

DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by faculty vote on 19 September 2014)

(Revised by faculty on 19 September 2014)

CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT PROCEDURES

(Approved by faculty vote on 19 September 2014)

(Revised by faculty on 19 September 2014)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by faculty vote on 14 May 2014)

(Revised by faculty on 14 May 2014)

PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD

(Approved by faculty vote on 14 May 2014)

(Revised by faculty on 14 May 2014)

Pamela Kempton, Department head

Date signed: 10 October 2014



Peter Dorhout, Dean

Date signed:  16 Oct 2015

April Mason, Provost

Date signed: 
26 Oct 15

**PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION,
REAPPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE**

**DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY**

APPROVED BY THE FACULTY ON 19 SEPTEMBER 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I – CRITERIA AND STANDARDS OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT

- 1.0 Purpose of the Annual Evaluation**
- 2.0 Criteria and Standards of Professional Accomplishments for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Evaluation**
 - 2.1 Introduction**
 - 2.2 Scholarship / Research**
 - 2.3 Teaching**
 - 2.4 Service**
 - 2.5 Administration**
- 3.0 Procedures and Format for Submission of Materials for Annual Evaluation**
 - 3.1 Summary and Statement of Expectations**
 - 3.2 Teaching**
 - 3.3 Research**
 - 3.4 Service**
 - 3.5 Administration**
- 4.0 Evaluation Process**
 - 4.1 Rating Scale**
 - 4.2 Weighted Overall Evaluation**
 - 4.3 Merit Salary Distribution**
- 5.0 Minimum Acceptable Standards for Faculty Members and Process for Chronic Low Achievement**

**PART II – STANDARDS, POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW AND
PROMOTION**

- 1.0 Faculty Qualified to Vote on Matters of Promotion / Tenure / Mid-Probationary Review**
- 2.0 Procedures for Promotion and/or Tenure**
 - 2.1 Candidate's Responsibilities**
 - 2.2 Supporting Documentation**

- 2.3 Department's Responsibilities
- 2.4 Appeal Procedure
- 2.5 Forwarding Procedure
- 2.6 Schedule Summary
- 3.0 Procedures for Mid-Probationary Review
 - 3.1 Candidate's Responsibilities
 - 3.2 Department's Responsibilities
 - 3.3 Forwarding Procedures
 - 3.4 Report from the Dean
- 4.0 Criteria for Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment
 - 4.1 Criteria for Reappointment of a Probationary Faculty Member
 - 4.2 Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with Tenure
 - 4.3 Criteria for Promotion to Professor
- 5.0 Professorial Performance Award
 - 5.1 Minimum Criteria
 - 5.2 Process

PART III – PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION, REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION OF TERM AND REGULAR NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

- 1.0 Introduction
 - 1.1 Definition of Non-tenure-track Faculty Positions
 - 1.2 Purpose of Annual Evaluation for Non-tenure-track Faculty
- 2.0 Criteria and Standards of Professional Accomplishment for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Evaluations
 - 2.1 Introduction
 - 2.2 Teaching
 - 2.3 Research / Scholarship
 - 2.4 Service
- 3.0 Procedures and Format for Submission of Materials for Annual Evaluation
 - 3.1 Summary and Statement of Expectations
 - 3.2 Teaching
 - 3.3 Research
 - 3.4 Service
- 4.0 Evaluation Process
 - 4.1 Rating Scale
- 5.0 Process and Criteria for Reappointment and Promotion
 - 5.1 Introduction
 - 5.2 Review for Promotion in Rank
 - 5.3 List of Responsibilities in the Non-tenure-track Faculty Promotion Process
 - 5.4 Appeals Procedure
 - 5.5 Report from the Dean

- 5.6 Criteria for Reappointment of a Non-tenure-track Faculty Member on Regular Appointment**
- 5.7 Criteria for Promotion of Non-tenure-track Faculty from Assistant Teaching Professor to Associate Teaching Professor and Assistant Research Professor and Associate Research Professor**
- 5.8 Criteria for Promotion of Non-tenure-track Faculty from Associate Teaching Professor to Teaching Professor and Associate Research Professor to Research Professor**
- 5.9 Length and Type of Appointment on Promotion**

Appendix A. Resume Template

Appendix B. Timetable of Actions for Reappointment of Faculty on Regular Appointment

PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION, REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE PART I

CRITERIA AND STANDARDS OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT

**DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY**

APPROVED BY THE FACULTY ON 19 SEPTEMBER 2014

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE ANNUAL EVALUATION

Annual evaluation is intended to describe and assess the accomplishments and contributions of each unclassified employee and to provide guidance if outputs in one or more areas of responsibility are deemed below expectations. It aids faculty in their professional development, provides a mechanism for ensuring that the standards and objectives of the Department of Geology are met, and contributes to the ongoing process of enhancing the overall quality of the department's efforts. It is also used for personnel decisions affecting annual merit salary increases, reappointment, tenure and promotion. The procedures and processes used for evaluation and assessment are important in that they assure that personnel decisions and faculty development are based on achievements and expectations that are both understood and reasonable. This document is a statement of the department's policies, procedures, and criteria for reaching decisions on these important and complex issues. The information contained herein is based on the procedures for evaluation outlined in the previous Geology Department Document (approved in 2006), updated and benchmarked against the current Department Documents for Biochemistry and Molecular Biophysics, Chemistry, Geography and Physics. The *KSU University Handbook* contains the University's policies and procedures. The timetable for action relevant to this document is summarized in Appendix A.

2.0 CRITERIA AND STANDARDS OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT FOR TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY EVALUATIONS

2.1 Introduction

The activities of geology faculty are encompassed by four broad areas of endeavor: research / scholarship, teaching, service and administration. A brief description of each category and anticipated performance expectations follow below. It is normally to be expected that every faculty member will be active to some degree in research, teaching and service—that is, there is no *exceptional* merit attached to keeping a research

program in operation, managing competently a normal teaching load, and carrying a reasonable share of departmental and university chores. However, the department recognizes that different individuals may legitimately and usefully choose to focus their activities in different areas. Faculty members who are in tenured and tenure-track positions are normally allocated responsibilities in the proportions: research (40%), teaching (40%), and service (20%). The distribution of effort for each individual will be agreed between the individual and the Head of Department and should be consistent with the collective needs of the department and the university. If reduction in service in one or more areas of responsibility is requested and approved, then corresponding increases will be made in the other areas of the faculty member's responsibilities. In cases where faculty members have less than full-time appointments in the department, expectations of their professional accomplishments should be proportional to the tenths of the time of appointment.

2.2 Scholarship / Research

Research in the geosciences can involve many different components:

- conducting scholarly studies on topics of current interest,
- developing proposals for external, and occasionally University, funding of research work,
- administration of research grants,
- supervision of support staff for research projects and laboratories,
- training of support staff and students,
- mentoring of students, research associates, junior faculty and visitors, and
- providing support and consultation to other members of the department, and/or the University.

When undertaken well, these activities should lead to a high level of research productivity in the department and to high visibility for KSU within the appropriate national and international research communities. While not all research will produce immediate tangible results, we anticipate that, on a regular basis, the typical faculty member will be involved in one or more of the following:

- publication of papers in appropriate journals, monographs and proceedings,
- obtaining external support for research efforts,
- presentations at appropriate professional meetings,
- distribution of materials that will aid the research or teaching of other scholars,
- engagement with the public and private sectors and distribution of materials that will increase the wider impact of the research,
- consultation with other scholars and researchers,
- development of a reputation for high quality research, and

- collaboration in research with students, post-doctoral fellows, and other scientists.

The complex nature of research and the number of different types of activities listed above make it unlikely that every faculty member will contribute equally to all of the areas listed. However, each faculty member is expected to show a strong research effort, either as an individual or as a part of a group working on projects of common interest. Typically, a faculty member will be cited by his/her colleagues here and/or elsewhere as providing important contributions to the advancement of geology.

Because research outputs do not always follow a calendar year, particularly publications and funding opportunities, each faculty member's annual review should take this into account by noting whether the faculty member is engaging in a preponderance of the activities listed above; especially in the areas of publication and research funding. In addition, faculty members' evaluations in the area of research / scholarship will reflect a three-year moving average.

The ranking of research contributions listed under each subheading below will be used as a guideline in the annual evaluation of tenured and tenure-track faculty as well as in merit and promotion processes.

Publication:

- *Journal articles.* Account will be taken of the rigor of refereeing to which papers are subjected and of the visibility of the journals to which they are submitted. Greatest weight will be given to high-impact peer-reviewed journals that are widely read, e.g. *Science* and *Nature*, but also major peer-reviewed journals that are international in scope and have high impact factors.
- *Invited review articles.* These may be particularly significant since they represent not only publication but also professional recognition through invitation.
- *Book authorship.* This may be given heavy emphasis in merit evaluations since it may represent much greater effort than a journal article. The Head of Department will make the determination of its relative weight.
- *Other scholarly publications,* such as symposium volumes, reports to industry and/or government agencies, and scientific newsletters, particularly where individually peer-reviewed prior to publication. The onus is on the faculty member to show evidence of a review process.
- Greater weight will be given to publications appearing in final form in print or on-line during the period under review. Preliminary reports and papers appearing in un-refereed journals are generally less significant than definitive papers in internationally recognized journals with high impact factors. Manuscripts in preparation will be of interest to the Head of Department but will be given less weight in faculty evaluation.
- Abstracts are not considered publications and are counted under presentations

Minimum expectation: On average, one manuscript accepted for publication per year (averaged over the last three years) in a nationally or internationally recognized refereed journal is the standard in this subcategory.

External Funding: Receipt of extramural grants and contracts is an important indicator of research activity and academic reputation, and these awards benefit the department directly through financial resources. The weight given for grants and contracts during the annual evaluation processes 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 department. While grants from prestigious funding bodies, such as NSF, are generally regarded as the “gold standard”, it is recognized that other sources of funding also bring benefits to the department and should be acknowledged appropriately. For example, considerable effort may be invested by a faculty member working with students to apply for funding from the university, learned societies or industry. Contributions of resources in kind (e.g. contributions of precious samples or analytical data) are another form of external funding. Traditional grant funding may be more difficult to obtain from some sources than from others and some fields are more in fashion than others with the granting agencies. These variations in the difficulty particular individuals may have in obtaining external funding need to be taken into account. However, substantial and continuing efforts in this direction are expected of all faculty that have a research component to their time allocation.

The greatest weight will be given to external grants or contracts that:

- are awarded through a peer-reviewed process,
- where the magnitude of the award or contract generates research overhead money for the department and/or salary savings that revert to the department, and
- where part of the award is used to finance one or more GRAs during the evaluation period.

Minimum expectation: Each faculty member should submit as a PI or co-PI at least one proposal for external funding per year, or its equivalent in support from industrial or government partners. The relative merits of this activity will be judged based on the prestige of the grant or contract, whether the faculty member is the PI, co-PI, or contributor, and its benefits to the department in terms of SRO generated, graduate students funded, and/or equipment purchased.

Presentations, engagement and impact: Opportunities to speak elsewhere generally represent appreciation outside the University of scholarly merit. The significance of this recognition depends on the nature of the presentation. A reasonable order of decreasing significance is the following:

- 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 meeting
- Invitation to speak at a non-research active university or college, secondary school or more local invitation, e.g. as part of a course or seminar program of another department within the university

Note that presentation in this context is not limited to presentation in person. 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.

Minimum expectation: Faculty members will present at least one paper at a discipline-recognized national or international meeting per year and/or engage in a comparable impact or engagement activity.

2.3 Teaching

Preparing our students for employment or further graduate study is a primary component of the department's mission. Therefore, faculty are expected to:

- maintain an up-to-date knowledge in each subject taught,
- provide a clear and coherent style of presentation,
- provide a learning environment that stimulates students' interest and appreciation for a field of study,
- intellectually challenge students,
- facilitate student learning outside the classroom,
- achieve status as members of the graduate faculty,
- meet students' academic advising needs,
- be accessible to students during posted office hours,
- convene classes on a regular basis or provide an alternative learning experience.

In the context of this document, teaching includes classroom instruction, preparing new or revised course materials, conducting seminars, advising undergraduate students, overseeing independent study courses, and mentoring students outside the classroom. Aspects of supervising graduate students (e.g. serving on thesis committees, general

advice on appropriate course requirements, etc.) come into this category, but more scientifically based activities such as co-formulation of research hypotheses, co-authorship of papers for conferences, journals or proposals for research funding are considered under Research (see previous section).

In addition to a high standard of teaching, it is expected that faculty perform with academic integrity, promote scholarship and intellectual growth, be effective communicators, and have concern for students as individuals. The head will take into consideration as part of teaching evaluation positive or negative evidence concerning these points and will apprise faculty members when serious concerns are involved.

Minimum Expectation: A standard teaching load will be the equivalent of two, three-hour courses per semester (12 hours per year). Low-enrollment classes will not be counted as part of the "standard load". Low enrollment is defined as 100- to 200-level classes with fewer than 15 students, 300- to 400 level classes with fewer than 12 students, 500- to 600-level classes with fewer than 10 students, and 700- to 800-level classes with fewer than 4 students. However, the teaching of a low-enrollment class that is required to satisfy an undergraduate major or a graduate program of study, when taught in addition to the standard load, may be counted as an additional contribution to teaching activities.

TEVAL ratings in the summary areas of "overall effectiveness," "increasing desire to learn," and "amount learned" should average at least a 3 or above for most courses taught in-load. For a faculty member to receive an annual evaluation rating greater than "met expectations", higher TEVAL scores (consistently greater than 4) are expected. However, TEVALs should be considered as one indicator among the others listed in this document. Other considerations could include:

- Development of a new course or of novel teaching methods
- Substantial improvement in content or course materials for a course that has been offered before
- Teaching a course that has been offered before by the department but not by the particular individual
- Competitive teaching award or unusually favorable student response
- Unusually heavy teaching load either in contact hours or student numbers while maintaining effort under other areas of responsibility (i.e. research, service or administration)

Faculty members may also want to arrange for the peer evaluation of at least one course annually through the K-State Teaching and Learning Center or from a faculty member in a related discipline who has won a university teaching award. The peer evaluation will be used to help assess instructional quality.

With regard to supervision of graduate students, the minimum expected standard will be supervision of one student who is on track to graduate in two years during the

evaluation period; supervision of two or more on-track graduate students will increase the rating. Because it is not always possible for each faculty member to supervise one or more graduate students in a given year, and because the graduate program is an integral part of the department and requires support from each faculty member, faculty members who are not formally supervising graduate students should devote an equivalent amount of time to supporting the graduate program in other ways, e.g. service on geology thesis committees, providing advice on problems or techniques for students working with other supervisors, substantial recruitment efforts, special seminars, field trips, or workshops specifically for geology graduate students, efforts to obtain external financial support for Graduate Research Assistants (GRAs), successful efforts to improve the facilities for graduate students in the department, etc.

2.4 Service

Service to the department is perhaps more critical in smaller units, such as the Department of Geology, where there are fewer people to share these responsibilities and everyone must carry their part of the load if the unit is to function effectively. The following activities do not constitute an exhaustive list, and some account must be taken of the fact that service of some kinds is likely to be done only at the request of the Head of Department or of the administration and so opportunities for service may not be equally available for all faculty members. Consideration should be given to the time invested in particular activities, to the importance of the service to the department and the university, and to the effectiveness with which the assigned work is done.

- Departmental service – This category includes, but is not limited to, the activities listed in Box 1.
- University service – This category includes service on college or university committees, faculty senate, grievance boards, advisory boards and *ad hoc* assignments to deal with specific problems.
- Public service and consulting - Includes all activities related to geology that involve interactions with the public, and consulting activities in geology.
- Professional society service and activities – This category includes society committee service or service as an officer in a geologic or scientific society as well

Box 1. Departmental Service

- *ad hoc* committees
- special tasks to increase the visibility or attractiveness of the department and its programs
- work to improve student experiences in the department
- seminar coordinator
- recruitment committees
- advisor to student clubs
- hallway displays
- department website
- department newsletter
- administration/maintenance of teaching labs and their supplies or equipment
- Supervision of GTAs and their teaching responsibilities
- Lead undergraduate advisor(s)
- Graduate program director(s)
- Open house coordinator

as involvement in peer review of journal articles and requests to review applications for funding agencies. Editorship of a journal, book or symposium proceedings and requests to review manuscripts for journals are similar indicators.

- Engagement with alumni and others (e.g. other donors, industry representatives, government, etc.) specifically for the advancement of the department and its programs.

Minimum Expectation: Faculty members will perform some combination of the activities listed above reliably and on a regular basis to a time equivalent to that negotiated with the Head of Department, i.e. typically 0.2 FTE.

2.5 Administration

In general, the Head of Department is the principal faculty member holding administrative duties. On occasion, administrative duties that go beyond the normal service load of typical faculty members may be assigned. The Head of Department and any faculty member engaged in administrative duties will negotiate the definition of the duties and the time allocation associated with them. Typically, aside from the Head of Department, administrative duties will not exceed 0.15 of a faculty member's time distribution.

3.0 PROCEDURES AND FORMAT FOR SUBMISSION OF MATERIALS FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION

3.1 Summary and Statement of Expectations

In accordance with the *University Handbook* (Sections C31, C32, and C41), every year in late December or early January, each faculty member will submit to the Head of Department a portfolio of accomplishments from the previous calendar year. This portfolio must include a brief summary in outline form, not longer than five pages, of the activities in each of the major categories (teaching, research, and service) and relevant subcategories described above. It should also include a statement of self-assessment of how the faculty member has met or exceeded his/her agreed expectations.

Meetings between the individual and the Head of Department at the beginning of the previous year (or the offer letter for new faculty) should have established the goals and expectations for each individual faculty member to ensure that he or she is evaluated fairly. Any changes to an individual's yearly plan need to be formally discussed and agreed with the Head of Department. The time allocation (or "tenths distribution") for each faculty member's activities should also have been established at this meeting. The tenths distribution usually will be: teaching 0.40, research 0.40, and service 0.2. Faculty

members who are assigned administration may vary their distribution of time from any of the other three areas of merit as negotiated and approved by the Head of Department prior to the beginning of the annual evaluation period.

In addition to the materials necessary for the retrospective annual evaluation, each faculty member should prepare a brief written statement of goals for the coming year relative to the categories and subcategories listed above. This statement should be submitted with the portfolio of the previous year's accomplishments. Any decision to deviate from devoting substantial efforts to each subcategory should be written down as part of the faculty member's goals and expectations for the coming year, and must be approved by the Head of Department.

3.2 Teaching

- *Teaching Load* - List classes, credit hours, number of students, and TEVALs for teaching effectiveness for each course. Also list independent studies courses and the number of student taught in these sections.
- *Quality of Teaching* - A brief statement by the faculty member should be included in the summary. Supporting documentation, including course syllabi, should be included as supplementary documentation. Each class syllabus should include a list of topics covered, a statement of expectations for the students, a clear description of the methods to be used in grading, and specific office hours as well as alternate means of communicating with the instructor. Each syllabus must also include any information required by the university (see <http://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/teaching/course.html> for K-State course syllabi statements). Other materials that support teaching effectiveness may also be submitted, e.g. reading lists, hand-outs, examinations, information on instructional techniques, special projects or other teaching innovations.
- *Student Evaluation of Teaching* - All faculty members will use the TEVAL system to evaluate every class they teach in-load and over-load. TEVAL scores in three major areas (effectiveness, desire to learn, and amount learned) should be reported. Faculty members who do not feel adequately evaluated by this means may also submit their own evaluation forms in addition to TEVAL. TEVAL reports and all student comments should be included as supplementary documentation.
- *Participation in the Graduate Program* - List graduate students supervised and indicate their progress, or describe other evidence of strong commitment to and support of the graduate program.
- *Academic Advising and Informal Teaching* - Undergraduate advising will be evaluated based upon documentation from faculty of quality advising, student complaints/praises of advising, the university's annual advising report, ease with which students meet graduation requirements, etc. Include number of students advised. (In the case of the Graduate Program Director(s), evaluation may include advising of graduate students until they are turned over to a major

professor.) Describe any informal teaching during the evaluation year. Informal teaching includes field trips, interaction with student clubs, encouragement and assistance to students in professional activities, etc. Informal teaching does not include the teaching of students enrolled in independent study courses (these are considered under teaching load).

- *Continuing development* - Attendance at teaching workshops or retaining a teaching mentor in a continuing effort to improve performance will be considered positively.

3.3 Research

- *Publications* - Faculty members should provide separate lists of (1) publications accepted during the evaluation year, (2) publications accepted during the previous two years before the evaluation year, and (3) papers submitted or in preparation. Each paper should include names and titles of all authors, author order, journal name, and page numbers, along with a statement of the faculty member's contribution to the paper. Quality of the publication(s) and the journal(s) will be considered.
- *External Funding*- List separately (1) proposals submitted, including information on funding agencies, amount requested, and direct benefits to the department (GRAs, permanent equipment, etc.) and (2) externally funded projects, including funding agencies, amount funded (that year and total over life of project), and direct benefits to the department.
- *Presentations, Impact and Outreach* - List presentations and impact / outreach activities, including dates, locations, whether invited or volunteered. For impact activities, provide a brief statement of the activity and outcome, if known.
- *Indications of Research Esteem* – List any awards, but also journals articles reviewed, journals for which you may serve as an editor, grant proposals reviewed and any other measures of research esteem.
- *Research Mentoring*– list relevant research activities associated with mentoring undergraduate students, graduate students, research associates, junior faculty and / or visitors

3.4 Service

List and describe contributions toward:

- Departmental service
- University service
- Public service and consulting
- Professional society service and activities
- Engagement with alumni and other supporters of the department.

3.5 Administration

Administrative Duties – List administrative duties, if any, and provide evidence that these expectations have been fulfilled.

A template for organizing the information for submission for annual evaluations is provided in Appendix A.

4.0 EVALUATION PROCESS

4.1 Rating Scale

After reviewing all the materials submitted by each faculty member (usually by mid-January), a written evaluation will be prepared by the Head of Department. For each major area, a faculty member will be rated on a continuous scale of 1 to 5 using the following categories:

5. Outstanding
4. Exceeded expectations
3. Met expectations
2. Below expectations*
1. Unsatisfactory, fails to meet minimum-acceptable levels of productivity**

** Where used for the overall rating of performance, a rating of 2 would typically correspond to a situation in which productivity meets minimum acceptable levels in one area, but not all.*

*** Where used for the overall rating of performance, a rating of 1 would typically correspond to a situation in which productivity failed to meet minimum acceptable levels in all areas.*

4.2 Weighted Overall Evaluation

Faculty members' overall rating will be based on their weighted score, based on their tenths distribution for teaching, research, service and administration. Thus, a faculty member with a standard distribution of 0.40 Teaching, 0.40 Research, and 0.2 Service, who receives "outstanding" (5) in Teaching, "met expectations" in Research (3), and "exceeded expectations" (4) in Service, would receive an overall evaluation of $[(0.40 \times 5) + (0.40 \times 3) + (0.2 \times 4)] = 4$ or an overall rating of "exceeds expectations." The overall performance in the major categories of teaching, research, and service should be at least "met expectations." The assessment of research outputs represents a moving average of the evaluation year and two previous years before the evaluation year.

4.3 Merit Salary Distribution

The head, based on the merit evaluations, will make recommendations for merit increases in salary when requested by the Dean's office (usually in May). The criteria

used to recommend merit increases will be based on the “weighted overall average” (discussed above).

5.0 MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE STANDARDS FOR FACULTY MEMBERS AND CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT DETERMINATION

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to contribute to the three areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service. If a faculty member fails to meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity in any of these three areas in any year, the Head of Department will meet with the faculty member and develop a written plan of improvement with goals and performance standards. Tenure-track faculty who fail to meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity may risk non-reappointment.

Due-process procedures for possible dismissal of a tenured faculty member because of chronic low achievement, i.e. fails to meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity in one or more of the three key areas in two successive years, or in three of five years, are described in sections C31.5-C31.8 of the University Handbook. The Head of Department is initially responsible for determining if a faculty member’s overall job performance is unacceptable and for recommending remedial action. If remedial action fails and the faculty member’s overall performance remains unacceptable, then the Head of Department will inform the faculty member in writing of this determination.

**PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION,
REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE
PART II**

**STANDARDS, POLICIES, AND PROCEDURES FOR
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW AND
PROMOTION**

**DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY**

APPROVED BY THE FACULTY ON 14 MAY 2014

**1.0 FACULTY QUALIFIED TO VOTE ON THE MATTERS OF PROMOTION /
TENURE / MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW**

All faculty whose tenure home is in Geology and who hold a rank equal to or higher than the rank being considered may vote on the question of promotion. Faculty who hold tenure, regardless of rank, may vote on the questions involving the awarding of tenure and mid-probationary review. If a qualified faculty member cannot be present for the discussion of the candidate's promotion/tenure/mid-probationary review document or available the day 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 Head of Department prior to the meeting and/or vote.

2.0 PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

The University's criteria and procedures for promotion and tenure are given in Section C of the *University Handbook* (<http://www.k-state.edu/provost/universityhb/fhsecc.html>). Candidates will normally be considered for tenure during the final year of the maximum probationary period, although, in exceptional cases, candidates with outstanding records in research, teaching and service may be considered for tenure at an earlier date. In these exceptional cases, the request for an early tenure decision may be made either by the candidate submitting a written request to the Head of Department (usually by mid-August) or by a majority vote of the tenured faculty with the concurrence of the candidate (see University Handbook C82.4).

A request for consideration of promotion may be made either by a majority of the faculty who are qualified to vote on the promotion or by the candidate submitting a written request to the Head of Department, typically by a date in mid-August (see University Handbook C131). In the case of either promotion or tenure, the candidate

has the right to proceed or withdraw from the process at any time (see University Handbook C110 and C113.4).

2.1 Candidate's Responsibilities.

Faculty members are expected to contribute to the mission of the department, the college, and the university through teaching, research, and service. As assignments and areas of expertise vary, faculty in Geology can contribute to the overall mission in diverse ways. Because this diversity makes it difficult to establish one format for the reporting of all faculty accomplishments and contributions, it is the obligation of each faculty member to substantiate her/his particular expertise and accomplishments. Responsibility for collecting the information that demonstrates the candidate's accomplishments will be borne principally by the candidate. The candidate is encouraged to consult with the Head of Department and members of the faculty concerning the content and preparation of the promotion/tenure evaluation documents.

The process for promotion/tenure evaluation begins automatically at the beginning of the final year of the probationary period, or when the candidate expresses in writing to the Head of Department her/his intention to seek promotion/tenure, or the candidate accepts the written nomination for early tenure by the majority of the faculty who are qualified to vote on the matter. The candidate will then prepare the portions of the promotion/tenure document that summarize her/his achievements in research, teaching, and service using the format specified by the office of the Provost (see <http://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/dhmanual/promotion/promotio.html>). This document will include:

Statements by Candidate:

Section III a: Candidate's statement of accomplishments (one page summary of why a candidate feels that she/he should be promoted/tenured).

Section III b: Candidate's statement of five-year goals (one page summary).

Instructional Contribution:

Section IV a: Statement of activities, including: classes taught, student advisement, theses and dissertations directed, and any other evidence of instructional productivity (one-page summary).

Section IV b: Evidence for quality of teaching, such as student evaluations, instructional projects, awards, etc. (one page summary).

Section IV c: Other evidence of scholarship and creativity in instruction, such as innovative teaching methods, introduction of new courses, substantive revision of existing courses, etc. (one page summary).

Research Contribution:

Section V a: Statement of research activities (one page summary).

Section V b: Publications, scholarly presentations, and other professional achievements for the evaluation period. Articles in press or accepted for

publication may be included, if they are denoted as such. A copy of up to five of the candidate's publications will be made available for departmental review.

Section V c: List of grants and contracts funded during the evaluation period, including funding agency, funding level, duration, title, and collaborators. A separate list of proposals that were not funded during the evaluation period may also be supplied.

Service Contribution:

Section VI: Statement of service activities (two page summary).

2.2 Supporting Documentation

Detailed evidence will be presented under separate cover and labeled **Supporting Documentation**. Examples of evidence that may be included are:

Teaching:

1. List of courses taught
2. Teaching evaluations
 - a. Student evaluation forms (standardized and other if available)
 - b. Other evidence of external evaluation of classroom teaching
 - c. Evidence of self-evaluation of teaching
3. National, regional, and local awards or recognition
4. Information on introduction of new courses and/or substantive course revision
5. Information about advising responsibilities, methods and level of effort
6. Other information that demonstrates the candidate's teaching effectiveness

Research:

1. A copy of each manuscript (published, accepted, or submitted) that has been produced at Kansas State University and other items from the evaluation period
2. A list of all proposals submitted for funding and the status of each proposal—copies of up to five funded and pending research proposals during the relevant period may be submitted; reviewers' comments are appropriate as long as all reviews and summaries for the proposal are included
3. Lists of invited and contributed presentations at scientific meetings, symposia and research seminars at universities, industries and government laboratories
4. National, regional, and local awards or recognition; copies of articles or other materials that cite or discuss the importance of the candidate's work and contributions
5. A list of former and current graduate and undergraduate students and the current status of each
6. A discussion of the candidate's collaborative work with other research groups

Service:

1. A summary of the candidate's activities on department, college, and university committees
2. A summary of the candidate's activities in international, national, regional and local professional societies
3. Information concerning the candidate's organization of symposia, etc.
4. Evidence of the candidate's reviews of books, papers, and research proposals
5. Evidence of substantive service and contributions to the scientific community
6. A summary of departmental duties performed during the probationary appointment period

Future Plans:

In addition to the documentation above, the faculty member should submit a five-year research and scholarly activities plan. The research plan, which is an extension of the one-page summary that is required by the university, should be consistent with the available resources and should include a discussion of the significance of the proposed work and its relationship with her/his current work.

Research Seminar:

All candidates for promotion and tenure will present a departmental research seminar that describes the results of the candidate's research studies for the relevant period. This seminar should be scheduled for the month of September for those candidates seeking promotion or tenure.

2.3 Department's Responsibilities

Upon receiving either the candidate's written request or, with the candidate's concurrence, the recommendation of the majority of the faculty who are eligible to vote on the matter, the Head of Department will coordinate with the qualified faculty in the acquisition of the following materials:

- **Letters from External Evaluators:** The Head of Department will provide the candidate and the faculty who are qualified to vote on the matter the opportunity to submit separate lists of potential external evaluators. The candidate's doctoral dissertation and master's thesis advisors are excluded as possible evaluators. The Head of Department will inform the candidate of the names of all potential evaluators and provide her/him with an opportunity to comment on them. The candidate may, for cogent written reasons, request the Head of Department to exclude certain individuals as external evaluators. With the input of qualified faculty, the Head of Department will choose the names of two evaluators from each list to perform the external reviews.

The Head of Department will write to the external evaluators and provide them with (1) a copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae, (2) a copy of the statements and materials specified by the office of the provost, (3) a copy of up to five of the candidate's publications (including manuscripts "accepted" and "submitted") resulting from studies conducted at Kansas State University. The materials and statements that are submitted to the reviewers must be identical to those submitted to the faculty and to the Dean.

Each external reviewer will be requested to: (1) evaluate the candidate's research work and accomplishments, and (2) compare the candidate with others in the same general area of research who are at a comparable career level. All solicited letters of evaluation concerning the candidate that are received must be included in the promotion/tenure document. When these letters are added to the candidate's promotion/tenure document, the letters will be accompanied by a copy of the letter that was sent to the evaluator by the Head of Department. Unsolicited letters of evaluation may be included in **Supporting Documentation**, but such letters cannot be substituted for the letters solicited by the Head of Department.

The identities of external evaluators who submitted evaluations will be disclosed only to voting members of the faculty, the Head of Department, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, the Dean's Advisory Committee, the university administrators and officials who are involved in the decision or review process, and other individuals, as may be required by the rules, regulations and laws of Kansas State University and the State of Kansas, i.e. identities of external evaluators will not be revealed to the candidate per University Handbook, Section C35-36. Per University Handbook Section C112.5, only the Head of Department's written recommendation is forwarded to the candidate.

The Head of Department will gather feedback from other faculty who have taught with the candidate concerning the candidate's teaching effectiveness. The Head of Department will gather feedback from a sample of current and former students, including those in the candidate's research group, to ascertain the candidate's degree of preparation, the timeliness and content of the candidate's course material, the candidate's fairness in grading and in the selection of examination material, and the ability of the candidate to excite and inspire the students. The questions that are asked of each student should accompany the survey results.

When four or more solicited letters of evaluation have been received, the Head of Department will make all supporting documentation provided by the candidate and external reviewer comments available to the qualified faculty for a suitable time period, but not less than fourteen calendar days prior to the scheduled meeting date to discuss the candidate's petition (University Handbook Section C112.1).

- **Faculty Vote:** Subsequent to the faculty's discussion of the candidate's accomplishments, each qualified member of the faculty will complete the recommendation for reappointment form and submit it to the Head of Department. The written recommendation should be submitted inside a sealed, unsigned envelope. The results of the faculty vote and a summary of the written justifications will be transmitted to the candidate and the qualified faculty. The summary will be appropriately edited to ensure confidentiality.
- **Report of the Head of Department:** The Head of Department will review the candidate's promotion/tenure document, the recommendations of the qualified faculty and the vote of the qualified faculty. The Head of Department will then formulate an independent recommendation supporting or failing to support the promotion/tenure of the candidate. The Head of Department will forward only a copy of the written recommendation to the candidate and to the faculty.

2.4 Appeal Procedures

If the candidate should wish to appeal the recommendation of either the faculty or the Head of Department, the request for reconsideration must be made in writing by the candidate within three working days of the candidate's notification of the recommendation. See University Handbook Appendix G for the definition of a working day. The candidate must present to the Head of Department the written arguments for reconsideration and provide any additional evidence that supports the candidate's position at that time.

If the candidate requests reconsideration of the faculty's recommendation, the Head of Department will convene a meeting of the qualified faculty to consider the candidate's written arguments and additional evidence. Within one working day of the conclusion of the meeting, each qualified faculty member will submit a second, written recommendation to the Head of Department. Participation in a reconsideration vote will be restricted to those members of the qualified faculty who participated in the original vote. The reconsideration recommendations of the faculty and the Head of Department, i.e. the final vote, will be transmitted in writing to the candidate and to qualified faculty.

2.5 Forwarding Procedures

After the candidate has studied the recommendations, the candidate should decide whether or not to withdraw her/his application. If the candidate wishes to continue the process, then the promotion/tenure document is forwarded to the Dean. In the case of a tenure decision involving the maximum probationary appointment period, the document must be forwarded unless the candidate withdraws and formally resigns pursuant to University Handbook Section C113.4. The Head of Department's submission to the Dean will include the results of the secret ballot (yes, no, abstain, absent and not

voting), a summary of the faculty’s justifications, and her/his written recommendation following Section I of the promotion/tenure document. Similarly, the Dean will include her/his written recommendation when the document is forwarded to the Provost.

2.6 Schedule Summary:

The following schedule should be considered as a general guide. Dates vary slightly from one year to the next. Consult the University Academic Calendar and with the Head of Department for specific dates.

by mid-August**	The candidate declares her/his intent to seek promotion and/or tenure to the department head, provides a list of potential external reviewers, a C.V., the two-four page statement of professional accomplishments and research plans, and five sets of copies of up to five publications.
by the fourth Friday in August	The candidate submits her/his portion of the promotion/tenure document to the department head.
by September	The candidate to have presented a departmental research seminar
by the end of the first full week of October	The department head completes the promotion/tenure document and submits the document to qualified members of the faculty for their examination.
by the end of the third full week in October (no less than 14 calendar days from the date above)	Qualified faculty and the department head meet to discuss the promotion/ tenure document. By the close of the next business day, each qualified faculty member forwards to the department head the recommendation that she or he believes to be appropriate.
by the end of the fourth full week in October	The department head reports the result of the faculty vote to the faculty and adds her/his recommendation to the promotion and/or tenure document. The result of the vote and the department head’s recommendation alone are made available to the candidate and the faculty.
by early November	Unless the file is withdrawn, the promotion and/or tenure document is forwarded to the Dean.

****Note:** the promotion and tenure timeline is set by central administration and dates are subject to change. The candidate should confirm at the start of the academic year.

3.0 MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW

The mid-probationary review will normally be conducted during the second semester of the probationary faculty member's third full year at Kansas State University. This review is intended to provide tenure-track faculty members with assessments of their performance by tenured faculty in their areas of research, teaching, and service; for the tenured faculty to comment on the probationary faculty member's long-range plans for research and other scholarly activities; to determine if the accomplishments and goals of the probationary faculty member are consistent with the missions and expectations of the department; to discuss progress toward tenure; and to determine if reappointment for a fifth year of service is merited.

3.1 Candidate's Responsibilities

The procedures for mid-probationary review are similar to the review procedure for promotion and/or tenure. By mid-January, the probationary faculty member presents to the Head of Department documentation of her/his accomplishments in research, teaching and service. The format that should be followed and type of evidence that should be provided will be the same as those for tenure / promotion. Outside letters of evaluation need not be sought.

In addition to Section III-B of the guidelines referenced above on page 18 (the statement of five-year goals in teaching, research, service, and other scholarly activity), the candidate should provide an additional one- to two-page research and scholarly activities plan that specifically addresses the next three years. The research plan should be consistent with available resources and should include a discussion of the significance of the proposed work and its relationship to her/his current work. These materials will be made available to the qualified faculty.

Lastly, the candidate will present a departmental research seminar that describes her/his research studies since coming to Kansas State University. This seminar should be scheduled for either February or the first week of March.

3.2 Department's Responsibilities

The same department responsibilities followed for tenure and promotion will be followed as part of the mid-tenure review.

- **Faculty Vote:** By the middle of April, tenured members of the faculty and the Head of Department will meet to discuss the probationary faculty member's documents. On the first business day subsequent to the faculty's discussion of the candidate, each tenured member of the faculty will submit a written recommendation to the Head of Department concerning whether or not the probationary faculty member should be appointed to a fifth year of service at Kansas State University. The results of the faculty vote and the summary of the written justifications will be transmitted to the candidate and the faculty.
- **Report of the Department Head:** The Head of Department will review the candidate's documents, and the recommendations of the faculty, and make an independent recommendation supporting or failing to support appointment of the candidate to the fifth year of service. The Head of Department will explain her/his recommendation in writing to the candidate. As per section C92.1 of the University Handbook, a positive mid-probationary review does not ensure that tenure will be granted in the future; nor does a negative review necessarily mean that tenure will be denied.

3.3 Appeal Procedures

If tenured faculty and/or the Head of Department should recommend that the probationary faculty member should not be re-appointed, then the probationary faculty member may appeal the decision by presenting additional evidence to the tenured faculty and/or the Head of Department. All appeals within the department must be heard by the end of April.

3.4 Forwarding Procedures

The summary recommendations of the tenured faculty and the Head of Department supporting or opposing reappointment of the probationary faculty member will be transmitted to the Dean, usually between mid-April to early May. The Head of Department will include the results of the secret ballot (yes, no, abstain, absent and not voting), a summary of the faculty's recommendation(s), and her/his written recommendation.

3.5 Report from the Dean

The candidate's file will be reviewed by the College of Arts & Sciences Dean's Advisory Committee and the Dean. The Dean will provide an assessment letter to the candidate (*University Handbook C92.4*).

4.0 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION, TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT

4.1 Criteria for Reappointment of a Probationary Faculty Member

Key characteristic: Potential to become distinguished in some area of geosciences, as reflected in a record of teaching, research and service

Teaching: The candidate must provide documented evidence that she/he is an effective and diligent teacher. The effective teacher will be recognized by: depth, breadth, and the importance and relevancy of the course's subject matter; effective course administration; and the ability to communicate effectively as judged by the faculty (possible classroom visitations, syllabus review, etc.) and students (acceptable teaching evaluations). Other examples of teaching effectiveness might include the successful direction of students in research or independent study; effective and diligent advisement of students; innovative instructional methods that inspire and excite the student; introduction of new courses and/or the substantive revision of existing courses and laboratories; and honors and special recognition for teaching excellence.

Research: By the end of the sixth semester of tenure-track service, the probationary faculty member is expected to have submitted an extramural research grant proposal (and continue to aggressively pursue extramural funding for her/his research program from one or more agencies/foundations/industries); and to be publishing and presenting the initial results of carefully performed studies to her/his research program. Leadership roles on publications are expected, the quality of the work to be reflected by publications that appear in quality journals and books, by the quality of graduate and undergraduate students that the faculty member attracts to geology and/or by other indications such as invitations to make presentations at meetings.

Service: The probationary faculty member is expected to have participated in the normal functions of the department, to have performed service on appointed committees and for the benefit of the department, and to have rendered service to the profession by way of reviewing manuscripts, proposals, etc.

4.2 Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with Tenure

Key characteristic: Evidence of developing a distinguished reputation in some area of geosciences, as reflected in a record of teaching, research and service

It is the responsibility of the tenure-seeking faculty member in Geology to offer high quality instruction, contribute new knowledge and ideas through creative activity and original scholarly research, and perform professional service to the discipline, the

university, and the department. The candidate must demonstrate expertise and research productivity in her/his area of specialty. The granting of tenure is based on sustained achievements that identify the candidate for tenure as being a leader in her/his field, or as having demonstrated substantial potential for becoming so. Tenure will not be granted simply as a result of routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies.

For tenure, the candidate must demonstrate significant professional accomplishment and excellence in the performance of the assigned duties, in teaching, research and service (usually in the proportions 40:40:20). The promise of continued professional growth is especially important in the tenure decision. Public and institutional service and professional activities are factors in the total evaluation of the candidate for tenure, although these are of less significance relative to the research and teaching. The candidate has the responsibility for providing service and leadership to geology or to the candidate's specialty within geology, or to make knowledge and ideas available to the public.

Teaching: In teaching, the candidate must provide documented evidence that she/he is an effective and diligent teacher. Effective teaching is based on sound scholarship, continued intellectual growth, the ability to communicate effectively, concern for students as individuals, and academic integrity. The candidate should demonstrate:

- substantive, content-based instruction;
- ability to organize materials and present them clearly and logically;
- ability to arouse curiosity and stimulate creativity in students;
- diligence and skill in advising students;
- formal supervision of students (thesis, topics, problems courses); and
- constructive informal interaction with students outside the classroom.

An important criterion will be the candidate's potential to sustain a life-long, high-quality teaching career.

Research: In research, there should be convincing evidence that the candidate has developed a record of independence, has established a pattern of productivity, and is building a strong national reputation in her/his area of expertise. Emphasis will be on research conducted at K-State. The candidate's research record will be judged for its quality, quantity, and consistency. Peer-reviewed, research-oriented publications important to the geosciences will be emphasized. Both the quantity and quality (judged, for example, by journal impact factors and numbers of citations) of research articles will be considered. Because research in some areas may produce fewer publications for a given effort than in other areas, the quantity of publications *per se* is less important than quality. Productivity will be considered in the light of the field, the teaching load, and the number of available co-workers. For collaborative publication efforts, there must be a written indication of the candidate's contribution. Extramural

funding of the candidate's activities will be viewed favorably. The extent of extramural funding obtained by the candidate will be considered with regard to the availability of funds in the given research area and the needs of the research program. The comments of the external referees will carry considerable weight in the faculty's evaluation of the candidate's research program.

Other evidence of the quality of the research program will include: invited papers and lectures, awards, reputation in her/his field among peers, potential for obtaining a national reputation in her/his research specialty and potential for sustaining a life-long research career.

Service: The department expects all faculty to render significant service on appointed committees and for the benefit of the department (e.g. recruitment of graduate students, assistance in the preparation of departmental proposals, and attendance at departmental functions). The department also expects service to be rendered to the geological profession. This may involve participation in the activities of national professional societies, organizing symposia or meetings, reviewing research proposals, papers, books, etc.

4.3 Criteria for Promotion to Professor

Key characteristic: Evidence of a distinguished reputation in some area of geosciences, as reflected in record of teaching, research and service

Teaching: The candidate must provide documented evidence of a 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 (acceptable 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 should be effective in both graduate and undergraduate teaching; however, it may be expected that some persons may be better at one than the other. An important criterion will be the candidate's potential to sustain a life-long, high-quality teaching career.

Research: The candidate must have established and maintained a research program that has earned international or outstanding national recognition in the candidate's area of specialty within the discipline of geology 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 publication of carefully performed work, published in leading journals, has been firmly established, i.e. a sustained level of publication of the candidate's research findings in high-quality, refereed journals or through scholarly books is required. It is also expected that the candidate's work has been presented frequently in lectures and papers at other institutions and scholarly meetings. Although it is important to demonstrate sustained productivity since promotion to associate professor with tenure, the absolute number of publications and presentations is less important than their significance, as measured by citations and reputation among peers in the field of expertise. The publication record will be considered in light of the field, teaching load, and other departmental responsibilities. The comments of external referees will carry considerable weight in the faculty's evaluation of the candidate's research program.

The candidate should have demonstrated his / her effectiveness in bringing outside financial support to the department through the candidate's own research program, through proposals for acquiring departmental research instruments, or other individual or collective efforts on behalf of the department. The amount of extramural funding will be considered with regard to the availability of funds in that research area. Other evidence for the quality of research 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 her/his research program.

Service: The candidate for full professor should have demonstrated leadership ability and a sustained record of service to the department. Evidence of leadership might include: service on department and university policy making and personnel selection committees, and substantive contributions in the development and promotion of research and teaching programs.

Professional service should include participation in the activities of professional societies, as committee member or officer; organizing symposia or meetings; reviewing research proposals, papers, or books. Preparation of departmental proposals, reports and service on departmental, college or university committees.

5.0 PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD

To qualify to be recommended to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences for a professorial performance award, the faculty member must be a full-time, full professor, in rank for at least six years, who has demonstrated sustained level productivity in the area of scholarship for the last six years. In essence, the faculty must produce, within a six-year time frame, a level of scholarship that is equivalent to what the department

expects for an associate professor to be promoted to a full professor.

5.1 Minimum Criteria

- A candidate must have earned a merit evaluation of “exceeded expectations” in the area of research in the majority of these six years, with at least two years being rated as “outstanding,” and received a merit evaluation of at least “met expectations” for teaching and service for the majority of these six years.
- A candidate must have produced a level of research that is equivalent to what the department expects for an associate professor to be promoted to a full professor during these six years (see “Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor”).
- By university rule, the six-year time frame must include the most recent performance review.
- A candidate may be awarded a professorial performance award no more than once every six years.

5.2 Process

Any candidate, who meets these minimum criteria, may apply for a professorial performance award. To apply, a candidate must assemble a professorial performance award file that documents her or his scholarly accomplishments over the past six years. A candidate’s file should include all the elements of a typical promotion file, but unlike a promotion file, should include only summary information regarding teaching and service.

The candidate will submit her or his file to the Head of Department who will review the file and make a written recommendation to the Dean. Outside peer reviews of each candidate’s file are not required. The Head of Department will make a decision regarding whether to forward the file to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences with a positive or negative recommendation. The Head of Department’s recommendation will be shared with the candidate. In accordance with the *University Handbook* C49.6, “Each candidate for the award will have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the Head of Department, and each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, each candidate has the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation to the Head of Department and to the Dean.” The Provost makes the ultimate decision of whether a candidate is awarded a performance award.

The timeline for this process will be the same as that for the annual evaluation review (see *University Handbook* Section C49.4), but candidates should know that this process will begin sometime in January of each year. Prospective candidates are encouraged to

consult with the Head of Department to help determine if they meet the minimum criteria.

6.0 POST TENURE REVIEW PROCESS

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

Kansas State University recognizes that the granting of tenure 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.

6.1 Procedures for the review

- The new Post Tenure Review policy is mandated by the Kansas Board of Regents and stipulates that the review is to be conducted every six years.
- If an individual receives promotion, tenure or an award for teaching or research (such as a Distinguished University Professorship or a professorial performance award), then the timing of the review will be reset from the date of the promotion, tenure or award.
- The review will be conducted by the Head of Department and involve submission of the materials listed below followed by a meeting to discuss the materials and, if applicable, agree on a development plan for the faculty member.
- The review will produce written outputs (see below) that are agreed between the faculty member and the Head of Department and retained in the faculty member's personnel file.

6.2 Materials to be used for the review

- Copies of the six previous annual evaluations

- A self-assessment report provided by the faculty member
- Letters of reference (optional)

6.3 Outputs from the review

- The stated purpose of the review (Kansas Board of Regents, 2014) is to determine whether the current level of professional development undertaken by a faculty member in the past six years has been sufficient to demonstrate “appropriate contribution to the university”.
- In some cases, the key output from the review process will be a development plan (to be produced by the faculty member), the purpose of which is to ensure continued successful and appropriate contribution to the department and the university.
- The Head of Department will be responsible for producing brief written feedback in response to the materials submitted prior to the review meeting, and a note of the review meeting discussion.
- Documents produced as part of the review process will be agreed between the faculty member and the Head of Department and retained in the faculty member’s personnel file.

PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION, REAPPOINTMENT, AND PROMOTION OF TERM AND REGULAR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

PART III

DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

APPROVED BY THE FACULTY ON 16 SEPTEMBER 2015

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Definitions of non-tenure-track faculty positions

The Department of Geology includes a number of positions and ranks for non-tenure track faculty (see Section C10-C12 in the *University Handbook*). These include:

- Instructor (3 ranks) – Instructor, Advanced Instructor, Senior Instructor;
- Teaching Professor (3 ranks) – Teaching Assistant Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, Teaching Professor;
- Research Professor (3 ranks) – Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Professor.

Non-tenure track **instructional** faculty members, with primary responsibilities in teaching and advising, may be recruited, hired, and appointed into regular or term positions as *instructor*, *advanced instructor*, or *senior instructor*, in the absence of a terminal degree (usually PhD), or as *teaching assistant professor*, *teaching associate professor*, or *teaching professor*, if holding a terminal degree (usually PhD). Initial appointment rank and subsequent promotions in rank are based on advanced degree(s) and experience, and achievements over time within a given rank. In general, instructor ranks will focus predominantly on delivery of introductory level courses (i.e. 100-level). Teaching professor ranks will develop a portfolio of upper level courses (500-level or above) in addition to introductory-level courses.

Non-tenure-track faculty members with primary responsibilities in **research** may be recruited, hired, and appointed into regular or term positions as *research assistant professor*, *research associate professor* or *research professor*. 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.

A faculty member on a regular appointment is one hired with a regular contract and appointed to a regular (budgeted) position. The employee is also benefits-eligible based on an FTE of 0.5 or greater. He / she is not eligible for tenure but is eligible for notice of non-reappointment, in keeping with the policies of the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) and Kansas State University. Unclassified term appointments are for a specified term of between one and three (fiscal) years for both 9-month and 12-month employees. A term appointment carries no expectation of continuous employment beyond the term stated. Such an employee may be appointed to a regular (budgeted) or temporary (non-budgeted) position and will be benefits eligible based on an FTE of 0.5 or greater. An employee may have consecutive term appointments as long as funding sources are available. Term appointments are not considered for tenure and the standards for notice of non-reappointment do not apply.

For more information on the positions and ranks for non-tenure-track faculty, please see the new descriptions in the *University Handbook*.

1.2 Purpose of annual evaluation for non-tenure-track faculty

In common with unclassified tenured and tenure-track faculty members, both regular and term non-tenure-track faculty will be evaluated as part of the annual evaluation process; faculty on regular appointments will also be evaluated for reappointment purposes.

Annual evaluation is intended to describe and assess the accomplishments and contributions of each regular and term non-tenure track faculty employee and to provide guidance if outputs in one or more areas of responsibility are deemed below expectations. It aids faculty in their professional development, provides a mechanism for ensuring that the standards and objectives of the Department of Geology are met, and contributes to the ongoing process of enhancing the overall quality of the department's efforts. It is also used for personnel decisions affecting (re)appointment, promotion, and salary. The procedures and processes used for evaluation and assessment are important in that they assure that personnel decisions and faculty development are based on achievements and expectations that are both understood and reasonable. This document is a statement of the department's policies, procedures, and criteria for reaching decisions on these important and complex issues. The information contained herein is based on the procedures and criteria outlined in Parts I and II of this document for evaluation of tenure-track faculty. The KSU *University Handbook* contains the University's policies and procedures. The timetable for actions relevant to annual evaluation and reappointment can be found in Appendix B; the timetable for actions relevant to promotion is given in Part II of this document (see pages 22-23).

2.0 CRITERIA AND STANDARDS OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT FOR NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY EVALUATIONS

2.1 Introduction

The activities of non-tenure-track geology faculty are encompassed predominantly by two broad areas of endeavor: teaching and research / scholarship. Service to the department may also be included, depending on the job description of the individual. A brief description of each category and anticipated performance expectations follow below. The efforts of non-tenure-track faculty will tend to be focused in one area—either teaching (ca. 100%) or research (ca. 100%), although other proportions can be negotiated. The distribution of effort for each individual will be agreed between the individual and the Head of Department and should be consistent with the collective needs of the department and the university. In cases where faculty members have less than full-time appointments in the department, expectations of their professional accomplishments should be proportional to the tenths of the time of appointment.

2.2 Teaching

Preparing our students for employment or further graduate study is a primary component of the department's mission. Therefore, non-tenure-track faculty with a responsibility for teaching (i.e. instructors and teaching professors) are expected to:

- maintain an up-to-date knowledge in each subject taught,
- provide a clear and coherent style of presentation,
- provide a learning environment that stimulates students' interest and appreciation for a field of study,
- intellectually challenge students,
- facilitate student learning outside the classroom,
- achieve status as members of the graduate faculty,
- meet students' academic advising needs,
- be accessible to students during posted office hours,
- convene classes on a regular basis or provide an alternative learning experience.

In the context of this document, teaching includes classroom instruction, preparing new or revised course materials, conducting seminars, advising undergraduate students, and mentoring students outside the classroom.

In addition to a high standard of teaching, it is expected that faculty perform with academic integrity, promote scholarship and intellectual growth, be effective communicators, and have concern for students as individuals. The head will take into consideration as part of teaching evaluation positive or negative evidence concerning these points and will apprise faculty members when serious concerns are involved.

Minimum Expectation: In compliance with IRS guidance and consistent with the Kansas Board of Regents, K-State has standardized the assigned FTE based on the credit hours taught for those whose sole responsibility is teaching and who are not assigned any duties related to research, scholarship or service. This equivalency is based on an academic term and equates to 2.5 hours of work for each credit hour taught. If a non-tenure-track instructional faculty member has any additional duties beyond teaching, such as advising or departmental service, the FTE are adjusted accordingly. A standard teaching load for a full-time teaching appointment (i.e. 1 FTE) will be the equivalent of 16 credit hours per semester (32 credit hours per year). Low-enrollment classes will not normally be approved as part of a "standard load" for a non-tenure-track faculty member. Low enrollment is defined as 100- to 200-level classes with fewer than 15 students, 300- to-400 level classes with fewer than 12 students, 500- to 600-level classes with fewer than 10 students, and 700- to 800-level classes with fewer than 4 students. However, the teaching of a low-enrollment class that is required to satisfy an undergraduate major or a graduate program of study, may be approved, as necessary, by the Head of Department.

TEVAL ratings in the summary areas of "overall effectiveness," "increasing desire to learn," and "amount learned" should average at least a 3 or above for most courses taught. For a non-tenure-track faculty member to receive an annual evaluation rating greater than "met expectations", higher TEVAL scores (consistently greater than 4) are expected. However, TEVALs should be considered as one indicator among the others listed in this document. Other considerations could include:

- development of a new course or of novel teaching methods,
- substantial improvement in content or course materials for a course that has been offered before,
- teaching a course that has been offered before by the department but not by the particular individual,
- competitive teaching award or unusually favorable student response.

Faculty members may also want to arrange for the peer evaluation of at least one course annually through the K-State Teaching and Learning Center or from a faculty member in a related discipline who has won a university teaching award. The peer evaluation will be used to help assess instructional quality.

2.3 Research / Scholarship

Research in the geosciences can involve many different components:

- conducting scholarly studies on topics of current interest,
- developing proposals for external, and occasionally University, funding of research work,
- administration of research grants,
- supervision of support staff for research projects and laboratories,

- training of support staff and students,
- mentoring of students, research associates, junior faculty and visitors, and
- providing support and consultation to other members of the department, and/or the University.

When undertaken well, these activities should lead to a high level of research productivity in the department and to high visibility for KSU within the appropriate national and international research communities.

A non-tenure-track faculty member appointed to a research professorship will be expected to be involved in one or more of the following:

- publication of papers in appropriate journals, monographs and proceedings,
- obtaining external support for research efforts,
- presentations at appropriate professional meetings,
- distribution of materials that will aid the research or teaching of other scholars,
- engagement with the public and private sectors and distribution of materials that will increase the wider impact of the research,
- consultation with other scholars and researchers,
- development of a reputation for high quality research, and
- collaboration in research with students, post-doctoral fellows, and other scientists.

Non-tenure-track teaching faculty (instructors and teaching professors) may also negotiate time for such activities on a case-by-case basis. However, unless supported by external funding, time allocation will typically be less than 0.1 FTE. The time allocation will be reviewed each year, and renewal will depend on submission, and approval, of a clear research plan with achievable deliverables.

The complex nature of research and the number of different types of activities listed above make it unlikely that all of the areas listed will be addressed equally. However, non-tenure-track research faculty are expected to show a strong research effort, either as an individual or as a part of a group working on projects of common interest. Typically, a research faculty member will be cited by his/her colleagues here and/or elsewhere as providing important contributions to the advancement of geology.

Because research outputs do not always follow a calendar year, particularly publications and funding opportunities, each faculty member's annual review should take this into account by noting whether the faculty member is engaging in a preponderance of the activities listed above; especially in the areas of publication and research funding.

The ranking of research contributions listed under each subheading below will be used as a guideline in the annual evaluation of non-tenure-track faculty as well as in promotion processes.

Publication:

- *Journal articles.* Account will be taken of the rigor of refereeing to which papers are subjected and of the visibility of the journals to which they are submitted. Greatest weight will be given to high-impact peer-reviewed journals that are widely read, e.g. *Science* and *Nature*, but also major peer-reviewed journals that are international in scope and have high impact factors.
- *Invited review articles.* These may be particularly significant since they represent not only publication but also professional recognition through invitation.
- *Book authorship.* This may be given heavy emphasis in merit evaluations since it may represent much greater effort than a journal article. The Head of Department will make the determination of its relative weight.
- *Other scholarly publications,* such as symposium volumes, reports to industry and/or government agencies, and scientific newsletters, particularly where individually peer-reviewed prior to publication. The onus is on the faculty member to show evidence of a review process.
- Greater weight will be given to publications appearing in final form in print or on-line during the period under review. Preliminary reports and papers appearing in un-refereed journals are generally less significant than definitive papers in internationally recognized journals with high impact factors. Manuscripts in preparation will be of interest to the Head of Department but will be given less weight in faculty evaluation.
- Abstracts are not considered publications and are counted under presentations

Minimum expectation: On average, the standard in this subcategory for full-time non-tenure-track research faculty is submission of at least three manuscripts per year, with at least two manuscripts (on average) accepted for publication in a nationally or internationally recognized refereed journal.

External Funding: Receipt of extramural grants and contracts is an important indicator of research activity and academic reputation, and these awards benefit the department directly through financial resources. The weight given for grants and contracts during the annual evaluation processes 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 department. While grants from prestigious funding bodies, such as NSF, are generally regarded as the “gold standard”, it is recognized that other sources of funding also bring benefits to the department and should be acknowledged appropriately. For example, considerable effort may be invested by a faculty member working with students to apply for funding from the university, learned societies or

industry. Contributions of resources in kind (e.g. contributions of precious samples or analytical data) are another form of external funding. Traditional grant funding may be more difficult to obtain from some sources than from others and some fields are more in fashion than others with the granting agencies. These variations in the difficulty particular individuals may have in obtaining external funding need to be taken into account. However, substantial and continuing efforts in this direction are expected of all faculty that have a research component to their time allocation.

The greatest weight will be given to external grants or contracts that:

- are awarded through a peer-reviewed process,
- where the magnitude of the award or contract generates research overhead money for the department and/or salary savings that revert to the department, and
- where part of the award is used to finance one or more GRAs during the evaluation period.

Minimum expectation: Full-time, non-tenure-track research faculty should submit as a PI or co-PI at least two proposals for external funding per year, or its equivalent in support from industrial or government partners. The relative merits of this activity will be judged based on the prestige of the grant or contract, whether the faculty member is the PI, co-PI, or contributor, and its benefits to the department in terms of SRO generated, graduate students funded, and/or equipment purchased.

Presentations, engagement and impact: Opportunities to speak elsewhere generally represent appreciation outside the University of scholarly merit. The significance of this recognition depends on the nature of the presentation. A reasonable order of decreasing significance is the following:

- 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 meeting
- Invitation to speak at a non-research active university or college, secondary school or more local invitation, e.g. as part of a course or seminar program of another department within the university

Note that presentation in this context is not limited to presentation in person. 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.

Minimum expectation: Full-time, non-tenure-track research faculty members will present at least two papers at a discipline-recognized national or international meeting per year and/or engage in a comparable impact or engagement activity.

2.4 Service

Service is not typically required of non-tenure-track faculty. However, where some element of service is negotiated, consideration will be given to the time invested, the importance of the service to the department and the university, and the effectiveness with which the assigned work is done.

- Departmental service –This category includes, but is not limited to, the activities listed in Box 1 (see Part I).
- University service – This category includes service on college or university committees, faculty senate, grievance boards, advisory boards and *ad hoc* assignments to deal with specific problems.
- Public service and consulting - Includes all activities related to geology that involve interactions with the public, and consulting activities in geology.
- Professional society service and activities – This category includes society committee service or service as an officer in a geologic or scientific society as well as involvement in peer review of journal articles and requests to review applications for funding agencies. Editorship of a journal, book or symposium proceedings and requests to review manuscripts for journals are similar indicators.
- Engagement with alumni and others (e.g. other donors, industry representatives, government, etc.) specifically for the advancement of the department and its programs.

Minimum Expectation: Where the work allocation of a non-tenure-track faculty member includes a service component, the expectation will be to perform the activity assigned reliably and on a regular basis to the time equivalent negotiated with the Head of Department.

3.0 PROCEDURES AND FORMAT FOR SUBMISSION OF MATERIALS FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION

3.1 Summary and Statement of Expectations

In accordance with the *University Handbook* (Sections C31, C32, and C41), every year in late December or early January, each faculty member, including non-tenure-track faculty, will submit to the Head of Department a portfolio of accomplishments from the previous calendar year. This portfolio must include a brief summary in outline form, not longer than five pages, of the activities in which the faculty member has engaged

(teaching, research, and service). It should also include a statement of self-assessment of how the faculty member has met or exceeded his/her agreed expectations.

Meetings between the individual and the Head of Department at the beginning of the previous year (or the offer letter for new faculty) should have established the goals and expectations for each individual faculty member to ensure that he or she is evaluated fairly. Any changes to an individual's yearly plan need to be formally discussed and agreed with the Head of Department. The time allocation (or "tenths distribution") for each faculty member's activities should also have been established at this meeting.

In addition to the materials necessary for the retrospective annual evaluation, each faculty member should prepare a brief written statement of goals for the coming year relative to the categories and subcategories listed above. This statement should be submitted with the portfolio of the previous year's accomplishments. Changes to previous years' assignments should be written down as part of the faculty member's goals and expectations for the coming year, and must be approved by the Head of Department.

Materials submitted for annual evaluation will also form the basis for consideration of reappointment for non-tenure-track faculty on regular appointments.

3.2 Teaching

Documentation of achievements in instruction should include some combination of the categories below, depending on the individual's job description:

- *Teaching Load* – List classes, credit hours, number of students, and TEVALs for teaching effectiveness for each course. Also list independent studies courses and the number of student taught in these sections.
- *Quality of Teaching* – A brief statement by the faculty member should be included in the summary. Supporting documentation, such as course syllabi, should be included as supplementary documentation. Each class syllabus should include a list of topics covered, a statement of expectations for the students, a clear description of the methods to be used in grading, and specific office hours as well as alternate means of communicating with the instructor. Each syllabus must also include any information required by the university (see <http://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/teaching/course.html> for K-State course syllabi statements). Other materials that support teaching effectiveness may also be submitted, e.g. reading lists; hand-outs; information on instructional techniques; description of changes in course delivery from previous offerings; special projects or other teaching innovations; copies of exams, quizzes, problem sets showing the level of course materials; notices of awards or special recognition for educational activities; student comments showing the impact of the

instructional activities on student progress, etc. Peer evaluations of classroom activities may also be included.

- *Student Evaluation of Teaching* – All faculty members will use the TEVAL system to evaluate every class they teach. TEVAL scores in three major areas (effectiveness, desire to learn, and amount learned) should be reported. Faculty members who do not feel adequately evaluated by this means may also submit their own evaluation forms in addition to TEVAL. TEVAL reports and all student comments should be included as supplementary documentation.
- *Academic Advising and Informal Teaching (where relevant)* – Where undergraduate advising (individuals, groups or teams) is included in the job description for a non-tenure-track faculty member, this will be evaluated based upon documentation from that faculty member of quality advising, student complaints/praises of advising, the university's annual advising report, ease with which students meet graduation requirements, etc. Documentation should include number of students advised. Describe any informal teaching during the evaluation year. Informal teaching includes field trips, interaction with student clubs, encouragement and assistance to students in professional activities, etc. Informal teaching does not include the teaching of students enrolled in independent study courses (these are considered under teaching load).
- *Continuing development* – Attendance at teaching workshops or retaining a teaching mentor in a continuing effort to improve performance will be considered positively.

3.3 Research

Documentation of achievements in research / scholarship should include some combination of the categories below, depending on the individual's job description:

- *Publications* – Faculty members should provide separate lists of (1) publications accepted during the evaluation year, (2) publications accepted during the previous two years before the evaluation year, and (3) papers submitted or in preparation. Each paper should include names and titles of all authors, author order, journal name, and page numbers, along with a statement of the faculty member's contribution to the paper. Quality of the publication(s) and the journal(s) will be considered.
- *External Funding* – List separately (1) proposals submitted, including information on funding agencies, amount requested, and direct benefits to the department (GRAs, permanent equipment, etc.) and (2) externally funded projects, including funding agencies, amount funded (that year and total over life of project), and direct benefits to the department.

- *Presentations, Impact and Outreach* – List presentations and impact / outreach activities, including dates, locations, whether invited or volunteered. For impact activities, provide a brief statement of the activity and outcome, if known.
- *Indications of Research Esteem* – List any awards, but also journals articles reviewed, journals for which you may serve as an editor, grant proposals reviewed and any other measures of research esteem.
- *Research Mentoring* – list relevant research activities associated with mentoring undergraduate students, graduate students, research associates, junior faculty and / or visitors

3.4 Service

Documentation of achievements in service should include some combination of the categories below, depending on the individual's job description:

- Departmental service
- University service
- Public service and consulting
- Professional society service and activities
- Engagement with alumni and other supporters of the department.

A template for organizing the information for submission for annual evaluation is provided in Appendix A.

4.0 EVALUATION PROCESS

4.1 Rating Scale

After reviewing all the materials submitted by each faculty member (usually by mid-January), a written evaluation will be prepared by the Head of Department. For each major area, a faculty member will be rated on a continuous scale of 1 to 5 using the following categories:

5. Outstanding
4. Exceeded expectations
3. Met expectations
2. Below expectations*
1. Unsatisfactory, fails to meet minimum-acceptable levels of productivity**

** Where used for the overall rating of performance, a rating of 2 would typically correspond to a situation in which productivity meets minimum acceptable levels in one area, but not all.*

*** Where used for the overall rating of performance, a rating of 1 would typically correspond to a situation in which productivity failed to meet minimum acceptable levels in all areas.*

Where the efforts of a non-tenure-track faculty member include contributions in more than one area (teaching, research, service), the overall rating will be based

on their weighted score, based on their tenths distribution for each area (see Section 4.2, Part I). The minimum expectation is that overall performance be at least “met expectations.”

5.0 PROCESS AND CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

5.1 Introduction

The procedures for reappointment and promotion in the non-tenure track instructor, teaching professor, and research professor ranks are similar to the processes for promotion of tenure-track/tenured faculty in the University Handbook (see sections C110-C116.2 and C150-C156.2) and as outlined for tenure-track faculty in Part II of this document. The timetable for action, in terms of annual reappointment, is summarized in Appendix B. The reappointment process for a non-tenure-track faculty on a regular appointment will be initiated automatically each year according to this timetable. The timetable for actions relevant to promotion are the same as those for tenure-track faculty and are summarized in Part II of this document (see pages 22-23). The average time in rank prior to consideration for promotion for a non-tenure-track faculty member is expected to be five years, although shorter and longer intervals are possible. The process and criteria are outlined below.

5.2 Review for Promotions in Rank

The process for promotion evaluation begins when the candidate expresses in writing to the Head of Department her/his intention to seek promotion in rank. The candidate will then prepare the portions of the promotion document that summarize her/his achievements in research, teaching, and/or service (as relevant) using the format specified by the office of the provost (see <http://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/dhmanual/promotion/promotio.html>). It is the obligation of the candidate to substantiate her/his particular expertise and accomplishments, and he / she will be responsible for collecting the information that demonstrates his / her accomplishments.

In support of their application, non-tenure-track faculty will provide the Head of Department with a curriculum vitae and/or appropriate supporting materials describing accomplishments in teaching and advising, research, and/or service, as relevant, following guidelines provided above. Portfolio items to document achievement are as described above for annual evaluation (Section 3, Part III). The candidate should also include in the portfolio a listing of goals and objectives that will guide professional activities for the next five years.

The portfolio will be provided to eligible faculty for evaluation and these faculty will provide their promotion recommendations to the Head of Department. The Head of Department will consider the responsibilities of the candidate during the evaluation

period, the accomplishments of the candidate in fulfilling those responsibilities, the assessments provided independently by eligible faculty, and will use this information to provide the Dean with a recommendation concerning the promotion decision.

5.3 List of Responsibilities in the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Promotion Process

Responsibilities of candidate:

- (i) Prepare a complete and detailed curriculum vitae
- (ii) Provide a portfolio that documents activities and achievements in instruction, research, and service, as appropriate based on effort distribution. Portfolios must be in the common KSU format required by the Provost for promotion (and tenure) of faculty. See Part II of this document, section 2.1.

Responsibilities of the Head of Department

- (i) Visits with potential candidates to reach a conclusion concerning the desirability and feasibility of consideration for promotion
- (ii) Describes the evaluation process to the candidates and requests from them the documentation that will be required to ensure a meaningful evaluation
- (iii) Compiles general faculty recommendations, votes, and comments
- (iv) Develops recommendations for the Dean
- (v) Provides the candidate with a copy of the Head of Department's letter of recommendation to the Dean
- (vi) Forwards the following to the Dean: the Head of Department's recommendation, the vote of the faculty, the transcribed, unedited comments of the faculty, and the candidate's credentials

Responsibilities of the faculty (including regular non-tenure track, tenure-track and tenured):

- (i) Reviews information in the curriculum vitae and supporting documents and forwards comments and a recommendation for promotion to the Head of Department. In the event that a candidate is a member of another faculty member's immediate household or family, that faculty member shall be excused from participation in the evaluation process.
- (ii) Faculty comments transmitted to the Head of Department will be identified as to name, academic rank, tenure status, and the level of interactions between the faculty member and the candidate. Note that, per University Handbook Section C112.5, only the Head of Department's written recommendation is forwarded to the candidate.

5.4 Appeal Procedures

If tenured faculty and/or the Head of Department should recommend that the non-tenure-track faculty member should not be re-appointed, then that faculty member may appeal the decision by presenting additional evidence to the tenured faculty and/or the Head of Department. All appeals within the department must be heard by the end of April.

5.5 Report from the Dean

The non-tenure-track faculty member's file will be reviewed by the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences, who will provide assessment to the department head and/or the faculty member as needed.

5.6 Criteria for Reappointment of a Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Member on Regular Appointment

The key characteristics and criteria for reappointment of a non-tenure-track faculty member on regular appointment are similar to those for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that, in most cases, the activities of non-tenure-track faculty will be focused in a single area. Therefore, criteria outlined below should be applied on the basis of the activities assigned to each individual.

Key characteristic: Potential to become distinguished in some area of geosciences, as reflected in a record of teaching, research and / or service

Teaching: The candidate must provide documented evidence that she/he is an effective and diligent teacher. The effective teacher will be recognized by: depth, breadth, and the importance and relevancy of the course's subject matter; effective course administration; and the ability to communicate effectively as judged by the faculty (possible classroom visitations, syllabus review, etc.) and students (acceptable teaching evaluations). Other examples of teaching effectiveness might include innovative instructional methods that inspire and excite the student; introduction of new courses and/or the substantive revision of existing courses and laboratories; honors and special recognition for teaching excellence; and effective and diligent advisement of students.

Research: Research faculty will be expected to be aggressively pursuing extramural funding for her/his research program from one or more agencies/foundations/industries, and to be publishing and presenting the initial results of carefully performed studies to her/his research program. Leadership roles on publications are expected, the quality of the work to be reflected by publications that appear in quality journals and books, by the quality of graduate and undergraduate students that the faculty member attracts to geology and/or by other indications such as invitations to make presentations at meetings.

Service: Non-tenure-track faculty participating in service activities are expected to have contributed to the normal functions of the department, to have performed service on appointed committees for the benefit of the department, and/or to have rendered service to the profession by way of reviewing manuscripts, proposals, etc.

5.7 Criteria for Promotion of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty from Assistant Teaching Professor to Associate Teaching Professor and Assistant Research Professor to Associate Research Professor

The key characteristics and criteria for promotion of a non-tenure-track faculty member from assistant to associate professor of teaching or research are similar to those for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that, in most cases, the activities of non-tenure-track faculty will be focused in a single area. Therefore, criteria outlined below should be applied on the basis of the activities assigned to each individual.

Key characteristic: Evidence of developing a distinguished reputation in some area of geosciences, as reflected in a record of teaching, research and / or service

Teaching: Non-tenure-track faculty seeking promotion from assistant teaching professor to associate teaching professor in Geology must provide documented evidence that she/he is an effective and diligent teacher. Effective teaching is based on sound scholarship, continued intellectual growth, the ability to communicate effectively, concern for students as individuals, and academic integrity. The candidate should demonstrate:

- substantive, content-based instruction;
- ability to organize materials and present them clearly and logically;
- ability to arouse curiosity and stimulate creativity in students;
- diligence and skill in advising students; and
- constructive informal interaction with students outside the classroom.

Formal supervision of students (topics, problems courses, thesis) is not required, but may be desirable. The candidate should be effective in both introductory level teaching (i.e. 100-level) and upper level undergraduate teaching (i.e. 500-level and above). An important criterion will be the candidate's potential to sustain a life-long, high-quality teaching career.

Research: Non-tenure-track faculty seeking promotion from assistant research professor to associate research professor in Geology must provide convincing evidence that the he / she has developed a record of independence, has established a pattern of productivity, and is building a strong national reputation in her/his area of expertise. Emphasis will be on research conducted at K-State. The candidate's

research record will be judged for its quality, quantity, and consistency. Peer-reviewed, research-oriented publications important to the geosciences will be emphasized. Both the quantity and quality (judged, for example, by journal impact factors and numbers of citations) of research articles will be considered. Because research in some areas may produce fewer publications for a given effort than in other areas, the quantity of publications *per se* is less important than quality. Productivity will be considered in the light of the field, the teaching load, and the number of available co-workers. For collaborative publication efforts, there must be a written indication of the candidate's contribution. Extramural funding of the candidate's activities will be viewed favorably. The extent of extramural funding obtained by the candidate will be considered with regard to the availability of funds in the given research area and the needs of the research program.

Other evidence of the quality of the research program will include: invited papers and lectures, awards, reputation in her/his field among peers, potential for obtaining a national reputation in her/his research specialty and potential for sustaining a life-long research career.

The promise of continued professional growth is especially important in the promotion decision.

Where service represents a formal component of the non-tenure-track faculty member's work allocation, activities of wider benefit to the department (e.g. service on appointed committees, assistance departmental activities, attendance at departmental functions, etc.) will be viewed most positively. Service to the geological profession (e.g. participation in the activities of national professional societies, organizing symposia or meetings, reviewing research proposals, papers, books, etc.) will also be viewed positively.

5.8 Criteria for Promotion to Teaching Professor and Research Professor

The key characteristics and criteria for promotion of a non-tenure-track faculty member from associate professor to professor of teaching or research are similar to those for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that, in most cases, non-tenure-track faculty will focus their activities in a single area. Therefore, criteria outlined below should be applied on the basis of the activities assigned to each individual.

Key characteristic: Evidence of a distinguished reputation in some area of geosciences, as reflected in record of teaching, research and service

Teaching: The candidate must provide documented evidence of a 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.

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; and the achievements of former students.

The candidate should be effective in both graduate and undergraduate teaching. An important criterion will be the candidate's potential to sustain a life-long, high-quality teaching career.

Research: The candidate must have established and maintained a research program that has earned international or outstanding national recognition in the candidate's area of specialty within the discipline of geology and is acknowledged by leading authorities in the field.

It must be clearly evident to the faculty that the habit of consistent publication of carefully performed work, published in leading journals, has been firmly established, i.e. a sustained level of publication of the candidate's research findings in high-quality, refereed journals or through scholarly books is required. It is also expected that the candidate's work has been presented frequently in lectures and papers at other institutions and scholarly meetings. Although it is important to demonstrate sustained productivity since promotion to associate professor, the absolute number of publications and presentations is less important than their significance, as measured by citations and reputation among peers in the field of expertise. The publication record will be considered in light of the field, teaching load, and other departmental responsibilities.

The candidate should have demonstrated his / her effectiveness in bringing outside financial support to the department through the candidate's own research program, through proposals for acquiring departmental research instruments, or other individual or collective efforts on behalf of the department. The amount of extramural funding will be considered with regard to the availability of funds in that research area. Other evidence for the quality of research 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 her/his research program.

Service: Although service is unlikely to be a major component of the non-tenure-track faculty work load, the candidate for full professor is likely to have demonstrated leadership ability and a sustained record of service to the department. Evidence of leadership might include: service on department or university policy making and personnel selection committees, substantive contributions in the development and

promotion of research and / or teaching programs; and preparation of departmental proposals and reports.

Professional service could include participation in the activities of professional societies as committee member or officer; organizing symposia or meetings; reviewing research proposals, papers, or books.

5.9 Length and Type of Appointment on Promotion

If a promotion is recommended, the Head of Department will need to decide with the candidate and the Dean on the length of the new appointment. The options are:

- *regular* appointment, one year entitled to notice of non-reappointment,
- *term* appointment for a one, two or three year term, with no notice of non-reappointment.

Once the type and length of the appointment are decided, it will need to be communicated in the recommendation to the Dean.

APPENDIX A

TEMPLATE FOR SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION

PERSONAL RESUME

1. NAME

2. PRESENT RANK

3. ACADEMIC DEGREES

Each degree earned, year awarded, institution.

4. KSU ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT

List each rank you have held at KSU, instructor or higher, with dates. List in chronological order with current rank last.

5. OTHER ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE

List institution you have been a member of while holding rank of instructor or higher with institution's name followed by dates in residence.

TEACHING AND ADVISING

Calendar Year xxxx

6. CLASSROOM TEACHING AND CLASS PREPARATION

List courses taught, number of students enrolled, innovations and professional development activities, major course revisions, new courses prepared, TEVALS, etc.

7. THESES, M.A. RESEARCH REPORTS, AND DISSERTATIONS SUPERVISED

List any students whose theses, research reports, and/or dissertations were completed under your supervision during the calendar year shown above.

Also list those students for which you served as a member of their thesis or dissertation committee.

8. TOPICS AND PROBLEMS COURSES SUPERVISED

List courses, students, and nature of project (research problem, reading problem, remedial review, etc.)

9. ADVISING

Identify your advisees and discuss the manner in which you conduct advising.

10. GOALS IN TEACHING AND ADVISING FOR THE UPCOMING YEAR

Identify your personal teaching goals and objectives for the upcoming evaluation period and indicate the proportion of time you would like to devote to these activities.

SERVICE
Calendar Year xxxx

11. DEPARTMENT SERVICE

List contributions made to the department. Include committee assignments, special projects, editorial efforts, promotional activities on campus, etc.

12. UNIVERSITY SERVICE

List University or College committees, membership on PhD examination committees for other departments, etc.

13. COMMUNITY SERVICE

Identify off-campus lectures, interviews, consultations, testimony, etc.

14. PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS ATTENDED

All meetings attended during the calendar year.

15. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Participation in professional organizations, organizing or chairing sessions, offices held, etc.

16. GOALS IN SERVICE FOR THE UPCOMING YEAR

Identify your personal service goals and objectives for the upcoming evaluation period and indicate the proportion of time you would like to devote to these activities.

RESEARCH
Calendar Years yyyy - xxxx

17. PUBLICATIONS

Please list all professional publications, during the 5 years yyyy through xxxx inclusively, and any other works, which have been unconditionally accepted for publication.

18. PRESENTATIONS AT PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS

List all the research papers you have presented orally or as posters at professional meetings during the 5 years yyyy through xxxx together with the name of the conference, date, and place.

19. RESEARCH GRANTS

For the last five years, list a) research grant proposals that have been funded or proposals that are currently accepted for funding, b) other grants such as those for travel, equipment, educational advancement etc., and c) unfunded proposals.

20. CURRENT RESEARCH

Identify current (current year only) research activities, which are intended for publication, verbal presentation at a professional meeting, or acquisition of research funds. Include papers, manuscripts, and grant proposals that are in review, work in revision, etc.

21. GOALS IN RESEARCH FOR THE UPCOMING YEAR

Identify your personal research goals and objectives for the upcoming year and indicate the proportion of time you would like to devote to these activities.

1. OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS AND ACHIEVEMENTS

Calendar Year xxx

22. List contributions or achievements not accounted for above. Please describe these contributions in the context of your professional activities.

Signed _____

Date _____

Appendix B

Timetable of Actions for Reappointment of Faculty on Regular Appointments*

**Precise dates vary from year to year and are established by the Dean's office. Faculty are advised to consult the Academic Calendar on the College of Arts & Sciences website for detailed timetable.*

by late December / early January	Candidate submits materials for annual assessment
by mid January	For faculty in their first year of service, the department head requests feedback from faculty eligible to vote on reappointment.
by first week of February	The department head forwards recommendation of the faculty on reappointment to the Dean.
in late March	For faculty two or more years of service, the department head requests feedback from faculty eligible to vote on reappointment
by mid April	The department head forwards recommendation on reappointment to the Dean.
by late October	For faculty in their second year of service, the department head requests feedback from faculty eligible to vote on reappointment
by mid November	The department head forwards recommendation on reappointment to the Dean.