assigned advising duties appropriate to their program employment. All permanent faculty attached to graduate programs in the Department shall be further certified by the Graduate School to serve on master's and doctoral committees. Additionally, such faculty as appropriate shall be certified to direct doctoral dissertations.

Each program, in consultation with the Department Chair, shall determine an efficient, effective, and equitable method of distributing advisement among all faculty.

J

DEPARTMENTAL GRADUATE-LEVEL EXAMINATIONS

The Department of Educational Leadership has a responsibility under rules of the Graduate School to administer final examinations to both master's and doctoral degree candidates.

Master's Comprehensive Examination

Master's examinations shall be made available to qualified students each semester at a regularly scheduled time. Care should be taken to plan ahead so that students request examinations in semesters when their supervisory committee members are contractually employed.

Construction and supervision of master's exams are the responsibility of the faculty in each respective academic program. These tasks may not be delegated except for normal clerical assistance in typing, mailing, and so forth.

The nature of master's examinations will vary over time. Each program area will consider and establish the structure of examinations on a regularly scheduled basis. Examinations may be oral, written, or portfolio- based at the discretion of each graduate program's Faculty.

Students passing master's comprehensive examinations will be notified in writing by the Graduate School. Students failing to secure a pass vote will also be notified in writing.

For accreditation and assessment purposes, an electronic system for collecting and reporting results of all comprehensive examinations shall be created, with results maintained on file in the Department Office and held until there is no further need to maintain such data.

Doctoral Preliminary Examinations

Doctoral preliminary examinations shall be made available to qualified students each semester at a regularly scheduled time. Care should be taken to plan ahead so that students request examinations in semesters when their supervisory committee members are contractually employed.

Construction and supervision of doctoral preliminary exams are the responsibility of the faculty in each respective program. These tasks may not be delegated except for clerical assistance in typing, mailing, and so forth.

The nature of doctoral examinations will vary over time within the constraints of Graduate School regulations. The scope of permissible preliminary examinations is wide and may follow the historic method of individual questions prepared by the supervisory committee; may take the form of a portfolio produced under the supervision of the major professor and/or doctoral committee; or may take the form of a successful dissertation proposal defense in lieu of any other written or oral examination. In effect, the nature of the preliminary examination is determined by the supervisory committee.

Students passing doctoral examinations will be notified in writing by the Graduate School. Students failing to secure a pass vote will also be notified in writing.

For accreditation and assessment purposes, an electronic system for collecting and reporting results of all preliminary examinations shall be created, with results maintained in the Department Office until there is no further need to maintain such data.

K

DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Introduction

In addition to the duties assigned to the Department Chair in the Department *Policy and Procedures Manual*, other duties and responsibilities for maintenance and operation of the Department may be apportioned out to individual faculty members within each academic program area, who will report regularly to each relevant Faculty. Maintenance tasks for the Department and College will be shared responsibilities of each Department member. Matters of committee assignment, Departmental projects, and initiation of new projects will be brought to the relevant Faculties for information purposes.

Definitions

For definition purposes, maintenance and operation of the Department have been classified as follows: (a) budget/resource allocation, (b) graduate studies, (c) external relations, (d) internal relations, (e) evaluation, (f) curriculum, (g) licensure, (h) clerical/aide supervision, (i) research, and (j) internship/field experiences. The Department Chair shall accept general oversight and leadership for all these areas and shall be responsible for coordinating all other work assignments in cooperation with the Faculties.

Duties

Department members have an obligation to equitably share all responsibilities reasonably associated with the Department. This includes, but is not limited to, membership on committees formed at the College and University levels. The faculty across all programs shall be sensitive to equitable distribution for service on standing College committees to include Executive Committee, Student Affairs Committee, Faculty Affairs Committee, Academic Affairs Committee, Diversity for Community Committee, Technology Committee, and Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Effort shall be made to avoid long-term service by any faculty member on any one College committee. The same spirit shall be observed in other College and University committee and service appointments as may arise on an irregular or special basis.

L

DEPARTMENT MEETINGS

Times

The widely diverse mission of the Department of Educational Leadership and its resulting umbrella academic program structure necessitates numerous meetings centered on the unique work of the various parts of the Department. The Chair shall call meetings, prepare agendas and materials, and conduct meetings with the various Faculties as needed, or may assign responsibility for scheduling and conducting such meetings. Each separate program's Faculty shall have the responsibility to meet regularly around its respective business and shall keep the Department Chair fully informed and engaged.

Conduct

Each faculty member is responsible for advance preparation and positive contribution to the meeting. Meetings are to allow for open exchange of ideas. In order to foster a professional atmosphere, no personal attacks or devaluing of members will be allowed and will be countered with verbal disapproval by other members.

Records

Minutes of each meeting will be written, distributed, and kept on file. The recorder for each meeting will assume responsibility to forward minutes to all members, the Department administrative assistant for file copy, and the Associate Dean's Office.

M

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR REVISION

The Department of Educational Leadership recognizes and accepts that other policy needs will arise over time that may not be included in this Department *Policy and Procedures Manual*. The Department recognizes that each program area has the need to create, amend, or delete its own unique policies relating to its particular programs and further recognizes that some policies and procedures are needed that apply uniformly across all programs. Nothing in this *Policy and Procedures Manual* shall be intended to create, preserve, or deny any other rights or privileges in law or University policy, and it is specifically acknowledged that any policy of the College or University shall supersede and nullify any contrary Department policy.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A: Faculty Evaluation Policies

- Joint Policy of the Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership, Community College Leadership, and Educational Leadership

Appendix B: Minimum Performance Standards

- Joint Policy of the Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership, Community College Leadership, and the Educational Leadership

Appendix C: Tenure and Promotion Standards

- Joint Policy of the Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership, Community College Leadership, and Educational Leadership

Appendix D: Professorial Performance Award Minimum Standards

- Joint Policy of the Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership, Community College Leadership, and Educational Leadership

Appendix E: Post-Tenure Review Standards

- Joint Policy of the Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership, Community College Leadership, and Educational Leadership

Appendix F: Professional Positions Titles for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

- Joint Policy of the Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership, Community College Leadership, and Educational Leadership

APPENDIX A:

Faculty Evaluation Policies

Faculty Evaluation Policy

**Joint Policy of the
Faculty of
Adult Learning and Leadership,
Community College Leadership, and
Educational Leadership**

ANNUAL EVALUATION FOR MERIT REVIEW AND PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT

Department of Educational Leadership FACULTIES OF ADULT LEARNING AND LEADERSHIP, COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERSHIP,

and EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Jointly approved September 2025

Following University procedures, the Department Chair will annually evaluate each faculty member for their contributions. The Chair's evaluation will be based on: (a) the performance categories and corresponding relative weights jointly established each year by the individual faculty member and the Chair as expressed in the written Load Assignment; (b) each faculty member's merit portfolio presentation; and (c) the Chair's own assessment of the faculty member's professional productivity relative to College and Department missions.

A. AREAS OF EVALUATION

Four areas of faculty performance are identified for annual review, although not all faculty members will automatically have equal or constant responsibilities for each area in each year. Allocation and distribution of responsibilities, and hence weighted effect, are determined jointly by the Chair and the individual faculty member within the limits prescribed here, to total 100% time assignment:

- Teaching 20% - 60%
- Student Advising 10% - 30%
- Scholarship 10% - 40%
- Service 10% - 60%

B. EVALUATION CALENDAR AND PROCESSES

It is understood that precise specification of performance outcomes is neither feasible nor constructive. Faculty evaluation is not served by rote checking off of goal attainment or tallying of points; such reductionism misdirects the spirit and purpose of performance evaluation. Rather, evaluation requires expert judgment about professional contributions and perceptive encouragement to exceed performance targets. Nonetheless, it is appropriate to establish each faculty member's responsibilities and to judge individuals' relative achievement in the prescribed areas of evaluation in order to better serve Department and College core missions of teaching, scholarship, and service and to strategically capitalize upon individual and collective faculty strengths.

Evaluation in the Department of Educational Leadership will occur following the calendar of events and deadlines published annually by the College of Education, to include the following: (a) the faculty member prepares their annual merit evaluation portfolio, generally due mid-January of each year, with the portfolio structured to self-identify and self-explain performance on the four categories of teaching, advising, scholarship and service in proportion to the current year's Load Assignment; (b) the Chair reviews the portfolio and provides a written merit letter to the faculty member, generally delivered by mid-February; (c) the Chair attaches to the merit letter a proposed Load Assignment for the new year and provides the faculty member with opportunity to discuss and amend by mutual agreement, generally within two weeks following issuance of the merit letter date; (d) the Chair meets all other college deadlines established by the Dean's office.

C. CRITERIA/REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Acceptable sources of information satisfying portfolio requirements are described in the following paragraphs. Faculty are expected to provide a portfolio containing the self-reports and evaluation information embedded within these criteria.

- **Teaching and Advising**

The University requires that an adequate system of summative evaluation of teaching must include at least two kinds of information: classroom effectiveness, and student assessment

practices. To demonstrate classroom effectiveness, each faculty member should provide a summary report of teaching activities inside and outside of the classroom, to include both formal instruction and advising. The faculty member should report, in executive summary form, data regarding instructional work during the evaluation period: examples of such data may include revision or reorganization of course content, development of new courses, efforts to introduce innovations into the curriculum or into a specific course, and advising activities. To demonstrate student assessment practices, each faculty member should provide a collection of formal data about student perceptions of instructional quality for each regularly scheduled course taught. Formal data on courses taught should be gathered via the University's TEVAL or IDEA standardized evaluation systems. Anecdotal observations gathered via open-ended questions on either TEVAL or IDEA may supplement standardized ratings. Faculty should include copies of official instruments and system-generated reports along with all student comments. Independent study courses and advising credits are excluded from the requirement to collect anonymous evaluation data.

- **Scholarship**

The University expects all faculty, and particularly so at the graduate level, to systematically engage in scholarly productivity. Scholarship includes a broad range of definition, including but not limited to publications in refereed journals. Clearest examples of scholarly works include authored or co-authored books, reviews, monographs, grant proposals, articles in peer reviewed journals, products of impactful field work, and so forth. Works that advance the teaching, development, research, and service missions of the University, that have the likelihood to be disseminated widely to relevant publics, and that are available for peer review also qualify as scholarship. To demonstrate scholarly productivity, the faculty member's annual merit portfolio should provide, in executive summary form, a bibliography of scholarly works completed during the past year. This can include evidence of publications as well as oral presentations at conferences or other recognized professional gatherings. Other appropriate artifacts could include published reviews of articles or grant proposals submitted, awards and recognitions for scholarship, reviews of books included in professional journals, and so forth.

- **Service**

The University expects all faculty to engage in the field and to provide support to external and internal constituencies. Almost all faculty members have directed service responsibilities which sometimes constitute a significant part of their Load Assignments. These can include specific assignments made by the Department or College, activities through funded grants, or major offices held in national associations. Non-directed service can include activities that contribute to the University community, the profession, or to the public. Faculty members will vary in terms of the focus of their contributions, but in all cases significant roles are expected. To demonstrate service productivity, the faculty member's merit portfolio should provide, in executive summary form, a record of all service completed during the evaluation year. Appropriate artifacts may include any evidence documenting the faculty member's work by external or internal peers such as awards for service to an organization, letters documenting the contributions made through service, and so forth.

OVERALL CHAIR EVALUATION RESPONSIBILITIES

Based on the materials supplied by each faculty member, the Chair will evaluate performance on the individual areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, along with determining an overall performance rating. For each area of evaluation, the Chair will rate the faculty member in terms of four rankings: Exceeds Standards, Meets Standards, Fails to Meet Standards but Meets Minimum Standards, or Fails to Meet Standards. These rankings are required by the University and are derived from the institutionally required *Minimum Acceptable Levels of Productivity Standards* also contained in this *Policy and Procedures Manual* (see Appendix B). The Chair is then institutionally required to link annual performance ratings and any associated annual salary increases by tying the percentage of time shown in the Load Assignment to each performance category (i.e., weighted categories). These results provide the primary contents of the Chair's letter of merit evaluation for each faculty member. As indicated previously, the individual faculty member will be provided opportunity to review the evaluation letter prior to submission to the

Dean and to acknowledge receipt via signature. In the event of a disagreement between the faculty member and the Chair concerning the evaluation rating, the faculty member will have the right to append their viewpoint to the Chair's evaluation letter.

For more information on evaluation, refer to the [*University Handbook Appendix Q*](#).

APPENDIX B:

Minimum Acceptable Levels of Productivity

Minimum Acceptable Levels of Productivity

**Joint Policy of the
Faculties of
Adult Learning and Leadership,
Community College Leadership, and
Educational Leadership**

MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE LEVELS OF PRODUCTIVITY

FACULTIES OF ADULT LEARNING AND LEADERSHIP, COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERSHIP, and EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Jointly approved September 2025

DEFINITIONS OF CATEGORIES

EXCEEDS STANDARDS (ES)

This rating is available only when a faculty member demonstrates exceptional overall performance. Exceptional is defined as:

- *Research*: Recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having been cited or depended on as a national authority.
- *Service*: Recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having secured significant external funding or national recognition for service to the profession.
- *Teaching*: Recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having been recognized for excellence in teaching through awards from Kansas State University, the College of Education, or nationally recognized organizations.

MEETS STANDARDS (MS)

This rating is available only when a faculty member meets and exceeds minimum standards for their respective academic rank. For purposes of definition, the rating of MS will be used when all the performance contract goals were achieved.

FAILS TO MEET STANDARDS, BUT MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS (MMS)

This rating is used to notify a faculty member that they have not met the terms of the annual individual performance contract, but that minimum standards have been met. The upper and lower limits of the rating of MMS are defined as follows. The upper limit shall be invoked when the individual has not met the terms of their annual performance contract. The lower limit shall be crossed when the individual has not met one or more of the standards on the minimum standards matrix. (See attached matrix).

FAILS TO MEET MINIMUM STANDARDS (FMS-MMS)

This rating is used to notify a faculty member that they have failed to satisfy one or more of the criteria on the matrix. (See matrix below). For more information on chronic low achievement, refer to the [*University Handbook* C31.1 – C31.8](#)

CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT

The procedures which follow next are in keeping with Section C31.5-8 of the *University Handbook*:

A faculty member whose overall performance falls below these levels of minimum acceptability during one evaluation year will be so informed in writing, and will meet with the Department Chair to establish a written plan of action to bring performance up to stated standards. Monthly meetings will be held with the Chair to monitor progress on the agreed upon plan. If the plan is not completed, resulting in a second year of below minimum performance, the faculty member and the Chair will meet with the Dean of the College of Education to outline specific remedial action. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which minimum standards are not met, then "dismissal for cause" will be considered at the discretion of the appropriate dean (*University Handbook* Section C31.5).

**CRITERIA SATISFYING THE DESIGNATION OF
MEETS STANDARDS (MS)**

TEACHING

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

- Posts office hours and is regularly available for advising.
- Places conforming syllabi on file for all didactic courses.
- Utilizes TEVAL or IDEA standardized measurements for appropriate courses.
- Achieves graduate faculty membership within two years.
- Achieves full graduate faculty membership within three years.
- Provides effective supervision of internships.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

- Posts office hours and is regularly available for advising.
- Places conforming syllabi on file for all didactic courses.
- Utilizes TEVAL or IDEA standardized measurements for appropriate courses.
- Serves as an effective advisor for master's students.
- Serves as an effective member on doctoral committees.
- Holds full graduate faculty status with certification to direct dissertations.
- Serves as an effective major professor for doctoral advisees if assigned to this role.
- Provides effective supervision of internships.

FULL PROFESSOR

- Posts office hours and is regularly available for advising.
- Places conforming syllabi on file for all didactic courses.
- Utilizes TEVAL or IDEA standardized measurements for appropriate courses.
- Serves as an effective advisor for master's students.
- Holds full graduate faculty status with certification to direct dissertations.
- Serves as an effective advisor for doctoral advisees if assigned to this role.
- Provides effective supervision of internships.

RESEARCH

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

- Shows evidence of submitting research for publication, with publications in print within three years.
- Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the teaching field.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

- Demonstrates ability to produce a research agenda.
- Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the teaching field.
- Provides evidence of successful involvement in scholarship and research (*e.g.*, refereed publications, funded grants, or product development).

FULL PROFESSOR

- Produces a mature research agenda.
- Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the teaching field.
- Provides evidence of successful sustained involvement in scholarship and research (*e.g.*, refereed publications, funded grants, or product development).

SERVICE

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

- Attends local, state, regional, national, or international meetings.
- Participates in the development of curriculum.

- Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating in Department activities and College and/or University committees.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

- Provides service to local, state, national, or international constituencies.
- Participates in the development of curriculum.
- Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating in Department activities and College and/or University committees.

FULL PROFESSOR

- Provides service to local, state, national, or international constituencies.
- Participates in the development of curriculum.
- Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating in Department activities and College and/or University committees.
- Positively and proactively mentors new and mid-career colleagues.

APPENDIX C:

Standards for Tenure and Promotion

and the

Mid-Tenure Review

Standards for Tenure and Promotion and the Mid-Tenure Review

**Joint Policy of the
Faculties of
Adult Learning and Leadership,
Community College Leadership,
and
Educational Leadership**

**MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR
TENURE AND PROMOTION, AND THE MID-TENURE REVIEW**

**FACULTIES OF
ADULT LEARNING AND LEADERSHIP,
COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERSHIP,
and
EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

Jointly approved September 2025

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

The Department of Educational Leadership recognizes and supports the acts of measuring, evaluating, and rewarding performance of all faculty. The Faculty values a wide range of contributions to the Department's assigned mission of teaching, scholarship, and service and asserts that the award of tenure and the award of promotion in rank are performance events that should be linearly connected to the greater institution's advancement. The Faculty therefore concludes that quality and versatility in performance, together with meaningful contribution to the Department's mission, are the appropriate metrics for decisions about tenure and/or promotion.

The Faculty declares that there can be no simple list of accomplishments that, when completed, will result in performance levels sufficiently meritorious to meet or exceed standards for tenure/promotion purposes. Rather, the Faculty declares that the true litmus test is a careful and informed judgment by knowledgeable tenured faculty *en banc* regarding a candidate's overall performance in the total context of 'quality', 'versatility', and 'mission'. More specifically, faculty holding expertise in the candidate's broad field (i.e., Department peers) must judge whether a candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service commendably advances the Department's reputation and whether the candidate's contributions advance the Department's overall mission. In sum, a candidate will be affirmed through the evaluation process and/or recommended for tenure and/or promotion only when their tenured peers holding equal or higher rank affirm through the balloting process that they have taught well, served well, and engaged in scholarship in substantial ways that bring lasting credit and visibility to the institution.

STATEMENT OF STANDARDS

The Department of Educational Leadership as established a set of standards for tenure/promotion which are conditioned upon accelerating performance by academic rank—i.e., each higher rank demands a higher level of accomplishment. More specifically, promotion to *Assistant Professor* reflects an acceptable level of achievement for time in rank and evidence of continuing trajectory for quality in teaching, scholarship, and service. Promotion to *Associate Professor with tenure* rests on evidence of substantial professional contributions given time in rank that reflect quality in teaching, scholarship or other creative endeavor, and service. Promotion to *Full Professor* is based on attainment of superior quality in the assigned responsibilities of the candidate, recognition of excellence by relevant external constituencies, and clear indication of continuing sustained contributions over an entire career. These same watershed expectations apply to annual evaluation as well, so that to that end, the Faculty has enacted a minimum performance matrix by academic rank, with all faculty held accountable for continual quality, versatility, and contribution to overall mission. See the *University Handbook* for [information on mid-tenure](#), [tenure](#), and [promotion](#).

PERFORMANCE MATRIX

The Faculty strongly supports new and expanded models of teaching, scholarship, and service. Accordingly, the Faculty has constructed a performance matrix that values a wide range of contributions to organizational goals. In sum, faculty may expect institutional rewards for outstanding performance on the dimensions illustrated in chart form:

EDLEA AND EDACE PROMOTION AND TENURE CHART

A candidate will be affirmed through the evaluation process and/or recommended for tenure and/or promotion only when their peers affirm that he or she has taught well, served well, and engaged in scholarship in substantial ways that bring lasting credit and visibility to the University. All candidates are expected to integrate the components of technology, diversity, and field-based engagement, as well as to provide evidence of student performance. Affirmation shall be by balloting of tenured faculty holding equal or higher rank—a simple majority shall be sufficient to advance a candidate to consideration by the Department Chair; the Chair may not vote at the faculty level, as their vote is recorded separately as part of the Chair’s recommendation to the College and Dean.

FOR SUCCESSFUL MID-TENURE REVIEW

Teaching and Advising	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Advisement	Does not maintain office hours or meet and/or communicate with students	Maintains office hours and meets students (face-to-face and/or electronically)	Develops regular office hours and engages in continuous communication (face-to-face and/or electronically)
Syllabi	Uses syllabi that lack goals and objectives reflecting Department/College guidelines	Creates course syllabi aligned to Department and College mission statements and accreditation guidelines	Creates comprehensive teaching agenda that is aligned to course syllabi and Department and College mission statements and accreditation guidelines
Evaluation	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department (e.g., TEVAL, IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of below-average rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department with results revealing a pattern of average or above rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department with results revealing a pattern of excellent rankings
Self-Reflection	Demonstrates no evidence of self-reflection activities	Demonstrates adequate evidence of self-reflection activities	Demonstrates high-quality evidence of self-reflection activities
Teaching Agenda	Demonstrates no teaching agenda, or an agenda which is poorly conceived	Creates a written teaching agenda	Creates a bold, comprehensive teaching agenda that is aligned to course syllabi

Research/Scholarship	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Publications and/or Grants	Demonstrates no activity related to publications or grants	Seeks mentoring for writing and publishing articles, books, and/or grants, and generates a publication and/or grant record appropriate to time in rank	Publishes articles, books, or receives local, state, national, or international grants aligned with research agenda and Department and College missions
Research Agenda	Does not provide evidence of a written research agenda	Creates written research agenda, appropriate to time in rank, focusing on attaining graduate faculty membership and certification to direct dissertations	Creates a sustained written research agenda that focuses on enhancing and/or expanding previous works
Currency	Has no new publications or grants since last review	Provides evidence of new scholarly efforts, appropriate to time in rank, since last review	Provides evidence of significant and current scholarly efforts since last review
Service	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Service Agenda	Possesses no written service agenda	Creates and implements a written service agenda appropriate to time in rank	Carries out a strong service agenda at local, state, national, and/or international levels
Department/College Contributions	Does not engage in Department or College committee work or curriculum development	Engages in Department and/or College committee work and curriculum development	Engages in activities at several levels of the organization (Department, College) and contributes to positive social-emotional culture
University, State, Regional, National or International Professional Organizations Participation	Demonstrates little or no activity in University, state, regional, or national/international professional organizations	Demonstrates record, appropriate to time in rank, of attending and presenting at state, regional, and national/international meetings	Regularly attends and presents at professional meetings at University, state, regional, and/or national/international levels

FOR SUCCESSFUL TENURE WITH PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Teaching and Advising	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Advisement	Does not maintain office hours or meet and/or communicate with students	Maintains office hours and meets students (face-to-face and/or electronically). Achieves full graduate faculty membership with certification to direct dissertations	Develops regular office hours and engages in consistent, continuous communications with advisees and is appropriately available for advisee appointments
Syllabi	Uses syllabi that lack goals and objectives reflecting Department/College guidelines	Updates course syllabi aligned to Department and College mission statements and accreditation guidelines	Implements a comprehensive teaching agenda that is aligned to course syllabi and Department and College mission statements and accreditation guidelines
Evaluation	Uses multiple evaluation forms with below-average rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms with average or above rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms with excellent rankings
Self-Reflection	Demonstrates little evidence of self-reflection activities	Demonstrates adequate evidence of self-reflection activities	Demonstrates high-quality evidence of self-reflection activities
Teaching Agenda	Demonstrates only a poorly conceived teaching agenda	Pursues teaching agenda with attention to currency and creativity	Engages in teaching practices reflecting current research and creativity
Research/Scholarship	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Publications and/or Grants	Demonstrates limited publications and/or grants	Publishes articles or books, and/or receives state, national, or international grants	Publishes multiple articles or books and/or receives state, national, or international grants over a sustained time
Research Agenda and Methodology	Does not pursue a written research agenda; provides no evidence of research methodology knowledge	Publishes articles or books and/or receives state, national or international grants; provides evidence of research methodology expertise; co-directs or directs doctoral dissertations	Publishes respected scholarly materials and successfully guides students through the dissertation process including multiple hoodings
Currency	Has generated no new research or publications since last review	Provides evidence of publications, appropriate to time in rank, since last review	Provides evidence of significant multiple publications since last review

Service	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Service Agenda	Demonstrates only limited or no evidence of attending to a written service agenda	Attends to a service agenda appropriate to time in rank	Updates and pursues a comprehensive written service agenda
Department/College Contributions	Does not engage in leadership roles in Department or College committee work and/or curriculum development	Engages in and assumes leadership roles in Department and/or College committee work and/or curriculum development	Assumes visible leadership roles and builds relationships and contributes to positive social-emotional culture in the Department and/or College
University, State, Regional, National or International Participation	Demonstrates little or no activity in University, state, regional, or national/international professional organizations.	Provides a record, appropriate to time in rank, of attending and presenting at state, regional, and national international meetings	Regularly attends and presents at professional meetings at University, state, regional, and/or national/international level

FOR SUCCESSFUL PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

Teaching and Advising	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Advisement	Does not maintain office hours or meet and/or communicate consistently with students	Maintains office hours and meets students (face-to-face and/or electronically) and is regularly available to students and other faculty	Maintains office hours, advises a full case load of advisees, and is available to students and faculty
Syllabi	Uses syllabi that lack periodic updating of goals, objectives, grading, etc.	Updates course syllabi based on evaluations and self-reflections that are aligned to Department and College mission statements and accreditation guidelines	Engages in innovative teaching practices reflecting attention to diversity issues, use of technology, field-based partnerships
Evaluation	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department (e.g., TEVAL, IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of below-average rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department (e.g., TEVAL, IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of average or above rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department (e.g., TEVAL, IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of excellent rankings
Self-Reflection	Demonstrates inadequate evidence of self-reflection activities	Demonstrates evidence of self-reflection activities on a regular basis	Demonstrates high-quality evidence of self-reflection activities

Teaching Agenda	Demonstrates weak or no implementation of a teaching agenda	Demonstrates strong implementation of a teaching agenda, with attention to currency and creativity	Demonstrates strong implementation of innovative teaching practices reflecting current research and creativity
Research/Scholarship	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Publications and/or Grants	Demonstrates only limited or erratic success with refereed publications and/or grants since last promotion	Regularly publishes multiple articles and/or books, and/or receives state, national, or international grants since last promotion	Publishes articles and/or books, and/or receives state, national, or international grants over a sustained period of time
Research Agenda and Research Methodology	Does not update and adjust written research agenda according to changes in field of expertise; exhibits only a limited grasp and application of valid, rigorous research methodologies	Updates and adjusts written agenda according to changes in field of expertise; recognizes legitimacy of different methods and/or provides support to College (expertise)	Documents a research agenda that contributes to current needs in the field and/or engages futuristic or cutting-edge lines of research; recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having been cited or depended on as a national authority; regularly and successfully guides students through the completed dissertation process
Currency	Has generated little research or publication since the last promotion	Provides evidence of a systematic record of publications since last promotion	Provides evidence of a record of significant and sustained publications since last promotion
Service	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Service Agenda	Exhibits only limited or no evidence of attending to a written service agenda beyond date of last promotion	Regularly updates written service agenda since last promotion	Regularly updates and pursues a written comprehensive service agenda that results in a state, national, and/or international reputation
Department/College Contributions	Engages in only limited leadership roles in Department and College committee work and/or curriculum development	Engages in and assumes appropriate leadership roles in Department and/or College committee work and/or curriculum development	Demonstrates role model behavior in Department and/or College committee work and/or curriculum development
University, State, Regional, National or International Professional Organizations	Exhibits limited or no participation in professional organizations at state, regional, national, or international levels since last promotion	Maintains a record of attending/presenting at state, regional, national, and/or international professional meetings on a regular basis	Appropriately assumes leadership roles in state, regional, national, and/or international professional organizations which lead to external recognition

The Mid-Tenure Review

All processes leading to the tenure and/or promotion event as described above shall be applied in the same form to the mid-tenure review, so that candidates are assessed at the mid-tenure point as if approaching the final decision except that the mid-tenure review shall be for the purpose of measuring the candidate's progress toward a total portfolio that will be acceptable at the final tenure/promotion time.

APPENDIX D:
Professorial
Performance Award

Professorial Performance Award

**Joint Policy of the
Faculties of
Adult Learning and Leadership,
Community College Leadership,
and
Educational Leadership**

PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD POLICY

Department of Educational Leadership

FACULTIES OF ADULT LEARNING AND LEADERSHIP, COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERSHIP and EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Jointly approved October 2017

Purpose

The policies and procedures that appear in this document govern the manner in which candidates in the Department of Educational Leadership are recommended for the [Professorial Performance Award](#). These policies and procedures are governed by *University Handbook* and conform to the guidelines issued by the Office of the Provost.

Philosophy

The Department of Educational Leadership supports the language of the *University Handbook* which states, "...the Professorial Performance Award is not a right accorded to every faculty member at the rank of Professor. Nor is it granted simply as a result of a candidate's routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies."(*University Handbook* C49.1). The Faculties further support the concept that the Professorial Performance Award shall be based on "...evidence of sustained productivity... and... of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards"(*University Handbook* C49.2) in the areas of teaching, research and service.

Award Eligibility

The foregoing statement of philosophy therefore governs the performance aspects of a candidate's initial eligibility for the Professorial Performance Award in the Department of Educational Leadership. The *University Handbook* imposes additional limits on eligibility. Specifically, the University requires that an eligible candidate must be a full-time faculty member holding the rank of Professor and must have been in rank at least six years since the last promotion or last receipt of the Professorial Performance Award; further, the eligible candidate must show sustained productivity for at least the last six years prior to review for the Professorial Performance Award. Using these metrics, the following statements of Department- level eligibility and procedures detail how the Department of Educational Leadership considers candidates' worthiness for this award.

Department-level Eligibility, Criteria, and Procedures

In order to be considered for the Professorial Performance Award, the Department of Educational Leadership requires that a faculty member: (1) must meet the eligibility criteria established in the *University Handbook*, (2) must follow the procedures which are outlined in this same section of the *Handbook*; and (3) must adhere to any additional Department requirements and procedures outlined below.

The candidate shall inform the Department Chair in writing of their intention to apply for the Professorial Performance Award and shall submit "...a file that documents her or his professional accomplishments for at least six years in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the Department. Upon receipt of such a request and supporting documentation, the Chair shall notify all eligible voting members of the Faculties. For the singular purpose of the Professorial Performance Award, the Department of Educational Leadership defines eligible voting members of the Faculties as those persons who presently hold the rank of Professor and whose full-time academic budgeted appointment is in the Department, excluding the Chair should they hold the rank of Professor (exception: if, in any given year there are less than four full-time Department Faculty holding the rank of Professor after excluding the Chair, the eligible voting Faculties shall include all tenured budgeted full-time faculty members in the Department holding the rank of Associate or Full Professor). The Chair shall then both make each candidate's materials available for review and call a meeting for obtaining a vote concerning the worthiness of each candidate's materials for the Professorial Performance Award. Such meeting may be by the most convenient majority agreeable means, including in person or by synchronous or asynchronous distance. The vote shall occur by dated individual ballots showing the signature of each voting member present indicating **Yes/ No/ Abstain**; the

Chair shall further make a record of any eligible faculty not voting and shall include all such results when reporting on the outcome. A simple majority affirmative vote by eligible faculty shall be sufficient to advance the candidate for consideration by the Department Chair.

If the Department Chair is willing to support the faculty's affirmative recommendation for the candidate, the Chair shall prepare their own ballot for each candidate and affirmatively sign and transmit all ballots to the Dean of Education. At the same time, a letter of support will also be sent by the Chair to both the Dean and to the candidate. If the Chair cannot support the faculty's affirmative recommendation, then the Chair will notify the voting faculty and the candidate in writing. The voting faculty shall have the option to select a spokesperson to convey and explain the majority position to the Dean. If the eligible voting faculty cannot recommend the candidate, the Chair will inform the applicant in writing and the process for seeking recourse as described in the *University Handbook* will be followed.

The Department of Educational Leadership has established minimum performance standards to be used in annual merit evaluation. These standards are stated by academic rank and form the initial basis both for satisfactory annual performance review *and* as the minimum threshold for favorable review whenever a candidate indicates intent to seek promotion to the next highest academic rank. By logical extension, those same minimum performance standards at the Full Professor level have a direct linear relationship to minimum favorable consideration for the Professorial Performance Award by satisfying the spirit and requirements of Paragraph 2 of this present Professorial Performance Award policy. The criteria for favorable recommendation for the Professorial Performance Award are therefore declared to be identical to the **Exceeds Standards** category for the rank of Full Professor as delineated in the Department's merit evaluation systems for the respective Faculties. Doing so ensures that the Professorial Performance Award is objectively based on "the attainment of excellence in the assigned duties of the faculty member and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies." (*University Handbook C120.1*)

For more information on the Professorial Performance Award, refer to the [*University Handbook*](#).

APPENDIX E: Post-Tenure Review Standards

Post-Tenure Review Standards

**Joint Policy of the
Faculties of
Adult Learning and Leadership,
Community College Leadership,
and
Educational Leadership**

POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY

Department of Educational Leadership

FACULTIES OF ADULT LEARNING AND LEADERSHIP, COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERSHIP, and EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP Jointly approved September 2025

Statement of Philosophy and Purpose

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

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

The Department of Educational Leadership's policy on post-tenure review follows the overarching purpose, principles, objectives, and procedures in the University's policy on post-tenure review ([University Handbook Appendix W](#)).

Procedures

Post-tenure review shall be conducted for tenured faculty in the Department every six years and shall conform to the timeline associated with the annual evaluation review as outlined in the *University Handbook*. The six-year post-tenure review clock shall be further defined to mean that post-tenure review will be conducted for each tenured faculty member either every six years or in the sixth year following promotion or awarding of a major University performance award. More specifically, the following events shall modify and reset the post-tenure review clock:

- a. Application for promotion to the rank of Full Professor;
- b. Application for the Professorial Performance Award;
- c. Receipt of a substantial College, University, national or international award requiring multi-year portfolio-like documentation, such as University Distinguished Professor, University Distinguished Teaching Scholar, an endowed chair or other national/international awards ([Faculty Awards](#)).
- d. Other exceptions to post-tenure review are as follows:
- e. If the faculty member is already undergoing the review process for chronic low achievement, that process will be considered to serve in lieu of post-tenure review;
- f. Any faculty member who has formally announced retirement through a written letter to the Department/Unit Head, or has begun phased retirement, is exempt from post-tenure review.

The post-tenure review clock shall operate as follows:

- a. The academic year 2014-2015 serves as the first year of post-tenure review implementation;
- b. Faculty holding the rank of Full Professor will be reviewed during the 2014-2015 cycle;
- c. Faculty holding the rank of Associate Professor will be reviewed during the 2015-2016 cycle;
- d. The review cycle will repeat in the respective academic years 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 for those faculty who have not received intervening promotions in rank or approved external awards;
- e. The College will maintain a database indicating the review year for each affected Faculty member.

Faculty undergoing a regular post-tenure review must submit the following materials:

- a. The individual annual merit evaluation reviews received across each of the preceding six years.

Faculty submitting the individual six-year collection of merit evaluation reviews shall be reviewed as follows:

- a. The faculty member submits required documents to the Department chair;
- b. The Chair reviews the materials collection and summarizes the cumulative annual ratings in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.
- c. The Chair meets with the candidate to discuss findings.
- d. If no overall annual rating across the six-year review period falls below MEETS STANDARDS, the post-tenure review process shall be declared complete and the Chair shall issue a letter indicating satisfactory completion of the post-tenure review requirement. Such letter shall bear a signature line for the faculty member showing agreement or disagreement.
- e. If one or more annual ratings across the six-year review period falls below MEETS STANDARDS, the faculty member shall be required to construct and file a professional development plan to be reviewed and approved by the Chair.

APPENDIX F:
Professional Positions Titles
for
Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Professional Positions Titles for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

**Joint Policy of the
Faculties of
Adult Learning and Leadership,
Community College Leadership,
and
Educational Leadership**

NON-TENURE-TRACK PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS TITLES

Department of Educational Leadership

FACULTIES OF ADULT LEARNING AND LEADERSHIP COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERSHIP EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP Jointly approved January 12, 2026

Positions and Ranks

In addition to the tenure-track and tenured positions that are described elsewhere in this *Policy and Procedures Manual*, the Department of Educational Leadership includes the non-tenure-track professional positions of Instructor, Teaching Professor, Research Professor, and Professor of Practice. The [*University Handbook*](#) governs and describes these positions.

The following ranks are further refined within each of these positions:

- *Instructor*--Instructor, Advanced Instructor, Senior Instructor
- *Teaching Professor*--Teaching Assistant Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, Teaching Professor
- *Research Professor*--Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Professor
- *Professor of Practice*--Professor of Practice, Senior Professor of Practice

Primary Responsibilities

Individuals holding the positions of any Instructor ranks or any Teaching Professor rank will be primarily responsible for instruction. Individuals holding the position of Professor of Practice or Senior Professor of Practice may have responsibilities concerning instruction, research, outreach and service or a combination of these duties. Those who hold any rank within the position of Research Professor will be responsible for engaging in research or creative endeavors. Research Professors at the Associate or Professor ranks will be governed by the language found in Section C12.1 of the *University Handbook* that applies specifically to these two roles.

In all cases, exact duties and expectations for individuals holding non-tenure track appointments in the Department of Educational Leadership will be defined in the letter of appointment. Likewise, responsibilities may vary between individuals depending upon the specific needs of the Department at the time that an offer of employment is made.

Appointment

Individuals holding non-tenure track professional positions in the Department of Educational Leadership may be appointed on a full or part-time basis and generally will be term employees. Regular appointments to non-tenure track positions in the Department are also possible. The exact nature of the appointment will be determined at the time that an offer of employment is made.

Academic rank at the time of the initial appointment is administratively based both upon such factors as advanced degree(s) held, experience, performance and achievement overtime and the exact needs of the Department. More specifically, candidates for the positions of Teaching and Research Professor at all ranks are expected to hold a terminal degree at the doctoral level in an appropriate discipline that is clearly related to their work within the Department. Candidates for the position of Instructor at all ranks are expected to hold a minimum of a masters degree in a field that is clearly related to their work within the

Department. Candidates for the position of Professor of Practice at both ranks must hold a minimum of a masters degree in a field that is clearly related to their work within the Department and have substantial appropriate related professional experience.

Annual Evaluation and Reappointment

Regular and term non-tenure track faculty will be evaluated as part of the annual evaluation process. Faculty on regular appointments will also be evaluated for reappointment purposes at this time. The Department Chair will

provide each faculty member with the timeline for evaluation/reappointment as well as a description of materials that are to be submitted for evaluation. The materials and timeline for the annual evaluation and reappointment of non-tenure track faculty will be those used for tenure track faculty in the Department and which are described elsewhere in this *Policy and Procedures Manual*.

All materials that are used for both annual evaluation and reappointment of non-tenure track faculty members will be submitted to the Department Chair. Criteria to be used in this process will be those employed in the annual reappointment process of tenure-track faculty that are described elsewhere in this policy manual. After consultation with the members of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the Department, the Chair will make recommendations concerning reappointment/non-reappointment of an individual holding a regular appointment or the continuance/discontinuance of a term employee to the Dean for final decision. The Chair will then provide a written letter of annual evaluation, reappointment or continuance to each faculty member.

Promotion Process

The process for promotion of individuals holding the non-tenure track positions at any rank of Instructor, Professor of Practice, Senior Professor of Practice, Teaching Assistant/Associate/Full Professor, or Research Assistant/Associate/Full Professor are similar to the processes for tenure-track/tenured faculty that are described in the *University Handbook*. The average time is rank is five years although longer or shorter periods of time in rank are possible. Each candidate who is seeking promotion will submit both a current curriculum vitae and a portfolio that follows the general outline for tenure consideration (i.e., teaching/research/service) as identified in [University policy](#), therein documenting related professional achievements and activities to the Department Chair. For each rank, the focus of the portfolio shall be:

Instructor (all ranks)

- Course syllabi
- Student evaluation materials
- Student and/or peer course evaluations (TEVAL or IDEA)

Teaching Professor (all ranks)

- Course syllabi
- Student evaluation materials
- Student and/or peer course evaluations (TEVAL or IDEA)

Research Professor (all ranks)

- Publications or presentations
- Grant proposals that have been submitted
- Involvement with graduate student research
- Evidence of other related creative activities

Professor of Practice (all ranks)

- Evidence of interaction with external groups and organization
- Feedback from clients/stakeholders
- Other evidence of professional and community collaboration

In addition to the curriculum vitae and portfolio, a statement of professional goals and objectives for the following five-year period is to be submitted. If a promotion is recommended, it may either be a regular appointment of one year that is entitled to Notice of Non-Reappointment or a term appointment for a period of one to three years with no Notice of Non-Reappointment being required.

After consultation with the members of the tenured and tenure track faculty of the Department, the Chair will make recommendations concerning promotion of an individual(s) holding a non-tenure track regular or term appointment/s to the Dean of the College of Education for final decision.

NON-TENURE-TRACK PROMOTION CHART

A candidate will be affirmed through the evaluation process and/or recommended for promotion only when their peers affirm that he or she has taught well, served well, and engaged in other creative works in substantial ways that bring lasting credit and visibility to the University. All candidates are expected to integrate the components of technology, variety, and field-based engagement, as well as to provide evidence of student performance. Affirmation shall be by balloting of tenure and tenure-track faculty holding equal or higher rank—a simple majority shall be sufficient to advance a candidate to consideration by the Department Chair; the Chair may not vote at the faculty level, as their vote is recorded separately as part of the Chair’s recommendation to the College and Dean.

FOR SUCCESSFUL TENURE WITH PROMOTION TO ADVANCED INSTRUCTOR or ASSOCIATE TEACHING PROFESSOR

Teaching and Advising	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Advisement	Does not maintain office hours or meet and/or communicate with students	Maintains office hours and meets students (face-to-face and/or electronically). Achieves full graduate faculty membership with certification to direct dissertations	Develops regular office hours and engages in consistent, continuous communications with advisees and is appropriately available for advisee appointments
Syllabi	Uses syllabi that lack goals and objectives reflecting Department/College guidelines	Updates course syllabi aligned to Department and College mission statements and accreditation guidelines	Implements a comprehensive teaching agenda that is aligned to course syllabi and Department and College mission statements and accreditation guidelines
Evaluation	Uses multiple evaluation forms with below-average rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms with average or above rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms with excellent rankings
Self-Reflection	Demonstrates little evidence of self-reflection activities	Demonstrates adequate evidence of self-reflection activities	Demonstrates high-quality evidence of self-reflection activities
Teaching Agenda	Demonstrates only a poorly conceived teaching agenda	Pursues teaching agenda with attention to currency and creativity	Engages in teaching practices reflecting current research and creativity; meritorious teaching accomplishments in some of the teaching and mentoring capacities.
Doctoral Student Mentoring <i>(as applicable to appointment)</i>	Provides no evidence of research methodology knowledge	Provides evidence of research methodology expertise; co-directs or directs doctoral dissertations	Successfully guides students through the dissertation process including multiple hoodings.
Research/Scholarship <i>(as applicable to appointment)</i>	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations

Publications and/or Grants	Demonstrates limited publications and/or grants	Publishes articles or book chapters, and/or receives state, national, or international grants	Publishes multiple articles or books and/or receives state, national, or international grants over a sustained time
Currency	Has generated no new research or publications since last review	Provides evidence of publications, appropriate to time in rank, since last review	Provides evidence of significant steady publications since last review
Service	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Service Agenda	Demonstrates only limited or no evidence of attending to a written service agenda	Attends to a service agenda appropriate to time in rank	Updates and pursues a comprehensive written service agenda
Department/College Contributions	Does not engage in leadership roles in Department or College committee work and/or curriculum development	Engages in and assumes leadership roles in Department and/or College committee work and/or curriculum development	Assumes visible leadership roles and builds relationships and contributes to positive social-emotional culture in the Department and/or College
University, State, Regional, National or International Participation	Demonstrates little or no activity in University, state, regional, or national/international professional organizations.	Provides a record, appropriate to time in rank, of attending and presenting at state, regional, and national international meetings	Regularly attends and presents at professional meetings at University, state, regional, and/or national/international level

FOR SUCCESSFUL PROMOTION TO SENIOR INSTRUCTOR OR TEACHING PROFESSOR

Teaching and Advising	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Advisement	Does not maintain office hours or meet and/or communicate consistently with students	Maintains office hours and meets students (face-to-face and/or electronically) and is regularly available to students and other faculty	Maintains office hours, advises a full case load of advisees, and is available to students and faculty
Syllabi	Uses syllabi that lack periodic updating of goals, objectives, grading, etc.	Updates course syllabi based on evaluations and self-reflections that are aligned to Department and College mission statements and accreditation guidelines	Engages in innovative teaching practices reflecting attention to diversity issues, use of technology, field-based partnerships

Evaluation	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department (e.g., TEVAL, IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of below-average rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department (e.g., TEVAL, IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of average or above rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department (e.g., TEVAL, IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of excellent rankings
Self-Reflection	Demonstrates inadequate evidence of self-reflection activities	Demonstrates evidence of self-reflection activities on a regular basis	Demonstrates high-quality evidence of self-reflection activities
Teaching Agenda	Demonstrates weak or no implementation of a teaching agenda	Demonstrates strong implementation of a teaching agenda, with attention to currency and creativity	Demonstrates strong implementation of innovative teaching practices reflecting current research and creativity
Doctoral Student Mentoring (as applicable to appointment)	Exhibits only a limited grasp and application of valid, rigorous research methodologies	Recognizes legitimacy of different methods and/or provides support to College (expertise)	Regularly and successfully guides students through the completed dissertation process
Research/Scholarship (as applicable to appointment)	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Publications and/or Grants	Demonstrates only limited or erratic success with refereed publications and/or grants since last promotion	Regularly publishes multiple articles and/or books, and/or receives state, national, or international grants since last promotion	Publishes articles and/or books, and/or receives state, national, or international grants over a sustained period of time
Research Agenda and Research Methodology	Does not update and adjust written research agenda according to changes in field of expertise.	Updates and adjusts written agenda according to changes in field of expertise; and provides support to College (expertise)	Documents a research agenda that contributes to current needs in the field and/or engages futuristic or cutting-edge lines of research; recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having been cited or depended on as a national authority
Currency	Has generated little research or publication since the last promotion	Provides evidence of a systematic record of publications since last promotion	Provides evidence of a record of significant and sustained publications since last promotion

Service	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Service Agenda	Exhibits only limited or no evidence of attending to a written service agenda beyond date of last promotion	Regularly updates written service agenda since last promotion	Regularly updates and pursues a written comprehensive service agenda that results in a state, national, and/or international reputation
Department/College Contributions	Engages in only limited leadership roles in Department and College committee work and/or curriculum development	Engages in and assumes appropriate leadership roles in Department and/or College committee work and/or curriculum development	Demonstrates role model behavior in Department and/or College committee work and/or curriculum development
University, State, Regional, National or International Professional Organizations	Exhibits limited or no participation in professional organizations at state, regional, national, or international levels since last promotion	Maintains a record of attending/presenting at state, regional, national, and/or international professional meetings on a regular basis	Appropriately assumes leadership roles in state, regional, national, and/or international professional organizations which lead to external recognition

-
FOR SUCCESSFUL TENURE WITH PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE RESEARCH PROFESSOR

Teaching and Advising (<i>as applicable to appointment</i>)	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Advisement	Does not maintain office hours or meet and/or communicate with students	Maintains office hours and meets students (face-to-face and/or electronically). Achieves full graduate faculty membership with certification to direct dissertations	Develops regular office hours and engages in consistent, continuous communications with advisees and is appropriately available for advisee appointments
Syllabi	Uses syllabi that lack goals and objectives reflecting Department/College guidelines	Updates course syllabi aligned to Department and College mission statements and accreditation guidelines	Implements a comprehensive teaching agenda that is aligned to course syllabi and Department and College mission statements and accreditation guidelines
Evaluation	Uses multiple evaluation forms with below-average rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms with average or above rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms with excellent rankings
Self-Reflection	Demonstrates little evidence of self-reflection activities	Demonstrates adequate evidence of self-reflection activities	Demonstrates high-quality evidence of self-reflection activities

Teaching Agenda	Demonstrates only a poorly conceived teaching agenda	Pursues teaching agenda with attention to currency and creativity	Engages in teaching practices reflecting current research and creativity; meritorious teaching accomplishments in some of the teaching and mentoring capacities.
Doctoral Student Mentoring (as applicable to appointment)	Provides no evidence of research methodology knowledge	Provides evidence of research methodology expertise; co-directs or directs doctoral dissertations	Successfully guides students through the dissertation process including multiple hoodings
Research/Scholarship	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Publications and/or Grants	Demonstrates limited publications and/or grants	Publishes articles or book chapters, and/or receives state, national, or international grants	Publishes multiple articles or books and/or receives state, national, or international grants over a sustained time
Research Agenda and Methodology	Does not pursue a written research agenda; provides no evidence of research methodology knowledge	Publishes articles or books and/or receives state, national or international grants; provides evidence of research methodology expertise	Publishes respected scholarly materials
Currency	Has generated no new research or publications since last review	Provides evidence of publications, appropriate to time in rank, since last review	Provides evidence of significant steady publications since last review
Service	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Service Agenda	Demonstrates only limited or no evidence of attending to a written service agenda	Attends to a service agenda appropriate to time in rank	Updates and pursues a comprehensive written service agenda
Department/College Contributions	Does not engage in leadership roles in Department or College committee work and/or curriculum development	Engages in and assumes leadership roles in Department and/or College committee work and/or curriculum development	Assumes visible leadership roles and builds relationships and contributes to positive social-emotional culture in the Department and/or College
University, State, Regional, National or International Participation	Demonstrates little or no activity in University, state, regional, or national/international professional organizations.	Provides a record, appropriate to time in rank, of attending and presenting at state, regional, and national international meetings	Regularly attends and presents at professional meetings at University, state, regional, and/or national/international level

FOR SUCCESSFUL PROMOTION TO RESEARCH PROFESSOR

Teaching and Advising (<i>as applicable to appointment</i>)	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Advisement	Does not maintain office hours or meet and/or communicate consistently with students	Maintains office hours and meets students (face-to-face and/or electronically) and is regularly available to students and other faculty	Maintains office hours, advises a full case load of advisees, and is available to students and faculty
Syllabi	Uses syllabi that lack periodic updating of goals, objectives, grading, etc.	Updates course syllabi based on evaluations and self-reflections that are aligned to Department and College mission statements and accreditation guidelines	Engages in innovative teaching practices reflecting attention to diversity issues, use of technology, field-based partnerships
Evaluation	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department (e.g., TEVAL, IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of below-average rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department (e.g., TEVAL, IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of average or above rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department (e.g., TEVAL, IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of excellent rankings
Self-Reflection	Demonstrates inadequate evidence of self-reflection activities	Demonstrates evidence of self-reflection activities on a regular basis	Demonstrates high-quality evidence of self-reflection activities
Teaching Agenda	Demonstrates weak or no implementation of a teaching agenda	Demonstrates strong implementation of a teaching agenda, with attention to currency and creativity	Demonstrates strong implementation of innovative teaching practices reflecting current research and creativity
Doctoral Student Mentoring (<i>as applicable to appointment</i>)	Exhibits only a limited grasp and application of valid, rigorous research methodologies	Recognizes legitimacy of different methods and/or provides support to College (expertise)	Regularly and successfully guides students through the completed dissertation process
Research/Scholarship	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Publications and/or Grants	Demonstrates only limited or erratic success with refereed publications and/or grants since last promotion	Regularly publishes multiple articles and/or books, and/or receives state, national, or international grants since last promotion	Publishes articles and/or books, and/or receives state, national, or international grants over a sustained period of time

Research Agenda and Research Methodology	Does not update and adjust written research agenda according to changes in field of expertise; exhibits only a limited grasp and application of valid, rigorous research methodologies	Updates and adjusts written agenda according to changes in field of expertise; recognizes legitimacy of different methods and/or provides support to College (expertise)	Documents a research agenda that contributes to current needs in the field and/or engages futuristic or cutting-edge lines of research; recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having been cited or depended on as a national authority.
Currency	Has generated little research or publication since the last promotion	Provides evidence of a systematic record of publications since last promotion	Provides evidence of a record of significant and sustained publications since last promotion
Service	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Service Agenda	Exhibits only limited or no evidence of attending to a written service agenda beyond date of last promotion	Regularly updates written service agenda since last promotion	Regularly updates and pursues a written comprehensive service agenda that results in a state, national, and/or international reputation
Department/College Contributions	Engages in only limited leadership roles in Department and College committee work and/or curriculum development	Engages in and assumes appropriate leadership roles in Department and/or College committee work and/or curriculum development	Demonstrates role model behavior in Department and/or College committee work and/or curriculum development
University, State, Regional, National or International Professional Organizations	Exhibits limited or no participation in professional organizations at state, regional, national, or international levels since last promotion	Maintains a record of attending/presenting at state, regional, national, and/or international professional meetings on a regular basis	Appropriately assumes leadership roles in state, regional, national, and/or international professional organizations which lead to external recognition

-
FOR SUCCESSFUL PROMOTION TO SENIOR PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE

Teaching and Advising	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Advisement	Does not maintain office hours or meet and/or communicate consistently with students	Maintains office hours and meets students (face-to-face and/or electronically) and is regularly available to students and other faculty	Maintains office hours, advises a full case load of advisees, and is available to students and faculty

Syllabi	Uses syllabi that lack periodic updating of goals, objectives, grading, etc.	Updates course syllabi based on evaluations and self-reflections that are aligned to Department and College mission statements and accreditation guidelines	Engages in innovative teaching practices reflecting attention to diversity issues, use of technology, field-based partnerships
Evaluation	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department (e.g., TEVAL, IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of below-average rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department (e.g., TEVAL, IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of average or above rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department (e.g., TEVAL, IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of excellent rankings
Self-Reflection	Demonstrates inadequate evidence of self-reflection activities	Demonstrates evidence of self-reflection activities on a regular basis	Demonstrates high-quality evidence of self-reflection activities
Teaching Agenda	Demonstrates weak or no implementation of a teaching agenda	Demonstrates strong implementation of a teaching agenda, with attention to currency and creativity	Demonstrates strong implementation of innovative teaching practices reflecting current research and creativity
Doctoral Student Mentoring	Exhibits only a limited grasp and application of valid, rigorous research methodologies	Recognizes legitimacy of different methods and/or provides support to College (expertise)	Regularly and successfully guides students through the completed dissertation process
Research/Scholarship (<i>as applicable to appointment</i>)	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Publications and/or Grants	Demonstrates only limited or erratic success with refereed publications and/or grants since last promotion	Regularly publishes multiple articles and/or books, and/or receives state, national, or international grants since last promotion	Publishes articles and/or books, and/or receives state, national, or international grants over a sustained period of time
Currency	Has generated little research or publication since the last promotion	Provides evidence of a systematic record of publications since last promotion	Provides evidence of a record of significant and sustained publications since last promotion
Service	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Service Agenda	Exhibits only limited or no evidence of attending to a written service agenda beyond date of last promotion	Regularly updates written service agenda since last promotion	Regularly updates and pursues a written comprehensive service agenda that results in a state, national, and/or international reputation

Department/College Contributions	Engages in only limited leadership roles in Department and College committee work and/or curriculum development	Engages in and assumes appropriate leadership roles in Department and/or College committee work and/or curriculum development	Demonstrates role model behavior in Department and/or College committee work and/or curriculum development
University, State, Regional, National or International Professional Organizations	Exhibits limited or no participation in professional organizations at state, regional, national, or international levels since last promotion	Maintains a record of attending/presenting at state, regional, national, and/or international professional meetings on a regular basis; gains feedback from clients/stakeholders	Appropriately assumes leadership roles in state, regional, national, and/or international professional organizations which lead to external recognition; establishes professional and community collaborations

-