

A. Q. Miler School of Media and Communication

**ARTS AND SCIENCES
College**


Policy Statement Concerning:

Personnel Review and Evaluation Standards/Procedures

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

Approved by Faculty Vote on
April 14, 2022

NEXT REVIEW DATE: 26/27 Academic Year



Director's Signature

April 14, 2022

Date



Dean's Signature

24 June 2022

Date



Provost's Signature

7/25/2022

Date

As of X/X/XXXX

Table of Contents

<i>I. Introduction</i>	6
<i>II. School Faculty</i>	7
<i>III. Faculty Work Responsibilities, Responsibility Distributions, and Responsibility Adjustments</i>	8
III A. Faculty Work Responsibilities	8
III B. Responsibility Distribution	9
III C. Responsibility Adjustments	9
<i>IV. Annual Evaluation</i>	10
IV A. Procedures for Annual Evaluation	10
IV A. 1. Timing.....	10
IV A. 2. Annual Evaluation Materials	10
IV A. 3. Review of Materials.....	11
IV A. 4. Rebuttal.....	12
IV A. 5. Evaluation Procedures for Faculty on Sabbatical or Leave Without Pay	13
IV B. Correspondence with Merit Salary Increases	13
IV C. Annual Evaluation Performance Expectations Rating Scale	13
IV D. Annual Evaluation Standards	13
IV D. 1. Evaluation of Effectiveness in Teaching	14
IV D. 2. Evaluation of Effectiveness in Research, Scholarship, Creative Activities, and Discovery	18
IV D. 3. Evaluation of Effectiveness in Service / Administration.....	21
<i>V. Professional and Collegial Conduct</i>	23
<i>VI. Reappointment</i>	24
VI A. Procedures for Reappointment	24
VI A. 1. Materials	24
VI A. 2. Process	24
VI A. 3. Director Recommendation.....	24
VI A. 4. Candidate Notification by the College	24
<i>VII. Mid-Tenure Review</i>	25
VII A. Procedures for Mid-Tenure Review	25
VII A. 1. Timing	25
VII A. 2. Dossier.....	25
VII A. 3. Faculty Review.....	25
VII A. 4. Director Recommendation	25
VII A. 5. Candidate Notification by the College.....	26
VII B. Standards for Mid-Tenure Review	26
VII B. 1. Research, Scholarship, Creative Activities, and Discovery	26
VII B. 2. Teaching	26
VII B. 3. Service	26
<i>VIII. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor</i>	27

VIII A. Procedures for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	27
VIII A. 1. Timing.....	27
VIII A. 2. Dossier	27
VIII A. 3. External Evaluation.....	27
VIII A. 4. Faculty Review	28
VIII A. 5. Director Recommendation.....	28
VIII A. 6. Appeal Procedure.....	29
VIII A. 7. Candidate Notification by the College.....	29
VIII B. Standards for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	29
VIII B. 1. Research, Scholarship, Creative Activities, and Discovery	29
VIII B. 2. Teaching.....	32
VIII B. 3. Service.....	33
<i>IX. Promotion to Professor.....</i>	35
IX A. Procedures for Promotion to Professor.....	35
IX A. 1. Timing.....	35
IX A. 2. Dossier Preparation and Submission	35
IX A. 3. External Evaluation	35
IX A. 4. Faculty Review	36
IX A. 5. Director Recommendation.....	36
IX A. 6. Appeal Procedure.....	36
IX A. 7. Candidate Notification by the College	37
IX B. Standards for Promotion to Professor.....	37
IX B. 1. Research, Scholarship, Creative Activities, and Discovery.....	37
IX B. 2. Teaching.....	40
IX B. 3. Service.....	41
<i>X. Promotion to Advanced Instructor and Senior Instructor.....</i>	43
X A. Procedures for Promotion.....	43
X A. 1. Timing.....	43
X A. 2. Dossier Preparation and Submission.....	43
X A. 3. Qualified Faculty.....	43
X A. 4. School Recommendation	44
X A. 5. Appeal Procedure.....	44
X A. 6. Forwarding Procedures	44
X B. Standards for Promotion to the Rank of Advanced Instructor	44
X B. 1. Teaching	44
X B. 2. Service.....	45
X C. Standards for Promotion to the Rank of Senior Instructor	45
X C. 1. Teaching	45
X C. 2. Service.....	46
<i>XI. Promotion to Senior Professor of Practice</i>	47
XI A. Procedures for Promotion.....	47
XI A. 1. Timing.....	47
XI A. 2. Dossier Preparation and Submission	47
XI A. 3. Qualified Faculty	47
XI A. 4. School Recommendation.....	47
XI A. 5. Appeal Procedure.....	47
XI A. 6. Forwarding Procedures.....	48
XI B. Standards for Promotion to the Rank of Senior Professor of Practice.....	48
XI B. 1. Teaching.....	48
XI B. 2. Service.....	49

XI B. 3. Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Discovery	49
XII. Promotion to Teaching Associate Professor and Teaching Professor.....	51
XII A. Procedures for Promotion	51
XII A. 1. Timing	51
XII A. 2. Dossier Preparation and Submission.....	51
XII A. 3. Qualified Faculty	51
XII A. 4. School Recommendation.....	52
XII A. 5. Appeal Procedure	52
XII A. 6. Forwarding Procedures.....	52
XII B. Standards for Promotion to the Rank of Teaching Associate Professor	52
XII. B. 1. Teaching	52
XII. B. 2. Service	53
XII. B. 3. Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Discovery.....	53
XII C. Standards for Promotion to the Rank of Teaching Professor.....	54
XII C. 1. Teaching	54
XII C. 2. Service	55
XII C. 3. Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Discovery.....	55
XIII. Policy on Chronic Low Achievement.....	57
XIV. Post-Tenure Review	58
XIV A. Timeline	58
XIV B. Materials.....	58
XIV C. Procedures	58
XV. Professorial Performance Awards	60
XV A. Eligibility	60
XV B. Selection Criteria.....	60
XV C. Procedures for Consideration for Professorial Performance Award.....	60
XV C. 1. Materials to be Forwarded.....	60
XV C. 2. Procedures	60
APPENDIX A: TRANSITION PLAN.....	61
IX A. Procedures for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	61
IX A. 1. Dossier	61
IX A. 2. External Evaluation	61
IX A. 3. Faculty Review	62
IX A. 4. Department Recommendation	62
IX A. 5. Appeal Procedure.....	62
IX A. 6. Forwarding Procedures.....	62
IX B. Standards for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.....	63
IX B. 1. Research.....	63
IX B. 2. Teaching.....	65
IX B. 3. Service.....	65
VI A. Tenure-Track	65
VI A. 1. Standards for Tenure.....	65
VI A. 2 Mid-Tenure Review Procedures.....	66
VI A. 3. Tenure Procedures	67
VI A. 4. Promotion Procedures.....	68

- III A. Teaching..... 68**
 - III A. 1. Formats of Teaching69
 - III A. 2. Syllabus and Instructional Methods.....69
 - III A. 3. Defining Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).....70
 - III A. 4. Undergraduate Advising70
- III B. Research and Creative Work..... 70**
 - III B. 1. Types of Research and Creative Work.....70
- III C. Service..... 71**
 - III C. 1. Professional Service.....71
 - III C. 2. Academic Service.....72
 - III C. 3. University Service.....72
 - III C. 4. Civic Service.....72
 - III C. 5. Administrative Duties73

I. Introduction

The A. Q. Miller School of Media and Communication (“School”) at Kansas State University (“University”) within the College of Arts and Sciences (“College”) values and is committed to its humanistic, social scientific, and professional traditions that constitute the foundation of the media and communication discipline. Through their research, teaching, and service, faculty in the School strive to advance theory, research, and practice; enhance critical thinking, knowledge, and understanding of the roles, practices, processes, and influence of communication and media individually, relationally, organizationally, and communally; prepare students for their professional, civic, relational, and individual journeys; and engage constructively and collaboratively with others in our School, University, profession, and community. Moreover, reflecting the University’s land-grant mission, the School values public-facing and engaged teaching, research, and service.

This document outlines policies and procedures related to [work responsibilities](#), [annual evaluation](#), [professionalism and collegiality](#), [reappointment](#), [mid-tenure review](#), [tenure and promotion for tenure-track faculty](#), [promotion for non-tenure-track faculty](#), [chronic low achievement](#), [post-tenure review](#), and [professorial performance awards](#). Where pertinent, this document provides citations of the [University Handbook](#), the [Policy and Procedures Manual](#), and other University policies.

II. School Faculty

Consistent with University Handbook Section C10, the School is comprised of the following positions, which constitute its faculty:

- Professor, associate professor, and assistant professor – probationary or tenured
- Senior instructor, advanced instructor, and instructor – term or regular appointment (C12.0)
- Senior professor of practice and professor of practice – term or regular appointment (C12.3)
- Teaching professor, teaching associate professor, and teaching assistant professor – term or regular appointment (C12.4)

III. Faculty Work Responsibilities, Responsibility Distributions, and Responsibility Adjustments

III A. Faculty Work Responsibilities

Faculty in a professor, associate professor, or assistant professor position (tenured / tenure-track) normally have the following work responsibilities:

- Carry a 12-credit hour teaching load per academic year (4 courses/year)
- Advise graduate students
- Be productive in RSCAD
- Contribute through service / administration

These positions are distinguished by the possession of a terminal degree and a focus on teaching, research, and service / administration.

Faculty in a senior instructor, advanced instructor, or instructor position (non-tenure track) normally have the following work responsibilities:

- Carry a 24-credit hour teaching load per year (8 courses/year)
- Contribute through service / administration responsibilities

These positions are distinguished by a primary focus on instruction.

Faculty in a senior professor of practice or professor of practice position (non-tenure track) normally have the following work responsibilities:

- Carry a 24-credit hour teaching load per year unless research and/or additional service expectations are negotiated with and agreed upon by the Director, resulting in reduced teaching expectations in exchange for increased research and/or service expectations
- Contribute through service / administration responsibilities

These positions are distinguished by extensive industry and/or professional experience and maintaining that experience and practice as part of their work responsibilities.

Faculty in a teaching professor, teaching associate professor, or teaching assistant professor (non-tenure track) normally have the following work responsibilities:

- Carry a 24-credit hour teaching load per year unless research expectations are negotiated with the Director, resulting in reduced teaching expectations in exchange for increased research and/or service expectations
- Contribute through service / administration responsibilities.

These positions are distinguished by the possession of a terminal degree and a focus on instruction.

Faculty with significant School administrative responsibilities (e.g., School assistant and associate directors) may receive a work adjustment of up to 20% to enable them to carry out their administrative responsibilities effectively. Responsibility adjustments will be negotiated with and determined by the Director. The evaluation of administrative performance will be factored into the responsibility area of service / administration.

Graduate faculty members are expected to be meaningfully involved in and contribute to the School's graduate programs. This includes teaching graduate courses, serving as major professor and committee member, and contributing to the functioning of the programs.

III B. Responsibility Distribution

The following table identifies standard responsibility distributions. The percentages pertaining to responsibility distribution reflect the relative weight of each responsibility area with regard to evaluation ratings.

Table 1

Table of Responsibility Percentages

Position	Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor		Sr. Prof of Practice, Prof of Practice, Teaching Asst/Assoc Prof		Sr. Instructor, Adv. Instructor, Instructor	
Responsibility Area	Min %	Max %	Min %	Max %	Min %	Max %
Teaching	40	50	40	80	70	90
Research	40	50	0	20	0	0
Service / Admin	10	20	20	40	10	30

Faculty members may discuss changes in distribution percentages for the upcoming annual evaluation period with the Director during the summative evaluation meeting. Variations in distribution percentages also can occur based on certain administrative responsibilities. All weights must add up to 100%. Coaching assignments will be treated as a percentage of the teaching responsibility and will not exceed 50% of the teaching distribution.

III C. Responsibility Adjustments

Responsibility adjustments can occur if the Director determines that it is appropriate and beneficial for the School and the faculty member. Reasons for adjustments can include, but are not limited to:

- A faculty member having an upcoming significant undertaking in teaching, research, or service that will have tangible benefits for the faculty member and the School and that requires a significant investment of time (e.g., preparation of a significant external grant application with indirects).
- A faculty member consistently meeting minimum expectations or falling below minimum expectations in a particular responsibility area (e.g., low research productivity, minimal graduate student supervision or committee work, minimal or no participation in assigned service responsibilities).
- A faculty member requesting a responsibility adjustment as part of their career direction (e.g., nearing retirement).

The Director will base their decision on the performance of the faculty member and the needs of the School.

If the Director or faculty member are contemplating a responsibility adjustment for a faculty member, they must first discuss the potential adjustment with one another. The Director next will evaluate the exigency and rationale regarding the load adjustment, communicate their decision and rationale to the faculty member in writing, and then meet with the faculty member to review the decision and rationale if the faculty member wishes to meet. The load adjustment will go into effect the next regular academic term.

IV. Annual Evaluation

The School expects that all faculty will perform effectively in their assigned work responsibilities. To promote effective performance, all tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty go through an annual evaluation process intended to be both summative and formative (C30.1). Summative annual evaluation is designed to evaluate performance during the evaluation window. Formative annual evaluation is designed to assist personnel in goal planning, resource identification, and professional growth and performance. The annual evaluation process is distinct from the tenure and promotion process (see University Handbook Section C and Appendix Q).

IV A. Procedures for Annual Evaluation

The following procedures will be used for annual evaluation.

IV A. 1. Timing

The evaluation window will correspond with the academic year (August 1-July 31).

September-October: By September 15, faculty members will submit the required annual evaluation materials as outlined in this document. The Annual Evaluation Committee and the Director will review the files, evaluate performance based on the submitted materials using the criteria identified in this document, and submit their individual evaluations to the Director. The Annual Evaluation Committee and the Director will meet to discuss observations.

October-November: The Director will calculate final scores for each relevant responsibility area for each faculty member and will develop a summative evaluation letter to be provided to each faculty member. Faculty members will sign their letter indicating that they have read it and will return the signed copy to the Director. The Director will schedule an individual meeting with faculty members for purposes of reviewing the completed annual evaluation (summative evaluation) and planning for short-term and long-term goals (formative evaluation).

IV A. 2. Annual Evaluation Materials

IV. A. 2. a. Required Materials

Faculty members will submit their annual evaluation materials for review using the process prescribed by the Director. Faculty must submit the following materials:

- **Summary, Reflection, and Goal Planning:** Faculty will complete and submit a summary, reflection, and goal planning document developed by the Director. The summary section should enable faculty to identify their performance and accomplishments in teaching, research, and service / administration. The reflection section should enable faculty to give a narrative context to the materials submitted in relation to the evaluation criteria and to reflect on their experiences, challenges, and successes during the evaluation window. Faculty also may use the reflective section to make the case for inclusion, interpretation, and evaluation of other items in the portfolio. The goal planning section should enable faculty to identify short-term goals related to their work responsibilities. The focus and content of the goals are an important line of communication between the faculty member and the Director to consider both individual and School needs.
- **Curriculum Vitae:** Faculty will submit a current curriculum vitae, a copy of which will be stored by the main office.
- **Syllabi:** Faculty will submit syllabi for all courses taught (in-load and overload). At minimum, all syllabi must include:
 - Statement of course purpose, goals, and objectives
 - Program Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and, if applicable, ACEJMC accreditation

- standards met by the course
- Assigned textbook/readings
- Statement of student grading, evaluation/assessment standards, and procedures
- Schedule of weekly topics readings, assignments, graded projects, and exams
- Office hours, office location, and up to date contact information
- Mandatory syllabi statements as identified by the School, College, and University
- Other such information as added from time to time by the Director, Dean, or Provost
- Student Course Evaluations: Faculty will submit official student course evaluations (e.g., TEVALs) for all courses taught (in-load and overload).
- Graduate Supervision Activity: Graduate faculty will submit data on the number of committees they served on as major professor and/or committee member.

IV A. 2. b. Optional Materials

If they wish, faculty members may submit other materials to be considered:

- Evidence of Student Learning and Innovation in Teaching: Such evidence can include exams, special projects, and assignments (in accordance with FERPA regulations) that, in their opinion, provides evidence of student learning and instructional innovation.
- Evidence of Professional Development: Faculty can provide evidence of any ongoing efforts to improve their performance in their work responsibility areas. Faculty must make the case in the reflective statement for why activities should be considered professional development and how they have incorporated the activities into their work. Such activities include (but are not limited to):
 - Attending conventions, workshops, or seminars on pedagogy, research, and/or service
 - Participating in circles, partnerships, or other groups devoted to professional development
 - Leading seminars or workshops focused on professional development
 - Conducting peer evaluation of teaching
- Evidence of Graduate Supervision Effectiveness: Such evidence can include conference presentations by graduate students, productivity by graduate students not related to their culminating experience, and other evidence of effective graduate supervision.
- Supplementary RSCAD materials that provide evidence of quality.
- Supplementary service / administration materials that provide evidence of quality.

It is incumbent on faculty members to describe and explain the significance and implications of the optional materials in their summary, reflection, and goals statement.

IV A. 3. Review of Materials

The annual evaluation process will be conducted by the Director and the Annual Evaluation Committee.

IV A. 3. a. Annual Evaluation Committee Purpose

The purpose of this committee is to review submitted materials and make recommendations to the Director on all areas of faculty assignment: teaching, research, and service / administration. The Director will conduct annual evaluations in consultation with the Annual Evaluation Committee.

IV A. 3. b. Annual Evaluation Committee Composition

The Annual Evaluation Committee will be comprised of three full-time School faculty members chosen by the Director. At least one member must be a full-time, tenured faculty member, and at least one member must be a full-time, non-tenure track faculty member. The Director will choose the chair. Membership regardless of rank will be for two terms, except for the first year in which this document is in effect, in which one person will serve a one-year term to achieve a staggered set of terms. Should this composition not be possible due to personnel composition of the School,

the Director will have the sole discretion to create an Annual Evaluation Committee that will be comprised of at least three full-time faculty members. Committee composition should reflect to the extent feasible the academic diversity of the School.

IV. A. 3. c. Annual Evaluation Committee and Director Responsibilities

After faculty members have submitted their annual evaluation materials, the Director will provide the Annual Evaluation Committee access to those materials and will provide directions for the committee on the evaluation process. For each faculty member being evaluated, the Director and the Annual Evaluation Committee will independently review the submitted materials, make independent assessments of performance during the evaluation window, and assign a numerical evaluation for each responsibility area of the faculty member using the School's annual evaluation rating scale. Each committee member will independently review the submitted materials, make assessments independently, and submit their scores and comments independently and directly to the Director. Committee members will not evaluate themselves.

The Director will then meet with the Annual Evaluation Committee to discuss their observations. The Director can use the comments submitted originally as well as the comments provided during this discussion to inform the written evaluation. The Director will store these materials in case of appeal.

Following the meeting the Director will calculate the scores for each responsibility area and an overall score for each faculty member. Committee members' independent scores will be averaged to produce a final score from the committee for each faculty member. In cases involving the evaluation of a committee member's work, that committee member will not score their own work. Instead, the scores of the other committee members will be averaged to determine the committee score. The committee's score will count for 50% of the final rating while the Director's score will count for 50% of the final rating. Scores for each responsibility area will be weighted based on the assigned percentage for each area. The Director will translate the scores based on the evaluation scale and will include the translation in the letter given to each faculty member.

IV A. 3. d. Written Letter and Individual Meeting

Faculty members will receive the original physical and/or electronic evaluation letter, sign the original indicating that they have read the letter, and return the signed letter to the Director. Faculty members should save a copy for their records. The Director will submit the original documents to the Dean's office and will keep copies of the evaluations in the respective personnel files for each faculty member.

The Director will schedule an individual meeting with faculty members for purposes of reviewing the completed annual evaluation (summative evaluation) and planning for short-term and long-term goals (formative evaluation).

IV A. 4. Rebuttal

If a faculty member wishes to rebut their evaluation (C45.3), they must submit their rebuttal in writing to the Director within seven working days from when they received their annual evaluation letter. If the rebuttal remains unresolved, the faculty member may articulate their position, in written form with supporting documentation, and the Director will forward the documentation to the Dean. For any unresolved differences, University Handbook procedures will be followed.

IV A. 5. Evaluation Procedures for Faculty on Sabbatical or Leave Without Pay

IV A. 5. a. Faculty Options

Faculty on sabbatical or on leave without pay (LWOP) will be evaluated (C42.2). During sabbatical or LWOP, faculty may choose one of the following two options:

- Option 1: Follow School processes and deadlines by submitting evaluation materials from the preceding year's work.
- Option 2: Do not turn in evaluation materials during leave. If the faculty member chooses this option, they will receive the rolling average calculated from their previous three years of employment in the School. If the faculty member chooses this option but has not been employed in the School for three years, they will receive the average calculated from the years served to date.

IV A. 5. b. Annual Evaluation Process

During the year following a sabbatical or LWOP, the Annual Evaluation Committee will evaluate the faculty member using the following process:

- For sabbatical/LWOP for a portion of the year: Evaluation will be based on performance during the time the faculty member was engaged in University assignments. Expectations will be adjusted proportionally.
- For sabbatical/LWOP for the entire year: In the case where the faculty member has submitted materials for review the previous year, the rolling average evaluation for the previous three years will be the final score for the year the faculty was on sabbatical or leave. Individuals who have not been with the School for three full years will receive the rolling average score for the years served to date.

In the case where the faculty member did not submit materials for review the previous year, they will submit materials for evaluation of the preceding two year's work (the leave year and the year preceding) according to the School's deadline, i.e., following the normal process.

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

IV B. Correspondence with Merit Salary Increases

Annual evaluation ratings shall form the basis for any merit salary increases (C40). Actual merit salary amounts are determined based on the overall annual evaluation rating once the monetary amounts are allocated to the University by the state government.

IV C. Annual Evaluation Performance Expectations Rating Scale

In conformity to University Handbook Section C31.8, performance in the work responsibility areas of teaching; research, scholarship, creative activities, and discovery; service / administration; and overall performance will be evaluated using the following scale:

4 = Exceeded performance expectations ["Exceeded"]

3 = Met performance expectations ["Met"]

2 = Fallen below expectations but has met minimum acceptable levels of productivity ["Met minimum"]

1 = Fallen below minimum acceptable levels of productivity ["Below"]

IV D. Annual Evaluation Standards

IV D. 1. Evaluation of Effectiveness in Teaching

Excellent teaching is a high priority for the School. Teaching includes facilitating learning inside and outside the classroom, preparing and revising course materials, conducting seminars, advising graduate students, supervising graduate students' culminating experiences, overseeing independent study courses, mentoring students outside the classroom, and leading co-curricular organizations that connect directly with student learning experiences. While there can be no concise, comprehensive definition of teaching excellence, the School is committed to supporting and expecting teaching that, in design and practice, is student-centered and growth-oriented; that is innovative, evidence-based, and attentive; that blends theory, research, and practice to promote student learning and development; that reflects a commitment to diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging; and that sets appropriately high standards while supporting students in achieving those standards. Regardless of modality, level, or format, we understand teaching excellence to be an ongoing pursuit that calls for a commitment to professional development and feedback.

IV D. 1. a. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness, which includes conventional as well as emerging forms of teaching (e.g., community engaged teaching) will be evaluated in terms of overall performance effectiveness, consistent productivity, and impact.

- Overall performance effectiveness
 - Effectiveness is evaluated through a variety of quantitative and qualitative indicators, such as student course evaluations, mid-term evaluation and feedback, SLO data, innovation in course design, and peer feedback. Effectiveness is evaluated for all assigned responsibility areas (e.g., undergraduate instruction, graduate instruction, graduate advising) and in all courses (in-load and overload). The School recognizes that student course evaluations are imperfect measures of teaching effectiveness. Therefore, evaluation of overall performance effectiveness will factor in multiple types of performance data.
 - Performance effectiveness of graduate faculty includes effective supervision / advising of graduate students. Effectiveness of graduate advising can be demonstrated by indicators such as number of master's and doctoral student advisees, number of master's and doctoral students for whom the candidate served as committee member, percent of advisees who defended final products, average time to graduation of advisees, student productivity besides core work of final product (e.g., conference papers, publications, participation in engaged scholarship projects, public-facing products), and support for advisees in terms of nomination and recommendation letters.
- Consistent productivity
 - Consistent productivity is evaluated by looking at performance across courses and assigned responsibility areas rather than focusing on solely one course or area.
- Impact
 - Impact can take a variety of forms, such as facilitation of undergraduate and graduate research, innovation in instruction, and indicators from students attesting to impact.
 - In the case of community engaged teaching activities, impact can be articulated through impact statements from students and engaged community members.

Note: Evaluation of teaching is attentive both to particulars of courses as well as to the whole. Quantitative and qualitative feedback from students can vary based on type of course, student interest in taking the course, and other factors not in the faculty member's control. Moreover, evidence-based experimentation with innovative teaching practices, which is valued and encouraged by the School, can affect student feedback. Faculty members can elect to include information regarding the type and nature of their courses and assignments as context for

interpreting quantitative and qualitative feedback. Evaluators should consider this context information when interpreting quantitative and qualitative course feedback.

At minimum, all faculty members are expected to:

- Abide by School, College, and University expectations in terms of teaching load, meeting schedule, modality, and office hours
 - Carry a normal teaching load;
 - Meet with classes in accordance with the class schedule and the assigned modality;
 - Hold an appropriate number of office hours (around 3 hours per week if on a normal teaching load) and be accessible to students during those office hours;
 - Submit final grades within expectations as communicated by the School, College, and/or University.
- Provide evidence of satisfactory teaching competence using a combination of student evaluations, syllabi, and other teaching materials
 - Provide a clear and coherent style of presentation appropriate to course modality;
 - Conduct University-approved evaluations of all courses taught, whether in-load or out of load;
 - Develop and maintain a learning environment that stimulates students' interest and an appreciation for our discipline;
 - Maintain up-to-date knowledge and skill in each subject taught;
 - Develop and maintain a learning atmosphere that supports diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging.
- Hold students accountable to reasonable standards of performance
 - Grade fairly and appropriately;
 - Intellectually challenge students;
 - Provide regular and appropriate feedback to students on course performance within a reasonable period during a course.

In addition, graduate faculty members are expected to serve as major professors and/or members on graduate student committees and to teach graduate courses on a regular basis.

IV D. 1. b. Expectations of Teaching

- A rating of **'Exceeded expectations'** may be earned if the faculty member meets and exceeds "met expectations" criteria and exhibits exemplary teaching and advising performance. Such performance can be evidenced by the following indicators:
 - Quantitative and qualitative feedback from students (and peers if available) that demonstrates exemplary teaching performance across all courses taught (e.g., comparative TEVAL scores in the HM-H range or numerical scores in the 4.5-5 range; excellent performance on SLO effectiveness data; observations attesting to exemplary performance);
 - Facilitation and support for research by several undergraduate and/or graduate students;
 - Above-and-beyond performance in graduate student supervision and advising;
 - Noteworthy efforts made toward professional development related to teaching (e.g., completing a series of workshops geared toward teaching enhancement);
 - Incorporation of evidence-based innovative teaching practices;
 - Accomplishments or recognition by an internal or external group (e.g., winning a prestigious teaching- or advising-related award, being recognized by an internal or external group for quality and impactful teaching, and/or being recognized for support of undergraduate and/or graduate research).

- A rating of **‘Met expectations’** may be earned if the faculty member meets and exceeds minimum expectations for teaching and advising performance. Such performance can be evidenced by such indicators as:
 - Quantitative and qualitative feedback from students (and peers if available) that demonstrates effective teaching performance across all courses taught (e.g., comparative TEVAL scores in the HM-M range or numerical scores in the **3.8-4.5** range; good performance on SLO effectiveness data; observations attesting to effective performance);
 - Facilitation and support for undergraduate and/or graduate research;
 - Effective performance in graduate student supervision and advising with an appropriate number of advisees;
 - Incorporation of evidence-based innovative teaching practices;
 - Other indicators of effective performance or efforts toward professional development related to teaching (e.g., attend a workshop geared toward teaching enhancement).
- A rating of **‘Met minimum expectations’** may be earned if the faculty member meets minimum expectations of teaching and advising performance but quantitative and qualitative feedback (from students, peers, or others) demonstrates a need for improvement. Such performance can be evidenced by indicators such as:
 - Quantitative and qualitative feedback from students (and peers if available) that demonstrates below average teaching performance across all courses taught (e.g., comparative TEVAL scores in the LM-M range or numerical scores in the **3.0-3.8** range; mixed performance on SLO effectiveness data; observations attesting to performance in need of improvement);
 - Meeting all minimum standards as identified in section IV. D. 1. a. above.
- A rating of **‘Fallen below expectations’** may be earned if the faculty member fails to meet minimum expectations as outlined in **‘Met minimum expectations’** above. Such performance can be evidenced by indicators such as:
 - Quantitative and qualitative feedback from students (and peers if available) that demonstrates teaching performance below expectations across all courses taught (e.g., comparative TEVAL scores in the L-LM range or numerical scores in the 1-3 range; poor performance on SLO effectiveness data; observations attesting to poor performance);
 - Failure to meet all minimum standards as identified in section IV. D. 1. a. above.

IV D. 1. c. Expectations of Coaching and Advising Debate, Forensics, and Student Media

Coaching and advising students in areas such as debate, forensics, and student media is evaluated similarly to course teaching performance. It is expected that faculty who coach, director, or advise or direct are continuously engaged in program-related activities and are committed to running effective programs. At minimum, coaching and advising effectiveness is evaluated in terms of:

- Activity engagement that is regular, predictable, and consistent with the group’s mission
- Performance quality
- Meeting regularity

Evaluation of coaching and advising effectiveness will be evaluated in terms of overall performance effectiveness, consistent productivity, and impact while accounting for size and funding.

- Overall performance effectiveness
 - Effectiveness is evaluated through a variety of quantitative and qualitative indicators, including tournament placing, rankings, awards, peer feedback, reasoned incorporation of evidence-based innovative teaching practices, and other indicators of effective performance.
- Consistent productivity

- Consistent productivity is evaluated by looking at regularity and quality of performance and activity across the evaluation window.
- **Impact**
 - Impact can take a variety of forms, including impact on student participants, external audiences, and others.

Coaching and advising effectiveness is evaluated as follows:

- A rating of **'Exceeded expectations'** may be earned if the faculty member meets and exceeds 'met expectations' criteria and exhibits exemplary coaching and advising performance. Such performance can be evidenced by the following indicators:
 - The group performed at an exemplary level relative to their peers, accounting for size and funding.
 - The group performed at a level sufficient to achieve regional and/or national recognition and is being competitive at the national level.
 - The group participated in an appropriate number of activities relative to their peers, accounting for size and funding.
 - The group meets deadline in content production and produces specialty projects.
- A rating of **'Met expectations'** may be earned if the faculty member meets and exceeds minimum expectations for coaching performance. Such performance can be evidenced by such indicators as:
 - The group performed at an acceptable level relative to their peers, accounting for size and funding.
 - The group performed at a level sufficient to achieve state and/or regional recognition.
 - The group held sufficient regular meetings.
 - The group participated in an appropriate number of activities relative to their peers, accounting for size and funding.
 - The group meets deadlines and produces content on schedule.
- A rating of **'Met minimum expectations'** may be earned if the faculty member meets minimum expectations for coaching performance as defined above. Such performance can be evidenced by indicators such as:
 - The group has performed on par with or slightly below that of their peers, accounting for size and funding.
 - The group held a sufficient number of regular meetings.
 - The group participated in fewer activities than expected relative to their peers, accounting for size and funding.
 - The group makes efforts to compete at the local/state and regional level.
 - The group produces content semi-regularly.
- A rating of **'Fallen below expectations'** may be earned if the faculty member fails to meet minimum expectations for coaching performance. Such performance can be evidenced by indicators such as:
 - The group performed below expectations in terms of quantity and quality of activity relative to its peers, accounting for size and funding.
 - The group did not meet regularly or sufficiently.
 - The group makes no effort to display its skill in competitions.
 - The group fails to produce content due to the conduct of the advisor.

Directors and assistant directors of a team/group may, at their choosing, submit a written evaluation of one another within their own team/group that (a) discusses the other person's strengths and weaknesses, (b) evaluates the role the other person made in contributing to the team's performance, and (c) provides a global evaluation based on position responsibilities of the other person.

IV D. 2. Evaluation of Effectiveness in Research, Scholarship, Creative Activities, and Discovery

Quality research productivity is an integral part and a high priority of the School's and the University's mission. Research productivity refers broadly to research, scholarship, creative activities, and discovery (RSCAD, research). The School supports and celebrates the many areas, forms, audiences, and types of RSCAD productivity related to media and communication. Media and communication RSCAD is not narrow or easily defined. RSCAD may appear in the sphere of communication, journalism, and mass communications, as well as in art, business, education, health, history, humanities, psychology, and science. Additionally, the School values emergent forms of RSCAD (e.g., public-facing, engaged, and interdisciplinary research), conventional forms of RSCAD (e.g., journal article, book, chapter publication, and grant-seeking), and creative forms of RSCAD (e.g., documentary production and advertising campaigns). The School also affirms and embraces RSCAD produced by faculty who do not have terminal degrees but who have extensive, distinguished professional experience in the field.

IV D. 2. a. Research Activities

Faculty members with research assignments are expected to maintain an active research agenda that is appropriate to their field and sub-field. Research activities should show evidence that the faculty member is an independent, effective, and productive researcher who can carry out a sustained program of high-quality, impactful research.

The following list of research activities that are recognized in the School is neither complete nor hierarchical:

- Conventional scholarly products, such as:
 - Conference paper or panel presentation
 - Peer-reviewed journal article, book, book chapter, or professional conference proceedings publication (or, in the case of an edited book, editorship and publication)
 - Development, submission, and securing of internal and/or external research funding
- Creative products, such as:
 - Audio or video programming
 - Media design
 - Infographic and data visualization
 - Documentaries and filmmaking
 - Photography exhibitions
 - Video or print editing
 - Website production
 - Social media campaigns
- Public-facing, applied, and community-engaged research, such as:
 - Advertising or PR campaigns, inclusive of digital, social, or multimedia content
 - Magazine and trade publication articles
 - Newspaper articles and columns
 - Reports and documents from community-based engaged scholarship

The School understands engaged scholarship to be a collaborative, reciprocal, and systematic process involving researchers and community stakeholders partnering together in a valid, ethical, and appropriate process to produce knowledge, learning, and problem-solving that is accessible to and co-created by the involved community and fellow researchers. Such products can include, but are not limited to, publications, online repositories, websites, videos, white papers, and reports.

IV D. 2. b. Expectations of RSCAD

The final evaluation earned by a faculty member in the area of research depends not just on the volume of research activities, but also on the quality of these research activities and the extent to

which these research activities match the goals of the University’s visionary plan and/or principles of community-engaged research. For example, methodology (i.e., quantitative, qualitative, rhetorical / critical-interpretive, or mixed / multiple methods) can impact the speed and nature of publication. Therefore, in addition to factoring in the number of publications and type of research the candidate pursues, evaluation will be based on a holistic review of the faculty member’s productivity for the year in terms of quantity and quality. Quality, which faculty must articulate regarding their research products, will be evaluated using the following factors:

- Quality, scope, impact, and relevance
 - Quality: Disciplinary association sponsorship, acceptance rate, and peer review will influence weighting. Publications that are peer reviewed will be weighted more heavily than those that are not. For community engaged research, quality can be articulated through statements from communities involved in the research and other indicators of quality.
 - Scope: Outlets with national or international scope will be weighted more heavily than regional or local journals. For community engaged research, scope can be articulated through the description of product and its resonance inside and outside the community (e.g., scalability).
 - Impact: Metrics such as readership, citation levels, advertising revenue equivalence, and external reviews can support claims of impact. For community engaged research, impact can be articulated through statements from communities involved in the research and other indicators of influence, outcome, or contribution of the research to larger community needs.
 - Relevance: Outlets that are pertinent and in good standing in their academic and/or practice field will be weighted more heavily.
- Contribution and effort
 - Contribution: Relative contribution to a product will be evaluated based on the information provided by the faculty member.
 - Effort: Projects involving greater degrees of original research and/or creativity will be weighted more heavily.
- Recognition
 - Recognition can be demonstrated through items such as awards, positive reviews, and other evidence that speaks to recognition.

As with teaching, evaluation of research is attentive both to particulars of products as well as to the totality of scholarship produced by the faculty member during the evaluation window. Instead of using a “checked-box” orientation, evaluation will factor in overall quantity and quality of scholarship.

IV D. 2. c. Expectations of RSCAD

Research performance is evaluated as follows:

- A rating of ‘**Exceeded expectations**’ may be earned if the faculty member meets and exceeds “met expectations” criteria and exhibits exemplary research performance. Such performance can be evidenced by such indicators as:
 - Publication of multiple high quality RSCAD products in high quality outlets as defined in section IV. D. 2. b.;
 - Publication of a scholarly book (which may be carried over two years of evaluation) in a high quality commercial or university press;
 - Being awarded and accepting a major external grant as a Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator (which may be carried over for each year of external funding) or submitted a highly-scored major external grant proposal.

- Note 1: Quality matters just as much as quantity. Publishing multiple RSCAD products is not a guarantee of exceeding expectations. Evaluation will consider items such as authorship contribution, impact, outlet scope, and other factors identified in section IV. D. 2. b. The faculty member must articulate quality.
- A rating of **‘Met expectations’** may be earned if the faculty member meets and exceeds minimum expectations for research performance. Such performance can be evidenced by such indicators as:
 - Publication of at least one high quality RSCAD product in an appropriate outlet as defined in section IV D. 2. b.;
 - Submission of a major external grant proposal (which includes overhead/indirect dollars) as a Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator;
 - Substantial progress toward publication of a large, high quality research project (e.g., major book, major external grant that includes indirect dollars; or Impactful, rigorous, and appropriate research-based product developed with community partnerships);
 - Submission of and being awarded an external or internal grant application that does not include overhead dollars;
 - Presentation of research at a regional, national, and/or international conference
 - Note 1: A rating of “Met expectations” can be achieved for only one year based on substantial progress toward publication and/or external grant submission.
 - Note 2: Submission and/or awarding of an external or internal grant application without indirect dollars typically is insufficient to achieve the “Met expectations” by itself. Additional RSCAD productivity is expected.
- A rating of **‘Met minimum expectations’** may be earned if the faculty member meets minimum expectations of research performance and demonstrates a need for improvement. Such performance can be evidenced by indicators such as:
 - Demonstrable progress on one or more RSCAD products;
 - No publications;
 - Minimal activity in terms of presenting research at conferences;
 - Minimal activity in terms of developing / submitting research funding proposals;
 - Note 1: Consistently meeting minimum expectations can lead to a determination by the Director to adjust work responsibility expectations that reduce research responsibilities and increase teaching responsibilities.
 - Note 2: Consistently meeting minimum expectations can lead to a rating of “Fallen below expectations” in subsequent evaluations.
- A rating of **‘Fallen below expectations’** may be earned if the faculty member fails to demonstrate that they have made reasonable progress on their research during the evaluation window. Such performance can be evidence by indicators such as:
 - Minimal or no activity on one or more RSCAD products;
 - No publications;
 - Minimal or no activity in terms of presenting research at conferences;
 - Minimal or no activity in terms of developing / submitting research funding proposals;
 - Note 1: Consistently falling below expectations can lead to a determination by the Director to adjust work responsibility expectations that reduce research responsibilities and increase teaching responsibilities and can trigger proceedings involving chronic low achievement.

All faculty invest substantial time commitments when they design, conduct, and publish/or present RSCAD; engage with external stakeholders; pursue collaborative research; and prepare, submit, and revise proposals for extramural financial support. The School recognizes that RSCAD productivity can vary from year to year based on factors such as project scope, methodology used, and contribution and effort towards projects. Consequently, the final

evaluation score for research will be evaluated based on a three-year “rolling average” (i.e., current evaluation window (year 1) = 50% of research evaluation; the previous evaluation window (year 2) = 30% of research evaluation; the evaluation year prior to year 2 (year three) = 20% of research evaluation).

RSCAD products may be included in the faculty member’s evaluation materials in the year it was accepted or the year it was presented or published, but not both.

IV D. 3. Evaluation of Effectiveness in Service / Administration

Service / administration plays a vital role in the life and performance of the School, the University, and the discipline. Involvement in service activities reflects not only positive organizational citizenship but also a commitment to contributing to the effective functioning of the School, the University, the discipline, and the public.

IV D. 3. a. Service / Administration Activities

Faculty are expected to be active and constructive contributors through their service activities.

- School / University service includes serving on School and University committees, committee chair, recruiting activities, advising / directing student organizations, undertaking special assignments, serving as a peer mentor, and engaging in other services rendered to the School or University.
- Service to students includes mentoring and supporting students. This can include writing letters on students’ behalf; providing them guidance on internships and employment-seeking; meeting with them to help identify future careers or vocations; advising or mentoring student organizations; and appropriately supporting students when called upon.
- Professional service includes activities such as holding office in a professional organization, organizing conferences or sessions; responding to or chairing sessions; giving presentations or performing other activities that contribute to the discipline; judging professional and academic contests related to the School’s mission; serving as an outside reviewer for tenure and promotion; performing editorial or referee activities in the context of work done by professional organizations, academic journals, or by other academic institutions, and other service to the profession.
- Public service includes contributing to, engaging with, and/or supporting the work of civil society organizations; consulting work that benefits the University or the discipline; community outreach; and/or community-based projects that are not listed under the teaching section. Not all community involvement counts as “public service.” To count, service must be aligned with the faculty member’s position responsibilities and teaching and research areas.

IV D. 3. b. Evaluation of Service / Administration

Quality of service effectiveness will be evaluated in terms of the following criteria:

- Overall performance effectiveness
 - Effectiveness is demonstrated through active and constructive contributions to assigned service areas.
 - If there is a budget associated with the activity, effectiveness is demonstrated through appropriate budget management.
 - In the case of department student organizations (DSOs), effectiveness is demonstrated through group size in terms of number of participants, recruitment, and retention
- Consistent productivity
 - The faculty member should demonstrate they have contributed consistently and as assigned to School service / administrative assignments.
 - In the case of DSOs, consistent productivity is measured in terms of regularity of meetings and activities.

- Impact and Reputation
 - Impact is demonstrated by identifying the outcomes of their activities in their assigned areas.
 - In the case of community-engaged service, impact can be articulated through statements from those in the community who partnered with the faculty member on the activity, and/or through public documentation such as stories and/or reports.
 - In the case of DSOs, impact can be articulated using a variety of indicators, including statements from community partners and students and other evidence of reputation.
 - Faculty members are expected to practice collegial and professional conduct (see Section V).

As with teaching and research, evaluation of service / administration is attentive both to particulars of performance as well as to the totality of service / administration by the faculty member during the evaluation window.

IV D. 3. c. Expectations of Service / Administration

Service activities are evaluated as follows:

- A rating of **'Exceeded expectations'** may be earned if the faculty member has performed extensive and impactful service / administration with exemplary quality for the School and the University, students, the profession, and/or the public. This rating is earned by exceeding the expectations for "Met expectations" in terms of effectiveness, consistency, and impact of service / administration.
- A rating of **'Met expectations'** may be earned if the faculty member has exceeded the expectations of "Met minimum expectations" in terms of quantity and quality of service / administration and has performed their responsibilities with acceptable effectiveness, consistency, and impact.
- A rating of **'Met minimum expectations'** may be earned if the faculty member has performed the minimum expectation for service / administration and/or the quality, productivity, or impact of such work needs improvement. At minimum, faculty members are expected to: (a) attend all faculty meetings and be a regular and active contributor, (b) be an active and constructive contributor on at least one School committee, and (c) meet expectations of collegiality as outlined in Section V.
- A rating of **'Fallen below expectations'** may be earned if the faculty member has performed below the minimum expectation of service in terms of both quantity and quality of service / administration. In certain circumstances, a rating of "fallen below expectations" can be earned if the faculty member's actions in the area of collegial and professional conduct is determined by the Director to have caused serious, detrimental consequences for the School, its programs, its faculty and staff, and/or its students.

Faculty members who have an administrative assignment should discuss their administrative activities (e.g., budgeting, recruiting, managing personnel, marketing, and other management responsibilities) in this section. Performance on administrative assignment will be factored into the service score.

V. Professional and Collegial Conduct

All faculty members are expected to conduct themselves in ways that foster goodwill, professionalism, collaboration, and collegiality within the School. As School citizens, faculty members are expected to contribute to the mission, vision, values, and goals of the School, its curricular and extracurricular programs, its research, and its service; build, strengthen, and support the self-efficacy, reputation, and progress of students and colleagues; and contribute to creating a supportive, productive, inclusive, and healthy environment for the School and its faculty. Examples consistent with such expectations include:

- Maintaining professional rapport with colleagues, staff, and students;
- Demonstrating a commitment to pursuing and supporting diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging;
- Avoiding bias and discrimination;
- Contributing to the goals of the School and its programs;
- Honoring the confidence of School discussions involving personnel or other sensitive issues;
- Respecting and supporting colleagues by listening, dialoguing, practicing empathy, and engaging in collaborative and constructive conflict management and decision-making practices and processes;
- Supporting an atmosphere of academic freedom, inquiry, and respect for the academic rights of others;
- Upholding expectations of academic honesty and professionalism.

All faculty members are expected to follow the standards of professional conduct described in the [University Handbook](#), the [Policy and Procedures Manual](#), policies on [information technology](#) and [intellectual property](#), the [Notice of Nondiscrimination](#), [Principles of Community](#), and other policies and guidelines pertaining to collegial and professional conduct.

VI. Reappointment

Sections C50.1-C116.2 outline the University's expectations regarding the reappointment process. Faculty members on probationary appointments (C50.1) and regular non-tenure track appointments (C60) are evaluated annually to determine whether they will be reappointed. Faculty members on a tenure-track appointment must go through the reappointment process until they are granted tenure.

VI A. Procedures for Reappointment

The following procedures will be used for reappointment decisions.

VI A. 1. Materials

The Director will distribute to the eligible faculty (i.e., the tenured faculty) the reappointment files for each person going through reappointment (the candidate). Reappointment files will consist of the candidate's CV, the summary sheet from the faculty member's most recent annual evaluation, a cumulative record of written recommendations and accompanying explanations forwarded to the candidate from previous reappointment meetings, and any written comments from relevant individuals outside the School (C53.1).

VI A. 2. Process

As part of this process, the Director and the eligible faculty will meet at least 14 calendar days after the review documents are made available to discuss the candidate's eligibility for reappointment and, in the case of non-tenured tenure-track faculty, progress toward tenure.

Within two business days of this meeting, the Director will distribute a confidential survey ballot to the eligible faculty for the eligible faculty to provide their recommendations on reappointment. Identities connected with votes and comments will not be shared with the candidate (i.e., will be kept confidential). Any member of the eligible faculty may, prior to the submission of any recommendation to the Director, request the candidate meet with the eligible faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate (C53.1). Within three business days of receiving this survey, the eligible tenured faculty will submit their survey ballot to the Director. Justifications of individual votes may or may not be provided by the faculty. At the close of the voting period, the Director will record the vote.

VI A. 3. Director Recommendation

Following the vote, the Director will provide a formal letter which includes their recommendation and the rationale for their recommendation, redacted comments to protect anonymity, and the faculty vote to the candidate. The letter will become part of the candidate's reappointment file. This letter, along with all recommendations and non-redacted written comments of the School's eligible tenured faculty members and the candidate's complete file are forwarded to the Dean.

In the case of non-tenured tenure-track faculty, the Director will meet with the candidate to discuss the candidate's progress towards tenure (C53.3). In the case of non-tenure-track faculty, the Director may meet with the candidate to discuss the candidate's performance.

VI A. 4. Candidate Notification by the College

The Dean, on behalf of the College, will provide their recommendation to the Provost. Candidates are informed of the College's recommendation prior to the time that the file and recommendations are forwarded to the Provost. Final authority in resolving conflicting opinions regarding reappointment is delegated to the Provost. Candidates are informed of the College's recommendation prior to the time that the file and recommendations are forwarded to the Provost.

VII. Mid-Tenure Review

Mid-tenure review (MTR, also called mid-probationary review) will be conducted during the probationary faculty member's third year of appointment (see University Handbook Section C92.1). The intent of this review is to provide tenure-track faculty members with substantive feedback from faculty colleagues and administrators relative to School tenure criteria. Neither a positive nor negative mid-tenure review determines the outcome of the tenure review process.

VII A. Procedures for Mid-Tenure Review

Procedures for the mid-tenure review are similar to the procedures for the tenure review (C92.2).

VII A. 1. Timing

At the beginning of the academic year in which the review is to occur the Director will inform the faculty member going through MTR (the candidate) of the review and of their responsibilities concerning the review.

VII A. 2. Dossier

The candidate should access “Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Mid-Tenure Review Documentation” located at the Office of the Provost website (<http://www.k-state.edu/Provost/forms/midtenure.doc>) and complete the MTR documentation packet no later than February 1st. Outside letters of evaluation will not be sought for mid-tenure review.

VII A. 3. Faculty Review

The dossier, along with the Director’s description of the faculty member’s responsibilities, a current curriculum vitae, a cumulative record of written recommendations and accompanying explanations forwarded to the candidate from previous reappointment meetings (e.g., annual evaluation), and any comments from individuals outside the School relevant to the assessment of the candidate will be made available for review by the eligible (tenured) faculty for a minimum of two weeks (C92.2). The Director will then meet with the eligible faculty members to discuss the faculty member’s progress towards tenure.

Within two business days of this meeting, the Director will distribute a confidential survey ballot to the eligible faculty for the eligible faculty to provide their recommendations on reappointment, their observations of areas of strengths and weaknesses, and any other comments relative to the candidate’s progress towards tenure. Identities connected with votes and comments will not be shared with the candidate (i.e., will be kept confidential). Within three business days of receiving this survey, the eligible tenured faculty will submit their survey ballot to the Director. Justifications of individual votes and other comments related to the candidate’s performance may or may not be provided by the faculty. At the close of the voting period, the Director will record the vote.

VII A. 4. Director Recommendation

The Director will review the candidate’s materials and the recommendations of the eligible faculty and will make an independent recommendation supporting or failing to support reappointment of the candidate to the fifth year of service. The Director will provide a letter of assessment to the candidate, including a summary of faculty comments and suggestions. The Director also will meet with the candidate to discuss the letter. After receiving the assessment, the candidate has the right to submit a written response for the file.

The candidate’s mid-tenure review file, a copy of the School’s criteria and standards, and other materials requested by the College will be forwarded to the College advisory committee. The Dean will provide a

letter of assessment to the candidate that includes a summary of recommendations from the College Advisory Committee (see C92.4)

VII A. 5. Candidate Notification by the College

The Dean, on behalf of the College, will provide their recommendation to the Provost. The candidate is informed of the College's recommendation prior to the time that the file and recommendations are forwarded to the Provost. Final authority in resolving conflicting opinions regarding reappointment is delegated to the Provost.

VII B. Standards for Mid-Tenure Review

The criteria used for this review are the same as for tenure and promotion adjusted for the time in rank. At minimum, the candidate should show evidence of becoming an independent, effective, and productive researcher who can carry out a sustained program of high-quality, impactful research; an effective teacher; and a productive contributor through service.

VII B. 1. Research, Scholarship, Creative Activities, and Discovery

The candidate should demonstrate that their research performance is of appropriate productivity and quality as described in Section VIII and that they are making appropriate progress towards meeting the expectations for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor. The candidate is expected to demonstrate that they are becoming an independent, effective, and productive researcher who can carry out a sustained program of high-quality, impactful research. The expectation is that the candidate will have published at least two scholarly products of appropriate quality within their academic field since beginning their probationary period at the University.

VII B. 2. Teaching

The candidate should demonstrate that their teaching performance is of appropriate effectiveness and quality as described in Section VIII and that they are making appropriate progress towards meeting the expectations for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor. The candidate is expected to demonstrate that they are teaching effectively at the undergraduate and graduate levels (if assigned to teach graduate courses). The candidate is expected to demonstrate through quantitative and qualitative feedback from students (and peers if available) as well as other evidence provided by the candidate that they are able to teach at least at a satisfactory level (e.g., student evaluation scores in the M-H or 3.8-5 range) at all levels assigned. The School recognizes that student course evaluations are imperfect measures of teaching effectiveness. Therefore, evaluation of overall performance effectiveness will factor in multiple types of data reflecting on performance. Furthermore, the candidate should demonstrate that they are able to work effectively with graduate students as major professor and/or as a committee member.

VII B. 3. Service

The candidate should demonstrate that their service performance is of appropriate effectiveness and quality as described in Section VIII and that they are making appropriate progress towards meeting the expectations for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor. The candidate is expected to demonstrate that they are participating in and contributing constructively to School service / administrative assignments and committees. The candidate also should be working towards contributing professionally beyond the School, such as through academic conferences or appropriate professional organizations.

VIII. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

To secure faculty of the highest possible caliber, the University uses a selective process in awarding tenure. The University Handbook notes: “Tenure is neither a right accorded to every faculty member nor is it granted simply as a result of a candidate’s routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies” (C.100.3). The University Handbook also notes, “There can be no simple list of accomplishments that, when achieved, guarantee that a faculty member will obtain tenure. Instead, tenure is granted. This action, taken by the Kansas Board of Regents, is based on the assessment by the tenured faculty of the University that a candidate has made outstanding contributions in appropriate academic endeavors. By granting tenure only to such individuals, the continued excellence of the University is ensured” (C. 100.1). Likewise, it notes, “Promotion is based upon an individual’s achievements to the specific criteria, standards, and guidelines.... Promotion to associate professor rests on substantial professional contributions that reflect excellence in teaching, research and other creative endeavors, directed service, or extension” (C120.1, C120.2).

Sections C90-C116.2 of the University Handbook govern standards for attaining tenure. Essentially, a favorable recommendation for tenure and promotion is an indication that the tenured faculty and Director believe that the candidate has met the high standards for tenure and promotion during the candidate’s probationary period at the University and a prediction that the candidate will continue to perform at a high level in all areas of their assigned responsibilities once tenured.

VIII A. Procedures for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The following procedures will be used for applications for promotion to associate professor.

VIII A. 1. Timing

Faculty members in the final year of probation will be automatically reviewed for tenure unless the faculty member resigns. A faculty member may request an early tenure review. Ordinarily, this is done after consultation with the Director and the tenured faculty members in the School (C110). If the faculty member wishes to go through an early tenure review, following consultation with the Director and the eligible tenured faculty members in the School, the faculty member should notify the Director by May 1 of their intent to apply for an early tenure review. Under certain circumstances, a delay in the tenure clock may be requested. Sections C83.1-C83.6 of the University Handbook explain the process and considerations for tenure clock delays.

VIII A. 2. Dossier

Consistent with C111, the candidate for tenure and/or promotion will compile and submit a file that documents their professional accomplishments in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the School. By July 1, the candidate will submit a complete dossier to the Director, in accordance with formats and procedures provided by the Provost and Dean (see “Guidelines for the Organization and Format Tenure and Promotion Documentation” found at <https://www.k-state.edu/Provost/resources/dhmanual/promotion/promotio.html>).

VIII A. 3. External Evaluation

To evaluate the quality of the candidate’s work, the School will obtain a minimum of three external evaluations. The Director will request the candidate and members of the eligible tenured faculty to provide a list of potential external reviewers. Eligible tenured faculty are those faculty already holding at minimum the position or rank the candidate is seeking. For example, the qualified faculty to vote on tenure decisions are those faculty already tenured (associate or full professor). The eligible tenured faculty to vote on promotion to full professor are those already at the rank of full professor.

The candidate and qualified faculty may each submit up to 6 names for potential external reviewers to the Director by May 7 of the year prior to when the candidate plans to apply for tenure and promotion. The candidate's former advisors and co-authors cannot be external evaluators. On or around May 14, the Director will inform the candidate of the names of all potential evaluators and provide them with an opportunity to comment on the list. By May 21, the candidate may request the Director to exclude certain individuals as external evaluators. The Director will choose the names of potential evaluators to perform the external reviews, aiming to secure five external review letters. The identities of the evaluators will be kept confidential and will not be shared with the candidate, only with the eligible tenured faculty at the time of reviewing the candidate's file. If one or more of the initially chosen external evaluators should be unable or should decline to review the candidate, the Director will work to secure alternate external evaluators so that ideally five letters, but at minimum three letters, of external evaluation are obtained. By the third week of July, the Director will write the external evaluators and provide them with (1) a copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae, (2) a copy of the candidate's statement, and (3) a copy of up to five of the candidate's publications (including manuscripts "accepted" and "submitted").

The Director will ask each external reviewer, by the end of the first week of September, 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. When the Director receives letters from external reviews, the Director will add them to the candidate's promotion/tenure file along with a copy of the letter sent to the external evaluator. The Director must include all received solicited letters of evaluation in the promotion/tenure document. Letters from external evaluators, of which there must be a minimum of three, are confidential and are not to be shared with the candidate.

VIII A. 4. Faculty Review

The eligible tenured faculty members of the School advise the Director regarding the qualifications of the candidate for tenure (C112.1). By the first week in October, eligible members of the faculty and the Director will meet to discuss the case for promotion and/or tenure of the candidate (C112.3). Eligible tenured faculty members will individually review the candidate's file, considering the School's criteria, standards, and guidelines for tenure (C112.3). The Director is responsible for making the candidate's file and School tenure criteria documents available to eligible tenured faculty members in the School at least 14 calendar days prior to the scheduled meeting date to discuss the candidate's petition and for calling the meeting of the eligible tenured faculty (C112.1). The Director will also make available to the eligible tenured faculty a cumulative record of recommendations from the reappointment and mid-probationary review meetings, and any outside reviews that have been solicited by the Director (C112.1).

Within two business days following this meeting, the Director will ask the individual eligible tenured faculty to provide their recommendation on tenure and promotion through a confidential survey ballot that asks for their vote and comments. The Director will maintain confidentiality and will not share with the candidate the identities connected with votes and comments (C112.5). Within three business days of receiving this survey, the eligible tenured faculty will submit their survey ballot and any justifications, rationales, or other comments to the Director. At the close of the voting period, the Director will record the vote.

VIII A. 5. Director Recommendation

The Director will review the candidate's promotion/tenure document and cumulative record, the external reviews, and the recommendations of the faculty and make an independent recommendation by the third week of October, supporting or failing to support promotion/tenure of the candidate. Within two normal working days of making the recommendation, the Director will provide a letter which includes their recommendation, the rationale for the recommendation, redacted comments to protect anonymity, and the faculty vote to the candidate (C112.5). The letter will become part of the candidate's reappointment file.

The Director will forward to the Dean this letter, the candidate's complete file, and all recommendations and non-redacted written comments of the School's eligible tenured faculty members (C112.5).

VIII A. 6. Appeal Procedure

If the candidate should wish to appeal the recommendation of either the faculty or the Director, the candidate must make a written request for reconsideration within three normal working days of the candidate's notification of the recommendation. The candidate must present in writing the arguments for reconsideration and provide the Director with any new or additional evidence that supports the candidate's position.

If the candidate requests reconsideration of the faculty's recommendation, the Director will convene a meeting of the qualified faculty at least one week before recommendations must be sent to the Dean to consider the candidate's written arguments and additional evidence. Within one business day of the conclusion of the meeting, each qualified faculty member will submit a second written recommendation to the Director. Participation in a reconsideration vote will be restricted to members of the qualified faculty and will be conducted in the same manner as in the original vote. Within two business days, the final recommendations of the faculty and the Director will be transmitted in writing to the candidate.

VIII A. 7. Candidate Notification by the College

Following the procedures laid out in C113.1-C113.4, the College will inform the candidate of its recommendation prior to the time that the file and recommendation are forwarded to the Deans Council. The candidate may withdraw from further consideration for tenure by submitting to the Dean a written request for withdrawal. If the candidate wishes to withdraw, they must do so within seven calendar days following notification of the College's recommendation by formally resigning effective at the end of the next academic year (C113.4).

VIII B. Standards for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

The candidate for promotion and tenure must show maturity, consistent productivity, excellence and impact, and potential for continued growth in research, teaching, and service. Additionally, the candidate must be a good citizen of the School, College, and University who contributes productively and maintains professional and appropriate relationships with colleagues and students.

The tenure and promotion recommendation is based on contributions in all areas based on assigned work responsibilities over the probationary period. A candidate will not be tenured or promoted based on performance in only one or two areas.

VIII B. 1. Research, Scholarship, Creative Activities, and Discovery

The candidate must demonstrate their ability to be an independent, effective, and productive researcher who can conduct a sustained program of high-quality, impactful research. The School recognizes that multiple factors, including scholarly traditions, reputation in the field, research interests, and previous experience, influence the types of RSCAD that faculty pursue and produce (e.g., journal articles, books, book chapters, grants, documentaries, and community-engaged research products). The School also recognizes that collaboration and interdisciplinarity can enhance the quality and impact of one's RSCAD. Thus, the School also notes that multiple types of RSCAD products can illustrate scholarly maturity, consistent productivity, excellence and impact, and potential for continued scholarly productivity.

VIII. B. 1. a. RSCAD Evaluation and Expectations

In general, the School's expectation is that a candidate for promotion and tenure will have published at least six peer-reviewed research articles (or their equivalents) with significant author contribution in quality academic journals at the time of the promotion and tenure decision. Neither the tenure and promotion recommendation nor the evaluation of RSCAD are based solely

on the number of publications. For example, methodology (i.e., quantitative, qualitative, rhetorical / critical-interpretive, or mixed / multiple methods) can impact the speed and nature of publication. Therefore, in addition to factoring in the number of publications and type of research the candidate pursues, evaluation will be based on a holistic review of the candidate's body of research and evaluation of the quality of the candidate's specific research products.

The School recognizes that different academic fields and audiences interpret impact, innovation, and productivity differently. The candidate should offer relevant information or context for readers to understand their contributions within their specific academic field.

The candidate's scholarly record will be evaluated holistically based on the following criteria:

- Scholarly maturity and innovation
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have developed a coherent and cohesive body of scholarship that is appropriately sound and well-executed, that continues to build and grow, and that is advancing the field.
- Consistent productivity
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have a record of consistent productivity at Kansas State University and that they have been active and primary contributors in their scholarship. Contribution can be reflected in areas such as authorship and percentage of effort.
- Impact, potential impact, and reputation
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they are making an impact or have the potential to make an impact on theory, research, and/or practice. Data such as scholarly impact factor (e.g., H-index, G-index, i10-index, Altmetrics, and others) can be used to support claims of impact and potential impact on the field. If there are other disciplinary factors or relevant information that may influence perception, reputation, or impact, candidates are encouraged to include them. For community engaged research, impact can be articulated through statements from communities involved in the research and other indicators of influence, outcome, or contribution of the research to larger community needs.
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have a positive reputation in their academic field. Letters secured from external reviewers will be used to inform evaluation in this area.
- Potential for continued scholarly productivity
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have the potential and vision for continued scholarly productivity that will make an impact in theory, research, and/or practice in their academic area.

The candidate's RSCAD products will be evaluated and weighted based on the following criteria:

- Quality, scope, impact, and relevance
 - Quality: Disciplinary association sponsorship, acceptance rate, and peer review will influence weighting. Publications that are peer reviewed will be weighted more heavily than those that are not. For community engaged research, quality can be articulated through statements from communities involved in the research and other indicators of quality.
 - Scope: Outlets with national or international scope will be weighted more heavily than regional or local journals. For community engaged research, scope can be articulated through the description of product and its resonance inside and outside the community (e.g., scalability).
 - Impact: Metrics such as readership, citation levels, advertising revenue equivalence, and external reviews can support claims of impact. For community engaged research, impact can be articulated through statements from communities involved in the research and

- other indicators of influence, outcome, or contribution of the research to larger community needs.
 - Relevance: Outlets that are pertinent and in good standing in their academic and/or practice field will be weighted more heavily.
- Contribution and effort
 - Contribution: Relative contribution to a product will be evaluated based on the information provided by the faculty member.
 - Effort: Projects involving greater degrees of original research and/or creativity will be weighted more heavily.
- Recognition
 - Recognition can be demonstrated through items such as awards, positive reviews, and other evidence that speaks to emerging national / international reputation.

VIII B. 1. b. RSCAD Products

The School recognizes the many forms academic scholarship can take and the differing traditions and expectations based on academic field, candidate goals, and other factors. Regardless of whether products are published in conventional or open-access outlets, they will be evaluated along the same criteria. The following notes are intended to provide a contextual framework for evaluating research products.

- Peer reviewed journal articles are standard research products. Articles published through vanity or predatory journals do not count towards the candidate's body of scholarship.
- Academic books / monographs: Books / monographs are standard research products. Article equivalence of these RSCAD products is based on the criteria noted above. Books published through vanity and/or self-publishing presses do not count towards the candidate's body of scholarship. The School expects that the candidate also will have been active and successful in publishing other RSCAD products appropriate for their areas.
- Textbooks: While primarily counting towards teaching, textbooks may count towards RSCAD depending on the degree to which they produce original scholarship and advance scholarship in the pertinent academic field(s). Textbooks published through vanity and/or self-publishing presses do not count towards the candidate's body of scholarship or teaching. Article equivalence of these RSCAD products is based on the criteria noted above as well as the extent to which they are comprehensive, accurate, relevant, clear, consistent, accessible, well-edited, and up-to-date ([Review Rubric – Open Textbook Library \(umn.edu\)](#)) The School expects that the candidate also will have been active and successful in publishing other RSCAD products appropriate for their areas.
- Edited books or volumes: While not having as much weight as academic books / monographs, edited books / volumes represent important contributions to academic fields in that they collect scholarship produced by others and present them within an overarching framework or argument. Article equivalence of edited volumes or books is based on the criteria noted above. Vanity and self-published books do not count towards the candidate's body of scholarship. The School expects that the candidate also will have been active and successful in publishing other RSCAD products appropriate for their areas.
- Book chapters, encyclopedia entries, and book reviews can demonstrate RSCAD productivity. Article equivalence of these RSCAD products is based on the criteria noted above. Chapters, entries, and reviews published in vanity and/or self-published books do not count towards the candidate's body of scholarship. The School expects that the candidate also will have been active and successful in publishing other RSCAD products appropriate for their areas.
- Creative works (e.g., documentaries, photo installations, digital humanities projects) are the standard in particular academic fields and, in some instances, are opportunities to illustrate innovation across or within a medium or setting. Article equivalence of creative works is based on the criteria noted above. Moreover, expectations regarding numbers of works will

vary significantly based on the type of medium. The School expects that the candidate will provide sufficient context for readers to evaluate creative works products.

- Up to two successful extramural funding proposals that support scholarly research can count as equivalents of peer-reviewed articles. Article equivalence is based on the criteria noted above. A competitive and highly-scored extramural funding proposal that was not funded may count as a peer-reviewed article (up to one such proposal), with equivalence being based on the same criteria outlined above. The candidate must provide evidence of its competitiveness / score. The School expects that a candidate for tenure and promotion who is awarded extramural and/or intramural scholarly funding also will have been successful in publishing other RSCAD products appropriate for their area(s) of expertise.
 - Successful intramural funding proposals that support scholarly research can contribute to the candidate's tenure and promotion application in showing consistent productivity, but they do not count as a peer-reviewed journal article.
- Community-engaged research products (e.g., white papers, reports, exhibits, computer programs, videos) reflect the University's land grant mission. Up to two such products can count, with article equivalence based on the criteria identified above. The School expects that the candidate also will have been active and successful in publishing other RSCAD products appropriate for their areas
- Conference papers, panel presentation, and other invited presentations reflect ongoing research productivity but generally are not equivalent in weight to other products listed above.
- Journal editorial board service is predominantly considered service to the discipline. Because it does play a role in shaping scholarship and scholarly discourse, such service can be considered to contribute to the candidate's holistic body of research. However, in and of itself, it is not equivalent in weight to other products listed above. The School expects that the candidate also will have been active and successful in publishing other RSCAD products appropriate for their areas.

To apply towards tenure and promotion, the publisher must have formally accepted the research products. The candidate must submit evidence of such acceptance.

In cases when a faculty member joins the School with previous experience as an assistant professor, associate professor, professor, post-doctoral student, instructor, or other role, publications produced while in those previous roles may be counted toward their tenure and promotion case only if (a) the works were published after the faculty member was granted their doctoral degree and (b) the works were published not more than five years prior to consideration for promotion and tenure.

VIII B. 2. Teaching

Teaching excellence is essential for promotion and tenure. To be considered for promotion and tenure, the candidate must demonstrate their ability to teach effectively at both the undergraduate and graduate level of instruction while at the University.

VIII. B. 2. a. Teaching Evaluation and Expectations

Teaching is evaluated both holistically and specifically, factoring in characteristics, nuances, and contexts of specific courses. The candidate's holistic teaching record will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Overall performance effectiveness
 - The candidate should demonstrate through quantitative and qualitative feedback from students (and peers if available) that they are able to teach at least at a satisfactory level (e.g., comparative TEVAL scores in the M-H or 3.8-5 range; satisfactory performance on SLO effectiveness data; observations attesting to satisfactory performance) at both the

undergraduate and graduate levels. The School recognizes that student course evaluations are imperfect measures of teaching effectiveness. Therefore, evaluation of overall performance effectiveness will factor in multiple types of performance data, including student course evaluation, facilitation and support for undergraduate and/or graduate research, reasoned incorporation of innovative teaching practices, and other indicators of effective performance.

- The candidate should demonstrate the quantitative and qualitative indicators that they are able to advise graduate students effectively. Such effectiveness can be demonstrated by indicators such as number of master's and doctoral student advisees, number of master's and doctoral students for whom the candidate served as committee member, percent of advisees who defended final products, average time to graduation of advisees, student productivity besides core work of final product (e.g., conference papers, publications, participation in engaged scholarship projects, public-facing products), and support for advisees in terms of nomination and recommendation letters.
- Consistent productivity
 - The candidate should demonstrate consistent satisfactory achievement and/or growth in teaching performance at the graduate and undergraduate levels.
 - The candidate should demonstrate consistent satisfactory achievement and/or growth in graduate advising.
- Impact and potential impact
 - The candidate should demonstrate the impact of their teaching at the graduate and undergraduate levels. Impact can take a variety of forms, such as facilitation of undergraduate and graduate research, innovation in instruction, scholarship of teaching and learning, textbooks, and indicators from students attesting to impact.
 - In the case of community engaged teaching activities, impact can be articulated through impact statements from students and engaged community members.
- Potential for continued satisfactory performance
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have the potential and vision for continued effective teaching performance at the graduate and undergraduate levels.

VIII B. 2. b. Teaching Activities

Teaching activities encompass graduate and undergraduate courses; in-load and overload courses; and instruction in online, on-campus, and hybrid modalities. Activities also include graduate advising, with greater weight being given to advising in the role of major professor than advising as a committee member. Public-facing instruction, aligned with one's professional responsibilities, can also be included as a demonstration of impact.

VIII B. 3. Service

The candidate is expected to participate in and contribute to School service / administrative assignments and committees. The candidate also should contribute professionally beyond the School.

VIII. B. 3. a. Service Evaluation and Expectations

As with RSCAD and teaching, service is evaluated both holistically and in terms of specific areas of contribution. The candidate's holistic service record will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Overall performance effectiveness
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have been active and constructive contributors to School service / administrative assignments.
- Consistent productivity
 - The candidate should demonstrate they have contributed consistently and as assigned to School service / administrative assignments.

- Impact, potential impact, and reputation
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have been active in professional service activities, including service to the discipline and/or their local, national, or international community.
 - The candidate should have an appropriate and professional reputation in their School achieved through service and School citizenship. Observations by the Director, the eligible faculty, and (if applicable) other colleagues outside the School will serve as the primary data for this.
- Potential for continued satisfactory performance
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have the potential and vision for leadership and deeper involvement in School, University, and professional service / administration.

VIII. B. 3. b. Service Activities

In general, the following types of activities count towards service:

- School / University service includes serving on School and University committees, committee chair, recruiting activities, advising / directing student organizations, undertaking special assignments, serving as a peer mentor, and engaging in other services rendered to the School or University.
- Service to students includes mentoring and supporting students. This can include writing letters on students' behalf; providing them guidance on internships and employment-seeking; meeting with them to help identify future careers or vocations; advising or mentoring student organizations; and appropriately supporting students when called upon.
- Professional service includes activities such as holding office in a professional organization; organizing conferences or sessions; responding to or chairing sessions; giving presentations or performing other activities that contribute to the discipline; judging professional and academic contests related to the School's mission; serving as an outside reviewer for tenure and promotion; performing editorial or referee activities in the context of work done by professional organizations, academic journals, or by other academic institutions, and other service to the profession. Public service involves engagement activities in partnerships with the community; consulting work that benefits the University or the discipline; community outreach; and/or community-based projects that are not listed under the teaching section. Not all community involvement counts as "public service." To count, service must be aligned with the faculty member's position responsibilities and their teaching and research areas.

IX. Promotion to Professor

To be considered for promotion to professor, a faculty member must maintain or exceed the level of performance required of the Associate Professor in all assigned responsibility areas. Promotion to professor is based on attainment of excellence in the assigned responsibilities of the faculty member and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies (C120.2). To be clear, promotion to professor is not solely based on one area of accomplishment. It is a recognition of superior professional accomplishment and excellence in the performance of assigned duties (C140).

IX A. Procedures for Promotion to Professor

The following procedures will be used for applications for promotion to professor.

IX A. 1. Timing

While there is no formal requirement for time in rank, the median time for promotion at Kansas State University has been approximately six years. Promotion may be granted earlier when the faculty member's cumulative performance at rank clearly meets the standards for promotion while at the University (C131). The faculty member, after consultation with the Director, may request a review for promotion (C151). The faculty member should notify the Director by May 1 of their request to be reviewed for promotion.

IX A. 2. Dossier Preparation and Submission

By July 1, the candidate for promotion will compile and submit a dossier to the Director (C111), in accordance with formats and procedures provided by the Provost and Dean (see "Guidelines for the Organization and Format Tenure and Promotion Documentation" found at: <https://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/forms/promotio.doc>). Also see <https://www.k-state.edu/Provost/resources/dhmanual/promotion/promotio.html>). The dossier should document their professional accomplishments in accordance with the School's criteria, standards, and guidelines.

IX A. 3. External Evaluation

To evaluate the quality of the candidate's work, the School will obtain a minimum of three external evaluations. The Director will request the candidate and members of the eligible tenured faculty to provide a list of potential external reviewers. Eligible tenured faculty are those faculty already holding at minimum the position or rank the candidate is seeking (C152.1).

The candidate and qualified faculty may each submit up to 6 names for potential external reviewers to the Director by May 7. The candidate's former advisors and co-authors are specifically excluded as possible evaluators. On or around May 14, the Director will inform the candidate of the names of all potential evaluators and provide them with an opportunity to comment on the list. By May 21, the candidate may request the Director to exclude certain individuals as external evaluators. The Director will choose the names of potential evaluators to perform the external reviews, aiming to secure five external review letters. The Director will keep the identities of the evaluators confidential from the candidate and will share them only with the eligible tenured faculty at the time of reviewing the candidate's file. If one or more of the initially chosen external evaluators should be unable or should decline to review the candidate, the Director will work to secure alternate external evaluators so that ideally five letters, but at minimum three letters, of external evaluation are obtained. By the third week of July, the Director will write the external evaluators and provide them with (1) a copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae, (2) a copy of the candidate's statement, and (3) a copy of up to five of the candidate's publications (including manuscripts "accepted" and "submitted").

The Director will ask each external reviewer 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. When the letters from external reviews are received, the Director will add them to the candidate's promotion document. A copy of the letter that was sent to the external evaluator will accompany the completed external reviews, of which there must be a minimum of three. The Director must include in the promotion document all solicited letters of evaluation received concerning the candidate. Letters should be returned to the Director by the end of the first week of September. Letters from external evaluators are confidential and are not to be shared with the candidate.

IX A. 4. Faculty Review

The eligible tenured faculty members of the School will advise the Director regarding the qualifications of the candidate for promotion (C152.1). By the first week in October, eligible members of the faculty and the Director will meet to discuss the case for promotion of the candidate (C152.3). Eligible tenured faculty members will individually review the candidate's file, considering the School's criteria, standards, and guidelines for tenure (C152.3). The Director is responsible for making the candidate's file and School tenure criteria documents available to eligible tenured faculty members in the School at least 14 calendar days prior to the scheduled meeting date to discuss the candidate's petition and for calling the meeting of the eligible tenured faculty (C152.1). The Director will make available to the eligible tenured faculty a compilation of the candidate's professional accomplishments during tenure in the current rank and comments from other individuals relevant to the assessment of the candidate's performance (C152.1).

Within two business days following this meeting, the Director will ask the individual eligible tenured faculty to provide their recommendation on promotion through a confidential survey ballot that asks for their vote and comments. The Director will not share with the candidate and will keep confidential the identities connected with votes or comments (C152.5). Within three business days of receiving this survey, the eligible tenured faculty will submit their survey ballot to the Director. Justifications of individual votes may or may not be provided by the faculty. At the close of the voting period, the Director will record the vote.

IX A. 5. Director Recommendation

The Director will review the candidate's promotion document and cumulative record, the external reviews, and the recommendations of the faculty and make an independent recommendation on promotion by the third week of October. Within two normal working days of making the recommendation, the Director will provide a letter which includes their recommendation, the rationale for the recommendation, redacted comments to protect anonymity, and the faculty vote to the candidate (C152.5). The letter will become part of the candidate's reappointment file. This letter, along with all recommendations and non-redacted written comments of the School's eligible tenured faculty members and the candidate's complete file are also forwarded to the Dean (C152.5).

IX A. 6. Appeal Procedure

If the candidate should wish to appeal the recommendation of either the faculty or the Director, the candidate must make a written request for reconsideration within three normal working days of the candidate's notification of the recommendations. The candidate must present in writing the arguments for reconsideration and provide the Director with any additional evidence that supports the candidate's position.

If the candidate requests reconsideration of the faculty's recommendation, the Director will convene a meeting of the qualified faculty at least one week before recommendations must be sent to the Dean to consider the candidate's written arguments and additional evidence. Within one business day of the conclusion of the meeting, each qualified faculty member will submit a second, written recommendation to the Director. Participation in a reconsideration vote will be restricted to members of the qualified

faculty and will be conducted in the same manner as in the original vote. Within two business days, the final recommendations of the faculty and the Director will be transmitted in writing to the candidate.

IX A. 7. Candidate Notification by the College

Following the procedures laid out in the University Handbook sections C153.1-C153.4, candidates are informed of the College's recommendations prior to the time that the file and recommendations are forwarded to the Deans Council. Candidates may withdraw from further consideration for promotion by submitting to the Dean a written request for withdrawal (C153.4). This must be done within seven calendar days following notification of the College's recommendation.

IX B. Standards for Promotion to Professor

The School is charged to establish criteria and standards (C141) consistent with the general principle of superior professional accomplishment and excellence in the performance of assigned duties (C140).

To be promoted to professor, the candidate must demonstrate that, since their last promotion and during their time at the University, they have established a national or international reputation in the discipline or within their sub-discipline and have achieved superior accomplishment in all aspects of their scholarship – teaching, research, and service / administration. The candidate also should demonstrate their commitment to mentoring graduate students and junior faculty.

IX B. 1. Research, Scholarship, Creative Activities, and Discovery

The candidate must demonstrate their ability to be an independent, effective, and productive researcher who can carry out a sustained program of high-quality, impactful research. The School recognizes that multiple factors, including scholarly traditions, reputation in the field, research interests, and previous experience, influence the types of RSCAD that faculty pursue and produce (e.g., journal articles, books, book chapters, grants, documentaries, and community-engaged research products). The School also recognizes that collaboration and interdisciplinarity can enhance the quality and impact of one's RSCAD. Thus, the School explicitly notes that multiple types of RSCAD products can illustrate scholarly maturity, consistent productivity, excellence and impact, and potential for continued scholarly productivity.

IX B. 1. a. RSCAD Evaluation and Expectations

In general, the School's expectation is that a candidate for promotion and tenure will have published at least seven peer-reviewed research articles (or their equivalents) with significant author contribution in quality academic journals at the time of the promotion and tenure decision. The publications must not have been counted in the candidate's application for tenure and promotion to associate professor and must have been published after the candidate's submission of their application for tenure and promotion. Neither the tenure and promotion recommendation nor the evaluation of RSCAD are based solely on the number of publications. For example, methodology (i.e., quantitative, qualitative, or mixed/multiple methods) can impact the speed and nature of publication. Therefore, in addition to factoring in the number of publications and type of research the candidate pursues, evaluation will be based on a holistic review of the candidate's body of research and evaluation of the quality of the candidate's specific research products.

The School recognizes that impact, innovation, and productivity are measured differently across academic fields and audiences. The candidate should offer relevant information or context for readers to understand their contributions within their specific academic field.

The candidate's holistic scholarly record will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Scholarly innovation and superior accomplishment
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have developed a coherent and cohesive body of scholarship that is appropriately sound and well-executed, that has attained national /

international prominence, that has demonstrated superior growth and accomplishment since their last promotion, and that is advancing the field.

- Consistent productivity
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have a record of consistent productivity at Kansas State University and that they have been active and primary contributors in their scholarship since their last promotion. Contribution can be reflected in areas such as authorship and percentage of effort.
- Impact, potential impact, and reputation
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have made a noteworthy impact on the scholarly field. Data such as scholarly impact factor (e.g., H-index, G-index, i10-index) can be used to support claims of impact and potential impact on the field. For community engaged research, impact can be articulated through statements from communities involved in the research and other indicators of influence, outcome, or contribution of the research to larger community needs.
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have a positive reputation in their academic field. Letters secured from external reviewers will be used to inform evaluation in this area.
- Potential for continued scholarly productivity
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have the potential and vision for continued scholarly productivity that will continue to make an impact in theory, research, and/or practice in their academic area. This will be reflected in the research plan submitted by the candidate covering the next five years.

The candidate's RSCAD products will be evaluated and weighted based on the following criteria:

- Quality, scope, impact, and relevance
 - Quality: Disciplinary association sponsorship, acceptance rate, and peer review will influence weighting. Publications that are peer reviewed will be weighted more heavily than those that are not. For community engaged research, quality can be articulated through statements from communities involved in the research and other indicators of quality.
 - Scope: Outlets with national or international scope will be weighted more heavily than regional or local journals. For community engaged research, scope can be articulated through the description of product and its resonance inside and outside the community (e.g., scalability).
 - Impact: Metrics such as readership, citation levels, advertising revenue equivalence, and external reviews can support claims of impact. For community engaged research, impact can be articulated through statements from communities involved in the research and other indicators of influence, outcome, or contribution of the research to larger community needs.
 - Relevance: Outlets that are pertinent and in good standing in their academic and/or practice field will be weighted more heavily.
- Contribution and effort
 - Contribution: Relative contribution to a product will be evaluated based on the information provided by the faculty member.
 - Effort: Projects involving greater degrees of original research and/or creativity will be weighted more heavily.
- Recognition
 - Recognition can be demonstrated through items such as awards, positive reviews, and other evidence that speaks to national / international reputation.

IX B. 1. b. RSCAD Products

The School recognizes the many forms academic scholarship can take and the differing traditions and expectations based on academic field, candidate goals, and other factors. Regardless of whether products are published in conventional or open-access outlets, they will be evaluated along the same criteria. The following notes are intended to provide a contextual framework for evaluating research products.

- Peer reviewed journal articles are standard research products. Articles published through vanity or predatory journals do not count towards the candidate's body of scholarship.
- Academic books / monographs: Books / monographs are standard research products. Article equivalence of these RSCAD products is based on the criteria noted above. Books published through vanity and/or self-publishing presses do not count towards the candidate's body of scholarship. It is expected that the candidate also will have been active and successful in publishing other RSCAD products appropriate for their areas.
- Textbooks: While primarily counting towards teaching, textbooks may count towards RSCAD depending on the degree to which they produce original scholarship and advance scholarship in the pertinent academic field(s). Textbooks published through vanity and/or self-publishing presses do not count towards the candidate's body of scholarship or teaching. Article equivalence of these RSCAD products is based on the criteria noted above as well as the extent to which they are comprehensive, accurate, relevant, clear, consistent, accessible, well-edited, and up-to- date ([Review Rubric – Open Textbook Library \(umn.edu\)](#)) It is expected that the candidate also will have been active and successful in publishing other RSCAD products appropriate for their areas.
- Edited books or volumes: While not having as much weight as academic books / monographs, edited books / volumes represent important contributions to academic fields in that they collect scholarship produced by others and present them within an overarching framework or argument. Article equivalence of edited volumes or books is based on the criteria noted above. Vanity and self-published books do not count towards the candidate's body of scholarship. It is expected that the candidate also will have been active and successful in publishing other RSCAD products appropriate for their areas.
- Book chapters, encyclopedia entries, and book reviews can demonstrate RSCAD productivity. Article equivalence of these RSCAD products is based on the criteria noted above. Chapters, entries, and reviews published in vanity and/or self-published books do not count towards the candidate's body of scholarship. It is expected that the candidate also will have been active and successful in publishing other RSCAD products appropriate for their areas.
- Creative works (e.g., documentaries, photo installations, digital humanities projects) are the standard in particular academic fields and, in some instances, are opportunities to showcase innovation across or within a medium or setting. Article equivalence of creative works is based on the criteria noted above. Moreover, expectations regarding numbers of works will vary significantly based on the type of medium. It is expected that the candidate will provide sufficient context for readers to evaluate creative works products.
- Up to two successful extramural funding proposals that support scholarly research can count as equivalents of peer-reviewed articles. Article equivalence is based on the criteria noted above. A competitive and highly-scored extramural funding proposal that was not funded may count as a peer-reviewed article (up to one such proposal), with equivalence being based on the same criteria outlined above. The candidate must provide evidence of its competitiveness/score. It is expected that a candidate for tenure and promotion who is awarded extramural and/or intramural scholarly funding also will have been successful in publishing other RSCAD products appropriate for their area(s) of expertise.
 - The candidate should be involved in and show evidence of applying for extramural funding.

- Community-engaged research products (e.g., white papers, reports, exhibits, computer programs, videos) reflect the University's land grant mission. Up to two such products can be counted, with article equivalence based on the criteria identified above. It is expected that the candidate also will have been active and successful in publishing other RSCAD products appropriate for their areas
- Conference papers, panel presentation, and other invited presentations reflect ongoing research productivity but generally are not equivalent in weight to other products listed above.
- Journal editorial board service is predominantly considered service to the discipline. Because it does play a role in shaping scholarship and scholarly discourse, such service can be considered to contribute to the candidate's holistic body of research. However, in and of itself, it is not equivalent in weight to other products listed above. The School expects that the candidate also will have been active and successful in publishing other RSCAD products appropriate for their areas.

IX B. 2. Teaching

Candidates for promotion to professor are expected to demonstrate teaching excellence as instructors, as major professors for graduate students, and (if applicable) as advisors / mentors for undergraduate students. Candidates must have evidence of effective supervision of graduate students. Collaboration with graduate students and undergraduate students on research demonstrates commitment to effective teaching at all levels.

IX B. 2. a Teaching Evaluation and Expectations

Teaching is evaluated both holistically and specifically, factoring in characteristics, nuances, and contexts of specific courses. The candidate's holistic teaching record will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Overall performance effectiveness
 - The candidate should demonstrate through quantitative and qualitative feedback from students (and peers if available) that they are able to teach at least at a superior level (e.g., comparative TEVAL scores in the HM-H or 4-5 range; excellent performance on SLO effectiveness data; observations attesting to superior performance) at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The School recognizes that student course evaluations are imperfect measures of teaching effectiveness. Therefore, evaluation of overall performance effectiveness will factor in multiple types of performance data, including student course evaluation, facilitation and support for undergraduate and/or graduate research, reasoned incorporation of innovative teaching practices, and other indicators of effective performance.
 - Performance effectiveness includes effective supervision / advising of graduate students. The candidate should demonstrate through quantitative and/or qualitative feedback that they have been effective at supervising graduate students. Such effectiveness can be demonstrated by indicators such as number of master's and doctoral student advisees, number of master's and doctoral students for whom the candidate served as committee member, percent of advisees who defended final products, average time to graduation of advisees, student productivity besides core work of final product (e.g., conference papers, publications, participation in engaged scholarship projects, public-facing products), and support for advisees in terms of nomination and recommendation letters.
- Consistent productivity
 - The candidate should demonstrate consistent superior achievement and/or growth in teaching performance at the graduate and undergraduate levels. This includes course instruction as well as graduate advising.
- Impact and Potential Impact

- The candidate should demonstrate the impact of their teaching at the graduate and undergraduate levels. Impact can take a variety of forms, such as facilitation of undergraduate and graduate research, innovation in instruction, scholarship of teaching and learning, textbooks, and indicators from students attesting to impact.
- In the case of community engaged teaching activities, impact can be articulated through impact statements from students and engaged community members.
- Potential for Continued Superior Performance
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have the potential and vision for continued effective teaching performance at the graduate and undergraduate levels.

IX B. 2. b. Teaching Activities

Teaching activities encompass graduate and undergraduate courses; in-load and overload courses; and instruction in online, on-campus, and hybrid modalities. Activities also include graduate advising, with greater weight being given to advising in the role of major professor than advising as a committee member. Public-facing instruction, aligned with one’s professional responsibilities, can also be included as a demonstration of impact.

IX B. 3. Service

The candidate for professor should demonstrate significant, effective involvement and leadership in areas of University; School; professional; and/or local, national, or international community service related to his or her expertise.

IX B. 3. a. Service Evaluation and Expectations

As with RSCAD and teaching, service is evaluated both holistically and in terms of specific areas of contribution. The candidate’s holistic service record will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Overall performance effectiveness
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have contributed significantly and meaningfully to School service / administration.
- Consistent productivity
 - The candidate should demonstrate they have contributed consistently and constructively in assigned School service / administration.
- Impact, Potential Impact, and Reputation
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have been active and have practiced leadership in professional service activities, including service to the discipline and/or their local, national, or international community.
 - The candidate should have an appropriate and professional reputation in their School achieved through service and School citizenship. Observations by the Director, the eligible faculty, and (if applicable) other colleagues outside the School will serve as the primary data for this.
- Potential for Continued Satisfactory Performance
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have the potential and vision for leadership and continued meaningful involvement in School, University, and professional service / administration.

IX B. 3. b. Service Activities

In general, the following types of activities reflect significant involvement and leadership in service:

- At the School, College, or University level, leading committees, advising/directing student organizations or other affiliated organizations (e.g., ICDD), undertaking special assignments, serving as a peer mentor, and engaging in other services rendered to the School or University.
- At the student level, writing letters on students' behalf, providing them guidance on internships and employment-seeking, meeting with them to help identify future careers or vocations, and providing above-and-beyond support for students when called upon.
- At the professional level, holding office in a professional organization; organizing conferences or sessions; responding to or chairing sessions; giving presentations or performing other activities that advance the discipline; judging professional and academic contests related to the School's mission; serving as an outside reviewer for tenure and promotion; serving on editorial boards or performing evaluative activities for professional organizations, academic journals, or other academic institutions; and other service to the profession.
- At the public level, engaging in community partnerships, performing consulting work that benefits the University or the discipline, and providing leadership on projects not listed under the teaching section. Not all community involvement counts as "public service." To count, service must be aligned with the faculty member's position responsibilities and their teaching and research areas.

X. Promotion to Advanced Instructor and Senior Instructor

The process for considering promotion for faculty in the rank of instructor is similar to those discussed in the University Handbook. Typically, the average time in rank prior to consideration for promotion to advanced instructor is approximately five (5) years and three (3) years after that for promotion to senior instructor, although shorter or longer periods are possible.

Though research and creative works are generally not weighed in the review process for non-tenure track faculty in titles other than the Research Professor ranks, those who produce such achievement may submit details and examples of their research for consideration in their promotion. A non-tenure track faculty member may also request an early review for promotion, which may or may not be granted after consultation with the School's Director.

X A. Procedures for Promotion

The School will use the following procedures for applications for promotion to advanced instructor and senior instructor positions.

X A. 1. Timing

The candidate for promotion will notify the Director in writing that they wish to be considered for promotion to the next rank by May 1 of the academic year prior to which they plan to seek promotion.

X A. 2. Dossier Preparation and Submission

By July 1, the candidate for promotion will submit a complete dossier consisting of:

- CV
- Reflective statement
- One-year plan
- Five-year plan
- Evidence of teaching effectiveness
- Evidence of service activities
- Evidence of research productivity (if relevant)

These materials will be made available for the qualified faculty and the Director to review. The process and timeline for reviewing and deliberating on the application for promotion will follow that used for tenure-track faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion.

X A. 3. Qualified Faculty

Qualified faculty include the School's (a) tenure-track faculty who already have earned tenure and promotion (i.e., associate professors and full professors) and (b) non-tenure-track faculty who have attained the rank above the candidate's current rank. That is, associate professors, full professors, advanced instructors, senior instructors, teaching associate professors, teaching professors and senior professors of practice in the School will review the case of an instructor seeking promotion to the rank of advanced instructor. Associate professors, full professors, senior instructors, teaching professors, and senior professors of practice in the School will review the case of an advanced instructor seeking promotion to the rank of senior instructor.

In instances where there are no qualified non-tenure-track faculty available within the School to review a candidate's application, the qualified faculty will include only tenured faculty.

X A. 4. School Recommendation

The Director will review the candidate's promotion document and the recommendations of the qualified faculty and make an independent recommendation by the third week of October, supporting or failing to support promotion of the candidate. Within two normal working days of making the recommendation, the Director will explain their recommendation to the candidate and the qualified members.

X A. 5. Appeal Procedure

If the candidate should wish to appeal the recommendation of either the faculty or the Director, the candidate must make the request for reconsideration in writing within three normal working days of the candidate's notification of the recommendations. The candidate must present in writing the arguments for reconsideration and provide to the Director any additional evidence that supports the candidate's position.

If the candidate requests reconsideration of the faculty's recommendation, the Director will convene a meeting of the qualified faculty at least one week before recommendations must be sent to the Dean to consider the candidate's written arguments and additional evidence. Within one business day of the conclusion of the meeting, each qualified faculty member will submit a second, written recommendation to the Director. Participation in a reconsideration vote will be restricted to members of the qualified faculty and will be conducted in the same manner as in the original vote. The final recommendations of the faculty and the Director will be transmitted in writing to the candidate and to qualified faculty.

X A. 6. Forwarding Procedures

After the candidate has reviewed the recommendations, the candidate decides whether to withdraw their application. If the candidate wishes to continue the process, then the promotion document is forwarded to the Dean. The Director will include the results of the secret ballot, all recommendations and non-redacted written comments of the School's qualified faculty members, the candidate's complete file, and their written recommendation.

X B. Standards for Promotion to the Rank of Advanced Instructor

To be considered for promotion to advanced instructor, the candidate must demonstrate excellence in all assigned work responsibilities and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies. Promotion to advanced instructor is not solely based on one area of accomplishment. It is a recognition of excellence performance in all areas of assignment.

X B. 1. Teaching

Candidates for promotion to advanced instructor are expected to demonstrate teaching excellence. Teaching is evaluated both specifically and holistically, factoring in characteristics, nuances, and contexts. The candidate's holistic teaching record will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

X B. 1. a. Teaching Evaluation and Expectations

The candidate's holistic teaching record will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Overall performance effectiveness
 - The candidate should demonstrate through quantitative and qualitative feedback from students (and peers if available) that they are able to teach at least at a satisfactory level (e.g., comparative TEVAL scores in the M-H or 3.8-5 range; appropriate performance on SLO effectiveness data; observations attesting to satisfactory performance) at all levels assigned. The School recognizes that student course evaluations are imperfect measures of teaching effectiveness. Therefore, evaluation of overall performance effectiveness will factor in multiple types of performance data, including student course evaluation, facilitation and support for undergraduate and/or graduate research, reasoned incorporation of innovative teaching practices, and other indicators of effective performance.

- Consistent productivity
 - The candidate should demonstrate consistent excellent performance in teaching at the undergraduate level.
- Impact and potential impact
 - The candidate should demonstrate the impact of their teaching. Impact can take a variety of forms, such as innovation in instruction, scholarship of teaching and learning, textbooks, and indicators from students attesting to impact.
 - In the case of community engaged teaching activities, impact can be articulated through impact statements from students and engaged community members.
- Potential for continued satisfactory performance
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have the potential and vision for continued effective teaching performance.

X B. 2. b. Teaching Activities

Teaching activities encompass undergraduate courses; in-load and overload courses; and instruction in online, on-campus, and hybrid modalities. Public-facing instruction, aligned with one’s professional responsibilities, can also be included as a demonstration of impact.

X B. 2. Service

The candidate is expected to participate in and contribute to School service / administration.

X B. 2. a. Service Evaluation and Expectations

As with teaching, service is evaluated both holistically and in terms of specific areas of contribution. The candidate’s holistic service record will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Overall performance effectiveness
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have been active and constructive contributors to School service / administration and, if applicable, other professional areas.
- Consistent productivity
 - The candidate should demonstrate they have contributed consistently and as assigned to School service / administration.
- Reputation
 - The candidate should have an appropriate and professional reputation in their School achieved through service and School citizenship. Observations by the Director, the eligible faculty, and (if applicable) other colleagues outside the School will serve as the primary data for this.
- Potential for continued satisfactory performance
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have the potential and vision for leadership and deeper involvement in School service / administration.

X C. Standards for Promotion to the Rank of Senior Instructor

To be considered for promotion to senior instructor, the candidate must demonstrate superior accomplishment in all assigned work responsibilities and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies. Promotion to senior instructor is not solely based on one area of accomplishment. It is a recognition of excellence performance in all areas of assignment.

X C. 1. Teaching

Candidates for promotion to senior instructor are expected to demonstrate superior teaching. Teaching is evaluated both specifically and holistically, factoring in characteristics, nuances, and contexts. The candidate’s holistic teaching record will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

X C. 1. a. Teaching Evaluation and Expectations

The candidate's holistic teaching record will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Overall performance effectiveness
 - The candidate should demonstrate through quantitative and qualitative feedback from students (and peers if available) that they are able to teach at least at a superior level (e.g., comparative TEVAL scores in the HM-H or 4-5 range; excellent performance on SLO effectiveness data; observations attesting to superior performance) at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The School recognizes that student course evaluations are imperfect measures of teaching effectiveness. Therefore, evaluation of overall performance effectiveness will factor in multiple types of performance data, including student course evaluation, facilitation and support for undergraduate and/or graduate research, reasoned incorporation of innovative teaching practices, and other indicators of effective performance.
- Consistent productivity
 - The candidate should demonstrate consistent superior performance in teaching at the undergraduate level.
- Impact and potential impact
 - The candidate should demonstrate the impact of their teaching. Impact can take a variety of forms, such as innovation in instruction, scholarship of teaching and learning, textbooks, and indicators from students attesting to impact.
 - In the case of community engaged teaching activities, impact can be articulated through impact statements from students and engaged community members.
- Potential for continued superior performance
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have the potential and vision for continued effective teaching performance.

X C. 2. Service

The candidate for senior instructor is expected to demonstrate significant, effective involvement not only in School service / administration but also outside the School.

X C. 2. a. Service Evaluation and Expectations

As with teaching, service is evaluated both holistically and in terms of specific areas of contribution. The candidate's holistic service record will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Overall performance effectiveness
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have been active and constructive contributors to School service / administration and, if applicable, other professional areas.
- Consistent productivity
 - The candidate should demonstrate they have contributed consistently and as assigned to School service / administration.
- Reputation
 - The candidate should have an appropriate and professional reputation in their School achieved through service and School citizenship. Observations by the Director, the eligible faculty, and (if applicable) other colleagues outside the School will serve as the primary data for this.
- Potential for continued satisfactory performance
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have the potential and vision for leadership and deeper involvement in School service / administration.

XI. Promotion to Senior Professor of Practice

The process for considering promotion for faculty in the rank of professor of practice is similar to those discussed in the University Handbook. Typically, the average time in rank prior to consideration for promotion to senior professor of practice instructor is approximately five (5) years, although shorter or longer periods are possible. A faculty member in a professor of practice position may request an early review for promotion, which may or may not be granted after consultation with the Director.

XI A. Procedures for Promotion

The following procedures will be used for applications for promotion to senior professor of practice.

XI A. 1. Timing

The candidate for promotion will notify the Director in writing that they wish to be considered for promotion to the next rank by May 1 of the academic year prior to which they plan to seek promotion.

XI A. 2. Dossier Preparation and Submission

By July 1, the candidate for promotion will submit a complete dossier consisting of:

- CV
- Reflective statement
- One-year plan
- Five-year plan
- Evidence of teaching effectiveness
- Evidence of service activities
- Evidence of research productivity (if relevant).

These materials will be made available for the qualified faculty and the Director to review. The process and timeline for reviewing and deliberating on the application for promotion will follow that used for tenure-track faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion.

XI A. 3. Qualified Faculty

Qualified faculty include the School's (a) tenure-track faculty who already have earned tenure and promotion (i.e., associate professors and full professors) and (b) non-tenure-track faculty who have attained the rank above the candidate's current rank. That is, full professors, senior instructors, and teaching professors in the School will review the case of a professor of practice seeking promotion to the rank of senior professor of practice.

In instances where there are no qualified non-tenure-track faculty available within the School to review a candidate's application, the qualified faculty will include only tenured faculty.

XI A. 4. School Recommendation

The Director will review the candidate's promotion document and the recommendations of the qualified faculty and make an independent recommendation by the third week of October, supporting or failing to support promotion of the candidate. Within two normal working days of making the recommendation, the Director will explain their recommendation to the candidate and the qualified members.

XI A. 5. Appeal Procedure

If the candidate should wish to appeal the recommendation of either the faculty or the Director, the candidate must make the request for reconsideration in writing within three normal working days of the candidate's notification of the recommendations. The candidate must present in writing the arguments for reconsideration and provide to the Director any additional evidence that supports the candidate's position.

If the candidate requests reconsideration of the faculty's recommendation, the Director will convene a meeting of the qualified faculty at least one week before recommendations must be sent to the Dean to consider the candidate's written arguments and additional evidence. Within one business day of the conclusion of the meeting, each qualified faculty member will submit a second, written recommendation to the Director. Participation in a reconsideration vote will be restricted to members of the qualified faculty and will be conducted in the same manner as in the original vote. The final recommendations of the faculty and the Director will be transmitted in writing to the candidate and to qualified faculty.

XI A. 6. Forwarding Procedures

After the candidate has reviewed the recommendations, the candidate decides whether to withdraw their application. If the candidate wishes to continue the process, then the promotion document is forwarded to the Dean. The Director will include the results of the secret ballot, all recommendations and non-redacted written comments of the School's qualified faculty members, the candidate's complete file, and their written recommendation.

XI B. Standards for Promotion to the Rank of Senior Professor of Practice

The candidate for promotion is expected to show superior accomplishment in all assigned work responsibility areas. Candidates will not be promoted based on outstanding contribution in only one area. All areas will be considered for promotion.

XI B. 1. Teaching

Candidates for promotion to senior professor of practice are expected to demonstrate superior teaching. Teaching is evaluated both specifically and holistically, factoring in characteristics, nuances, and contexts. The candidate's holistic teaching record will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

XI B. 1. a. Teaching Evaluation and Expectations

The candidate's holistic teaching record will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Overall performance effectiveness
 - The candidate should demonstrate through quantitative and qualitative feedback from students (and peers if available) that they are able to teach at least at a superior level (e.g., comparative TEVAL scores in the HM-H or 4-5 range; excellent performance on SLO effectiveness data; observations attesting to superior performance) at all assigned levels. The School recognizes that student course evaluations are imperfect measures of teaching effectiveness. Therefore, evaluation of overall performance effectiveness will factor in multiple types of performance data, including student course evaluation, facilitation and support for undergraduate and/or graduate research, reasoned incorporation of innovative teaching practices, and other indicators of effective performance.
- Consistent productivity
 - The candidate should demonstrate consistent superior performance in teaching at all assigned levels.
- Impact and potential impact
 - The candidate should demonstrate the impact of their teaching. Impact can take a variety of forms, such as innovation in instruction, scholarship of teaching and learning, textbooks, evidence of student success and awards, mentorship and support of undergraduate students, and indicators from students attesting to impact.
 - In the case of community engaged teaching activities, impact can be articulated through impact statements from students and engaged community members.
- Potential for continued superior performance

- The candidate should demonstrate that they have the potential and vision for continued, active engagement regarding quality teaching that reflects a commitment towards continuous improvement, refinement, and growth.

XI B. 2. Service

The candidate for senior professor of practice is expected to demonstrate significant, effective involvement in areas of University, School, professional, and/or community service related to their expertise.

XI B. 2. a. Service Evaluation and Expectations

As with teaching, service is evaluated both holistically and in terms of specific areas of contribution. The candidate's holistic service record will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Overall performance effectiveness
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have been active and constructive contributors to School service / administration and other professional areas.
- Consistent productivity
 - The candidate should demonstrate they have contributed consistently and as assigned to School service / administration and other professional areas.
- Reputation
 - The candidate should have an appropriate and professional reputation in their School achieved through service and School citizenship. Observations by the Director, the eligible faculty, and (if applicable) other colleagues outside the School will serve as the primary data for this.
- Potential for continued satisfactory performance
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have the potential and vision for leadership and deeper involvement in School service / administration.

XI B. 3. Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Discovery

If the candidate has official work responsibilities related to research, their research productivity should demonstrate scholarly maturity, consistent productivity, excellence and impact, and potential for continued scholarly productivity.

XI B. 3. a. Research Evaluation and Expectations

The candidate's holistic scholarly record will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Scholarly innovation and superior accomplishment
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have developed a coherent and cohesive body of research that is appropriately sound and well-executed.
- Consistent productivity
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have a record of consistent productivity at Kansas State University and that they have been active and primary contributors in their scholarship.
- Impact, potential impact, and reputation
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have made an impact on theory, research, and/or practice. For community engaged research, impact can be articulated through statements from communities involved in the research and other indicators of influence, outcome, or contribution of the research to larger community needs.
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have a positive reputation in their academic and/or professional field.
- Potential for continued scholarly productivity

- The candidate should demonstrate that they have the potential and vision for continued scholarly productivity that is appropriate to their field. This will be reflected in the research plan submitted by the candidate covering the next five years.

The candidate's RSCAD products will be evaluated and weighted based on the following criteria:

- Quality, scope, impact, and relevance
 - Quality: It is incumbent on the candidate to demonstrate the quality of the outlet and the product.
 - Scope: Products that are national or international in scope will be weighted more heavily than products that are mainly regional or local.
 - Impact: It is incumbent on the candidate to demonstrate impact through appropriate evidence.
 - Relevance: The research must be relevant to the candidate's academic and/or industry field.
- Contribution and effort
 - Contribution: Relative contribution to a product will be evaluated based on the information provided by the faculty member.
 - Effort: Projects involving greater degrees of original research and/or creativity will be weighted more heavily.
- Recognition
 - Recognition: Awards, positive reviews, and other types of recognitions can be used to demonstrate emerging regional / national reputation.

XII. Promotion to Teaching Associate Professor and Teaching Professor

The process for considering promotion for faculty in the rank of teaching assistant or associate professor is similar to those discussed in the University Handbook. Typically, the average time in rank prior to consideration for promotion to teaching associate professor is approximately five (5) years and three (3) years after that for promotion to teaching professor, although shorter or longer periods are possible.

Though research and creative works are generally not weighed in the review process for non-tenure track faculty in titles other than the Research Professor ranks, those who produce such achievement may submit details and examples of their research for consideration in their promotion. A teaching assistant or associate professor may also request an early review for promotion, which may or may not be granted after consultation with the School's Director.

XII A. Procedures for Promotion

The following procedures will be used for applications for promotion to teaching associate professor and teaching professor.

XII A. 1. Timing

The candidate for promotion will notify the Director in writing that they wish to be considered for promotion to the next rank by May 1 of the academic year prior to which they plan to seek promotion.

XII A. 2. Dossier Preparation and Submission

By July 1, the candidate for promotion will submit a complete dossier consisting of:

- CV
- Reflective statement
- One-year plan
- Five-year plan
- Evidence of teaching effectiveness
- Evidence of service activities
- Evidence of research productivity (if relevant).

These materials will be made available for the qualified faculty and the Director to review. The process and timeline for reviewing and deliberating on the application for promotion will follow that used for tenure-track faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion.

XII A. 3. Qualified Faculty

Qualified faculty include the School's (a) tenure-track faculty who already have earned tenure and promotion (i.e., associate professors and full professors) and (b) non-tenure-track faculty who have attained the rank above the candidate's current rank. That is, associate professors, full professors, advanced instructors, senior instructors, teaching associate professors, teaching professors, and senior professors of practice in the School will review the case of a teaching assistant professor seeking promotion to the rank of teaching associate professor. Associate professors, full professors, senior instructors, teaching professors, and senior professors of practice in the School will review the case of a teaching associate professor seeking promotion to the rank of teaching professor.

In instances where there are no qualified non-tenure-track faculty available within the School to review a candidate's application, the qualified faculty will include only tenured faculty.

XII A. 4. School Recommendation

The Director will review the candidate's promotion document and the recommendations of the qualified faculty and make an independent recommendation by the third week of October, supporting or failing to support promotion of the candidate. Within two normal working days of making the recommendation, the Director will explain their recommendation to the candidate and the qualified members.

XII A. 5. Appeal Procedure

If the candidate should wish to appeal the recommendation of either the faculty or the Director, the candidate must make the request for reconsideration in writing within three normal working days of the candidate's notification of the recommendations. The candidate must present in writing the arguments for reconsideration and provide to the Director any additional evidence that supports the candidate's position.

If the candidate requests reconsideration of the faculty's recommendation, the Director will convene a meeting of the qualified faculty at least one week before recommendations must be sent to the Dean to consider the candidate's written arguments and additional evidence. Within one business day of the conclusion of the meeting, each qualified faculty member will submit a second, written recommendation to the Director. Participation in a reconsideration vote will be restricted to members of the qualified faculty and will be conducted in the same manner as in the original vote. The final recommendations of the faculty and the Director will be transmitted in writing to the candidate and to qualified faculty.

XII A. 6. Forwarding Procedures

After the candidate has reviewed the recommendations, the candidate decides whether to withdraw their application. If the candidate wishes to continue the process, then the promotion document is forwarded to the Dean. The Director will include the results of the secret ballot, all recommendations and non-redacted written comments of the School's qualified faculty members, the candidate's complete file, and their written recommendation.

XII B. Standards for Promotion to the Rank of Teaching Associate Professor

The candidate must demonstrate excellence in all assigned work responsibilities and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies. Promotion to teaching associate professor is not solely based on one area of accomplishment. It is a recognition of excellence performance in all areas of assignment.

XII. B. 1. Teaching

Candidates for promotion to teaching associate professor are expected to demonstrate teaching excellence. Teaching is evaluated both specifically and holistically, factoring in characteristics, nuances, and contexts. The candidate's holistic teaching record will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

XII B. 1. a. Teaching Evaluation and Expectations

The candidate's holistic teaching record will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Overall performance effectiveness
 - The candidate should demonstrate through quantitative and qualitative feedback from students (and peers if available) that they are able to teach at least at a satisfactory level (e.g., comparative TEVAL scores in the M-H or 3.8-5 range; appropriate performance on SLO effectiveness data; observations attesting to satisfactory performance) all assigned levels. The School recognizes that student course evaluations are imperfect measures of teaching effectiveness. Therefore, evaluation of overall performance effectiveness will factor in multiple types of performance data, including student course evaluation, facilitation and support for undergraduate and/or graduate research, reasoned incorporation of innovative teaching practices, and other indicators of effective performance.
- Consistent productivity

- The candidate should demonstrate consistent excellent performance in teaching performance all assigned levels.
- Impact and potential impact
 - The candidate should demonstrate the impact of their teaching. Impact can take a variety of forms, such as innovation in instruction, scholarship of teaching and learning, textbooks, and indicators from students attesting to impact.
 - In the case of community engaged teaching activities, impact can be articulated through impact statements from students and engaged community members.
- Potential for continued satisfactory performance
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have the potential and vision for continued effective teaching performance.

XII. B. 2. Service

The candidate is expected to participate in and contribute to School service / administration.

XII B. 2. a. Service Evaluation and Expectations

As with teaching, service is evaluated both holistically and in terms of specific areas of contribution. The candidate's holistic service record will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Overall performance effectiveness
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have been active and constructive contributors to School service / administration and, if applicable, other professional areas.
- Consistent productivity
 - The candidate should demonstrate they have contributed consistently and as assigned to School service / administration.
- Reputation
 - The candidate should have an appropriate and professional reputation in their School achieved through service and School citizenship. Observations by the Director, the eligible faculty, and (if applicable) other colleagues outside the School will serve as the primary data for this.
- Potential for continued satisfactory performance
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have the potential and vision for leadership and deeper involvement in School service / administration.

XII. B. 3. Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Discovery

If the candidate has official work responsibilities related to research, their research productivity should demonstrate scholarly maturity, consistent productivity, excellence and impact, and potential for continued scholarly productivity.

XII B. 3. a. Research Evaluation and Expectations

The candidate's holistic scholarly record will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Scholarly innovation and superior accomplishment
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have developed a coherent and cohesive body of research that is appropriately sound and well-executed.
- Consistent productivity
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have a record of consistent productivity at Kansas State University and that they have been active and primary contributors in their scholarship.
- Impact, potential impact, and reputation

- The candidate should demonstrate that they have made an impact on theory, research, and/or practice. For community engaged research, impact can be articulated through statements from communities involved in the research and other indicators of influence, outcome, or contribution of the research to larger community needs.
- The candidate should demonstrate that they have a positive reputation in their academic and/or professional field.
- Potential for continued scholarly productivity
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have the potential and vision for continued scholarly productivity that is appropriate to their field. This will be reflected in the research plan submitted by the candidate covering the next five years.

The candidate's RSCAD products will be evaluated and weighted based on the following criteria:

- Quality, scope, impact, and relevance
 - Quality: It is incumbent on the candidate to demonstrate the quality of the outlet and the product.
 - Scope: Products that are national or international in scope will be weighted more heavily than products that are mainly regional or local.
 - Impact: It is incumbent on the candidate to demonstrate impact through appropriate evidence. For community engaged research, impact can be articulated through statements from communities involved in the research and other indicators of influence, outcome, or contribution of the research to larger community needs.
 - Relevance: The research must be relevant to the candidate's academic and/or industry field.
- Contribution and effort
 - Contribution: Relative contribution to a product will be evaluated based on the information provided by the faculty member.
 - Effort: Projects involving greater degrees of original research and/or creativity will be weighted more heavily.
- Recognition
 - Recognition: Awards, positive reviews, and other types of recognitions can be used to demonstrate emerging national / international reputation.

XII C. Standards for Promotion to the Rank of Teaching Professor

To be considered for promotion to teaching professor, the candidate must demonstrate superior accomplishment in all assigned work responsibilities and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies. Promotion to teaching professor is not solely based on one area of accomplishment. It is a recognition of excellence performance in all areas of assignment.

XII C. 1. Teaching

Candidates for promotion to teaching professor are expected to demonstrate superior teaching. Teaching is evaluated both specifically and holistically, factoring in characteristics, nuances, and contexts. The candidate's holistic teaching record will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

XII C. 1. a. Teaching Evaluation and Expectations

The candidate's holistic teaching record will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Overall performance effectiveness
 - The candidate should demonstrate through quantitative and qualitative feedback from students (and peers if available) that they are able to teach at least at a superior level (e.g., comparative TEVAL scores in the HM-H or 4-5 range; excellent performance on SLO effectiveness data; observations attesting to superior performance) all assigned levels. The School recognizes that student course evaluations are imperfect measures of teaching

effectiveness. Therefore, evaluation of overall performance effectiveness will factor in multiple types of performance data, including student course evaluation, facilitation and support for undergraduate and/or graduate research, reasoned incorporation of innovative teaching practices, and other indicators of effective performance.

- Consistent productivity
 - The candidate should demonstrate consistent superior performance in teaching performance all assigned levels.
- Impact and potential impact
 - The candidate should demonstrate the impact of their teaching. Impact can take a variety of forms, such as innovation in instruction, scholarship of teaching and learning, textbooks, and indicators from students attesting to impact.
 - In the case of community engaged teaching activities, impact can be articulated through impact statements from students and engaged community members.
- Potential for continued superior performance
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have the potential and vision for continued effective teaching performance.

XII C. 2. Service

The candidate for teaching professor is expected to demonstrate significant, effective involvement not only in School service / administration but also outside the School.

XII C. 2. a. Service Evaluation and Expectations

As with teaching, service is evaluated both holistically and in terms of specific areas of contribution. The candidate's holistic service record will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Overall performance effectiveness
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have been active and constructive contributors to School service / administration and, if applicable, other professional areas.
- Consistent productivity
 - The candidate should demonstrate they have contributed consistently and as assigned to School service / administration.
- Reputation
 - The candidate should have an appropriate and professional reputation in their School achieved through service and School citizenship. Observations by the Director, the eligible faculty, and (if applicable) other colleagues outside the School will serve as the primary data for this.
- Potential for continued satisfactory performance
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have the potential and vision for leadership and deeper involvement in School service / administration.

XII C. 3. Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Discovery

If the candidate has official work responsibilities related to research, their research productivity should demonstrate scholarly maturity, consistent productivity, excellence and impact, and potential for continued scholarly productivity.

XII C. 3. a. Research evaluation and Expectations

The candidate's holistic scholarly record will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Scholarly innovation and superior accomplishment
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have developed a coherent and cohesive body of research that is appropriately sound and well-executed.

- Consistent productivity
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have a record of consistent productivity at Kansas State University and that they have been active and primary contributors in their scholarship.
- Impact, potential impact, and reputation
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have made an impact on theory, research, and/or practice. For community engaged research, impact can be articulated through statements from communities involved in the research and other indicators of influence, outcome, or contribution of the research to larger community needs.
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have a positive reputation in their academic and/or professional field.
- Potential for continued scholarly productivity
 - The candidate should demonstrate that they have the potential and vision for continued scholarly productivity that is appropriate to their field. This will be reflected in the research plan submitted by the candidate covering the next five years.

The candidate's RSCAD products will be evaluated and weighted based on the following criteria:

- Quality, scope, impact, and relevance
 - Quality: It is incumbent on the candidate to demonstrate the quality of the outlet and the product.
 - Scope: Products that are national or international in scope will be weighted more heavily than products that are mainly regional or local.
 - Impact: It is incumbent on the candidate to demonstrate impact through appropriate evidence. For community engaged research, impact can be articulated through statements from communities involved in the research and other indicators of influence, outcome, or contribution of the research to larger community needs.
 - Relevance: The research must be relevant to the candidate's academic and/or industry field.
- Contribution and effort
 - Contribution: Relative contribution to a product will be evaluated based on the information provided by the faculty member.
 - Effort: Projects involving greater degrees of original research and/or creativity will be weighted more heavily.
- Recognition
 - Recognition: Awards, positive reviews, and other types of recognitions can be used to demonstrate emerging national / international reputation.

XIII. Policy on Chronic Low Achievement

University Handbook Sections C31.5-31.8 governs chronic low achievements situations in which a tenured faculty member fails to perform their professional duties, as defined by the unit, constituting evidence of “professional incompetence” and warranting consideration for “dismissal for cause” under existing University policies (C31.5). Such situations arise when a tenured faculty member falls below the minimum-acceptable level of performance, as indicated by the annual evaluation, which is based on the criteria laid out in Section IV of this document. If minimum standards for teaching, research, and service are not met on overall performance evaluations over two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period, “dismissal for cause” proceedings will be considered at the discretion of the Dean (C31.5).

The School will follow [Sections C31.5-31.8 of the University Handbook](#) concerning administrative actions to be taken upon the identification of chronic low achievement.

XIV. Post-Tenure Review

The process and purpose for post-tenure review are outlined in Appendix W of the University Handbook.

The purpose of post-tenure review at Kansas State University is to enhance the continued professional development of tenured faculty. It is also designed to enhance public trust in the University by ensuring that the faculty community undertakes regular and rigorous efforts to maintain high professional standards.

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 School 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 says, in summary:

- In no case shall the faculty member be made to explain why he or she should be retained.
- The written criteria for post-tenure review shall be periodically reviewed by the faculty.
- The review shall be developmental and allow for changes in professional direction.
- The review should be flexible, allowing for differences in discipline and stages of careers.
- Outcomes should remain confidential unless appealed or required by law.

XIV A. Timeline

Post-tenure review will be conducted for tenured faculty every six years and will conform to the timeline associated with the annual evaluation review (Appendix W). This six-year clock will be reset if the faculty member does any of the following:

- applies for promotion to full professor;
- applies for the Professorial Performance Award; or
- receives a substantial College, University, national or international award requiring multi-year portfolio-like documentation, such as University Distinguished Professor, University Distinguished Teaching Scholar, an endowed chair, or other national/international awards.

The schedule for post-tenure review could also be delayed for one year to accommodate sabbatical leave, a major health issue, or another compelling reason, provided that both the faculty member and the Director approve the delay.

XIV B. Materials

The following materials will be used for post-tenure review:

- All annual evaluation materials submitted by the faculty member within the review period;
- A three-to-four-page reflections/summary of performance related to teaching, research, service, and administration (if relevant) within the review period; areas of improvement or effectiveness related to their responsibility areas; and plans for continued improvement or effectiveness related to their responsibility areas; and
- An updated curriculum vitae

The faculty member may submit any additional materials that they feel will support or provide evidence for the reflective/summary statement.

XIV C. Procedures

The faculty member will submit all materials to the Director at the same time as they submit their annual evaluation.

The Director will review the materials submitted and prepare a brief written report of the faculty member's activities during the review period using the criteria set forth for annual evaluation.

Post-tenure professional development will be evaluated based on whether the faculty member has met or exceeded expectations for all six evaluation periods within the evaluation window.

If the faculty member received an overall ranking of "below expectations" for two consecutive years and the reflection/summary statement and submitted curriculum vitae show insufficient evidence of post-tenure professional development, the Director will meet with the faculty member to review and discuss the report and identify goals and practices for the faculty member to engage in expected professional development during the next review period. The Director will summarize the discussion, goals, and practices in a brief letter, which will be signed by the Director and the faculty member.

The Director oversees the review and may waive a meeting if the average of the six annual reviews is above the rating of "needs improvement" in the three areas of the evaluation. If there are areas of concern, the Director will indicate these in writing in advance of a meeting. The Director and the faculty member will discuss specific ways to address concerns. In the event a post-tenure review leads to a formal plan of improvement, this outcome will be reported to the Dean.

Each faculty member will have the opportunity to discuss the report with the Director. Both the Director and the faculty member will sign a statement indicating that they have had the opportunity to review the report.

The faculty member will have the opportunity, within seven working days of receiving the report, to submit to the Director and to the Dean a written statement of unresolved differences regarding report content. A copy of the Director's report will be forwarded to the faculty member.

After reviewing the faculty member's post-tenure review file, the Director will submit to the Dean: (a) a copy of the criteria used for post-tenure review, (b) a copy of the Director's report, and (c) documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the faculty member to examine the report. Although the faculty member's six previous annual evaluations, reflection/summary, and c.v. will not be forwarded, they will be available for review by the Dean's office upon request.

XV. Professorial Performance Awards

The Professorial Performance Award (PPA) is available to faculty at the rank of Professor. The PPA rewards strong performance at the highest rank with a base salary increase in addition to that provided for by the annual evaluation process. The PPA does not create a “senior” professoriate. Furthermore, the PPA is neither a right accorded to every faculty member at the rank of Professor, nor granted simply as a result of a candidate’s routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies (C49.1).

XV A. Eligibility

An eligible candidate for the PPA must be a full-time Professor and have been in rank for at least six years since their promotion from Associate Professor, or since last receiving a PPA. The candidate should compile a portfolio that documents their professional activities in teaching, research, and service during the eligibility period in accordance with the criteria listed below (C49.5). This file should be submitted to the Director no later than September 1.

XV B. Selection Criteria

To earn the PPA, the candidate must meet the criteria below, as specified in the University Handbook, C49.2:

- The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at Kansas State for at least six years since the last promotion or Professional Performance Award.
- The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review.
- The candidate’s productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to full professor according to the current approved School guidelines.

XV C. Procedures for Consideration for Professorial Performance Award

The following procedures will be used to evaluate an application for the PPA.

XV C. 1. Materials to be Forwarded

Per C49.7, The Director will forward the following materials to the Dean:

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

XV C. 2. Procedures

In consultation with the School’s Annual Evaluation Committee, the Director will review the candidate’s file and prepare a written evaluation of their materials with respect to the criteria outlined in Section IX. The Director will also include a favorable or unfavorable recommendation of the candidate’s PPA application. A copy of the Director’s written recommendation will be provided to the candidate, and they will have an opportunity to discuss the Director’s evaluation before it is forwarded to the Dean. Both parties will sign a statement acknowledging that they have met and discussed the evaluation. If there remain unresolved differences between the two, the candidate will be afforded the opportunity to submit a written response to their PPA evaluation to the Director and Dean (C49.6).

APPENDIX A: TRANSITION PLAN

School faculty who started as assistant professors and who will be going up for tenure and promotion during AY22-23, AY23-24, or AY24-25 will have the option of having their dossier evaluated according to the committee composition, external evaluation requirements, and performance standards identified in this unit document or according to the committee composition, external evaluation requirements, and performance standards identified in the document corresponding with their original unit (either the Department of Communication Studies or the A. Q. Miller School of Journalism and Mass Communications). The timeline and decision-making process to be used will be what is outlined in this document, as it conforms more closely to University expectations and timelines.

Language pertinent to tenure and promotion to associate professor from the respective documents is provided below. Although the text below retains the original language as used in the department documents in effect during academic year 2021-2022 for the Department of Communication Studies and the A. Q. Miller School of Journalism and Mass Communications, that language and information pertaining to timeline and decision-making processes is to be replaced with language and information from this current unit document, given that timeline and decision-making processes to be used will be what is outlined in this document.

Communication Studies

IX A. Procedures for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

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 Teaching, Research, and Service may be considered for tenure at an earlier date. In all cases of tenure as well as promotion, the candidate should submit a written request to the department head by May 15.

IX A. 1. Dossier

By July 15, the candidate for tenure and/or promotion will submit a complete dossier, in accordance with formats and procedures provided by the provost and dean (see “Guidelines for the Organization and Format Tenure and Promotion Documentation” found at: <https://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/forms/promotio.doc>). Also see <https://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/dhmanual/promotion/promotio.html>).

IX A. 2. External Evaluation

In order to evaluate the quality of the candidate’s work, the department will obtain three external reviews. The department head will request the candidate and members of the qualified faculty to provide a list of potential external reviewers. Qualified faculty are those faculty already holding the position or rank the candidate is seeking. For example, the qualified faculty to vote on tenure decisions are those faculty already tenured. The qualified faculty to vote on promotion to full professor are those already at the rank of full professor.

Qualified faculty and the candidate should submit their lists to the department head by July 1. The candidate’s former advisors and co-authors are specifically excluded as possible evaluators. On or around July 7, the department head will inform the candidate of the names of all potential evaluators and provide her/him with an opportunity to comment on them. By July 14, the candidate may request the department head to exclude certain individuals as external evaluators. The department head will choose the names of three evaluators to perform the external reviews. If one or more of the initially chosen external evaluators should be unable or should decline to review the candidate, then the department head should make a reasonable attempt in her/his selection of alternate external evaluators. The department

head will write the external evaluators and provide them with (1) a copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae, (2) a copy of the candidate's statement, and (3) a copy of up to five of the candidate's publications (including manuscripts "accepted" and "submitted").

Each external reviewer will be asked 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. These letters must be mailed to the external reviewers by the third week of July. When the letters from external reviews return, they are added to the candidate's promotion/tenure document. The completed external reviews will be accompanied by a copy of the letter that was sent to the external evaluator. All solicited letters of evaluation concerning the candidate that are received must be included in the promotion/tenure document.

IX A. 3. Faculty Review

By the first week in October, qualified members of the faculty and the department head will meet to discuss the case for promotion and/or tenure of the candidate.

Within five business days following the qualified members' discussion of the candidate, each qualified member of the faculty will submit a written recommendation/ballot to the department head. Justifications of individual votes may or may not be provided by the faculty. At the close of the voting period, the department head will record the vote.

IX A. 4. Department Recommendation

The department head will review the candidate's promotion/tenure document, the external reviews, and the recommendations of the faculty and make an independent recommendation by the third week of October, supporting or failing to support promotion/tenure of the candidate. Within two normal working days of making the recommendation, the department head will explain their recommendation to the candidate and the qualified members.

IX A. 5. Appeal Procedure

If the candidate should wish to appeal the recommendation of either the faculty or the department head, the candidate must make a written request for reconsideration within three normal working days of the candidate's notification of the recommendations. The candidate must present in writing the arguments for reconsideration and provide the department head with any additional evidence that supports the candidate's position.

If the candidate requests reconsideration of the faculty's recommendation, the department head will convene a meeting of the qualified faculty at least one week before recommendations must be sent to the dean to consider the candidate's written arguments and additional evidence. Within one business day of the conclusion of the meeting, each qualified faculty member will submit a second, written recommendation to the department head. Participation in a reconsideration vote will be restricted to members of the qualified faculty, and will be conducted in the same manner as in the original vote. Within two business days, the final recommendations of the faculty and the department head will be transmitted in writing to the candidate and to qualified faculty.

IX A. 6. Forwarding Procedures

After the candidate has studied the recommendations, the candidate decides whether or not to withdraw their application. If the candidate wishes to continue the process, then the promotion/tenure dossier is forwarded to the dean. The department head will include the results of the secret ballot, all recommendations and non-redacted written comments of the department's qualified faculty members,

the candidate's complete file, and their written recommendation ([see University Handbook Section C 53.3](#)).

IX B. Standards for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

The successful candidate for promotion and tenure is expected to show maturity, productivity, excellence, and growth in teaching and research. The candidate must establish at least a regional reputation and demonstrate the potential to acquire a national and/or international reputation in their research as well. Service to the department, the university, and the larger academic/professional community also is expected. The tenure and promotion recommendation is based on contributions in all three areas of research, teaching, and service. A candidate will not be tenured or promoted based on contribution in only one or two areas.

IX B. 1. Research

The department recognizes that collaboration and interdisciplinarity can enhance the quality and impact of one's research. The department also recognizes that multiple factors, including scholarly traditions, reputation in the field, research interests, and previous experience, influence the types of scholarship and research that faculty pursue and produce (e.g., journal article, book, book chapter, grants, and community-engaged research products). Thus, while the outline of expectations below is framed in terms of peer reviewed journal articles, the department explicitly notes that multiple types of scholarly products can illustrate scholarly maturity, productivity, excellence, growth, reputation, and potential.

The tenure and promotion decision is based on scholarly maturity, productivity, quality, growth, reputation, and potential evidenced in a candidate's publication record. The candidate must demonstrate clearly and convincingly that their body of scholarship exhibits those characteristics and the tenure and promotion committee must agree.

In general, the Department's expectation is that a candidate for promotion and tenure will have published at least six peer-reviewed research articles (or their equivalents) with significant author contribution in quality academic journals at the time of the promotion and tenure decision. *Publishing six peer-reviewed research articles is not a guarantee of tenure and promotion.* This number depends on several factors:

- the quality, prestige, and appropriateness of the journals (as indicated, for example, by journal impact factor, disciplinary association sponsorship, acceptance rates, and appropriateness of the outlet for the research published);
- significance of authorship contribution (as indicated by author rank and/or contribution/effort toward authorship);
- impact or potential impact of the articles (as indicated by impact factor, number of citations, or appropriateness of the outlet for the research published);
- scholarly rigor of the research (as indicated by quality of method/analysis); and
- amount of original research involved (i.e., not having relied solely on dissertation data, but rather having conducted appropriate data collection over the candidate's probationary period).

In terms of journal article equivalents:

- Peer-reviewed books published by a reputable university or commercial press can count for as many as four peer-reviewed articles. Article equivalence is based on:
 - quality, prestige, and appropriateness of the press;
 - significance of authorship contribution;
 - impact or potential impact of the book;
 - scholarly rigor; and
 - amount of original research involved.

It is anticipated that a candidate for tenure and promotion who publishes a book also will have been successful in publishing other research products appropriate for their area(s).

- Peer-reviewed edited books published by a reputable university or commercial press can count for as many as three peer-reviewed articles. Article equivalence is based on:
 - quality, prestige, and appropriateness of the press;
 - significance of editorship and authorship contribution;
 - impact or potential impact;
 - scholarly rigor; and
 - amount of original research involved.

(Note: if the candidate has one or more chapters within the book that they edited, the chapter(s) do not “double count.” Instead, they go toward establishing article equivalence of the edited book.) It is anticipated that a candidate for tenure and promotion who publishes an edited book also will have been successful in publishing other research products appropriate for their area(s) of expertise.

- Peer-reviewed book chapters in edited books can count as equivalents of peer-reviewed articles depending on:
 - quality, prestige, and appropriateness of the press and book;
 - significance of authorship contribution;
 - impact or potential impact;
 - scholarly rigor; and
 - amount of original research involved.

Given that journal articles traditionally are given more weight than book chapters within the discipline, this equivalence is not necessarily 1:1. (In other words, five book chapters do not necessarily count as five peer-reviewed journal articles.) It is anticipated that a candidate for tenure and promotion who publishes one or more book chapters also will have been successful in publishing other research products appropriate for their area(s) of expertise.

- Up to three successful extramural funding proposals that support scholarly research can count as equivalents of peer-reviewed articles. As with book chapters, this equivalence is not necessarily 1:1. Article equivalence should be based on:
 - the scope and nature of the grant;
 - prestige/competitiveness of the funding agency;
 - role on the grant (e.g., PI, co-PI, investigator); and
 - amount of original research involved in the development of the funding application. A competitive/highly-scored extramural funding proposal that was not funded may count as a peer-reviewed article (up to two such proposals), with equivalence being based on the same criteria outlined above. (The candidate should provide evidence of its competitiveness/score.)

Successful intramural funding proposals that support scholarly research can contribute to the candidate’s tenure and promotion application, but they carry less weight than successful extramural funding proposals and count less than a peer-reviewed journal article. It is anticipated that a candidate for tenure and promotion who is awarded extramural scholarly funding also will have been successful in publishing other research products appropriate for their area(s) of expertise.

- Community-engaged research products (e.g., white papers, reports, exhibits, computer programs, videos) can count as up to two peer-reviewed article equivalents. As with book chapters, this equivalence is not necessarily 1:1. Article equivalence should be based on:
 - scope of authorship contribution;
 - methodological rigor as argued by the candidate in terms of methodological validity;
 - amount of original research; and
 - demonstrated impact/usefulness of findings.

To apply towards tenure, books, articles, chapters, etc., must be formally accepted by the publisher.

Evidence of such acceptance should be submitted.

In cases when a faculty member joins the department with previous experience as an assistant, associate, or full professor, post-doctoral student, instructor, or other role, publications produced while in those previous roles may be counted toward their tenure and promotion case only if (a) the works were published after the faculty member was granted their doctoral degree and (b) the works were published not more than five years prior to consideration for promotion and tenure.

IX B. 2. Teaching

Teaching excellence is essential for promotion and tenure in this department. To be considered for promotion and tenure, the candidate must demonstrate their ability to teach effectively at both the undergraduate and graduate level of instruction. Teaching effectiveness may be measured by the quality of instruction, scholarly content of the courses taught, and interactions with students as an instructor and advisor.

Teaching effectiveness is evidenced by a combination of several indicators:

- Satisfactory quantitative ratings and qualitative comments on student course evaluations (e.g., quantitative scores on average at least in the “middle” range for department and university);
- Satisfactory ratings by peers who have conducted peer reviews of the candidate’s teaching;
- Supervision of graduate theses/dissertations;
- Teaching awards;
- Satisfactory quantitative ratings on student advisement evaluations (e.g., quantitative scores on average at least in the “middle” range for department and university); and/or
- Other evidence of effective teaching, including letters of appreciation from former students or student accomplishments under supervision of the faculty member.

IX B. 3. Service

While a candidate is expected to participate in and contribute to departmental affairs and committees where possible, they should also contribute professionally beyond the Department. Such contributions can include, for example: serving as an ad hoc reviewer or editorial board member for academic journals or professional associations, serving in an official capacity in a professional association, serving on university committees, and/or performing professional or public service as discussed in [Section V C](#).

Journalism and Mass Communications

VI TENURE and PROMOTION

VI A. Tenure-Track

To secure a faculty of the highest possible caliber, the university uses a selective process in awarding tenure. The University Handbook notes: “Tenure is not a right accorded to every faculty member. Nor is it granted simply as a result of a candidate’s routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies” (C.100.3).

Qualifying for tenure and promotion derives from a balance of high-quality teaching, research and/or creative work, and service.

VI A. 1. Standards for Tenure

Sections C90–C116.2 of the University Handbook govern standards for attaining tenure.

A favorable recommendation for granting tenure by tenured faculty is basically a prediction that the faculty member under consideration, once tenured, will continue to perform at a sufficiently high level, and in the post-tenure period will, attain national or international recognition for excellence in teaching and research/creative work, with competence demonstrated in the area of service to the university, the professions, or both.

VI A. 1. a. Teaching

Tenure-track faculty must, at a minimum, show high-quality teaching, which means they meet expectations as a teacher and an adviser to students as enumerated in Section III A., Teaching, above. Some faculty may exceed this standard and show evidence of meritorious teaching that might include instructional awards; external grants devoted to innovative teaching, advising or student assessment; presentations at national or international conferences to advance pedagogy; or the publication of peer-reviewed scholarly work that addresses teaching, measurement of student achievement, or issues related to student advising. However, while evidence of meritorious teaching is highly valued, it is not required for tenure or promotion .

VI A. 1. b. Research and Creative Work

Scholarly or creative work of high quality must be formally recognized by the faculty member's peers to determine if it exerts influence in the discipline. Tenured faculty shall evaluate research and creative work that addresses an interesting or important issue, topic or process in mass communications. The candidate must provide the tenured faculty with external evidence that the creative or scholarly work is consistent with the guidelines established in Section III B. of this document.

Tenure-track faculty members are required to produce ~~no less than five~~ scholarly or creative products that demonstrate significance and impact, or a minimum of one scholarly book or textbook, over a five-year period as outlined in Section III B.

VI A. 1. c. Service

Except in the most extraordinary circumstances, service is almost never sufficient, in itself, to assure a candidate of tenure. So the conservative view of service is as a complement to one's teaching and research or creative activity. Therefore, pre-tenure faculty time should not exceed the amount they agreed to in their annual categories for faculty performance (also referred to as "distribution of effort by percentage"). Serving on graduate committees is expected, but should be only one component of one's service.

The demands for service within and outside the university are especially prevalent in communication. Therefore, candidates for tenure must show service to the external community. For instance, a new faculty member is expected to serve the outside community and to serve on one or two internal committees initially. Over time, the faculty member is expected to acquire additional service obligations, such as chairing an internal committee or serving on a college- or university-wide committee. For a more comprehensive list of service opportunities, please refer to Section III C., Service, above. Faculty must limit service until they are tenured.

VI A. 2 Mid-Tenure Review Procedures

In accordance with the University Handbook (C92.1–C92.4), all probationary faculty will receive a formal review midway through the probationary period, usually five semesters after one's initial appointment.

Mid-tenure review materials are the same as those in IV A. 1., Annual Review Materials, above, with the exception that instead of covering only an annual period, they include the total time since the faculty

member's initial appointment at Kansas State University.

The review provides probationary faculty members with substantive feedback from faculty colleagues and administrators regarding their accomplishments relative to the school's tenure criteria and standards as described above. A positive mid-tenure review does not ensure that tenure will be granted in the future nor does a negative review mean that tenure will be denied.

Procedures for the mid-tenure review are similar to procedures for the tenure review. The director is responsible for making the candidate's mid-tenure review file available to the tenured faculty members in the school at least 14 calendar days prior to a meeting to discuss the candidate's progress. The director may discuss the review and assessment by the school's tenured faculty members with the dean, and shall provide a detailed letter of the assessment to the candidate; the chair of the tenured faculty committee will provide a summary of comments and recommendations for the candidate, provided by the committee. No comments will be attributed to any individual faculty member. (See Section C35 of the University Handbook regarding confidentiality of peer evaluations.) This letter of assessment and the faculty report will become a part of the candidate's reappointment and mid-tenure review file. After receiving the assessment, the candidate has the right to submit a written response for the file within 14 calendar days.

The candidate's mid-tenure review file and materials and a copy of the school's criteria and standards will be forwarded to an advisory committee in the dean's office. The dean will provide a letter of assessment to the candidate that includes a summary of recommendations.

VI A. 3. Tenure Procedures

In accordance with the University Handbook (C110–C116.2), all faculty members in the final year of probation (typically, but not always, the sixth year) will be automatically reviewed for tenure unless they resign. A faculty member may request an early tenure review, which may or may not be granted after consultation with the school's director. If a faculty member chooses to appeal the director's decision for an early tenure review, the faculty member may appeal to the dean.

Candidates must compile and submit a file that documents their professional accomplishments in accordance with the criteria, standards and guidelines established by the school. This file should include accomplishments completed at the university, as well as from prior institutions (as long as such inclusion is detailed in the candidate's offer letter). For a candidate to qualify for consideration for early tenure, all items detailed in the file should have been completed after having earned a terminal degree.

The director is advised by the tenured faculty of the school regarding the qualifications of the candidate for tenure. The director is responsible for making the candidate's file and the school's tenure criteria documents available to tenured faculty members at least 14 calendar days prior to the scheduled meeting date to discuss the candidate's application. A cumulative record of recommendations from the reappointment and mid-tenure review meetings, and any outside reviews that have been solicited by the director, will also be made available to the tenured faculty.

Well in advance of the tenured faculty's review of the candidate, the director must seek outside reviewers who are recognized as leaders in the candidate's discipline or profession and who will evaluate the candidate's academic materials as provided by the director. The candidate and the director each identify three outside reviewers among whom the director selects five.

Tenured faculty members will individually review the candidate's file, considering the school's criteria, standards and guidelines for tenure, and will then meet to discuss the candidate's application. All recommendations and written comments of the tenured faculty will be forwarded to the director. However, before submitting recommendations to the director, a tenured faculty member may request a

meeting with the candidate to discuss or to clarify the candidate's record of accomplishment.

The director will forward a written recommendation to the dean, accompanied by an explanation of her or his judgment. All recommendations and unedited written comments of the school's tenured faculty, and the candidate's complete file, will also be forwarded to the dean. A copy of the director's written recommendation alone is forwarded to the candidate.

VI A. 4. Promotion Procedures

Sections C120–C156.2 of the University Handbook govern promotions in rank.

VI A. 4. a. Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to associate professor rests on evidence that the candidate demonstrates performance that is meritorious or exceeds expectations in a combination of annual evaluations and review by the tenured faculty committee between the appointment date and the time the candidate is seeking promotion regarding teaching, research and/or creative work, and meets expectations in service as defined in Section IV A.2. A preponderance of the evaluations should indicate meritorious or exceeds expectations in teaching and research/creative work. If the tenured faculty committee deviates from this standard, the committee must justify its position and provide evidence for the justification.

III CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION, REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

The evaluation of faculty is based on their quality of performance in teaching, research and/or creative activity, and service. Faculty provide evidence for their performance on an annual basis by compiling materials that establish the range, quality and context of the work they have accomplished in each of these areas.

In accordance with the University Handbook (C82.4), faculty members who have academic experience at other colleges or universities and who have met the criteria and standards for tenure may apply for tenure and promotion at any time during the probationary period if specified in the agreement under which they were hired or with the permission of the director.

The following guidelines and criteria are provided to establish the standards against which a faculty member's performance will be assessed in each of the three areas of faculty responsibility.

III A. Teaching

Teaching encompasses a range of faculty activity, which could include planning and teaching courses, creating new courses, advising students and supervising graduate students. These responsibilities in teaching are consistent with the University Handbook (C2).

Therefore, in the context of this document, teaching may include 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-formulating research hypotheses, co-authorship of papers for conferences, writing journal articles or developing proposals for research funding are considered under research (III B., below).

Additionally, faculty are expected to:

- provide coherent course materials;

- prepare students for employment or further graduate study;
- maintain 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;
- 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;
- return graded assignments in a reasonable amount of time and provide meaningful and constructive feedback.

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

Indicators of poor teaching may be mitigated by factors that may include:

- class characteristics such as size of class and type of class (e.g., lecture versus case-oriented, required versus elective, etc.);
- the first time a faculty member has taught a course;
- new course preparation for a faculty member;
- insufficient percentage of time assigned to teaching;
- consistent overload teaching.

III A. 1. Formats of Teaching

The school recognizes a variety of teaching formats. Teaching in the program can include large lectures, small seminars, studios, online, career coaching, study abroad, practica, facilitating internships or independent study.

Faculty should refer to the school's policy for online teaching, which defines in-load, overload and optional loads, and determines eligibility for teaching online courses.

III A. 2. Syllabus and Instructional Methods

Faculty members are expected to develop a syllabus for each class they teach. Examples of major instructional materials also may be provided.

A. Q. Miller School course syllabi must include the following minimum requirements:

- Statement of course purpose, goals, objectives and student learning outcomes;
- Assigned textbook/readings and course readings list;
- Statement of student grading and assessment standards and procedures;
- Schedule of class dates and topics;
- Listing of assignments, graded projects and examinations;
- Faculty office hours, campus address, phone number and e-mail;
- Classroom conduct policy;
- FERPA statement;
- Campus safety statement; and
- Other such information as added from time to time by the school, dean or provost.

In addition to the above, mandatory syllabus statements from the university include:

- Academic honesty statement;
- Statement regarding students with disabilities; and
- Statement defining expectations for classroom conduct;
- Other university-mandated information.

Faculty members are to submit copies of syllabi to the main office by the first day of class. If modifications are made to a syllabus during the term, the revised version must be filed in the main office with the date of revision marked.

III A. 3. Defining Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

Student learning outcomes help faculty members measure student achievement. SLOs should align with the overall mission of the school, the ACEJMC accreditation standards, advance the goals of a specific class and fulfill the goals of the curriculum.

The work done within a particular class should advance the goals of the specific class and of the broader curriculum.

In general, the faculty member should explicitly state the academic and/or professional standards that are being applied and how they are measured.

III A. 4. Undergraduate Advising

Advising is considered part of teaching. All full-time faculty members may engage in advising of undergraduate students who have been admitted to the school as majors. The advising relationship between a student and a faculty member is important to the student's development.

III B. Research and Creative Work

Mass communications has the power to influence considerable development in ensuring the freedom of a democratic society. Faculty members in the A.Q. Miller School are expected to make contributions to the field through research, creative works or interdisciplinary scholarship. These expectations are consistent with the University Handbook (C1–15).

Communications research is not narrow or easily defined, so research and creative works in the discipline may appear in the sphere of mass communications as well as in art, business, education, health, history, humanities, psychology and science. Additionally, the discipline has a strong orientation toward faculty who do not have terminal degrees but who have extensive, distinguished professional experience in the field.

Because the quality of research and creative works is important in the academy, faculty achievements should be externally evaluated, in whatever manner is appropriate. External peers in the discipline should have the capacity to make strong, independent decisions about the merit of a faculty member's productivity for the purpose of annual review, tenure and promotion.

III B. 1. Types of Research and Creative Work

In the A.Q. Miller School, research and creative works encompass: 1) quantitative research such as content analysis, experimental studies, narrative analysis or survey design; 2) qualitative research such as case studies, participant observation, rhetorical criticism or textual analysis; and 3) creative works, which can be broadly defined and are usually discipline-specific.

Evaluation of faculty performance in the area of research and creative works must consider not only the scale of different activities, but also acknowledge the ways those activities are classified by scholars and mass communicators within the field's various academic disciplines. A "peerreviewed" classification refers to academic research and scholarship, while "juried" and "refereed" classifications refer to creative works. Faculty achievements in research and creative works will be evaluated on their quality and significance in their respective fields and in society.

Because research and creative works merit different outcomes among tenure and non-tenure track faculty in the school, they apply toward faculty members' record of achievement in different ways. The following list of activities that are recognized in the school is neither complete nor hierarchical:

- Abstracts
- Advertising or PR campaigns
- Anthology chapters
- Audio or video programming
- Books authorship or editorship
- Book chapters
- Book reviews
- Conference panels
- Conference presentations
- Conference proceedings
- Media design
- Digital, social or multimedia content
- Documentaries and filmmaking
- Grant writing (internal and external)
- Journal articles
- Magazine and trade publication articles
- Newspaper articles and columns
- Photography exhibitions
- Poster presentations
- Video or print editing

When applying for tenure, research or creative work will be a major consideration.

III C. Service

Every faculty member is expected to make meaningful contributions to the school's wide range of constituencies. The service component involves professional, academic, university and civic activities.

When determining a faculty member's contribution, the focus is on the leadership level and the quality of involvement. As stated in the University Handbook, "non-directed service cannot be the major grounds upon which tenure or promotion are based" (C.32.7). Non-directed service is defined as "profession-based service, institution-based service, and public-based professional service" (C.32.7).

Faculty can provide service in any field in which they have an interest. However, faculty activities generally should be relevant to the faculty member's role and/or area of specialization at the university. The following service areas are not a complete list and are not hierarchical.

III C. 1. Professional Service

Professional service involves assisting and sharing knowledge about communications to various

organizations or audiences. Criteria in this category are focused on, but not limited to, the following activities:

- Freelance communication work;
- Communication consulting;
- Representing the profession at public events (e.g., speeches, panel discussions, expert testimony);
- Cultivating productive relationships with outside journalism and mass communications constituents.

III C. 2. Academic Service

Academic service involves taking an active role in scholarly associations and publications. Criteria in this category are focused on, but not limited to, the following items:

- Holding an office, serving as a committee chair or handling other administrative responsibilities in an appropriate scholarly and professional organization;
- Planning and participating in programs, seminars and workshops that contribute to serving the school's professional and academic constituencies;
- Serving as journal editor or editorial board member for a professional organization's publication;
- Serving as a peer reviewer of articles, manuscripts submitted to refereed journals, book chapters or books;
- Serving as a peer reviewer of papers or abstracts for inclusion in proceedings or presentation at a professional meeting;
- Giving speeches and other activities that contribute to the discipline;
- Judging professional and academic contests related to the school's mission;
- Representing the school at professional meetings;
- Mentoring other faculty members;
- Advising or mentoring student organizations;
- Serving as an outside reviewer of candidates for tenure and promotion at other institutions;
- Reviewing application or nominations for awards, honors, and grants at other organizations;
- Serving as an outside reviewer of candidates for tenure and promotion at the university.

III C. 3. University Service

University service involves activities performed for the school, college or university. Criteria in this category are focused on, but not limited to, the following:

- Supervising student media;
- Sponsoring and advising student organizations;
- Serving as chair of school, college, and university committees;
- Serving as a member of school, college and university committees (e.g., Faculty Senate, Graduate Council, etc.);
- Serving as outside member or outside chair for master's and Ph.D. committees;
- Recruiting outstanding students to the school and engaging in promotional activities;
- Reviewing application or nominations for awards, honors and grants at the university;
- Participating in fund raising activities on behalf of the school;
- Mentoring other faculty members;
- Attending school-sponsored activities (lectures, receptions, etc.);
- Attending and participating in school faculty meetings.

III C. 4. Civic Service

Civic service relates to activities faculty perform for the community in which they live. Criteria in this category are focused on, but not limited to, the following:

- Providing academic or professional expertise to the public;

- Serving as a member of various city, county, state, regional, national and/or international committees;
- Serving as a member of a community organization or service club (member of board of directors of a non-profit agency, etc.).

III C. 5. Administrative Duties

These duties include a range of activities among faculty in the school who serve in a variety of management and administrative capacities, including the director; associate director for undergraduate affairs; associate director for research, graduate studies, and international programs; sequence heads; the director of the Huck Boyd Center for Community Media; the executive director of the Journalism Education Association; and other faculty with similar responsibilities.