

V7 February, 2026

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS

**ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on X/XX/20XX)**

**PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on X/XX/20XX)**

**POST-TENURE REVIEW
(Approved by Faculty Vote on X/XX/20XX)**

REVIEW AND REVISION DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES*:
XX/XX/20XX

REVIEW AND REVISION DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*:
XX/XX/20XX

REVIEW AND REVISION DATE FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW*:
XX/XX/20XX

**Timothy Bolton, Department Head
Date signed: XX/XX/20XX**

**Chris Culbertson, Dean
Date signed: XX/XX/20XX**

**Jesse Mendez, Provost and Senior Vice President
Date signed: XX/XX/20XX**

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

PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION, REAPPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Adopted by Physics Faculty: Month XX, 2025
Approved by Provost:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents

REVIEW AND REVISION DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES*: XX/XX/20XX.....	1
<i>PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION, REAPPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE</i>	2
I. INTRODUCTION	3
II. CHARACTERISTICS OF AN EFFECTIVE FACULTY MEMBER.....	3
III. ANNUAL EVALUATION	5
IV. CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION	7
V. PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION OR TENURE	10
VI. MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW.....	13
VII. CRITERIA FOR PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARDS.....	15
VIII. PROCEDURES FOR PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARDS	15
IX. FACULTY QUALIFIED TO VOTE ON THE MATTERS OF PROMOTION/TENURE AND MID- PROBATIONARY REVIEW	16
X. POST-TENURE REVIEW.....	16
XI. MINIMUM PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR ADDRESSING PERFORMANCE DEFICIENCIES	18
XII. PROCEDURES CONCERNING THIS DOCUMENT	22
APPENDIX A: Timetables.....	28
APPENDIX B: College of Arts and Sciences Policy on Unit Evaluation of Teaching.....	29

I. INTRODUCTION

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

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

This document outlines the department's policies, procedures, and criteria for making decisions on these important and complex issues. The timetables for action relevant to this document are presented in Appendix A. The policies, procedures, and criteria included in this document are based on the department's long-standing practices as stated in a short document originally passed by the faculty in 1983, the department's procedures to evaluate the quality of teaching passed by the faculty in 1989, and the K-State University Handbook, which contains the University's policies and procedures, and can be found at:

<https://www.k-state.edu/provost/policies-resources/university-handbook/>

At the time of the 2025 revision of this document, the College and the University are discussing College-wide and University-wide guidelines for workload, teaching evaluation, engagement, and other areas. When these guidelines are finalized, they will be added to this document as appendices by the Department Head. The Department Head will notify the faculty of the addition of any appendix to this document and will convey to the faculty their opinion on whether the addition of any new appendix requires revisions in other parts of the document. If further revisions are required, the Department Head will charge an ad-hoc committee to create these revisions in a timely manner, and new revisions will be voted on by the faculty and submitted to the Dean of the College and the Provost of the University for approval.

II. CHARACTERISTICS OF AN EFFECTIVE FACULTY MEMBER

All faculty are expected to contribute to scholarly activities and service to the professional and University community. Within scholarly activities, we generally distinguish between teaching and research. We note that this distinction is not always easy to make. For example, when a faculty member is developing a new course or a different approach to teaching, they are involved in research on the pedagogy of physics as well as teaching. Likewise, when a faculty member collaborates with a graduate student or postdoctoral associate on research, they are also involved in instructional activities. These types of scholarly activities will always involve a combination of both research and teaching. Taking this difficulty of clearly distinguishing different types of activities into account, we establish approximate guidelines for the allocation of a faculty member's time as 40% teaching and related scholarly activities, 40% research and related scholarly activities, 20% service and engagement.

A. Scholarly Activities: Teaching

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

The introductory courses are taken by a large fraction of the K-State undergraduate population. Because of the large enrollments in these courses and the importance of communicating the content, methods, and excitement of physics to these students, they require a large fraction of our teaching resources. In return, we gain a general population that can better understand and appreciate physics, and when appropriate, better apply it to other endeavors. The advanced undergraduate courses, which we have selected as required for each of the undergraduate degrees, form a set of knowledge that all well-educated physicists must know. The graduate courses form the basis upon which the students will complete their research for a graduate degree and upon which they will rely for the remainder of their professional careers.

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

Faculty should engage in professional development activities intended to improve their teaching abilities. Examples of such activities could be developing new teaching strategies or materials, developing demonstrations, or attending a conference or workshop on teaching physics at the university level. Professional development activities need not occur every year, but faculty members need to establish a continuing effort to improve teaching skills. By the time a tenure-track faculty member applies for promotion/tenure or prepares the package for the mid-tenure or post-tenure review, information about professional development activities should be included. Given that these professional development activities are intended to perfect a faculty member's teaching effectiveness, post-tenured faculty with evidence of consistent excellence in teaching will benefit less from such activities and have less expectation for engagement in professional development.

While most faculty should be able to teach a wide variety of courses and will probably teach at all levels during their career, not all faculty will be able to teach with equally high quality at all levels. In making and accepting teaching assignments, the department's faculty and administration will work to develop and exploit the strengths and preferences of each faculty member. In this way, we can develop and maintain the best possible teaching program.

B. Scholarly Activities: Research

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

- conducting experimental or theoretical studies, or both;
- developing proposals for external (and occasionally university) funding of research;
- administration of research grants;
- training of support staff and students; supervision of support staff and students for research projects and laboratories;

- mentoring of students, research associates, junior faculty, and visitors;
- providing support and consultation to other members of the department; and
- other activities supporting existing research efforts of the department or the University.

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

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

The complex nature of research and the number of different types of items listed above makes it unlikely that every faculty member will contribute equally to all the areas listed. However, each faculty member is expected to show a strong research effort either as an individual or as part of a group of faculty members.

C. Service and Engagement

Members of our faculty are expected to participate effectively in departmental committees and, to a reasonable extent, fulfill service responsibilities within or outside the University. There are a wide variety of ways to meet the expectations of the department in these areas. Some conventional areas of service are listed in sections C5-C6 of the University Handbook. Engagement refers to how one's activities may interact, inform, or otherwise involve the public with the University. Such activities may take many forms and need not occur on a regular basis. Examples of engagement include, but are not limited to, lectures and physics demonstrations for high schools, community Colleges, or other universities, and in other educational settings. Colloquia, seminars, public lectures, and the promotion of one's scholarly activities online for an interdisciplinary audience or to the public are also relevant.

III. ANNUAL EVALUATION

Following University procedures, the Department Head will evaluate each faculty member for their contributions to teaching, research, and service every year.

A. Performance Standards

The performance standards for instructional activities, research, service and engagement follow a numerical scale from 0 to 4. The cumulative merit factor is a weighted sum of the performance levels in each of the three areas of effort. Performance standards are listed as follows: between 0 and up to 1: "Unsatisfactory", between 1 and up to 2: "Needs Improvement", between 2 and up to 3: "Meets Expectations", between 3 up to 4: "Exceed Expectations", and finally, if a faculty member receives the maximal performance score of 4, their performance is graded as "Exceptional".

B. Faculty Member's Responsibility

The faculty member must provide an up-to-date curriculum vitae and a report on activities during the prior calendar year. The report should follow the Template for Annual Report of Faculty Activities, posted by the Department Head and available at:

<https://www.phys.ksu.edu/about/resources/evaluation-tenure-promotion.html>

The guidelines for the annual evaluation for the instructional activities, research, service, and engagement are given below.

1. Instructional Activities

Faculty members are expected to perform high-quality teaching and advising. Such activities include, but are not restricted to, teaching courses as a lead instructor, leading recitations or studios, advising undergraduate students, graduate students, or postdoctoral associates in research activities, and leading workshops for professional skill-development. In addition to instructional activities, faculty are expected to be engaged in professional development activities related to instruction, examples of which could be attending lectures on teaching methodologies, developing new teaching strategies or materials, developing demonstrations, or implementing suggestions for improvement based on TEVALs or a colleague's assessment. Professional development activities need not occur every year, but when they do, they should be listed in the relevant category.

Examples of excellent teaching that merit an "Exceptional" or an "Exceeds Expectations" evaluation could be, but are not limited to, based on consistent excellent TEVAL assessments, overcoming student biases that hinder learning, receiving teaching awards, student accounts from TEVALs or exit interviews, and participation in professional-skills development activities. A "Meets Expectations" evaluation could be obtained by satisfactory performance in teaching assignments with evidence of continued maintenance of effective instruction. A "Needs Improvement" evaluation may be given when expectations are not met. Finally, an "Unsatisfactory" evaluation would be assigned for a consistent lack of effective teaching overall for consecutive years or a year of very poor performance that severely impacted student success.

Faculty members will submit a copy of the syllabus for all courses in which they serve as primary instructor in a given year. The syllabi must demonstrate consistency with the College Of Arts and Sciences teaching values and commitments (<https://artsci.k-state.edu/about/faculty-staff-resources/teaching-values.html>). Collection of data about the students' perceptions of instruction should be completed by using TEVALs, which are available through the K-State Teaching and Learning Center at: <https://www.k-state.edu/tlc/course-evaluation/>.

2. Research Activities

Faculty members are expected to be active scholars in their field. "Exceptional" and "Exceeds Expectation" evaluations could be obtained by some combination of receiving a scientific award or fellowship, publishing in peer-reviewed journals, giving invited talks or seminars, and applying for or receiving a grant. A "Meets Expectations" evaluation could be obtained by continuing to be active in one's field, which includes, but is not restricted to, some combination of publishing in peer-reviewed journals, formulating grant-proposal concepts, contributing conference proceedings, or giving contributed talks at professional meetings, and applying for grant support. "Needs Improvement" would typically be given to someone who maintains some activity in the field, for example, by only publishing non-peer-reviewed results, but otherwise falls below expectations. "Unsatisfactory" evaluations would be given for a lack of evidence of active research in one's field over consecutive years.

3. Service and Engagement

Faculty members are also evaluated on their activities that interact, inform, or otherwise involve the public with the University. It is also intended to summarize one's service work to the community and University. Such activities may take many forms and need not occur annually. "Exceptional" and "Exceeds Expectations" evaluations could include, but are not limited to, leading departmental committees; serving on University or College committees; holding positions of responsibility in professional societies or multi-institutional scientific collaborations; or leading a significant outreach activity such as K-State Open House. A "Good" evaluation could be obtained by meeting the expectation for service work to the community and University, which includes, but is not restricted to, serving on departmental committees. "Needs improvement" and "Unsatisfactory" evaluations may be assigned if there is a consistent lack of evidence of providing service and engagement over consecutive years.

C. Availability of Faculty Portfolios

All documentation should be provided to the Department Head by a time that they will specify and will be consistent with reporting to the Dean on schedule. Each faculty member may review the documentation of their colleagues. In general, this documentation will be placed on the department's website in a password-protected directory so that all faculty may review it. If a faculty member wishes to have any documents treated as confidential and not placed on the secure website, they should inform the Department Head when submitting the materials.

D. Department Head's Responsibility

The Department Head will elicit impressions from every faculty member of the performance of their colleagues, and other aspects of departmental operation, at a time that they will specify and that will be consistent with reporting to the Dean on schedule.

The Department Head will prepare an evaluation of each faculty member. The faculty member will use feedback from other faculty and the portfolio as primary sources for their conclusions. The criteria for judging a faculty member's performance will be the same as those for promotion and tenure and will be appropriate for the faculty member's present rank.

The Department Head will prepare a letter of evaluation for each faculty member, addressed to the Dean, for performance in each of the three areas, along with an *overall* score, following the guidelines on performance standards outlined in Section III.A

Prior to its submission to the Dean, the individual faculty member will be provided with the opportunity to review the evaluation letter and the opportunity to discuss the contents of the letter with the Department Head. In the event of a disagreement between the faculty member and the Department Head concerning the evaluation rating, the faculty member has the right to append their viewpoint to the letter of evaluation. The evaluation letter and evaluation ratings of an individual faculty member shall be strictly confidential.

E. Merit Pay Increases

Merit pay is allocated following policies set by the College and University, which may change from year to year. The Department Head provides the College with a weighted average score from the previous year of teaching, research, and service and engagement for this purpose.

IV. CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION

The University's criteria and procedures for reappointment, tenure, and promotion are given in the

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

A. Reappointment of Tenure Track Faculty

To be reappointed on an annual basis, tenure-track faculty should be making adequate progress toward tenure and promotion as described below. Tenured faculty will vote on the reappointment, and the Department Head will follow the forwarding procedure as described in Section VI.F.

B. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

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

1. Research Activities

a. The candidate for promotion and tenure should have demonstrated that they have the potential to acquire a national reputation in an appropriate sub-field of physics. The judgment of this potential will be made by the tenured faculty with the advice of faculty members in the candidate's sub-field and external referees.

b. The quality of their work in physics should be reflected by their publications. These publications should be, at least, similar in number and quality of other researchers who are or were at a similar state in their careers working in an equivalent sub-field of physics and at an institution of equivalent standing in the physics community. In making these comparisons, the faculty will use its own judgments and seek the advice of external referees.

c. They should have worked constructively to bring outside support to the department through proposals which would provide extramural funding for research. Examples of this effort include the following.

i. If eligible, the candidate should have submitted proposals to federal programs, such as the DOE Early Career Award, NSF/CAREER Award, or ESPCoR First Award, that target the research funding for junior faculty.

ii. If appropriate and eligible, the candidate should have sought funding from applicable K-State programs providing funding for research activities or the development of proposals.

iii. The candidate should have prepared proposals or contributed effectively to collaborative proposals that have been submitted to agencies that support research in the candidate's specialty.

Except for internal K-State proposals, the candidate's proposals should have sought sufficient funding to support adequately their research, including the support of graduate students and post-doctoral research associates.

d. They should have worked effectively with one or more of the following:

other faculty members;

i. students;

- ii. other scientists in a common collaborative research endeavor.

2. Instructional Activities

To be considered for tenure and promotion, the candidate should have demonstrated their ability to teach effectively at **two** of the three levels of instruction. To aid the determination of teaching effectiveness, the candidate should submit approved teacher evaluations for all classes taught each semester, i.e., TEVALs as well as copies of syllabi. The candidate needs to provide a summary of their engagement in professional development related to instruction, examples of which could be attending lectures on teaching methodologies, developing new teaching strategies or materials, developing demonstrations, or implementing suggestions for improvement based on TEVALs or a colleague's feedback. In assessing the candidate's teaching, the department will address the following questions:

- (a) Is the candidate teaching physics that is appropriate for the courses involved?
- (b) Is the candidate teaching in a way that is contributing to high quality instruction in the department?
- (c) Is the candidate an effective advisor to graduate or undergraduate students?
- (d) Is the candidate helpful to other faculty in their teaching efforts?
- (e) Does the candidate seem to be communicating effectively with students?
- (f) Does the candidate engage in professional development activities related to instruction?

3. Service and Engagement

The candidate for promotion and tenure should have served as an effective member of departmental committees. They should demonstrate an ability to serve in other capacities described in Section II.C of this document.

C. Promotion to Professor

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

1. Research Activities

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

2. Instructional Activities

The candidate should have demonstrated the ability to teach effectively at **two** of the three levels of instruction.

3. Service and Engagement

The candidate should have demonstrated a leadership role in service to the department, University, or professional associations. They should also demonstrate a record of activity in other capacities described in Sec. II.C of this document.

V. PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION OR TENURE

The University's criteria and procedures for tenure and promotion are given in the University Handbook. Candidates will normally be considered for tenure during the final year of the maximum probationary period. In exceptional cases, candidates with outstanding records in research, teaching, and service may be considered for tenure at an earlier date. In these exceptional cases, the request for a tenure decision before the final year of the probationary period may be made either by the candidate by submitting a written request to the Department Head by September 15 or by one of the tenured faculty or the Departmental Advisory Committee (DAC), with the concurrence of the candidate, by submitting a written nomination to the Department Head by September 15. One graduate student and seven faculty members, who are chosen by faculty vote, compose the DAC.

In the case of promotions, a written request for consideration of promotion may be made with the candidate's concurrence by a faculty member who is qualified to vote (see Section IX) on the promotion, or by nomination of the DAC, or by the candidate submitting a written request, to the Department Head during the spring semester. The Department Head will inform the faculty of candidates being considered for promotion by the end of the spring semester.

A. Candidate's Responsibilities

The candidate is primarily responsible for assembling and providing documentation that demonstrates their professional accomplishments. However, candidates are encouraged to seek guidance from the Department Head and other faculty members regarding the content, organization, and preparation of the promotion and tenure materials.

The process for promotion/tenure evaluation begins automatically at the beginning of the final year of the probationary period, or when the candidate expresses in writing to the Department Head their intention to seek early promotion/tenure, or the candidate accepts the written nomination for a tenure decision before the final year of the probationary period by at least one of the faculty who are qualified to vote on the matter. The candidate will then prepare the portions of the promotion/tenure documentation that summarize their achievements in research, teaching, and service.

Additional Supporting Documentation. Supporting documentation should include, where applicable, the following:

Scholarly Activities: Research

1. A copy of each manuscript published, accepted, or submitted, of work that has been performed while a K-State faculty member for the relevant period.
2. Copies of all research proposals during the relevant period; reviewers' comments may be included.
3. Lists of invited and contributed presentations at scientific meetings and symposia; research seminars at universities, industries, and government laboratories; and graduate student

recruitment seminars.

4. A list of former and current students and the current status of each of them.
5. A discussion of the candidate's collaborative work with other research groups.
6. National, regional, and local awards or recognition; copies of articles or other materials that cite or discuss the importance of the candidate's work and contributions.

Scholarly Activities: Teaching

1. List of courses taught.
2. Teaching evaluations.
3. The standard evaluations, i.e., TEVALs, were furnished by students who were enrolled in the candidate's courses for the relevant period or for the last three years, whichever is shorter.
4. National, regional, and local awards or recognition.
5. Information about the introduction of new courses or substantive course revision.
6. Evidence of professional development activities related to teaching.
7. Other information that demonstrates the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

Service and Engagement

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

In addition to the documentation above, the faculty member should submit a five-year research and scholarly activities plan. This plan should be consistent with available resources and should include a discussion of the significance of the proposed work and its relationship to the candidate's current work. Lastly, each candidate for promotion and tenure will present a colloquium that describes the results of the candidate's research studies for the relevant period. The candidate should arrange for this colloquium to be scheduled for the month of September. If the candidate has presented a departmental colloquium during the current calendar year, the Department Head, with the concurrence of the DAC may waive the requirement of an additional colloquium.

B. Department's Responsibilities

Upon either receiving a written request for promotion by the candidate, or a written nomination for promotion from a qualified faculty member, or the DAC, the Department Head will obtain the following documents and information:

1. Letters from External Evaluators

The Department Head will request the candidate and the faculty who are qualified to vote on the matter to submit separate lists of potential external evaluators. The candidate's former mentors are specifically excluded as possible evaluators. The Department Head will inform the candidate of the

names of all potential evaluators and provide them with an opportunity to comment on them. The candidate may, for cogently written reasons, request the Department Head to exclude certain individuals as external evaluators. With the advice of the faculty, the Department Head will choose the names of two evaluators from each list to perform the external reviews. If one or more of the initially chosen external evaluators should be unable, or should decline, to review the candidate, then the Department Head should make a reasonable attempt in their selection of alternate external evaluators to keep in balance the number of external evaluators selected from the two lists. The Department Head will write the external evaluators and provide them with (1) a copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae, (2) a copy of the candidate's statement, and (3) a copy of up to five of the candidate's publications (including manuscripts "accepted" and "submitted") resulting from studies conducted as a Kansas State University faculty member. With the referees' concurrence, these documents will be provided in electronic form or by links to webpages. Each external reviewer will be requested to: (1) evaluate the candidate's research work and accomplishments, and (2) compare the candidate with others in the same general area of research who are at a comparable career level. When these letters are added to the candidate's promotion/tenure document, the letters will be accompanied by a copy of the letter that was sent to the evaluator. All solicited letters of evaluation concerning the candidate that are received must be included in the promotion/tenure document.

2. Teaching Documentation

The Department Head will gather additional information by direct contact with students, and with other faculty who have taught with the candidate (if applicable). In speaking with students, the Department Head will collect information on the students' perception of the candidate's:

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

In discussing the candidate with others in the department who may have taught with them, the Department Head will collect information about other faculty members' perceptions of the candidate's:

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

When four or more solicited letters of evaluation have been received, the Department Head will make these materials available for inspection by the qualified faculty by the end of the second full week of October. By the end of the third full week in October, qualified members of the faculty and the Department Head will meet to discuss the case for promotion or tenure of the candidate. The candidate will be represented by an advocate at this meeting. The advocate may be the qualified faculty member who requested consideration of the candidate for promotion/tenure, a member of the DAC, or a qualified faculty member who is appointed by the Department Head.

C. Faculty Vote

Within five business days after the qualified faculty members' discussion of the candidate, each qualified member of the faculty will submit a secret ballot (typically electronic) to the Department Head. The results of the faculty vote and a summary of the written justifications will be transmitted to the candidate and the faculty. The summary, prepared by the Department Head, will be appropriately edited to ensure confidentiality.

D. Report of the Department Head

The Department Head will review the candidate's promotion/tenure documentation, external reviews, the recommendations of the qualified faculty, and the vote of the qualified faculty. The Department Head will then formulate an independent recommendation either supporting or failing to support promotion/tenure of the candidate. The Department Head will forward a written recommendation to the Dean, accompanied by an explanation of their judgment. All recommendations and unedited written comments of the department's eligible tenured faculty members and the candidate's complete file are also forwarded to the Dean. Prior to the submission of the Department Head's recommendation letter to the Dean, the individual candidate will be provided with the opportunity to review the letter and the opportunity to discuss its contents with the Department Head. In the event of a disagreement between the candidate and the Department Head concerning the recommendation, the candidate has the right to append their viewpoint to the recommendation letter.

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

E. Forwarding Procedures

After the candidate has studied the recommendations, the candidate decides whether to withdraw their application. If the candidate wishes to continue the process, then the promotion/tenure document is forwarded to the Dean. In the case of a tenure decision involving the maximum probationary period and the mid-probationary review, the document must be forwarded. The Department Head will include the results of the secret ballot, the summary of the faculty members justifications, including verbatim comments from the ballots, and their written recommendation.

VI. MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW

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

A. Department Head's Responsibilities

At the beginning of the academic year in which the review is to occur, the Department Head will inform the candidate of the review and of their responsibilities concerning the review. The Department Head will interview a representative sample of current and former graduate and undergraduate students, including those in the candidate's research group, to ascertain the quality of the candidate's

teaching. The students' teaching evaluations of the faculty member being evaluated will also be reviewed by the Department Head.

B. Candidate's Responsibilities

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

In addition to the documentation above, the faculty member should submit a three-year research and scholarly activities plan. The research plan should be consistent with available resources and should include a discussion of the significance of the proposed work and its relationship to their current work. Lastly, the candidate will present a departmental colloquium that describes their research studies since joining the department. The candidate should arrange for this colloquium to be scheduled at the beginning of the spring semester by the date established by the Department Head.

C. Faculty Vote

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

D. Report of the Department Head

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

E. Appeal Procedures

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

F. Forwarding Procedures

The recommendations of the tenured faculty and the Department Head supporting or opposing reappointment of the probationary faculty member will be transmitted to the Dean by the last Friday in March. The Department Head will include the results of the secret ballot, the summary of the faculty members' recommendations, including verbatim comments from the ballots, and their written recommendation.

G. Report from the Dean

The candidate's file will be reviewed by the College of Arts & Sciences College Advisory Committee. The Dean will provide an assessment letter to the candidate, the University Handbook, C92.4.

VII. CRITERIA FOR PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARDS

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

A. Time in Rank

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

B. Scholarly Activities: Research

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

C. Scholarly Activities: Teaching

The candidate should have maintained the ability to teach effectively at **two** of the three levels of instruction. The questions to be addressed are described in Section II.B of this document.

D. Service and Professional Activities

The candidate should continue to maintain a leadership role in service to the department, University, or professional associations. They should also demonstrate a record of activity in capacities described in Section. II.C of this document.

VIII. PROCEDURES FOR PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARDS

A. Candidate's Responsibilities

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

B. Department Head's Responsibilities

The Department Head will evaluate the candidate's performance and seek input from other full professors for their evaluation of their performance. The weighting of each of the three categories in Section II will be consistent with the candidate's responsibilities as stated in their annual letter of responsibility. The Department Head will then prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's

materials and make a recommendation for or against the award. The Department Head's recommendation will occur in sufficient time so that the candidate may review and respond to the recommendation as stated in the University Handbook, Sec. C49.6.

After the candidate has had the opportunity to review the recommendation as described in Sec. C below, the Department Head will forward their written recommendation to the candidate and to the Dean along with documentation as described in the University Handbook, Sec. C49.7.

C. Candidates Review of the Recommendation

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

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

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

X. POST-TENURE REVIEW

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

K-State and the department recognize that the granting of tenure for University faculty is a vital protection of free enquiry and open intellectual debate and is vital to the University's ability to recruit and retain high quality scholars and educators. It is expressly recognized that nothing in this policy alters or amends the University's policies regarding the removal of tenured faculty members for cause, which are stipulated in the University Handbook. This policy and any actions taken under it are separate from, and have no bearing on, the chronic low-achievement or annual evaluation policies and processes.

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

A. Guidelines

Post-tenure review is to be conducted for all tenured faculty every five years and will follow the same timeline as the annual evaluation review, as specified in the University Handbook. The five-year post-

tenure review cycle begins in the fifth year following either promotion or the previous post-tenure review. Specifically, the review takes place during the spring semester after five full years of tenured service. The following events will reset the post-tenure review clock:

- Application for promotion to full professor;
- Returning to a faculty position after serving a year or more in an administrative position (for example, Department Head, assistant/associate Dean).

The schedule for post-tenure review could also be delayed for one year to accommodate sabbatical leave, a major health issue, or another compelling reason, provided that both the faculty member and Department Head approve the delay.

If the faculty member has already been identified as not meeting minimum standards according to the policies and department procedures relating to chronic low achievement, that process will be considered to serve in lieu of post-tenure review. Those who have formally announced their retirement through a written letter to the Department Head or have begun phased retirement are exempt from post-tenure review.

B. Materials to be Used for the Review

The primary material to be used for the review of a faculty member will be the six previous annual evaluations that were written by the Department Head. If the faculty member so chooses, the evaluation materials provided by the faculty member during the previous six years may also be included. If one or more annual evaluations were “Needs improvement” or “Unsatisfactory” or if the overall numerical performance evaluation was below 1.5

C. Responsibilities of the Department Head

The Department Head will conduct the post-tenure review. For a faculty member’s post-tenure performance rating to fall below the minimum level of appropriate contribution to the University, they must have received at least two deficient overall evaluations from the Department Head during the five previous years, unless it is determined by the Department Head that notable strengths in research or teaching outweigh the deficiencies. Having received a *deficient* evaluation, the overall annual evaluation of the faculty member during any of the previous five years will have indicated that they are not meeting expectations, i.e., receiving an overall evaluation score below 1.5.

D. Procedures for Addressing Performance Deficiencies

If the Department Head determines that a faculty member’s post-tenure performance (for the previous five years) indicates that they have not appropriately discharged the duties associated with their position, the Department Head will inform the faculty member of this conclusion and will prepare a written report describing the basis for it. The faculty member shall be given a copy of the report. A face-to-face meeting between the faculty member and the Department Head is encouraged. If the determination of the report suggests that a plan for additional professional development should be identified, a face-to-face meeting to discuss options and develop a plan is required. The development plan should be utilized in future annual evaluations and post-tenure review to review progress toward any goals set in the plan.

If the faculty member does not agree with the conclusion of the Department Head’s report, the faculty member-in-question will have seven working days following receipt of the report to prepare a rebuttal that will be submitted to the Department Head. After reviewing the faculty member-in-question’s rebuttal, the Department Head must decide within two working days whether the faculty member-in-question has met the minimum post-tenure performance standard considering the new information given in the rebuttal. If, after reviewing the rebuttal, the Department Head is still of the opinion that

the faculty member-in-question has not met the minimum level of post-tenure performance, the head will submit their report and the faculty member-in-question's rebuttal to the departmental tenured faculty for review and vote on whether a negative post-tenure review be forwarded to the Dean.

During this stage of the review, the Department Head and the faculty member in question must be given the opportunity, but are not required, to address the tenured faculty members. The tenured faculty, acting as a committee of the whole, will consider and discuss the evidence the Department Head has provided and the faculty member in question's written rebuttal, both of whom may be present at the meeting. A faculty member who has been elected by a majority vote will serve as presiding officer for the process. Tenured faculty may ask questions that the Department Head and the faculty member in question may answer if they wish. An anonymous vote of the tenured faculty will then take place. Voting faculty members may write comments in their ballots; these comments will be collected along with the votes by the presiding officer within 24 hours. The opinion indicated by this vote, if divergent from that of the Department Head, is intended to encourage the Department Head to modify their performance assessment of the faculty member in question within 24 hours so that the assessment agrees with the vote. If the Department Head is not persuaded to modify their assessment within 24 hours, then the negative post-tenure evaluation, the result of the faculty vote, and unedited faculty comments from the vote will be forwarded to the Dean. The faculty member has the right to append their viewpoint to the negative evaluation letter. This last decision is not subject to appeal.

XI. MINIMUM PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR ADDRESSING PERFORMANCE DEFICIENCIES

As required and described by Secs. C31.5-C31.8 of the University Handbook, the faculty of the Department of Physics, herein set forth the minimum acceptable level of faculty performance and the procedures that must be completed before the revocation of tenure and dismissal for cause of any tenured faculty member within the department.

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

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

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

A. Minimum Performance Standards

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

1. Research Activities

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

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

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

2. Instructional Activities

Tenured faculty members are expected to:

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

3. Service and Engagement

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

- participation in standing or *ad hoc* departmental committees;
- editing of departmental newsletter;
- organizing workshops or weekly seminars;
- undergraduate advising;
- supervision of support staff;

- departmental administration;
- supervising or participating in the University Open House;
- participating in the department's fund-raising activities; and
- outreach activities, i.e., working with public schools, REU programs, etc.

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

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

Other forms of service may be mutually agreed upon between the faculty member and the Department Head.

A faculty member is in low achievement if they receive the weighted annual rating strictly below 2.0. The low achievement is determined every year. Individuals with low achievement may become a chronic low achiever, which may result in dismissal from employment due to professional incompetence.

B. Procedures for addressing low achievement

Section C31.5 of the University Handbook provides guidelines for appropriate actions to be considered in case a faculty member receives an annual rating strictly below 2.0. This document describes procedures that will be followed internally before the matter is brought to the attention of the College Dean. For a faculty member's *overall* performance rating to fall below the minimum level of acceptable performance, they must be deficient in at least two of the three areas under evaluation, research, teaching, and service, during any one evaluation-period or deficient in one of these three areas for two consecutive evaluation periods, unless it is determined by the Department Head that notable strengths in research or teaching outweigh the deficiencies. Section C31.5 of the University Handbook states that if a faculty member has received two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which minimum standards are not met, then "dismissal for cause" will be considered at the discretion of the appropriate Dean. Hence, negative evaluations are a serious matter. If, in the judgment of the Department Head, a faculty member's overall performance has fallen below the minimum for the past year, then the Department Head's annual evaluation letter should explicitly state this judgment: that the faculty member's *overall* performance has fallen below the minimum level of acceptable performance. The following procedure will be followed if the Department Head makes such an *overall* evaluation.

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

If the Department Head determines that a faculty member fails to meet *overall* minimum standards, the Department Head should take the course of actions described in Sec. 31.7 of the University Handbook to assist the faculty member-in-question towards meeting minimum levels of acceptable performance. Furthermore, the Department Head will provide full written descriptions of the area that is judged not to meet minimum levels of acceptable performance and the level of performance that is necessary to meet minimum levels of acceptable performance. The faculty member must be permitted with the opportunity to respond in writing to the record. Together, the Department Head and faculty member-in-question are to develop a plan of action designed to correct the alleged deficiencies. This plan must include specific expectations that are to be met, and what new resources

will be provided. The goal is to provide a means whereby the faculty member will soon exceed the level(s) of minimum acceptable performance. If the faculty member-in-question and Department Head cannot agree on a plan of corrective action and specific criteria for exceeding minimum levels of acceptable performance, the Department Head and faculty member in question will submit their respective proposals for review by the tenured faculty of the department. The tenured faculty will then work with the faculty member and the Department Head to develop a viable plan.

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

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

A tenured member with low achievement in any two consecutive years or three out of any five years is considered chronic low achievement. If the Department Head's annual evaluation classifies the tenured faculty member as a chronic low achiever, then the following procedure must take place prior to the Department Head submitting this faculty member's annual evaluation to the Dean.

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

The Department Head's report and the faculty member's rebuttal (if provided) will be submitted for review by all tenured faculty. The Department Head and the faculty member in question must be given the opportunity, but are not required, to address the tenured faculty members. The tenured faculty, acting as a committee of the whole (see presiding officer above) will consider and discuss the evidence the Department Head has provided and the faculty member in question's written rebuttal. The tenured faculty may ask questions that the Department Head and the faculty member in question may answer if they wish. An anonymous vote of the tenured faculty, where the faculty will have the opportunity to include written comments, will then take place. A vote of two-thirds or more of all tenured faculty is necessary for the faculty to find that revocation of tenure and dismissal for cause is appropriate. Voting faculty members may write comments on their ballots; these comments will be collected with the votes. The opinion indicated by this vote, if divergent from that of the Department Head, is intended to strongly encourage the Department Head to modify their performance assessment of the faculty-member-in-question so that the assessment agrees with the vote. This level of faculty participation satisfies Sec. 31.6 of the University Handbook, which is

stated above. If the Department Head is not persuaded to modify their assessment, then the negative evaluation, the result of the faculty vote, and *unedited* faculty comments from the vote will be forwarded to the Dean. The faculty member has the right to append their viewpoint to the negative evaluation letter.

The re-initiation of this procedure by the Department Head against the same faculty member can only occur after a period of not less than one year following completion of the previous faculty review and vote. It is expected that during this time the Department Head will have undertaken additional steps to improve the faculty member's performance.

XII. PROCEDURES CONCERNING THIS DOCUMENT

After the final version of this document has been approved by the Physics Faculty, it will become the document that describes faculty evaluation. It will supersede all previous departmental documents on this topic. This document, upon approval, will be posted on the departmental website within two weeks of its approval. When a new tenured or tenure-track faculty member joins the department, they will be given the link to this document by the Department Head during the first week of the semester in which they begin at K-State. Each year, as soon as the specific dates for any of the actions listed in Appendix A are known to the Department Head or the office staff, they will be posted on the department's webpages.

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

APPENDIX A: Timetables

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

A. Promotion and Tenure	
<i>Date to complete action</i>	<i>Action</i>
Before the end of spring semester	The candidate notifies Department Head of intent to apply the following fall either through self-nomination or nomination by another faculty member with candidate concurrence.
By July 1	The Department Head gathers list of prospective referees from candidate and faculty.
By August 1	The Department Head begin solicitation process for referees. Both candidate and Department Head schedule colloquium.
By September 1	Candidate prepares tenure and promotion documentation.
4 weeks before College deadline	The latest date for colloquium.
3 weeks before College deadline	Latest date to post candidate tenure and promotion documentation.
2 weeks before College deadline	Latest date for faculty meeting to consider colloquium.
1 week before College deadline	Latest date for Department Head to discuss faculty recommendation with candidate
The following dates are not controlled by the department. As each of these events occurs, the Department Head will inform the candidate and the faculty of the action.	
	The Dean sends materials and summary sheet for each candidate to the Dean's Council for review.
	Review by Council of Academic Deans.
	The Dean forwards recommendations to the provost.
	The Dean mails a letter which informs the candidates of the decision.

B. Mid-Probationary Review	
<i>Date to complete action</i>	<i>Action</i>
Semester in which the review will occur.	The Department Head informs the candidate of his/her responsibilities.
Fall Semester	The Candidate prepares materials.
By 15 th of January	The Candidate submits materials to the Department Head. Those materials become available for faculty inspection. Department Head and the candidate schedule the

	colloquium.
By 15 th of February	The candidate gives a colloquium.
No later than 2 weeks after the colloquium.	The faculty meets to discuss the candidate. Faculty votes.
No later than 3 weeks after the colloquium.	The Department Head informs the candidate and the faculty of his/her recommendation.
Date established by the Dean	The Department Head forwards the recommendation to the Dean.

C. Annual Evaluation	
<i>Date to complete action</i>	<i>Action</i>
Six weeks before the date established by the Dean	Report of scholarly and professional activities due.
Five weeks before the date established by the Dean	Relevant portions of these materials are placed for faculty inspection.
No later than two weeks Before the date established by the Dean	Faculty members provide peer evaluation and input to the Department Head.
One week before the date established by the Dean	Letters of evaluation are available for faculty review and for discussion with the Department Head.
On the date established by the Dean	The Department Head send the letters of evaluation to the Dean
No later than two weeks after the date established by the Dean	Department Head reports the results of the review to the faculty.

D. Reappointment of non-tenured faculty (A different timetable will be created for the first, second, and the other years.)	
<i>Date to complete action</i>	<i>Action</i>
One month before the date established by the Dean	Candidate provides a CV and other relevant materials which become available for faculty inspection.
No later than 2 weeks before the date established by the Dean	Faculty members meet to discuss the candidate. Faculty votes.
No later than 1 week before the date established by the Dean	The Department Head informs the candidate and the faculty of his/her recommendation.
Date established by the Dean	The Department Head send recommendation to the Dean

APPENDIX B: College of Arts and Sciences Policy on Unit Evaluation of Teaching

We expect that our faculty's teaching will be evaluated with the intention and attention it deserves, reflecting the importance of teaching to our mission and the relative percentage of time assigned to this activity in faculty workloads. To this end, the College of Arts & Sciences establishes the following policy for evaluation of teaching.

This policy applies to unit evaluation of teaching and instruction for promotion and tenure, annual evaluation, reappointment, mid-probationary review, post-tenure review, and related processes. Units are responsible for evaluating faculty teaching, research, and service. This policy provides the framework within which A&S units must work when evaluating teaching. Units are responsible for determining their own discipline-specific policies for evaluating teaching and for incorporating these policies into their department documents.

Unit policies for evaluation of teaching must:

- reflect the [Arts & Sciences Teaching Values and Commitments](#). This may be accomplished by explicitly aligning rubrics with the commitments and any additional criteria aligned with the general A&S values or unit-specific goals. It may instead be accomplished more holistically, as long as it is clear how the holistic evaluation reflects the Values and Commitments.
- require candidates to submit a set of clearly defined teaching-related artifacts, in addition to TEVALs, for all processes that evaluate teaching. Annual processes such as reappointment and evaluation may require subsets of the artifacts required for promotion and tenure. Note: Artifacts for promotion and tenure should be included as an Appendix in Section X in the KSU Promotion & Tenure Template.
- articulate the process for making the overall evaluation of teaching.
- incorporate the evaluation of teaching into the faculty member's overall assessment or evaluation in alignment with the faculty member's workload for the evaluation period. This may be done through either a direct numeric weighting or some other method, with the following exception:
 - In no case where teaching is 20% or greater of a faculty member's workload should an individual receive "meets expectations" (or the equivalent) or above in overall evaluation if they *fail to meet minimum expectations* in teaching.

In addition, unit policies for evaluation of teaching *may*:

- require evidence of student learning as part of any of the above evaluation or review processes. The evaluation of such evidence must recognize that student learning depends on a number of factors beyond the quality of instruction.
- allow additional questions related to the A&S Teaching Values and Commitments to be added to TEVALs to provide supporting evidence from students for the evaluation of teaching.
- include peer observations of teaching.

Units have flexibility in how they evaluate teaching within these guidelines and in accordance with their own specific disciplinary expectations. To support units in their implementation, CTEQ has provided examples of artifacts that units might collect as evidence of Teaching Values and Commitments.