

Department

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 ()

NEXT REVIEW DATE: 12/2025



 Department Head's Signature

8/16/2021

 Date

Amit Chakrabarti

 Dean's Signature

8-27-2021

 Date



 Provost's Signature

9/14/2021

 Date

Annual Faculty Evaluations¹

Introduction

This statement provides a summary of current departmental practices regarding the various forms of faculty evaluation. The practices and procedures noted in this document apply to intra-departmental personnel processes. All of these practices and procedures fall within spirit of the University Handbook.² It is anticipated that modifications may be made in these practices and procedures as a result of departmental planning and review and/or changes in the University Handbook.

Annual Merit Evaluation

1. Annual merit evaluations of faculty performance are designed both to provide feedback to faculty and to provide a fair and objective basis for the allocation of merit salary increases.
2. Faculty are requested to submit information concerning their instructional activities (including teaching, advising, and participation on graduate committees), research, and service for the previous academic year (August to July). University policy mandates that faculty submit all teaching evaluations and summaries for each of the courses they have taught during the year. In addition, syllabi, tests, student test performances (names removed) and other evidence of learning outcomes, peer reviews, unsolicited student comments and other evidence of instructional performance are welcomed. See Annual Evaluation Guidelines for more information on submitting evidence of teaching effectiveness. Copies of publications, professional papers, and other evidence of scholarly performance should also be submitted. Faculty members are required to state explicitly in the narrative which year an accepted manuscript should be counted. If an accepted manuscript is counted toward your research evaluation prior to its appearance in print, it cannot also count in the year it is printed/published. Given the various hurdles between accepted book contracts, which are typically based upon brief proposals, and the actual publication of books or monographs, this type of research product will only be counted when it is published. Appendix D provides a sample copy of the request for information and the format of submissions.
3. Faculty members will submit materials that will be initially reviewed by a three member faculty evaluation committee.

¹ Revised Evaluation and Tenure and Promotion Procedures accepted by the department on December 21, 2020. The department accepted previous versions of this document in 1992, 1995, 2003, 2007, 2010, and 2015. Faculty in tenure earning positions in the department when new criteria are established may choose to use either 1) the criteria in place when they were hired into the tenure track line in the department or 2) the newly established criteria for promotion to either associate or full professor.

²Personnel files made available by faculty to the department for the purposes of evaluation are assumed to be confidential. Likewise, conversations in committees regarding all personnel files are considered confidential. Documents that are already publicly available, like vitas, course syllabi, publications, committee assignments, are not considered confidential. Finally, the University Handbook specifies other faculty rights, appeals and grievance procedures, which are beyond the scope of this document. Copies of the most recent version of the University Handbook can be found on K-State's web site.

4. The Faculty Evaluation Committee, whose recommendations are advisory to the department head, is chosen annually on a rotating basis. Whenever possible the committee should include a full professor, an associate professor, and an assistant professor.³ Usually, one member is carried over from the previous year to serve as chair of the committee and is joined by two new additional members. Although faculty may opt not to serve, all faculty members are encouraged to serve when selected. The FEC members may confer with one another, but submit separate evaluations to the chair of the committee who summarizes their evaluations to the department head, in each case excluding herself or himself. The FEC will complete its review by mid-November for submission to the department head). The FEC is to evaluate each faculty member based on a rating scale of outstanding, exceeds departmental expectations, meets departmental expectations, fails to meet departmental expectations (i.e., needs improvement, but exceeds minimum expectations outlined on pages 14 and 15 of this document) and unsatisfactory (i.e., does not meet minimum departmental expectations). This rating excludes any combination of two different ratings such as outstanding/exceeded expectations. In the instance of a faculty member who cannot be evaluated by the department head, the committee members report their assessments directly to the Dean of Arts and Sciences or to the person designated by the dean to serve in that evaluative capacity.
5. Review and Rating by Department Head: After the head independently reviews the faculty evaluations and considers the recommendation of the FEC members, the department head determines faculty ratings based on a scale of outstanding, exceeds departmental expectations, meets departmental expectations, fails to meet departmental expectations (i.e., needs improvement, but exceeds minimum expectations outlined on pages 14 and 15 of this document) and unsatisfactory (i.e., does not meet minimum departmental expectations). This rating excludes any combination of two different ratings such as outstanding/exceeded expectations. Each component of performance (instruction, research, service) is rated independently and a composite rating is also given. The allocation of an individual faculty member's rating is entirely independent of the ratings of other faculty members. In other words, it is theoretically possible for all faculty to be outstanding or, conversely, for all to be unacceptable, or for any other distribution to occur between these two polar possibilities.
6. Communications between the FEC and the Department Head: Prior to the head's presenting their written evaluation statement to each faculty member, the head and FEC will share and discuss their initial evaluations of each faculty member. Based on the FEC's additional input, the head may choose to revise their initial evaluation of a faculty member.
7. Draft Statements and Consultation with Faculty: The department head prepares a draft statement for each faculty member. The statement summarizes the year's activities and includes the ratings assigned. These statements are shared with the faculty individually and corrections and comments are invited. Faculty are requested to discuss the evaluation with the department head. After such opportunities for consultation the evaluation statements are finalized. Faculty initial or sign one copy to acknowledge receipt. If there is disagreement with the statement, a dissenting statement may be submitted. The full set of statements is then submitted to the dean with a cover letter from

³Assistant professors serving on the committee should, at a minimum, be in their second year of appointment.

the department head.

8. Nominees for Special Honors (Teaching and Advising): The department head must consult with the FEC concerning nominees for teaching awards or other honors which might be related to faculty evaluation. Candidates for special awards should have taught at least three total courses over the past year. Criteria for nominations are included in the department's *Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion: Procedures, Standards and Criteria*.
9. Recommendations for Merit Salary Increases: When salary recommendations are invited by the Dean of Arts and Sciences, the department head distributes increases in relationship to faculty ratings. All faculty who have done a satisfactory job are provided at least a minimal salary increase.
10. Recommendations for Equity Adjustments: When equity adjustment funds are available, the department head recommends one or more individuals for equity adjustment increases based on both merit and peer universities' salaries. The head informs all faculty and invites them to submit statements indicating why they should be considered for equity increases. The department head consults the FEC in their equity calculations and makes final recommendations.

Evaluation Guidelines

Department of Political Science

To assist the department head in arriving at a fair and accurate assessment of faculty members' performance, the Faculty Evaluation Committee will request information pertaining to each faculty member's instructional activities and load, research and professional activities, department and university service and public service.

For the sake of comparability, this information, which will be used to determine merit salary adjustments and promotions, should be presented in the following manner:

- 1 Your name and rank
- 2 An updated vita
- 3 Instruction: Instruction encompasses classroom instruction, undergraduate student supervision, and graduate student supervision. All three are important in the evaluation process. Information relevant to performance in this area must include the following items:
 - a. Classroom Instruction:
 - i. **Course Load:** Please list in-load courses taught (number, course title, and approximate number of students in each) over the past academic year (fall, spring, and summer semesters). Only those courses and activities that are part of a faculty member's normal contract are considered in the merit evaluation. Overload courses will be evaluated by department head or appropriate body.
 - ii. **Teaching Performance:** Please attach the results of all individual and summary TEVAL/IDEA course evaluations for each in-load class taught over the past academic year (fall, spring and summer semesters). Recognizing the sources of bias in teaching evaluations (Holman, Mirya, Ellen Key and Rebecca Kreitzer. 2019. "Evidence of Bias in Standard Evaluations of Teaching."), the FEC will evaluate teaching holistically. See sections C 34.1 and C34.2 in the University Handbook and the university's Effective Faculty Evaluation on-line manual for additional suggestions. Evidence of effective teaching should include: course syllabi and student evaluations of teaching (TEVAL). It may also include but not limited to such indicators of teaching effectiveness such as examples of student work; evidence of learning from pre and post-tests; teaching workshops attended and peer evaluations. Following section C34.2 in the University Handbook, the FEC ***is encouraged to*** evaluate teaching in a holistic sense.
 - b. Undergraduate Student Supervision: Identify the number of undergraduate students you supervise and specify the nature of your relationship with them, such as direct reading, mentoring, undergraduate research, and so forth. Please specify if they come in once a semester, or are you in more frequent contact with them. What percentage of your time is devoted to undergraduate supervision?
 - c. Graduate Student Supervision:

- i. List the graduate students who have completed their M.A., M.P.A., or Ph.D. under your direction this academic year.
 - ii. List the graduate students currently enrolled under your guidance.
 - iii. List service on M.A., M.P.A., or Ph.D. committees where you are/were not the principal advisor in this and other departments. List names and departments; specify M.A., M.P.A., or Ph.D.

- 4 Research/Professional Service: This includes material published during the academic year or accepted for publication, work in progress or part of a large project, papers before professional societies, panel member, chairperson or panel, journal reviewer, member of professional board, etc. Appendices A and B provide information on departmental research expectations and the department's approach to different types of research contributions.
 - a. Publications During Academic Year (August 1 - July 31): Please list publications and indicate whether they are in a professional journal (J), book/monograph (M), book chapter (CH), public scholarship (P), community engaged research products⁴ (E), book review or encyclopedia article (BR), or other (O), and whether they are single, co- or multi-authored. Please provide some details about these publications, for example, whether the articles were refereed, and something of the nature of the journal/magazine, if it is not one of the common professional ones. Please make certain that copies of these publications are included in your departmental open file (publications and vita).
 - b. Work in Progress: Identify work in progress and indicate how it fits into ongoing projects. Please include copies of papers written, book chapters, tables of contents, and the like.
 - c. Professional Activities: List all professional activities carried out during the academic year: papers given, panel member or chair, board member, books or manuscripts reviewed.

- 5 Department/University/Public Service: This includes service on departmental and university committees, special assignments undertaken, and other services rendered to the department or university.
 - a. Please list university and departmental committees on which you have served during this academic year. Please also list contribution to various departmental events and activities.
 - b. List other services performed for the university community.
 - c. Engaged Service and Public Outreach: Please list and/or discuss the various efforts to engage with the wider community through activity such as interviews, speaking engagements, community-based projects or mutually beneficial partnerships with media, non-governmental organizations, international organizations, and government institutions. Listed service and outreach should include only that which reflects faculty members' expertise and cannot include consulting/contracting activities that a faculty member receives direct compensation for from a source outside the university.

- 6 Diversity and Inclusion: Please list and/or discuss any activities in your teaching, research, or service that have served to promote diversity and a climate of inclusiveness in the department, the

⁴ White papers, reports, exhibits, computer programs, videos, etc.

university, the profession, or the community.

- 7 Additional Considerations: Please indicate any additional information you feel is relevant to the proper assessment of your overall performance. This may include providing information about past projects, those about to come to fruition, long-term projects, such as administrative roles and phased retirement or extenuating circumstances.
- 8 The following percentages are given as an indication of the general expectations of the department concerning the distribution of efforts for each area of performance:

<u>Area</u>	<u>Minimum or Maximum %</u>	
Instruction	Minimum	35%
Research/Professional Activity	Minimum	40%
Service (Department/University/Public Service)	Minimum	10%
	Maximum	20%, within which no more than one half (or 10%) can be designated to public service
Administration	Maximum	20%

Administration: A faculty member with significant departmental or university administrative responsibilities, such as serving as director of undergraduate studies or graduate studies, or as an administrator in an affiliated program, may allocate up to 20% of distribution of effort for administration. This time may be reallocated from any of the other three areas of distribution of effort as negotiated and approved by the department head prior to the beginning of the annual evaluation period. The minimum percentages for the other three areas of distribution of effort thus do not apply to those with administrative responsibilities. The distribution of effort associated with the activities of each director will be reported and evaluated under the area of administration.

Each faculty member is reminded to make an appointment with the department head each year to jointly establish personal goals and objectives for the upcoming evaluation period and to discuss their relative importance within the context of the department's goals. This meeting should be scheduled as soon as possible after the faculty member receives this year's evaluation from the department head and may coincide with the consultation concerning this year's evaluation with the department head. It is expected that the previous year's statement will be considered during the annual evaluation and goal setting process (See UHB C-45.1).

- 9 Differential loads / areas of responsibility: Tenured faculty who wish to shift their focus to teaching scholarship should discuss the possibility of teaching additional courses beyond the four per academic year (fall/spring semesters) that is typical. The department head may accept such an arrangement if it will benefit the aggregate research output and teaching performance of the department and will negotiate higher teaching loads up to but not exceeding eight courses per academic year. For each additional course taught beyond four per academic year, the faculty member can reduce the minimum percentage assigned to research/professional activity in annual merit evaluations by 7.5 percentage points. Such arrangements may provide the opportunity for other faculty members to earn course releases. Appendix C provides guidelines for the allocation of course releases for tenure-track faculty.
- 10 Previous Year Materials: Materials which were credited in the previous year should not be

presented in the current year for recognition. Annual evaluation is designed to give feedback to the faculty and to provide a fair and objective basis for the allocation of annual salary increases, therefore it is based on the faculty's current annual performance. As noted above, faculty members must state explicitly in the submitted narrative which year an accepted journal manuscript should be counted.

Annual Reappointment, Mid-Tenure Review Tenure and Promotion Procedures

Annual Reappointment:

1. **Dates Established by University:** Non-Tenured faculty are considered for reappointment during the spring semester of their first year (for year 2), once during the fall and again during the spring of their second year (for years 3 and 4), and during the spring semester in subsequent years until tenure reappointment. The dates for these evaluations are established by the university in accordance with Appendix A of the University Handbook.
2. **Candidate Invited to Submit Dossier:** The candidate for reappointment is invited to compile a complete dossier, including vita, publications and teaching evaluations, and to make it available in the departmental office or on a secure web platform for review by tenured faculty.
3. **Faculty Recommendations:** The tenured faculty are invited by letter to submit written recommendations to the department head concerning the reappointment. Faculty are also welcome to comment on the record and performance of the colleague being considered for recommendation.
4. **Discussion Session:** A meeting of the eligible faculty is scheduled at least 14 days after the release of the candidate materials (see Section 53.1 of University Handbook), and prior to the deadline for the tenured faculty recommendations, during which the performance of the candidate for reappointment is discussed. The meeting is designed to provide an opportunity for a sharing of perspectives. No votes are taken at this meeting. Subsequent to this meeting there will be a ballot of the eligible faculty on reappointment of the candidate.
5. **Letter of Recommendation to Dean:** The department head, having received recommendations from participating tenured faculty, decides on a reappointment recommendation, which is then communicated to the Dean of Arts and Sciences in a letter. The letter includes a report of the level of faculty support for the recommendation, including arguments for or against the reappointment.
6. **Letter to Candidate:** The department head subsequently reports the substance of the recommendation to the candidate, along with any relevant comments on performance.
7. **Letter to Faculty:** The department head also notifies the tenured faculty concerning the reappointment recommendation.
8. **Tenure Clock:** Provisions for stopping the tenure clock of untenured faculty members are outlined in the KSU Faculty Handbook, sections C82.1 to C82.9. Consistent with the KSU Faculty Handbook, a candidate may seek tenure before the sixth year (C82.4).

Mid-Tenure Review

1. Time-Frame: The policy of conducting a mid-tenure review (MTR) for non-tenured faculty was established in April 1992. Faculty will normally go through the MTR process halfway through their tenure period (e.g., in the third year of appointment for an assistant professor without credit for prior teaching experience). This is consistent with C.92.1 of the Faculty Handbook.
2. Procedures: The department head will plan to follow the procedures used for tenure review, but will not request external evaluations.

Tenure/Promotion

1. Dossier: The candidate for tenure and/or promotion is requested to submit a complete dossier, in accordance with the Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation (<http://www.kstate.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/promotionguidelinesfororganization.pdf>)
2. External Evaluation: Upon request from the department head, the candidate will provide a list of up to ten references as possible reviewers of the candidate's work. Three of the candidate's references and three more not listed by the candidate will be chosen by the department head in consultation with the Rank and Tenure Committee⁵ and other tenured faculty. The total number of referees will be six. Outside references should be familiar with the candidate's work but not in so close a relationship as to compromise objectivity (e.g., former professor, etc.). The candidate reserves the right to request that one name not be included in the potential referee pool, but will not have access to the names of those referees selected by the department. The department head will request the participation of the selected referees, send them copies of the candidate's publications and other records of appropriate accomplishment, and then collect their letters of reference. These letters will then be made available for review by all tenured faculty members.
3. Faculty Review: Tenured faculty and/or faculty at rank(s) above that to which promotion is being considered review documents and make written recommendation to the department head.
4. Discussion Session: As with reappointment, a non-voting discussion session without the candidate present is held prior to the deadline for faculty recommendations in order to provide full scope for consideration of strengths and weaknesses of the candidate.
5. Department Recommendation: After reviewing written faculty recommendations, the department head prepares a recommendation letter to the Dean of Arts and Sciences and submits it with the forms and supporting materials prepared by the candidate. The department head's letter includes an indication of the degree of support from faculty, including relevant arguments for and/or against promotion or tenure.
6. Notification: The department head notifies the candidate and the participating faculty of his/her recommendation. Subsequently, the candidate will be notified by the recommendation of the Dean.

Note on Appeals:

⁵ The Rank and Tenure Committee is appointed annually by the head.

A faculty member who disagrees or is not satisfied with the final decision made upon her/his reappointment, tenure, promotion, or merit salary may use the appeal process as provided in the KSU University Handbook, Section C and Appendix G.

Standards for Mid Tenure Review

Standard

It is expected that the faculty member being reviewed should be able to demonstrate an ability to teach a variety of courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels and to be an effective student supervisor. They should also have a research agenda and record of publications submitted or accepted that will indicate a potential for meeting the standard for tenure and promotion in at least three years. They should be participating in and contributing to the committees and affairs of this department.

Criteria

The criteria used for this review are the same as for tenure and promotion adjusted for the time in rank.

Standard for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Promotion to associate professor rests on substantial professional contributions that reflect excellence in teaching and research. Service to the political science department, the university, and the larger academic/professional community and society is expected.

Satisfaction of the minimum quantitative publication requirements does not alone constitute sufficient to support a successful tenure or promotion review; teaching and department and university service are also relevant. At the same time, in extraordinary cases, the scope and exceptional quality of individual publications may justify an exception to the minimum number (see University Handbook C100.1).

Criteria

In making a recommendation for tenure and promotion the department is saying that the candidate has excellent credentials for advancement and also has demonstrated versatility and talent, consistent with the current and anticipated needs of the department.

Teaching: Teaching excellence is essential for promotion and tenure in this department. Convincing evidence of effective teaching includes an ability to teach well a variety of courses at both the introductory and advanced levels. The candidate is also expected to advise students and provide them with letters of reference when appropriate.

Persuasive evidence of good teaching includes student evaluations, syllabi, tests, teaching awards, student accomplishments under supervision of the faculty member and letters of appreciation from former students. These examples are not meant to be exhaustive but are some of the suggestions from the University's Effective Faculty Evaluation manual.

Research: The following are the department’s expectations for a candidate’s publication record at the time of the tenure decision.

At least **six** peer reviewed⁶ articles in academic journals are expected. Candidate should provide evidence of journal and peer review process. Prominent social science journals are expected to be among the mix of publications.⁷ In order to demonstrate intellectual independence, at least one single-authored publication must also be in the mix of publications.

A peer reviewed book published by a university or commercial press can count for two to three articles.⁸ Peer-reviewed edited books, published by a university or commercial press, can count for one article. The editor can also receive an additional credit (an article) if they have a chapter in the peer-reviewed edited volume. A chapter in a peer-reviewed book will count as one article in a journal. Candidates should submit evidence of peer review when submitting reviewed publications for consideration. Candidates for tenure who publish their dissertations as a book need to publish the equivalent of an additional four peer reviewed articles/chapters.

To apply towards tenure, books, articles, chapters, etc., must be formally accepted by the publisher and, except for minor typographical and formatting changes be, in their final form. Evidence of such acceptance should be submitted.

A research agenda for the future including a 5 year research plan is required. The submission of grant applications for university and external funding is expected. In this regard, a research grant that meets the equivalent of criteria 1, 2 and 3 on page 17 of this document (on evaluating grants) may count for one article. One grant may be counted as an article toward tenure.

In order to evaluate the quality of the publications submitted by the candidate six outside reviewers will be utilized. The candidate will provide a list of up to ten reviewers, from which three will be selected, while the department will choose three others not listed by the candidate. For more details of the outside review procedure, see point 2 under Tenure and Promotion.

Note on publications prior to joining the department:

For faculty who have yet to hold a tenure track position, up to two articles or one book published before joining the department faculty can be counted toward promotion to associate professor with tenure. The

⁶ Here and elsewhere in this document “peer review” refers to the process by which a publisher/editor obtains evaluation of the candidate’s research from anonymous academic peer (i.e., political scientists or faculty in public administration, or other experts in appropriate disciplines), not chosen by the candidate, and upon whose judgment rests the publication or rejection of the candidate’s research. For reference on this process, consult the process of anonymous peer review practiced by the American Political Science Review and other major political science journals.

⁷ Faculty members should provide affirmative evidence for journal importance and impact. For information and guidance on journal quality, the following sources can be consulted: the list of top 50 journals from the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) on the Web of Knowledge based on a 5 year impact factor, PS & Politics articles ranking political science and subfield specific journals, and similar lists of major journals in public administration (such as Krueger and Bernick 2010) and multidisciplinary area studies.

⁸ For guidance on press quality, faculty members can consult rankings of presses in PS & Politics and similar publications.

department head will have discretion with regard to the evaluation of work published before an individual joins the ranks of departmental faculty. When a faculty member joining our department is moving from a tenure track position, service time, publications, and other aspects of previous service will be negotiated with the Head.

Candidates in the tenure track at the time this document goes into effect have the choice of referencing and adhering to the previous document (2015) when assembling their tenure packet.

Service: While a candidate will be expected to participate in and contribute to departmental affairs and committees, where possible they should also contribute professionally beyond the department.

Standards and Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Standards for Promotion.

To be promoted to full professor, an individual should have a national or international reputation in the discipline of political science or within his or her sub-discipline. They should also have a distinguished record in teaching and service to the university.

Procedures

In making a decision regarding the promotion of an individual to the rank of full professor, all full professors in the Department will review the professional record of the individual concerned. They will meet to discuss the candidate's application and then forward their opinions individually to the department head who will forward their opinions and his or her own recommendation to the dean. (See Faculty Handbook C150-C152.5).

Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

Research. The minimum expectations for a candidate for promotion to the rank of full professor will be at least seven peer reviewed articles since promotion to the rank of associate professor or a combination of books and articles equivalent to seven peer reviewed articles. To apply toward promotion, books must be peer-reviewed. As stated in the previous sub-section, a peer reviewed book published by a university or commercial press can count for two to three articles. A peer-reviewed edited book can count for one article. In all cases, the candidate should submit evidence of the peer review process and any other evidence of the work's quality, such as reviews of the book after publication. Prominent political science journals and/or book publishers should be in the mix of publications.

The candidate is also expected to be involved in applying for external funding such as grants, fellowships, and residencies. In this regard, a research grant that meets the equivalent of criteria 1 and 2 on page 17 of this document (on evaluating grants) may count for one article. Candidates must also present a research plan to cover the next five years.

In order to evaluate the quality of the publications submitted by the candidate, six external reviews will be obtained by the department. The candidate will provide a list of up to ten reviewers from which three will be selected. The head in consultation with the faculty will choose three others not from the candidate's list. For more details of the outside review procedure, see point 2 under Tenure and Promotion.

Teaching: To evaluate the quality of the candidate's teaching, the Department will review student evaluations and solicit copies of the candidate's syllabi and other relevant course materials developed over the period since tenure. The candidate is encouraged to review the Effective Faculty Evaluation manual for other evidence they may wish to submit regarding teaching effectiveness.

Candidates are expected to teach effectively at all levels and to advise both undergraduate and graduate students as part of their teaching responsibilities. The candidate should demonstrate a willingness to meet with students, write letters of recommendation and mentor them in their careers. Candidates should have evidence of supervision of graduate students.

Service: A candidate for full professor should demonstrate involvement in areas of university and community service related to his or her expertise.

Professional Standing: The candidate is expected to demonstrate his or her involvement in the discipline at an appropriate level. Evidence of such involvement may include participation in governance of professional associations, service on editorial boards of journals, frequency of citation by other scholars in the field, and service as a peer reviewer for journals and book publishers.

Professorial Performance Award⁹

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

Minimum Criteria

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

Process

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

The candidate will submit her/his file to the Rank and Tenure committee which will review the file and make a written recommendation to the Head. Outside, peer-reviews of each candidate’s file are not required. Using input from the Rank and Tenure committee, the Head will make a decision regarding whether to forward the file to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences with a positive or negative recommendation. The Head’s recommendation will be shared with the candidate. The ultimate decision of whether a candidate is awarded a performance award is made by the Provost.

The timelines for this process will be established each year by the Provost’s office, but candidates should know that this process will begin sometime in January of each year. Prospective candidates are encouraged to consult with the department head and the chair of the Rank and Tenure committee to help determine if they meet the minimum criteria.

⁹ Standards developed and approved by faculty in May 2006 and reapproved on May 7, 2010, December 12, 2014, and December 21, 2020.

Department of Political Science Minimal Acceptable Levels for Faculty Performance¹⁰

These standards were developed by and apply to members of the political science faculty at Kansas State University. Failure to meet these standards may have consequences for tenure-track faculty and tenured faculty. Tenure-track faculty members falling below these standards may be notified of non-reappointment. There are additional potential grounds for non-reappointment, including inadequate progress toward tenure/promotion. Tenure-track faculty members must be explicitly informed by the Dean in writing of a decision not to renew their appointments in accordance with The Standards of Notice of Non-Reappointment (See University Handbook, C162.3 and Appendix A.) Tenured faculty failing to meet these standards may be subjected to dismissal for cause if their performance falls under Chronic Low Achievement (University Handbook, Sections C31.5-C31.8).

The decision to invoke C31.5 must take into account a faculty member's overall performance including areas of responsibility with the weighted importance (%) of each area, weaknesses not balanced by strengths and/or predetermined agreements between the faculty member and department head about the relative distribution of effort of different areas of responsibility. Action may be taken to initiate "dismissal for cause" as provided for in Section C31.5 of the University Handbook. As with any policy, allowances should be made for health and family circumstances that affect a faculty member's work performance. The following standards do not in any way affect departmental expectations for annual merit evaluations, promotion and/or tenure already approved by the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Provost. However, one additional category will be added to annual evaluations, viz. "unsatisfactory", which indicates that a faculty member has fallen below minimal acceptable levels of productivity.

A. Research

1. Minimal standards. The department expects all faculty to meet at least one of the following requirements.
 - a. One recent research paper submitted or revised and resubmitted for publication within the past two years, or
 - b. Presentation of one recent research paper at a professional meeting within the past two years, or
 - c. Submission of a proposal for external funding within the past two years.
2. Exceptions.
 - a. The faculty member develops a new course or substantially revises an existing course equivalent to a new course. Examples might include development of new distance courses or revisions involved in shifting a course from one curriculum category to another.
 - b. The faculty member is working on a longer range project and shows evidence of progress (e.g. a book or other research project).
 - c. The faculty member is engaged in some other scholarly pursuit that is expected to enhance the overall reputation of the department, college or university (e.g. editing a professional journal or chairing a professional association).
 - d. New faculty who are working on their degrees or who have received the Ph.D. within the last year may receive a one year extension on these requirements. Note: this does not affect departmental expectations for granting of tenure.
 - e. Submission to scholarly journals or other publication fora that have particularly long notification times.
 - f. Where faculty have past exemplary records and/or may be developing new research

¹⁰ Originally approved February 1977. Revised version approved December 12, 2014.

interests and can show evidence of progress in the new field.

g. When faculty members are engaged in significant administrative duties.

h. Special understandings exist between the faculty member and department head regarding items a - f, or other circumstances such as sabbatical leave.

B. Teaching

1. Minimum Standards. The department expects all faculty will meet each of the following requirements:

a. Carry normal teaching loads.

b. Show evidence of up to date teaching materials (syllabi, handouts, tests, etc.).

c. Provide evidence of satisfactory teaching competence using a combination of student evaluations, syllabi, and other teaching materials. Other sources of teaching evaluations such as (but not limited to) peer review may also be used with the faculty member's consent.

d. Meet classes, hold office hours and advise students.

2. Exceptions

a. Faculty member is on sabbatical or other leave

b. Variations in teaching loads on agreement with the department head.

C. Service. Minimum standards will be met if the faculty member serves in a satisfactory manner on a normal number of departmental committees.

SPECIAL APPEALS REGARDING MINIMUM STANDARDS

Faculty members may appeal to the department head to approve alternatives to the performance criteria outlined. It will be the responsibility of the faculty member to prove that suggested alternatives are adequate substitutions. Should this procedure prove unsatisfactory to the faculty member, they may appeal to the full tenured department faculty members.

DEPARTMENTAL PROCESS

A. The department head will follow procedures specified in the University Handbook Sections C31.5-31.8.

B. 1. Should those procedures and attempts to improve performance fail, the department head will bring the case to a meeting of the department's tenured faculty with a recommendation. The department head and the faculty member must each document their side of the case in writing and all materials prepared and submitted to the full tenured faculty must be available to each other as well. Any relevant documentation may be submitted by either party.

2. The full tenured faculty will select a chair among themselves who is not the department head. The tenured faculty will then hear the arguments from the head and faculty member. Members of the faculty may ask questions pertaining to the case of either party.

3. After hearing both sides and questioning them, the tenured faculty may discuss the case and will vote on whether to accept the department head's recommendation to the Dean to invoke dismissal for cause procedures. The number of "yes" votes, "no" votes, and abstentions will be recorded by the chair. The total votes along with any recommendations the faculty wish to make will be forwarded by the chair to the faculty member, department head and Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. As with tenure and promotion decisions, confidentiality of individual votes and

comments will be protected.

C. This process in no way prevents a faculty member from pursuing a formal grievance using the process outlined in the University Handbook should the faculty member not agree with the final resolution.

Post Tenure Review¹¹

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

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

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

Post tenure review will be conducted by the department head, following the procedure below. Given the presence of non-tenured faculty members on the faculty evaluation committee, the FEC will not participate in post-tenure review processes.

Procedure:

- Exceptions to the review: tenured faculty members who have applied for promotion to full professor, applied for a professorial performance award (University Handbook C49), or have been recognized with a notable university, national, or international award requiring multi-year portfolio-like documentation, within the last six years are subjected to reset of post-tenure review clock. University teaching, advising and other awards fall under this rubric.
- Materials for the review: faculty members should submit copies of his/her six previous annual merit evaluations to the department head, as stated in university policy. The faculty member should also provide the head with a self-evaluation statement of no more than one page which lists accomplishments over the previous six years and goals for the next five years.
- Criteria for successful contributions to the university. If the faculty's six previous annual merit evaluations rest at or exceed the designation "meets expectations," the individual will be deemed to be continuing to make a successful, ongoing contribution to the university. If one or more of these annual merit evaluations fall below the "meets expectations" designation, the faculty member will work with the department head to develop a plan to continue to provide lasting and meaningful contributions to the university.
- Confidentiality. Per university policy, post tenure review outcomes are confidential and confined to the appropriate university personnel and bodies.

¹¹ Standards developed in summer 2014 and approved December 12, 2014.

APPENDIX A

Guidelines for Ranking Research Contributions

Publications

The following ranking of research contributions will be used as a guideline in the evaluation process:

1. Peer reviewed books, peer reviewed edited books, peer reviewed articles and research notes in prominent political science and public administration journals. For guidance on book and journal quality, please refer to footnotes 8 and 10.
2. Peer reviewed articles and research notes in other political science/public administration journals, and in related disciplines, in specialized journals, in monographs and as chapters in edited books.
3. Non peer reviewed books and articles, textbooks, readers, annotated bibliographies, chapters in specialized journals and in books, engaged research projects, public scholarship, book reviews, and encyclopedia entries.¹²

*Note: The department encourages co-authorship with students (graduate or undergraduate), and such articles will not be considered less valuable than any other publication of its quality.

Guidelines for Evaluating External Funding

The department values the receipt of external grants and contracts. Receipt of extramural grants and contracts are important indicators of research activity and academic reputation, and these awards benefit the department directly through financial resources to support GRAs/GTAs and so forth. The weight given for grants and contracts during merit review is based on the nature of the awarding process, the magnitude of the award, and the benefit to the department.

The greatest weight will be given to external funding¹³ and that 1) are awarded through a peer reviewed process, 2) where the magnitude of the funding generates research overhead money for the department and/or salary savings that revert to the department, or where the magnitude or prestige of the award brings significant positive attention to the faculty member and the department.

Satisfying these two criteria above, research funding can count for up to one article in the faculty member's annual merit evaluation for research. Also, funding for teaching development will result in at least a one-step rise in the faculty member's annual merit evaluation for teaching, and funding for administrative development will produce a similar one-step rise in the faculty member's annual administrative or

¹² Public scholarship is defined as a) writing based on our professional research, and b) designed for a broader audience. Examples of public research outlets include the Monkey Cage and The Conversation. Examples of engaged research include white papers, reports, and exhibits. To count for evaluation candidate should demonstrate methodological rigor, amount of original research, and demonstrated impact/usefulness of findings. These activities do not include consulting/contracting activities that a faculty member receives direct compensation for from a source outside the university.

¹³Contracts must include the provision that researchers will be able to use any data derived from the research and to publish any work resulting from the research after 6 months to a maximum of 1 year from when the contracted research is complete.

department/university service evaluation. If a faculty member's evaluation in the particular area is already at the "outstanding" level, the faculty evaluation committee and the head may offer credit for the grant in other areas of responsibility at their discretion. The faculty member can also request that the grant be allocated to the next year's evaluation period.

APPENDIX B

Expectations of Professional Research Activities

The following guidelines reflect the department's expectations for scholarly activity. To receive a rating above "unsatisfactory" for the area of research during merit evaluation, faculty members should maintain research activity. The primary evidence that a faculty member is maintaining an active research agenda during an annual evaluation period is:

1. Presenting a paper at a professional conference, or working on one or more scholarly studies, or working on a book length manuscript(s), or working on an externally funded research proposal
or
2. Attempting to publish one or more scholarly works in appropriate outlets (journals, edited books, university/commercial presses) or submitting grant proposal(s) to an external funding agency.

Because the process of publication can be lengthy, faculty members may claim in their merit files studies initiated/presented in previous years provided they show evidence of meaningful progress toward the revision and/or publication of these works.

In addition to these minimal expectations, faculty members are encouraged to apply for small university research and travel grants, serve as panel discussants and/or panel chairs at professional conferences, review manuscripts for journals and presses, publish book reviews, sit on editorial boards, etc. While all of these professional research activities enhance each faculty member's research agenda and merit evaluation, by themselves, these supplemental activities do not constitute evidence of an active research agenda.

Because publication and funding opportunities do not always follow a academic year, faculty members' evaluation in the area of research will reflect a three year moving average (current year plus the two previous merit evaluation years).

In general, faculty members who receive an evaluation of "meets departmental expectations" or higher for the area of research for an annual evaluation period may have:

1. Published¹⁴ one book.
or
2. Published at least one article or book chapter.
or
3. Obtained external funding for a research proposal.

The final evaluation earned by a faculty member in the area of research depends on the volume of research activities, the quality of these research activities, and the extent to which these research activities match the department's priorities for publication or external funding (See Appendix A).

¹⁴ Only completed books that have been published within the period of evaluation shall be considered.

APPENDIX C

Guidelines for allocating course releases for tenure-track faculty

Department, college, and university strategic goals emphasize that the department should continue to increase the volume and quality of our collective research output. One way to meet this goal is to use teaching load reductions to promote research activity as long as such reductions do not hurt the quality of instruction in the department.

Course reductions will tend to be possible when some faculty in the department choose reduced research responsibilities (see paragraph on differential loads on page 7). If course reductions are available to tenure track faculty, the first priority in their allocation is to ensure that, over a period of several years, all faculty members actively contributing to the department's research goals are provided roughly equivalent time for research. The department head can consider any of the following factors when allocating course reductions:

1. At a minimum, faculty members considered for course reductions must have earned "meets departmental expectations" for research/professional activity on their most recent annual merit evaluations. Consistent annual merit evaluations of "Outstanding" in the category of research/professional activity will contribute to decisions about granting course reductions.
2. Previous course reductions allocated to the same faculty member.
3. Heavy graduate student advising loads that involve supervision of multiple MA theses or PhD dissertations simultaneously.
4. Award of a major grant (see criteria on page 17) in which the faculty member is the Principle Investigator (PI or co-PI).
5. Professional service as a journal or book series editor or associate editor.
6. Serving in leadership positions in professional organizations such as conference chair or section head/president for a social science conference.
7. Other uncompensated professional service in the faculty member's area of expertise.

APPENDIX D

Sample Request for Materials

Department of Political Science
M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Faculty
FROM: Head
DATE:

RE: Request for Evaluation Materials

Please prepare your materials for our annual merit evaluation process. These should include a current vita, a completed narrative responding to the attached **EVALUATION GUIDELINES**, and appropriate supporting materials. I will be unable to recommend a merit increase/equity increase for anyone choosing not to submit these requested materials.

Your materials may be submitted to the office manager. The Faculty Evaluation Committee has requested that files be completed by _____. The new deadline will permit completion of the processing of student evaluations before materials are due. Please be certain to have student evaluations completed before the end of the semester.

Remember to make an appointment with me to discuss your goals and objectives for next year as soon as possible after you have received this year's final merit evaluation.