
Special Education, Counseling, and Student Affairs
Department

College of Education

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 (10/03/2022)


NEXT REVIEW DATE:



Department Head's Signature

10/3/2022


Date



Dean's Signature

11/17/2022

Date



Provost's Signature

11/17/2022

Date

**BYLAWS
for the
Department of
Special Education, Counseling, and Student Affairs**
(hereinafter referred to as the Department)

Approved 11/27/06

Modified (5/07/08, 8/24/09, 11/26/12, 4/28/14, 1/26/15, 5/4/15, 2/22/16, 2/26/18, 10/25/21,
10/03/22)

1 Members of the Department

1.1 Probationary or tenured faculty

Assistant Professor
Associate Professor
Professor

1.2 Non-tenure track faculty (regular or term)

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

2 Voting Membership of the Department

2.1 Definition

Faculty with the rank (probationary or tenured) of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor with some portion of their continuing full-time University appointment as a faculty member within the Department have voting privileges (except that only faculty who are evaluated by the departmental merit process may vote on matters directly related to the merit process).

2.1.1 Term appointments

Term appointments (e.g., adjuncts appointees; term appointees as professor, associate professor, assistant professor, teaching assistant professor, teaching associate professor, teaching professor, research professor, research associate professor, research assistant professor, instructor, advanced instructor, senior instructor, assistant instructor, extension assistant, extension associate, research assistant, research associate, graduate assistant, graduate teaching assistant, graduate research assistant) do not have voting privileges.

2.2 Absentee Voting

If a voting member of the Department or committee thereof anticipates being absent from a meeting at which a specific vote may be taken, the member may, prior to the meeting, deliver to the Chair of the body a written, signed, statement indicating how the specific vote is to be counted. In this case, the Chair shall

announce that the member is casting an absentee vote and have it counted by the members who count the votes of those present.

2.3 Proxies

A voting member of the Department or committee thereof may designate in writing another member of the body as his or her proxy. Such written designation must be delivered to the Chair of the body and announced at the opening of the meeting.

3 Notification of Faculty Meetings

When feasible, faculty meetings that bear on departmental policies should have five working days' notice. There will be no exception to the five-day notice requirement for selection of the nominee for Department Chair and proposals of policy change. Moreover, copies of proposed policy changes must be distributed at least five working days prior to action.

4 Committee Organization

Ad hoc committees (e.g., search committees) shall be elected by the Department faculty.

5 Faculty Recruitment and Selection

5.1 Committee Election and Organization

When there is a faculty vacancy to be filled, a five-member Search Committee will be elected by the Department. One of the members shall be a student. The Department shall elect one member of the Search Committee to serve as chair. There shall be no restrictions concerning eligibility to serve on Search Committees. The Committee shall write the job description and assist the Department Chair in preparing all required Affirmative Action documents.

5.2 Screening

The Search Committee shall conduct the screening and will, in consultation with the Department Chair, recommend to the faculty the candidate(s) to be interviewed on campus. The Chair carries that recommendation to the Dean.

5.3 Faculty Recommendations

Following the interview(s), the Department Chair shall conduct a secret ballot vote of recommendation. The voting shall take place after the Search Committee has made its recommendation(s) and after a reasonable time for discussion of candidate qualifications. Although all voting members of the Department are eligible to participate in this discussion, voting is restricted to faculty who have a rank equal to or higher than the one to be offered. A vote shall be conducted for each candidate separately to determine his or her acceptability for employment.

If the Department Chair is willing to support the Department faculty's recommendation(s), then the Chair shall convey the recommendation(s) to the Dean. If the Chair cannot support the recommendation(s), then the Chair will

so notify the Department and it shall elect a spokesperson to convey and explain its position(s) to the Dean.

6 Functions, Terms, and Selection of Department Chair

6.1 Functions of Chair

Except where otherwise specified in these Bylaws, the duties and responsibilities of the Department Chair shall be those ordinarily associated with the office of Department Head at Kansas State University.

6.2 Term of Chair

The term of the Chair shall be for three years, running from July 1 through June 30.

6.3 Selection of Chair

6.3.1 Internal Selection Procedure

At a time no later than the April department meeting that precedes a June 30 expiration of a Chair's term, the Department shall select its nominee whose name shall be sent to the Dean.

All voting members of the Department, including the incumbent Chair, are eligible to vote and to be selected. After nominations have been made from the floor, voting will be by secret ballot. If no person receives a majority of the votes, there shall be a runoff ballot between the two persons receiving the greatest number of votes. In the event of a tie the final ballot, both names shall be sent to the Dean as nominees.

If the person(s) nominated is unacceptable to the Dean, then the selection process will be repeated to select a new nominee. If the nominee and the Dean are unable to agree on the conditions, the process will be repeated.

6.3.2 Open Search Procedure

If the Dean decides to have an open search to fill the office of Chair, then a search committee shall be elected as specified in 4.1.

The Search Committee shall function as specified in 4.2 and 4.3 except that its selection of candidate(s) to be interviewed will be in consultation with the Dean rather than with the Department Chair, and the Search Committee chair shall convey the Department's recommendation(s) to the Dean.

7 Reappointment of Nontenured Faculty on Regular Appointments

Each tenured voting member of the Department shall have an annual opportunity and responsibility to make recommendations concerning reappointment of each nontenured member on a regular appointment. These recommendations shall be obtained by the

Department Chair on a dated, signed form which has been approved by majority vote of the tenured faculty. University policy concerning when the reappointment process occurs, the processes to be followed, and the criteria used to determine reappointment will be followed (*University Handbook*, C53.1).

Members of the voting faculty may solicit feedback from members of the department and other professionals with whom the nontenured faculty regularly interact. Nontenured faculty may also solicit feedback from members of the department and other professionals with whom they regularly interact.

If the Department Chair is willing to support the majority recommendation for a given nontenured faculty member, then the Chair shall convey the recommendation to the Dean. If the Chair cannot support the majority recommendation, then the Chair will so notify the tenured faculty and they shall, if they choose, elect a spokesperson to convey and explain the majority position to the Dean.

8 Promotions

When members of the Faculty are considered for promotion, recommendations will be solicited from all voting members of the faculty holding a rank equal to or higher than the one sought. This recommendation shall be obtained by the Department Chair on a dated, signed form which has been approved by a majority vote of eligible voting faculty.

Members of the voting faculty may solicit feedback from members of the department and other professionals with whom faculty regularly interact. Faculty may also solicit feedback from members of the department and other professionals with whom they regularly interact.

If the Department Chair is willing to support the majority recommendation for a given candidate, then the Chair shall convey the recommendation to the Dean. If the Chair cannot support the majority recommendation, then the Chair will so notify the faculty eligible to recommend and they shall, if they choose, elect a spokesperson to convey and explain the majority position to the Dean.

The procedures for promotion in the non-tenure track instructor, advanced instructor, teaching assistant professor, teaching associate professor, research assistant professor and research associate professor ranks are similar to the processes for promotion of tenure-track faculty in the *University Handbook* (see sections C110-C116.2 and C150-C156.20). The average time interval in rank prior to consideration for promotion is expected to be 5 years, although shorter and longer intervals are possible. The department chair will solicit from each candidate a portfolio documenting activities and achievements in instruction (teaching and advising), service and outreach, and research duties depending on the assignment of the non-tenure track faculty member. Promotion of non-tenure track faculty will be to either a regular appointment entitled to Notice of Non-Reappointment or to a term appointment for a one-, two-, or three-year term, with no Notice of Non-reappointment.

9 Annual Faculty Goal Setting Procedures

Consistent with University timelines and procedures, each faculty member will establish individual performance goals for the following calendar year to be shared with the Chair as part of the annual evaluation process. Furthermore, each faculty member will propose load allocations totaling 100% to designate the intended time and effort toward accomplishing those goals.

9.1 Goals and Load Allocations

Goal and load allocations for the following calendar year will be noted on the faculty member's annual performance evaluation document.

9.2 Renegotiation of Goals and Load Allocations

On occasion, a faculty member may wish to establish new goals and renegotiate load percentages at some point during the year. In such a case, the proposed modification shall be made in writing to the Chair within 30 days after the faculty member's perceived need for the change. Examples of such need for modification would be notification of publication or grant funding, changes in courses or advising loads, or new research opportunities. A change of load allocation made during the year shall reflect the assignment for the entire year. For example, if a change is made late in the year of evaluation, it is to reflect a proportional change across categories in the use of total time for the year.

9.3 Rank and Contract Length Differentiations

In addition to the load percentages across categories, two other factors will be considered in establishing performance goals, and consequently will have significance in merit evaluation. They are faculty rank and type of contract(s).

It is reasonable to have qualitatively different expectations for faculty of different ranks. Senior faculty may be expected to contribute to the departmental mission through greater versatility in teaching, through more broad-based forms of service (e.g., university committees vs. departmental ones, or national associations vs. local ones), and through more fully developed research agendas.

Differences between the nine-month, nine-plus-one-month, and nine-plus-two-months contracts will be considered in evaluating relative faculty performance, particularly in the area of teaching, since summer contracts tend to be heavily, if not exclusively, contracts for teaching. A load of five courses during an academic year has been the typical departmental load for graduate faculty with graduate advisees. Summer contracts typically add one course (over one month at ten tenths or two months at five tenths) or two courses (over two months) to the total number of courses taught in the calendar year. Such quantitative differences are legitimate and require appropriate considerations in load allocation and evaluation; to ignore them would suggest that summer session teaching is unimportant and faculty need not be accountable for it.

10 Annual Evaluation

Regular and term non-tenure track faculty will be evaluated as part of the annual evaluation process. In January each faculty member who holds five-tenths time or more within the Department and whose salary recommendation originates within the Department will be evaluated on her or his performance during the prior calendar year. Faculty are required by the University to be evaluated for two purposes--annual evaluation of productivity and merit rating for salary increases. The Chair normally will not be included in faculty evaluation procedures because that merit salary recommendation originates with the Dean. A Chair leaving the chair role and others leaving administrative roles during the current evaluation year will be included in faculty evaluation covering accomplishments during the time period in which they serve as regular faculty.

The faculty will decide, by simple majority of those voting at the last faculty meeting of the fall semester, whether or not to engage in peer review or review by Chair only that year. Should the faculty choose not to conduct peer review, the Chair will evaluate and rate faculty without formal input from the faculty, but in accordance with the criteria, considerations, and processes included in these Bylaws. When the Chair has a familial conflict of interest (e.g., spouse) with a faculty member participating in the merit review process, peer review will be conducted (see K-State's *Policies and Procedures Manual 4095.02* along with sections 10.1 and 10.6 of this document). For situations involving a faculty member who is also a graduate student in the department, the chair will evaluate and rate the individual without input from the faculty.

10.1 Evaluation Timeline

Evaluation materials for the previous year's accomplishments, along with the faculty member's goals and load allocations from the previous year and the goals and load allocations proposed for the next year shall be provided to the Chair during the month of January as so designated by the Chair. If the Department has voted for peer review, the peer review process will take place in a timely manner on a schedule established by the Chair.

The Chair (the Dean for a faculty member when the faculty member and the Chair have a familial conflict of interest) will transmit evaluation letters to faculty and provide opportunity for formal discussion by appointment with each ratee during February. However, this timeline may be adjusted to meet any College deadlines or central administration deadlines.

10.2 Description of Evaluation Categories

In most cases faculty will be evaluated in each of the four general areas: teaching and advising; research and creative endeavors; nondirected/directed service; and academic citizenship.

The lists presented below provide examples of criteria and data sources for the evaluation categories. They are intended to reflect some of the activities that a faculty member may engage in to fulfill the criteria of each category. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to present adequate documentation of his or her

accomplishments toward meeting the goals and fulfilling the load allocation commitment outlined earlier that year.

Areas of Evaluation

Teaching and Advising
Research and Creative Endeavors
Service
Academic Citizenship (always 5%)

Examples of Evidence

Teaching and Advising

Student evaluations
Awards/recognition
Peer review
Other student feedback
Curricular innovations/new text/inclusion of technology
Team teaching
Advising evaluations/feedback
Advising documentation
International teaching
Professional development opportunities
Quality of theses/dissertations
Audio-visual recordings of teaching
Student products
Podcasts

Research and Creative Endeavors

Publications in refereed journals
Publications in non-refereed journals
Books/book chapters
Monographs
Book reviews
External funding/grant proposals (funded and not funded)
Conference presentations/attendance
Serving on editorial boards for refereed journals
Reviewing manuscripts for journals
Reviewing proposals for professional meetings
Product development
Book revision
Editing a journal or book
Research awards or recognition
Authorship or co-authorship of accreditation self-studies or Kansas State Department of Education program reports (co-authorship must be confirmed by letter from appropriate administrator)

Service

Membership on university committees
Membership on college committees
Chairing of committees
Participation in the mentor project
Participation in the honors student program
Supporting department activities and goals
Advising student organizations
Recruiting efforts for department
Service to the public/community
Mentoring
Faculty Senate
Graduate Council
Service in international, national, regional, and state organizations
Inservice or workshop presentations
Consultations
Membership on an accreditation team
Participation in K-State development activities

Teaching and Advising

Instructor/Advanced Instructor/Senior Instructor

Fulfills an individual annual performance document of goals and load allocation form
Obtains student ratings for all regular courses (e.g., IDEA, TEVAL, faculty-developed surveys, evaluations for small classes)
Uses data sources to improve teaching
Supervises practicum and internship
Selects and uses appropriate resources including technology in teaching and advising
Assesses student learning regularly and provides appropriate feedback

Assistant Professor/Teaching Assistant Professor

Fulfills an individual annual performance document of goals and load allocation form
Obtains student ratings for all regular courses (e.g., IDEA, TEVAL, faculty-developed surveys, evaluations for small classes)
Uses data sources to improve teaching and advising
Selects and uses appropriate resources including technology in teaching and advising
Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the teaching field
Teaches and advises to serve varied learning needs of diverse student populations
Assesses student learning regularly and provides appropriate feedback
Supervises practicum and internship

Associate Professor/Teaching Associate Professor

Meets criteria expected of assistant professors
Updates, revises, and/develops course material as appropriate for the field
Coordinates and responsibly supervises practica/internships/field placements
Serves responsibly as major advisor for students in advanced degree programs

Achieves graduate faculty status
Serves as an effective member on master's and doctoral committees
Serves as an advisor for master's and doctoral students

Professor/Teaching Professor

Meets criteria expected of assistant and associate professors
Provides leadership in curriculum development in the College, University, and/or field

Research and Creative Endeavors

Assistant Professor/Research Assistant Professor

Fulfills an individual annual performance document of goals and load allocation form
Submits and/or develops research and/or scholarly activity appropriate to the discipline for publication
Achieves toward graduate faculty status
Demonstrates initiative toward acquiring external funding

Associate Professor/Research Associate Professor

Meets criteria expected of assistant professors
Maintains graduate faculty status
Provides evidence of scholarship involvement in publications, funded grants, or product development
Provide evidence of successful involvement in scholarship and research (e.g., refereed publications, grants, or product development)

Professor/Research Professor

Meets criteria expected of assistant and associate professors
Contributes scholarly work disseminated to conventions, conferences, books, and journals
Mentors professional colleagues in research and other creative endeavors.

Service

Assistant Professor/Teaching Assistant Professor

Fulfills an individual annual performance document of goals and load allocation form
Participates in professional organizations
Participates in the development of curriculum
Provides service to college, university, state, and/or various constituencies

Associate Professor/Teaching Associate Professor

Meets criteria expected of assistant professors
Collaborates with professional colleagues in service activities

Teaching Professor

Meets criteria expected of assistant and associate professors
Performs leadership roles for the profession at the state and national levels

Professor

Meets criteria expected of assistant and associate professors

Provides leadership in sensitive areas such as grievance committees or search committees for administrative personnel

Performs leadership roles for the profession at the state and national levels

Academic Citizenship

All Ranks

Posts office hours and is regularly available for advising

Updates and submits vita to Department and college administration

Updates and submits syllabi to department and college administration

Engages in ethical and professional behaviors

Consistently responds to requests from Department Chair or administrators in a timely manner

Participates on college and/or university committees

10.3 Evaluation Materials

Sets of materials are to be prepared for each of the four areas to be rated: teaching and advising; research and creative endeavors; nondirected/directed service; and academic citizenship. Within each of the first three areas listed, the faculty member will prepare the appropriate cover page by listing the goals and load percentages that were negotiated with the Chair the previous January or renegotiated at a later date, and will follow that page with a summary no longer than 4 to 5 pages describing accomplishments toward the goals and load allocation. A brief summary that addresses academic citizenship is to be included with the set of materials. For any area in which 0% load has been declared, a cover page for the area is to be included, with notation to that effect. In general, if an accomplishment cuts across more than one category, faculty may cross enter if they indicate that they have done so in both categories. With regard to the category of research, one may list a journal publication in only one year. Books or ongoing research projects may be listed across successive years if percentages of the total product are spread across those years.

10.4 Criteria for Merit Evaluation

The following criteria illustrate, but do not exhaust the extent, of these general standards and values within the three categories of faculty evaluation:

Teaching and Advising

- a. In-depth, versatile teaching is generally more meritorious than teaching that is ordinary, superficial, and limited in scope.
- b. Evidence of developing or revising a course to respond to contemporary issues and to incorporate advanced teaching technology generally merits more weight than presenting and teaching the same course in the same way time after time.

- c. Student ratings are more meritorious when they measure course objectives that are appropriate for the course, when class size and evaluation format do not compromise student anonymity, and when the number of student raters comprises a sizable percentage of the total class enrollment.
- d. Advisement of doctoral students and supervision of their dissertations generally merit considerably more credit than advisement of non-thesis, non-project master's students and supervision of their programs.

Research and Other Creative Endeavors

- a. Sole authorship or senior authorship in international or national refereed journals with focus relevant to the mission of the faculty member's academic domain generally merits more credit than junior authorship and authorship in regional publications or non-refereed journals; however, it is inappropriate to deny exceptions, to stipulate how much more credit, or to imply that all articles of a given category merit equal credit. There are at least two reasons for recognizing exceptions. First, multiple authorship among members of the Department fosters collegiality. Second, authorship with graduate students benefits their careers and the Department's graduate programs. For publications with multiple authors, faculty must indicate their relative contribution to the article.
- b. Sole authorship of scholarly books published by recognized publishers of professional works generally merits considerably more weight than authorship of books of selected readings or works published by sources that publish at the author's request.
- c. Grant proposals that are relevant to the faculty member's academic domain and are accepted and funded by external agencies generally merit more credit than proposals that are not funded or are not generally related to the Department's mission.

Service

- a. Service activities that relate directly to the mission of the faculty member's academic domain generally merit more credit than those having only marginal relevance.
- b. Service in professional organizations of international or national status generally merits more credit than corresponding service in regional, state, or local groups; however, serving in a major role within the regional, state, or local group might well outweigh only a minor contribution to national or international organizations.
- c. Consulting that involves high-level application of professional competence to novel situations generally merits more credit than consulting of a routine nature.

- d. Editorial responsibility for a refereed professional journal generally earns more credit than does preparing single article reviews for a similarly reputable publication.
- e. Serving as chair of university-wide or college-wide committees generally outweighs more minor roles in committee work.

10.5 Merit Rating Procedures

Early each calendar year, the faculty member and Chair will determine the time allocation for each of the above categories, except for academic citizenship which will have an allocation of 5%. Minimums would be set to ensure involvement in all areas relevant to the position. Based on the materials supplied by each faculty member along with relevant information that the Chair receives from other sources (e.g., students, colleagues), the Chair will evaluate performance on the individual areas of teaching and advising, research and creative endeavors, service, and academic citizenship, along with determining an overall performance rating. For each area of evaluation, the Chair will rate the faculty member in terms of four rankings:

- 4 = Exceeded Expectations
- 3 = Met Expectations
- 2 = Fallen Below Expectations, but has Met Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity
- 1 = Fallen Below Minimum Acceptable Levels of Productivity

These rankings are required by the University and are derived from the institutionally required “minimum acceptable levels of productivity” (*University Handbook* Appendix C).

A faculty member who performs at expected levels on criteria the Department illustrated as standards, and who substantially fulfills his/her annual goals and load allocation developed in the annual conference with the Department Chair, would be noted as having “Met Expectations.” Some faculty may accomplish ambitious goals, exceeding the expected levels on criteria and/or the annual goals. This performance evaluation would be rated as “Exceeded Expectations.” At times, the performance of some faculty may be evaluated as failing to meet the standards for their rank and goals/load allocation but meeting minimum acceptable levels of productivity; in that case, their rating would be “Fallen Below Expectations, but has Met Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity.” A faculty member who fails to meet minimum standards, including marginal or worse performance on annual goals and load allocation, would have his/her performance rated as “Fallen Below Minimum Acceptable Levels of Productivity.” In this case, the Chair would follow the procedures for facilitating improved performance noted in the *University Handbook* (C31.5).

The Chair is then institutionally required to link annual performance ratings and any associated annual salary increases by tying the percentage of time shown in the load allocation to each performance category (i.e., weighted categories). For example,

assume a faculty member has the following load allocations and earned performance ratings:

<u>Area</u>	<u>Load</u>	<u>Earned Rating</u>
Teaching/advising	50%	“Exceeded Expectations” = 4
Research and Creative Endeavors	25%	“Exceeded Expectations” = 4
Service	20%	“Met Expectations” = 3
Academic Citizenship	5%	“Met Expectations” = 3

The ratings in the individual areas are weighted (according to distributions of responsibility) and then summed to produce the overall rating. See the following example for how an overall rating would be developed:

<u>Teaching & Advising</u>	<u>Research & Creative Endeavors</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>Academic Citizenship</u>
$.50 \times 4 = 2$	$.25 \times 4 = 1$	$.20 \times 3 = 0.6$	$.05 \times 3 = 0.15$

$$\text{Overall rating} = 2 + 1 + 0.6 + 0.15 = 3.75$$

The evaluation of teaching and advising, research and creative endeavors, service, and academic citizenship is based upon the supporting documentation submitted by the faculty along with relevant information that the Chair receives from other sources (e.g., students, colleagues). The evaluation of faculty performance should be as objective as possible; however, evaluation requires subjective judgments because all activities may not be easily quantified. When subjective evaluation is required, the rater must use sound, professional judgment to evaluate performance.

During each annual review period faculty are expected to achieve criteria as illustrated in each domain of activity for the appropriate academic rank. This includes fulfilling the goals and the load allocation specified in the individual annual performance document. As a result, the evaluation is based on both the extent to which the faculty member achieved criteria for their academic rank and the extent to which they achieved their performance goals for the evaluation period.

As indicated previously, the individual faculty member will be provided with an opportunity to review the evaluation letter prior to submission to the Dean and to acknowledge receipt via signature. In the event of a disagreement between the faculty member and the Chair concerning the evaluation rating, the faculty member will have the right to append their viewpoint to the Chair’s evaluation letter. For more information on evaluation, refer to the *University Handbook* Appendix Q.

10.6 Rating Procedures for Peer Review

If peer review is selected for a given year, all voting faculty members whose salary originate within the Department will be invited to independently rate faculty in all four categories. Raters will consider stated goals and load percentages in determining their ratings for each ratee. In addition, raters may also submit narrative comments

explaining why they rated someone as they did. No individual will rate himself or herself or spouse in any of the categories. The ratings of the faculty raters will exist as advisory input to the Chair who ultimately makes recommendations to the Dean for merit salary increases and annual evaluation of productivity. The Chair will rate all faculty in each of the categories prior to receiving input from the raters. When there is a familial conflict of interest of the Chair and a faculty member, the ratings of the individual faculty member by faculty raters will be provided to the Dean who will use the ratings to determine a rating in each of the four areas. This information will be provided to the Chair and integrated into the merit evaluation process with the other

10.7 Chronic Low Achievement by Tenured Faculty

When a tenured faculty member's overall performance falls below the minimum-acceptable level, as indicated by the annual evaluation, the department or unit head/chair shall indicate so in writing to the faculty member. The department head/chair will also indicate, in writing, a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member. In subsequent annual evaluations, the faculty member will report on activities aimed at improving performance and any evidence of improvement (as directed in the *University Handbook* C31.5). In the next annual evaluation, a faculty member who fails to “meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity” the previous year will report on the improvement activities and on any evidence of improvement. If a faculty member fails to “meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity” criteria for the year following the Chair’s suggested course of action, that person’s name will be forwarded to the Dean. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which an overall evaluation of “Did not meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity” is received, then “dismissal for cause” will be considered at the discretion of the Dean.

The activities presented below shall constitute the Department’s minimum-acceptable productivity standards. All faculty members must perform all duties outlined in the *University Handbook* and be in compliance with all university policies. The “minimum acceptable level of productivity” standards established in this document apply to all tenured faculty members in the department. Decisions on acceptable performance levels must contain the individual judgments of the faculty and administrators involved in the decision. These individuals evaluate productivity in each area based on assigned activities and the percentage of the individual’s appointment allocated to that activity. Each faculty member is expected to perform, as a minimum, the following activities, as assigned:

- a. Teaching and Advising
 - i. Be conscientious about meeting classes on time; about the content, organization, and presentation of lectures; and about the appropriate evaluation of students.
 - ii. Be consistent in content and depth of material covered in required courses such that the students earning a C or better are appropriately prepared for the subsequent courses.
 - iii. Work to keep course materials current.

- iv. Perform student advising conscientiously.
 - v. Serve as graduate student advisor and/or on the graduate committee of one or more graduate students.
- b. Research and Creative Endeavors
- i. Engage in scholarly and other creative activities appropriate to the profession.
 - ii. Communicate the results of the scholarly activities (e.g., publishing journal articles, presentations at conferences).
- c. Service
- i. Serve on departmental committees.
 - ii. Attend department faculty meetings.
 - iii. Attend an appropriate number of student-oriented functions such as Open House, Scholarship Days, and so forth.

10.8 Review of Merit Evaluation Procedures

The evaluation procedures outlined in these Bylaws shall be reviewed by the Department faculty every five years, or more often if deemed necessary by a majority vote of the Department faculty or at the discretion of the Chair, Dean, or Provost, and revised as needed.

11 Instructional Evaluation for Faculty Not Participating in Merit Evaluation

For the purposes of enhancing instruction and student learning, all individuals teaching in the Department but not participating in the merit evaluation process shall annually present evidence to the Department Chair (or other administrator, if appropriate). A one- or two-page self-assessment of classroom performance (brief description of duties, successes/strengths, and possible areas of improvement) is to be submitted. Recommended examples of supporting documentation include course evaluations (e.g., TEVAL or IDEA reports), course syllabi, and instructional materials.

12 Standards for Promotion and Tenure

In decisions regarding the awarding of tenure and promotion in rank, the Department is guided by the policies and procedures stipulated in the *University Handbook*.

The performance criteria in the areas of teaching, research and creative endeavors, and service are based on those described by the Department's merit evaluation system (see Section 10.2 for examples). That is, the standards or expectations for promotion and tenure represent logical, reasonable, cumulative extensions of the standards that apply in annual performance evaluations. However, given the importance (and relative irrevocability) of decisions to award or deny tenure, recommendations in this context are based upon very careful scrutiny of the nontenured faculty member's accomplishments and credentials.

Evaluation requires judgment. The faculty of the Department exercises professional judgment in the application of those standards in annual merit review and in making tenure and promotion recommendations.

12.1 Mid-Probationary Review

A mid-probationary review is conducted during the third year of the nontenured faculty member's probationary period. "This review provides the faculty member with substantive feedback from faculty colleagues and administrators regarding his or her accomplishments relative to departmental tenure criteria. A positive mid-probationary review does not insure that tenure will be granted in the future nor does a negative review mean that tenure will be denied. Procedures for the mid-probationary review are similar to procedures for the tenure review" (*University Handbook*, C92.1 & 92.2).

Members of the voting faculty may solicit feedback from members of the department and other professionals with whom the nontenured faculty regularly interact. Nontenured faculty may also solicit feedback from members of the department and other professionals with whom they regularly interact.

By the time the mid-probationary review is conducted, the nontenured faculty member is expected to satisfy the requirements for Graduate Faculty status.

12.2 Recommendations Regarding Tenure

Tenure decisions should be based on demonstrated individual excellence (merit) and, more importantly, on a faculty member's contribution to the institutional mission (worth). Faculty members who are versatile, balanced, and specialized best serve the institution. Versatility may be exhibited across the areas of teaching, research and creative endeavor, and service and/or within one or more of those areas. Obviously, specialization entails both depth and breadth of knowledge in a discipline, and, key to worth, the ability and disposition to apply that knowledge in teaching, research, and/or service.

In making tenure recommendations, the Department is guided by the general principles of excellence and versatility in teaching and in contribution to one or more of the University's other missions of research, service, and extension. In making tenure recommendations, our obligation of stewardship to students, citizens, consumers of research, the community of scholars, and other University constituents to provide the best faculty possible renders it necessary, albeit difficult, to ask, "Would the University likely do better if it denied tenure to this person and tried to get a better person for the job?"

12.3 Recommendations Regarding Promotion to Associate Professor

In making promotion recommendations, the Department is guided by principles of assessing demonstrated individual merit in relation to work assignment and the University's missions. As noted in the *University Handbook* (sec. C120.2), promotion to associate professor should be based on "substantial professional contributions that reflect excellence."

12.4 Procedures for Decisions Regarding Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The Department Chair and the candidate for tenure and/or promotion complete the appropriate sections of the document package that must be submitted to the college and university.¹ The nontenured faculty member is given the option of including external reviews. If this option is chosen, the Department Chair, in consultation with the nontenured faculty member and tenured faculty members, solicits written recommendations from at least two outside reviewers who are recognized for their contributions in the faculty member's discipline and profession (see next section for procedures). The Department Chair then makes the faculty member's file (including information pertaining to performance in the teaching, research, and service domains described in subsequent sections) available for review by all tenured faculty members in the department. Tenured faculty members subsequently meet (as a group) with the Department Chair to discuss the nontenured faculty member's qualifications and to generate a departmental recommendation via secret, signed ballot. If the faculty member is seeking both tenure and promotion, separate ballots are collected. The ballots shall be a single page that provides the following four options for voting and space beneath each option for comments: (1) The faculty member should definitely be tenured/promoted, (2) the faculty member should probably be tenured/promoted, (3) the faculty member should probably *not* be tenured/promoted, and (4) the faculty member should definitely *not* be tenured/promoted. The results of the vote are immediately announced to those who participated in the vote. The Department Chair then conveys to the Dean in writing the results of that vote and a recommendation that may or may not be consistent with those results. The Chair also informs tenured faculty members about the nature of that recommendation and the rationale that supports it.

12.5 Letters from External Reviewers

When external reviews are to be included in the faculty member's materials, the Department Chair will request the nontenured faculty member and the faculty who are eligible to vote on such matters to submit separate lists of potential external reviewers. The faculty member's current or former collaborators and former mentors are specifically excluded as possible reviewers. The Department Chair will inform the nontenured faculty member of the names of all potential reviewers and provide her/him with an opportunity to comment on them. The faculty member may ask the Department Chair to exclude certain individuals as external reviewers. With the advice of the faculty who are eligible to vote, the Department Chair will choose the names of at least two reviewers from the combined list to perform the external reviews. At least half the reviewers will be chosen from the nontenured faculty member's list.

The Department Chair will write the external reviewers and provide them with (1) a copy of the faculty member's curriculum vita, (2) a copy of up to five of the faculty member's scholarly products (including manuscripts "accepted" and "submitted"), and (3) a copy of the criteria for promotion/tenure. Each external reviewer will be asked to: (1) evaluate the faculty member's research work and accomplishments, using the criteria as a guide; and (2) compare the faculty member with others in the same general

¹ "Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation," Kansas State University (<http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/promotio.html>)

area of research that are at a comparable career level. When these letters are added to the faculty member's promotion documents, a copy of the letter the Department Chair sent to the reviewer will accompany them.

13 Criteria for Evaluating Faculty Members for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

13.1 Teaching Effectiveness

Faculty applying for promotion to associate professor are encouraged to submit multiple forms of evidence regarding their instructional effectiveness. They must submit student ratings for every course taught over the last three years. Although the faculty member is free to choose a rating system, instruments with high reliability and validity are strongly recommended.

Because student ratings are typically intended for formative purposes, faculty who make decisions about promotion and tenure should exercise caution in using these instruments for summative evaluations. They should base decisions on a cumulative record of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness, and they should look for trends in effectiveness (i.e., improvement, steadiness, or decline).

Students are unable to judge all features of instructional effectiveness. Consequently, faculty members for promotion are encouraged to submit additional indicants of teaching effectiveness, including the most recent course syllabi, related materials for each course taught, and alternative forms of evidence as described in Section 10.2.

By the time the tenure and/or promotion review is conducted, the faculty member is expected to be certified to direct doctoral dissertations.

13.2 Research and Creative Endeavors

Although quality of scholarship is of prime importance, faculty members are expected to demonstrate a record of ongoing scholarship during the time of probation. Substantive productivity should be evidenced consistently. Examples of scholarly products are found in Section 10.2.

13.3 Service

The faculty member is expected to serve on Department and College committees during the probationary period. The faculty member is also expected to fulfill expectations of academic citizenship as described in Section 10.2 of this document.

14 Recommendations for Evaluating Faculty Members for Promotion to Professor

In making recommendations regarding promotion to professor, the Department is guided by principles of assessing demonstrated individual merit in relation to work assignment and the University's missions. As noted in the *University Handbook* (sec. C120.2), promotion to professor should be based on "the attainment of excellence in the assigned duties of the faculty member and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies."

14.1 Procedures for Evaluating Promotion to Professor

Although no specific time in rank as an associate professor is required for promotion to professor, the median time for promotion at Kansas State University has been about six years (*University Handbook*, C131). Promotion may be granted earlier when the faculty member's cumulative performance at rank clearly meets the standards for promotion. The Department Chair and the faculty member applying for promotion complete the appropriate sections of the document package that must be submitted to the College and University. In consultation with the faculty member and professors in the Department, the Department Chair solicits written recommendations from at least two outside reviewers (see Section 12.5 of this document for procedures). The Department Chair then makes the faculty member's file (including information pertaining to performance in the teaching, research, and service domains described in subsequent sections) available for review by all faculty members eligible to vote in the department. Eligible faculty members subsequently meet (as a group) with the Department Chair to discuss the faculty member's qualifications and to generate a departmental recommendation via secret, signed ballot. The ballot shall be a single page that provides the following four options for voting and space beneath each option for comments: (1) The faculty member should definitely be promoted, (2) the faculty member should probably be promoted, (3) the faculty member should probably not be promoted, and (4) the faculty member should definitely not be promoted. The results of the vote are immediately announced to those who participated in the vote. The Department Chair then conveys to the Dean in writing the results of that vote and a recommendation that may or may not be consistent with those results. The Chair also informs professors about the nature of that recommendation and the rationale that supports it.

14.2 Criteria for Evaluating Faculty Members for Promotion to Professor

14.2.1 Teaching Effectiveness

Faculty members applying for promotion to professor are encouraged to submit multiple forms of evidence regarding their instructional effectiveness. They must submit summaries of student ratings for every course taught over the last three years. They are encouraged to submit the most recent course syllabi and related materials for each course taught, and alternative forms of evidence of teaching effectiveness (see Section 10.2).

Faculty members applying for promotion to professor should be certified to direct doctoral dissertations. During time in rank as an associate professor, the faculty member is expected to serve as "major professor" for additional graduate students since the last promotion. Those graduate students are expected to make noticeable progress toward completion of their degree requirements (e.g., completion of thesis or dissertation, satisfactory performance on comprehensive examinations or preliminary examinations).

Throughout their time in rank as an associate professor, faculty members are expected to serve (continuously) on the program committees of other

graduate students (who are expected to make noticeable progress toward completion of their degree requirements).

14.2.2 Research and Creative Endeavors

Although quality of scholarship is of prime importance, faculty members are expected to demonstrate a record of ongoing scholarship during their time in rank as associate professor. Substantive productivity should be evidenced consistently. Examples of scholarly products are found in Section 10.2.

14.2.3 Service

Recommendations regarding promotion to the rank of professor are guided by basically the same standards or expectations that apply to recommendations concerning tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor. The only modification to these standards is a general expectation that faculty who have earned tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor will be more inclined (than their nontenured colleagues) to serve on College and University committees and task forces and to be involved in international, national, or regional professional organizations.

15 Professorial Performance Award

In decisions regarding the Professorial Performance Award, the Department is guided by Sections C49.1 through C49.14 of the *University Handbook* and by the guidelines issued by the Office of the Provost on February 15, 2006.

As noted in the *University Handbook* (sec. C49.1), “the Professorial Performance Award is not a right accorded to every faculty member at the rank of Professor. Nor is it granted simply as a result of a candidate’s routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies.” The award should be based on “the attainment of excellence in the assigned duties of the faculty member and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies” (see C120.2).

15.1 Award Eligibility

The faculty member must be a full-time professor and have been in this rank at Kansas State University for at least six years since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award. Professors with appointments in different departments are eligible for the award provided their appointments are equivalent to a full-time position. The faculty member must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years since promotion to professor or the last receipt of the Professorial Performance Award.

15.2 Award Criteria

The criteria for the award in the areas of teaching, research and creative endeavors, and service are based on those expected of professors as described by the Department’s merit evaluation system. The faculty acknowledges the minimum nature of those criteria because the successful faculty member for either promotion or the

Professorial Performance Award will have significantly exceeded the criteria. Similar to promotion to professor, the Professorial Performance Award should be based on “the attainment of excellence in the assigned duties of the faculty member and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies” (*University Handbook*, C120.1).

15.3 Award Procedures

The faculty member shall inform the department chair in writing of his or her intention to apply for the Professorial Performance Award and shall submit “...a file that documents her or his professional accomplishments for at least six years in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the department” (*University Handbook*, C49.5). “Recommendations for the Professorial Performance Award will follow the timeline associated with the annual review outline in the *University Handbook*” (*University Handbook*, C49.4). Upon receipt of such documentation, the chair shall notify all voting members of the faculty holding the rank of professor. The professors, excluding the chair should he/she hold the rank of Professor, shall review the materials and hold a vote regarding the worthiness of the faculty member’s achievements for the Professorial Performance Award. The vote shall occur by dated ballot showing the signature of each voting member present indicating Yes/No/Abstain. Additionally, the ballot shall bear a signature line of Yes/No/Abstain for the chair’s recommendation. The chair may not abstain. A simple majority affirmative vote by eligible faculty shall be sufficient to advance the faculty member for consideration by the department chair.

If the chair supports the majority recommendation for a given faculty member, then she/he shall convey the recommendation to the Dean. The chair will send a letter of support to the Dean and a copy to the faculty member. If the chair cannot support the majority recommendation, then he/she will notify the voting faculty and the faculty member in writing. The voting faculty shall have the option to elect a spokesperson to convey the majority position to the Dean. If the eligible voting faculty members cannot recommend a faculty member, the chair will inform him or her in writing. The faculty member may choose to seek recourse as described in the *University Handbook*.

16 Post-Tenure Review

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

Kansas State University recognizes that the granting of tenure for university faculty is a vital protection of free 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.

16.1 Procedures

1. Post-tenure review shall be conducted for tenured faculty 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 shall be further defined to mean that post-tenure review will be conducted for all tenured faculty either every six years, or in the sixth year following promotion or awarding of a major university performance award. More specifically, the following events shall modify and reset the post-tenure review clock:
 - A. Application for promotion to full professor;
 - B. Application for the Professorial Performance Award (*University Handbook* C49);
 - C. 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>).
2. Other exceptions to post-tenure review are as follows:
 - A. If the faculty member is already undergoing the review process for chronic low achievement, that process will be considered to serve in lieu of post-tenure review.
 - B. Any faculty member who has formally announced retirement through a written letter to the department/unit head, or has begun phased retirement, is exempt from post-tenure review.
3. The post-tenure review clock shall operate as follows:
 - A. The academic year 2014-2015 shall be the first year of post-tenure review implementation.
 - B. Faculty holding the rank of full professor will be reviewed during the 2014-2015 cycle.
 - C. Faculty holding the rank of associate professor will be reviewed during the 2015-2016 cycle.
 - D. The review cycle will repeat in the respective academic years 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 for those faculty who have not received intervening promotions in rank or approved external awards.
 - E. The college will maintain a database indicating the review year for each affected faculty member.

4. Faculty who participate in the departmental annual evaluation procedures (see Section 10 of this document) and who are undergoing a regular post-tenure review must submit the individual annual merit evaluation reviews received for each of the preceding six years. Faculty who do not participate in the departmental annual evaluation procedures and who are undergoing a regular post-tenure review must submit other forms of evidence related to their responsibilities in the department for the preceding six years (e.g., teaching evaluations, scholarly achievements, service accomplishments).
5. In an event where a faculty submits a successful external award requiring multi-year portfolio-like documentation, it will result in the reset of his/her post-tenure review clock.
6. Faculty submitting the individual six-year collection of merit evaluation reviews shall be reviewed as follows:
 - A. The faculty member submits required documents to the department head.
 - B. The department head reviews the materials submitted and summarizes the cumulative annual ratings in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.
 - C. The department head meets with the candidate to discuss findings.
 - D. If no overall annual rating across the six-year review period falls below MEETS STANDARDS, the post-tenure review process shall be declared complete and the department head shall issue a letter indicating satisfactory completion of the post-tenure review requirement. Such letter shall bear a signature line for the faculty member showing agreement or disagreement.
 - E. If one or more annual ratings across the six-year review period fall below MEETS STANDARDS, the faculty member shall be required to construct and file a remediation plan to be reviewed and approved by the department head. If the faculty member and the department head cannot agree on a remediation plan, the matter will be referred to an internal panel of tenured faculty. Such remediation plan shall bear a signature line for the faculty member showing agreement or disagreement.

17 Topics, Seminars, Problems, and Intersession Courses Approval

New topics, seminars, problems, and intersession courses must have the prior consent of the Chair.