

K-STATE SALINA LIBRARY

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on 5/12/2023)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on 5/12/2023)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **05/2028**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **5/2028**



Ruth Mirtz, Department Head
Date signed: 7/14/2023



Alysia Starkey, Dean
Date signed: 7/14/2023



Debbie Mercer, Interim Provost and Executive Vice President
Date signed: 5/16/2024

*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.

K-STATE SALINA LIBRARY
COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY AND AVIATION

Promotion & Tenure
Guidelines

Contents

1. Introduction.....	Page 4
2. Criteria for Promotion & Tenure.....	Page 5
3. Procedures for Promotion & Tenure.....	Page 8
4. Procedures for Annual Evaluation	Page 11
5. Procedures for Post Tenure Review	Page 12
6. Procedures Regarding Chronic Low Achievement.....	Page 13
7. Professorial Performance Award	Page 14
8. Appendix A – Documentation for Promotion & Tenure Review	Page 16
GUIDELINES FOR THE ORGANIZATION AND FORMAT OF TENURE AND PROMOTION DOCUMENTATION	
9. Appendix B –Tenure Peer Evaluation.....	Page 23
FORM FOR EVALUATION OF CANDIDATE BALLOT FOR REAPPOINTMENT BALLOT FOR MID-TENURE REVIEW BALLOT FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION UNIT DIRECTOR’S LETTER TO CANDIDATE	
10. Appendix C – Forms for Annual Evaluation.....	Page 29
11. Appendix D – Forms for Professorial Performance Award	Page 34

INTRODUCTION

The basic employment criteria and procedures for unclassified faculty in the K-State Salina Library are outlined in Section C of the *University Handbook (UH)*. K-State Salina Library personnel in tenure-track positions may be tenured as specified in Sections C70-C116 of the *University Handbook*. The guidelines set forth in this document serve as the Library's supplement to those procedures and to elaborate further on the criteria as they specifically apply to academic work in a small college library. Criteria set by the latest revision of the *University Handbook* take precedence.

These guidelines have been prepared as a guide for faculty regarding professional achievement. It is not intended to be prescriptive but rather, these guidelines provide broad guidance to help faculty as they seek to set goals and to design their career plans, professional development, and activities aligned with the norm of expectations for faculty at Kansas State University and the College of Technology and Aviation.

Many parts of this document duplicate exactly the contents of the *KSU (Kansas State University) Libraries Documents for Tenure* guidelines, last revised 07-22-2022. Many quotes are also taken from *Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustments, Tenure, and Promotion (EFE)*, a document developed by the University Task Force on Faculty Evaluation along with others. All of these documents are available on the Kansas State University web site and can be reached through the Office of Academic Personnel's web pages <<http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel>>.

A master's degree in library and/or information science from an American Library Association accredited program is the appropriate terminal degree for academic librarians. An additional graduate degree is considered desirable but is not a formal requirement for promotion or tenure. Equivalent degrees at the master's or doctorate level combined with significant academic library experience may be considered in lieu thereof.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

“Promotion is based upon an individual’s achievements related to the specific criteria, standards, and guidelines developed by departmental faculty members in consultation with the department head and the appropriate dean.” (C120.1, *UH*)

“Promotion to assistant professor reflects an acceptable level of achievement and potential for excellence. Promotion to associate professor rests on substantial professional contributions that reflect excellence in teaching, research, and other creative endeavor, directed service, or extension. 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.” (C120.2, *UH*)

“Tenure is not granted below the rank of associate professor (effective July 1994), except in special circumstances approved by the Provost.” (C82.2, *UH*) A negative decision concerning promotion to the rank of associate professor during the final year of probation ordinarily constitutes a decision that a candidate’s work lacks sufficient excellence to justify tenure.

“Tenure should be granted only to those who have demonstrated individual excellence and whose expertise corresponds to the present and anticipated continuing needs of the University. Thus, tenure decisions are based mainly on candidates’ contribution to institutional mission.... Tenure evaluation is not merely the sum of the annual merit evaluations.” (p.24, *EFE*) Excellent annual evaluations are a necessary, albeit not sufficient, condition for tenure. Tenure will be awarded only to those who are excellent overall and who are above standard in every significant aspect of job performance. Similarly, behaviors that adversely affect collegiality or are chronically disruptive would properly influence tenure decisions.

Although institutional excellence is enhanced by faculty specialization, specialization of labor carried to excess could seriously limit the extent to which faculty would be able to meet changing conditions. “A major purpose of the probationary period is to provide opportunity to assess a candidate’s versatility.” (pp. 25-26, *EFE*)

CRITERIA

There are four major criteria in the review for promotion and/or tenure to Associate Professor and Professor: Directed Service, Non-Directed Service, Research and Other Creative Activities, and Academic Citizenship.

Directed Service

The practice of librarianship is diverse, taking place in a variety of settings and requiring various skills and talents. In keeping with the discipline’s multifaceted nature, Libraries faculty members engage in a broad spectrum of activities. As specialists providing access to information, Libraries faculty are involved in activities such as the development of resources, collections, and information systems, bibliographic control and organization, instruction, reference, administration and planning, outreach services, academic support, and instructional design.

- A. High level of performance, working independently, collaboratively and with initiative. Increasing knowledge of one’s assigned responsibilities and demonstrated skill in performing those responsibilities. This includes judgment and decision-making abilities, quality of completed work assignments, and the ability to set and accomplish appropriate short and long-term performance goals.
- B. Progressive knowledge of the profession, including trends, issues, new ideas, and technological changes in librarianship, instructional technology, or other area of specialization. This includes demonstrated effectiveness in applying one’s expertise

to bibliographic techniques, developing timely access to research-level information resources, and offering user-centered services to support research, teaching, and learning in order to meet the needs of the user community.

- C. Commitment to the unit, college, and university mission as a collaborative partner with members of the college and university communities in meeting the information, curricular, technology, research, and academic needs of students, faculty, and staff of K-State Salina.
- D. Understanding of the organization, policies, procedures, and services of K-State Salina, and a demonstrated ability to serve the user community through interpretation of these policies and procedures.

Non-Directed Service

A strong service profile at the local, regional, and/or national levels is highly valued among K-State faculty. Candidates must demonstrate Nondirected Service beyond their assigned area of responsibility (Directed Service). Teaching and/or development of courses or workshops conducted for audiences external to their assigned duties may be considered here or as part of RSCAD, based on the decision of the candidate and their supervisor. External activities such as these should be managed so as not to create conflicts of interest and/or time commitment as defined in University Handbook Appendix S. Teaching K-State courses unrelated to librarianship may be considered as long as they fall outside the candidate's directed service. The quality and impact of these efforts will determine their consideration for tenure and promotion.

UH Section C6 defines three categories of Non-directed Service: profession-based service, institution-based service, and public-based professional service. The unit allows latitude within this category so that candidates may choose the area(s) that best suits their interests and abilities. Any one of the avenues of non-directed service described below is a sufficient criterion for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor when pursued to a high level of achievement.

Institution-Based Service

Institutional service includes contributions to the K-State Salina Library, the College of Technology and Aviation, and the University as a whole. University service embraces the broad range of activities involved in establishing and implementing policies at every level of the institution. Institutional service may include, but is not limited to:

- A. University Committees
- B. Faculty Governance Bodies
- C. College Committees
- D. University or College Sponsored Events

Profession-Based Service

Professional service encompasses contributions to the academic profession beyond the campus including, but not limited to:

- A. Holding office in professional societies or membership on their committees;
- B. Performing editorial functions for professional publications;
- C. Organizing professional meetings;
- D. Honors or special recognitions for contributions to an organization, discipline, or profession;
- E. Professional recognition as evidenced by awards, consultantships, grants, fellowships, etc.

Public-Based Professional Service

Professional training as an information specialist provides a broad knowledge base. Public-based professional service is not limited to the candidate's area of Directed Service but must be related to the profession of librarianship or the candidate's specialization. Only civic and personal services that employ professional practice are applicable. Other types of civic activities are viewed as a person's participation as a citizen and indicate personal skills and individual choice in use of private time. Public-based professional service may include, but is not limited to, developing programs and providing training or consultation to a nonacademic audience.

Research and Other Creative Activities

"Research and other creative endeavors encompass a broad spectrum of scholarship and other activities that require critical analysis, investigation, or experimentation. These endeavors are directed toward discovery, interpretation or application of knowledge and ideas." (p.3, *EFE*) Creative activities must be related to the individual's directed service responsibilities. "The results of research, scholarship and other creative activity should be shared with others through publication, performance, or other media appropriate to the discipline." (p.3, *EFE*) Examples include:

- A. Research as evidenced by publications. Publications will be evaluated in light of purpose, audience, and potential contribution to the goals of the unit, college and university. In general, works that undergo considerable scrutiny before publication (for example by referees, editorial boards, anthology, editors, etc.) will be deemed of highest value.
- B. Presentations at professional meetings, such as papers, workshops, and poster sessions; organizing or chairing committees that produce a research product. In general, presentations/poster sessions that are competitively selected and have a demonstrable positive impact will be deemed of highest value.
- C. Teaching and/or development of courses or training modules pertaining to the faculty member's position description and area of specialization. In general, courses/training conducted for external audiences will be deemed of highest value.
- D. Pursuing or receiving grants, awards, scholarships, internships, or other honors giving evidence of scholarly activity and achievement. Funded grants and those written to national granting agencies are given more weight. Awards and honors will be evaluated based on their significance.
- E. Creation and/or development of tools that aid the institution or profession, such as focused blogs and web sites. The quality and impact of these efforts will determine their consideration for tenure.

Some activities (e.g., grants, teaching courses, consulting) could fit in more than one category. In these situations, candidates should seek guidance from their supervisor to determine where to acknowledge this work.

Academic Citizenship

"The University needs collegiality to function effectively...Some faculty members foster goodwill and harmony within the University, mentor colleagues, and generally contribute to the pursuit of common goals. Other individuals may display behavior that is highly disruptive to the University; as a result, collegiality and morale suffer." (p. 5, *EFE*). Behavior which affects, whether positively or negatively, the ability of others to carry out their assignments in the department will be considered in the total evaluation for tenure.

Collegiality affects all other criteria. In particular, collegiality means participation and collaboration with library staff, students, faculty, and other university staff in a positive manner.

PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION & TENURE

Procedural steps stated here are intended to facilitate and standardize Mid-Tenure Review, Promotion, and Final Tenure Review Deliberations in the K-State Salina Library. In the K-State *University Handbook*, the procedures for tenure and promotion state that recommendations are forwarded to the prospective direct supervisor who in turn forwards favorable or unfavorable recommendations to the college dean.

“Mid-probationary review. A formal review of a probationary faculty member is conducted midway through the probationary period. Unless otherwise stated in the candidate's contract, the mid-probationary review shall take place during the third year of appointment. This review provides the faculty member with substantive feedback from faculty colleagues and administrators regarding his or her accomplishments relative to departmental tenure criteria. 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.” (C92.1, *UH*)

“For persons appointed at the rank of assistant professor, the maximum probationary period for gaining tenure and promotion to associate professor consists of six (6) regular annual appointments at Kansas State University at a probationary rank. In these cases, decisions of tenure must be made before or during the sixth year of probationary service. Candidates not approved for tenure during the sixth year will be notified by the appropriate dean that the seventh year of service will constitute the terminal year of appointment.” (C82.2, *UH*) Tenure deliberations will be held prior to promotion deliberations.

“For persons appointed at the rank of associate professor or professor, the maximum probationary period for gaining tenure consists of five (5) regular annual appointments at Kansas State University at probationary ranks. 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.” (Section C82.3 *UH*)

Early Tenure

Section C82.4 of the *University Handbook* states: “Faculty members on probationary appointments who have met the criteria and standards for tenure prior to the above maximum times may be granted early tenure. Because candidates may be considered for tenure at any time during their probationary period, no time credit shall be granted for service prior to employment at K-State.”

Procedures for Promotion, Mid-Tenure, and Final Tenure Reviews

Candidate's Portfolio

It is the responsibility of the candidate to complete the portfolio. Assistance may be sought from the department head, mentor, and others, if desired. Accomplishments from jobs held prior to employment at Kansas State University should be included where relevant. The portfolio should contain, in this order:

A. Portfolio Contents:

- I. Recommendation for Tenure and Promotions
- II. Description of Responsibilities During Evaluation Period
- III. Statement by Candidate
 - A. Candidate's statement of accomplishments (one page summary of why a candidate feels he/she should be promoted/tenured)
 - B. Statement of Five-Year Goals
- IV. Summary of Candidate's Directed Service
- V. Evidence of Research and Other Creative Endeavors
- VI. Summary of Candidate's Non-Directed Service Contributions

- VII. Internal/External Letters of Evaluation (for promotion and final tenure, the Department Head will insert the letters of support and assessments into the portfolio after the document has been submitted for review.)
- VIII. Annual Evaluation Forms and/or Mid-Probationary Tenure Review Letter
- IX. Vita
- X. Supporting Documents (appendices as required)

Faculty Qualified to Vote on the Matters of Promotion/Tenure and Mid-Probationary Review

For promotion from associate professor to full professor, all unit faculty who hold a rank equal to or higher than the rank being considered may vote on the question of promotion. All faculty who hold tenure, regardless of rank, may vote on the questions involving the promotion from assistant professor to associate professor, awarding of tenure and mid-probationary review. If a qualified faculty member cannot be present during the discussion of the candidate's promotion/tenure/mid-probationary review document or be present on the day that the vote is recorded, the qualified faculty member may leave her/his ballot and any statement that he/she may want incorporated into the discussion summary with the Department Head prior to the meeting and/or vote.

Untenured supervisors of candidates will appear and participate in discussions of those candidates but do not have voting privileges. Faculty with a family relationship to a candidate will not participate in any discussion or vote related to that candidate (see UH Appendix S, specifically about conflict of interest, and PPM Chapter 4095). It is essential that all tenured faculty participate fully in reviewing the tenure portfolios and voting.

Procedures for Promotion/Mid-Tenure/Tenure

The procedures for promotion and/or tenure follow a standard academic calendar for the entire university. The timeline in this document augments and details these procedures as they are carried out in the College and Technology and Aviation for the K-State Salina Library, for both mid-tenure and full promotion/tenure review. This timeline is general in nature and susceptible to change. Absolute dates are determined by the Provost and outline in the University's Master Calendar

< <http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/depthead/master.html>>

May

- Unit faculty member consults with the direct supervisor (or the unit director consults with the dean) about the upcoming academic year and the promotion/tenure process.
- Preliminary plans are made for next year's reviews.

June-August

- Candidate prepares portfolio contents for the promotion or tenure process. These include the table of contents listing as required by the university and all necessary forms.

September

- Unit director or dean solicits letters from internal/external reviewers from list submitted by candidate. Letters are not usually solicited for mid-tenure review.

October

- Candidate prepares application materials and submits file to unit director or dean.
- Documents made available for review by unit faculty and college faculty.
- Unit faculty who qualify to vote on such matters meet to discuss tenure and promotion (at least 14 days after documents have been made available to faculty.)

- Traditionally, the candidate makes a presentation to all college faculty in late October. Faculty may ask to meet individually or in a group with the candidate.
- All unit faculty submit evaluations to direct supervisor or the dean.

November

- Unit director submits recommendation and documents to Dean. For promotion and tenure of the unit director, the Dean organizes and directs this process.
- Unit director/dean's recommendation is forwarded to the candidate.
- Dean forwards documents to College Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee. The Committee is asked to provide feedback to the candidate on the form included in Appendix B of this document.
- Committee reports findings to Dean of College.

December

- The dean notifies the candidate and unit director of the dean's recommendations. Candidates for early tenure may withdraw within 7 days.
- The dean submits documents and recommendations to the Deans Council of those candidates who have not withdrawn.

February

- The Deans Council notifies the candidate and unit director of council recommendation. The Deans Council provides a written report to candidate, unit director, and dean if finding differs from that of the college.
- The Deans Council sends documents to Provost for approval of tenure and promotion.
- Provost sends recommendations for tenure and promotion to President.

March

- Dean informs candidate and unit director of promotion/tenure decision(s).

PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION AND REAPPOINTMENT

Faculty evaluation is an assessment of the quality and importance of the accomplishments and contribution made by each faculty member during the calendar year. Annual evaluation by the unit director or direct supervisor contributes to merit salary recommendations and serves as a yardstick for performance evaluation leading to tenure and promotion.

When merit increases are available, the direct supervisor or Dean will recommend a salary adjustment for each faculty member evaluated. The recommended percentage increases will be based on the four performance categories, such that the percentage recommended for persons in the top category (4- Exceeds Expectation) will be higher than those for the next category (3 – Achieves Expectations), which in turn shall exceed those for level of accomplishment in the third category (2 – Needs Improvement), etc. For first-year appointees, the Head has the option of: a) recommending an increase based on the individual's evaluation (adjusted proportionally to encompass the entire year), b) recommending an average increase, or c) recommending the larger of the above, since the length of time for evaluating performance was limited.

Reappointment

Faculty members on probationary appointments are evaluated annually to determine if they will be reappointed for another year. Eligibility for reappointment will be based on the annual review. Faculty members must be explicitly informed by the dean in writing of a decision not to renew their appointments by no later than March 1st of the academic year in accordance with The Standards of Notice of Non-Reappointment. (C162.3 and Appendix A.) These annual evaluations also serve as an opportunity to provide feedback to a faculty member on probationary appointment about his or her performance in comparison to the department's criteria and standards for tenure." (C50.1, UH)

At the annual evaluation, non-tenured faculty members are notified of their progress toward tenure as set forth in the university handbook (C60-C66, UH). Tenured faculty in the department vote by secret ballot on re-appointment of non-tenured faculty for the following year. If there are no other tenured faculty members in the department besides the unit director, a vote will not be taken. The department head forwards a written recommendation and the unedited comments of the faculty members to the dean. Final authority on reappointment is delegated to the provost (C63.3-C66, UH). Faculty members are evaluated on their record of teaching, scholarship/creative endeavors, and service.

Annual Performance Evaluation and Plan

In January, the faculty member collaborates with the unit director to develop a Performance Plan for the evaluation year (see Appendix C). Performance expectations reflect position description responsibilities, departmental goals and personal goals. They should support the K-State Salina Library's strategic plan, mission and/or vision. They should be specific, measurable, acceptable, realistic, and attainable to both the faculty member and the supervisor. Each expectation will be given a weight of "high," "medium," or "low" to indicate its importance. Progress will be reviewed regularly throughout the years, with a mid-year review at a minimum. Expectations may be modified as circumstances warrant, with a signature and date verifying mutual agreement from the faculty member and the unit director.

Self-Evaluation

The steps for completing the annual evaluation are provided below.

1. Employee completes self-evaluation addressing core responsibilities for the year as defined in the position description and the annual performance plan.
2. Unit director completes evaluation determining the faculty member's merit salary category, according to the Standards for Evaluation, and reflected by the final overall rating.
3. Unit director shares evaluation with the faculty member.

4. Unit director forwards evaluation materials to the Dean. "The dean will review all evaluation materials and recommendations" (C47.1, UH).

PROCEDURES REGARDING POST TENURE REVIEW

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

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

The department policy on post tenure review follows the overarching purpose, principles, objectives, and procedures in the university policy on post tenure review (see University Handbook, Appendix W), which was approved by Faculty Senate on February 11, 2014.

Procedures

Materials to be used for the review

To initiate the post tenure review process, the tenured faculty member will submit copies of the six previous annual evaluations to the Department Head. If all six annual evaluations met or exceeded expectations, additional materials are not required. If one or more of the annual evaluations did not meet or exceed expectations for the year in question, then the faculty member undergoing the review will also submit a written plan, not to exceed three pages in length, indicating how he or she will develop his or her career appropriately during the next six (6) years and detailing what University resources will be required to support that transformation.

Who will conduct the review

In the event that not all of the six (6) annual evaluations met or exceeded expectations, two tenured faculty members, holding the rank of Professor, will review the materials submitted by the faculty member and provide recommendations for future growth and goals. One reviewer will be chosen by the faculty member being reviewed and the other by the Department Head. Reviewers are expected to maintain completely confidentiality of the materials submitted by the person being reviewed.

Standard

If in all six annual evaluations that are submitted for the post tenure review process the faculty member being reviewed met or exceeded expectations, the faculty member is making appropriate contributions to the university and no further action will be needed. The department head will affirm this information to the Dean and this result will become part of the permanent file of the faculty member who was reviewed. In the event that one or more of the six (6) annual evaluations did not meet or exceed expectations, the steps described below in the "Review Process" section will be followed.

Review Process

In the event that not all of the six (6) annual evaluations met or exceeded expectations, then within two weeks after the materials are submitted for review, the team of faculty conducting the review will read the submitted materials and write a summary of their findings. The summary will include comments regarding observed strengths, areas where growth is needed, and will provide recommendations for future growth. The faculty member undergoing the review will be given a copy of the written review. The reviewing faculty members will then forward the summary to the department head as well as any comments by the person being reviewed. The person reviewed has seven days in which to submit any comments regarding the review to the department head. The department head will forward the written review, any of his/her recommendations, and any comments by the faculty member reviewed to the dean. The review and all comments will become part of the permanent file of the faculty member that was reviewed. Post-tenure review may 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 unit director or Associate Dean of Academics approve the delay. A faculty member who has formally announced retirement or is in phased retirement is exempt from post-tenure review.

PROCEDURES REGARDING CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT

Section C31.5-C31.8 of the University Handbook is implemented when a final overall rating of a tenured faculty member falls “below standard performance”, as outlined on the *Standards for Evaluation* document. Performance is considered to reach Chronic Low Achievement when the annual evaluation is “Below Standard Expectations,” meaning the position’s requirements and expectations have not been met. The tenured faculty member has:

- Failed to meet the planned performance expectations.
- Lacks initiative.
- Poor collegiality/interpersonal skills that disrupt the work environment.

Performance must improve to an acceptable level at the next review or chronic low achievement processes will be initiated for tenured faculty members.

The K-State Salina Library maintains that the response to evidence of chronic low achievement should first be elaboration of the problem and then encouragement to become more active. All tenured faculty deserve an opportunity to ameliorate the situation before more serious employment actions are considered. Consequently, the procedure for implementation involves a three-pronged process as follows.

Procedure for Implementation of the Chronic Low Achievement Policy

The procedures for implementing the K-State Salina Library standards will conform to written guidelines in the University Handbook. Accordingly, when a tenured faculty member fails to meet the minimum standards set forth in this policy, the following sequence of events will occur:

- **First**, notification will be in writing during a private oral consultation with the unit director.
- **Second**, the faculty member will have the opportunity to provide written justification of activity within one month of written notification.
 - The unit director may withdraw the written notification if the faculty justification is accepted.
 - If the justification is not accepted, the unit director will select another faculty member in the college to serve as a peer mentor with the faculty at issue, with his/her approval of the selection of mentor. The unit director will also indicate, in writing, a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member. During the next year’s evaluation period, the unit director will solicit feedback and provide assistance with the peer mentor to improve the performance of the faculty member.

- **Third**, at the end of the yearlong evaluation period, the faculty member at issue will participate in the regular departmental evaluation process. In the event that the unit director determines that the faculty member at issue has once again failed to meet the minimum standards set forth in this policy, a second written notification will be issued to the faculty member and the faculty member will be reported to the dean. "The names of faculty members who fail to meet minimum standards for the year following the (department head's) suggested course of action will be forwarded to the appropriate dean. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which the minimum standards are not met, then "dismissal for cause" will be considered at the discretion of the appropriate dean." (See C31.5, UH)

As with all issues within this document, faculty members have all the rights and privileges afforded them, including the right to appeal, as set forth in the University Handbook.

PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD

Significance of the Award

The Professorial Performance Award rewards strong performance at the highest rank with a base salary increase in addition to that provided by the annual evaluation process. The Performance Award review is not a form of promotion review. It does not create a "senior" professoriate. Furthermore, the Professorial Performance Award is not a right accorded to every faculty member at the rank of Professor. Nor is it granted simply as a result of a candidate's routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies. (C49.1, UH)

Criteria:

1. The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at least six years since the last promotion or professorial performance award. (C49.2, UH)
2. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review. (C49.2, UH)
3. The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards. (C49.2, UH)

Procedure:

1. The timing for the award will coincide with the annual evaluation cycle. The faculty member will provide the following supporting materials which will form the basis of adjudicating the award's eligibility.
 - a. Evidence of productivity that supports the promotion to Professor using the current department standards. The format of the documentation will consist of Sections I-VI of the K-State Salina Library's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and the Professorial Performance Award Evaluation Forms (see Appendix D) signed by the candidate, unit director and dean of the College of Technology and Aviation
 - b. Copy of current vitae.
 - c. Copies of annual evaluations for each year since the last promotion or professorial performance award.
2. The unit director (or the dean if the candidate is the unit director) reviews the supporting materials and prepares a written recommendation.
3. The recommendation and supporting materials are forwarded to the dean of the College of Technology & Aviation at the same time as the annual evaluation is forwarded.

4. The dean of the College of Technology & Aviation reviews recommendation and supporting materials and prepares a written recommendation.
5. All recommendations for the Professorial Performance Awards are forwarded to the Provost. (C49.4, UH)

Appendix A

Documentation for Promotion and Tenure Review

RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE—SECTION I

FOR USE BY THE UNIT DIRECTOR AT THE K-STATE SALINA LIBRARY

(To Be Filled Out by the Candidate)

Department/Unit:

A. Name of Candidate: _____

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

C. For Promotion: Yes _____ No _____
To rank of: _____

D. Current Rank: _____
Year/Month Received: _____

E. Average Distribution of Assignment:

Directed Service _____

Non-Directed Service _____

Research and other Creative Activities _____

Academic Citizenship _____

F. Highest Degree: _____ Date: _____ Institution: _____

G. Years of Professional Experience Prior to KSU: _____ at KSU: _____

H. Years of Prior Service Credited Toward Tenure Consideration: _____

I have reviewed the documents contained herein and they contain all of the materials I wish to submit.

Candidate's Signature _____

To Be Completed by the Unit Director After Departmental Review

Faculty Recommendation:	<u>Tenure / Promotion</u>
Number Voting Yes:	_____
Number Voting No:	_____
Number Abstaining:	_____
Number Absent and Not Voting:	_____

Unit Director's Recommendation: _____ (Yes) _____ (No)

Unit Director's Signature: _____

RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE—SECTION I

FOR USE BY THE DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY AND AVIATION

(To Be Filled Out by the Candidate)

Department/Unit:

A. Name of Candidate: _____

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

C. For Promotion: Yes _____ No _____
To rank of: _____

D. Current Rank: _____
Year/Month Received: _____

E. Average Distribution of Assignment:

Directed Service _____

Non-Directed Service _____

Research and other Creative Activities _____

Academic Citizenship _____

F. Highest Degree: _____ Date: _____ Institution: _____

G. Years of Professional Experience Prior to KSU: _____ at KSU: _____

H. Years of Prior Service Credited Toward Tenure Consideration: _____

I have reviewed the documents contained herein and they contain all of the materials I wish to submit.

Candidate's Signature _____

To Be Completed by the Dean After Review by the College Advisory Committee on Academic Tenure

Faculty Recommendation: Tenure / Promotion

Number Voting Yes: _____

Number Voting No: _____

Number Abstaining: _____

Number Absent and Not Voting: _____

Dean's Recommendation: _____ (Yes) _____ (No)

Dean's Signature: _____

Each box below represents a separate section in the tenure portfolio. Full pages are not reproduced here, but the text in each box should be used as a header for each section of the notebook. Most sections are limited to one or two pages ONLY. Additional documentation may be included at the end in Section X.

SECTION II

DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES DURING EVALUATION PERIOD

One page summary. To be completed by Department/Unit Head and signed by Candidate and Head.

SECTION III - A

STATEMENT BY CANDIDATE

Statement of Candidate Accomplishments

Instructions: Candidate is to provide a one-page summary of major achievements during the evaluation period at the local, regional, national, and international levels. Candidate may provide any other information he/she feels pertinent to the tenure/promotion decision. Summary is limited to the space provided below.

SECTION III - B

STATEMENT BY CANDIDATE

Statement of Five-Year Goals

Instructions: Candidate is to provide a one-page statement of the individual's five-year goals regarding teaching, research, service, and any other scholarly activity. Statement is limited to the space provided below.

SECTION IV

SUMMARY OF CANDIDATE'S DIRECTED SERVICE

Instructions: The candidate is required to submit a one-page statement demonstrating excellence in directed service towards furthering the strategic goals and mission of the unit, college, and university. This should include evidence of quality and an understanding of policies, procedures, and services, particularly in the candidate's area of specialization. (See K-State Salina Library's Criteria for Tenure, page 5).

SECTION V

RESEARCH AND OTHER CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

Instructions: Candidate is to provide evidence of research and other creative activities, relating to the candidate's directed service responsibilities. (See K-State Salina Library's Criteria for Tenure, page 7).

SECTION VI

LIBRARY NON-DIRECTED SERVICE

Instructions: Candidate is to provide a one-page statement of non-directed service to the institution, to the professions, and to the public. (See K-State Salina Library's Criteria for Tenure, page 6).

SECTION VII

INTERNAL/EXTERNAL LETTERS OF EVALUATION

SECTION VIII

ANNUAL EVALUATION FORMS AND/OR MID-TENURE REVIEW LETTER

SECTION IX

OTHER SUMMARY INFORMATION

Current Vita

SECTION X

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Appendices as required.

Appendix B

Form for Promotion & Tenure Evaluation by Peers

FORM FOR EVALUATION OF CANDIDATE

K-State Salina Library

Indications of Progress Toward Tenure and Areas for Improvement

Please indicate with your comments below each of the listed criteria the progress made towards tenure and the areas of improvement that might be made for this candidate. Thank you.

Directed Service:

"This type of service is explicitly delineated in a faculty member's position description and requires academic credentials and/or skills. This service furthers the unit, college, and university mission and is central to the goals and objectives of the institution. In directed service, the candidate must show understanding of policies, procedures, and services of the unit, college, and university. In addition, the candidate must demonstrate excellence in one's job-related responsibilities..."

Non-Directed Service:

"Non-directed service is often referenced by the generic term 'service.' It is non-directed in the sense that specific expectations are not delineated in job descriptions and much latitude exists for faculty members to choose how they will fill some obligation for non-directed service."

Research & Other Creative Activities:

"Research and other creative endeavors encompass a broad spectrum of scholarship and other activities that require critical analysis, investigation, or experimentation. These endeavors are directed toward discovery, interpretation or application of knowledge and ideas." (p.3, EFE) Creative activities must be related to the individual's directed service responsibilities."

Academic Citizenship:

"The University needs collegiality to function effectively...Some faculty members foster goodwill and harmony within the University, mentor colleagues, and generally contribute to the pursuit of common goals. Other individuals may display behavior that is highly disruptive to the University; as a result, collegiality and morale suffer." (p. 5, EFE) Behavior which affects, whether positively or negatively, the ability of others to carry out their assignments in the department will be considered in the total evaluation for tenure."

Ballot for Reappointment

Candidate's Name: _____

For the purposes of Reappointment, I find the candidate:

Acceptable _____

Not Acceptable _____

Comments in support of acceptable/not acceptable recommendation:

I abstain _____

Give reason(s) for abstention:

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Ballot for Mid-Tenure Review

Candidate's Name: _____

For the purposes of Mid-Tenure Review, I find the candidate:

Acceptable _____

Not Acceptable _____

Comments in support of acceptable/not acceptable recommendation:

I abstain _____

Give reason(s) for abstention:

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Ballot for Final Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Candidate's Name: _____

For the purposes of Final Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor, I find the candidate:

Acceptable _____

Not Acceptable _____

Comments in support of acceptable/not acceptable recommendation:

I abstain _____

Give reason(s) for abstention:

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Contents of Unit Director/Dean's Letter to Candidate

Candidate's Name: _____

Results of Vote for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion

Acceptable: _____

Not acceptable: _____

Abstentions: _____

Unit Director's Recommendation and Rationale:

Themes of Significance from Faculty Comments:

Unit Director's Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix C

Forms for Annual Evaluation

K-State Salina Library College of Technology and Aviation

Annual Performance Evaluation and Plan

NAME: _____

YEAR: _____

DIRECTED SERVICE

Performance Expectation	Weight (High, Medium, Low)
1.	
2.	
3.	
Other Core Responsibilities	

NON-DIRECTED SERVICE

Performance Expectation	Weight (High, Medium, Low)
1.	
2.	
3.	
Other Core Responsibilities	

RESEARCH/CREATIVE

Performance Expectation	Weight (High, Medium, Low)
1.	
2.	
3.	
Other Core Responsibilities	

ACADEMIC CITIZENSHIP

Performance Expectation	Weight (High, Medium, Low)
1.	
2.	
3.	
Other Core Responsibilities	

Signature of Unit Director/Date

Signature of Employee/Date

* High = 3, Medium = 2, Low = 1

Self-Evaluation
(Must be typed)

Each faculty member is required to complete a self-summary. Assess performance of duties as outlined in the annual Performance Plan and your position description. Self-evaluation should not exceed 5 pages in length.

STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION

STANDARDS	DEFINITIONS
Exceeds Expectations = 4	Performance and results frequently exceed the position's requirements and expectations. All planned goals were achieved above established standards. The performance exceeded the planned performance expectations. The contributions made improved the effectiveness of the department or unit.
Achieved Expectations = 3	Performance and results met all position requirements and expectations. Planned goals were achieved within acceptable standards. There may have been some accomplishments which exceeded expectations, and some areas where results did not fully meet expectations. Similarly, the performance behavior is generally consistent with the planned performance expectations. On balance, this is a good performer.
Needs Improvement =2	Performance and results met some, but not all, of the position's requirements and expectations. The need for further development and/or improvement is recognizable. The performance behavior demonstrated is occasionally consistent with the planned performance expectations. Sustained progress and improvement are required.
Below Standard Expectations = 1	The position's requirements and expectations have not been met. Failed to meet the planned performance expectations. Lacks initiative. Poor collegiality/interpersonal skills that disrupt the work environment. Performance must improve to an acceptable level at the next review or chronic low achievement processes will be initiated for tenured faculty members.

EVALUATION & MERIT RECOMMENDATION

PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION	WEIGHT (High, Medium, Low)	RATING (From Standards for Evaluation)
Directed Service 1. 2. Other Core Responsibilities:		
Non-Directed Service 1. 2. Other Core Responsibilities:		
Research/Creative 1. 2. Other Core Responsibilities		
Academic Citizenship 1. 2. Other Core Responsibilities		

FINAL OVERALL RATING _____

MERIT SALARY CATEGORY RECOMMENDATION

Exceeds Expectations _____

Achieved Expectations _____

Needs Improvement _____

Below Standard Expectations _____

*For tenured faculty, a final overall rating of BELOW STANDARD leads to the implementation of section C31.5 (chronic low achievement) of the KSU University Handbook.

Appendix D

Forms for Professorial Performance Award

Professorial Performance Evaluation Form EVALUATION FORM I

Date: _____

Name: _____

Job Title: _____

Dept: _____

Date of Promotion to Professor at K-State: _____

Recommendation:

Unit Director

Date

Faculty Member

Date

**Professorial Performance Evaluation Form
EVALUATION FORM II**

My signature signifies that I have seen the Unit Director's recommendation.

Comments by the Dean:

Dean of the College of Technology & Aviation

Date