

SCHOOL OF CONSUMER SCIENCES
College of Health and Human Sciences
Kansas State University

ANNUAL FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION GUIDELINES, INCLUDING
CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE
AWARD

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 05/20/2025)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 05/20/2025)

WORKLOAD GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 05/20/2025)



D. Elizabeth Kiss, Interim Director School of Consumer Sciences

05/27/2025

Date signed



Brad J. Behnke, Betty L. Tointon Dean

6/18/2025

Date signed



Jesse Perez Mendez, Provost and Executive Vice President

7/30/2025

Date signed

Document Purpose

Each academic department is required by University Handbook policy to develop department documents containing criteria, standards, and guidelines for promotion, tenure, reappointment, annual evaluation, and merit salary allocation. These documents must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty members in the department, by the department head or chair, by the dean concerned, and by the provost.

In accordance with University Handbook policy, provision must be made to review these documents at least once every five years or more frequently if it is determined to be necessary. Dates of revision (or the vote to continue without revision) must appear on the first page of the document.

SCHOOL OF CONSUMER SCIENCES
College of Health and Human Sciences
Kansas State University

School Mission

To transform lives through education, scholarship, and community engagement in consumer-focused business disciplines. We prepare learners for meaningful careers that have a sustainable impact on the well-being of individuals, families, and communities.

General Guidelines

For purposes of University policy, the academic unit guided by this document is referred to as the School of Consumer Sciences and the unit leader is referred to as the School Director.

This document is current as of the date indicated. All faculty and staff members in the School will be held to the standards, responsibilities, and requirements detailed in this document.

Those who joined the College of Health and Human Sciences before July 1, 2025, the effective date of the College reorganization and this document, should refer to the Guidance on Tenure and Promotion document shared with the College on May 1, 2025 for information on the College's transition plan for probationary faculty and faculty seeking promotions.

Table of Contents

Document Purpose	1
School Mission.....	2
General Guidelines.....	2
Annual Evaluations.....	6
Responsibilities of Employee.....	6
Responsibilities of the Program Chair	6
Responsibilities of the Associate Director	6
Responsibilities of the Director	7
Annual Evaluation Meetings.....	7
Merit Salary Allocation	8
Annual Goals and Evaluation Criteria	8
Annual Goal Setting Process.....	8
Evaluation Criteria	9
Teaching.....	9
Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Discovery (RSCAD).....	10
Extension.....	13
Service	15
Collegiality/Academic Citizenship Expectations.....	15
School Workload Guidelines.....	16
Teaching Workload Expectations and Adjustments	17
Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Discovery Workload Expectations and Activities	18
Extension Workload Expectations and Activities	19
Service Workload Expectations and Activities	20
Directed Service	20
Non-Directed Service	20
Adjustment for Administrative Roles	21
Regular Review of Workload Assignment and Process for Handling Disagreements	21
Procedures and Criteria for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment: Tenure-Track Faculty.....	22
School Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Criteria: Tenure Track.....	22
Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty Cumulative Expectations/Evaluation Criteria	23
Annual Reappointment Review of Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty	23
Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty Reappointment Review Procedures.....	24

Mid-Tenure Review (also known as Mid-Probationary Review)	25
Purpose.....	25
Procedures	25
Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	26
Evaluation Criteria	26
Procedures	27
Letters from External Evaluators	29
Faculty Eligible to Vote	30
Appeal Procedures and Transfers from Tenure-Track to Non-Tenure Track Appointment ...	31
Promotion to Professor	31
Evaluation Criteria	31
Procedures	32
Letters from External Reviewers.....	33
Faculty Eligible to Vote	34
Procedures and Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Reappointment: Non-Tenure Track Faculty	34
Initial Appointment & Professional Titles.....	34
Guidelines for Non-Tenure Track Faculty Appointment, Promotion, and Reappointment.....	35
Instructional Track Faculty	35
Research Track Faculty.....	36
Practice Track Faculty	37
Teaching Track Faculty.....	39
Extension Track Faculty	40
Annual Evaluation and Reappointment Process.....	41
Responsibilities of the School Director (or designee) and the Candidate	41
Criteria for Reappointment	42
Promotion Process	42
Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review Committee	43
Denial of Promotion.....	44
Professorial Performance Award (University Handbook Sections C49.1-C49.14)	44
Submission and Review Process	45
Chronic Low Achievement Policy for Tenured Faculty (University Handbook Section C31.5-C31.8)	45
Post-Tenure Review Policies (University Handbook Appendix W)	47
Review Procedure	47

Annual Evaluations

The School Director (or the director's designee) must prepare a written annual evaluation for each full or part-time (0.5 and above) faculty and professional staff person (see University Handbook [C46.1](#)).

The annual evaluation is to be based on: (1) the relative proportion of time and effort devoted to each area jointly established each year by the individual faculty/staff member and the Program Chair (and, as needed, in consultation with the School's Director and Associate Director), (2) each unclassified member's self-report accompanied by appropriate evaluation data, and (3) the Program Chair's own assessment of faculty/staff growth and productivity. This policy applies to those unclassified personnel (faculty or professional staff) with regular and term appointments of 0.5 FTE or greater.

Materials required for annual evaluations include: (1) one page report on annual accomplishments as compared to the previous year's goals framed within the context of workload assignment(s), (2) one page report on goals for the coming year, (3) CV with the accomplishments from the previous year highlighted, and (4) TEVALs from courses taught. Faculty are welcome to attach additional appendices at their discretion.

The evaluation system is based on performance during the 12-month evaluation period from August 1st through July 31st.

Responsibilities of Employee

- The employee is responsible for preparing and submitting the materials pertinent to annual evaluations and annual goals for the next year. All materials must be submitted to the Program Chair by September 15th.

Responsibilities of the Program Chair

- The Program Chair will determine an overall evaluation rating for each employee based on the materials provided by each member of the program.
- Once the Program Chair has determined an evaluation rating for each member of the program, the Program Chair will send all submitted materials and evaluation ratings for each employee to the Associate Director.
- The Program Chair is responsible for preparing and submitting the materials pertinent to their own annual evaluation and annual goals for the next year to the Associate School Director. All materials must be submitted to the Associate School Director by September 15th.

Responsibilities of the Associate Director

- Once the Associate Director receives evaluation materials from all Program Chairs, the Associate Director will review materials and workload assignments for all members of the School to ensure consistency across evaluations.
- In a case where the Program Chair is not a tenured faculty member, the Associate Director will lead the evaluation meeting for tenure track and tenured faculty members with input from the Program Chair.

- The Associate Director will also engage in the [University Performance Management](#) evaluation process for each School level staff member.
- The Associate Director is responsible for preparing and submitting the materials pertinent to their own annual evaluation and annual goals for the next year to the School Director. All materials must be submitted to the School Director by September 15th.

Responsibilities of the Director

- The Director will determine an overall evaluation rating for each Program Chair and the Associate Director based on the materials provided by each employee.
- The Director has ultimate oversight and final determinations on all evaluations within the School, and the Director will submit all evaluation materials to the Dean.
- If there are any discrepancies between the employee, Program Chair, and/or Associate Director, the case may be referred to the Director for resolution.
- The Director is responsible for preparing and submitting the materials pertinent to their own annual evaluation and annual goals for the next year based on direction given by the Dean.

Annual Evaluation Meetings

- The Associate Director and Director will meet with each Program Chair individually to review the evaluations of faculty/staff within their program, make any adjustments as needed following the full School review, and discuss overall areas of strength for the program as well as areas for improvement in the future.
- The Program Chair will then hold individual meetings with each member of the program to discuss their annual goals for the following year as well as the evaluation rating. The document must be reviewed and co-signed by both the Program Chair and the employee, who will keep a personal copy.
- In cases where the employee does not meet expectations in one or more areas of their work, the Associate Director and the Program Chair will meet with the employee together for the annual evaluation meeting.
- In the case where the Program Chair is not a tenured faculty member, and the faculty member is tenured or tenure track, the Associate Director and Program Chair will meet with the employee together for the annual evaluation meeting. In these cases, the Program Chair will discuss the evaluation of teaching and service requirements, and the Associate Director will discuss the evaluation of research and progress towards tenure.

Categories used for annual evaluation will be consistent with the recommendations provided in [C31.8 a.](#) of the University Handbook and will be used to assess performance in each category of assigned responsibility. They are as follows:

- Exceeded expectations (4 points)
- Met expectations (3 points)
- Fallen below expectations but met minimum acceptable levels of productivity (2 points)
- Fallen below minimally acceptable levels of productivity (1 point)

The evaluator will assign points to each of the categories listed in a faculty member's appointment. These performance expectation scores will be weighted by time allocation per category then summed to result in an "Overall Rating" score that is used to determine an overall evaluation score. Those who have not met expectations in one or more categories will be counseled by the evaluator on ways to rectify that situation (e.g., consider steps to improve performance and/or reallocation of the faculty member's responsibilities). The evaluator will request a plan of action from the faculty member to address the faculty member's performance (see University Handbook [C30.3](#), for potential resources for faculty improvement).

Merit Salary Allocation

The School Director will refer to the University Handbook [C40- C48.3](#) for procedures regarding annual merit salary adjustments.

Total dollars allotted to the School for annual merit salary adjustment will be divided by the total salary dollars of current faculty members to determine the baseline percentage. The baseline percentage will be used as the starting point to develop the formula for distribution of salary increases. Annual merit salary increases will be based on a rolling average of three years. They will be allocated based on the following guidance:

- Faculty exceeding overall expectations will be awarded the School baseline percentage for annual merit salary adjustments, plus a bonus percentage to be determined by the School Director.
- Faculty meeting overall expectations will be awarded the School baseline percentage for annual merit salary adjustments, unless changes in allocations are necessary to accommodate bonuses and/or reductions for faculty members who have exceeded or fallen below expectations.
- Faculty falling below expectations will be awarded the School baseline percentage for annual merit salary adjustments, less a percentage to be determined by the School Director.
- Faculty eligible for Chronic Low Achievement will not receive annual merit salary adjustments.

Annual Goals and Evaluation Criteria

Annual Goal Setting Process

Each faculty/staff member will meet annually with their program chair to establish personal goals and objectives in the major areas of professional activity. These goals should be determined in consultation with and approval of the program chair. In the case where the Program Chair is not a tenured faculty member, and the faculty member is tenured or tenure track, the Associate Director and Program Chair will jointly approve these goals. According to the University Handbook [C45.1](#), these goals and objectives "should reflect the relative percentages of time and effort the person plans to allocate to the appropriate areas in the upcoming period. It is expected that the previous year's statement will be considered during the annual evaluation and goal setting process."

On occasion, modifications to appointments and/or statements of objectives are necessary due to unanticipated changes in School circumstances (e.g., changes in course offerings, funding of

grants, or research opportunities). Any such modifications should be documented and kept in personnel files.

Evaluation Criteria

Teaching

Instructional quality is a major factor in educational excellence. The faculty in the School engage in several different types of teaching beyond traditional classroom teaching. Evaluation of teaching may occur with respect to the following areas of activity: instruction (regardless of modality), curriculum-related activity, instructional innovation, and graduate student thesis/dissertation committee service. Awards/recognition received for significant teaching accomplishments, including student work performed under the faculty member's supervision, may also be considered in the evaluation of a faculty member's teaching activities.

Faculty with a responsibility for undergraduate or graduate teaching should:

- Maintain up-to-date knowledge of each subject taught.
- Deliver courses in accordance with student learning outcomes and identified course competencies.
- Provide a clear and coherent style of presentation.
- Provide a learning environment that stimulates students' interest and appreciation for course content.
- Intellectually challenge students.
- Meet students' mentoring needs.
- Be accessible to students during posted office hours.
- Convene classes on a regular basis.
- Adhere to course objectives required for program registration/accreditation.

Graduate student advising and mentoring include the academic advising and mentoring of students through their scholarly activity. The effective graduate advisor and mentor:

- Accurately advises graduate students concerning their academic program and enrollment.
- Serves as a member of a graduate student's committee, provides input to proposal, thesis/report or dissertation, and reviews written examination.
- Serves as a major professor for a graduate student (non-thesis, distance non-thesis, thesis/report, or dissertation). Mentors and facilitates major events towards degree completion: program of study, proposal, preparation of written examination, defense of the written exam, conducting research and/or design activity, defense of thesis/report or dissertation, graduation, and submission of work to appropriate peer-reviewed or juried venues.
- Recruits graduate students through personal contacts and professional venues.
- Encourages advisee involvement in the wider scholarship community, such as attending and presenting work at conferences.
- Nominates students for appropriate awards and writes letters of recommendation for scholarships and postgraduate positions.

Expectation

Teaching should be evaluated in totality. Primary considerations when evaluating teaching should include:

- Course TEVAL ratings.
- Development of a new course or innovative/novel teaching method.
- A peer review of multiple class sessions, coordinated between the instructor and the peer, where the actual days of observation are unannounced.
- Evidence of substantial improvement in content/course material.
- A competitive teaching award.
- Unusually favorable or unfavorable written student responses.

As a guideline, TEVAL ratings in the summary areas of “overall effectiveness,” “increased desire to learn about the subject,” and “amount learned” should be considered. Comparative statistics in these areas should be in the middle range or above for most courses taught. Raw scores will be used for classes with less than 10 responses, adjusted will be used otherwise. Written comments should be taken in context, but overall indicate a positive learning environment for students. Additional expectations include:

- Meet all assigned classes for scheduled periods and is prepared for instruction
- Prepare up-to-date syllabus for each assigned course and places it on file with the School
- Supervise student assistants in accordance with accepted professional and ethical standards
- Post and keep office hours
- Conduct standard University evaluation of teaching for each assigned course, or uses other methods of evaluation approved by the School Director
- Assign grades equitably and turns in grades in on time
- Collect assessment data as needed for accreditation and other reports

For faculty that serve as graduate advisors, expectations include:

- Serve on an appropriate number of committees given program needs
- Respond to student emails in a timely manner
- Mentor and facilitates major events towards degree completion
- Provides input to proposals, theses/reports or dissertations
- Facilitate positive mentoring relationships

Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Discovery (RSCAD)

High quality scholarship and academic excellence are fundamental to attaining a national and international reputation in consumer sciences. Faculty members are expected to maintain consistent scholarship programs focused in one or more specific areas and regularly engage in a variety of rigorous scholarly activities. Scholarly *activities and outcomes* are evaluated in the annual merit salary adjustments evaluation process. The intention of evaluating activities in addition to outcomes is that when faculty members engage in scholarly activities at the level of rigor and productivity required to produce outcomes that can be counted in all forms of review, the individual faculty member and the School meet their productivity goals.

The following are examples of the results of productive scholarly efforts with possible indicators of excellence in scholarship:

- Published manuscripts in peer-reviewed, professional journals and proceedings
- Published books (including textbooks, research-based monographs, and edited volumes)

- Publications in editor-reviewed outlets (including book chapters, editorials published in a journal, etc.)
- Presented papers at juried international, national, and regional conferences and meetings including documented acceptance/rejection rates, rigor of the review process, etc.
- Exhibitions of creative scholarship in juried international, national, and regional exhibitions, conferences, and meetings – documented exhibition acceptance/rejection rates, rigor of the review process, etc.
- Invited presentations and exhibitions at the international, national, and regional level
- Awards/recognition received for significant research and creative scholarship, including student work performed under the faculty member's supervision
- External and internal competitive funding (including grants and contracts) to support scholarly activities
- Other evidence of high quality, significant scholarship provided by the faculty member

The evaluation process must remain flexible to accommodate a variety of models of research and scholarship, reflecting the variety of disciplines housed within the school. Because research outputs do not always follow an academic year, particularly publications and funding opportunities, each faculty member's annual review should note the degree to which the faculty member is engaging in a preponderance of the activities listed above. In addition, faculty members' evaluations in scholarship/research will reflect a three-year rolling average.

Expectation

Faculty members should maintain a coherent program of RSCAD with clearly defined theoretical, empirical, and/or intervention-oriented goals, as opposed to unorganized and scattered efforts in numerous unrelated research directions. Faculty may engage in scholarship with colleagues and/or students that represent a diverse range of topics reflective of their diverse interests. Faculty may also change the focus of their research or scholarship from time to time. Such efforts should generally be rewarded and not penalized. However, over time, the personal scholarly program of the faculty member should reflect sustained efforts necessary for defining systematic progress and for achieving national and international recognition in a selected area of RSCAD. It is the responsibility of the evaluator and faculty member to monitor the spirit and letter of this expectation during each annual merit evaluation.

Scholarly Outputs

Fashion Studies

Research effort allocation of .40 corresponds to an average of around 1.5 major scholarly accomplishments per year (averaged over the last three years). If a faculty member is using RSCAD methods that are more time-consuming, starting a new project, submitting a grant proposal, or otherwise doing scholarly work that would explain a lower level of productivity, those issues will be taken into consideration in the evaluation with the understanding that over a three-year period the overall productivity will meet the expectation.

Hospitality Management

Research effort allocation of .40 corresponds to an average of around two manuscripts accepted for publication annually (averaged over the last three years). Account will be taken of the rigor and visibility of the journals to which papers are accepted. Greatest weight will be given to

journals with a high (greater than 2.0) impact factor as well as journals included in the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI). Publications in journals with an impact factor greater than or equal to 1.0 are encouraged. As a guideline for evaluations of scholarship, the absolute number of publications is less important than their significance, as measured by citations and reputation among peers in the field of expertise.

Personal Financial Planning

Research effort allocation of .40 correspond to an expectation of an average around two manuscripts published annually (averaged over the last three years). However, faculty members producing very high-quality research or employing time-consuming research methods (e.g., primary data collection, experimental designs) will receive consideration for exceptions to this minimum expectation. The Australian Business Deans Journal List will be used as a measure of publication quality, though an article's impact and relevance to financial planning practitioners should be given weight. If the candidate has had a larger or smaller average research effort allocation than .40, then prorating must be used.

Sensory Sciences

Research effort allocation of .40 corresponds to an average of around two manuscripts accepted for publication per year (averaged over the last three years) plus two manuscripts submitted and under consideration. Account will be taken of the rigor and visibility of the journals to which papers are accepted and submitted. Greatest weight will be given to journals with a high (greater than 2.0) impact factor. Publications in journals with an impact factor greater than or equal to 1.0 are encouraged. As a guideline for evaluations of scholarship, the absolute number of publications is less important than their significance, as measured by citations and reputation among peers in the field of expertise.

RSCAD Funding

Receiving extramural grants and contracts are an important indicator of scholarly activity and academic reputation, plus many of these awards benefit the School directly through financial resources. The weight given for grants and contracts during the annual evaluation process is based on the nature of the awarding process, the role of the faculty member in the grant preparation process, the magnitude of the award, and the benefit to the School. It is recognized that many other sources of funding bring benefits to the School and should be acknowledged. Contributions of resources in-kind (e.g., contributions of equipment, data, etc.) and private industry sponsored research as fee-for-service are other forms of external funding. Variations in the difficulty particular individuals and fields may have in obtaining external funding should be considered. However, substantial, and continuing efforts in this direction are expected of all faculty that have a scholarly component to their time allocation.

While all grants and contracts are valued, the greatest weight will be given to those grants that:

1. Are awarded through a peer-reviewed process,
2. Are used to finance at least one GRA/GTA for a minimum of two semesters,
3. Are used to support full- or part-time professional staff, or
4. Generate research overhead money for the School and/or salary savings that revert to the School.

Awarding of significant external RSCAD funding, as filtered through the criteria above, as a PI or Co-PI will be considered equivalent to one manuscript/major accomplishment in the year that the award is received.

Expectation

Each faculty member should submit as a principal investigator or co-principal investigator at least one proposal for external or internal funding per year, or its equivalent in support from industry or government partners, unless the faculty member has an active grant, contract, or other external support for scholarly activities. The amount, size, and source of funding should be consistent with discipline norms and career stage.

Presentations

Opportunities to share research outcomes elsewhere generally represent appreciation outside the University of scholarly merit. The significance of this recognition depends on the nature of the presentation. The following are examples of types of presentations:

- Peer-reviewed conference presentation or poster at a national or international meeting
- Invitation to speak at a national or international meeting and/or preside at a session of a national or international meeting
- Invitation to speak at a university, active in research
- Contributed paper (oral or poster) at a national or international conference
- Invitation to speak at a state-level, non-research agency outside of the university
- Invitation to speak at a non-research active university or college, secondary school, or a more local invitation (e.g., as part of a course or seminar program of another department within the university)

Note that presentations in this context are not limited to in-person presentations. Online presentations, such as webinars or online seminars, may be equally significant depending on the nature, reach, scope, and prestige of the event. Demonstrating the broader impacts of research is increasingly important and such activities engaging public and private-sector organizations should be given due consideration under this heading as part of the overall research effort.

Expectation

Faculty members will present at least one paper, or a comparable impact or engagement activity, at a discipline-recognized national or international conference per year. Expectations are dependent on the availability of funding.

Extension

Extension scholarship may be defined as strategies, resources, programs, products, and endeavors in which research-based knowledge is applied to practical situations. Extension scholarship focuses on outreach efforts designed to improve the lives of Kansans living within a national and global context.

Extension scholarship may have many forms depending on the nature of the subject, the target audience, and the intended outcomes. While the extent of activity will depend on the percent of extension tenths, scholarship will include one or more of the following items:

- A research or evidence-base that provides a solid foundation for the strategies, resources, programs, products, and endeavors
- A plan of work that includes goals, activities, outcomes, research and evaluation design and methods or other possible components that are integral to the specific work
- Peer review by colleagues in Kansas or other states familiar with the content area
- Resources for dissemination
- Evaluation or other data
- A summary report of outputs, impacts; and/or outcomes
- A synopsis of the above communicated to others through articles in journals, conference proceedings, or reports and monographs. Appropriate dissemination includes posting of the synopsis on websites, sharing through national listservs, or other printed or electronic methods.

The evaluation process must remain flexible enough to accommodate the changing nature of Extension work, recognizing the importance of citizen and stakeholder input and collaboration on current public issues. Such scholarship frequently involves effort across more than one evaluation year, and, therefore, progress is an important element of the evaluation process. In the case of work that extends over multiple years, faculty members may request that the evaluator to use a multi-year perspective.

Expectations for Extension scholarship include:

- Clear and relevant goals and anticipated outcomes
- Breadth of activities
- Creativity
- Mastery of existing subject matter
- Teaching techniques and skills
- Program outputs, impact assessment and outcomes
- Publications and dissemination of Extension scholarship
- Research supporting the faculty member's overall Extension program
- Leverage of existing resources
- Grants and user fees support
- Effective communication
- Leadership and impact of programming and professional activities
- Ethical behavior

Expectation

- Participates in Extension scholarship as described in the Expectations for Extension Specialists [document](#). This may be active participation on a project team as well as individual work.
- Prepares and updates educational materials in a timely way.
- Is available and responsive to agent requests within limitations of available time and other resources.
- Actively participate on appropriate subject matter teams.

Service

Individual faculty members may have service responsibilities that constitute a significant part of their work assignment. Expectations will vary greatly between faculty and not all faculty will be expected to engage in each type of service. These activities may include:

1. Non-directed service – not specified in appointment or offer letter
 - a. to the profession,
 - b. to the Program, School, the College, or the University, and
 - c. to the public, professionally-related service
2. Directed service – specified in appointment or offer letter

Expectation

- Non-directed Service – Institution
 - Attends Program, School, and College meetings
 - Serves on Program, School, College, and University committees as demonstrated by active participation in meetings
 - Assists with student recruitment and retention
 - Serves as a primary tenure mentor when appropriate
- Non-directed Service – Professional
 - Attends professional meetings
 - Engage in committees and leadership roles in professional associations
 - Serves as a journal editor, editorial board member, or review committee member of a professional association
 - Serves as a peer reviewer of manuscripts submitted to refereed journals or book publishers; reviews proposal submitted funding agencies, reviews papers for professional meetings
 - Serves as an external reviewer of candidates for tenure and promotion
- Non-directed Service – Public
 - Direct engagement in local, state, regional, or national activities that enhance the well-being of the public and that require the application of professional expertise
 - Uses expertise to facilitate or implement a project for community enhancement
 - Gives talks/lectures/workshops to the public on topics related to area of expertise
 - Serves as a resource for the media on topics related to area of expertise
 - Consults for public and private groups engaged in educational and scholarly endeavors related to areas of expertise
- Directed Service
 - Pursue, as directed, by the Program Chair, Associate School Director, or Director

Collegiality/Academic Citizenship Expectations

The School needs collegiality to function effectively. Annual faculty evaluations will include an assessment of behaviors that positively or negatively affect others in carrying out their assignments in the school. In the absence of collegiality and good academic citizenship, other evidence of academic excellence will not suffice to offset this deficiency in the pursuit of merit pay increases, reappointment, tenure, and promotion. There should be no effort by the School to discourage debate or disagreement on policies; rather, it is vital to foster and maintain an environment conducive to vigorous debate and inquiry. Faculty disagreement with colleagues and administrators is not to be taken as evidence of a lack of collegiality but should proceed in a

manner consistent with civil debate, constructive criticism, and the resolution of differences. Personal qualities such as integrity, leadership, objectivity, candor, fairness, willingness to cooperate, and a positive attitude are vital to the team functioning of the school's faculty members and are highly valued. The evaluator should review any concerns that are raised about collegiality/academic citizenship.

Expectation

The following activities are indicators of excellence in collegiality and academic citizenship. Overriding all of these is the expectation that faculty should always act professionally.

- Attends and participates in school, unit, and college faculty meetings
- Attends and participates in school, unit, and college events
- Participates in institutional activities (e.g., career fairs; Open House, commencement)
- Attends meetings and participates in self-governance regarding curriculum through curriculum and assessment efforts at the program level
- Eligible faculty members fully participate in self-governance decisions regarding faculty such as interviewing/hiring, reappointment, mid-tenure, tenure, promotion, and professorial awards
- Faculty members seek to maintain open communications with colleagues and administrators and to work toward solutions to shared problems
- Commitment to working effectively and cooperatively with others
- When disagreements are present, being committed to resolving differences by engaging in civil debate as characterized by open, honest communication, and constructive criticism
- Maintaining high professional standards of conduct, including interacting with students, faculty, and staff appropriately and respectfully, and engaging each other in ways that enrich the academic community
- Fostering of goodwill and harmony
- Mentoring of colleagues
- Contribution to the pursuit of unit and school goals

School Workload Guidelines

The School of Consumer Sciences in the College of Health and Human Sciences is dedicated to fostering a balanced and productive environment for both faculty and students. The workload policy of the school is designed to ensure that faculty members can excel in teaching, research, engagement, Extension, and service responsibilities while also maintaining a healthy work-life balance. This policy aligns with the university's broader guidelines, which emphasize flexibility, fairness, and the recognition of diverse faculty contributions across various disciplines and faculty position. For more detailed information on the specific elements of the workload policy, including expectations and responsibilities, refer to the [Kansas State University Faculty Handbook](#), the College of Health and Human Sciences Workload Policy, and the K-State Extension Workload Guidelines.

The School of Consumer Sciences acknowledges that significant variability will occur based on factors such as faculty position and the specific demands of the School and each program.

Allocation of effort for tenured and tenure-track faculty members within the school begins with the university standard of 40-40-20, which suggests 40 percent effort in teaching, 40 percent in research, and 20 percent in service.

Teaching Workload Expectations and Adjustments

Faculty allocation for instruction will include:

- class time
- other student contact hours (e.g., office hours)
- course preparation time including normal course updates or modifications
- assignment grading time
- out-of-class activity time (e.g., course management and/or writing letters of recommendation for students)

The 40% Teaching Standard is two courses totaling 6 credit hours per semester, totaling 12 credit hours per academic year. With respect to workload-to-section credit hour conversion, the school follows standard equivalencies below. Given specific circumstances, these may be altered on a case-by-case basis.

- 1-credit hour course = 3.33% effort
- 2-credit hour course = 6.67% effort
- 3-credit hour course = 10% effort
- 4-credit hour course = 13.33% effort

Example typical teaching workload for faculty with a standard 9-month contract:

- Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty: Standard teaching load is 12 credit hours, often distributed as a 2:2 load per fall/spring semester (40% teaching effort).
- Non-Tenure Track Instructional Faculty: Standard teaching load is 24 credit hours, often distributed as 4:4 load per fall/spring semester (80% teaching effort).

It is recognized that not all courses fall within the standard. In some instances, there may be more (or fewer) credit hours than contact hours. Standard equivalencies for those situations are below.

More Contact Hours than Credit Hours

- 3-credit hours; 6 contact hours = 15%
- 6 contact hours reduced to 10% with GTA
- 3-credit hours; 5 contact hours = 13.33%
- 3-credit hours; 4 contact hours = 11.66%

More (or less) Credit Hours and Contact Hours

- 4-credit hours; 8 contact hours = 20%
- 4-credit hours; 4 contact hours = 13.33%
- 2-credit hours; 4 contact hours = 10%
- 2-credit hours; 2 contact hours = 6.6%
- 1-credit hour; 1 contact hour = 3.3%

Additional factors may influence an individual's instructional load. The FTE for teaching may be adjusted to reflect these considerations, with a corresponding reduction in service-related responsibilities or other responsibilities as negotiated with the school director.

- Large class size as designated by the unit
- Writing-intensive or extensive grading, and student evaluation as designated by the School or Unit
- Individualized instruction (Problems, Practicum, Intern Supervision)
- Formal mentoring of graduate students
- New course preparation or major revision approved by program chair (including for new faculty)
 - Course development and teaching: 1.33% effort (first delivery), then standard
- Course coordination of several sections and/or supervision of GTA or instructors
 - x 0.2 per section (max of 3)
- Course team taught with another faculty member
- Presence of instructional support such as a GTA or grader
- Formal undergraduate mentoring
- Enrollment is substantially less than required
 - If authorized to offer the course, the workload credit may be adjusted.
- Multiple Sections
 - Credit for teaching multiple sections of the same course in the same semester will be as follows: add 50% of the total base effort of the course (e.g., 3 credit hours = $10\% \times 0.5 = 15\%$)

The School Director has the authority in coordination with the Program Chair and the faculty member to adjust the standard teaching workload distribution based on the representative factors described above, as well as those identified in the College of Health and Human Sciences' Workload Policy.

Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Discovery Workload Expectations and Activities

Kansas State University, a public land-grant institution, holds the prestigious R1 Carnegie Classification, denoting its status as a doctoral university with the highest level of research activity. This designation brings with it the expectation that faculty members will demonstrate leadership in research, creative endeavors, discovery, innovation, and scholarship. In general, research tenths for tenured and tenure-track faculty with expectations for RSCAD will not go below 0.2 tenths.

At an R1 land-grant institution such as Kansas State University, faculty with RSCAD tenths are expected to pursue external funding from relevant agencies and other sources to support their scholarly endeavors and to disseminate scholarly work through appropriate academic channels. Faculty members with RSCAD appointments are expected to remain current in their respective fields through ongoing professional development, staying current with scholarly literature, and active involvement in research and creative activity initiatives. As mentioned in the University Handbook [Appendix Y](#), engaged scholarly activity can be embedded in teaching, research, extension, and service percentages.

Faculty actively engaged in research may qualify for teaching load reductions through mechanisms like course buyouts or other negotiated arrangements, allowing them to focus more on their research goals. However, when a faculty member's research productivity falls short of the expected standards outlined in school documents, adjustments may be made to their teaching and service responsibilities to better meet the needs of the school or college. This flexibility ensures that faculty can meet their 100% effort allocation in varying combinations of teaching, research, and service, depending on individual circumstances and roles, such as clinical or administrative duties.

In the School of Consumer Sciences, faculty members' research and creative activities are integral to their workload and should produce measurable scholarly achievements. These activities include, but are not limited to:

- **Grant/contract proposals:** Actively seeking and securing extramural funding to support research endeavors.
- **Management of extramural awards:** Administering the execution and reporting of research projects funded by external sources from both public and private sectors.
- **Research-based (Contract) Fee-for-Service activities:** Developing and providing specialized services to external entities, thereby generating funds to support research initiatives and student assistantships.
- **Peer-reviewed publications:** Publishing research and creative activity findings in peer-reviewed journals or discipline specific journals.
- **Scholarly books and book chapters:** Authoring or contributing to publications that enhance knowledge within the faculty member's area of expertise.
- **Graduate research supervision (theses, dissertations, or similar achievements):** Producing tangible outcomes such as theses and dissertations from graduate student research.
- **Conference presentations:** Presenting research or creative scholarship at juried or peer-reviewed international, national, and regional conferences.
- **Exhibitions of creative scholarship:** Presenting creative or innovative scholarly work in relevant academic or public venues including juried or invited exhibitions.

Extension Workload Expectations and Activities

The allocation of workload for extension faculty members will reflect the diversity of their roles and the specific expectations of their appointments. Workload distribution will be scalable based on the percentage of the extension appointment, accommodating the variable demands of research, teaching, and community engagement activities. In the School of Consumer Sciences, the K-State Extension Workload Guidelines for specialists shall be followed.

Extension workload for faculty within the School of Consumer Sciences encompasses the key areas of: Extension Scholarship, Program Planning and Development, Education and Program Delivery, Program Evaluation and Accountability, and Service to the Extension Mission. Each of these areas is described in detail in the K-State Extension Workload Guidelines.

Service Workload Expectations and Activities

Service excellence within the School of Consumer Sciences is achieved when faculty members utilize their expertise to significantly contribute to the profession, the university, and the broader community. According to the University Handbook ([C32.6 – C32.7](#)), service responsibilities are classified into two main categories: directed and non-directed service. In general, service tenths for faculty will not go below 0.1 tenths.

Directed Service

As defined from Section [C5](#) in the University Handbook: “All other work that furthers the mission of and is directly related to the goals and objectives of a unit and the university, that requires academic credentials or special skills, and that is a part of a faculty member's explicit assignment. Typical positions that involve such work are industry research services, librarians, and clinicians-diagnosticians.” Directed service can include leadership of consulting services or a fee-for-service unit, as well as supervising clinical services, operating or managing shared resources (e.g. scientific core lab, display cases, etc.) or participating in temporary international assignments.

Non-Directed Service

There are three categories: institution-, profession-, and public-based service as defined below from Section [C6](#) of the University Handbook: “Institution-based service. Work that is essential to the operation of the university; for example, contributing to the formulation of academic policy and programs, serving on the faculty senate, the graduate council, and committees of the department [school], college or university, or acting as adviser to student organizations.

Profession-based service. Work that is directly related to the function of the unit and that provides leadership and service to the faculty member’s profession or discipline; for example, holding office in a professional association or service on an editorial board or professional journal.

Public-based professional service. Efforts that are not directed service but that are the application of knowledge and expertise intended for the benefit of a non-academic audience; for example, serving as an expert witness, developing programs and providing training, or providing consultation ad honorem.”

In the College of Health and Human Sciences, a minimum of 5% institutional service to the School, college or university is required of all faculty members unless otherwise negotiated with the School Director. Regardless of appointment type, faculty are expected to actively participate in:

- faculty meetings
- faculty recruitment
- curriculum development
- accreditation processes

While faculty members may engage in both directed and non-directed service activities, it is important to note that substantial participation in non-directed service does not substitute for fulfilling workload expectations in teaching, RSCAD, or Extension. Contributions to service are

invaluable to the functioning of the university and the advancement of the profession, providing faculty with opportunities to lead, influence, and impact both within and beyond the academic community.

Adjustment for Administrative Roles

Faculty who assume administrative roles within the college or school (e.g., Dean, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean, School Director, Associate Director, Program Chair, etc.) require adjusted expectations for their teaching, research, creative activities, Extension expectations, and service. These adjustments are typically influenced by factors such as the size of the unit, the scope of the administrative responsibilities, and other relevant considerations. The extent of the reduction in other duties is determined by the demands of the administrative role and the need to balance these responsibilities.

Regular Review of Workload Assignment and Process for Handling Disagreements

The College of Health and Human Sciences Workload Policy provides for the annual review of faculty workload assignments. It also broadly describes the process to be followed within the College when disagreements exist.

In the School of Consumer Sciences, assessment of workload must compare the faculty member's assigned workload to what was conducted and achieved to determine if an adjustment in workload assignment or faculty activities must be made for the next evaluation year. If necessary, a faculty member, Program Chair, Associate School Director, or School Director may request a mid-year workload assessment, which will be conducted by the faculty member and Program Chair. Any disagreements will follow the process outlined below.

In cases where disagreement arises concerning a faculty member's workload apportionment, it is expected that both the faculty member and the Program Chair will make every effort to reach a collaborative resolution. Should these efforts prove unsuccessful, the faculty member should then request a meeting with the Associate School Director. If a resolution cannot be reached, the faculty member may request a meeting with the School Director and/or the Associate Dean for Academic and Faculty Affairs to seek resolution. If an agreement cannot be reached, the faculty member may pursue the Administrative Appeal process, as outline in [Appendix G](#) of the University Handbook. The faculty member may utilize a Kansas State University Ombudsperson at any or all stages of this disagreement process.

Base Faculty Workload Categories				
<i>Faculty Type</i>	<i>Teaching/Mentoring</i>	<i>Research</i>	<i>Extension</i>	<i>Service</i>
Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty <i>not mentoring graduate students</i>	40% 2:2 6 credit hrs./semester 12 credit hrs./year	40%	<i>NA</i>	20%
Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty <i>directly mentoring graduate students</i>	50% (10% assigned to graduate student mentoring) 2:2 6 credit hrs./semester 12 credit hrs./year	40%	<i>NA</i>	10%
Non-Tenure Track Instructional Faculty	80% 4:4 12 credit hrs./semester 24 credit hrs./year	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>	20%
Non-Tenure Track Research Faculty	<i>NA</i>	80%	<i>NA</i>	20%
Tenured/Tenure-Track/Non-Tenure Track Extension Faculty	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>	80%	20%
Non-Tenure Track Instructional/Advising Faculty	50% Teaching 50% Advising 15 credit hrs./year	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>
It is anticipated that over the course of a faculty member's career, and based on a faculty member's type and rank, that the percentage/level of effort in the different workload categories (e.g., teaching, research and creative activities, Extension, and service) will shift.				

Procedures and Criteria for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment: Tenure-Track Faculty

School Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Criteria: Tenure Track

The School must evaluate the performance of its probationary tenure-track members regularly in order to:

- Help the School Director provide feedback, commendations, and constructive criticism to its members.
- Provide information to non-tenured faculty during the probationary period.
- Determine if a faculty member has earned the rights both to be tenured and to be promoted at Kansas State University.
 - Note: Decisions about tenure and about promotion may be separate actions under some circumstances.

Awarding of tenure and promotion progression through the academic ranks depends upon a sustained record of high competence and performance. Tenure and promotion are independent considerations in the School. Though unusual, a faculty member may be awarded tenure but denied immediate promotion to the rank of associate professor. Conversely, a faculty member may be hired on a probationary appointment (without tenure) at a rank higher than assistant professor. Tenure and promotion are based on accomplishments and demonstrated excellence in the performance of assigned professional activities. The burden of evidence is on each faculty member to document the quality and quantity of his or her contributions (University Handbook [C111](#)).

As assignments and areas of expertise vary, the faculty of the School contribute to its overall mission in diverse ways. Because this diversity makes it difficult to establish one format for the reporting of faculty accomplishments, it is the responsibility of each faculty member to substantiate his or her particular expertise and accomplishments in assigned responsibilities. Faculty members are expected to contribute to the mission of the School, the College, and the University through teaching, research, extension, and service as stipulated in their assignments.

The School Director is responsible for informing the candidate of the processes and criteria involved in tenure and/or promotion. Each candidate must be given a copy of this document. In addition, the School Director is responsible for the general mentoring of each candidate over time and for assigning a specific tenured faculty as a mentor. The School Director's mentoring includes evaluating the competence of the candidate via annual evaluations and giving guidance to the candidate in the preparation of a multiple-year portfolio containing evidence of activities to be evaluated (e.g., mid-probationary review, tenure and/or promotion reviews). In the case of probationary faculty, the School Director must recommend to the candidate those faculty members who may serve as the primary tenure mentor should they consent to do so.

Ordinarily, the primary tenure mentor should be a faculty member from the School. If desired (or when the number of School faculty who may serve is too small), the candidate may seek mentoring advice from faculty outside of the School, electing to form a formal mentoring committee of tenured faculty members.

Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty Cumulative Expectations/Evaluation Criteria

As stated in the University Handbook, awarding faculty members with tenure is a result of demonstrated expertise in the faculty member's field of study. The cumulative record of the faculty member's professional activity during the probationary period should show evidence of a national reputation and a record of excellence. "The university uses a selective process in awarding tenure to secure a faculty of the highest possible caliber. To be tenured, faculty members must be experts in their chosen fields, and must have full academic freedom in pursuit of ideas or inquiries without fear of censure or retribution." (University Handbook [C90](#).)

Annual Reappointment Review of Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

Before being considered for tenure at Kansas State University, the faculty member enters a probationary period during which the candidate's ability to contribute to the University's mission and to meet criteria for tenure specified by the School are assessed. The precise terms and conditions of every initial appointment should be stated in writing and be in the possession of

both the institution and the faculty member before the appointment is finalized. The duration of the probationary period relative to tenure varies with rank and experience. For individuals appointed at the rank of assistant professor, the maximum probationary period for gaining tenure and promotion to associate professor rank consists of six (6) regular appointments at Kansas State University at a probationary rank. See University Handbook [C73](#), Section B for faculty with prior service at another academic institution.

Candidates appointed at the rank of assistant professor and not approved for tenure during the sixth year of service will be notified by the Dean of the College that the seventh year of service will constitute the terminal year of appointment (University Handbook [C82.2](#)). For individuals appointed at the rank of associate professor or professor, the maximum probationary period consists of five (5) regular appointments at Kansas State University at probationary ranks (University Handbook [C82.3](#)).

Tenure decisions must be made before or during the fifth year of probationary service. Candidates not approved for tenure during the fifth year of service will be notified by the appropriate dean that the sixth year of service will constitute the terminal year of appointment. Under certain circumstances, the tenure clock may be delayed by one year. See University Handbook [C83.1-83.6](#) for conditions under which delay of the tenure clock may be considered and the procedures for making such a request.

Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty Reappointment Review Procedures

The School Director requests annual evaluation reporting materials and any supplementary documents from the candidate for submission to the School Director by the last day of Fall finals week. During the probationary period, the School Director will appoint a Probationary Annual Review Committee of no fewer than three tenured faculty members. All tenured faculty members from within the School will serve on this committee, and if fewer than three, tenured faculty members from other schools within the College will be added to the committee. The School Director, in consultation with the School tenured faculty members, will choose these additional committee members. The probationary faculty member may submit a list of names to the School Director for consideration and may also submit a list of names whom they believe may not be able to provide a fair and unbiased evaluation of the candidate's materials, specifying the reasons for this claim. The Probationary Annual Review Committee will evaluate and provide written comments on the file, and vote on the reappointment of candidates. Reasonable efforts will be made to create consistency in this committee's composition during a candidate's probationary period. The School Director schedules a meeting with the Probationary Annual Review Committee and provides the candidate's materials to the committee 14 days prior to the meeting. At the meeting the committee discusses the candidate's materials and votes for or against reappointment using a signed, confidential ballot. Committee members also provide written comments to the School Director.

Within 14 days of the committee meeting, the School Director reviews the candidate's materials and the Probationary Annual Review Committee's votes and written ballot comments to prepare a recommendation to the Dean on reappointment that includes evaluative statements in support of the recommendation. The School Director also provides a copy of the recommendation to the candidate. Faculty members must be explicitly informed in writing of a decision not to renew

their annual appointments in accordance with The Standards of Notice of Non-reappointment (see University Handbook [Appendix A](#)).

Mid-Tenure Review (also known as Mid-Probationary Review)

A formal review of a probationary faculty member is conducted during fall semester of the third year of his or her appointment (University Handbook [C92.1](#)). For faculty on a seven-year tenure track, the mid-probationary review is in November of the third year at Kansas State. For faculty whose tenure clock at Kansas State is other than seven years, the timing of the mid-probationary review will be determined in consultation with the School Director at the time of appointment.

Purpose

The mid-tenure review is intended to be formative and consists of an evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence in the candidate's portfolio and includes recommendations for continued growth. The objective of the mid-tenure review is to

- Provide tenure-track faculty members with assessments of their performance by tenured faculty in their assigned areas of professional activities,
- Provide tenured faculty with an opportunity to comment on the probationary faculty member's long-range plans for research and other scholarly activities, and
- Determine if the accomplishments and goals of the probationary faculty member are consistent with the missions and expectations of the School.

The outcome of this review at the School level is a letter from the School Director that summarizes the views of the tenured faculty. The letter will include a vote of the tenured faculty. This letter is separate from the outcomes of the annual evaluation process and re-appointment process. A positive mid-probationary review does not ensure that tenure will be granted in the future, nor does a negative review mean that tenure will be denied.

Procedures

Candidates should prepare their mid-tenure review documentation following the Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Mid-Tenure Review Documents, which can be found on the K-State web page at: <https://www.kstate.edu/provost/resources/dhmanual/>.

According to these instructions, faculty members are required to prepare summaries of their accomplishments in the areas of their appointment during their first three academic years at K-State. In the School of Consumer Sciences, the procedures defined in the University Handbook [C92.1-C92.4](#) are followed with the exception that for mid-tenure review, the faculty submitting their materials need not include comments from students (outside of teaching evaluations), other relevant faculty, and outside reviewers. When possible, every effort should be made to submit the documentation digitally as a searchable PDF.

The School Director will appoint a Mid-Tenure Review Committee of no fewer than three tenured faculty members. All tenured faculty members from within the School will serve on this committee, and if fewer than three, tenured faculty members from other Schools within the College will be added to the committee. The School Director, in consultation with the School's tenured faculty members, will choose these additional committee members. The probationary faculty member may submit a list of names to the School Director for consideration and may also

submit a list of names whom they believe may not be able to provide a fair and unbiased evaluation of the candidate's materials, specifying the reasons for this claim.

The School Director will convene the meeting of Mid-Tenure Review Committee and will be present throughout the discussion. The School Director is responsible for making the candidate's mid-probationary portfolio available to the Mid-Tenure Review Committee at least 14 calendar days before a meeting to discuss the candidate's progress. A cumulative record of written recommendations and accompanying explanations forwarded to the candidate from previous reappointment meetings will also be made available to the Mid-Tenure Review Committee. Outside letters of evaluation are not required.

The faculty member serving as the tenure mentor to the candidate (if one has been chosen) may be asked to provide an oral summary of the candidate's accomplishments. If there is no tenure mentor, then the candidate selects a tenured faculty member to present the information. If the candidate does not select a presenter, then the School Director appoints a senior faculty member to present the material. If the candidate or the faculty reviewers so request, the candidate may make comments on his or her own behalf to the faculty gathered for the review. In this case, the candidate leaves the meeting after making a statement and answering questions.

During the mid-probationary review, if there are instances when the Mid-Tenure Review Committee and the School Director are in conflict with respect to the performance of a probationary faculty, the School Director and the Mid-Tenure Review Committee, including (if one has been chosen) the candidate's tenure mentor, will meet to resolve the differences. This is to ensure that probationary faculty members do not receive conflicting messages regarding their development. In cases where differences cannot be resolved, the candidate should be informed of the differences.

The School Director may discuss the results of the mid-probationary review with the Dean of the college and will provide a letter of assessment to the candidate, including a summary of faculty comments and suggestions. This letter of assessment will become a part of the candidate's reappointment and mid-probationary review file. Before forwarding the candidate's file to the Dean of the college, the School Director will discuss the review and assessment with the candidate within one week after the review by the eligible tenured faculty. The candidate will receive a copy of the School Director's letter of assessment. After receiving the assessment, the candidate has the right to submit a written response that henceforth becomes a permanent addition to the candidate's file.

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Evaluation Criteria

As stated in the University Handbook [C90](#), faculty being considered for tenure should be experts in their chosen fields. "The university uses a selective process in awarding tenure to secure a faculty of the highest possible caliber. To be tenured, faculty members must be experts in their chosen fields, and must have full academic freedom in pursuit of ideas or inquiries without fear of censure or retribution."

To be awarded tenure, faculty members should be meeting or exceeding expectations in each of the assigned areas of professional activities. The faculty member's cumulative record in each of the professional activities should provide clear evidence of the faculty member's expertise and impact in the field of study.

The candidate must provide documented evidence of performance as an effective and diligent teacher. This includes both course content and the ability to communicate, as judged by the faculty and the current students (e.g., teaching evaluations). Other evidence for the quality of teaching might include specific awards for teaching; improvements in the instructional program via the successful acquisition of extramural grants for instructional equipment, etc.; course initiation and major revision of existing courses; successful innovations in teaching methods; effective counseling and advising of students; direction of graduate thesis and dissertation research; and the achievements of former students.

The candidate must have established an RSCAD program that has earned national recognition in the candidate's area of specialty within the field. It must be clearly evident to the faculty and the external evaluators that the habit of consistent, high-quality scholarly outputs has been firmly established. The scholarly record will be considered in light of the field, type of RSCAD conducted (e.g., qualitative, quantitative, primary, secondary, creative, etc.), teaching load, and other School responsibilities. The comments of external evaluators will be considered as part of the faculty's evaluation of the candidate's RSCAD program.

The candidate should have demonstrated his or her competitive efforts and/or effectiveness in bringing outside financial support or other resources to the School through the candidate's own RSCAD program, through proposals for acquiring School research instruments, or other individual or collective efforts on behalf of the School. Other evidence for the quality of scholarship might include national, regional, and local awards; and the achievements of the candidate's former students.

For those with Extension appointments, promotion to Associate Professor will depend on the development of an Extension portfolio of accomplishments that reflects the tenths time assigned to Extension. The portfolio should include: an emerging record of excellence as judged by other colleagues throughout the nation who are familiar with the Specialist's area of expertise; an emerging reputation as a "role model for Extension" among other Extension Specialists in the Specialist's area of expertise; and a growing record of sustained scholarly work published in national refereed or other reputable sources.

The candidate should have demonstrated engagement and emerging leadership ability in service to the School, college and/or university, and to the profession. Evidence of leadership might include service on School and university policy making and personnel selection committees, substantive contributions in the development and promotion of research and teaching programs, preparation of School proposals, reports and service on School, college or university committees, leadership in professional associations.

Procedures

A candidate normally will be considered for tenure during the sixth year of the seven-year

probationary period, with an application for tenure made at the beginning of the sixth year. If tenure is denied, a candidate has one additional year available for employment at Kansas State University. For faculty members appointed at the ranks of associate professor and professor, the maximum probationary period for gaining tenure consists of five (5) regular annual appointments at Kansas State University. Tenure may be granted to those on full-time probationary appointments at the rank of associate professor or above. Unless they resign, faculty members in the final year of probation will be automatically reviewed for tenure. In exceptional cases, a candidate with outstanding records in research, teaching, Extension and/or service may be considered for tenure in an earlier year following a written request by the candidate or by a written nomination of tenured faculty member, with concurrence of the candidate. The School Director must support this request to begin the early tenure evaluation process.

Written requests for consideration of tenure and/or promotion (including those seeking tenure prior to the 6th year or those nominating such candidates) must be submitted to the School Director no later than June 15. It is more common that the candidate and School Director (in consultation with faculty mentor) discuss application for tenure and/or promotion as part of the candidate's annual review/reappointment meeting the preceding spring semester.

The typical sequence of events is as follows:

- The probationary faculty member and School Director (in consultation with faculty mentor) discuss consideration for promotion and/or tenure during the preceding spring semester.
- The School Director will inform the candidate and candidate's mentor to prepare a list of approximately seven external evaluators by May 1st. An equal number of external reviewers from the candidate's list and the School Director's list will be selected (see University Handbook [C112.2](#)).
- School Director requests that the candidate prepare materials (abbreviated version of promotion and tenure packet) for external review by early summer.
- The candidate submits materials for internal review in September.
- Eligible School of Consumer Sciences faculty review packet of materials in October and vote.
- School recommendations are forwarded to the Dean of the College (early November).
- The College Promotion and Tenure Committee convenes to review materials and reports finding to the Dean (early December).
- The Dean notifies candidate and School Director of college and Dean's recommendation (early December). The candidate may withdraw materials within seven calendar days.
- The Dean submits materials and recommendations of those candidates who have not withdrawn to the Deans Council (mid December).
- The Dean notifies candidate and School Director of the Deans Council recommendation (early February). Candidates not recommended by the Deans Council have 14 days to appeal to the Provost.
- Recommendations from the Deans Council are sent to the Provost and then the President of Kansas State University (late February).
- The Provost informs candidates of promotion/tenure decisions (mid March).

The candidate's tenure mentor, if any, presents the candidate's materials to the eligible voting faculty members. If there is no tenure mentor, then the School Director appoints a senior faculty member to present the materials. If the candidate or the faculty reviewers request, the candidate may make comments on his or her own behalf to the faculty gathered for the review. In this case, the candidate leaves the meeting after making a statement and answering questions. Within five working days from that date, each eligible faculty member will submit a written ballot and any written comments to the School Director. At the close of the voting period, the School Director will open the ballots and record the vote.

The School Director will review the promotion/tenure document used to guide the candidate, the entire probationary portfolio of the candidate, the recommendations of the eligible faculty, and the vote of the eligible faculty. Following this review, the School Director will formulate an independent recommendation either supporting or failing to support tenure and/or promotion of the candidate and forward a recommendation to the Dean of the Health and Human Sciences along with the results of the vote of the eligible faculty and unedited ballots. A summary of the comments will be transmitted to the candidate and to the eligible faculty, upon request.

The tenure and/or promotion file of the candidate will be forwarded by the Dean to the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. This Committee, in advising the Dean (in accordance with the University Handbook [C153.2](#)), has three charges: to review the documentation submitted by the candidate and the School Director, to assure that applicable procedures have been followed, and to provide a written recommendation and vote to the Dean as to whether all applicable procedures have been followed.

After the expiration of a probationary period, faculty should have continuous tenure, and their services should be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the cases of retirement, chronic low achievement, program or unit discontinuance, or in extraordinary circumstances, because of financial exigency. (See University Handbook [C31.5 to C31.7](#), [C160.1 to C162.5](#), and Appendixes [B](#), [C](#), and [K](#).)

Letters from External Evaluators

Persons outside the university who are recognized for excellence in the candidate's discipline or profession will be asked to participate as reviewers in evaluations for tenure and promotion (University Handbook [C36.1](#)). The candidate for promotion and/or tenure provides the School Director with the names and addresses of approximately seven external evaluators by no later than May 1, and the tenured faculty members of the candidate's program provide the School Director with a similar number of external evaluators. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion have the right to submit to the School Directors the names of potential outside reviewers whom they believe may not be able to provide a fair and unbiased evaluation of the candidate's materials, specifying the reasons for this claim. The School Director retains the final authority for determining the composition of the list of outside reviewers. The School will make every effort to obtain a minimum of three letters from external reviewers.

Each external reviewer should be provided a written description of the candidate's responsibilities during the period being evaluated, and copies of relevant sections of the School's tenure guidelines (e.g. the Activities and Expectations sections), as well as pertinent materials

from the candidate's file. External reviewers will be asked to consider the candidate's entire portfolio (see below). Reviewers should be assured that the letters of evaluation will remain confidential except as required by court order and will not be seen by the candidate. Reviewers should also be informed that specific words or phrases used in their letters may be part of a written recommendation prepared by the School Director; however, every effort will be made to remove any material that might reveal the identity of the external evaluators.

The value of outside reviews depends on the appropriate choice of objective reviewers. Candidates and units are urged to avoid listing as external reviewers individuals who have had a personal or professional relationship with the candidate, such as the candidate's former major professor, postdoctoral mentor, graduate school classmates, or graduated students.

External reviewers will be sent evidence of performance in all assigned domains (i.e., teaching, research, extension, service) of professional work and informed of the proportion of time devoted by the candidate to each domain during each year of the evaluation period. In the event that an external reviewer fails to respond to the request for evaluation of the candidate's materials, whenever possible, the School Director will select another qualified external reviewer to replace the nonresponsive reviewer.

External reviews will not be sought by anyone other than the School Director. It is inappropriate for persons at other administrative levels (i.e., College Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Dean of the College, the Council of Deans, and the Provost) to solicit additional external reviews beyond those sought by the School Director. However, following notification to the candidate, the School Director may solicit comments from students, other faculty members, and administrative heads in the College or the University, as well as from faculty members and professionals in the field with whom the candidate has collaborated, if relevant. Such comments are not required; however, all such comments become a part of the candidate's record once they are obtained, although the name and affiliation of each person who comments will be kept confidential.

Faculty Eligible to Vote

When a candidate seeks tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, the School Director will appoint a Promotion Committee of no fewer than three tenured faculty members. When there are more than three tenured faculty members in the School, the Committee will include all faculty eligible to vote on matters of promotion and mid-probationary review. Faculty eligible to vote on matters of promotion and mid-probationary review are all School faculty holding a rank equal to or higher than the rank being considered. Faculty holding tenure, regardless of rank, are expected to participate in the mid-probationary review and vote on questions involving the awarding of promotion and tenure. If an eligible faculty member cannot be present during the voting period, the faculty member may leave his or her ballot and any statement he or she may want incorporated into the discussion summary with the School Director before the week of voting.

All eligible faculty members are expected to vote unless a reason can be documented for abstention. If there are fewer than three eligible faculty in the School, tenured faculty members from other Schools within the College will be added to the committee. The School Director, in consultation with the School tenured faculty members, will choose these additional eligible

faculty. The probationary faculty member may submit a list of names to the School Director for consideration and may also submit a list of names whom they believe may not be able to provide a fair and unbiased evaluation of the candidate's materials, specifying the reasons for this claim.

Appeal Procedures and Transfers from Tenure-Track to Non-Tenure Track Appointment

If the finding of the Dean's Council is not to grant tenure and/or promotion, the candidate may appeal this decision in accordance with University Handbook [C114.2](#) and [Appendix G](#). A tenure-track faculty member must request a transfer to a non-tenure track position in accordance with University Handbook [C12.6](#).

Promotion to Professor

Promotion to professor is based on attainment of excellence in the assigned responsibilities of the faculty member and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies" (University Handbook [C120.2](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

The candidate must provide documented evidence of sustained performance as an effective and diligent teacher. This includes both course content and the ability to communicate, as judged by the faculty and the current students (e.g., teaching evaluations). Other evidence for the quality of teaching might include: specific awards for teaching; improvements in the instructional program via the successful acquisition of extramural grants for instructional equipment, etc.; course initiation and major revision of existing courses; successful innovations in teaching methods; effective counseling and advising of students; direction of graduate thesis and dissertation research; and the achievements of former students. The candidate must have established and maintained a RSCAD program that has earned international or outstanding national recognition in the candidate's area of specialty within the field and is acknowledged by leading authorities in the field. It must be clearly evident to the faculty and the external evaluators that the habit of consistent, high-quality scholarly outputs has been firmly established.

Although it is important to demonstrate sustained productivity since promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, the absolute number of scholarly outputs is less important than their significance, as measured by citations and reputation among peers in the field of expertise. The scholarly record will be considered in light of the field, type of scholarship conducted (e.g., qualitative, quantitative, primary, secondary, creative, etc.), teaching load, and other School responsibilities. The comments of external evaluators will be considered as part of the faculty's evaluation of the candidate's RSCAD program.

The candidate should have demonstrated his or her effectiveness in bringing outside financial support or other resources to the School through the candidate's own RSCAD program, through proposals for acquiring School research instruments, or other individual or collective efforts on behalf of the School.

Other evidence for the quality of scholarship might include: national, regional, and local awards; the achievements of the candidate's former students; and the utilization of a sabbatical leave or leave of absence to enhance his or her RSCAD program.

For those with Extension appointments, promotion to Professor will depend on the development of an Extension portfolio of accomplishments that reflects the tenths time assigned to Extension. The portfolio should include: a record of excellence as judged by other colleagues throughout the nation who are familiar with the Specialist's area of expertise; a reputation as a "role model for Extension" among other Extension Specialists in the Specialist's area of expertise; a record of excellence as judged by national recognition; and a record of sustained scholarly work published in national refereed or other reputable sources.

The candidate should have demonstrated leadership ability and a sustained record of service to the School, college and/or university, and to the profession. Evidence of leadership might include: service on School and university policy making and personnel selection committees, substantive contributions in the development and promotion of research and teaching programs, preparation of School proposals and reports, service on School, college or university committees, and leadership in professional associations.

Procedures

Written requests for consideration of promotion to professor must be submitted to the School Director no later than June 15. It is more common that the candidate and School Director discuss application for promotion as part of the candidate's annual review/reappointment meeting and the preceding spring semester.

The typical sequence of events is as follows:

- The candidate and School Director discuss consideration for promotion during the preceding spring semester.
- The candidate prepares promotion materials for external review by early summer. Supporting materials should be determined by the faculty member in consultation with the School Director. The materials sent for external reviews are typically the full documentation for promotion required of the candidate by the university.
- The candidate prepares a list of three possible external reviewers and the School Director, in consultation with the K-State faculty in the candidate's area of specialization, prepares a list of three possible external reviewers list of three will be prepared by the School Director.
- The School Director sends a letter, the candidate's vita, and other supporting materials to two reviewers selected by the candidate and to two reviewers selected by the full professors evaluating the candidate's materials (i.e., four total external reviewers) for review in the summer.
- If an external expert declines the request to review the candidate's credentials, another reviewer will be selected from the candidate's or the School Director's list. If necessary, if potential external reviewers decline, additional reviewers will be solicited by the School Director. The reviewers are provided a copy of the School criteria for promotion and informed of the proportion of time appointed to all assigned duties such as research, instruction, service, etc. The candidate will not be permitted to see the external reviews.
- The candidate submits materials for internal review in September.
- Eligible faculty review the packet of materials in October and vote.
- School recommendations are forwarded to the Dean (early November).

- The College Promotion and Tenure Committee convenes to review materials and reports finding to the Dean (early December).
- The Dean notifies the candidate and School Director of college and Dean's recommendation (early December). The candidate may withdraw materials within seven calendar days.
- The Dean submits materials and recommendations of those candidates who have not withdrawn to the Deans Council (mid-December).
- The Dean notifies candidate and School Director of the Deans Council recommendation (early February). Candidates not recommended by the Deans Council have 14 days to appeal to the Provost.
- Recommendations from the Deans Council are sent to the Provost and then the President of Kansas State University (late February).
- The Provost informs candidates of promotion decisions (mid-March).

Letters from External Reviewers

External reviewers who are recognized as leaders in the candidate's discipline or profession will be asked to evaluate and discuss the candidate's attainment of excellence in assigned responsibility. Comments from a candidate's research partners, major professor, or graduate school classmates are generally less persuasive and should not be solicited ([University Handbook C36.2](#)).

Each external reviewer should be provided a written description of the candidate's responsibilities during the period being evaluated, and copies of relevant sections of the School's tenure guidelines (e.g. the Activities and Expectations sections), as well as pertinent materials from the candidate's file. External reviewers will be asked to consider the candidate's entire portfolio. Reviewers should be assured that the letters of evaluation will remain confidential except as required by court order and will not be seen by the candidate. Reviewers should also be informed that specific words or phrases used in their letters may be part of a written recommendation prepared by the School Director; however, every effort will be made to remove any material that might reveal the identity of the external evaluators.

External reviewers will be sent evidence of performance in all assigned domains (i.e., teaching, research, extension, service) of professional work and informed of the proportion of time devoted by the candidate to each domain during each year of the evaluation period. In the event that an external reviewer fails to respond to the request for evaluation of the candidate's materials, whenever possible, the School Director will select another qualified external reviewer to replace the nonresponsive reviewer.

External reviews will not be sought by anyone other than the School Director. It is inappropriate for persons at other administrative levels (i.e., College Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Dean of the College, the Council of Deans, and the Provost) to solicit additional external reviews beyond those sought by the School Director. However, following notification to the candidate, the School Director may solicit comments from students, other faculty members, and administrative heads in the College or the University, as well as from faculty members and professionals in the field with whom the candidate has collaborated, if relevant. Such comments are not required; however, all such comments become a part of the candidate's record once they

are obtained, although the name and affiliation of each person who comments will be kept confidential.

Faculty Eligible to Vote

When an associate professor applies for promotion to full professor, the School Director will appoint a Full Professor Promotion Committee of no fewer than three full professors. All full professors from within the School will serve on this committee, and if fewer than three, full professors from other Schools within the College will be added to the committee. The School Director, in consultation with the School full professors, will choose these additional committee members. The faculty member being considered for promotion may submit a list of names to the School Director for consideration and may also submit a list of names whom they believe may not be able to provide a fair and unbiased evaluation of the candidate's materials, specifying the reasons for this claim. The Full Professor Promotion Committee will evaluate and provide written comments on the file, and vote on the promotion of candidates to professor. If the candidate has been at the associate professor rank for more than six years, the evaluating faculty will evaluate the productivity and accomplishment in all areas of appointment and take a holistic view of the candidate's complete work and its national or international impact.

Procedures and Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Reappointment: Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Initial Appointment & Professional Titles

As permitted by the University, the School includes a number of positions and ranks for non-tenure track faculty (University Handbook [C10 – C12](#)) including:

- Instructor (3 ranks): Instructor, Advanced Instructor, Senior Instructor
- Research (3 ranks): Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Professor
- Practice (2 ranks): Professor of Practice, Senior Professor of Practice
- Teaching (3 ranks): Teaching Assistant Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, Teaching Professor
- Extension (3 ranks): Extension Assistant Professor, Extension Associate Professor, Extension Professor

Non-tenure track faculty members may be recruited, hired, and appointed into regular or term positions. Initial appointment rank and subsequent promotions in rank are based on advanced degree(s) held, experience, performance, and achievements over time within a given rank. Non-tenure track faculty members at any rank on a regular appointment are members of the general faculty and are afforded all perquisites accorded to the general faculty, including Notice of Non-Reappointment ([University Handbook Appendix A](#)).

Non-tenure track faculty members on regular appointments will participate in faculty governance processes as defined by the School, and University Faculty Senate. Non-tenure track faculty members have voting rights in college and departmental matters and elections, and may serve on school, college, and university committees unless policies limit membership to tenure-track

faculty. Non-tenure track faculty are eligible to submit grant applications and those on regular appointments may direct research as principal investigators (Policies and Procedures Manual [7010.60](#)). Non-tenure track faculty may be eligible for graduate faculty status, which allows faculty to serve as major professor, graduate committee member, and course coordinator for graduate-level courses (Graduate Handbook [Chapter 5](#)). Non-tenure track faculty must follow university policies related to eligibility for sabbatical leave (University Handbook [E2](#)) and Professorial Performance Awards (University Handbook [C49.2](#)).

Guidelines for Non-Tenure Track Faculty Appointment, Promotion, and Reappointment

Instructional Track Faculty

Instructional track faculty at Kansas State University are educators who have a mix of academic and professional preparation, but are not required to hold the terminal degree appropriate to the discipline. Instructors are not eligible for tenure and are not eligible to vote on matters of tenure or promotion for tenure-track faculty (University Handbook [C12.0](#)). Service in these positions is not credited toward tenure (University Handbook [C12.1](#)). Appointment ranks in this track include Instructor, Advanced Instructor, and Senior Instructor.

The goal of these positions is to enhance the academic and professional development of students in support of the teaching and service missions of the institution. Instructional track faculty are typically involved in classroom instruction and may be involved in non-classroom instructional and curriculum-related activity; university, school/college committees; and local, state/regional, and national professional organizations. Because there is generally less time for the type of research carried out by tenure-track faculty, instructional faculty focus on the scholarship of teaching and learning.

The primary responsibilities of faculty on instructional-track appointments are instruction of students, although other responsibilities may be included in the appointment. The offer letter should clearly define the entire set of expectations. The distribution of effort for instructional-track faculty consists of a 55% to 100% appointment devoted to instruction.

Academic Ranks for Instructional Track Faculty

Instructor: Instructor is the primary entry-level rank for instructional track faculty at the University.

Degree: The candidate typically possesses a graduate degree, but individuals in these positions are not required to hold the terminal degree appropriate to the discipline. In some circumstances, appropriate professional experience with the corresponding professional designations may satisfy the graduate degree requirement.

Criteria: The candidate must have: (1) a current independent capability of teaching, (2) a potential for significant professional growth in the area of teaching, and (3) evidence of a high level of competence in the content area and demonstrated promise of moving toward excellence in student instruction.

Advanced Instructor: Advanced Instructor is the mid-career instructional faculty rank at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a graduate degree appropriate to the discipline.

Criteria: The candidate should demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching by demonstrating active engagement and high commitment to teaching. They must demonstrate a record of effective instruction and evidence of professional development in teaching (e.g., participating in the university peer review of teaching program, attending university teaching conferences).

Senior Instructor: Senior Instructor is the highest instructional faculty rank at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a graduate degree appropriate to the discipline.

Criteria: The candidate should have maintained a sustained record of excellence in teaching and serve as an effective role model for colleagues, students, and clientele. An effective role model leads or guides others in pursuit of teaching excellence. In addition, the candidate should demonstrate superior performance and be recognized by students and peers as an outstanding educator in the discipline. The candidate has engaged in creative endeavors related to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (e.g., University workshop on teaching, presentations in discipline).

Research Track Faculty

Research track faculty at Kansas State University are faculty members who have RSCAD credentials in their disciplinary area. These individuals will normally qualify for principal investigator status on proposals to external agencies if approved by their School Director and the Dean of the college. Individuals appointed to these positions should have RSCAD credentials consistent with those mandated for the comparable tenure-track rank in their disciplines.

Individuals on these appointments are not eligible for tenure and are not eligible to vote on matters of tenure or promotion for tenure-track faculty. Service in these positions is not credited toward tenure (University Handbook [C12.1](#)). Appointment ranks in this track include Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor.

The goal of these positions is to enhance the level of scholarship and external funding in the Department in support of the research mission of the institution. Research track faculty are typically involved in scholarship, and may be involved in university, school/college committees; and local, state/regional, and national professional organizations.

The primary responsibility of faculty on research-track appointments is scholarship, although other responsibilities may be included in the appointment. The offer letter should clearly define the entire set of expectations. The distribution of effort for research-track faculty consists of a 55% to 100% appointment devoted to RSCAD.

Academic Ranks for Research Track Faculty

Research Assistant Professor: Research Assistant Professor is the primary entry-level rank for research track faculty at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a terminal degree appropriate to the discipline.

Criteria: The candidate must have a current independent capability of having a program of scholarship and a potential for significant professional growth in the area of RSCAD. There should be evidence of a high level of competence in scholarship and demonstrated promise of moving toward excellence in maintaining a coherent program of scholarship, developing and/or maintaining a multi-disciplinary RSCAD program, and securing funding to support the program of RSCAD.

Research Associate Professor: Research Associate Professor is the mid-career research faculty track rank at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a terminal degree appropriate to the discipline.

Criteria: The candidate should demonstrate excellence as a scholar, with evidence of contributing to the knowledge base of the chosen discipline at a national and/or international level. The faculty member should maintain a coherent program of scholarship with clearly defined theoretical, empirical, and/or intervention-oriented goals. If appropriate, the candidate should play a significant and clearly defined role in developing and/or maintaining a multi-disciplinary RSCAD program (on a local, national, or international scale). The candidate must have received internal grants and/or sought significant external grants to support his or her program of scholarship.

Research Professor: Research Professor is the highest research faculty track rank at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a terminal degree appropriate to the discipline.

Criteria: The candidate should demonstrate a nationally or internationally recognized and sustained record of research, scholarship, and/or other creative endeavors. In addition, the candidate must provide evidence of serving as a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. The faculty member should maintain a coherent program of scholarship with clearly defined theoretical, empirical, and/or intervention-oriented goals. If appropriate, the candidate should play a significant and clearly defined role in developing and/or maintaining a multi-disciplinary RSCAD program (on a local, national, or international scale). In the case of a candidate for promotion to the rank of professor, the evaluating faculty will look for recent evidence of a sustained and high-quality program of scholarship with national or international impact. The candidate must have received significant external grants to support his or her program of scholarship.

Practice Track Faculty

Practice track faculty at Kansas State University are educators who have substantial non-academic experience in their disciplinary field and credentials appropriate to the discipline.

Individuals on these appointments are not eligible for tenure and are not eligible to vote on matters of tenure or promotion for tenure-track faculty. Service in these positions is not credited toward tenure (University Handbook [C12.3](#)). Appointment ranks in this track include professor of practice and senior professor of practice.

The goal of these positions is to enhance the academic and professional development of students in support of the teaching and service missions of the institution. They are typically involved in classroom instruction and may be involved in non-classroom instructional and curriculum-related activity; university, School/college committees; and local, state/regional; and national professional organizations. Because there is generally less time for the type of traditional scholarship carried out by tenure-track faculty, the scholarship of practice faculty focuses on professional practice improvements or advancement of teaching in the professional setting. They may also engage in various types of research projects that are directed toward advancing instruction, the profession; and/or practice.

The primary responsibilities of faculty on practice-track appointments are instruction of students. These appointments may include teaching, research, outreach and service, or some combination of these duties. The offer letter should clearly define the entire set of expectations. The distribution of effort for practice-track faculty consists of a 55% to 100% appointment devoted to instruction.

Academic Ranks for Practice Track Faculty

Professor of Practice: Professor of Practice is the primary entry-level rank for practice track faculty at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a graduate degree and have substantial non-academic experience in their disciplinary field.

Criteria: The candidate must have: (1) substantial non-academic experience in the disciplinary field and credentials appropriate to the discipline, (2) a current independent capability of teaching, (3) a potential for significant professional growth in the area of teaching, and (4) evidence of a high level of competence in the content area and demonstrated promise of moving toward excellence in student instruction, student mentorship, scholarly activities, professional leadership, and practice/service/outreach as related to the profession.

Senior Professor of Practice: Senior Professor of Practice is the highest practice faculty track rank at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a graduate degree and have substantial non-academic experience in their disciplinary field.

Criteria: The candidate should demonstrate a sustained record of excellence in teaching and serve as an effective role model for colleagues, students, and clientele. An effective role model leads or guides others in pursuit of teaching excellence. The candidate should be recognized at the national/international level as an authority within his or her specialty based on demonstrated excellence in student instruction, student mentorship, scholarly activities, professional

leadership, and practice/service/outreach as related to the position. In addition, the candidate should demonstrate superior performance and be recognized by students and peers as an outstanding educator in the discipline.

Teaching Track Faculty

Teaching track faculty at Kansas State University are educators who have a background in their disciplinary area and are required to hold the terminal degree appropriate to the discipline. Individuals on these appointments are not eligible for tenure and are not eligible to vote on matters of tenure or promotion for tenure-track faculty. Service in these positions is not credited toward tenure (University Handbook [C12.4](#)). Appointment ranks in this track include teaching assistant professor, teaching associate professor, and teaching professor.

The goal of these positions is to enhance the academic and professional development of students in support of the teaching and service missions of the institution. They are typically involved in classroom instruction and may be involved in non-classroom instructional and curriculum-related activities; university, School/college committees; and local, state/regional, and national professional organizations. Because there is generally less time for the type of traditional research carried out by tenure-track faculty, the scholarship of teaching faculty focuses on the scholarship of teaching and learning.

The primary responsibility of faculty on teaching-track appointments is instruction, although other responsibilities may be included in the appointment. A component of the teaching appointment may include the opportunity for scholarly achievement and service. The offer letter should clearly define the entire set of expectations. The distribution of effort for teaching-track faculty consists of a 55% to 100% appointment devoted to instruction.

Academic Ranks for Teaching Track Faculty

Teaching Assistant Professor: Teaching Assistant Professor is the primary entry-level rank for teaching track faculty at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a terminal degree appropriate to the discipline.

Criteria: The candidate must have: (1) a current independent capability of teaching, (2) a potential for significant professional growth in the area of teaching, and (3) evidence of a high level of competence in the content area and demonstrated promise of moving toward excellence in student instruction.

Teaching Associate Professor: Teaching Associate Professor is the mid-career teaching track faculty rank at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a terminal degree appropriate to the discipline.

Criteria: The candidate should demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching by demonstrating active engagement and high commitment to teaching. They must demonstrate a record of effective instruction and evidence of professional development in teaching (e.g., participating in the university peer review of teaching program, attending university teaching conferences). The

candidate should also show evidence of being engaged in the scholarship of teaching and learning, which may be demonstrated by publications in appropriate venues, presentations at conferences, writing internal grants that promote teaching, and/or development of teaching materials, including books and innovative teaching technologies.

Teaching Professor: Teaching Professor is the highest teaching track faculty rank at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a terminal degree appropriate to the discipline.

Criteria: The candidate should have maintained a sustained record of excellence in teaching and serve as an effective role model for colleagues, students, and clientele. An effective role model leads or guides others in pursuit of teaching excellence. In addition, the candidate should demonstrate superior performance and be recognized by students and peers as an outstanding educator in the discipline. The candidate should also be engaged in sustained scholarship of teaching and learning, which may be demonstrated by publications in appropriate venues, presentations at conferences, writing external grants that promote teaching, development of teaching materials, including books and innovative teaching technologies. These efforts may include scholarship published in national refereed journals or other reputable sources with national or international stature.

Extension Track Faculty

This section describes guidelines for Extension track faculty in the School and appointments at the rank of extension assistant professor, extension associate professor, and extension professor. In certain cases, the university's best interests are served by entering into ongoing relationships with personnel beyond the Extension Associate level. The entire set of expectations must be clearly defined in the offer letter. Individuals appointed to these positions should have extension credentials consistent with those mandated for the comparable tenure-track rank in their disciplines. Individuals on these appointments are not eligible for tenure and are not eligible to vote on matters of tenure or promotion for tenure-track faculty. Service in these positions is not credited toward tenure (University Handbook [C12.5](#)). Extension assistant professor positions will be awarded as one-year, regular or term contracts.

Extension faculty at Kansas State University are faculty members who have credentials in their disciplinary area. The goal of these positions is to enhance the level of Extension activity in the Department in support of the outreach and engagement mission of the institution. They are typically involved in Extension activities and may be involved in research or other creative endeavors; instruction; university, school/college committees; and local, state/regional; and national professional organizations. The primary responsibilities of faculty on Extension-track appointments are Extension activities. The distribution of effort for Extension-track faculty consists of a 55% to 100% appointment devoted to Extension activities.

Academic Ranks for Extension Track Faculty

Extension Assistant Professor: Extension Assistant Professor is the primary entry-level rank for Extension track faculty at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a terminal degree appropriate to the discipline.

Criteria: The candidate must have: (1) a current independent capability of having a program of Extension scholarship, (2) a potential for significant professional growth in the area of Extension scholarship, and (3) potential for securing funding to support the Extension scholarship. This includes identification of evidence-based knowledge, application, utilization, and evaluation, professional leadership, and practice and/or service in the disciplinary area of the position.

Extension Associate Professor: Extension Associate Professor is the mid-career Extension track faculty rank at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a terminal degree appropriate to the discipline.

Criteria: The candidate should demonstrate excellence in Extension scholarship, concentrating in one or two areas that meet the needs of Kansas residents. The candidate demonstrates expertise and educational resources in these given areas that has the potential for national/international reputation for excellence. The candidate has communicated his or her Extension scholarship through nationally refereed articles, chapters in books published by reputable sources, reports, conference proceedings, or monographs that are of high quality, and that are available on K-State websites or through other appropriate regional and national avenues. The candidate must have received some level of grant support.

Extension Professor: Extension Professor is the highest Extension track faculty rank at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a terminal degree appropriate to the discipline.

Criteria: The candidate should demonstrate sustained excellence in Extension scholarship, concentrating in one or two areas that meet the needs of Kansas residents. The candidate demonstrates expertise and national/international reputation for excellence. The candidate has a reputation as a "role model for Extension" among other Extension Specialists or has been a leader in multidisciplinary collaborations. The candidate has a record of sustained scholarly work published in national refereed or other reputable sources, reports, conference proceedings, or monographs that are of high quality, and that are available on K-State website or through other appropriate regional and national avenues. The candidate must have received significant external grants to support his or her Extension scholarship.

Annual Evaluation and Reappointment Process

Responsibilities of the School Director (or designee) and the Candidate

Given the differences in practice areas, the application of specific criteria for non-tenure track faculty appointment, annual evaluation, and promotion must consider responsibilities outlined in the appointment letter and modifications of these responsibilities as documented during or after the annual evaluation process.

Regular and term non-tenure track faculty will be evaluated as part of the annual evaluation process. The School Director will provide faculty with the timeline for

evaluations/reappointments, as well as the materials that faculty members are expected to submit for evaluation.

For annual evaluations of term and regular non-tenure track faculty, non-tenure track faculty submit to the School Director a portfolio documenting performance in the areas reflected in the distribution of effort for the preceding year. Evaluation decisions related to annual evaluation of non-tenure track faculty will be based upon the criteria and guidelines outlined for each area of responsibility that may apply. See the sections related to annual evaluations, merit salary allocation, and annual goals and evaluation criteria of this document for details regarding annual reviews.

The review for reappointment is conducted by the Program Chair. Withdrawal from the mandatory review for reappointment indicates reappointment is not sought and will not be granted. Reporting materials and any supplementary documents from the candidate are due to the appropriate Program Chair by September 15. Faculty may submit supplemental materials up to January 5 to reflect any achievements that occur before the end of the review period.

Criteria for Reappointment

Faculty members should be meeting or exceeding expectations in each of the assigned areas of professional activity. The faculty member's cumulative record in each of the professional activities should provide clear evidence of the faculty member's expertise and impact in the field of study.

Promotion Process

See #3 <https://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/dhmanual/proftitletemp.pdf>

The procedures for promotion for non-tenure track faculty are similar to the processes and timelines for promotion of tenure-track/tenured faculty in the University Handbook ([C110-C116.2](#) and [C150-C156.2](#)). The time in rank interval prior to consideration for promotion is typically expected to be five years, although shorter and longer intervals are possible, provided that the candidate follows the timeline and deadlines established by the School, College, and University.

Although the School Director will assist the candidate in understanding the standards for each rank and will guide the candidate's preparation of the materials, the candidate is solely responsible for the materials presented to the School Director and for consideration by the Dean of the College. The candidate will submit a portfolio to the School Director documenting professional activities appropriate to the appointment. The candidate should include in the portfolio a listing of goals and objectives that will guide professional activities for the next five years. See "Annual Evaluation and Merit Salary Allocation" of this document for examples of items to be included in the portfolio for review.

Once a formal application is made, the School Director will summarize the applicant's responsibilities and contributions to the unit during the evaluation period in a one-page document, which will be provided to the School Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review Committee for review. The Review Committee will write a report to the School Director (two pages

maximum) evaluating the candidate and recommending whether the person should be promoted or not, and the basis for that recommendation. Additionally, the committee will report its vote (count in favor or against promotion). In cases of a split vote, the report should explain why that occurred with respect to differences in interpretation of evidence that is based on the standards expected for the rank being sought.

The School Director will consider the responsibilities of the candidate during the evaluation period, the accomplishments of the candidate in fulfilling those responsibilities, the assessments provided by the School Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review Committee and will use this information to provide the Dean with a recommendation concerning the promotion decision. If a promotion is recommended, the School Director will need to inform the candidate on the length of the new appointment.

The School Director forwards the committee report with a written summary of the School Director's recommendation, including the type and length of appointment, and rationale to the College Dean. The promotion file of the candidate will be forwarded by the Dean of the College to the Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee of the College. This Committee is advisory to the Dean. Per the University Handbook [C153.2](#), the Committee has three charges: to review the documentation submitted by the candidate and the School Director, to assure that applicable procedures have been followed, and to provide a written recommendation and vote to the Dean as to whether all applicable procedures have been followed.

The Dean of the College, after consulting with the School Director and the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee, will submit a written recommendation to the Dean's Council no sooner than seven calendar days following notification to the candidate of the Dean's recommendation and the report of the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. Both the Dean's recommendation and the recommendation of the college advisory committee will be copied to the School Director and the candidate. The Dean's recommendation will be accompanied by the recommendation and unedited written comments of: 1) the School Director, 2) the Department eligible voting faculty, and 3) the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review Committee

The Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review Committee consists of three full-time faculty members. The School Director will appoint two faculty members to the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review Committee, each serving 3-year staggered terms. One member will be a tenured faculty member (either Associate Professor or Professor) and one member will be a non-tenure track faculty member. The School Director will appoint one of these faculty members to serve as Head of the committee. A third faculty member from either the tenure or non-tenure track ranks will also be appointed to the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review Committee by the School Director. The School Director will convene the meetings and finalize the written evaluation transmitted to the School Director after committee approval.

In the event that a committee member is under consideration for promotion, the committee member will be excused from promotion-related deliberations for that academic year. Likewise, consistent with the University nepotism policy (*Policies and Procedures Manual*, Chapter 4095),

should a member of a committee member's household or family be under consideration for promotion, that committee member will be excused from all related deliberations for that academic year.

The duties of the promotion committee are as follows:

- Evaluate credentials of candidates for promotion using the materials provided by the candidate
- Vote approval or disapproval of a candidate's application, and provide a substantive report on the rationale for the approval/disapproval recommendation
- Forward, in writing, vote and recommendation to the School Director
- Maintain confidentiality of all deliberations of the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review Committee

Denial of Promotion

If the Deans Council does not recommend promotion in rank, the candidate may appeal this decision to the Provost Office within a period of 14 days following notification. If the Provost concurs with the findings of the College Dean, the candidate has the option of filing a grievance with the General Faculty Grievance Board (University Handbook [Appendix G](#)). An ombudsperson may be available for assistance during the appeal procedures. Candidates who do not receive a favorable decision on a request for promotion in rank may not submit their materials for review until two academic years later (e.g., an unfavorable decision received in January of an academic year would prohibit another review request until August of the second calendar year after the decision).

Professorial Performance Award (University Handbook Sections C49.1-C49.14)

The Professorial Performance Award is intended to recognize excellent and sustained performance of full professors. The award carries with it an increase to the faculty member's base salary in addition to that provided for by the annual evaluation process. The Performance Award is neither a form of promotion review, nor a "senior" professoriate. Further, the Professorial Performance Award is not a right accorded to every faculty member at the rank of Professor and does not occur simply as a result of a candidate's routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies.

Faculty members have different distributions of effort. Regardless of distribution of assignment (e.g. teaching, research, extension, or service), all full professors are eligible for the Award. To be considered for a Professorial Performance Award, the candidate must:

- Be a full-time professor (either tenured or non-tenure-track) and have been in rank at Kansas State University at least six years since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award.
- Show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review.

- Demonstrate productivity and performance of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards.

It is expected that collegiality and institutional citizenship will also be exhibited.

Submission and Review Process

An eligible candidate submits a written request for consideration for the Professorial Performance Award to the School Director by September 15 to be considered during the timeline associated with annual evaluation review. The full process is described in the University Handbook [C49.1-C49.14](#), including responsibilities of the candidate, School Director, and Dean.

The School Director will review the evidence of sustained productivity submitted by the candidate and evaluate it to determine if the candidate's record meets the requirements to receive the Award. The candidate has the option to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the School Director and can submit written statements of unresolved differences. The School Director will notify the candidate in writing of that decision.

As soon as feasible after the School Director has prepared their written recommendation, the School Director will convene the School's full professors with a minimum of 0.5 FTE appointment in the School for discussion of the recommendation and to obtain a vote of those faculty members as part of the process to advise the College Dean regarding the candidate's qualifications for the award.

The School Director submits the following to the Dean:

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

If the request is successful, in the year it is awarded the Professorial Performance Award is consolidated with any salary increase resulting from the annual evaluation and becomes part of the faculty member's base salary.

Chronic Low Achievement Policy for Tenured Faculty (University Handbook Section C31.5-C31.8)

Tenured faculty are evaluated each year during the annual evaluation process. When a tenured faculty member's overall performance falls below the minimum acceptable level of productivity, as indicated by the annual evaluation, the School Director will notify the faculty member in writing. The notification will include a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member. In subsequent annual evaluations, the faculty member will report on activities aimed at improving performance and provide evidence of improvement.

If the School Director rates the performance of the faculty member's overall productivity as "below minimally acceptable level of productivity" for two consecutive years or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period, a peer review process will be initiated.

In keeping with regular procedures in matters of tenure, a peer review panel will be asked to review the faculty member's work-load, performance ratings, other pertinent evidence, and procedural documentation unless the faculty member wishes to waive review by such a panel. The panel will submit a written recommendation to the School Director regarding results of its review. The School Director will forward the written recommendation as well as his or her own written recommendation to the Dean of the College, and the Dean in turn will make a written recommendation to the Provost.

The review panel will be comprised of three faculty members, including two members at the rank of the faculty member being reviewed (associate professor, full professor), and one from the other level. If there is not a faculty member available from one of the levels, the School Director may recruit faculty members from other Schools within the College. The School Director initially nominates four faculty members who are at the same rank as the faculty member being reviewed and two faculty at the other rank. The faculty member being reviewed can then strike three names, provided that the composition of the panel remains as specified above. The School Director then appoints one of the three panelists to be the chair of the panel.

The review panel will meet within three weeks of its appointment. The School Director will provide relevant materials for review to the panel upon appointment. The faculty member under review may submit materials to the review panel. Either the panel or the faculty member being reviewed can request that the faculty member being reviewed appear before it in person. The panel will submit its report, to the School Director and the faculty member being reviewed. If there is disagreement among panel members, a majority and one or more minority reports may be submitted. The faculty member being reviewed has one week (seven days) to respond to the report by writing to the School Director. After the School Director has written their assessment, a copy is provided to the faculty member being reviewed, who has one week (seven days) to respond in writing to the School Director's assessment. The School Director will then submit these documents to the Dean of the College.

Judgements of failure to meet minimally acceptable levels of productivity are limited to significant or critical areas or professional activity of the faculty member. In accordance with the options afforded by the University Handbook [C31.8b](#), such judgements may occur only when the area of the professional activity, in predetermined agreements with the faculty member:

1. Comprises 30% or more of the faculty member's responsibilities, **and**
2. Occurs in two or more substantial areas of professional responsibility.

These judgements must always occur in a context that considers the degree to which weaknesses are balanced by strengths. For example, a faculty member may have .20 FTE assigned to RSCAD and .15 FTE to Service. Failure to meet minimum-acceptable levels of productivity in either assignment alone would not constitute an instance credited toward chronic low achievement. However, failure to meet standards in both areas (.35 FTE) would constitute such an instance.

At the discretion of the College Dean, consistent failure to meet minimally acceptable levels of performance can result in dismissal for cause as described in the University Handbook [C31.5](#). If this decision is made, standards for notice of non-appointment apply (University Handbook [Appendix A](#)).

Post-Tenure Review Policies (University Handbook Appendix W)

Every six years after a faculty member receives tenure or appointment as a tenured faculty member, the faculty member must complete the post-tenure review process or its equivalent (University Handbook [Appendix W](#)). An equivalent shall include but is not limited to: application for promotion to full professor, Professorial Performance Award, promotion to full professor, or receipt of substantial college, university, national, or international award requiring multi-year portfolio-like documentation. These equivalent reviews modify and reset the post-tenure review clock. In addition, the schedule for post-tenure review could be delayed for one year to accommodate sabbatical leave, a major health issue, or another compelling reason, provided that both the faculty member and the School Director approve the delay.

Review Procedure

The School Director will complete the six-year Post-Tenure Review form with input from the tenured faculty member at the time of the faculty member's annual performance review. If the faculty member's prior six annual evaluations resulted in ratings of met or exceeded expectations, the faculty member will be evaluated as demonstrating appropriate contributions to the university. Upon completion of the post-tenure review, the form is signed by both the School Director and the faculty member and placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

If the performance review indicates the need for a professional development plan to enable the faculty member to advance professionally and to make "appropriate contributions to the university," the School Director will activate the Faculty Development Committee within five working days of the performance review and send the committee chair (the School's representative on the College Tenure and Promotion Committee) a copy of the feedback and recommendations form. The School Director is responsible for designating two other tenured faculty members to serve on the Faculty Development Committee for a term of two years.

The Committee will provide a copy of its written report to the School Director within 14 working days of the committee meeting. Based on the written report from the Committee and additional recommendations from the School Director, the School Director will send a letter outlining the development plan to the faculty member. The School Director will place the development plan in the faculty member's personnel file and share with the Dean of the College in summary reports of all faculty review.