

**DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING**

**ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on December 15, 2015)**

**PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on December 15, 2015)**

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

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES\*: **January 2020**

**Brett R. Wilkinson, Department Head**

Date signed:

4-7-16

**Kevin Gwinner, Dean**

Date signed:

4-8-16

**April Mason, Provost**

Date signed:

April Mason 30 Apr 16

*\*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.*

# INDEX

	Page
I. ANNUAL EVALUATION .....	3
A. DEFINITIONS.....	3
1. TEACHING .....	3
2. RESEARCH.....	4
3. SERVICE.....	6
4. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.....	7
B. GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS.....	7
1. ANNUAL MERIT EVALUATION .....	8
2. EVALUATION FOR REAPPOINTMENT .....	8
C. EVALUATION CRITERIA .....	9
D. FACULTY EVALUATION RATING SYSTEM .....	13
1. TEACHING .....	13
2. RESEARCH.....	14
3. SERVICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT .....	15
E. PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD.....	17
II. GUIDELINES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION .....	18
A. GENERAL GUIDELINES .....	18
B. TENURE GUIDELINES .....	19
C. PROMOTION GUIDELINES .....	20
III. CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS .....	21
A. GENERAL.....	21
B. SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES.....	23
IV. POST TENURE REVIEW .....	23
A. GUIDELINES.....	23
B. PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS.....	24
V. GUIDELINES FOR ADMINISTRATORS .....	25
VI. APPENDIX A: RESPONSIBILITIES OF TENURED AND TENURE TRACK FACULTY.....	26
VII. APPENDIX B: RATING FORMS.....	28
A. Rating Form for Teaching Effectiveness .....	28
B. Rating Form for Research Effectiveness .....	29
C. Rating Form for Service Effectiveness.....	30
D. Rating Form for Professional Development Effectiveness.....	31
VIII. APPENDIX C: DEFINITIONS OF NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY .....	32

# I. ANNUAL EVALUATION

## A. DEFINITIONS

The department's policy for faculty evaluation should encourage and reward a broad spectrum of professional activities, with each faculty member's evaluation based on teaching, research (not required of regular non-tenure-track instructors), service and professional development. These four criteria are described in detail in the following sections. These categories are not intended to be rigid. A specific activity might be listed in one category for one faculty member and in a different category for another depending on the precise nature of the activity.

### 1. TEACHING

Teaching includes communicating knowledge to students and developing the intellectual foundation necessary to prepare students for a lifetime of learning. Teaching also involves preparing students for entry into professional and scholarly disciplines. Effective teaching is based upon sound scholarship and continued intellectual growth. Faculty members should be able to arouse curiosity, stimulate creativity, and develop and organize instructional materials. Academic advising and mentoring of students are valued instructional activities.

During the faculty member's appointment, teaching performance must be measured and demonstrate effectiveness **and/or** continued improvement. The quality of teaching is admittedly difficult to evaluate; however, this difficulty does not eliminate the need for measurement. Accordingly, both internal and external sources of information could be included in the evaluation. The following list is organized into broad categories considered appropriate for assessing teaching effectiveness. This list should not be considered exhaustive; further forms of evidence may be found in the University Handbook.

- A. Instructional evaluations. Faculty members will arrange for the administration of surveys to allow student rating of instruction for each course taught and submit the results to the department head. Exceptions are permitted in unusual circumstances. Student ratings are not required for team-taught or distance-education courses. A score from a single question on a student rating form should not form the entire basis of teaching effectiveness. Other methods of evaluation include:
  - 1. Graduating senior exit interviews.
  - 2. Alumni evaluations concerning quality of instruction.
  - 3. Performance of students on standardized examinations.
  - 4. Competitive awards or recognition for outstanding teaching.
  - 5. Student feedback to dean or department head. (Which must be documented if considered.)

- B. Curricular management, development, and/or innovations, among which may be:
1. Development of new and/or innovative courses and/or curricula.
  2. Innovations in existing courses with respect to content, instructional techniques, or course materials.
  3. Development and preparation of courses using alternate methods of instruction, including videotaping, computer facilitation, etc.
  4. Coordination of multi-section courses.
  5. Team teaching or interdisciplinary teaching.
  6. Pedagogical research
- C. Scholastic and/or professional growth that contributes to teaching effectiveness, among which may be:
1. Supervision of independent study, masters' theses, or serving on thesis or dissertation committees.
  2. Writing textbooks and text-related materials such as guides, case books, instructor's manuals, games, simulations and test banks, and reviewing such materials.
  3. Presentation of workshops and seminars relative to teaching methods and techniques.
  4. Consulting services in which one applies his/her area of expertise (within the limits of University policies).
  5. Designing, conducting, or teaching local, regional or state executive development programs.
  6. Involving students in faculty research projects and consulting activities.
- D. Peer evaluation, defined as a comprehensive, critical review by knowledgeable colleagues of each faculty member's entire range of teaching activities, may serve as an additional source of information for assessing teaching effectiveness.

## 2. RESEARCH

Research includes a broad spectrum of scholarship and other creative activities that require critical examination and investigation. These endeavors are directed toward discovering new ideas, developing new interpretations of existing ideas, or participating in the application of these ideas. The results of research, scholarship, or creative activity should be shared with others through recognized channels appropriate to the discipline. These outputs may include theoretical and practical scholarship, as well as publication of innovative teaching materials.

A. Publications

1. Journal articles. In the evaluation of journal articles, the primary consideration is the quality of the article and the impact that it has. Additional consideration should be given to the rigor of the review process to which papers are subjected and the stature of the journals. The following classifications may serve as guidelines for evaluating journal quality.
  - a. The department does not maintain a journal list but faculty members are rewarded most for publications in the top journals in the field, including all AAA sections journals and other equivalent journals, especially those with acceptance rates of equal to or less than 20%.
  - b. Other, peer reviewed journals.
  - c. Citations and reprints of articles in textbooks.
2. Invited articles. These may be particularly significant since they represent not only publication but professional recognition as well.
3. Textbooks, textbook revisions, reference books, and related materials should be evaluated consistent with their contribution to the field.
4. Published book reviews of scholarship or practitioner books in the field should also be considered a contribution to scholarship within the field and should be evaluated accordingly.
5. Other scholarly output, which should be evaluated by the department head related to quality and contribution.

B. Other Scholarship Activities:

1. Presentations at refereed meetings should be evaluated based on the quality of the paper and the rigor of the review process. The following classifications, ranked in order of importance may serve as guidelines for evaluation of such presentations:
  - a. American Accounting Association national and sectional meetings and other meetings of similar exposure and rigor.
  - b. AAA regional meetings and other meetings competitive paper sessions.
  - c. Other symposia: e.g., symposia at other universities and research institutions.
  - d. Invited presentations of papers or projects at scholarly meetings.
  - e. Presentations at non-refereed meetings.

While the greatest weight should be given for concurrent or stand-alone paper sessions at these meetings, participation in panels, forums and acting as a discussant at these meetings should also carry some weight.

Awards received for "Best Paper" or inclusion in proceedings that publish only selected papers from the meetings should be considered when weighing the quality of the paper.

2. The development and acceptance of proposals for research grants. The primary criterion for evaluating faculty members' efforts in preparing research proposals is the competitiveness of the review process.
3. Serving as an editor, on the editorial board, or as a reviewer for a journal or conference.

### 3. SERVICE

Service activities provide opportunities for faculty members to apply professional expertise, to participate in the governance and mission of the university, and to voice positions unique to the department. Excellence in service entails the faculty member's contribution toward results which reflect favorably on the individual's academic status and favorably on the department, college, or university. Faculty members should document achievements that resulted from their service activity. The evaluation process will place more weight on contribution towards results and much less on mere attendance at committee meetings.

Service responsibilities may be fulfilled in a number of ways, many of which are listed below. Faculty members are not expected to be active in all or even most of these activities. The following list is merely indicative of the variety of services that may be performed. Other areas of service are listed in the University Handbook.

1. Within the University
  - A. Service to the university and college includes but is not limited to:
    1. Chairing of, or active membership on, college or university-wide committees or University-controlled organizations.
    2. Organizing and sponsoring, or participating in, student professional societies and clubs;
    3. Directing or participating in activities associated with college or university centers or institutes.
  - B. Service to the department includes but is not limited to:
    1. Chairing of, or active membership on, departmental standing or *ad hoc* committees;
    2. Assuming administrative opportunities and/or responsibilities;
    3. Participating in and supporting department activities.
    4. Individual counseling and faculty advisor work with students groups.

## II. Outside the University

### A. Service to the profession includes but is not limited to:

1. Serving as an officer of professional organizations at all geographic levels;
2. Chairing of, or active membership on, professional committees at any geographic level;
3. Developing, organizing, or conducting conferences and/or seminars at any geographic level.

### B. Service to the community directly related to professional and scholarly activities includes but is not limited to:

1. Serving on evaluation teams for business and civic organizations;
2. Active membership on business or civic boards and committees; and
3. Speeches to groups as a representative of the department, college, or university.

## 4. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Professional development activities are efforts an individual undertakes to become capable of better teaching and research. Professional development activity is itself an area that may be evaluated for merit pay purposes. It is not necessarily synonymous with current teaching, research, or service performance because professional development activities may improve future performance. All faculty members should be engaged in activities that help maintain or enhance their intellectual capital.

This area encompasses a wide scope of activities, and the following list is merely indicative of the variety of those activities:

1. Participation at academic or professional development meetings.
2. Development of research skills through class attendance and study leaves.
3. Faculty residencies.
4. Self-study toward specific academic or professional objectives. (For example, professional certification, research tools, and increased specialization in particular areas of expertise).
5. Consulting in substantive business problems.

## B. GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

In evaluating a faculty member's productivity it is important to avoid distortions caused by arbitrary time periods. Furthermore, a faculty member's activities may extend over many evaluation periods. If credit for the activity is given in only a single period, faculty members may be discouraged from engaging in long-term projects.

Generally, annual evaluations should be based on activities in the current period, with the exception of research, as specified in that section of this document.

The evaluation of teaching, research, service and professional development activities should be based on valid supporting material.

## **1. ANNUAL MERIT EVALUATION**

The department head should inform each faculty member concerning the timing of performance evaluations. A suggested procedure for gathering evaluation evidence follows:

- At the beginning of the calendar year, each faculty member shall outline goals for the four areas of performance, as appropriate, as described in the next section. These goals shall be discussed with the department head, resulting in goals that are mutually agreed upon. A copy of these goals should be sent to the dean's office within a month of their discussion.
- At the end of the calendar year, the department head shall request annual faculty activity reports. Activity reports consist of the faculty member's documentation of his or her performance in teaching, research, service and professional development during the past year.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to gather and organize the documentation and provide this to the department head. However, the faculty member is not responsible for gathering data such as items A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5 under "TEACHING". Requests by the department head for activity reports should be made at a reasonable interval prior to their due date so that faculty members can be complete and clear in their activity reports.

- The department head shall be responsible for the evaluation of faculty member activity reports for purposes of recommending salary adjustments. Reviews will be provided in written form. For details regarding merit salary adjustment see *University Handbook*, Sections C40-C48.3.
- Each faculty member will review, and must have the opportunity to discuss, his/her written evaluation with the individual who prepared it.
- Within seven working days after the review and discussion, faculty members have the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations by the department head to the department head and to the next administrative level. In addition, the faculty member may also request a meeting with the dean for the purpose of attempting to resolve the disagreement. Such a meeting will be convened as soon as possible after the faculty member's meeting with the department head.

## **2. EVALUATION FOR REAPPOINTMENT**

Probationary faculty members will be reviewed annually for reappointment. A suggested procedure for gathering evaluation evidence follows:



- In September, the probationary faculty member will provide an activity report to the department head. The department head will make the report available to the tenured faculty members of the department.
- The activity report will be reviewed by the tenured faculty members in the department during a meeting in October or November, convened for this purpose in accordance with section C50 of the *University Handbook*. The goal of this meeting will be to provide feedback to the faculty member regarding progress toward tenure for tenure-track faculty members and to vote on the issue of reappointment.
- Reappointment decisions for regular non-tenure track faculty will be carried out by the Department Head and the tenured faculty. In addition to meeting the teaching and service requirements of their positions, all regular non-tenure track faculty must also maintain their academic or professional requirements for accreditation purposes, consistent with the requirements of their contract.

The department head will notify regular non-tenure track faculty of reappointment decisions via email or in writing and will offer to meet with regular non-tenure track faculty who are not reappointed. The department head's letter/email will explain the reason for the non-reappointment decision. Within seven working days after such notification, regular non-tenure track faculty members have the opportunity to submit written statements to the department head regarding any concerns they have about the non-reappointment decision. If concerns remain after the faculty member has met with the department head, the faculty member may request a meeting with the dean for the purpose of attempting to resolve any concerns. Such a meeting will be convened as soon as possible after the faculty member's meeting with the department head.

- A decision for non-reappointment for tenure-track faculty candidates may be made in any probationary year. However, during the third year of the pre-tenure period, the tenured-faculty members will specifically evaluate a tenure-track candidate's likelihood of successfully attaining tenure. If the faculty deem that the likelihood is low, the candidate should be recommended for non-reappointment

### **C. EVALUATION CRITERIA**

At the beginning of the calendar year, each faculty member will meet with the department head and together they shall set goals for teaching, research, service and professional development performance for the coming year. These goals shall include the specific weights assigned to each performance area. The specific goals should reflect expectations consistent with the level of accomplishment expected of any and all department faculty members with the same weight assigned to the particular performance area. The only exception to this requirement should be for tenure-track faculty members who, because of past performance below the level necessary to attain tenure and promotion, must establish goals that exceed this level of accomplishment.

This process recognizes that the roles of faculty members within the department may be different, and such difference should be reflected in the evaluation process. The specific combination of weights assigned to the performance areas, and corresponding goals which reflect these weights, may vary depending on the role of the faculty member in achieving the goals of the department and college, as well as the faculty member's rank. For example, the recommended combinations for tenure-track assistant professors may be different than those combinations for tenured associate professors.

In general, the weights for tenure-track and tenured professors should be set according to the following criteria, to allow better comparison of performance based on time devoted to different activities. Because it is the most easily standardized measure, these weights are based on typical teaching loads.

- Faculty members teaching a total of 15 hours with 2 preparations or 12 hours and three preparations (excluding summer courses) who teach no more than one graduate course should have a weight of 50% for teaching.
- Upward or downward adjustments of 5% can be made for each of the following variations from these typical loads (1) added or reduced preparations, (2) added or reduced numbers of courses, (3) added or reduced number of graduate courses (4) new preparations and (5) other factors deemed appropriate by the department head.
- Thus, a typical tenure-track assistant professor, who would likely teach 12 hours and two preparations with one of these being at the graduate level, would have a teaching weight of 45% assigned. Assuming a typical weight of 5% for service, and an additional 5% assigned to professional development, this typical assistant professor would have a weight of 45% for research. An associate professor with twelve hours and three preparations, with two at the graduate level, would have a weight of 55% for teaching. Assuming a 5% weight for professional development and 10% weight for service, this associate professor would have a weight of 30% for research.

In addition to these guidelines, the weights should fall within the following ranges.

	Minimum	Maximum
Teaching	30%	60%
Research <sup>1</sup>	20%	60%
Service	5%	30%
Professional Development <sup>2</sup>	5%	10%

<sup>1</sup> For probationary faculty members, the minimum is 40%.

<sup>2</sup> Continual professional development is expected of all faculty members. Individuals may elect to have development activities evaluated as part of other activities. For example, it might be difficult to separate a consulting assignment that produced a case study and a research paper into teaching, research and professional development activities.

There are no recommended weights for regular non-tenure-track faculty members. Weights for each instructor will be negotiated with the department head.

These predetermined expectations and category weights will serve as the basis for the faculty member's next annual performance evaluation unless an agreement between the department head and faculty member is reached to change them, consistent with the goals of the department and college, during the course of the evaluation period due to unforeseen opportunities or circumstances; for example, if additional teaching responsibilities were added because of an unexpected sabbatical by a colleague. In such instances, both the weights assigned for each area of service should be adjusted, and the goals should be adjusted to correspond to the time commitment implied by these weights.

At the end of the year, the department head shall evaluate faculty member performance in each of the four areas of teaching, research, service, and professional development. Performance in each area shall be given a corresponding numerical rating by the department head as described in those sections using the following rating scale:

- Significantly exceeds expectations (5)
- Exceeds expectations (4)
- Meets expectations (3)
- Fails to meet expectations (i.e., needs improvement) (2)
- Substantially fails to meet expectations (1)
- Falls below the minimum-acceptable level of productivity (0)

The word "expectations" used in the foregoing should relate to the level of accomplishment expected of any and all department faculty members with the same weight assigned to the particular performance area and should also be reflected in the individual's goals established at the beginning of the year. These expectations should be based on the criteria for teaching, research, service, and professional development described earlier in this document. While it is difficult to distinguish faculty performance more finely than these general categories, the department head may assign ratings between categories (i.e. using a continuous scale) to the extent deemed necessary for fairness.

The overall faculty evaluation should be computed as a weighted average of the numerical ratings assigned for the four performance categories, using the weights assigned to each performance category at the beginning of the year.

Consistent with the "minimum-acceptable standards" established by that section of this document, an overall evaluation of "falls below the minimum-acceptable level of productivity" and a score of 0 will be assigned if the evaluation for any of the four categories is "falls below the minimum-acceptable level of productivity."

Merit pay increases for individual faculty members should be determined by comparing each individual's weighted overall rating as determined above to those of the other faculty members. Individuals with a score of 0, "falls below the minimum-acceptable level of productivity" will not receive a merit pay increase.

In the event that categorical ratings are required for the overall faculty evaluation, the following conversion scale should be used to convert final numerical scores to a categorical rating:

- Significantly exceeds expectations (4.5-5.0)
- Exceeds expectations (3.5-4.49)
- Meets expectations (2.5-3.49)
- Fails to meet expectations (i.e., needs improvement) (1.5-2.49)
- Substantially fails to meet expectations (<1.5)
- Falls below the minimum-acceptable level of productivity (0)

Probationary faculty members should recognize that annual evaluations are not the only determinant of tenure and promotion. In addition to examining their annual evaluation feedback, probationary faculty should look to the feedback provided by tenured faculty members consistent with the tenure and promotion guidelines of the department.

The forms in Appendix B are provided to serve as decision aids for the department head's ratings of teaching, research, service and professional development. The department head is not required to use these, however.

## **D. FACULTY EVALUATION RATING SYSTEM**

### **I. TEACHING**

The Department Head will evaluate teaching based on a combination of inputs from students and inputs from other sources. The inputs are as follows:

#### ***Inputs from students***

Each semester, each faculty member will conduct an evaluation of each section using either:

- TEVAL or
- IDEA (Short or Long form).

In the spirit of academic freedom, faculty members may elect either evaluation metric at their discretion and each metric will be accorded equal status.

If the faculty member elects to use TEVAL, the Department Head will use the average of the two summary (adjusted) measures of effectiveness (1) overall effectiveness as a teacher (50%)(2) the amount learned in the course (50%). Each of these is measured on a five-point scale.

If the faculty member elects to use IDEA, the Department Head will use the IDEA form Summary Evaluation (adjusted) score which consists of a weighted average of two items (2) Excellent Teacher (50%) and (3) Excellent Course (50%).

In both cases, the Department Head will use the average evaluation of all sections taught by the faculty member that are included as part of the faculty member's regular teaching load. The Department Head will not include courses taught on an over-load basis for which faculty members are compensated separately from their regular duties. These courses will be separately evaluated in accordance with any contractual arrangements made for over-load teaching.

#### ***Inputs from other sources***

The Department Head will evaluate each faculty member's teaching using one or more of the following.

##### **A. Peer Review Assessment**

Faculty members in the pre-tenure period and instructors in their first three years of service are required to participate in the peer review process.

Tenured faculty members, and instructors and teaching professors who are in or beyond their fourth year of appointment, may elect to participate in the peer review processes to enhance their teaching skills and provide evidence of their teaching proficiency beyond the information contained in student evaluations. If such faculty members do not elect to participate in the peer review process,

the department head will evaluate their teaching entirely on the basis of student teaching evaluations and external measures provided in (B) below.

To participate in the peer review process, a faculty member will have one or more experienced faculty members observe at least one teaching period each semester. The faculty member should provide the evaluator with any relevant teaching material that would help in the evaluation. The evaluator will provide the faculty member with written feedback and with an assessment score (on a scale of 1 to 5). The department head will use this assessment score when evaluating the faculty member's teaching in the annual review process.

The evaluator will be drawn from the Department's Peer Review Committee. Any experienced faculty member may serve on the peer review committee including instructors with more than five years of experience and faculty members who have been granted tenure. Faculty members may only serve on the peer review committee if their average evaluation score exceeds 3.5 on a 5 point scale for each of the three years prior to their appointment. Faculty members who are appointed to the peer review committee will serve for three years and then rotate off the committee. A faculty member may be reappointed to the committee after a one year break.

As a substitute for the Department's peer review process, faculty members may participate in the Peer Review of Teaching Program conducted by the Teaching & Learning Center.

#### B. External measures

Faculty members may choose to provide the department head with any external measures of teaching evaluation that are available. An example might include a situation where a faculty member received a teaching award from the Kansas Society of CPAs for outstanding teaching. The department head should take into account the prestige of the award and the institution bestowing the award.

## 2. RESEARCH

All tenured and tenure-track faculty members have scholarship responsibilities. The specific expectations with respect to scholarship will vary with respect to the weight assigned to this activity. Therefore, scholarship expectations will vary among the faculty. Nevertheless, all faculty members are expected to be able to demonstrate how the results of their scholarship activity are being shared over a period of time with others through recognized channels appropriate to accounting and the type of scholarship undertaken. For example, academic research must be submitted for journal review or presentation at appropriate meetings. Faculty members should also be able to demonstrate continuous efforts in this area during the current year, consistent with the goals and expectations established at the beginning of the year and described earlier in this document.

Yearly goals and expectations for scholarship should reflect the current period activities necessary to accomplish a level of scholarly activity over a five-year period consistent with the accomplishments expected of any and all department faculty with the same weight assigned to

the particular performance area. We use a five year period to more reasonably reflect the long run nature of the research process and to be consistent with our accreditation measures.

On an annual basis, the department head should take into account progress toward goals. Performance is ultimately based on outputs achieved over a five year period and the evaluation of the faculty member's research should be primarily output focused.

In evaluating research performance, the following principles should be kept in mind.

- Publications in top journals in accounting, as described earlier in this document, should be accorded additional weight, thus reducing the total productivity expectation.
- Publications in journals with a greater than 20% acceptance rate should be accorded less weight, resulting in a higher expectation regarding the number of publications.
- Sole-authorship of publications should be given additional weight in evaluating total productivity expectations.
- The department recognizes and encourages both practice-based and education-based research as part of a portfolio of research.
- Other activities mentioned in the research definition earlier in this document such as grant writing, textbook authoring, book reviews, etc. should also be considered in assessing the faculty member's research portfolio, with the amount of credit given to these activities being based on a combination of the time necessary to produce this scholarship and the degree of recognition it provides to the department and university relative to publication in a journal with an acceptance rate of 20% or less. Faculty members can provide justification for the level of credit accorded these activities, but the final evaluation of their weight rests with the department head and should reflect the contribution of the activity to achieving the goals and expectations of the department and college.

### **3. SERVICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

All faculty members share in the service responsibilities of the department and all faculty members are expected to demonstrate continued efforts in professional development. There are a wide variety of ways to meet the expectations of the department in these areas as described in the earlier sections of this document.

## Service

There is both a quantity and a quality dimension to service and measurement of service contributions should embrace both dimensions. The department head's evaluation of service should be based 50 percent on service time (quantity) and 50 percent on the quality of the service commitment.

Internal service to the department, college, and university, and external service to the accounting profession (nationally and regionally) and other forms of service (community) as described earlier in this document, are important in assessing service.

### *Quantity dimension*

The number and type of committees and other service activities are used to evaluate time commitment (quantity). Service expectations vary depending on rank and tenure status although everyone is expected to provide some service.

For quantity-based evaluation, the time spent doing service is estimated and the following scale is used to evaluate service at the 20% level. The scale is prorated for levels of less than 20%. Thus, the expectations for 10% would be half of the expectations for 20%.

<u>Estimated Hours</u>	<u>Rating</u>
>80	5
41-80	4
25-40	3
15-24	2
< 14	1

All faculty members are expected to fulfil minimum service level activities such as attending department and college faculty meetings, and writing recommendation letters for students. These activities should not be counted in the service quantity measure. Similarly service does not include attendance at discretionary social events run by the department, college or university.

### *Quality dimension*

Assessing the quality of service involves considerable subjectivity. The department head will assign a score on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest quality level. In assessing service quality, the department head should take into account the contribution that the service makes to the mission of the department, the College of Business Administration and Kansas State University. For example, serving in a leadership capacity at the national level in a professional accounting organization such as the AAA or AICPA would warrant a higher weighting than being a member of a local community non-accounting committee. Similarly, a higher weighting should be attached to chairing a committee or serving as an officer (for example, treasurer) than to merely participating on a committee as a member.



The department head has the discretion to ask for clarifying documentation on the service activity.

The overall score will be an average of the two dimensions, quality and quantity.

### **Professional Development**

Professional development includes anything that keeps you current in your field. These activities may or may not receive CPE credit. Examples are attending presentations at meetings, reading books, articles, and taking CPE courses. This list is not meant to be all inclusive. The following scale is used to evaluate professional development at the 20% level. The scale is prorated for levels of less than 20%. Thus, the expectations for 10% would be half of the expectations for 20%. Based on the quality of professional development activity and benefit to the department, the department head has the discretion to adjust the ratings up or down one category.

Additionally, the department head has the discretion to ask for clarifying documents on the development activity.

<u>Estimated Hours</u>	<u>Rating</u>
>80	Significantly Exceeds Expectations (5)
41-80	Exceeds Expectations (4)
25-40	Meets Expectations (3)
15-24	Fails to meet expectations (2)
<14	Substantially fails to meet expectations (1)
	Falls below the minimum-acceptable level of productivity (refer to minimum-acceptable productivity standards later in this document for guidance on service amounts resulting in this rating) (0)

### **E. PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD**

**Description** - Consistent with the guidelines provided in the Kansas State University *University Handbook* Section C49, faculty members who have attained the rank of Professor and who have completed at least six years of service since promotion or since the last Professorial Performance Award, may submit materials to apply for a Professorial Performance Award. This is not a promotion, but instead a base salary increase in addition to that provided for by the annual evaluation process. It is intended to reward strong performance at the same level necessary to achieve promotion from associate to full professor.

**Requirements** - Similar to the requirements for promotion from associate professor to full professor, an individual applying for a Professorial Performance Award should submit a portfolio that demonstrates the candidate's proficiency in teaching, research, professional development, and service. The items considered important in each of these areas are described in Section I. A. of this document, Annual Evaluation: Definitions. In particular, the faculty member should demonstrate their continued role in meeting the department's strategic objectives through activities in these areas. The following items will be given paramount emphasis:

1. Teaching – The faculty member should demonstrate continued quality teaching as well as leadership in the area of curriculum development.
2. Research – The faculty member should provide evidence of a continued stream of quality research that examines relevant areas as well as other activities.
3. Service – The faculty member should demonstrate service that enhances the strategic goals of the department, college and/or university. While this service may be achieved in part by maintaining relationships with the professional or academic community, leadership within the department, college and/or university should also be demonstrated.
4. Professional Development – The faculty member should demonstrate continued development to constantly maintain current knowledge and capabilities to enhance their contributions in the first three areas.

The candidate must also provide evidence that activities conducted since promotion to full professor or since the last Professorial Performance Award have had an impact on the profession (academe or practice) at the national or regional level. This evidence cannot rely on reputation retained based on activities conducted in prior years, but only specific activities conducted in the past six years and should demonstrate evidence of sustained productivity in the last six years before the performance review. As with promotion to full professor, activities that may demonstrate maintenance of a national reputation are diverse, but in the area of teaching, national recognition may be satisfied by publishing a nationally recognized textbook; in the area of research it may be satisfied by publishing an extensively cited article. Letters of support from external reviewers may serve to corroborate such evidence, but are not required for evaluation for the Professorial Performance Award as they are for Promotion.

**Evaluation** – The faculty member should complete a file documenting accomplishments in the past six years consistent with the criteria defined above. This file should be submitted to the department head at the time of annual evaluations. The materials submitted by the faculty member will be evaluated according to the requirements above, by the department head with the department head's recommendation submitted to the dean following a procedure consistent with the annual evaluation process described in this document and guidelines provided in Section C49 of the *University Handbook*.

## **II. GUIDELINES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION**

University criteria and procedures for promotion and tenure decisions are described in the Kansas State University *University Handbook*, Sections C70-C156, which is available on the Internet via the university's Homepage. The following departmental criteria and procedures are to be used by tenure-track and regular non-tenure track faculty members in conjunction with university guidelines.<sup>3</sup>

### **A. GENERAL GUIDELINES**

1. For purposes of tenure and promotion decisions, the Department Head shall call a meeting of the tenured faculty for tenure recommendations and of the faculty whose rank

---

<sup>3</sup> Although these requirements are necessary, they are not automatically sufficient.

is higher than the candidate's rank for promotion recommendations. For purposes of promotion decisions of regular non-tenure track faculty members, decisions will be carried out by the Department Head and tenured faculty members. The purpose of the meeting shall be to evaluate the candidate's achievements and qualifications and to vote on a recommendation for tenure or promotion. The candidate's performance and potential shall be evaluated for all relevant activities including teaching, research, service, and professional development. Collegiality shall also be considered for tenure recommendations. Appropriate collegial behavior is consistent with the standards outlined in the *University Handbook*, Sections D3 and D12.

2. Sections C36.1, C112.2, and C152.2 of the *University Handbook* state that outside reviewers may be asked to evaluate a candidate's portfolio for both tenure and promotion. For departmental purposes, outside reviewers shall be used. The candidate shall provide the Department Head with the names of two individuals from outside the university who are qualified to evaluate the candidate's portfolio, and the Department Head shall select two additional reviewers from outside the university who are similarly qualified to evaluate the candidate's portfolio. The four outside evaluations shall supplement the review of the candidate's promotion or tenure application by the resident faculty.
3. In evaluating a candidate's research portfolio for both tenure and promotion, the candidate's cumulative research achievements through the tenure or promotion cutoff date shall be considered. Primary emphasis, however, shall be placed on research productivity during the five years immediately preceding the submission of the tenure or promotion application.

## **B. TENURE GUIDELINES**

1. In conformity with Section C82.2 of the *University Handbook*, tenure decisions for persons appointed at the rank of assistant professor shall normally be made no later than during the sixth year of service; in conformity with Section C82.3 of the *University Handbook*, tenure decisions for persons appointed at the rank associate professor or professor shall be made no later than during the fifth year of service. The Department Head shall provide each tenure-track faculty member with a letter specifying the responsibilities of tenure-track faculty members when the faculty member accepts a position in the department. Letters to new assistant professors shall include the attached statement, "Responsibilities of Assistant Professors" (see Appendix A). For new faculty at other ranks, the department head shall draft, and the dean approve, a letter of expectations specific to the new faculty member. Tenure-track faculty members seeking tenure shall submit a portfolio for the probationary period that demonstrates proficiency in teaching, research, and service consistent with the expectations specified in the department head's letter of responsibilities. The candidate's portfolio shall also provide evidence of superior ability in either teaching or research.
2. In conformity with Section C92.1 of the *University Handbook*, a mid-probationary review shall take place during the third year of a tenure-track faculty member's appointment unless otherwise stated in the faculty member's contract. Unlike evaluations

for tenure, which are performed at both the college and university level, mid-probationary reviews shall be performed solely within the college. For departmental purposes, the criteria and procedures for this review shall be similar to those for tenure except that outside reviewers shall not participate.

### C. PROMOTION GUIDELINES

3. Instructors applying for promotion to the rank of assistant professor shall have the appropriate terminal degree as described in Section C130 of the *University Handbook* and demonstrate evidence of teaching and research competence.
4. Instructors seeking a promotion (from instructor to advanced instructor or advanced instructor to senior instructor); and teaching professors seeking promotion (from assistant to associate or associate to full) shall submit a portfolio for the probationary period that demonstrates proficiency in teaching, professionalism, and service consistent with the expectations specified in the department head's letter of responsibilities. The candidate's portfolio shall also provide evidence of superior ability in teaching. All regular or term non-tenure track faculty must also maintain their academic or professional requirements for accreditation purposes, consistent with the requirements of their contract.

The average time in rank interval prior to consideration for promotion is expected to be five years, although shorter and longer intervals are possible. Promotion decisions for regular or term non-tenure track faculty will be carried out by the department head, tenured faculty and regular non-tenure track faculty of higher rank. The tenured faculty and regular non-tenure track faculty of higher rank will evaluate the candidate's portfolio and provide their recommendations to the department head. The department head will then draft a letter of recommendation to the dean. The candidate will be provided a copy of the department head's letter.

5. In conformity with Section C82.2 of the *University Handbook*, decisions concerning promotion to associate professor shall normally be made no later than during a faculty member's sixth year of service. The department head shall provide each assistant professor with a letter specifying the responsibilities for tenure-track assistant professors when the assistant professor initially joins the faculty (see above, Tenure Guidelines, par. A, and Appendix A, "Responsibilities of Assistant Professors"). Assistant professors seeking promotion to the rank of associate professor shall submit a portfolio that demonstrates proficiency in teaching, research, and service consistent with the expectations specified in the department head's letter of responsibilities. The candidate's portfolio shall also provide evidence of superior ability in either teaching or research.
6. In conformity with Section C131 of the *University Handbook*, there shall be no explicit time-in-rank requirement for promotion to professor (Section C131 notes that the median time for promotion at Kansas State University has been about six years). Associate professors seeking promotion to the rank of full professor shall submit a portfolio that

demonstrates the candidate's proficiency in teaching, research, professional development, and service. The candidate must also provide evidence that he or she has had an impact on the profession (academe or practice) at the national or regional level. As examples, in the area of teaching, national recognition may be satisfied by publishing a nationally recognized textbook; in the area of research it may be satisfied by publishing an extensively cited article. Letters of support from external reviewers (see paragraph 2, of General Guidelines in this section) shall serve to corroborate such evidence.

### **III. CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS**

#### **A. GENERAL**

In accordance with the *University Handbook* (C31.5), the faculty of the Department of Accounting has established minimum-acceptable levels of productivity for each of the four performance areas for tenured faculty members. This policy is concerned with revocation of tenure and should not in any way be confused with criteria for the initial awarding of tenure. As such, these criteria are exclusively for tenured faculty members in a regular nine-month faculty position. Chronic failure to meet the minimum-acceptable levels constitutes evidence of professional incompetence.

The Department of Accounting is committed to and considers its highest priority high-quality teaching, including innovative curriculum and other instructional development. The faculty is also committed to research and other forms of scholarly activity that add to the body of knowledge or support and foster improvement in teaching. Within this broader context, professional service and professional development also represent essential tasks for the professorate, which are important to the overall functioning of the department and cannot be ignored. It is vital for all faculty members to demonstrate a minimum level of attention to all four of these areas – teaching, research, professional development, and service. Below minimum-acceptable performance in these categories is cause for evoking the process envisioned in the *University Handbook* C31.5. The department head will indicate in writing to the tenured faculty member when his or her overall performance falls below the minimum-acceptable level as indicated by the annual evaluation.

The department head will also indicate, in writing, a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member with key benchmarks and time schedules. If either the department head or the faculty member deems it appropriate, a peer review group with membership determined by the department head, will be created to assist the department head in monitoring and evaluating the faculty member's performance. In subsequent annual evaluations, the tenured faculty member will inform the department head about activities designed to improve performance and submit evidence of improvement.

Exceeding minimum-acceptable standards and avoiding the process outlined in the *University Handbook* C31.5 (and potential revocation of tenure) requires that a faculty member under the special review process outlined above satisfy each of the standards set forth below. The Dean of the College of Business Administration will be notified by the department head about the names of tenured faculty members who fail again to meet the minimum-acceptable levels for the second

year after the department head's suggested course of action has been completed. The dean has the discretion to recommend dismissal of a tenured faculty member who receives two successive evaluations below minimum-acceptable standards, or three evaluations below minimum-acceptable standards in any five-year period.

The faculty in the Department of Accounting consider tenure essential for promoting an environment of free inquiry and scholarship. No single individual has the right to determine the revocation of tenure without input from the department faculty. Prior to consideration of dismissal for cause and therefore determining a tenured faculty member is a chronic low achiever, the department head must take action to help the faculty member improve his or her performance and make sure that duties have been assigned equitably. The department head and the faculty member may agree to reallocate the faculty member's time to avoid duties in the area of deficient performance and reassign the person to areas of better performance, see *University Handbook* C31.7. For example, a tenured faculty member may be assigned a greater role in either teaching or research. This reassignment must be possible in terms of the Department of Accounting's mission and needs.

The following represents minimum departmental standards for productivity.

A. Teaching

The minimum-acceptable standard for teaching shall be determined by a combination of student evaluations and inputs from other sources, as described under section I.D.1, "Annual Evaluation: Faculty Evaluation Rating System: Teaching". The critical minimum value that must be achieved to meet minimum acceptable productivity standards is 2 on a 5 point scale, averaged over a two-year period.

B. Research

The minimum-acceptable standard for research is two of the following every five years on a rolling basis (i.e., each year represents the fifth year of a five-year evaluation period): (1) a refereed conference presentation, (2) a refereed journal article, (3) an academic book published by a recognized national press. Only one refereed conference presentation may be used in this count. Co-authored works are acceptable in meeting this standard provided the faculty member contributes substantively to the work.

C. Professional Development

The minimum-acceptable standard for professional development is participation in at least one professional development activity every two years.

D. Service

The minimum-acceptable standard for service is serving on at least one departmental, college, university, or professional society committee every two years.

The chronic low achiever determination may be reached when a tenured faculty member fails to meet any of the above listed performance standards.

## **B. SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES**

The faculty of the Department of Accounting recognize that as faculty members' careers progress, the relative extent to which they emphasize the different categories of teaching, research, professional development, and service often evolves. Faculty members in the advanced stages of their careers, for example, are not infrequently called upon to make substantial contributions in the area of service. For this reason, the minimum-acceptable standards enumerated above may be modified on an individual basis to allow for special circumstances. Any modifications, however, may only be made (1) when substantial contributions in one category clearly offset contributions in others and (2) when a faculty member has a cumulative, demonstrable record of achievement in the categories of teaching and research. Any such modifications must be memorialized in a faculty member's annual goals and expectations document for the evaluation periods affected.

## **IV. POST TENURE REVIEW**

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

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

The department policy on post tenure review follows the overarching purpose, principles, objectives, and procedures in the university policy on post tenure review (see University Handbook, Appendix W), which was approved by Faculty Senate on February 11, 2014." The remainder of the section on Post Tenure Review will describe the guidelines, procedures, and criteria to be used by the department.

### **A. GUIDELINES**

1. Post-tenure review shall be conducted for tenured faculty members every six years and shall conform to the timeline associated with the annual evaluation review as outlined in the University Handbook. The six-year post-tenure review clock is defined as the sixth year following promotion or awarding of a major university performance award. More

specifically, the review shall take place in the spring semester following 6 full years of tenured service subject to the clock reset modifications below. The following events shall modify and reset the post-tenure review clock:

- application for promotion to full professor;
  - application for the Professorial Performance Award (University Handbook C49);
  - receipt of a substantial college, university, national or international award requiring multi-year portfolio-like documentation, such as University Distinguished Professor, University Distinguished Teaching Scholar, an endowed chair or other national/international awards (see list of Faculty Awards <http://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/natlawards.html>);
  - returning to a faculty position after serving a year or more in an administrative position (e.g., department head, assistant/associate dean)
2. The schedule for post-tenure review could also be delayed for one year to accommodate sabbatical leave, a major health issue, or another compelling reason, provided that both the faculty member and department/unit head approve the delay.
  3. Exceptions for Post-Tenure Review: If the faculty member has already been identified as not meeting minimum standards according to the policies and department procedures relating to chronic low achievement, that process will be considered to serve in lieu of post-tenure review. Those who have formally announced their retirement through a written letter to the department/unit head, or have begun phased retirement, are exempt from post-tenure review.

## **B. PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS**

1. The Department Head will notify tenured faculty for which a post-tenure review is required that a review will be completed. An email notification will be sent to the faculty member with the six prior annual evaluations attached and a statement that they have the option of submitting a response in support of their post-tenure performance. The Department Head may request additional relevant material that demonstrates the tenured faculty member's contributions to the department/college/university.
2. The Department Head reviews the annual reviews, optional responses, and any additional material to determine whether the tenured faculty member has made "appropriate contributions to the department/college/university." As part of this review, the Department Head may consult with the area coordinator or other tenured faculty members in the same discipline to assess the tenured faculty member's strengths and areas for improvement, to determine whether he/she is making appropriate contribution or whether additional plans or activities need to be developed. At a minimum, the tenured faculty member must have all six annual evaluations "meet" expectations (based on a weighted score of research, teaching,



and service categories for each annual evaluation\*). In cases where the tenured faculty member does not meet this minimum standard, but is not qualified for Chronic Low Achievement, the Department Head must review and assess the need for developing an improvement plan to ensure the tenured faculty member's contribution.

3. The Department Head will prepare a written report. The faculty member shall be given a copy of the review. A face-to-face meeting between the faculty member and the reviewer(s) is encouraged. If the review 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 reviews to review progress toward any goals set in the plan.
4. The Department Head will forward a written recommendation to the Dean, accompanied by an explanation of her or his judgment.

## **V. GUIDELINES FOR ADMINISTRATORS**

A faculty member who moves to full-time in college administration (such as department heads, dean or associate/assistant deans) or university academic administration will be evaluated separately by the dean (or other university administrator as appropriate) and not under the Department Document. The faculty member will not be subject to the post-tenure review or chronic low achievement standards of the document but rather will be assessed on the quality of administrative contribution by the Dean (or other university administrator as appropriate).

Such a faculty member will maintain the same qualification status in effect at the time of administrative appointment as the faculty member engages in periodic development activities related either to his or her discipline (active scholarship) or the administrative appointment (related to their leadership role and responsibilities).

An administrator who leaves a full-time administrative role and returns to the faculty will maintain their qualification for a period of three years. By the end of the fourth year following the departure from administrative assignment the faculty member must have published at least one peer-reviewed journal article or presented at least one national or international conference paper directly related to their academic discipline since returning to the faculty. By the end of the fifth year (and beyond) in a regular faculty appointment, the former administrator must meet the same qualification criteria required of other faculty members.

## **VI. APPENDIX A: RESPONSIBILITIES OF TENURED AND TENURE TRACK FACULTY**

The duties and responsibilities of tenured and tenure-track professors involve teaching, research, and service activities consistent with the mission and broader collegial efforts of the department, college, and university. The Department of Accounting's mission statement emphasizes high-quality teaching balanced with research and other forms of discovery and scholarship. Normally, teaching loads are six to nine credit hours per semester. When departmental demands allow, tenure-track faculty members are assigned lighter loads (six credits per term, multiple sections of the same course, fewer new preparations, etc.) to allow them to focus more fully on research activities. While service requirements are generally intentionally limited for junior faculty members, some evidence of competence in handling service assignments is an important indicator of long-term productivity and, thus, a legitimate issue in a tenure decision. The effective functioning and long-term development of the Department of Accounting require that the entire spectrum of interactions and joint efforts of the faculty be based on integrity, adherence to professional ethics, co-operation, and generosity. For this reason, collegiality is an important responsibility for each faculty member.

Teaching responsibilities include ongoing general curriculum development, the design and delivery of needed new courses, and the overall responsibility for the design and delivery of assigned courses. Mentoring and advising students and continuous development of teaching competence are also explicit teaching responsibilities. Given the relatively small size of the department, furthermore, tenure-track faculty members are expected to be able to cover a reasonable range of courses within their general area of expertise. Although the evaluation of teaching effectiveness is not solely dependent on student evaluation ratings, student evaluation results are heavily weighted. A number of other factors may complement student ratings, including, for example, the extent to which courses taught involve new preparations, the range of courses taught, advising effectiveness, and involvement in teaching-related professional development.

Required research activity involves the discovery, development, and integration of new knowledge in one's area of expertise. The researcher's role calls for the dissemination of research results to audiences that include one's academic peers. Articles in peer-reviewed academic accounting or accounting-related journals, accordingly, weigh heavily in tenure decisions. The faculty also recognizes, however, that useful academic accounting research has ramifications for practice. Thus, various forums may be appropriate for disseminating the fruits of one's intellectual activities. Publications in practice journals, for example, can usefully complement publications in academic journals. Tenure deliberations, furthermore, will not narrowly focus on the quantity of publications. Rather, quality is, at the very least, taken equally into account. There is no explicitly required minimum number of publications, although a reasonable target for tenure-track seeking tenure is six journal articles or their equivalent. Indicators of quality include, for example, journal prestige, sound theory development, methodological sophistication, citation extensiveness, and impact on the field.

Collegiality, while a crucial issue relative to research and teaching, will be explicitly addressed in tenure decisions. In evaluating this performance dimension, faculty members are expected to

provide examples of specific interactions and events that support their assessments. Minor interpersonal style issues that do not affect mission-related contributions will not be considered, nor will professional or philosophical differences. Indeed, the faculty recognizes the value of a wide range of professional and philosophical perspectives. Relevant collegiality factors include interpersonal integrity, adherence to professional ethics, effective management of disagreement and conflict, co-operation, and generosity. Helping others be effective is an explicit expectation.

## VII. APPENDIX B: RATING FORMS

### A. Rating Form for Teaching Effectiveness

Using the documentation provided by the faculty member, the Department Head should indicate on this form the activities to be considered in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. This form is provided only as a guide and is not required.

- A. Student Rating of Instruction: The adjusted average Summary Evaluations from the TEVAL or IDEA output for all regular teaching load courses taught during the evaluation period should be averaged in determining an overall summary evaluation.

B. Department Head Rating

1. Peer Review Assessment data
2. External measures.

Department head rating for teaching effectiveness (using the scale below):

- Significantly Exceeds Expectations (5)
- Exceeds Expectations (4)
- Meets Expectations (3)
- Fails to meet expectations (2)
- Substantially fails to meet expectations (1)
- Falls below the minimum-acceptable level of productivity (0)

\_\_\_\_ Overall Rating: The higher of (1) average of ratings in A and B, or (2) Rating in A.

**B. Rating Form for Research Effectiveness**

Using the documentation provided by the faculty member, the department head should indicate on this form the activities to be considered in the evaluation of research effectiveness. The following categories are provided as a framework for objective evaluation and judgment. This form is provided only as a guide and is not required.

- A. Current Period Activity (30% of evaluation)
  - 1. Activity
  - 2. Annual Expectations
  - 3. Comparison
  
- B. Productivity over the last 5 years (70% of the evaluation)
  - 1. Journal Articles Accepted/Published:
    - Top Journals
    - Other with 20% or less acceptance
    - Refereed Journals with > 20% acceptance
    - Scholarly Books/Invited Reviews
  - 2. Textbooks, Text Related Materials & Book Reviews
  - 3. Obtained Funding Research
  - 4. Presentations & Conference Proceedings
    - National
    - Other
  - 5. Comparison to expectations based on research weight

Overall rating for research effectiveness: \_\_\_\_\_

Significantly exceeds expectations (5)

Exceeds expectations (4)

Meets expectations (3)

Fails to meet expectations (i.e., needs improvements) (2)

Substantially fails to meet expectations (1)

Falls below minimum-acceptable level of productivity (i.e., unsatisfactory) (0)

### C. Rating Form for Service Effectiveness

Using the documentation provided by the faculty member, the department head should indicate on this form the activities to be considered in the evaluation of service effectiveness. The evaluation includes both quantity and quality dimensions. The categories A and B are provided as a framework for objective evaluation and judgment. Hours in each category should be documented and a rating assigned based on the total hours using the scale provided.

This form is provided only as a guide and is not required.

#### A. Within the University:

1. University-wide or college activities:
2. Departmental activities:

#### B. Outside the University:

1. Professional activities (officer or committee membership with professional organization or conference activities; reviewer or editor for publications; etc.):
2. Community activities (continuing education, in-service programs, speeches to professional groups, etc.):

#### Quantity Dimension:

<u>Estimated Hours</u>	<u>Rating</u>
>80	5
41-80	4
25-40	3
15-24	2
<14	1

#### Quantity Dimension:

Department head rating for Service effectiveness (using the scale below):

- Significantly Exceeds Expectations (5)
- Exceeds Expectations (4)
- Meets Expectations (3)
- Fails to meet expectations (2)
- Substantially fails to meet expectations (1)
- Falls below the minimum-acceptable level of productivity (0)

Overall rating for service effectiveness:

**D. Rating Form for Professional Development Effectiveness**

Using the documentation provided by the faculty member, the department head should indicate on this form the activities to be considered in the evaluation of professional development effectiveness. The following categories are provided as a framework for objective evaluation and judgment. Hours in each category should be documented and a rating assigned based on the total hours using the scale provided. This form is provided only as a guide and is not required.

A. Self-study:

1. Toward specific academic or professional objectives
2. For new course preparation:
3. For new research programs:

B. Others:

1. Faculty Residencies:
2. Continuing Educational Activities:

Overall rating for professional development effectiveness:

_____ >80	Significantly Exceeds Expectations (5)
_____ 41-80	Exceeds Expectations (4)
_____ 25-40	Meets Expectations (3)
_____ 15-24	Fails to meet expectations (2)
_____ < 14	Substantially fails to meet expectations (1)
	Falls below the minimum-acceptable level of productivity (refer to minimum-acceptable productivity standards in this document for guidance on service amounts resulting in this rating) (0)

## **VIII. APPENDIX C: DEFINITIONS OF NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY**

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

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

Non-tenure track faculty members with primary responsibilities in teaching and advising students may be recruited, hired, and appointed into regular or term positions. All non-tenure track faculty members holding regular or term appointments will be evaluated annually for merit raises. Initial appointment rank and subsequent promotions in rank are based on advanced degrees held, experience, performance, and achievement over time within a given rank.

All non-tenure track faculty on regular or term appointments will be evaluated as part of the annual evaluation process, and those on regular appointments also will be evaluated annually for reappointment, as outlined in Section I of this document.

The procedures for promotion in the regular or term non-tenure track instructor and teaching professor ranks are similar to the processes for promotion of tenure-track/tenured faculty in the University Handbook (see sections C110-C116.2 and C150-C156.2). Specific instructions and criteria for promotion are outlined in Section II of this document. If a promotion is recommended, the unit head in conjunction with the candidate and the Dean of the College will determine the length of the new appointment. The options are a regular one-year appointment entitled to Notice of Non-Reappointment or a term appointment for a one, two or three year term with no Notice of Non-Reappointment.