

Department of Personal Financial Planning

College of Health and Human Sciences

Policy Statement Concerning:

Personnel Review and Evaluation Standard and 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 (7/31/2023)

NEXT REVIEW DATE:

Department Head's Signature

Marta Jay 7/31/23

Dean's Signature

Bradley Behrke

Chal

12/11/2023

Department of Personal Financial Planning

College of Health and Human Sciences

Policy Statement Concerning:

Personnel Review and Evaluation Standard and 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 (8/25/2020)

NEXT REVIEW DATE:

Department Head's Signature

Dean's Signature

Page intentionally left blank

Table of Contents

I. Evaluation	3
II. Annual Evaluation and Merit Salary Allocation Procedures	3
A. Annual Evaluation	3
B. Annual Evaluation Performance Criteria	3
1. Teaching	4
2. Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities, Discovery (RSCAD)	5
3. Extension	8
4. Service.....	9
5. Collegiality/Academic Citizenship Expectations	9
C. Procedure and Format for Submission of Annual Evaluation Materials.....	10
1. Annual Goal Setting Process.....	10
2. Documentation of Professional Activities.....	10
D. Merit Salary Allocation	13
III. Departmental Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Criteria: Tenure Track	13
A. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty Cumulative Expectations/Evaluation Criteria	14
B. Annual Reappointment Review of Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty	15
C. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty Reappointment Review Procedures	15
D. Mid-Tenure Review (also known as Mid-Probationary Review).....	16
1. Purpose.....	16
2. Procedures.....	16
E. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.....	17
1. Evaluation Criteria.....	18
2. Procedures.....	19
F. Promotion to Professor	23
1. Evaluation Criteria.....	23
2. Procedures.....	24
IV. Departmental Promotion and Reappointment Criteria: Non-Tenure Track	25
A. Initial Appointment & Professional Titles	25

1.	Instructional Track Faculty	26
2.	Research Track Faculty	28
3.	Practice Track Faculty	30
4.	Teaching Track Faculty.....	31
5.	Extension Track Faculty.....	32
B.	Annual Evaluation and Reappointment Process.....	34
D.	Promotion Process	35
1.	Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review Committee.....	36
2.	Denial of Promotion	37
V.	The Professorial Performance Award (Full Professors)	37
A.	Submission and Review Process	38
VI.	Chronic Low Achievement Procedures.....	39
VII.	Post Tenure Review Procedures	40
A.	Review Procedure	40
VIII.	Appendix.....	42
A.	Indicators of Collegiality / Academic Citizenship	43
B.	Annual Evaluation Template.....	44
C.	Explanation of Components of Extension Scholarship	46
D.	Feedback and Recommendations Form (Post-Tenure Review)	49
E.	Journal Ranking List.....	51

I. Evaluation

This evaluation document is a statement of the policies, procedures, and criteria for personnel decisions affecting annual merit salary increases, reappointment, promotion, and tenure evaluation issues in the Department of Personal Financial Planning. This document is based on information from the *Kansas State University Handbook*

The evaluation (1) aids faculty and staff members in their professional development, (2) provides a mechanism for ensuring standards and meeting goals of the Department of Personal Financial Planning, and (3) contributes to the continuous enhancement and quality of the faculty efforts.

II. Annual Evaluation and Merit Salary Allocation Procedures

A. Annual Evaluation

The Department Head will prepare a written evaluation for each faculty member with a .50 appointment or greater, regular or term by February 28th or earlier if required by the college/university (see *Kansas State University Handbook*, C46.1). All faculty, including tenured, tenure-track, and regular and term non-tenure track faculty will be evaluated. Faculty members with less than a .50 appointment and all staff will be evaluated by their immediate supervisor. The evaluation period will be the 12-month evaluation period ending December 31st and will be the same for all individuals in the Department, except first year appointees and those who have been on leave for all or a part of the year. The Department Head requests annual evaluation reporting materials and any supplementary documents from the candidate for submission to the Department Head by the last day of Fall final's week. Faculty may submit supplemental materials up to January 5th to reflect any achievements that occur before the end of the review period.

Evaluation and merit salary allocation options for first-year appointees, faculty in phased retirement, and faculty on leave are designated as: (1) an increase based on the individual's evaluation (adjusted proportionally to encompass the entire year); (2) an average increase, or; (3) the larger of the above, since the length of time for evaluating was limited. Such individuals are also eligible for salary adjustments on bases outside the annual evaluation (e.g., market, equity). See *Kansas State University Handbook Section C42.1*.

B. Annual Evaluation Performance Criteria

Faculty/staff are required to submit a summary of activities in accordance with the appointment across different areas of professional activity. Depending on the Department's mission and needs, individual appointments within the Department will vary across the areas of professional activity and may not include all of the areas. The Department Head, in consultation with the faculty/staff member, will determine appointments. The section that follows describes areas of professional activity and performance expectations. For each area of assigned duties, the minimally acceptable standards of performance are delineated below.

1. Teaching

The faculty in the Department engage in a number of different types of teaching beyond traditional classroom teaching. Evaluation of teaching may occur with respect to the following areas of activity: instruction (regardless of modality), curriculum-related activity, instructional innovation, and graduate student thesis/dissertation committee service.

Expectations

Faculty with a responsibility for undergraduate or graduate teaching should:

- Maintain an up-to-date knowledge in each subject taught
- Deliver courses in accordance with student learning outcomes and identified course competencies
- Provide a clear and coherent style of presentation
- Provide a learning environment that stimulates students' interest and appreciation for PFP
- Intellectually challenge students
- Meet students' mentoring needs
- Be accessible to students during posted office hours
- Convene classes on a regular basis
- Adhere to course objectives required for program registration

Further, graduate faculty members should:

- Serve as a graduate student's major professor or committee member on thesis/dissertation committees
- Co-author papers with graduate students for conference submissions, journals, or research proposals
- Attain certified graduate faculty status as soon as possible
- Provide career mentorship to graduate students

Minimum Expectations

- Meet all assigned classes for scheduled periods and is prepared for instruction

- Prepare up-to-date syllabus for each assigned course and places it on file with the Department
- Supervise student assistants in accord with accepted professional and ethical standards
- Post and keep office hours
- Conduct standard University evaluation of teaching for each assigned course, or uses other methods of evaluation approved by the Department Head
- Assign grades equitably and turns in grades in a timely manner
- Respond to student committee requests
- Serve actively on student committees

2. Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities, Discovery (RSCAD)

Research, scholarly and creative activities, and discovery traditionally include a broad range of products, including publications in refereed journals, book chapters, books, monographs, opinions pieces, educational product development, reviews, grant proposals, editorial responsibilities, and other creative – and frequently collaborative – activities. Work that advances the teaching, development, research, and service missions of the University that has the capacity to be disseminated widely to relevant audiences and that is available for peer review is considered appropriate for this review.

Expectations

The evaluation process must remain flexible enough to accommodate less traditional models of research and scholarship as well. Because research outputs do not always follow a calendar year, particularly publications and funding opportunities, each faculty member's annual review should note whether the faculty member is engaging in a preponderance of the activities listed above. In addition, faculty members' evaluations in the area of scholarship/research will reflect a three-year rolling average.

Faculty members should maintain a coherent program of research or scholarship with clearly defined theoretical, empirical, and/or intervention-oriented goals, as opposed to unorganized and scattered efforts in numerous unrelated research directions. Faculty may engage in research with colleagues and/or students that represent a diverse range of topics reflective of their diverse interests. Faculty may also change the focus of their research or scholarship from time to time. Such efforts should generally be rewarded and not penalized. However, over time, the personal research program of the faculty member should reflect sustained efforts necessary for defining systematic progress and for achieving national and international recognition in a selected area of research. It is the responsibility of the Department Head and faculty member to monitor the spirit and letter of this expectation during each annual merit evaluation.

1. Publications

Publishing research or other scholarly projects are one of the primary ways that faculty engage in RSCAD. Faculty should be producing original and impactful research and preference is given to quality of publications rather than quantity of publications. Publications, in order of importance, include

- Peer-reviewed journal articles
- Peer-reviewed conference proceedings
- Book or chapter authorship
- Other scholarly publications

Minimum expectations

Research effort allocation of .30 correspond to an expectation of an average around two research articles in publication, in press, or accepted annually (corresponding to the annual evaluation period). However, faculty members producing very high quality research or employing time-consuming research methods (e.g., primary data collection, experimental designs) will receive consideration for exceptions to this minimum expectation. If the candidate has had a larger or smaller average research effort allocation than .30, then prorating must be used.

Many of the peer-reviewed publications should be categorized as Tier 1 journals in Appendix E of this document. However, this list is simply a guide to gauge research impact within the field and is not exhaustive. Submissions to and publications in journals that are not included on the list (i.e., non-listed journals) are encouraged when the journal is a good fit for the research and should be justified with respect to systematic progress for achieving national or international recognition in a coherent program of research or scholarship. Justification for submission to and publication in non-listed journals should include information to help understand the impact of non-listed journals such as impact factors, indexing, citations, circulation, etc. as well an explanation of why the journal is an appropriate place to publish the manuscript.

2. Research Funding

Receiving extramural grants and contracts are an important indicator of research activity and academic reputation. Additionally, many of these awards benefit the department directly through financial resources. The weight given for grants and contracts during the annual evaluation process is based on:

- the nature of the awarding process
- the role of the faculty member in the grant preparation process,
- the magnitude and impact of the award, and
- the benefit to the department.

Other sources of funding bring benefits to the department are also valuable. Contributions of resources in-kind (e.g., contributions of equipment, data, etc.) are another form of external funding. External funding has traditionally been limited in PFP and the competitiveness of the available sources of funding will be taken into account. However, faculty with research appointments should have substantial and continuing efforts in this area.

Minimum Expectations

Each faculty member should submit, as a principal investigator or co-principal investigator, an average of at least one proposal for competitive external or internal funding every two years, or its equivalent in support from industry or government partners, unless the faculty member has an active research grant.

3. Presentations

Opportunities to share research-outcomes elsewhere generally represent appreciation outside the University of scholarly merit. The significance of this recognition depends on the nature of the presentation. Note that presentations are not limited to presentation in-person. Online presentations, such as webinars or online seminars, may be equally significant depending on the nature, reach, scope and prestige of the event. Demonstrating the broader impacts of research is increasingly important and such activities engaging public and private sector organizations should be given due consideration under this heading as part of the overall research effort. The following provides a list with reasonable order of decreasing significance.

- Invitation to speak at a national or international meeting and/or preside at a session of a national or international meeting.
- Invitation to speak at a research active university
- Contributed paper (oral or poster) at a national or international conference.
- Invitation to speak at a state-level, non-research agency outside of the university.
- Invitation to speak at a non-research active university or college, secondary school or more local invitation (e.g., as part of a course or seminar program of another department within the university).

Minimum Expectations

Faculty members with a research appointment of .30 should give at least one presentation, at a discipline recognized national or international meeting per year. Expectations may be dependent on the availability of funding from the department for travel for in-person meetings and on the availability of virtual national meetings. When possible, faculty members should seek external funding to support travel.

3. Extension

Extension scholarship may be defined as strategies, resources, programs, products, and endeavors in which research-based knowledge is applied to practical situations. Extension scholarship focuses on outreach efforts designed to improve the lives of Kansans living within a national and global context.

Extension scholarship may have many forms depending on the nature of the subject, the target audience, and the intended outcomes. While the extent of activity will depend on the percent of extension tenths, scholarship will include one or more of the following items:

- A research or evidence-base that provides a solid foundation for the strategies, resources, programs, products, and endeavors
- A plan of work that includes goals, activities, outcomes, research and evaluation design and methods or other possible components that are integral to the specific work
- Peer review by colleagues in Kansas or other states familiar with the content area
- Resources for dissemination
- Evaluation or other data
- A summary report of outputs, impacts; and/or outcomes
- A synopsis of the above communicated to others through articles in journals, conference proceedings, or reports and monographs. Appropriate dissemination includes posting of the synopsis on websites, sharing through national listservs, or other printed or electronic methods.

Faculty should refer to Appendix C of this document for many examples of Extension strategies, resources, programs, products and/or endeavors. The evaluation process must remain flexible enough to accommodate the changing nature of Extension work, recognizing the importance of citizen and stakeholder input and collaboration on current public issues. Such scholarship frequently involves effort across more than one evaluation year, and, therefore, progress is an important element of the evaluation process. In the case of work that extends over multiple years, faculty members may request that the Department Head use a multi-year perspective.

Expectations for Extension scholarship include:

- Clear and relevant goals and anticipated outcomes
- Breadth of activities
- Creativity
- Mastery of existing subject matter
- Teaching techniques and skills
- Program outputs, impact assessment and outcomes
- Publications and dissemination of Extension scholarship
- Research supporting the faculty member's overall Extension program
- Leverage of existing resources

- Grants and user fees support
- Effective communication
- Leadership and impact of programming and professional activities
- Ethical behavior

Minimum Expectations

- Participates in Extension scholarship as described in Appendix C. This may be active participation on a project team as well as individual work
- Prepares and updates educational materials in a timely way
- Is available and responsive to agent requests within limitations of available time and other resources
- Actively participate on appropriate subject matter teams

4. Service

Individual faculty members may have service responsibilities that constitute a significant part of their work assignment and will vary greatly between faculty. These activities may include:

1. Non-directed service – not specified in appointment or offer letter
 1. to the profession,
 2. to the Department, the College, or the University, and
 3. to the public, professionally-related service
2. Directed service – specified in appointment or offer letter

Expectations for Service include:

Minimum Expectations

- Non-directed Service - Institution
 - Attends Department and College meetings
 - Serves on Department, College, and University committees as demonstrated by active participation in meetings
 - Assists with student recruitment and retention
- Non-directed Service – Professional
 - Attends professional meetings
 - Engage in committees and leadership roles in professional associations
- Non-directed Service – Public
- Directed Service
 - Engage, as directed, by the Department Head

5. Collegiality/Academic Citizenship Expectations

The department needs collegiality to function effectively. Annual faculty evaluations will include the assessment of behaviors that positively or negatively affect others

in carrying out their assignments in the department. In the absence of collegiality and good academic citizenship, other evidence of academic excellence will not suffice to offset this deficiency in the pursuit of merit pay increases, reappointment, tenure, and promotion. There should be no effort by the department to discourage debate or disagreement on policies; rather, it is vital to foster and maintain an environment conducive to vigorous debate and inquiry. Faculty disagreement with colleagues and administrators is not to be taken as evidence of lack of collegiality, but should proceed in a manner consistent with civil debate, constructive criticism, and the resolution of differences. Personal qualities such as integrity, leadership, objectivity, candor, fairness, willingness to cooperate, and a positive attitude are vital to the team functioning of the department's faculty members and are highly valued. See Appendix A for a discussion of indicators of collegiality.

The Department Head should review any concerns that are raised about collegiality/academic citizenship.

C. Procedure and Format for Submission of Annual Evaluation Materials

1. Annual Goal Setting Process

Each faculty/staff member will meet annually with the Department Head to establish personal goals and objectives in the major areas of professional activity. These goals should be determined in consultation with and approval from the Department Head. According to the *Kansas State University Handbook* Section C45.1, these goals and objectives "should reflect the relative percentages of time and effort the person plans to allocate to the appropriate areas in the upcoming period. It is expected that the previous year's statement will be considered during the annual evaluation and goal setting process." See Appendix B of this document for an annual evaluation reporting template.

On occasion, modifications to appointments and/or statements of objectives are necessary due to unanticipated changes in Department circumstances (e.g., changes in course offerings, funding of grants, or research opportunities). Any such modifications should be documented and kept in personnel file.

2. Documentation of Professional Activities

1. Teaching

The following list identifies forms of evidence that may be used to document competence in the classroom:

1. Listing of all courses taught, including numbers of students in each course
2. Teaching evaluations, comments, and other forms of feedback
3. Teaching evaluations by peers based on review of teaching portfolio and/or classroom observation
4. Course materials (e.g., syllabi, project assignments, exams)
5. Examples of students' work, with names removed
6. Letters from students, peers, and others observing teaching of candidate
7. Nominations and awards for teaching
9. Documentation and evaluation of guest lectures
10. Evidence of use of candidate's teaching materials beyond own class (e.g., adoptions of texts, inclusion in texts, requests for use by other faculty)
11. Evidence of new or innovative teaching strategies, materials, or media
12. Materials related to the development of a new course
13. Contributions to curriculum development and revision
14. Evidence of teaching resulting in scholarship (e.g., publications with or by students arising from class discussion)
15. Description and documentation of supervisory and advising activities (including number of students supervised and advised and the percentage of time assigned to advising)
16. Evidence of effectiveness of supervisory and advising activities (e.g., completed reports, theses, and dissertations, peer-reviewed presentations and publications with students)
17. Faculty and staff who arrange, supervise, and evaluate student practica and internships should submit a self-report for these duties. The self-report should be no longer than one page and should include information about the number of students placed, a report of the duties involved in maintaining liaison with sites, and comments about the timeliness and appropriateness of placements.
18. Faculty who engage in supervision of honors projects or independent study courses, who assist others in their instructional duties, or who develop new courses or instructional programs should provide a self-report of these activities, together with copies of any products or outcomes generated.

2. *Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Discovery (RSCAD)*

The following list identifies forms of evidence that may be used to document competence in RSCAD:

1. Description and documentation of percentage of time assigned to research, scholarship, or other creative endeavor
2. Number, complexity, and quality of current research projects or programs, including others involved
3. Source and amount of funding of research projects
4. Copies of all materials "in press" or published during relevant period (each journal citation must include the ranking of the journal in the unit's scale, or the author's suggested ranking and accompanying rationale)
5. Unsolicited letters of support from experts in the discipline
6. List of presentations, targeted audiences, and content summary

7. Awards for research or creative endeavors
8. Evidence of citations of work (e.g., copies of materials citing work, Social Science Citation Index or ISI Web of Science index)

3. *Extension*

In addition to a description and documentation of percentage time assigned to Extension activities, the following unranked list identifies forms of evidence that may be used to document competence in Extension:

- Breadth of activities: Activities support a plan for achieving clear and relevant goals associated with programming objectives
- Creativity: Willingness to try new concepts, develop pilot efforts or use innovative approaches in program development, delivery, or evaluation
- Teaching techniques and skill
- Program outputs, impact assessment and outcomes: Conduct or participate in well-planned evaluations of program impact that may span several years
- Publications and dissemination of Extension scholarship: Examples of publications and dissemination include bulletins, fact sheets, reports, refereed journal articles, books, book chapters, invited papers, key-note speeches, presented papers, published abstracts, non-refereed journal articles, white papers, videos, slide sets, data, and emerging communication media
- Research supporting the faculty member's overall extension program: Research publications in appropriate/relevant outlets
- Grants and user fees support: Outside support for research and scholarly activities supporting programming objectives
- Leadership and impact of programming and professional activities: Self-evaluation and reflection as well as solicited and unsolicited letters from peers (colleagues in Kansas or other states familiar with the faculty member's area of expertise or leadership ability); data summarizing the reactions to leadership; and out-of-state workshops; special awards and recognitions

4. *Service*

The following list identifies forms of evidence that may be used to document competence in all types of service activities:

1. Listing of professional memberships, committee assignments, offices held
2. Listing of review activities (e.g., journal reviews, peer reviews of grant proposals)
3. Descriptive/evaluative letters from coworkers, committee chairs, or organizations delivering or receiving services
4. Documentation of presentations (e.g., target audience, topic, outline of content)
5. Documentation of special recognition (prizes/awards) for service activities
6. Media publicity regarding substance of service/presentations (e.g.,

- newspaper, newsletter, radio, or television summary)
7. In the case of the Department Head, feedback from faculty for whom Department Head provides leadership

D. Merit Salary Allocation

The Department Head will refer to the *Kansas State University Handbook*, C40-C48.3 for procedures regarding annual merit salary adjustments.

Faculty who have met or exceeded goals in all areas will participate fully in the merit increase provided to the College. Those who have not met goals in one or more categories will be counseled by the Department Head on ways to rectify that situation (e.g., consider steps to improve performance and/or reallocation of the faculty member's responsibilities), and will receive merit increases at a lower percentage than the first group. The Department Head will request a plan of action from the faculty member to address the faculty member's performance (see *Kansas State University Handbook*, C30.3, for potential resources for faculty improvement). Those who have failed to meet goals in every area will not receive a merit pay increase. This may apply to those who have fallen below expectations but meet minimally acceptable levels of productivity, as well as to those who have fallen below minimally acceptable levels of productivity.

III. Departmental Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Criteria: Tenure Track

The Department must evaluate the performance of its probationary tenure-track members regularly in order to:

- Help the Department Head provide feedback, commendations, and constructive criticism to its members;
- Provide information to non-tenured faculty during the probationary period;
- Determine if a faculty member has earned the rights both to be tenured and to be promoted at Kansas State University.
 - Note: Decisions about tenure and about promotion may be separate actions under some circumstances.

Awarding of tenure and promotion progression through the academic ranks depends upon a sustained record of high competence and performance. Tenure and promotion are independent considerations in the Department. Though unusual, a faculty member may be awarded tenure but denied immediate promotion to the rank of associate professor. Conversely, a faculty member may be hired on a probationary appointment (without tenure) at a rank higher than assistant

professor. Tenure and promotion are based on accomplishments and demonstrated excellence in the performance of assigned professional activities. The burden of evidence is on each faculty member to document the quality and quantity of his/her contributions (see *Kansas State University Handbook* C100.10100.4).

As assignments and areas of expertise vary, the faculty of the Department contribute to its overall mission in diverse ways. Because this diversity makes it difficult to establish one format for the reporting of faculty accomplishments, it is the responsibility of each faculty member to substantiate his/her particular expertise and accomplishments in assigned responsibilities. Faculty members are expected to contribute to the mission of the Department, the College, and the University through teaching, research, extension, and service as stipulated in their assignments.

The Department Head is responsible for informing the candidate of the processes and criteria involved in tenure and/or promotion. Each candidate must be given a copy of this document. In addition, the Department Head is responsible for the general mentoring of each candidate over time and for assigning a specific tenured faculty as a mentor. The Department Head's mentoring includes evaluating the competence of the candidate via annual evaluations and giving guidance to the candidate in the preparation of a multiple-year portfolio containing evidence of activities to be evaluated (e.g., mid-probationary review, tenure and/or promotion reviews).

In the case of probationary faculty, the Department Head must recommend to the candidate those faculty members who may serve, should they consent to do so, as the primary tenure mentor. Ordinarily, the primary tenure mentor should be a faculty member from the Department. If desired (or when the number of department faculty who may serve is too small), the candidate may seek mentoring advice from faculty outside of the department, electing to form a formal mentoring committee of tenured faculty members.

A. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty Cumulative Expectations/Evaluation Criteria

As stated in the University Handbook, awarding faculty members with tenure is a result of demonstrated expertise in the faculty member's field of study. The cumulative record of the faculty member's professional activity during the probationary period should show evidence of a national reputation and a record of excellence.

"The university uses a selective process in awarding tenure to secure a faculty of the highest possible caliber. To be tenured, faculty members must be experts in their chosen fields, and must have full academic freedom in pursuit of ideas or inquiries without fear of censure or retribution." (*Kansas State University Handbook*, C90).

B. Annual Reappointment Review of Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

Prior to being considered for tenure at Kansas State University, the faculty member enters a probationary period during which the candidate's ability to contribute to the University's mission and to meet criteria for tenure specified by the Department. The precise terms and conditions of every initial appointment should be stated in writing and be in the possession of both the institution and the faculty member before the appointment is finalized. The duration of the probationary period relative to tenure varies with rank and experience. For persons appointed at the rank of assistant professor, the maximum probationary period for gaining tenure and promotion to associate professor rank consists of six (6) regular appointments at Kansas State University at a probationary rank. See *Kansas State University Handbook C73, Section B* for faculty with prior service at another academic institution.

Candidates not approved for tenure during the sixth year of service will be notified by the Dean of the College that the seventh year of service will constitute the terminal year of appointment (*Kansas State University Handbook, C82.2*). For persons appointed at the rank of associate professor or professor, the maximum probationary period consists of five (5) regular appointments at Kansas State University at probationary ranks (*Kansas State University Handbook, C82.3*). Tenure decisions must be made before or during the fifth year of probationary service. Candidates not approved for tenure during the fifth year of service will be notified by the appropriate dean that the sixth year of service will constitute the terminal year of appointment.

Under certain circumstances, the tenure clock may be delayed by one year. See *Kansas State University Handbook, C83.1-83.6* for conditions under which delay of the tenure clock may be considered and the procedures for making such a request.

C. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty Reappointment Review Procedures

The Department Head requests annual evaluation reporting materials and any supplementary documents from the candidate for submission to the Department Head by the last day of Fall final's week.

During the probationary period, the Department Head will appoint a Probationary Annual Review Committee of no fewer than three tenured faculty members. All tenured faculty members from within the Department will serve on this committee, and if fewer than three, tenured faculty members from other departments within the College will be added to the committee. The Department Head, in consultation with the Department tenured faculty members, will choose these additional committee members. The probationary faculty member may submit a list of names to the Department Head for consideration and may also submit a list of names whom they believe may not be able to provide a fair and unbiased evaluation of the

candidate's materials, specifying the reasons for this claim. The Probationary Annual Review Committee will evaluate and provide written comments on the file, and vote on the reappointment of candidates. Reasonable efforts will be made to create consistency in this committee's composition during a candidate's probationary period.

The Department Head provides the candidate's materials to the Probationary Annual Review Committee fourteen days prior to a meeting the Department Head schedules for them to discuss the candidate's materials and vote for or against reappointment by signed, confidential ballot that also provides the opportunity for written comments to the Department Head.

Within 14 days, the Department Head reviews the candidate's materials and the votes and written ballot comments from the Probationary Annual Review Committee to prepare a recommendation to the Dean on reappointment that includes evaluative statements in support of the recommendation. The Department Head also provides a copy of the recommendation to the candidate.

Faculty members must be explicitly informed in writing of a decision not to renew their annual appointments in accordance with The Standards of Notice of Non-reappointment (see *Kansas State University Handbook Appendix A*).

D. Mid-Tenure Review (also known as Mid-Probationary Review)

A formal review of a probationary faculty member is conducted during fall semester of the third year of his or her appointment (*Kansas State University Handbook*, C92.1). For faculty on a seven-year tenure track, the mid-probationary review is in November of the third year at Kansas State. For faculty whose tenure clock at Kansas State is other than seven years, timing of the mid-probationary review will be determined in consultation with the Department Head at the time of appointment.

1. Purpose

The mid-tenure review is intended to be formative in nature and will consist of an evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of the evidence in the candidate's portfolio and include recommendations for continued growth.

The objective of the mid-tenure review is to

- Provide tenure-track faculty members with assessments of their performance by tenured faculty in their assigned areas of professional activities,
- Provide tenured faculty with an opportunity to comment on the probationary faculty member's long-range plans for research and other scholarly activities
- Determine if the accomplishments and goals of the probationary faculty member are consistent with the missions and expectations of the department

The outcome of this review at the departmental level is a letter from the Department Head that summarizes the views of the tenured faculty. The letter will include a vote of the tenured faculty. This letter is separate from the outcomes of the annual evaluation process and re-appointment process. A positive mid-probationary review does not ensure that tenure will be granted in the future, nor does a negative review mean that tenure will be denied.

2. Procedures

Candidates should prepare their mid-tenure review documentation following the Guidelines for the **Organization and Format of Mid-Tenure Review Documents**, which can be found on the K-State web page at: <https://www.kstate.edu/provost/resources/dhmanual/>. According to these instructions, faculty members are required to prepare summaries of their accomplishments in the areas of their appointment during their first three academic years at K-State. In PFP, the procedures defined in the Kansas State University Handbook, C92.1-C92.4 are followed with the exception that for mid-tenure review the faculty submitting their materials need not include comments from students (outside of teaching evaluations), other relevant faculty, and outside reviewers. When possible, every effort should be made to submit the documentation digitally as a searchable pdf.

The Department Head will appoint a Mid-Tenure Review Committee of no fewer than three tenured faculty members. All tenured faculty members from within the Department will serve on this committee, and if fewer than three, tenured faculty members from other departments within the College will be added to the committee. The Department Head, in consultation with the Department tenured faculty members, will choose these additional committee members. The probationary faculty member may submit a list of names to the Department Head for consideration and may also submit a list of names whom they believe may not be able to provide a fair and unbiased evaluation of the candidate's materials, specifying the reasons for this claim.

The Department Head will convene the meeting of Mid-Tenure Review Committee and will be present throughout the discussion. The Department Head is responsible for making the candidate's mid-probationary portfolio available to the Mid-Tenure Review Committee at least 14 calendar days prior to a meeting to discuss the candidate's progress. A cumulative record of written recommendations and accompanying explanations forwarded to the candidate from previous reappointment meetings will also be made available to the Mid-Tenure Review Committee. Outside letters of evaluation are not required.

The faculty member serving as the tenure mentor to the candidate (if one has been chosen) may be asked to provide an oral summary of the candidate's accomplishments. If there is no tenure mentor, then the candidate selects a tenured faculty member to present the information. If the candidate does not select a presenter, then the Department Head appoints a senior faculty member to present the material. If the candidate or the faculty reviewers so request, the candidate may make comments on his or her own behalf to the faculty gathered for

the review. In this case, the candidate leaves the meeting after making a statement and answering questions.

During the mid-probationary review, if there are instances when the Mid-Tenure Review Committee and the Department Head are in conflict with respect to the performance of a probationary faculty, the Department Head and the Mid-Tenure Review Committee, including (if one has been chosen) the candidate's tenure mentor, will meet to resolve the differences. This is to ensure that probationary faculty members do not receive conflicting messages regarding their development. In cases where differences cannot be resolved, the candidate should be informed of the differences.

The Department Head may discuss the results of the mid-probationary review with the Dean of the college and will provide a letter of assessment to the candidate, including a summary of faculty comments and suggestions. This letter of assessment will become a part of the candidate's reappointment and mid-probationary review file. Before forwarding the candidate's file to the Dean of the college, the Department Head will discuss the review and assessment with the candidate within one week after the review by the eligible tenured faculty. The candidate will receive a copy of the Department Head's letter of assessment. After receiving the assessment, the candidate has the right to submit a written response that henceforth becomes a permanent addition to the candidate's file.

E. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

1. Evaluation Criteria

As stated in the *Kansas State University Handbook*, C90, faculty being considered for tenure should be experts in their chosen fields.

"The university uses a selective process in awarding tenure to secure a faculty of the highest possible caliber. To be tenured, faculty members must be experts in their chosen fields, and must have full academic freedom in pursuit of ideas or inquiries without fear of censure or retribution."

To be awarded tenure, faculty members should be meeting or exceeding expectations in each of the assigned areas of professional activities. The faculty member's cumulative record in each of the professional activity should provide clear evidence of the faculty member's expertise and impact in the field of study.

The candidate must provide documented evidence of performance as an effective and diligent teacher. This includes both course content and the ability to communicate, as judged by the faculty and the current students (e.g., teaching evaluations). Other evidence for the quality of teaching might include: specific awards for teaching; improvements in the instructional program via the successful acquisition of extramural grants for instructional equipment, etc.; course initiation and major revision of existing courses; successful innovations in teaching methods; effective counseling and advising of students; direction of graduate thesis and dissertation research; and the achievements of former students.

The candidate must have established a research program that has earned national recognition in the candidate's area of specialty within the field. It must be clearly evident to the faculty and the external evaluators that the habit of consistent publication, published in leading journals, has been firmly established. The publication record will be considered in light of the field, type of research conducted (e.g., qualitative, quantitative, primary, secondary, etc.), teaching load, and other departmental responsibilities. The comments of external evaluators will be considered as part of the faculty's evaluation of the candidate's research program.

The candidate should have demonstrated his / her competitive efforts and/or effectiveness in bringing outside financial support or other resources to the department through the candidate's own research program, through proposals for acquiring departmental research instruments, or other individual or collective efforts on behalf of the department. Other evidence for the quality of research might include: national, regional, and local awards; and the achievements of the candidate's former students.

For those with Extension appointments, promotion to Associate Professor will depend on the development of an Extension portfolio of accomplishments that reflects the tenths time assigned to Extension. The portfolio should include: an emerging record of excellence as judged by other colleagues throughout the nation who are familiar with the Specialist's area of expertise; an emerging reputation as a "role model for Extension" among other Extension Specialists in the Specialist's area of expertise; and a growing record of sustained scholarly work published in national refereed or other reputable sources.

The candidate should have demonstrated engagement and emerging leadership ability in service to the department, college and/or university, and to the profession. Evidence of leadership might include: service on department and university policy making and personnel selection committees, substantive contributions in the development and promotion of research and teaching programs, preparation of departmental proposals, reports and service on departmental, college or university committees, leadership in professional associations.

2. Procedures

A candidate normally will be considered for tenure during the sixth year of the seven-year probationary period, with an application for tenure made at the beginning of the sixth year. If tenure is denied, a candidate has one additional year available for employment at Kansas State University. For faculty members appointed at the ranks of associate professor and professor, the maximum probationary period for gaining tenure consists of five (5) regular annual appointments at Kansas State University. Tenure may be granted to those on full-time probationary appointments at the rank of associate professor or above. Unless they resign, faculty members in the final year of probation will be automatically reviewed for tenure. In exceptional cases, a candidate with outstanding records in research, teaching, and service may be considered for tenure in an earlier year. A request for an a tenure decision prior to the 6th year may be made either by the

candidate submitting a written request to the Department Head or by a tenured faculty member, with concurrence of the candidate, submitting a written nomination to the Department Head. The Department Head must support this request to begin the early tenure evaluation process.

Written requests for consideration of tenure and/or promotion (including those seeking tenure prior to the 6th year or those nominating such candidates) must be submitted to the Department Head no later than June 15. It is more common that the candidate and Department Head (in consultation with faculty mentor) discuss application for tenure and/or promotion as part of the candidate's annual review/reappointment meeting the preceding spring semester. The typical sequence of events is as follows:

- The probationary faculty member and Department Head (in consultation with faculty mentor) discuss consideration for promotion and/or tenure during preceding spring semester;
- The Department Head will inform the candidate and candidate's mentor to prepare a list of approximately 10 external evaluators by May 1st. An equal number of external reviewers from the candidate's list and the department head's list will be selected (see *Kansas State University Handbook*, C112.2).
- Department Head requests that the candidate prepare materials (abbreviated version of promotion and tenure packet) for external review by early summer
- The candidate submits materials for internal review in September.
- Eligible PFP faculty review packet of materials in October and vote.
- Department recommendations are forwarded to the Dean of the College (early November).
- The College Promotion and Tenure Committee convenes to review materials and reports finding to the Dean (early December).
- The Dean notifies candidate and Department Head of college and Dean's recommendation (early December). The candidate may withdraw materials within seven calendar days.
- The Dean submits materials and recommendations of those candidates who have not withdrawn to the Deans Council (mid December).
- The Dean notifies candidate and Department Head of the Deans Council recommendation (early February). Candidates not recommended by the Deans Council have 14 days to appeal to the Provost.
- Recommendations from the Deans Council are sent to the Provost and then the President of Kansas State University (late February).
- The Provost informs candidates of promotion/tenure decisions (mid March).

The candidate's tenure mentor, if any, presents the candidate's materials to the eligible voting faculty members. If there is no tenure mentor, then the Department Head appoints a senior faculty member other than the session Department Head to present the materials. If the candidate or the faculty reviewers so request, the candidate may make comments on his or her own behalf to the faculty gathered for the review. In this case, the candidate leaves the meeting after making a statement and answering questions. Within five working days from that date, each eligible

faculty member will submit a written ballot and any written comments to the Department Head. At the close of the voting period, the Department Head will open the ballots and record the vote.

The Department Head will review the promotion/tenure document used to guide the candidate, the entire probationary portfolio of the candidate, the recommendations of the eligible faculty, and the vote of the eligible faculty. Following this review, the Department Head will formulate an independent recommendation either supporting or failing to support tenure and/or promotion of the candidate and forward a recommendation to the Dean of the Health and Human Sciences along with the results of the vote of the eligible faculty and unedited ballots. A summary of the comments will be transmitted to the candidate and to the eligible faculty, upon request.

The tenure and/or promotion file of the candidate will be forwarded by the Dean to the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. This Committee, in advising the Dean (in accordance with the Kansas State University Handbook, C153.2), has three charges: to review the documentation submitted by the candidate and the Department Head, to assure that applicable procedures have been followed, and to provide a written recommendation and vote to the Dean as to whether all applicable procedures have been followed.

After the expiration of a probationary period, faculty should have continuous tenure, and their services should be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the cases of retirement, chronic low achievement, program or unit discontinuance, or in extraordinary circumstances, because of financial exigency. (See *Kansas State University Handbook*, C31.5 to C31.7, C160.1 to C162.5 and Appendixes B, C, and K.)

1. Letters from External Evaluators

Persons outside the university who are recognized for excellence in the candidate's discipline or profession will be asked to participate as reviewers in evaluations for tenure and promotion (*Kansas State University Handbook*, C36.1). The candidate for promotion and/or tenure provides the Department Head with the names and addresses of approximately 10 external evaluators by no later than May 1, and the members of the candidate's unit provide the Department Head with a similar number of external evaluators. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion have the right to submit to the Department Heads the names of potential outside reviewers whom they believe may *not* be able to provide a fair and unbiased evaluation of the candidate's materials, specifying the reasons for this claim. The Department Head retains the final authority for determining the composition of the list of outside reviewers. The Department will make every effort to obtain a minimum of three letters from external reviewers for promotion both to associate professor and to full professor ranks.

Each external reviewer should be provided a written description of the candidate's responsibilities during the period being evaluated, and copies of relevant sections of the Department's tenure guidelines (e.g. the *Activities* and *Expectations* sections), as well as pertinent materials from the candidate's file. External reviewers will be asked to consider the candidate's entire portfolio (see below). Reviewers should be assured that the letters of evaluation will remain confidential except as required by court order and will not be seen by the candidate. Reviewers should also be informed that specific words or phrases used in their letters may be part of a written recommendation prepared by the Department Head; however, every effort will be made to remove any material that might reveal the identity of the external evaluators.

The value of outside reviews depends on the appropriate choice of objective reviewers. Candidates and units are urged to avoid listing as external reviewers persons who have had a personal or professional relationship with the candidate, such as the candidate's former major professor, postdoctoral mentor, graduate school classmates, or graduated students.

External reviewers will be sent evidence of performance in *all* assigned domains (i.e., teaching, research, extension, service) of professional work and informed of the proportion of time devoted by the candidate to each domain during each year of the evaluation period. In the event that an external reviewer fails to respond to the request for evaluation of the candidate's materials, whenever possible, the Department Head will select another qualified external reviewer to replace the nonresponsive reviewer.

External reviews will not be sought by anyone other than the Department Head. It is inappropriate for persons at other administrative levels (i.e., College Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Dean of the College, the Council of Deans, and the Provost) to solicit additional external reviews beyond those sought by the Department Head. However, following notification to the candidate, the Department Head may solicit comments from students, other faculty members, and administrative heads in the College or the University, as well as from faculty members and professionals in the field with whom the candidate has collaborated, if relevant. Such comments are not required; however, all such comments become a part of the candidate's record once they are obtained, although the name and affiliation of each person who comments will be kept confidential.

2. Faculty Eligible to Vote

When a candidate seeks tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, the Department Head will appoint a Promotion Committee of no fewer than three tenured faculty members. Faculty eligible to vote on matters of promotion and mid-probationary review are all Department faculty holding a rank equal to or higher than the rank being considered. Faculty holding tenure, regardless of rank, are expected to participate in the mid-probationary review and vote on questions

involving the awarding of promotion and tenure. If an eligible faculty member cannot be present during the voting period, the faculty member may leave her/his ballot and any statement s/he may want incorporated into the discussion summary with the Department Head prior to the week of voting. All eligible faculty members are expected to vote unless a reason can be documented for abstention.

If there are fewer than three eligible faculty in the department, tenured faculty members from other departments within the College will be added to the committee. The Department Head, in consultation with the Department tenured faculty members, will choose these additional eligible faculty. The probationary faculty member may submit a list of names to the Department Head for consideration and may also submit a list of names whom they believe may not be able to provide a fair and unbiased evaluation of the candidate's materials, specifying the reasons for this claim.

3. Appeal Procedures and Transfers from Tenure-Track to Non-Tenure Track Appointment

If the finding of the Dean's Council is not to grant tenure and/or promotion, the candidate may appeal this decision in accordance with *Kansas State University Handbook*, C114.2; Appendix G. A tenure-track faculty member must request a transfer to a non-tenure track position in accordance with *Kansas State University Handbook*, C12.6.

F. Promotion to Professor

Promotion to professor is based on attainment of excellence in the assigned responsibilities of the faculty member and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies" (*Kansas State University Handbook*, C120.2).

1. Evaluation Criteria

The candidate must provide documented evidence of a sustained performance as an effective and diligent teacher. This includes both course content and the ability to communicate, as judged by the faculty and the current students (e.g., teaching evaluations). Other evidence for the quality of teaching might include: specific awards for teaching; improvements in the instructional program via the successful acquisition of extramural grants for instructional equipment, etc.; course initiation and major revision of existing courses; successful innovations in teaching methods; effective counseling and advising of students; direction of graduate thesis and dissertation research; and the achievements of former students.

The candidate must have established and maintained a research program that has earned international or outstanding national recognition in the candidate's area of specialty within the field and is acknowledged by leading authorities in the field. It

must be clearly evident to the faculty and the external evaluators that the habit of consistent publication, published in leading journals, has been firmly established. Although it is important to demonstrate sustained productivity since promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, the absolute number of publications and presentations is less important than their significance, as measured by citations and reputation among peers in the field of expertise. The publication record will be considered in light of the field, type of research conducted (e.g., qualitative, quantitative, primary, secondary, etc.), teaching load, and other departmental responsibilities. The comments of external evaluators will be considered as part of the faculty's evaluation of the candidate's research program.

The candidate should have demonstrated his / her effectiveness in bringing outside financial support or other resources to the department through the candidate's own research program, through proposals for acquiring departmental research instruments, or other individual or collective efforts on behalf of the department. Other evidence for the quality of research might include: national, regional, and local awards; the achievements of the candidate's former students; and the utilization of a sabbatical leave or leave of absence to enhance her/his research program.

For those with Extension appointments, promotion to Professor will depend on the development of an Extension portfolio of accomplishments that reflects the tenths time assigned to Extension. The portfolio should include: a record of excellence as judged by other colleagues throughout the nation who are familiar with the Specialist's area of expertise; a reputation as a "role model for Extension" among other Extension Specialists in the Specialist's area of expertise; a record of excellence as judged by national recognition; and a record of sustained scholarly work published in national refereed or other reputable sources.

The candidate should have demonstrated leadership ability and a sustained record of service to the department, college and/or university, and to the profession. Evidence of leadership might include: service on department and university policy making and personnel selection committees, substantive contributions in the development and promotion of research and teaching programs, preparation of departmental proposals, reports and service on departmental, college or university committees, leadership in professional associations.

When an associate professor applies for promotion to full professor, the Department Head will appoint a Full Professor Promotion Committee of no fewer than three full professors. All full professors from within the Department will serve on this committee, and if fewer than three, full professors from other departments within the College will be added to the committee. The Department Head, in consultation with the Department full professors, will choose these additional committee members. The faculty member being considered for promotion may submit a list of names to the Department Head for consideration and may also submit a list of names whom they believe may *not* be able to provide a fair and unbiased evaluation of the candidate's materials, specifying the reasons for this claim. The Full Professor Promotion Committee will evaluate and provide written comments on the file, and vote on the promotion of candidates to professor.

If the candidate has been at the associate professor rank for more than six years, the evaluating faculty will evaluate the productivity and accomplishment in all areas of appointment and take a holistic view of the candidate's complete work and its national or international impact.

External reviewers who are recognized as leaders in the candidate's discipline or profession will be asked to evaluate and discuss the candidate's attainment of excellence in assigned responsibility. Comments from a candidate's research partners, major professor, or graduate school classmates are generally less persuasive and should not be solicited (*Kansas State University Handbook*, C36.2).

2. Procedures

Written requests for consideration of promotion to professor must be submitted to the Department Head no later than June 15. It is more common that the candidate and Department Head discuss application for promotion as part of the candidate's annual review/reappointment meeting the preceding spring semester. The typical sequence of events is as follows:

- The candidate and Department Head discuss consideration for promotion during preceding spring semester;
- The candidate prepares promotion materials for external review by early summer. Supporting materials should be determined by the faculty member in consultation with the department head. The materials sent for external reviews are typically the full documentation for promotion required of the candidate by the university.
- The candidate prepares a list of three possible external reviewers and the department head, in consultation with the K-State faculty in the candidate's area of specialization, prepares a list of three possible external reviewers list of three will be prepared by the department head.
- The department head will send a letter, the candidate's vita, and other supporting materials to two reviewers selected by the candidate and to two reviewers selected by the full professors evaluating the candidate's materials (i.e., four total external reviewers) for review in the summer.
 - If an external expert declines the request to review the candidate's credentials, another reviewer will be selected from the candidate's list or the department head's list. If necessary because potential external reviewers decline, additional reviewers will be solicited by the department head. The reviewers will be provided a copy of the departmental criteria for promotion and informed of the proportion of time appointed to all assigned duties research, instruction, service, etc. The candidate will not be permitted to see the external reviews.
- The candidate submits materials for internal review in September.
- Eligible faculty review packet of materials in October and vote.
- Department recommendations are forwarded to the Dean (early November).
- The College Promotion and Tenure Committee convenes to review materials and reports finding to the Dean (early December).

- The Dean notifies candidate and Department Head of college and Dean's recommendation (early December). The candidate may withdraw materials within seven calendar days.
- The Dean submits materials and recommendations of those candidates who have not withdrawn to the Deans Council (mid-December).
- The Dean notifies candidate and Department Head of the Deans Council recommendation (early February). Candidates not recommended by the Deans Council have 14 days to appeal to the Provost.
- Recommendations from the Deans Council are sent to the Provost and then the President of Kansas State University (late February).
- The Provost informs candidates of promotion decisions (mid-March).

IV. Departmental Promotion and Reappointment Criteria: Non-Tenure Track

A. Initial Appointment & Professional Titles

The Department includes a number of positions and ranks for non-tenure track faculty (see Kansas State University Handbook, C10 – C12) including:

- Instructor (3 ranks) – Instructor, Advanced Instructor, Senior Instructor
- Research (3 ranks) – Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Professor
- Practice (2 ranks) – Professor of Practice, Senior Professor of Practice
- Teaching (3 ranks) – Teaching Assistant Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, Teaching Professor
- Extension (3 ranks) – Extension Assistant Professor, Extension Associate Professor, Extension Professor

Non-tenure track faculty members may be recruited, hired, and appointed into regular or term positions. Initial appointment rank and subsequent promotions in rank are based on advanced degree(s) held, experience, performance, and achievements over time within a given rank. Non-tenure track faculty members at any rank on a regular appointment are members of the general faculty and are afforded all perquisites accorded to the general faculty, including Notice of Non-Reappointment (see *University Handbook Appendix A*).

Non-tenure track faculty members on regular appointments will participate in faculty governance processes as defined by the Department, and University Faculty Senate. Non-tenure track faculty members have voting rights in college and departmental matters and elections, and may serve on departmental, college, and university committees unless policies limit membership to tenure-track faculty. Non-tenure track faculty are eligible to submit grant applications and those on regular appointments may direct research as principal investigators (*Pre-Awards Policy and Procedures Manual*, Chapter 7010, .060). Non-tenure track faculty may be eligible for graduate faculty status, which allows faculty to serve as major professor, graduate committee member, and course coordinator for graduate-level courses (*Graduate Handbook, Chapter 5, Section C*). Non-tenure track faculty must

follow university policies related to eligibility for sabbatical leave (*Kansas State University Handbook, E2*) and Professorial Performance Awards (*Kansas State University Handbook, C49.2*).

This section describes guidelines for non-tenure track faculty for appointment, evaluation, promotion, and reappointment in the Department.

1. Instructional Track Faculty

Instructional track faculty at Kansas State University are educators who have a mix of academic and professional preparation but are not required to hold the terminal degree appropriate to the discipline. Instructors are not eligible for tenure and are not eligible to vote on matters of tenure or promotion for tenure-track faculty (*Kansas State University Handbook, C12.0*). Service in these positions is not credited toward tenure (*Kansas State University Handbook, C12.1*). Appointment ranks in this track include Instructor, Advanced Instructor, and Senior Instructor.

The goal of these positions is to enhance the academic and professional development of students in support of the teaching and service missions of the institution. Instructor track faculty are typically involved in classroom instruction and may be involved in non-classroom instructional and curriculum-related activity; university, department/college committees; and local, state/regional, and national professional organizations. Because there is generally less time for the type of research carried out by tenure-track faculty, instructional faculty focus on the scholarship of teaching and learning.

The primary responsibilities of faculty on instructional-track appointments are instruction of students, although other responsibilities may be included in the appointment. The offer letter should clearly define the entire set of expectations. The distribution of effort for instructional-track faculty consists of a 55% to 100% appointment devoted to instruction.

Academic Ranks for Instructional-Track Faculty

Instructor: Instructor is the primary entry-level rank for instructional track faculty at the University.

Degree: The candidate typically possesses a graduate degree, but individuals in these positions are not required to hold the terminal degree appropriate to the discipline. In some circumstances, appropriate professional experience with the corresponding CFP® designations may satisfy the graduate degree requirement.

Criteria: The candidate must have: (1) a current independent capability of teaching, (2) a potential for significant professional growth in the area of teaching, and (3) evidence of a high level of competence in the content area and demonstrated promise of moving toward excellence in student instruction.

Advanced Instructor: Advanced Instructor is the mid-career instructional faculty rank at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a graduate degree appropriate to the discipline.

Criteria: The candidate should demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching by demonstrating active engagement and high commitment to teaching. She or he must demonstrate a record of effective instruction and evidence of professional development in teaching (e.g., participating in the university peer review of teaching program, attending university teaching conferences).

Senior Instructor: Senior Instructor is the highest instructional faculty rank at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a graduate degree appropriate to the discipline.

Criteria: The candidate should have maintained a sustained record of excellence in teaching and serve as an effective role model for colleagues, students, and clientele. An effective role model leads or guides others in pursuit of teaching excellence. In addition, the candidate should demonstrate superior performance and be recognized by students and peers as an outstanding educator in the discipline. The candidate has engaged in creative endeavors related to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (e.g., University workshop on teaching, presentations in discipline).

2. Research Track Faculty

Research track faculty at Kansas State University are faculty members who have research credentials in their disciplinary area. These individuals will normally qualify for principal investigator status on proposals to external agencies if approved by their department head and the Dean of the college. Individuals appointed to these positions should have research credentials consistent with those mandated for the comparable tenure-track rank in their disciplines. Individuals on these appointments are not eligible for tenure and are not eligible to vote on matters of tenure or promotion for tenure-track faculty. Service in these positions is not credited toward tenure (*Kansas State University Handbook*, C12.1). Appointment ranks in this track include Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor.

The goal of these positions is to enhance the level of research and external funding in the Department in support of the research mission of the institution. Research track faculty are typically involved in research, and may be involved in university, department/college committees; and local, state/regional, and national professional organizations.

The primary responsibility of faculty on research-track appointments is research, although other responsibilities may be included in the appointment. The offer letter should clearly define the entire set of expectations. The distribution of effort for research-track faculty consists of a 55% to 100% appointment devoted to research.

Academic Ranks for Research-Track Faculty

Research Assistant Professor: Research Assistant Professor is the primary entry-level rank for research track faculty at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a terminal degree appropriate to the discipline.

Criteria: The candidate must have a current independent capability of having a program of research and scholarship and a potential for significant professional growth in the area of research and scholarship. There should be evidence of a high level of competence in the area of research and demonstrated promise of moving toward excellence in maintaining a coherent program of research and scholarship, developing and/or maintaining a multi-disciplinary research program, and securing funding to support the program of research.

Research Associate Professor: Research Associate Professor is the mid-career research faculty track rank at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a terminal degree appropriate to the discipline.

Criteria: The candidate should demonstrate excellence as a researcher and scholar, with evidence of contributing to the knowledge base of the chosen discipline at a national and/or international level. The faculty member should maintain a coherent program of research and scholarship with clearly defined theoretical, empirical, and/or intervention-oriented goals. If appropriate, the candidate should play a significant and clearly defined role in developing and/or maintaining a multi-disciplinary research program (on a local, national, or international scale). The candidate must have received internal grants and/or sought significant external grants to support his or her program of research.

Research Professor: Research Professor is the highest research faculty track rank at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a terminal degree appropriate to the discipline.

Criteria: The candidate should demonstrate a nationally or internationally recognized and sustained record of research, scholarship, and other creative endeavors. In addition, the candidate must provide evidence of serving as a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. The

faculty member should maintain a coherent program of research and scholarship with clearly defined theoretical, empirical, and/or intervention-oriented goals. If appropriate, the candidate should play a significant and clearly defined role in developing and/or maintaining a multi-disciplinary research program (on a local, national, or international scale). In the case of a candidate for promotion to the rank of professor, the evaluating faculty will look for recent evidence of a sustained and high quality program of research with national or international impact. The candidate must have received significant external grants to support his or her program of research.

3. Practice Track Faculty

Practice track faculty at Kansas State University are educators who have substantial non-academic experience in their disciplinary field and credentials appropriate to the discipline. Individuals on these appointments are not eligible for tenure and are not eligible to vote on matters of tenure or promotion for tenure-track faculty. Service in these positions is not credited toward tenure (*Kansas State University Handbook*, C12.3). Appointment ranks in this track include professor of practice and senior professor of practice.

The goal of these positions is to enhance the academic and professional development of students in support of the teaching and service missions of the institution. They are typically involved in classroom instruction and may be involved in non-classroom instructional and curriculum-related activity; university, department/college committees; and local, state/regional; and national professional organizations. Because there is generally less time for the type of traditional research carried out by tenure-track faculty, the scholarship of practice faculty focuses on professional practice improvements or advancement of teaching in the professional setting. They may also engage in various types of research projects that are directed toward advancing instruction, the profession; and/or practice.

The primary responsibilities of faculty on practice-track appointments are instruction of students. The primary responsibility for persons on these appointments will be teaching, research, outreach and service, or some combination of these duties. The offer letter should clearly define the entire set of expectations. The distribution of effort for practice-track faculty consists of a 55% to 100% appointment devoted to instruction.

Academic Ranks for Practice-Track Faculty

Professor of Practice: Professor of Practice is the primary entry-level rank for practice track faculty at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a graduate degree and have substantial non-academic experience in their disciplinary field.

Criteria: The candidate must have: (1) substantial non-academic experience

in the disciplinary field and credentials appropriate to the discipline, (2) a current independent capability of teaching, (3) a potential for significant professional growth in the area of teaching, and (4) evidence of a high level of competence in the content area and demonstrated promise of moving toward excellence in student instruction, student mentorship, scholarly activities, professional leadership, and practice/service/outreach as related to the profession.

Senior Professor of Practice: Senior Professor of Practice is the highest practice faculty track rank at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a graduate degree, and have substantial non-academic experience in their disciplinary field.

Criteria: The candidate should demonstrate a sustained record of excellence in teaching and serve as an effective role model for colleagues, students, and clientele. An effective role model leads or guides others in pursuit of teaching excellence. The candidate should be recognized at the national/international level as an authority within his or her specialty based on demonstrated excellence in student instruction, student mentorship, scholarly activities, professional leadership, and practice/service/outreach as related to the position. In addition, the candidate should demonstrate superior performance and be recognized by students and peers as an outstanding educator in the discipline.

4. Teaching Track Faculty

Teaching track faculty at Kansas State University are educators who have a background in their disciplinary area and are required to hold the terminal degree appropriate to the discipline. Individuals on these appointments are not eligible for tenure and are not eligible to vote on matters of tenure or promotion for tenure-track faculty. Service in these positions is not credited toward tenure (*Kansas State University Handbook*, C12.4). Appointment ranks in this track include teaching assistant professor, teaching associate professor, and teaching professor.

The goal of these positions is to enhance the academic and professional development of students in support of the teaching and service missions of the institution. They are typically involved in classroom instruction and may be involved in non-classroom instructional and curriculum-related activity; university, department/college committees; and local, state/regional, and national professional organizations. Because there is generally less time for the type of traditional research carried out by tenure-track faculty, the scholarship of teaching faculty focuses on the scholarship of teaching and learning.

The primary responsibility of faculty on teaching-track appointments is instruction, although other responsibilities may be included in the appointment. A component of

the teaching appointment may include opportunity for scholarly achievement and service. The offer letter should clearly define the entire set of expectations. The distribution of effort for teaching-track faculty consists of a 55% to 100% appointment devoted to instruction.

Academic Ranks for Teaching Track Faculty

Teaching Assistant Professor: Teaching Assistant Professor is the primary entry-level rank for teaching track faculty at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a terminal degree appropriate to the discipline.

Criteria: The candidate must have: (1) a current independent capability of teaching, (2) a potential for significant professional growth in the area of teaching, and (3) evidence of a high level of competence in the content area and demonstrated promise of moving toward excellence in student instruction.

Teaching Associate Professor: Teaching Associate Professor is the mid-career teaching track faculty rank at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a terminal degree appropriate to the discipline.

Criteria: The candidate should demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching by demonstrating active engagement and high commitment to teaching. She or he must demonstrate a record of effective instruction and evidence of professional development in teaching (e.g., participating in the university peer review of teaching program, attending university teaching conferences). The candidate should also show evidence of being engaged in the scholarship of teaching and learning, which may be demonstrated by publications in appropriate venues, presentations at conferences, writing internal grants that promote teaching, and/or development of teaching materials, including books and innovative teaching technologies.

Teaching Professor: Teaching Professor is the highest teaching track faculty rank at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a terminal degree appropriate to the discipline.

Criteria: The candidate should have maintained a sustained record of excellence in teaching and serve as an effective role model for colleagues, students, and clientele. An effective role model leads or guides others in pursuit of teaching excellence. In addition, the candidate should demonstrate superior performance and be recognized by students and peers as an outstanding educator in the discipline. The candidate should also be engaged in sustained scholarship of teaching and learning, which may be demonstrated by publications in appropriate venues, presentations at

conferences, writing external grants that promote teaching, development of teaching materials, including books and innovative teaching technologies. These efforts may include scholarship published in national refereed journals or other reputable sources with national or international stature.

5. Extension Track Faculty

This section describes guidelines for Extension track faculty in the PFP Department, and appointments at the rank of extension assistant professor, extension associate professor, and extension professor. In certain cases, the university's best interests are served by entering into ongoing relationships with personnel beyond the Extension Associate level. The entire set of expectations must be clearly defined in the offer letter. Individuals appointed to these positions should have extension credentials consistent with those mandated for the comparable tenure-track rank in their disciplines. Individuals on these appointments are not eligible for tenure and are not eligible to vote on matters of tenure or promotion for tenure-track faculty. Service in these positions is not credited toward tenure (*Kansas State University Handbook* C12.5). Extension assistant professor positions will be awarded as one-year, regular or term contracts.

Extension faculty at Kansas State University are faculty members who have credentials in their disciplinary area. The goal of these positions is to enhance the level of Extension activity in the Department in support of the outreach and engagement mission of the institution. They are typically involved in Extension activities and may be involved in research or other creative endeavors; instruction; university, department/college committees; and local, state/regional; and national professional organizations.

The primary responsibilities of faculty on Extension-track appointments are Extension activities. The distribution of effort for Extension-track faculty consists of a 55% to 100% appointment devoted to Extension activities.

Academic Ranks for Extension Track Faculty

Extension Assistant Professor: Extension Assistant Professor is the primary entry-level rank for Extension track faculty at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a terminal degree appropriate to the discipline.

Criteria: The candidate must have: (1) a current independent capability of having a program of Extension scholarship, (2) a potential for significant professional growth in the area of Extension scholarship, and (3) potential for securing funding to support the Extension scholarship. This includes identification of evidence-based knowledge, application, utilization, and evaluation, professional leadership, and practice and/or service in the disciplinary area of the position.

Extension Associate Professor: Extension Associate Professor is the mid-career

Extension track faculty rank at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a terminal degree appropriate to the discipline.

Criteria: The candidate should demonstrate excellence in Extension scholarship, concentrating in one or two areas that meet the needs of Kansas residents. The candidate demonstrates expertise and educational resources in these given areas that has the potential for national/international reputation for excellence. The candidate has communicated his or her Extension scholarship through nationally refereed articles, chapters in books published by reputable sources, reports, conference proceedings, or monographs that are of high quality, and that are available on K-State websites or through other appropriate regional and national avenues. The candidate must have received some level of grant support.

Extension Professor: Extension Professor is the highest Extension track faculty rank at the University.

Degree: The candidate must possess a terminal degree appropriate to the discipline.

Criteria: The candidate should demonstrate sustained excellence in Extension scholarship, concentrating in one or two areas that meet the needs of Kansas residents. The candidate demonstrates expertise and national/international reputation for excellence. The candidate has a reputation as a "role model for Extension" among other Extension Specialists or has been a leader in multi-disciplinary collaborations. The candidate has a record of sustained scholarly work published in national refereed or other reputable sources, reports, conference proceedings, or monographs that are of high quality, and that are available on K-State website or through other appropriate regional and national avenues. The candidate must have received significant external grants to support his or her Extension scholarship.

B. Annual Evaluation and Reappointment Process Responsibilities of the Head and the Candidate

Given the differences in practice areas, the application of specific criteria for non-tenure track faculty appointment, annual evaluation, and promotion must consider responsibilities outlined in the appointment letter and modifications of these responsibilities as documented during or after the annual evaluation process.

Regular and term non-tenure track faculty will be evaluated as part of the annual evaluation process. The Department Head will provide faculty with the timeline for evaluations/reappointments, as well as the materials that faculty members are expected to submit for evaluation.

For annual evaluations of term and regular non-tenure track faculty, non-tenure track faculty submit to the Department Head a portfolio documenting performance in the areas reflected in the distribution of effort for the preceding year. Evaluation

decisions related to annual evaluation of non-tenure track faculty will be based upon the criteria and guidelines outlined for each area of responsibility that may apply. See Section II "Annual Evaluation and Merit Salary Allocation Procedures" of this document and Appendix B for details regarding annual reviews.

The review for reappointment is conducted by the Department Head. Withdrawal from the mandatory review for reappointment indicates reappointment will not be granted. The Department Head requests reporting materials and any supplementary documents from the candidate for submission to the Department Head by the last day of Fall final's week. Faculty may submit supplemental materials up to January 5th to reflect any achievements that occur before the end of the review period.

C. Criteria for Reappointment

Faculty members should be meeting or exceeding expectations in each of the assigned areas of professional activity (see Section II, B "Annual Evaluation Performance Criteria" of this document). The faculty member's cumulative record in each of the professional activity should provide clear evidence of the faculty member's expertise and impact in the field of study.

D. Promotion Process

See #3 <https://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/dhmanual/proftitletemp.pdf>

The procedures for promotion for non-tenure track faculty are similar to the processes and timelines for promotion of tenure-track/tenured faculty in the *Kansas State University Handbook* (see C110-C116.2 and C150-C156.2). The time in rank interval prior to consideration for promotion is typically expected to be five years, although shorter and longer intervals are possible, provided that the materials are made available to the College in January.

Although the Department Head will assist the candidate in understanding the standards for each rank and will guide the candidate's preparation of the materials, the candidate is solely responsible for the materials presented to the Department Head and for consideration by the Dean of the College. The candidate will submit a portfolio to the Department Head documenting activities of professional activity appropriate to the appointment. The candidate should include in the portfolio a listing of goals and objectives that will guide professional activities for the next five years. See Section II "Annual Evaluation and Merit Salary Allocation" of this document for examples of items to be included in the portfolio for review.

Once a formal application is made, the Department Head will summarize the applicant's responsibilities and contributions to the unit during the evaluation period in a one-page document, which will be provided to the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review Committee for review. The Review Committee will write a report to the Department Head (two pages maximum) evaluating the candidate and recommending whether the person should be promoted or not, and the basis for

that recommendation. Additionally, the committee will report its vote (count in favor or against promotion). In cases of a split vote, the report should explain why that occurred with respect to differences in interpretation of evidence that is based on the standards expected for the rank being sought.

The Department Head will consider the responsibilities of the candidate during the evaluation period, the accomplishments of the candidate in fulfilling those responsibilities, the assessments provided by the Department Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review Committee and will use this information to provide the Dean with a recommendation concerning the promotion decision. If a promotion is recommended, the Department Head will need to inform the candidate on the length of the new appointment.

The Department Head forwards the committee report with a written summary of the Department Head's recommendation, including the type and length of appointment, and rationale to the College Dean. The promotion file of the candidate will be forwarded by the Dean of the College to the Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee of the College. This Committee, in advising the Dean (in accordance with the *Kansas State University Handbook*, C153.2), has three charges: to review the documentation submitted by the candidate and the Department Head, to assure that applicable procedures have been followed, and to provide a written recommendation and vote to the Dean as to whether all applicable procedures have been followed.

The Dean of the College, after consulting with the Department Head and the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee, will submit a written recommendation to the Dean's Council no sooner than seven calendar days following notification to the candidate of the Dean's recommendation and the report of the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. Both the Dean's recommendation and the recommendation of the college advisory committee will be copied to the Department Head and the candidate. The Dean's recommendation will be accompanied by the recommendation and unedited written comments of: 1) the Department Head, 2) the Department eligible voting faculty, and 3) the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee.

1. Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review Committee

The Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review Committee consists of three full-time faculty members. The Department Head will appoint two faculty members to the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review Committee, each serving 3-year staggered terms. One member will be a tenured faculty member (either Associate Professor or Professor) and one member will be a non-tenure track faculty member. The Department Head will appoint one of these faculty members to serve as Head of the committee. A third faculty member from either tenure or non-tenure track will also be appointed to the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review Committee by the Department Head. The

Head will convene the meetings and finalize the written evaluation transmitted to the Department Head after committee approval.

In the event that a committee member is under consideration for promotion, the committee member will be excused from promotion-related deliberations for that academic year. Likewise, consistent with the University nepotism policy (Kansas State University Policies and Procedures, Chapter 4095), should a member of a committee member's household or family be under consideration for promotion, that committee member will be excused from all related deliberations for that academic year.

The duties of the promotion committee are as follows:

- Evaluate credentials of candidates for promotion using the materials provided by the candidate.
- All members vote approval or disapproval of a candidate's application, and the committee provides a substantive report on the rationale for the approval/disapproval recommendation.
- The committee vote and recommendation for promotion are forwarded in writing to the Department Head.
- All deliberations of the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review Committee are confidential and should not be divulged to anyone except the Department Head.

2. Denial of Promotion

If the Deans Council does not recommend promotion in rank, the candidate may appeal this decision to the Provost Office within a period of 14 days following notification. If the Provost concurs with the findings of the College Dean, the candidate has the option of filing a grievance with the General Faculty Grievance Board (see *University Handbook Appendix G*). An ombudsperson may be available for assistance during the appeal procedures.

Candidates who do not receive a favorable decision on a request for promotion in rank may not submit their materials for review until two academic years later (e.g., an unfavorable decision received in January of an academic year would prohibit another review request until August of the second calendar year after the decision).

V. The Professorial Performance Award (Full Professors)

The Professorial Performance Award is intended to recognize excellent and sustained performance of full professors (see the *Kansas State University Handbook*, sections C49.1-49.14 for complete information about this award). The award carries with it an increase to the faculty member's base salary. The criteria associated with this award are as follows:

- The candidate must be a full professor and must have been in rank at least

- six years since the last promotion or professorial award.
- The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity for at least the six years immediately preceding the performance review.
- The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards.

The Department recognizes that full professors do not all have the same load distribution. In particular, some may have only teaching and service responsibilities. Nevertheless, the Department's policy is that all full professors are eligible for the award. In the case of faculty who have teaching as a high proportion of the load, evidence of the scholarship of teaching should be presented along with the other forms of evidence that support a strong record of teaching.

A. Submission and Review Process

The candidate submits a written request for consideration for the Professorial Performance Award to the Department Head by November 15 to be considered during the following January. The performance review follows the timeline for the annual review process. By the last day of fall final's week, the candidate must submit a vita, samples of work, and respond to a possible request for supportive and/or clarifying documentation from the Department Head.

The Department Head will review materials, decide if the candidate meets the requirements to receive the award, and notify the candidate in writing of that decision. Each candidate for the award will have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the Department Head, and each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, each candidate has the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation to the Department Head and to the Dean. A copy of the Department Head's written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate.

As soon as feasible after the Department Head has prepared his/her written recommendation, the Department Head will convene the Department's tenured faculty for discussion of the recommendation and to obtain a vote of those faculty members as part of the process to advise the College Dean regarding the candidate's qualifications for the award.

The Department Head must submit the following items to the Dean:

1. A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award,
2. Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation,
3. Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation,
4. The candidate's supporting materials that served as the basis for adjudicating eligibility for the award (*Kansas State University Handbook*, C49.6-49.7).

VI. Chronic Low Achievement Procedures

When a tenured faculty member's overall performance falls below the minimum-acceptable level, as indicated by the annual evaluation, the Department Head shall notify the faculty member in writing. The notification should include 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.

If the Department Head rates the performance of the Department member's overall productivity as "below the minimally acceptable level of productivity" for two consecutive years or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period, a peer review process will be initiated.

In keeping with regular procedures in matters of tenure, a peer review panel will be asked to review the member's work load, performance ratings, other pertinent evidence, and procedural documentation unless the faculty member wishes to waive review by such a panel. The panel will submit a written recommendation to the Department Head regarding the results of its review. The Department Head will then forward the written recommendation as well as his or her own written recommendation to the Dean of the College, and the Dean in turn will make a written recommendation to the Provost.

The review panel will be comprised of three faculty members, including two members at the rank of the faculty member being reviewed (associate professor, full professor), and one from the other level. If there is not a faculty member available from one of the levels, the Department Head may recruit faculty members from other departments within the College. The Department Head initially nominates four faculty members who are at the same rank as the reviewee and two faculty at the other rank. The reviewee can then strike three names, provided that the composition of the panel remains as specified above. The Department Head then appoints one of the three panelists to be the chair of the panel.

The review panel will meet within three weeks of its appointment. The Department Head will provide relevant materials for review to the review panel upon

appointment. The faculty member under review may submit materials to the review panel. Either the panel or the reviewee can request that the reviewee appear before it in person. The panel will submit its report, including any minority reports, to the Department Head and to the reviewee. The reviewee has one week to respond to the report by writing to the Department Head. After the Department Head has written his or her assessment, a copy is furnished to the reviewee, who has one week to respond in writing to the Department Head's report. The Department Head will then submit all of these documents to the Dean of the College.

Judgments of failure to meet minimally acceptable levels of productivity are limited to significant or critical areas of professional activity of the faculty member. In accordance with the options afforded by the *Kansas State University Handbook* (C31.8b), such judgments may occur only when the area of professional activity – in predetermined agreements with the faculty member – (1) comprises 30% or more of one's total responsibilities AND (2) occurs in two or more substantial areas of professional responsibility. These judgments must always occur in a context that considers the degree to which weaknesses are balanced by strengths. (For example, a faculty member may have 20% of responsibilities in the area of Research and 15% in Service. Failure to meet minimum-acceptable levels of productivity in either area alone would not constitute an instance credited toward chronic low achievement; however, failure to meet these standards in both areas (35%) would constitute such an instance.)

Consistent failure to meet minimally acceptable levels of performance can result in dismissal for cause as stated in the *Kansas State University Handbook*, C31.5.

“Chronic failure of a tenured faculty member to perform his or her professional duties, as defined in the respective unit, shall contribute evidence of ‘professional incompetence’ and warrant consideration for ‘dismissal for cause’ under existing university policies.”

VII. Post Tenure Review Procedures

Every six years after a faculty member receives tenure or appointment as a tenured faculty member, the faculty member must complete the post-tenure review process or its equivalent. An equivalent shall include, but is not limited to: application for promotion to full professor, Professorial Performance Award, promotion to full professor, receipt of substantial college, university, national or international award requiring multi-year portfolio-like documentation (*Kansas State University Handbook Appendix W*).

A. Review Procedure

The Department Head will complete the six-year Post-Tenure Review form (Appendix D of this document) with input from the tenured faculty member at the

time of his or her annual performance review. Upon completion of the post-tenure review, the form is signed by both the Department Head and the faculty member and placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

If the performance review indicates the need for a professional development plan to enable the faculty member to advance professionally and to make "appropriate contributions to the university" the Department Head will activate the Faculty Development Committee within five working days of the performance review by sending the committee chair (Department's Professor for the College Tenure and Promotion Committee) a copy of this feedback and recommendations form. The Department Head is responsible for designating the other two members of the Faculty Development committee, who will serve two-year terms.

The Faculty Development Committee will then meet with the faculty member within one month of receipt of the Post-Tenure Review form from the Department Head. The purpose of that meeting will be to discuss the areas of development outlined by the Department Head and to construct a professional development plan, with input from the faculty member, to guide the faculty member's progress towards making "appropriate contributions to the university" (see *Kansas State University Handbook* Appendix W). The reviewed faculty member may provide additional documentation to the committee.

The Committee will provide a copy of the written report to the Department Head within 14 working days of the committee meeting. Based on the written report from the Committee and additional recommendations from the Department Head, the Department Head will send a letter outlining the development plan to the faculty member. The Department Head will place the development plan in the faculty member's personnel file and share with the Dean of the College in summary reports of all faculty reviews.

VIII. Appendix

A. Indicators of Collegiality / Academic Citizenship

The following activities are indicators of excellence in collegiality and academic citizenship. Faculty are expected to act professionally at all times.

- A. Attends and participates in departmental and college faculty meetings.
- B. Attends and participates in departmental and college events.
- C. Participates in institutional activities (e.g., career fairs; Open House, commencement).
- D. Attends meetings and participates in self-governance regarding curriculum through curriculum and assessment efforts at the program level.
- E. Eligible faculty members fully participate in self-governance decisions regarding faculty at the department-level such as interviewing/hiring, reappointment, mid-tenure, tenure, promotion, and professorial awards.
- F. Faculty members seek to maintain open communications with colleagues and administrators and to work toward solutions to shared problems.
- G. Commitment to working effectively and cooperatively with others.
- H. When disagreements are present, being committed to resolving differences by engaging in civil debate as characterized by open, honest communication, and constructive criticism.
- I. Maintaining high professional standards of conduct, including interacting with students, faculty, and staff appropriately and respectfully, and engaging each other in ways that enrich the academic community.
- J. Fostering of goodwill and harmony.
- K. Mentoring of colleagues.

B. Annual Evaluation Template

FACULTY MEMBER:

DATE:

RANK/APPOINTMENT:

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS: Vita, TEVALs, and Supervisor Evaluations

Activities (Evaluator to "check off" during meeting; Minimum requirements underlined)	Goals for Evaluation Period (please limit response to 150 words)	Self-Report of Outcome (Self-Evaluation of Last Year's Goals; please limit response to 150 words)	Projected Goals for Year (2-3 goals are anticipated for areas of tenths assignment; (please limit response to 150 words)
Teaching (___ tenths)			
Research, Scholarship, & Creative Endeavors (___ tenths)			
Extension (___ tenths)			
Service (___ tenths)			
Administration (program chair, clinical director, graduate program coordinator, undergraduate program coordinator; ___ tenths)			

Faculty Member's Overall Summary of Evaluation Period (3 to 6 sentence synopsis of essential information):

_____ I have submitted all teaching evaluations for instructional activities that were available to me at the time this report was due. (Indicate yes or no – be sure to provide explanation for “no” response).

Explanation: _____

_____ I have submitted an updated vita that includes activities within the evaluation period. (Indicate yes or no – provide explanation for “no” response)

Explanation: _____

Recommendations/Actions (Completed by Department Head):

_____ Faculty member exceeded expectations.

_____ Faculty Member met expectations.

_____ Faculty Member has fallen below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity.

_____ Faculty member has fallen below minimum acceptable levels of productivity.

_____ Self-report information reflects importance of further discussion. Action steps include (indicate course of action):

- Provide additional information: _____
- Consultation with Faculty Mentor: _____
- Follow-up meeting with Department Head: _____
- Other: _____

_____ General Comment: _____

Faculty Member / Date

Department Head / Date

C. Explanation of Components of Extension Scholarship

Extension scholarship is likely to reflect some combination of the following examples of activity:

Planning

1. Participates in formal program planning process;
2. Coordinates with local agents, area specialists, state specialists and other professionals to identify and document needs for education;
3. Reviews appropriate state and national data to assess needs;
4. Considers views of specialists in other states and individuals in other organizations;
5. Participates in interdisciplinary program planning;
6. Pursues potential grant opportunities;
7. Obtains funding to support efforts and research, creation, translation, and/or evaluation needs (e.g., internal Extension funds, federal Extension grants, private foundation funding, internal University grants, federal and state grants, professional organization grants and awards).

Preparation

1. Prepares new educational resources;
2. Translates and/or creates a model to test existing evidence-based strategies, resources, programs, products and endeavors using methods to best meet client needs;
3. Contributes to materials developed by an interdisciplinary team, state, regional, or national initiative.

Delivery

1. Delivers in-service training to local agents and/or other professionals who then train volunteers, teach intended audiences and/or implement recommended practices;
2. Delivers strategies, resources, programs, products and endeavors directly to clientele groups;
3. Responds to questions and needs of local agents and clientele groups through phone, electronic, face-to-face consultation, and dissemination of appropriate support resources;
4. Prepares information tools (e.g., newsletters, articles, web pages, research, translation of information briefs) to support local efforts and to strengthen capabilities of local agents, Extension personnel, and consumer groups;
5. Develops, delivers, and evaluates mixed media (e.g., electronic, print, campaigns, etc.) strategies, resources, programs, products, and endeavors;
6. Administers special projects that may or may not have attached internal or external funding support.

Evaluation/Accountability

1. Integrates evaluation components into overall design of strategies, resources, programs, products and endeavors when appropriate and possible;
2. Conducts evaluation in cooperation with local Extension agents, colleagues, or other clientele groups when appropriate and possible;
3. Prepares federal, state, and other reports, as required;
4. Communicates evaluation results to legislators, decision makers, stakeholders, clients and others as appropriate;
5. Presents or publishes relevant information or findings pertaining to Extension.

Examples of Strategies, Resources, Programs, Products, and Endeavors:

- Strategies: social marketing campaigns, needs assessments, evaluations of existing curricula and resources, portfolios, virtual marketing, apprenticeships;
- Resources: webinars, downlinks, training institutes;
- Programs: Presentations, course development (online, virtual, or live);
- Products: fact sheets, curricula, notebooks, teaching guides, notebooks, games, audio programs, displays, television programs/YouTube films/vlogs/blogs, Second Life interactives, websites;
- Endeavors: social networks, coalitions, demonstration sites, national/state conferences, community development sites, subcontracts and funding awards, exchanges/shadowing/mentorship programs, public policy, "best practice" programs, benefit packages).

Examples of Evaluation:

Appropriate evaluations will vary significantly. Evaluation may include the effort or outputs (numbers, process), effect (impact outcomes), and efficiency (cost/benefit, utility and sustainability):

- Audience/clientele contacts: A summary of audience reached including such items as the number of resources distributed, the geographical distribution of resources, the size of the media market, and the number of leaders trained and other measures of effort;
- Peer and leader evaluations: Data summarizing the reactions to leadership; solicited and unsolicited letters from peers (colleagues in Kansas or other states familiar with the Specialist's area of expertise or leadership ability);
- Reputation: Presentations at professional conferences; keynote speeches and out-of-state workshops; publications in professional journals and resources (e.g., websites, articles, newsletters; publication in state and national media related to target audience for the strategy, resource, program, or endeavor; special awards and recognitions);

- Impact: A summary of short- or long-term consequences of the strategy, resource, program, or endeavor; letters of confirmation by colleagues in Kansas or other states familiar with the Specialist's area of expertise or leadership ability; case studies; self-reports, and evaluative research;
- Efficiency: Evidence of cost-benefit, assessment of consumer utilization, likelihood of sustainability, and the effect of inspiring new innovations among colleagues and consumers.

D. Feedback and Recommendations Form (Post-Tenure Review)

Date: _____ Review Period (six years): _____

Faculty member (name) _____

Member's rank and appointment: _____

Tenths Assignment (During evaluation period):

Instruction ____ Research ____ Service ____ Extension ____ Administration ____

Evidence items that support <i>Appropriate Contributions to the University</i>	Clear Support	Area in Development	N/A
Ratings of teaching and/or clinical instruction (e.g., TEVALS)			
Ratings of administrative duties			
Qualitative comments from students, mentees, peers, colleagues, stakeholders			
Unit leadership activities			
State and/or national representation, reputation			
Engagement evaluations, stakeholder feedback			
Record of grant applications and grant awards			
Record of state and/or national applications and awards			
Record of university and/or college applications and awards			
Summary of service within and/or outside the university			
Scholarly endeavors resulting in peer-reviewed publications, manuals, reports, documents, media			
Supervised students completing degrees			
Demonstration of consistently following the K-State Principles of Community			
Other:			
Other:			

Recommendations/Plan:

- No recommendations or plan are necessary. Faculty member is progressing and is making *appropriate contributions to the university*. (And/or the Faculty member is exempt from post-tenure review because of a promotion in rank, review for Endowed Department Head or professorial performance award, etc., during the past five years.)
- Faculty member requests additional input from the Faculty Development Committee to support professional development.
- Department Head will meet with faculty member to discuss unit plan to support professional development.
- Department Head requests additional input from the Faculty Development Committee for the faculty member's professional development.
- Other: _____

Brief Description of Committee Objectives for Faculty Development Plan:

The next projected post tenure review year is scheduled for: _____.

Signature of Department Head

Signature of faculty member

E. Journal Ranking List

Tier 1 Journals:

Family Business Review
Journal of Consumer Affairs
Journal of Economic Psychology
International Journal of Consumer Studies
Financial Services Review
Journal of Behavioral Finance
Journal of Family and Economics Issues
Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning
Family Relations

Tier 2 Journals:

Financial Planning Review
Journal of Personal Finance
Journal of Financial Therapy
Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal
Housing and Society
Journal of Financial Planning
Journal of Financial Service Professionals