

**DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS**

**ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 6/24/2014)**

**PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 6/24/2014)**

**POST-TENURE REVIEW**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 6/24/2014)**

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES \*(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): 6/24/2019

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES\*: 6/24/2019

REVIEW DATE FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW: 6/24/2019

**Amit Chakrabarti, Department Head**

**Date signed: 12/17/2014**

**Peter Dorhout, Dean**

**Date signed: 12/17/2014**

**April C. Mason, Provost and Senior Vice President**

**Date signed: 1/19/2015**

*\*Each academic department is required by University Handbook policy to develop department documents containing criteria, standards, and guidelines for promotion, tenure, reappointment, annual evaluation and merit salary allocation. These documents must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty members in the department, by the department head or chair, by the dean concerned, and by the provost. In accordance with University Handbook policy, provision must be made to review these documents at least once every five years or more frequently if it is determined to be necessary. Dates of revision (or the vote to continue without revision) must appear on the first page of the document.*

Physics

Department

Arts and Sciences

College

**Policy Statement Concerning:**

**Annual Evaluations  
(including Professorial Performance Award Criteria and  
Standards and Chronic Low Achievement Standards)**

Approved by Faculty Vote on (6/24/2014)

**Promotion, Tenure, Mid-Tenure Review and Reappointment**

Approved by Faculty Vote on (6/24/2014)

**Post-Tenure Review**

Approved by Faculty Vote on (6/24/2014)

*Amit Chakrabarti*

Department Head's Signature

12-17-2014

Date

Dean's Signature

17 Dec 2014

Date

*April C. Mason*

Provost's Signature

19 Jan 15

Date

RECEIVED

JAN 21 2015

Academic Personnel

For Office of Academic Services Use Only

Date Posted to Web: \_\_\_\_\_

**DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS**

**ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 6/24/2014)**

**PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 6/24/2014)**

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES \*(WHICH INCLUDES THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD, POST TENURE REVIEW, AND CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT): **6/2019**

**Amit Chakrabarti, Department Head**

**Date signed: 6/25/2014**

**Peter Dorhout, Dean**

**Date signed:**

**April C. Mason, Provost & Senior Vice President**

**Date signed:**

*\*Each academic department is required by University Handbook policy to develop department documents containing criteria, standards, and guidelines for promotion, tenure, reappointment, annual evaluation and merit salary allocation. These documents must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty members in the department, by the department head or chair, by the dean concerned, and by the provost. In accordance with University Handbook policy, provision must be made to review these documents at least once every five years or more frequently if it is determined to be necessary. Dates of revision (or the vote to continue without revision) must appear on the first page of the document.*

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

## DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Adopted by Physics Faculty: June 24, 2014

Approved by Provost:

---

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>II. CHARACTERISTICS OF AN EFFECTIVE FACULTY MEMBER.....</b>	<b>4</b>
A. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES: TEACHING .....	5
B. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES: RESEARCH .....	5
C. SERVICE AND PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES .....	6
<b>III. CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION .....</b>	<b>6</b>
A. REAPPOINTMENT OF TENURE TRACK FACULTY .....	6
B. TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR.....	6
1. <i>Scholarly Activities: Research</i> .....	7
2. <i>Scholarly Activities: Teaching</i> .....	7
3. <i>Service and Professional Activities</i> .....	8
C. PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR .....	8
1. <i>Scholarly Activities: Research</i> .....	8
2. <i>Scholarly Activities: Teaching</i> .....	8
3. <i>Service and Professional Activities</i> .....	8
<b>IV. PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE .....</b>	<b>8</b>
A. CANDIDATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES .....	9
<i>Scholarly Activities: Research</i> .....	9
<i>Service</i> .....	10
B. DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSIBILITIES .....	10
1. <i>Letters from External Evaluators</i> .....	10
2. <i>Teaching Documentation</i> .....	11
C. FACULTY VOTE.....	11
D. REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD .....	12
E. FORWARDING PROCEDURES .....	12
<b>V. MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW .....</b>	<b>12</b>
A. DEPARTMENT HEAD'S RESPONSIBILITIES.....	13
B. CANDIDATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES .....	13
C. FACULTY VOTE .....	13
D. REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD .....	13
E. APPEAL PROCEDURES .....	14
F. FORWARDING PROCEDURES .....	14
G. REPORT FROM THE DEAN.....	14
<b>VI. CRITERIA FOR PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARDS .....</b>	<b>14</b>
A. TIME IN RANK.....	14
B. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES: RESEARCH .....	14
C. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES: TEACHING.....	15
D. SERVICE AND PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES.....	15

<b>VII. PROCEDURES FOR PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARDS .....</b>	<b>15</b>
A. CANDIDATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES .....	15
B. DEPARTMENT HEAD'S RESPONSIBILITIES .....	15
C. CANDIDATES REVIEW OF THE RECOMMENDATION.....	15
<b>VIII. FACULTY QUALIFIED TO VOTE ON THE MATTERS OF PROMOTION/TENURE AND MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>IX. ANNUAL EVALUATION.....</b>	<b>16</b>
A. FACULTY MEMBER'S RESPONSIBILITY .....	16
1. <i>Scholarly Activities: Research</i> .....	16
2. <i>Scholarly Activities: Teaching</i> .....	16
3. <i>Service and Professional Activities</i> .....	17
B. AVAILABILITY OF FACULTY PORTFOLIOS .....	17
C. DEPARTMENT HEAD'S RESPONSIBILITY .....	17
D. MERIT PAY INCREASES .....	18
<b>X. POST TENURE REVIEW.....</b>	<b>18</b>
A. MATERIALS TO BE USED FOR THE REVIEW .....	18
B. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD.....	19
C. PROCEDURES FOR ADDRESSING PERFORMANCE DEFICIENCIES.....	19
<b>XI. MINIMUM PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR ADDRESSING PERFORMANCE DEFICIENCIES.....</b>	<b>20</b>
A. MINIMUM PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.....	20
1. <i>Scholarly Activities: Research</i> .....	20
2. <i>Scholarly Activities: Teaching</i> .....	21
3. <i>Service</i> .....	21
B. PROCEDURES FOR ADDRESSING PERFORMANCE DEFICIENCIES .....	22
1. <i>Upon the First Negative Overall Evaluation of a Faculty Member in a Five-Year Period:</i> .....	22
2. <i>Prior to the Second Consecutive Negative Evaluation or the Third Negative Evaluation in a Five- Year Period:</i> .....	23
<b>XII. PROCEDURES CONCERNING THIS DOCUMENT .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>THIS DOCUMENT WILL EXPIRE FIVE YEARS FROM THE DATE OF ITS MOST RECENT APPROVAL.APPENDIX A .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>BALLOTS.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>APPENDIX B.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>FORMS FOR PRESENTING SUMMARIES OF ACTIVITIES FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>APPENDIX C .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>TIME TABLES.....</b>	<b>28</b>
A. PROMOTION AND TENURE.....	28
B. MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW .....	28
C. ANNUAL EVALUATION.....	29
D. REAPPOINTMENT OF NON-TENURED FACULTY .....	29

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Department of Physics faculty must evaluate its members regularly in order to:

- help the department head provide feedback, commendations and constructive criticism to members of the department in an ongoing effort to enhance the overall quality of the department's efforts;
- provide information to the department head to help him/her in the determination of annual salary adjustments;
- provide information to non-tenured faculty about advancement at the mid-point between his/her initial appointment and tenure decisions;
- determine if a faculty member has earned the right to be tenured at Kansas State University; and
- determine if a faculty member has earned the right of promotion to associate professor or professor.

This document is a statement of the department's policies, procedures, and criteria for reaching decisions on these important and complex issues. The time tables for action relevant to this document are presented in [Appendix C](#). The policies, procedures, and criteria included in this document are based on the department's long standing practices as stated in a short document originally passed by the faculty in 1983, the department's procedures to evaluate the quality of teaching passed by the faculty in 1989, and the K-State [University Handbook](#). The K-State *University Handbook* contains the university's policies and procedures.

## II. CHARACTERISTICS OF AN EFFECTIVE FACULTY MEMBER

Each faculty member of the department is a unique individual who can contribute to the department's overall mission in many diverse ways. Because of this diversity, it is difficult to list a set of goals or criteria which all faculty must reach or demonstrate in order to be considered an effective and positive contributor to our efforts. However, we can state some general concepts which guide our department as it strives to create an environment in which high quality teaching, learning, research and service can occur. All faculty are expected to contribute to scholarly activities, and service to the professional and university community. Within scholarly activities, we generally distinguish between teaching and research. However, we note that this distinction is not always easy to make. For example, when a faculty member is developing a new course or a different approach to teaching, he/she is involved in research on the pedagogy of physics as well as teaching. Likewise, when a faculty member is collaborating with a graduate student or post-doctoral associate on research, he/she is involved in instructional activities. These types of scholarly activities will always involve a combination of both research and teaching. Taking this difficulty of clearly distinguishing different types of activities into account, we establish approximate guidelines for the allocation of a faculty members' time as 50% teaching and related scholarly activities, 40% research and related scholarly activities, 10% service and professional activities.

## **A. Scholarly Activities: Teaching**

The department's teaching activities can be divided into three levels of instruction -- the introductory courses (typically PHYS 100 - PHYS 299), the advanced undergraduate courses (typically PHYS 300 - PHYS 699), and the graduate courses (typically PHYS 700 - PHYS 999).

The introductory courses are taken by a large fraction of the K-State undergraduate population. Because of the large enrollments in these courses; and the importance of communicating the content, methods, and excitement of physics to these students; they require a large fraction of our teaching resources. In return we gain a general population which can better understand and appreciate physics, and when appropriate, better apply it to other endeavors.

The advanced undergraduate courses which we have selected as required for each of the undergraduate degrees form a set of knowledge which all well-educated physicists must know.

The graduate courses form the basis upon which the students will complete their research for a graduate degree and upon which they will rely for the remainder of their professional careers.

Typically, a faculty member should be able to teach at all three of the levels described above. At the introductory level he/she should be able to teach independent sections of the service courses as well as recitations and studios. For advanced courses he/she should demonstrate the ability to teach effectively at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. All faculty members of the department are expected to help maintain balance and fairness in the teaching loads by accepting particularly difficult or time-consuming teaching assignments (such as lecturing in one of the service courses or preparing new approaches in advanced courses) with reasonable frequency. When a faculty member is being considered for promotion and/or tenure, he/she will typically have taught successfully at two of the three levels of teaching since his/her previous promotion or since joining our faculty.

While most faculty should be able to demonstrate an ability to teach a wide variety of courses and will probably teach at all levels during his/her career, not all faculty will be able to teach with equally high quality at all levels. In making and accepting teaching assignments the department's faculty and administration will work to develop and exploit the strengths of each faculty member. In this way we will continually work toward developing the best possible teaching program.

## **B. Scholarly Activities: Research**

Research in physics is a complex activity which can involve many different components. The components which are part of an effective research program include:

- conducting experimental and/or theoretical studies on topics of current interest;
- development of proposals for external, and occasionally university, funding of research work;
- administration of research grants;
- supervision of support staff for research projects and laboratories;
- training of support staff and students;
- mentoring of students, research associates, junior faculty and visitors;
- providing support and consultation to other members of the department; and
- other activities which support the existing research efforts of the department and/or the university.

These activities should result in a high level of research productivity in the department and high visibility for K-State within the appropriate national and international research communities. While not all research will produce immediate tangible results, we anticipate that, on a regular basis, the typical faculty member will be involved in one or more of the following:

- publication of papers in appropriate journals, monographs and proceedings;
- presentations at appropriate professional meetings;
- distribution of materials which will aid the research or teaching of other scholars;
- development of products and/or patents;
- consultation with other scholars and researchers;
- obtaining external support for research efforts;
- the development of a reputation for high quality research; and
- collaboration in research with students, post-doctoral fellows, and other scientists.

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

### **C. Service and Professional Activities**

Members of our faculty are expected to participate effectively in departmental committees and, to a reasonable extent, fulfill service responsibilities within or outside the university. There are a wide variety of ways to meet the expectations of the department in these areas. Areas of service are listed in sections C5-6 of the University Handbook.

## **III. CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION**

The University's criteria and procedures for reappointment, tenure and promotion are given in the [University Handbook](#) (Sections C50.1-C66, C70-C116.2 and C120-156.2). Promotion may be granted earlier when the faculty member's cumulative performance at rank clearly meets the standards for promotion. This includes cases for tenure, which may occur before the final year of the probationary period. In addition, the Department of Physics by action of its faculty has established criteria to be considered.

### **A. Reappointment of Tenure Track Faculty**

To be reappointed on an annual basis tenure track faculty should be making adequate progress toward tenure and promotion as described below. Tenured faculty will vote on the reappointment, and the department head will follow the forwarding procedure as described in V.I.F.

### **B. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

Under present university policy, an assistant professor cannot receive tenure unless he/she is also promoted to associate professor, as described in Section C82.2 of the University Handbook. Thus, the criteria for tenure and for promotion to associate professor are identical.



### *1. Scholarly Activities: Research*

- a. The candidate for promotion and tenure should have demonstrated that he/she has the potential to acquire a national reputation in an appropriate sub-field of physics. The judgment of this potential will be made by the tenured faculty with the advice of faculty members in the candidate's sub-field and external referees.
- b. The quality of his/her work in physics should be reflected by his/her publications. These publications should be, at least, similar in number and quality of other researchers who are or were at a similar state in their careers working in an equivalent sub-field of physics and at an institution which has an equivalent standing in the physics community. In making these comparisons the faculty will use its own judgments and seek the advice of external referees.
- c. He/she should have worked constructively to bring outside support to the department through proposals which would provide extramural funding for research. Examples of this effort include the following.
  - i. If eligible the candidate should have submitted proposals to programs, such as DOE Outstanding Junior Investigator, NSF /CAREER or ESPCoR First Award, which focus on the funding of research for junior faculty.
  - ii. If appropriate and eligible, the candidate should have sought funding from applicable K-State programs which provide funding for research activities and/or the development of proposals.
  - iii. The candidate should have prepared proposals and/or contributed effectively to collaborative proposals which have been submitted to agencies that support research in the candidate's specialty.

Except for internal K-State proposals the candidates proposals should have sought sufficient funding to support adequately his/her research, including the support of graduate students and post-doctoral research associates.

- d. He/she should have worked effectively with one or more of the following:
  - i. other faculty members;
  - ii. students;
  - iii. other scientists in a common collaborative research endeavor.

### *2. Scholarly Activities: Teaching*

To be considered for tenure and promotion, the candidate should have demonstrated his/her ability to teach effectively at two of the three levels of instruction. As an aid to addressing the determination of teaching effectiveness the candidate should submit approved teacher evaluations for all classes taught each semester, copies of syllabi and exams, and links to course webpages. In assessing the candidate's teaching, the department will address the following questions:

- a. Is the candidate teaching physics which is appropriate for the courses involved?
- b. Are the syllabi and tests at an appropriate level for the students in the course?
- c. Is the candidate teaching in a way which is contributing to high quality teaching in the department?
- d. Is the candidate an effective advisor to graduate and undergraduate students?
- e. Is the candidate helpful to other faculty in their teaching efforts?

- f. Is the candidate actively and productively addressing issues which could improve the quality of teaching in the department?
- g. Does the candidate seem to be communicating effectively with students?

### *3. Service and Professional Activities*

The candidate for promotion and tenure should have served as an effective member of departmental committees. He/she should demonstrate an ability to serve in other capacities which are described in [Section II.C](#) of this document.

## **C. Promotion to Professor**

The promotion from associate professor to the rank of professor is based on demonstrated distinction in teaching, research and scholarly activities, and service and professional activities. Considerations for promotion to the rank of professor are:

### *1. Scholarly Activities: Research*

- a. The candidate should have acquired a national and/or international reputation in some area of physics.
- b. The quality of his/her work in physics should be reflected by his/her publications.
- c. He/she should have worked constructively to bring outside support to the department through proposals which would provide extramural funding for research.
- d. He/she should have worked effectively with one or more of the following:
  - i. other faculty members;
  - ii. students;
  - iii. other scientists in a common collaborative research endeavor.

### *2. Scholarly Activities: Teaching*

The candidate should have demonstrated the ability to teach effectively at two of the three levels of instruction. The questions to be addressed are described in [Section III.B.2.](#) of this document.

### *3. Service and Professional Activities*

The candidate should have demonstrated a leadership role in service to the department, university or professional associations.

## **IV. PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE**

The University's criteria and procedures for tenure and promotion are given in the [University Handbook](#). Candidates will normally be considered for tenure during the final year of the maximum probationary period, although, in exceptional cases, candidates with outstanding records in research, teaching, and service may be considered for tenure at an earlier date. In these exceptional cases, the request for a tenure decision before the final year of the probationary period may be made either by the candidate submitting a written request to the department head

by September 15 or by one of the tenured faculty or the Departmental Advisory Committee, with the concurrence of the candidate, submitting a written nomination to the department head by September 15. One graduate student and seven faculty members, who are chosen by a faculty-vote, compose the advisory committee.

In the case of promotions, a written request for consideration of promotion may be made with the candidate's concurrence by a faculty member who is qualified to vote (see Section VIII) on the promotion, or by nomination of the Departmental Advisory Committee, or by the candidate submitting a written request, to the department head by September 15. The department head will inform the faculty of candidates being considered for promotion by September 20.

### **A. Candidate's Responsibilities**

The responsibility for collecting the information that demonstrates the candidate's accomplishments will be borne principally by the candidate. The candidate is encouraged to consult with the department head and members of the faculty concerning the content and preparation of the promotion/tenure document.

The process for tenure/promotion evaluation begins automatically at the beginning of the final year of the probationary period, or when the candidate expresses in writing to the department head his/her intention to seek early promotion/tenure, or the candidate accepts the written nomination for a tenure decision before the final year of the probationary period by at least one of the faculty who are qualified to vote on the matter. The candidate will then prepare the portions of the promotion/tenure documentation that summarize his/her achievements in research, teaching, and service. The material must include all information required by the university and be presented in the format specified by the Office of Academic Personnel. (See <http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/promotionguidelinesfororganization.pdf> )

#### *Additional Supporting Documentation*

This supporting documentation should include:

#### *Scholarly Activities: Research*

1. A copy of each manuscript published, accepted, or submitted, of work that has been performed while a K-State faculty member for the relevant period.
2. Copies of all research proposals during the relevant period; reviewers' comments may be included.
3. Lists of invited and contributed presentations at scientific meetings and symposia; research seminars at universities, industries, and government laboratories; and graduate student recruiting seminars.
4. A list of former and current students and the current status of each of them.
5. A discussion of the candidate's collaborative work with other research groups.
6. National, regional, and local awards or recognition; copies of articles or other materials that cite or discuss the importance of the candidate's work and contributions.

#### *Scholarly Activities: Teaching*

1. List of courses taught.
2. Teaching evaluations

3. The standard evaluations that were furnished by all students who were enrolled in the candidate's courses for the relevant period or for the last three years, whichever is shorter.
4. National, regional, and local awards or recognition.
5. Information concerning the introduction of new courses and/or substantive course revision.
6. Other information that demonstrates the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

### *Service*

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

In addition to the documentation above, the faculty member should submit a five-year research and scholarly activities plan. The research plan, which is an extension of the one-page summary that is required by the university (see <http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/promotionguidelinesfororganization.pdf>), should be consistent with available resources and should include a discussion of the significance of the proposed work and its relationship to her/his current work.

Lastly, all candidates for promotion and tenure will present a colloquium that describes the results of the candidate's research studies for the relevant period. The candidate should arrange for this colloquium to be scheduled for the month of September. If the candidate has presented a departmental colloquium during the current calendar year, the department head with the concurrence of the Advisory Committee may waive the requirement of an additional colloquium.

## **B. Department's Responsibilities**

Upon either receiving a written request for promotion by the candidate or a written nomination for promotion from a qualified faculty member or the Departmental Advisory Committee, the department head will obtain the following documents and information.

### *1. Letters from External Evaluators*

The department head will request the candidate and the faculty who are qualified to vote on the matter to submit separate lists of potential external evaluators. The candidate's former mentors are specifically excluded as possible evaluators. 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. The candidate may, for cogently written reasons, request the department head to exclude certain individuals as external evaluators. With the advice of the faculty, the department head will choose the names of two evaluators from each list 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 to keep in balance the number of external evaluators selected from the two lists. 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") resulting from studies conducted as a Kansas State University faculty member. With the referees' concurrence, these documents will be provided in electronic form or by links to webpages. Each external reviewer will be requested to: (1) evaluate the candidate's research work and accomplishments, and (2) compare the candidate with others in the same general area of research who are at a comparable career level. When these letters are added to the candidate's promotion/tenure document, the letters will be accompanied by a copy of the letter that was sent to the evaluator. All solicited letters of evaluation concerning the candidate that are received must be included in the promotion/tenure document.

## *2. Teaching Documentation*

The department head will gather additional information by direct contact with students and with other faculty who have taught with the candidate. In speaking with students the department head will collect information on the students' perception of the candidate's:

- preparation for teaching;
- appropriateness of teaching methods and style;
- appropriateness of the content of courses;
- fairness in grading;
- equity of treatment of all students; and
- individual consultation with students.

In discussing the candidate with others in the department who have taught with him/her, the department head will collect information about other faculty members' perceptions of the candidate's:

- interactions with other faculty in collaborative efforts such as teaching recitations;
- general interest and ability to teach at all levels of instruction;
- preparation for teaching;
- appropriateness of teaching methods and style; and
- appropriateness of the content of courses.

When four or more solicited letters of evaluation have been received, the department head will make these materials available for inspection by the qualified faculty by the end of the second full week of October. By the end of the third full 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. The candidate will be represented by an advocate at this meeting. The advocate may be the qualified faculty member who requested consideration of the candidate for promotion/tenure, a member of the Departmental Advisory Committee, or a qualified faculty member who is appointed by the department head.

## **C. Faculty Vote**

Within five business days subsequent to the qualified faculty members' discussion of the candidate, each qualified member of the faculty will submit a written recommendation/ballot to the department head. A recommended form for the ballot is given in [Appendix A](#). At the close of the voting period, the department head will open the ballots and record the vote. The results of the faculty vote and a summary of the written justifications will be transmitted to the candidate and

the faculty. The summary, prepared by the department head, will be appropriately edited to ensure confidentiality. Copies of the recommendation forms for promotion/tenure/mid-probationary review are provided on the Office of Academic Personnel website.

#### **D. Report of the Department Head**

The department head will review the candidate's promotion/tenure documentation, external reviews, the recommendations of the qualified faculty, and the vote of the qualified faculty. The department head will then formulate an independent recommendation either supporting or failing to support promotion/tenure of the candidate. The department head 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 department's eligible tenured faculty members and the candidate's complete file are also forwarded to the dean. Prior to the submission of the department head's recommendation letter to the dean, the individual faculty member will be provided the opportunity to review the letter and the opportunity to discuss the contents of the letter with the department head. In the event of a disagreement between the faculty member and the department head concerning the recommendation, the faculty member has the right to append his/her viewpoint to the recommendation letter.

In cases of promotion and/or tenure before the final year of the probationary period, the department head will not forward his/her recommendation to the dean if the recommendation is negative and the candidate wishes to withdraw his/her application. Notification on the above matters to the candidate and the faculty should precede the transmittal of recommendations to the dean by an amount of time sufficient to allow the candidate to review the department head's recommendation letter. The department head will report to the faculty any new information or decisions concerning the candidate's status as soon as it may become available.

#### **E. Forwarding Procedures**

After the candidate has studied the recommendations, the candidate decides whether or not to withdraw his/her application. If the candidate wishes to continue the process, then the promotion/tenure document is forwarded to the dean. (In the case of a tenure decision involving the maximum probationary period and the mid-probationary review, the document must be forwarded.) The department head will include the results of the secret ballot, the summary of the faculty members justifications, including verbatim comments from the ballots, and his/her written recommendation.

### **V. MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW**

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

### **A. Department Head's Responsibilities**

At the beginning of the academic year in which the review is to occur, the department head will inform the candidate of the review and of his/her responsibilities concerning the review.

The department head will interview a representative sample of current and former graduate and undergraduate students, including those in the candidate's research group, to ascertain the quality of the candidate's teaching. The students' teaching evaluations of the faculty member being evaluated will also be reviewed by the department head.

### **B. Candidate's Responsibilities**

The procedure for mid-probationary review will be similar to the review procedure for promotion and/or tenure. The probationary faculty member will present to the department head by January 15 documentation of her/his accomplishments in research, teaching, and service. The format that should be followed and the types of evidence that should be provided will be the same as those for tenure/promotion. Outside letters of evaluation need not be sought.

In addition to the documentation above, the faculty member should submit a three-year research and scholarly activities plan. The research plan should be consistent with available resources and should include a discussion of the significance of the proposed work and its relationship to his/her current work.

Lastly, the candidate will present a departmental colloquium that describes his/her research studies since coming to K-State. The candidate should arrange for this colloquium to be scheduled before February 15.

### **C. Faculty Vote**

By the end of February, tenured members and the department head will meet to discuss the probationary faculty member's performance. As explained in Section VIII, the tenured faculty is the faculty qualified to vote on mid-probationary review. After the meeting when the tenured faculty members' discuss the candidate, each tenured member of the faculty will submit an electronic ballot/written recommendation to the department head concerning whether or not the probationary faculty member should be appointed to a *fifth* year of service at K-State. The results of the faculty vote and a summary of the written justifications will be transmitted to the candidate and the faculty. The summary, which will be prepared by the department head, will be appropriately edited to ensure confidentiality.

### **D. Report of the Department Head**

The department head will review the candidate's documentation, the summary of the candidate's research and teaching effectiveness, and the recommendations of the faculty and make an independent recommendation supporting or failing to support appointment of the candidate to the fifth year of service. The department head will explain her/his recommendation in writing to the candidate and to the faculty.

## **E. Appeal Procedures**

If tenured faculty members and/or the department head should recommend that the probationary faculty member should not be reappointed, then the appeal procedure that is used in the case of denial of promotion and/or tenure may be used by the probationary faculty member. All appeals must be resolved one week before recommendations are to be sent to the dean.

## **F. Forwarding Procedures**

The recommendations of the tenured faculty and the department head supporting or opposing reappointment of the probationary faculty member will be transmitted to the dean by the last Friday in March. The department head will include the results of the secret ballot, the summary of the faculty members' recommendation, including verbatim comments from the ballots, and his/her written recommendation.

## **G. Report from the Dean**

The candidates file will be reviewed by the College of Arts & Sciences College Advisory Committee. The dean will provide an assessment letter to the candidate. ([University Handbook C92.4](#))

# **VI. CRITERIA FOR PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARDS**

Eligibility for the Professorial Performance Award is based on continued demonstrated strong distinction in teaching, research and scholarly activities, and service and professional activities. Criteria for the Professorial Performance Award are:

## **A. Time in Rank**

The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at least six years since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award.

## **B. Scholarly Activities: Research**

1. The candidate should have maintained a national and/or international reputation in some area of physics.
2. The quality of his/her work in physics should be reflected by his/her publications.
3. He/she should have worked constructively to bring outside support to the department through proposals which would provide extramural funding for research.
4. He/she should have worked effectively with one or more of the following:
  - i. other faculty members;
  - ii. students;
  - iii. other scientists in a common collaborative research endeavor.



### **C. Scholarly Activities: Teaching**

The candidate should have maintained the ability to teach effectively at two of the three levels of instruction. The questions to be addressed are described in [Section III.B.2.](#) of this document.

### **D. Service and Professional Activities**

The candidate should have continued to maintain a leadership role in service to the Department, University or professional associations.

## **VII. PROCEDURES FOR PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARDS**

### **A. Candidate's Responsibilities**

Eligible candidates will compile and submit a file that documents his/her professional accomplishments for at least the previous six years.

### **B. Department Head's Responsibilities**

The department head will evaluate the candidate's performance and seek input from other full professors for their evaluation of his/her performance. The weighting of each of the four categories in Section VI will be consistent with the candidate's responsibilities as stated in his/her annual letter of responsibility. The department head will then prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials and make a recommendation for or against the award. The department head's recommendation will occur in sufficient time so that the candidate may review and respond to the recommendation as stated in the University Handbook, [Section C49.6.](#)

After the candidate has had the opportunity to review the recommendation as described in Section C below, the department head will forward his/her written recommendation to the candidate and to the dean along with documentation as described in the University Handbook, [Section C49.7.](#)

### **C. Candidates Review of the Recommendation**

Each candidate who is eligible for the award will have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the department head and will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review and discuss the evaluation. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, the candidate may submit to the department head and dean a written statement reflecting unresolved differences regarding the evaluation. Consistent with annual evaluation, the candidate may appeal to the dean for resolution as described in the University Handbook Section C49.6.

## **VIII. FACULTY QUALIFIED TO VOTE ON THE MATTERS OF PROMOTION/TENURE AND MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW**

All faculty who hold a rank equal to or higher than the rank being considered may vote on the question of promotion; faculty who hold tenure, regardless of rank, may vote on the questions involving the awarding of tenure and mid-probationary review. If a qualified faculty member cannot be present during the discussion of the candidate's promotion/tenure/mid-probationary review document, the qualified faculty member may leave any statement that he/she may want incorporated into the discussion summary with the department head prior to the meeting. All eligible faculty may vote by electronic ballot during the voting period that is determined by the department head.

## **IX. ANNUAL EVALUATION**

Following university procedures, the department head will evaluate each faculty member for his/her contributions to teaching, research and service.

### **A. Faculty Member's Responsibility**

The faculty member must provide an up-to-date vita and a report on activities during the prior calendar year. The report should follow the format described in [Appendix B](#). In addition, each faculty member should provide the following documentation:

#### *1. Scholarly Activities: Research*

Each faculty member should submit copies of all published and unpublished papers; or reports which have been completed or published during the year; and other materials related to faculty member's research activities. If some of these materials are not in printed format (e.g. videodiscs, CD-ROMs or computer programs) a written description of the item will be submitted in lieu of the actual work. Copies of all proposals submitted for grants will be part of each faculty member's permanent file.

#### *2. Scholarly Activities: Teaching*

Three components are needed in any attempt to document the quality of one's instructional activities. The first is a self-report on activities inside and outside of the classroom. The second is a set of documentation which can allow one's colleagues to see that the course was indeed academically sound, and the third is an indication that the instructor communicated effectively with the students in the course. Together these materials can provide any concerned person with rather complete documentation on the quality of a faculty member's instructional activities.

The report on one's own instructional activities is perhaps the most important component because it can document the instructional activities which are not a part of a formal classroom but which are a fundamental component in the educational process in our department. Every faculty member should report, in short paragraphs, instructional work with graduate students and undergraduates, work in helping our students prepare to present seminars or papers at meetings, and the direct supervision of graduate students who are working on research projects. Information should be provided concerning any activities which took place in the classroom and which might be considered by other faculty to be particularly notable. For example, if a faculty member has taken

the time to revise and reorganize the content of a course or to rewrite a lab manual, it should be included in a report of teaching. Finally, if a faculty member has tried anything different or innovative in classes, a report on successes and failures could be extremely valuable. (The failure of an innovation in teaching should never be considered a reflection of low quality teaching).

To document the academic quality of a course, each faculty member must present a "portfolio" which contains all written information which was presented to the students during the semester. This collection should include a course syllabus, the course examinations, and other handouts such as reference materials and homework assignments. Distributions of students' grades on examinations can also be useful. (For print material prepared by the office staff, this material will be collected automatically by the office staff. Each time class materials are prepared, the office staff can place a copy in a file for teaching documentation. If a faculty member prepares his/her own instructional materials, he/she is responsible for inserting it into the portfolio.)

Collection of data about the students' perceptions of instruction should be completed by using one of the questionnaires which are available through the Office of Planning and Evaluation Service. In general the department's faculty will use the TEVAL form. However, faculty members who are interested in collecting information for use to improve their teaching may use the IDEA form as a substitute. While this form was not created as a method of documenting the quality of teaching, many of the questions on it can be used for that purpose.

### *3. Service and Professional Activities*

Any appropriate documentation.

### **B. Availability of Faculty Portfolios**

All documentation should be provided to the department head by a time that he/she will specify and will be consistent with reporting to the dean on schedule. Each faculty member may review the documentation of his/her colleagues.

In general this documentation will be placed on the department's website in a password protected file so that all faculty may review it. If a faculty member wishes to have any documents treated as confidential and not placed on the secure website, he/she should inform the department head when submitting the materials.

### **C. Department Head's Responsibility**

The department head will elicit impressions from every faculty member of the performance of his/her colleagues, and other aspects of departmental operation, by a time that he/she will specify and that will be consistent with reporting to the dean on schedule.

The department head will prepare an evaluation of each faculty member. He/she will use feedback from other faculty and the portfolio as primary sources for his/her conclusions. The criteria for judging a faculty member's performance will be the same as those for promotion and tenure, and will be appropriate for the faculty member's present rank.

The department head will prepare a letter of evaluation for each faculty member, for performance in each of the three areas, along with an *overall* evaluation. This letter will be addressed to the

dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The evaluation ratings should be divided into no more than 4 categories, such as *Outstanding*, *Very Good*, *Good*, and *Unsatisfactory*.

Prior to its submission to the dean, the individual faculty member will be provided the opportunity to review the evaluation letter and the opportunity to discuss the contents of the letter with the department head. In the event of a disagreement between the faculty member and the department head concerning the evaluation rating, the faculty member has the right to append his/her viewpoint to the letter of evaluation.

The evaluation letter and evaluation ratings of an individual faculty member shall be strictly confidential.

#### **D. Merit Pay Increases**

Merit pay increases will be based on an average of each faculty member's evaluation over the three most recent years. For faculty members who have fewer than three years of service, the merit pay increase will be based on an average of all years of service. Sabbatical years will be included in the calculation of the averages but leaves without pay will not. Please see University Handbook C46.2 for details.

## **X. POST TENURE REVIEW**

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

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

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

#### **A. Materials to be Used for the Review**

The primary material to be used for the review of a faculty member will be the six (6) previous annual evaluations that were written by the department head. If the faculty member so chooses, the evaluation materials provided by the faculty member during the previous six (6) years may also be included.

## **B. Responsibilities of the Department Head**

The department head will conduct the post tenure review. For a faculty member's post tenure performance rating to fall below the minimum level of appropriate contribution to the university, he/she must have received at least two (2) deficient overall evaluations from the department head during the six previous years, unless it is determined by the department head that notable strengths in research and/or teaching outweigh the deficiencies. To have received a *deficient* evaluation, the overall annual evaluation of the faculty member during any of the previous six (6) years will have indicated that he/she is not meeting expectations. In terms of the assessment categories that are currently used by the department (Outstanding, Very Good, Good, and Unsatisfactory), an assessment of less than Good means that the faculty member is not meeting expectations.

## **C. Procedures for Addressing Performance Deficiencies**

In the event that the department head determines that a faculty member's post tenure performance (for the previous 6 years) indicates that he or she has not appropriately discharged the duties associated with his or her position, the department head will inform the faculty member of this conclusion and will prepare a written report describing the basis for this conclusion. The faculty member shall be given a copy of the report. A face-to-face meeting between the faculty member and the department head is encouraged. If the determination of the report suggests that a plan for additional professional development should be identified, a face-to-face meeting to discuss options and develop a plan is required. The development plan should be utilized in future annual evaluations and post tenure review to review progress toward any goals set in the plan.

If the faculty member does not agree with the conclusion of the department head's report, the faculty member-in-question will have seven (7) working days following receipt of the report to prepare a rebuttal which will be submitted to the department head. After reviewing the faculty member-in-question's rebuttal, the department head must decide within two (2) working days whether the faculty member-in-question has met the minimum post-tenure performance standard in light of the new information that was reported in the rebuttal. If, after reviewing the rebuttal, the department head is still of the opinion that that the faculty member-in-question has not met the minimum level of post-tenure performance, the head will submit his/her report and the faculty member-in-question's rebuttal to the departmental tenured faculty for review and vote on whether a negative post tenure review be forwarded to the dean.

During this stage of the review, the department head and the faculty member-in-question must be given the opportunity, but are not required, to address the tenured faculty members. The tenured faculty, acting as a committee of the whole (a faculty member who has been elected by a majority vote will serve as presiding officer) will consider and discuss the evidence the department head has provided and the faculty member-in-question's written rebuttal, both of whom may be present at the meeting. The tenured faculty may ask questions which the department head and faculty member-in-question may answer if they wish. An anonymous vote of the tenured faculty will then take place. Voting faculty members may write comments on their ballots; these comments will be collected along with the votes by the presiding officer within 24 hours. The opinion indicated by this vote, if divergent from that of the department head, is intended to encourage the department head to modify his/her performance assessment of the faculty-member-in-question within 24 hours so that the assessment agrees with the vote. If the department head is not persuaded to modify his/her assessment within 24 hours, then the negative post tenure evaluation,

the result of the faculty vote, and unedited faculty comments from the vote will be forwarded to the dean. The faculty member has the right to append his/her viewpoint to the negative evaluation letter. This last determination is not subject to appeal under Appendix G.

## **XI. MINIMUM PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR ADDRESSING PERFORMANCE DEFICIENCIES**

As required and described by Sections C31.5-C31.8 of the [University Handbook](#), the Faculty of the Department of Physics herein set forth the minimum acceptable level of faculty performance and the procedures which must be completed prior to the revocation of tenure and dismissal for cause of any tenured faculty member within the department.

The collective strength of a faculty is related to the abilities and level of contribution individual faculty provide toward meeting the department's missions. The contribution of individual faculty members is expected to vary both in area (teaching, research, and service) and in level of performance. Contributions of individual faculty may change over time, and circumstances beyond the control of the faculty member may cause the level of performance to decline.

The cornerstone of performance assessment in academics is peer review. Because the initial granting of tenure and promotion involves the collective assessment of a candidate's documented performance and potential by the departmental faculty, that faculty is the appropriate group to be involved in deciding whether or not an individual faculty member's performance does not measure up to a minimum acceptable level of productivity.

The determination that a faculty member's performance is below minimum acceptable limits in any area must be judged in relation to the resources provided to the faculty member, the level of responsibility that the faculty has in each area, and the faculty member's specific area of expertise (as demonstrated by previous acceptable levels of performance). In the same fashion, a finding that minimum-acceptable levels of performance are not being met must be weighed against what would normally be expected from other faculty with the same credentials, levels of responsibility, and levels of experience. Furthermore, a determination that minimum levels of performance are not being met is not appropriate if resources are not provided that would allow a faculty member to meet minimum levels of performance. Failure to meet minimum-acceptable levels of performance because of a documented medical problem is also not grounds for revocation of tenure and dismissal for cause.

### **A. Minimum Performance Standards**

All tenured faculty members should (1) provide a competent level of instruction, (2) be active in scholarly research, and (3) contribute to the university and/or the professional community in a service capacity. The proportion of these activities shall be agreed upon annually in writing by the faculty member and the department head.

#### *1. Scholarly Activities: Research*

Tenured faculty members are expected to be engaged in scholarly research. Evidence of scholarly activities may include any of the following:

- publications in scholarly journals, books, book chapters, reports in conference proceedings, technical reports, book reviews;
- submission of manuscripts for publication;
- presentations at professional conferences;
- participation as principal or co-principal investigator or co-investigator on research grants or proposals;
- collaboration in research with students, post-doctoral associates, or other co-workers; and
- receipt of fellowships based on scholarly performance.

Other acceptable evidence of scholarly activities may be mutually agreed upon between the faculty member and the department head.

## 2. *Scholarly Activities: Teaching*

Tenured faculty members are expected to:

- maintain knowledge in subjects which they teach;
- provide students with guidelines to courses which they teach, including a statement of the goals and scope of the course and procedures for grading;
- meet classes as scheduled or arrange for an alternative learning experience;
- be accessible to students through office hours and/or other arrangements;
- provide guidance to graduate students under their direction, through supervision of research and advice regarding their course of study.

## 3. *Service*

Tenured faculty members are expected to contribute to the department, university and/or professional community in some service capacity. Examples of activities that constitute service to the department include (but are not limited to):

- participation in standing or *ad hoc* departmental committees;
- editing of departmental newsletter;
- organizing workshops or weekly seminars;
- undergraduate advising;
- supervision of support staff;
- departmental administration;
- supervising or participating in University Open House;
- participating in the department's fund raising activities; and
- outreach activities (working with public schools, REU programs, etc.)

Examples of service activities outside the department include (but are not limited to):

- service on a standing or *ad hoc* college or university committee or Faculty Senate;
- service as an officer in an international, national, or regional professional organization;
- organizing conferences and workshops on behalf of a professional organization;
- review of manuscripts for a peer-reviewed scholarly journal;
- review of grant proposals on behalf of funding agencies.

Other forms of service may be mutually agreed upon between the faculty member and the department head.

## **B. Procedures for addressing performance deficiencies**

Section C31.5 of the [University Handbook](#) provides guidelines for appropriate actions to be considered in case a department head in consultation with departmental faculty determines the performance of a tenured faculty member to be below the minimum acceptable standards. This document describes procedures that will be followed internally before the matter is brought to the attention of the college dean. For a faculty member's *overall* performance rating to fall below the minimum level of acceptable performance, he/she must be deficient in at least two of the three areas under evaluation (research, teaching, and service) in any one evaluation period or deficient in one of these three areas for two consecutive evaluation periods, unless it is determined by the department head that notable strengths in research and/or teaching outweigh the deficiencies. Section C31.5 of the [University Handbook](#) states that if a faculty member has received two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which minimum standards are not met, then “dismissal for cause” will be considered at the discretion of the appropriate dean. Hence, negative evaluations are a serious matter. If, in the judgment of the department head, a faculty member’s overall performance has fallen below the minimum for the past year, then the department head’s annual evaluation letter should explicitly state this judgment: that the faculty member’s *overall* performance has fallen below the minimum level of acceptable performance. The following procedure will be followed if the department head makes such an *overall* evaluation.

### *1. Upon the First Negative Overall Evaluation of a Faculty Member in a Five-Year Period:*

If the department head determines that a faculty member fails to meet *overall* minimum standards, the department head should take the course of actions described in Section 31.7 of the [University Handbook](#) to assist the faculty member-in-question towards meeting minimum levels of acceptable performance. Furthermore, the department head will provide full written descriptions of the area which is judged not to meet minimum levels of acceptable performance and the level of performance that is necessary to meet minimum levels of acceptable performance. The faculty member must be permitted the opportunity to respond in writing for the record. Together, the department head and faculty member-in-question are to develop a plan of action designed to correct the alleged deficiencies. This plan must include specific expectations that are to be met, and what new resources will be provided. The goal is to provide a means whereby the faculty member will soon exceed the level(s) of minimum acceptable performance. If the faculty member-in-question and department head cannot agree on a plan of corrective action and specific criteria for exceeding minimum levels of acceptable performance, the department head and Faculty member-in-question will submit their respective proposals for review by the tenured faculty of the department. The tenured faculty will then work with the faculty member and the department head to develop a viable plan.

An assessment regarding success in meeting minimum standards of performance (or progress towards this goal) will be provided to the faculty member-in-question by the department head in subsequent written evaluations. Failure by the faculty member to progress towards acceptable performance will ultimately result in a written reassessment by the department head of the plan of corrective action and a determination as to the specific reason(s) for the faculty member failing to make progress towards meeting or exceeding minimum levels of acceptable performance. Prior to forwarding a second consecutive negative evaluation or a third negative evaluation in a five-year period to the dean, the following procedure will be followed.



*2. Prior to the Second Consecutive Negative Evaluation or the Third Negative Evaluation in a Five-Year Period:*

Section C31.6 of the [University Handbook](#) states that decisions about revocation of tenure, especially if the grounds are professional incompetence, should not be exclusively controlled or determined by and should not be unduly influenced by single individuals without input from faculty. If, in the judgment of the department head, a faculty member is on the verge of receiving two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which minimum standards are not met, the department head will write a preliminary draft of an annual evaluation letter for the faculty member. The following steps will be taken before the department head finalizes the annual evaluation letter.

The department head will inform the faculty member-in-question that his/her performance is below the minimum standard and will prepare a full written report of the basis for proposing to the dean that tenure be revoked and that the faculty member-in-question be dismissed for cause. The report must include a detailed account of the evidence related to the finding that minimum-acceptable levels of performance have not been and are not being met and that constructive attempts to correct the deficiency have failed. The faculty member-in-question will have seven (7) working days to prepare a rebuttal which will be submitted to the department head. After reviewing the faculty member-in-question's rebuttal, the department head must decide within two (2) days whether the faculty member-in-question has met the minimum standard in light of the new information that was reported in the rebuttal. If, after reviewing the rebuttal, the department head is still of the opinion that that the faculty member-in-question has not met the minimum level of acceptable performance, the head will submit his/her report and the faculty member-in-question's rebuttal to the departmental tenured faculty for review and vote on whether revocation of tenure and dismissal for cause is warranted.

The department head's report and the faculty member's rebuttal (if provided) will be submitted for review by all tenured faculty (excluding the faculty-member-in-question). The department head and the faculty member-in-question must be given the opportunity, but are not required, to address the tenured faculty members. The tenured faculty, acting as a committee of the whole (a faculty member which has been elected by a majority vote will serve as presiding officer) will consider and discuss the evidence the department head has provided and the faculty member-in-question's written rebuttal. The tenured faculty may ask questions which the department head and faculty member-in-question may answer if they wish. An anonymous vote of the tenured faculty where the faculty will have the opportunity to include written comments will then take place. A vote of two-thirds or more of all tenured faculty is necessary for the faculty to find that revocation of tenure and dismissal for cause is appropriate. Voting faculty members may write comments on their ballots; these comments will be collected along with the votes. The opinion indicated by this vote, if divergent from that of the department head, is intended to strongly encourage the department head to modify his/her performance assessment of the faculty-member-in-question so that the assessment agrees with the vote. This level of faculty participation satisfies Section 31.6 of the [University Handbook](#), which is stated above. If the department head is not persuaded to modify his/her assessment, then the negative evaluation, the result of the faculty vote, and unedited faculty comments from the vote will be forwarded to the dean. The faculty member has the right to append his/her viewpoint to the negative evaluation letter.

The re-initiation of this procedure by the department head against the same faculty member can only occur after a period of not less than one (1) year following completion of the previous

faculty review and vote. It is expected that during this time the department head will have undertaken additional steps to improve the faculty member's performance.

## **XII. PROCEDURES CONCERNING THIS DOCUMENT**

After the final version of this document has been approved by the Physics Faculty, it will become the document which describes faculty evaluation. It will supersede all previous departmental documents on this topic.

This document, upon approval, will be posted on the departmental website within two weeks of its approval. When a new tenured or tenure-track faculty member joins the department, he/she will be given the link to this document by the department head during the first week of the semester in which he/she begins at K-State.

Each year, as soon as the specific dates for any of the actions listed in [Appendix C](#) are known to the department head or the office staff, they will be posted on the department's webpages.

**This document will expire five years from the date of its most recent approval.**

## APPENDIX A

### Ballots

- [Ballot for Promotion and/or Tenure](#)
- [Ballot for the Reappointment](#)

## APPENDIX B

### Forms for Presenting Summaries of Activities for Annual Evaluation

Any appropriate method of reporting annual activities is acceptable. However, it is recommended the faculty use the method available in the link below.

Version 1: [Word document](#) [PDF file](#)

The faculty member should provide this report in electronic format (PDF preferred) or hard copy. In addition, each faculty member should provide a copy of an up-to-date vita.

Independent of the form used, the annual report should cover the faculty member's completed activities for the calendar year. Activities in progress may be reported to date. Listed below are items that should be reported.

1. Teaching
  - Formal courses taught. Give title and semester.
  - List of students who have earned M.S. or Ph.D. degrees with you as the major advisor.
  - Students for whom you are the major advisor.
2. Publications, and Research Grants Awarded
  - Published papers. Please enclose one copy of each paper. Give complete reference, if the reprint is not available.
  - Grants and Contracts. Give title, amount, identify funding agency, grant period and your role.
  - Research, writing and scholarly work in progress
3. Unpublished books and articles. Give status of the manuscript: in preparation, submitted for publication (indicate journal), in press (indicate journal).
  - Grants and contracts applied for. Indicate status.
  - Other Scholarly Activities
  - Conferences attended. Indicate the nature of your participation.
4. Editorial responsibilities.
  - Memberships on boards and committees of professional organizations.
  - Collaborative research. List research associates at K-State and scientists from other institutions with whom you collaborated in research.
  - University service
  - Membership on departmental, college, and university boards and committees.
5. Any Other Relevant Additional Information Not Included Above.

NOTE: The information supplied by each faculty member may either be designated as private information for the Department Head only or as public information. Unless the faculty member requests otherwise all public information will be made available on the Web in a password protected file. The password will be available to all tenured and tenure-track faculty.

## APPENDIX C

### Time Tables

Each year when the deadlines for tenure, promotion, mid-probationary review and annual evaluation are established by the dean of the College of Arts & Sciences, the department head will establish the deadlines for departmental actions. These deadlines will follow as closely as possible the time tables below. The department head will make adjustments to these dates to account for his/her travel, the candidate's travel, professional meetings which will be attended by a significant number of faculty, and holidays. Once the dean establishes the calendar for a given year, the department head will have a time table created and will make it available on the department website [from this link](#).

<b>A. Promotion and Tenure</b>	
<i>Date by which action must be completed</i>	<i>Action</i>
First week of Fall Semester*	The department head informs the candidates who are in the final year of the probationary period of their responsibilities in preparing for the tenure decision.
Six weeks before XXX (XXX defined below)	Nominations and written requests for tenure before the end of the probationary period and for promotion due to department head.
No later than one month before XXX	Candidate presents a departmental colloquium.
No later than one month before XXX	Candidates prepare materials.
One month before XXX	Candidate's materials become available for faculty inspection.
No later than 2 weeks before XXX	Faculty members meet to discuss the candidate. Faculty votes.
No later than 1 week before XXX	The department head informs the candidate and the faculty of his/her recommendation.
XXX: Date established by Dean's Office	Department head sends recommendations to the dean and reports to the candidate and faculty.
The following dates are not controlled by the department. As each of these events occurs, the department head will inform the candidate and the faculty of the action.	
	The dean sends materials and summary sheet for each candidate to the Dean's Council for review.
	Review by Council of Academic Deans.
	The dean forwards recommendations to the provost.
	The dean mails a letter which informs the candidates of the decision.
<b>B. Mid-Probationary Review</b>	
<i>Date by which action must be completed</i>	<i>Action</i>
Semester in which the review will occur.	The department head informs the candidate of his/her responsibilities.
Fall Semester	The Candidate prepares materials.
No later than one month before YYY (YYY defined below)	The Candidate submits materials to the department head. Those materials become available for faculty inspection.

No later than one month before XXX	The Candidate has presented a departmental colloquium by this date.
No later than 2 weeks before XXX	The faculty meets to discuss the candidate. Faculty votes.
No later than 1 week before XXX	The department head informs the candidate and the faculty of his/her recommendation.
YYY: Date established by the Dean	The department head forwards the recommendation to the dean.
<b>C. Annual Evaluation</b>	
<i>Date by which action must be completed</i>	<i>Action</i>
Six Weeks before ZZZ (ZZZ defined below)	Report of scholarly and professional activities due.
Five Weeks before ZZZ	Relevant portions of these materials are placed in the library for faculty inspection.
No later than two weeks before ZZZ	Faculty members provide peer evaluation and input to the department head.
One week before ZZZ	Letters of evaluation are available for faculty review and for discussion with the department head.
ZZZ: Date established by the Dean	The department head send the letters of evaluation to the dean
No later than two weeks after ZZZ	Department head reports the results of the review to the faculty.
<b>D. Reappointment of non-tenured faculty (A different time table will be created for first year, second year and the other years.)</b>	
<i>Date by which action must be completed</i>	<i>Action</i>
One month before WWW	Candidate provides vita and other relevant materials which become available for faculty inspection.
No later than 2 weeks before WWW	Faculty members meet to discuss the candidate. Faculty votes.
No later than 1 week before WWW	The department head informs the candidate and the faculty of his/her recommendation.
WWW: Date established by the Dean	The department head send recommendation to the dean