

Educational Leadership

Department

Education

College

Policy Statement Concerning:

Personnel Review and Evaluation Standards/Procedures

- Performance Evaluation Criteria
- Annual Evaluation
- Reappointment Evaluation for:
 - Annual Reappointment Reviews
 - Mid-Tenure Review
- Tenure
- Promotion
- Professorial Performance Award
- Chronic Low Achievement
- Post-Tenure Review
- Non-Tenure Track Faculty Titles

Approved by Faculty Vote on (10/10/17)

NEXT REVIEW DATE: October 2022


Department Head's Signature


1/22/18

Date


Dean's Signature

1/23/18

Date


Provost's Signature

25 Jan 18

Date

POLICY AND PROCEDURES MANUAL

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

**Kansas State University
College of Education**

Revisions approved by EDLEA, EDACE, LEAD Faculties October 10, 2017

Brief Modern History

In 2004, the Department of Educational Administration and Leadership and the Department of Foundations and Adult Education were joined and renamed The Department of Educational Leadership. Selected major policy documents were reviewed and approved in September 2004. The entire Department *Policy and Procedures Manual* was reviewed by all faculty and approved in March 2006. Changes to undergraduate Leadership Studies and Programs reporting structures made in August 2006 were reflected in that printed version. In July 2008, Leadership Studies was removed from the Department and created as a separate School under the Provost's Office, with continued reporting to the College of Education and the Department of Educational Leadership for course and curriculum and tenure and promotion matters. In January 2009, for reasons involving accreditation matters, evaluation policies affecting the Faculties of Adult Education and Educational Leadership were clarified to require evaluation of all teaching personnel, including adjuncts and instructors. In October 2013, the Department *Policy and Procedures Manual* and imbedded evaluation and performance documents were reviewed, revised, and approved as required by the University every five years and again updated in December 2015 to reflect changing faculty demographics having to do with tenure and promotion self-governance and the University's authorization of new professional titles for non-tenure track faculty. This current October 2017 revision contains the mandated five-year review of tenure and promotion standards for the Staley School of Leadership Studies, collapses select sections governing EDLEA and EDACE into joint policies, and also provides a full review and update of the entire *Policy and Procedures Manual* for all EDLEA and EDACE programs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section A</u>	
Introduction	4
Brief Complete History.....	4
Mission.....	4
<u>Section B</u>	
Institutional and Departmental Structure	6
Overview.....	6
University.....	6
College.....	6
Department.....	6
<u>Section C</u>	
Relationships to Other Units	7
<u>Section D</u>	
Department Administrative Structure	8
Overview.....	8
Chair Definition.....	8
Appointment and Term of Department Chair.....	8
Duties of Department Chair.....	8
Evaluation of Department Chair.....	9
<u>Section E</u>	
Faculty Structure	10
Overview.....	10
Appointment and Assignment of Faculty.....	10
Promotions in Rank.....	11
<u>Section F</u>	
Evaluation Structure	12
Overview.....	12
Evaluation Defined.....	12
Evaluation Procedure.....	12
<u>Section G</u>	
Department Budget	13
Overview.....	13
General Reporting.....	13
<u>Section H</u>	
Departmental Programs	14
Overview.....	14
Educational Leadership (EDLEA).....	14
Adult and Continuing Education (EDACE).....	14
School of Leadership Studies (LEAD).....	14
<u>Section I</u>	
Departmental Advising	15
Expectation for Advisement.....	15
Qualification for Advising and Committee Membership.....	15
<u>Section J</u>	
Departmental Graduate-Level Examinations	16
Masters Comprehensive Examination.....	16
Doctoral Preliminary Examination.....	16

<u>Section K</u>	
Departmental Responsibilities	17
Introduction.....	17
Definitions.....	17
Duties.....	17
<u>Section L</u>	
Department Meetings	18
Times.....	18
Conduct.....	18
Records.....	18
<u>Section M</u>	
Policies and Procedures for Revision	19
APPENDIXES	20
Appendix A: Faculty Evaluation Policies	21
Joint Policy of the Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership and the Faculty of Educational Leadership	22
Faculty of Mary Lynn and Warren Staley School of Leadership Studies.	26
Appendix B: Minimum Acceptable Levels of Productivity	31
Joint Policy of the Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership and the Faculty of Educational Leadership	32
Faculty of Mary Lynn and Warren Staley School of Leadership Studies	36
Appendix C: Standards for Tenure and Promotion and Mid-Tenure Review	40
Joint Policy of the Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership and the Faculty of Educational Leadership	41
Faculty of Mary Lynn and Warren Staley School of Leadership Studies.	48
Appendix D: Professorial Performance Award	56
Joint Policy of the Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership and the Faculty of Educational Leadership	57
Faculty of Mary Lynn and Warren Staley School of Leadership Studies.	60
Appendix E: Post-Tenure Review Standards	63
Joint Policy of the Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership and the Faculty of Educational Leadership	64
Faculty of Mary Lynn and Warren Staley School of Leadership Studies.	67
Appendix F: Professional Positions Titles for Non-Tenure Track Faculty	70
Joint Policy of the Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership and the Faculty of Educational Leadership	71
Faculty of Mary Lynn and Warren Staley School of Leadership Studies.	75
Appendix G: ATTACHMENT--Provost Memorandum on School of Leadership Studies Supervision	78

POLICY AND PROCEDURES MANUAL

Department of Educational Leadership

A INTRODUCTION

Brief Complete History

The Department of Educational Leadership¹ has evolved through many iterations over nearly five decades at Kansas State University². Housed in the College of Education³, the Department now joins together academic faculties and programs from several previous departments. In 1987, the Department of Administration and Foundations was collapsed into several small faculties, from among which emerged the Department of Educational Administration (EDADM) and the Department of Foundations and Adult Education (FAE). In 1995, EDADM changed its name to Educational Administration and Leadership (EDADL) and began a new undergraduate interdisciplinary minor under the title Leadership Studies and Programs (EDLST). In 2004, the College merged the Department of Educational Administration and Leadership and the Department of Foundations and Adult Education, renaming it the Department of Educational Leadership (EDLEA). Under this structure, faculties and programs in educational administration, adult and continuing education, and leadership studies and programs were joined across broad similar aims, with each program's faculty retaining autonomy in certain matters such as tenure and promotion, curriculum, and more. In 2008, Leadership Studies and Programs was completely severed from the Department and placed under the Provost's control for purposes of creating a new School of Leadership Studies⁴. In 2009, the School of Leadership Studies was partially returned to the Department for the purpose of supervising the tenure/promotion and curriculum processes of the School. In 2010 the School was renamed as the Staley School of Leadership Studies⁵ in honor of donors who provided a new permanent campus building to house the program. In 2017, the School broadened its scope to include both undergraduate and graduate programming. Also in 2017, degree names in adult and continuing education (AOCNT) were changed to adult learning and leadership (ALRLD), and the Department subsumed the College's graduate certificate in social justice education into the adult learning and leadership curriculum.

Mission

The College of Education houses a variety of undergraduate and graduate academic programs. Central to the definition of a true university are the roles of undergraduate preparation for a wide range of careers, and graduate training for prospective researchers and practitioners within individual disciplines and career options. The College of Education, through the Department of Educational Leadership, now carries out both undergraduate and graduate education for persons aspiring to careers as leaders in a wide variety of settings. These aspirants are served by a full spectrum of degree and/or professional license options. Undergraduate students in the School of Leadership Studies regard the leadership minor as value-added to any contributing academic major in the entire University, and graduate students similarly choose advanced degrees on the same

¹ <http://coe.k-state.edu/edlea/>

² <https://www.k-state.edu>

³ <http://coe.k-state.edu>

⁴ <http://www.k-state.edu/leadership/about/history.html>

⁵ <http://www.k-state.edu/leadership/>

basis.⁶ Graduate students in the adult learning and leadership emphasis⁷ come from a wide variety of career paths including business and industry, private/nonprofit/government sectors, higher education, the military, and more. Graduate students in the educational leadership emphasis⁸ usually seek administrative or staff positions in public or private school systems, colleges or universities, federal/state/tribal governments and agencies, businesses that place emphasis on learning, or in research organizations. As a result, the mission of the Department is a range of leadership education at the masters and doctoral levels.

⁶ <http://www.k-state.edu/leadership/academics/Academic%20Programs.html>

⁷ <http://coe.k-state.edu/adulted/index.html>

⁸ <http://coe.k-state.edu/academics/graduate/educational-leadership/>

B

INSTITUTIONAL AND DEPARTMENTAL STRUCTURE

Overview

The Department of Educational Leadership is governed under rules and organizational structure laid out by the University, the College of Education, and the Department itself. These rules and structures also shape the Department's relationship to other units, particularly within the College of Education.

University

The *University Handbook*⁹ sets out the structure of the University, defining the organizational hierarchy and rules of University operation under the direction of the Kansas Board of Regents, the University's President, the Provost, and other staff assigned to support roles for these persons.

College

The *University Handbook* further identifies the major administrative units of the University as the respective Colleges making up the University. The College of Education is under the direction of the Dean of Education who is charged with operation and development, planning and budgeting, and personnel management and activities of the College.

Department

The *University Handbook* defines the basic administrative unit of the University as the academic department. Each department reports to its respective dean. The Department of Educational Leadership is housed in the College of Education and is responsible to the Dean of Education. Within the umbrella Department itself, the Faculty of Educational Leadership is hereby designated an internally autonomous unit in matters of performance evaluation, tenure and promotion, and academic program control, and the Faculty of Adult Education and Leadership is an internally autonomous unit in all identical matters as well. The Staley School of Leadership Studies is externally designated as an autonomous unit under the Provost's control for matters relating to budget, non-tenure track personnel, and daily operation, while the Department has internally designated it as reporting solely to the Faculty of Educational Leadership for tenure and promotion matters.¹⁰ These Faculties in turn report to the Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership.

⁹ <http://www.k-state.edu/provost/universityhb/>

¹⁰ See Appendix G, *Provost Memorandum* dated February 12, 2009.

C

RELATIONSHIPS TO OTHER UNITS

Colleges and departments are subject to University-wide rules and regulations. In addition, departments offering graduate instruction and advanced degrees are subject to rules and regulations of the Graduate School¹¹, which stands apart from other units in the University. The Department of Educational Leadership is thus significantly affected by Graduate School rules and regulations pertaining to eligibility for graduate faculty membership and doctoral certification to direct dissertations as enacted by the Graduate Council and administered by the Graduate Dean apart from individual Colleges. The impact of all these rules and regulations is wide-ranging, affecting how faculty are permitted to teach, direct research, and award degrees. Effectively, the Department of Educational Leadership is subject to two dual reporting and administrative governance channels.

Other relationships with separate academic units within the College of Education also exist through cases of collaboration, cross-disciplinary coursework, participation in College and University committees, and representation on the College of Education's Administrative Council.

¹¹ <http://www.k-state.edu/grad/>

D

DEPARTMENT

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

Overview

The Department of Educational Leadership is organized as a single free-standing unit within the College of Education under the leadership of the Department Chair in concert with full Faculty participation.

Department Chair Definition

As intended by the Department of Educational Leadership, the position of Department Chair is one of collegial leadership among peers and faculty liaison to the Dean of Education, wherein the Chair is regarded as a faculty member with administrative responsibilities and who is answerable to the Department Faculties as a whole. This stands in contrast to the traditional definition of a department head, who is usually regarded as a true administrator within a college. The distinction and adoption of chairship is deliberate and based on principles of collegiality within the Department.

Appointment and Term of Department Chair

Chairs shall serve for a five-year period. Chairs shall be eligible for coterminous terms without limit. The Chair shall be recommended in an open meeting of the Department or by other manner as approved by the Dean of Education. Any faculty member whose appointment is in the Department of Educational Leadership shall be eligible to serve. The Chair serves at the pleasure of the Dean who by policy may opt for an internal or external search as vacancies arise.

Duties of Department Chair

The Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership shall take primary leadership for the following:

- Effectively communicating the Department's expectations to the Dean and other administrators;
- Making effective administrative decisions in implementing the Department's expectations;
- Providing opportunities for Department input in decisionmaking;
- Taking a primary leadership role in planning and actualizing Department goals and objectives, while encouraging individual and collective faculty initiative designed to move the Department forward;
- Keeping the Faculties informed of important extra-departmental events affecting the nature, scope, and direction of goals and objectives;
- Responding promptly and effectively to faculty concerns by providing proper follow-up and confidentiality;
- Establishing a responsible fiscal plan and securing faculty agreement on budgetary principles and expenditures;
- Providing administrative and support services that reflect competence, promptness and accuracy in an environment that promotes a professional image for the Department;
- Securing and sustaining high levels of faculty confidence regarding Chair performance on the traits of trustworthiness, flexibility, fairness, decisiveness, thoughtfulness, organizational effectiveness, and democratic decisionmaking.

Evaluation of Department Chair

College procedure mandates that Chairs report directly to the Dean of Education. By custom and policy, the Dean evaluates Chairs at least every three years and historically has elected to do so annually. The concept of chairship, however, strongly implies accountability to the Faculties. Chairs in the Department of Educational Leadership therefore should expect to be multiply evaluated.

The Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership shall be evaluated annually by members of the Department: i.e., the Chair shall offer his/her merit materials for faculty review as part of the merit evaluation cycle conducted within the Department, except that the Chair shall not be included in the merit ranking data forwarded to the Dean. The purpose of excluding the Chair is to avoid drawing down available merit pool monies since the Dean separately evaluates Chairs for merit purposes. While faculty are not required to offer formal comments on Chair performance, they are encouraged to do so and may submit their comments directly to the Chair or to the Dean. Evaluation by peers within the Department shall include assessment of all areas applicable to all other similarly situated faculty (i.e., teaching, research, service) and shall additionally include comments regarding administrative performance by the Chair on the duties of that office.

E

FACULTY STRUCTURE

Overview

The Department of Educational Leadership recognizes that faculty are the essential element of a university, a college, and successful academic programs and services. Faculty are distinguished by their professional expertise and, in the case of the Department of Educational Leadership, by their participation in international, national, state and local teaching, research, and/or service contributions. As a result, the Department stands on record as supporting a strong cohesive, yet independent, faculty structure that enhances the mission of the University, the College, and the disciplines represented by individual faculty and the collective named Faculties.

Appointment and Assignment of Faculty

Appointment of faculty to the Department of Educational Leadership shall follow University and College requirements for standards and procedures. The Department of Educational Leadership, however, strongly asserts the appropriateness of position searches lodged at the Department-level and further independently within each academic program area (EDLEA, EDACE, LEAD). The Department further accepts responsibility to assign faculty in keeping with Department needs after consultation with the Dean.

Reappointment of tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty on regular appointments deserves serious attention in a university environment. In the Department of Educational Leadership, the Faculty in each separate and autonomous program area asserts the right to play a primary role in such decisions. In each such case, each tenured faculty member in the relevant program of the Department, constrained by other University and College requirements, shall have an annual opportunity and responsibility to make recommendations concerning reemployment of each nontenured faculty member in that academic program. Guiding, but not limiting, such reappointment decision shall be the tenure and promotion standards adopted by each eligible program Faculty (see Appendix C) or other applicable formally adopted standards. If the Chair is willing to support the majority Faculty recommendation concerning the nontenured faculty member, then the Chair shall convey that recommendation to the Dean with justification. If the Chair cannot support the majority recommendation, then the Chair shall so inform the tenured Faculty, who shall have the right to select a person from faculty ranks to convey and explain the majority opinion to the Dean.

Reappointment of tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty on regular appointments shall further conform to all University and College requirements relating to reappointment procedures, including mid-tenure review, if applicable, and shall occur in conformity with dates prescribed annually by the University. The Department of Educational Leadership affirms its commitment to the spirit of mid-tenure review, which was established for the purpose of providing specific feedback on faculty progress toward satisfactory attainment of tenure status in conformity with tenure and promotion standards as adopted by each eligible program Faculty (see mid-tenure process section also located in Appendix C). As presently structured, mid-tenure review requires all tenure track faculty in the third year of service to submit the collection of materials and other documentation on University-prescribed forms to the Chair of the Department. The purpose of such submission shall be to permit the Chair, the tenured voting Faculty in the Department, the Tenure and Promotion Committee of the College, and the Dean to examine all items submitted as if the faculty member were being evaluated for tenure, except that the mid-tenure process shall end with the Dean's review. Upon completion of the mid-tenure review, the Chair and the Dean shall inform the faculty member(s) under review of the results, including specific advice to the faculty member on expected improvements.

Occasionally persons may be appointed to adjunct positions in the Department of Educational Leadership. It is the policy of the Department that adjuncts may only be used after: (a) consultation and agreement among the affected Faculty regarding the appropriateness of adjunct assignment; (b) assurance that no other qualified regular faculty members are available to fulfill the same role; and (c) the program will be well served through the adjunct's work. At the graduate level, under no circumstance may an adjunct serve as a major professor for either masters or doctoral committees, although in specific cases adjuncts may provide a useful service to the Department by serving on masters and/or doctoral committees as appropriate and as permitted under Graduate School rules and regulations. Adjunct faculty are further subject to performance evaluation as prescribed later in this *Policy and Procedures Manual*.

Promotions in Rank

Regularly appointed ranked faculty may be considered for promotion, either by advocacy or by personal request (see Appendix C). The Chair shall determine eligibility for such request by consulting the *University Handbook*. If the person is eligible, the Chair shall elicit recommendations from the eligible voting Faculty holding equal or higher rank than the requested new rank, except that only equal rank shall qualify individuals to vote in the case of promotion to the rank of full professor. For promotion to Associate or Full Professor, eligible voting Faculty are defined as those tenured faculty whose primary appointment resides in the academic program wherein such promotion would occur if the applicant's request were to be granted. For promotion within any of the term or regularly appointed non-tenure track professional positions, eligible voting Faculty are defined as tenured and tenure-track faculty of the Department. Recommendations from eligible voting Faculty shall conform to ballot requirements. If the Chair is willing to support the majority Faculty recommendation regarding promotion, then the Chair shall convey that recommendation to the appropriate levels required by tenure and promotion procedures. If the Chair cannot support the majority recommendation, then the Chair shall so inform the Dean of voting results and shall further so inform the voting Faculty, who shall have the right to select a person from Faculty ranks to convey and explain the majority opinion to the Dean.

The history of the Department of Educational Leadership favoring autonomous Faculties in EDLEA, EDACE, and LEAD has long worked to the benefit of all programs and groups. All three Faculties, recognizing a desire to continue such autonomy in perpetuity, also recognize that foreseeable and unforeseeable events may at times render impractical the conduct of complete self-direction. This reality arises most predictably when retirements or resignations reduce mid-level and senior voting ranks to such levels within a single program area so as to cause too few eligible voting faculty to defensibly conduct business as described throughout this *Policy and Procedures Manual*. Therefore, if and only when such voting rights imbalance occurs, it is the policy of the Department to combine EDLEA, EDACE, and LEAD voting Faculties in order to obtain a reasonable number of eligible votes in matters of curriculum conduct and/or especially in matters of carrying out promotion and tenure responsibilities. By definition, therefore, whenever there are fewer than three eligible members of a given Faculty (i.e., EDLEA, EDACE, or LEAD) entitled to vote on any tenure and/or promotion or course and curriculum matter, the other Faculties shall be asked to vote. Once a program's faculty numbers and ranks are restored, however, each Faculty shall return to its autonomous state.

F

EVALUATION STRUCTURE

Overview

The Department of Educational Leadership accepts and validates the concept of accountability and performance evaluation. Each respective Faculty (EDACE, EDLEA, LEAD) shall be required to adopt a formal evaluation policy (see Appendix A).

Evaluation Defined

Evaluation is defined in the Department of Educational Leadership as comprising a set of activities engaged in by the Department leading to assessment of the performance of individual faculty against the goals and objectives set out for each individual within the categories of teaching, research, and service as appropriate to the Department's various program emphases.

Evaluation Procedure

The set of activities resulting in the act of evaluation within each program area is elaborated in Appendix A. For general policy explanation purposes, evaluation procedures in the Department of Educational Leadership are as follows:

- All faculty in the Department shall be evaluated annually for merit purposes.
- The evaluation period shall cover the timeframe of January through December.
- Performance contracts shall be constructed for each faculty member.
- Evaluation shall encompass only those goals and objectives drawn for each individual faculty member and included in the written performance contract.
- Evaluation shall strictly follow the timelines for performance contracts and other dates as set out in the evaluation policy in Appendix A.
- In addition to the foregoing, all other persons having teaching or student-supervisory responsibility in the Department through special arrangement such as adjunct or other status (.e.g., mentors, field-based practicum supervisors), shall be subject to formal evaluation. Such evaluation, however, shall be only on teaching /supervisory performance and shall be carried out only in those semesters when the adjunct/ supervisor is actively assigned to a teaching role.
- The procedure outlined here applies in its entirety to EDLEA and EDACE. It applies to LEAD only as it affects tenure-track or tenured appointments in the Staley School of Leadership Studies.

G

DEPARTMENT BUDGET

Overview

The Department of Educational Leadership accepts the responsibility and privilege of Faculty self-determination regarding use of available resources. The Department Chair shall be charged with wise and resourceful administration of Department budget matters. Faculty may expect to be provided with equal access to the Department's resources within the limitations of program priorities, benefit, and resource constraints.

General Reporting

The Chair shall make the budget open to all faculty members of the Department.

H

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRAMS

Overview

The Department of Educational Leadership offers a variety of programs and curricular emphases under a broad leadership umbrella.

Educational Leadership (EDLEA)

The Department offers a full program of educational leadership graduate studies culminating in the M.S. and Ed.D degrees. The programmatic focus is on developing leaders in educational settings, with emphasis on P-12 public schools. For most graduates, program focus leads to professional building or district leadership licensure as a school principal or superintendent. The Department cooperates with other parts of the College to license other school professionals such as special education directors. Program materials identify degree and/or license requirements.^{12,13,14}

Adult Learning and Leadership (EDACE)

The Department offers a full program of graduate studies in adult learning and leadership, culminating in the M.S. and Ed.D., and Ph.D degrees. Program materials identify degree requirements.¹⁵

Staley School of Leadership Studies (LEAD)

See earlier description of the relationship of the Department of Educational Leadership to the evolving Staley School of Leadership Studies. Program materials identify degree requirements.¹⁶

¹² <http://coe.k-state.edu/academics/graduate/educational-leadership/>
¹³ <http://coe.k-state.edu/academics/endorse/building-leader.html>
¹⁴ <http://coe.k-state.edu/academics/endorse/district-leader.html>
¹⁵ <http://coe.k-state.edu/adulted/index.html>
¹⁶ <http://www.k-state.edu/leadership/academics/Academic%20Programs.html>

I

DEPARTMENTAL ADVISING

Expectation for Advisement

High quality academic advising is essential to ensuring that students achieve their degree and/or professional license objectives in a timely and efficient manner. All faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership are thus expected to provide responsive, high-quality advisement. Faculty shall be evaluated in meaningful part on their advising to students at all degree levels.

Qualification for Advising and Graduate Committee Membership

All faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership shall be assigned advising duties appropriate to their program employment. All permanent faculty attached to graduate programs in the Department shall be further certified by the Graduate School to serve on masters and doctoral committees. Additionally, such faculty as appropriate shall be certified to direct doctoral dissertations.

Each program, in consultation with the Department Chair, shall determine an efficient, effective, and equitable method of distributing advisement among all Faculties.

J

DEPARTMENTAL GRADUATE-LEVEL EXAMINATIONS

The Department of Educational Leadership has a responsibility under rules of the Graduate School to administer final examinations to both masters and doctoral degree candidates.

Masters Comprehensive Examination

Masters examinations shall be made available to qualified students each semester at a regularly scheduled time. Care should be taken to plan ahead so that students request examinations in semesters when their supervisory committee members are contractually employed.

Construction and supervision of masters exams are the responsibility of the Faculty in each respective academic program. These tasks may not be delegated except for normal clerical assistance in typing, mailing, and so forth.

The nature of masters examinations will vary over time. Each program area will consider and establish the structure of examinations on a regularly scheduled basis. Examinations may be oral, written, or portfolio-based at the discretion of each graduate program's Faculty.

Students passing masters comprehensive examinations will be notified in writing by the Graduate School. Students failing to secure a pass vote will also be notified in writing.

For accreditation and assessment purposes, an electronic system for collecting and reporting results of all comprehensive examinations shall be created, with results maintained on file in the Department Office and held until there is no further need to maintain such data.

Doctoral Preliminary Examinations

Doctoral preliminary examinations shall be made available to qualified students each semester at a regularly scheduled time. Care should be taken to plan ahead so that students request examinations in semesters when their supervisory committee members are contractually employed.

Construction and supervision of doctoral preliminary exams are the responsibility of the Faculty in each respective program. These tasks may not be delegated except for clerical assistance in typing, mailing, and so forth.

The nature of doctoral examinations will vary over time within the constraints of Graduate School regulations. The scope of permissible preliminary examinations is wide and may follow the historic method of individual questions prepared by the supervisory committee; may take the form of a portfolio produced under the supervision of the major professor and/or doctoral committee; or may take the form of a successful dissertation proposal defense in lieu of any other written or oral examination. In effect, the nature of the preliminary examination is determined by the supervisory committee.

Students passing doctoral examinations will be notified in writing by the Graduate School. Students failing to secure a pass vote will also be notified in writing.

For accreditation and assessment purposes, an electronic system for collecting and reporting results of all preliminary examinations shall be created, with results maintained in the Department Office until there is no further need to maintain such data.

K

DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Introduction

In addition to the duties assigned to the Department Chair in the Department *Policy and Procedures Manual*, other duties and responsibilities for maintenance and operation of the Department may be apportioned out to individual faculty members within each academic program area, who will report regularly to each relevant Faculty. Maintenance tasks for the Department and College will be shared responsibilities of each Department member. Matters of committee assignment, Departmental projects, and initiation of new projects will be brought to the relevant Faculties for information purposes.

Definitions

For definition purposes, maintenance and operation of the Department have been classified as follows: (a) budget/resource allocation, (b) graduate studies, (c) external relations, (d) internal relations, (e) evaluation, (f) curriculum, (g) licensure, (h) clerical/aide supervision, (i) research, and (j) internship/field experiences. The Department Chair shall accept general oversight and leadership for all these areas and shall be responsible for coordinating all other work assignments in cooperation with the Faculties as a whole.

Duties

Department members have an obligation to equitably share all responsibilities reasonably associated with the Department. This includes, but is not limited to, membership on committees formed at the College and University levels. The Faculty across all programs shall be sensitive to equitable distribution for service on standing College committees to include Executive Committee, Student Affairs Committee, Faculty Affairs Committee, Academic Affairs Committee, Diversity for Community Committee, Technology Committee, and Tenure and Promotion Committee. Effort shall be made to avoid long-term service by any faculty member on any one College committee. The same spirit shall be observed in other College and University committee and service appointments as may arise on an irregular or special basis.

L

DEPARTMENT MEETINGS

Times

The widely diverse mission of the Department of Educational Leadership and its resulting umbrella academic program structure necessitates numerous meetings centered on the unique work of the various parts of the Department. The Chair shall call meetings, prepare agendas and materials, and conduct meetings with the various Faculties as needed, or may assign responsibility for scheduling and conducting such meetings. Each separate program's Faculty shall have the responsibility to meet regularly around its respective business and shall keep the Department Chair fully informed and engaged.

Conduct

Each Faculty member is responsible for advance preparation and positive contribution to the meeting. Meetings are to allow for open exchange of ideas. In order to foster a professional atmosphere, no personal attacks or devaluing of members will be allowed and will be countered with verbal disapproval by other members.

Records

Minutes of each meeting will be written, distributed, and kept on file. The recorder for each meeting will assume responsibility to forward minutes to all members, the Department administrative assistant for file copy, and the Associate Dean's Office.

M

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR REVISION

The Department of Educational Leadership recognizes and accepts that other policy needs will arise over time that may not be included in this Department *Policy and Procedures Manual*. The Department recognizes that each program area has the need to create, amend, or delete its own unique policies relating to its particular programs and further recognizes that some policies and procedures are needed that apply uniformly across all programs. Nothing in this *Policy and Procedures Manual* shall be intended to create, preserve, or deny any other rights or privileges in law or University policy, and it is specifically acknowledged that any policy of the College or University shall supersede and nullify any contrary Department policy.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A: Faculty Evaluation Policies

- Joint Policy of the Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership and the Faculty of Educational Leadership
- Faculty of the Staley School of Leadership Studies

Appendix B: Minimum Performance Standards

- Joint Policy of the Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership and the Faculty of Educational Leadership
- Faculty of the Staley School of Leadership Studies

Appendix C: Tenure and Promotion Standards

- Joint Policy of the Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership and the Faculty of Educational Leadership
- Faculty of the Staley School of Leadership Studies

Appendix D: Professorial Performance Award Minimum Standards

- Joint Policy of the Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership and the Faculty of Educational Leadership
- Faculty of the Staley School of Leadership Studies

Appendix E: Post-Tenure Review Standards

- Joint Policy of the Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership and the Faculty of Educational Leadership
- Faculty of the Staley School of Leadership Studies

Appendix F: Professional Positions Titles for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

- Joint Policy of the Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership and the Faculty of Educational Leadership
- Faculty of the Staley School of Leadership Studies

Appendix G: Provost Memorandum on School of Leadership Studies Supervision

APPENDIX A

Faculty Evaluation Policies

Faculty Evaluation Policy

**Joint Policy of the
Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership
and
Faculty of Educational Leadership**

ANNUAL EVALUATION FOR MERIT REVIEW AND PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT

Department of Educational Leadership

FACULTIES OF ADULT LEARNING AND LEADERSHIP and EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Jointly approved October 2017

Following University procedures, the Department Chair will annually evaluate each Faculty member for his/her contributions. The Chair's evaluation will be based on: (a) the performance categories and corresponding relative weights jointly established each year by the individual Faculty member and the Chair as expressed in the written Load Assignment; (b) each Faculty member's merit portfolio presentation; and (c) the Chair's own assessment of the Faculty member's professional productivity relative to College and Department missions.

A. AREAS OF EVALUATION

Four areas of Faculty performance are identified for annual review, although not all Faculty members will automatically have equal or constant responsibilities for each area in each year. Allocation and distribution of responsibilities, and hence weighted effect, are determined jointly by the Chair and the individual Faculty member within the limits prescribed here, to total 100% time assignment:

- Teaching 20% - 60%
- Student Advising 10% - 30%
- Scholarship 10% - 40%
- Service 10% - 60%

B. EVALUATION CALENDAR AND PROCESSES

It is understood that precise specification of performance outcomes is neither feasible nor constructive. Faculty evaluation is not served by rote checking off of goal attainment or tallying of points; such reductionism misdirects the spirit and purpose of performance evaluation. Rather, evaluation requires expert judgment about professional contributions and perceptive encouragement to exceed performance targets. Nonetheless, it is appropriate to establish each Faculty member's responsibilities and to judge individuals' relative achievement in the prescribed areas of evaluation in order to better serve Department and College core missions of teaching, scholarship, and service and to strategically capitalize upon individual and collective Faculty strengths.

Evaluation in the Department of Educational Leadership will occur following the calendar of events and deadlines published annually by the College of Education, to include the following: (a) the Faculty member prepares his/her annual merit evaluation portfolio, generally due mid-January of each year, with the portfolio structured to self-identify and self-explain performance on the four categories of teaching, advising, scholarship and service in proportion to the current year's Load Assignment; (b) the Chair reviews the portfolio and provides a written merit letter to the Faculty member, generally delivered by mid-February; (c) the Chair attaches to the merit letter a proposed Load Assignment for the new year and provides the Faculty member with opportunity to discuss and amend by mutual agreement, generally within two weeks following issuance of the merit letter date; (d) the Chair meets all other college deadlines established by the Dean's office.

C. CRITERIA/REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Acceptable sources of information satisfying portfolio requirements are described in the following paragraphs. Faculty are expected to provide a portfolio containing the self-reports and evaluation information embedded within these criteria.

- **Teaching and Advising**

The University requires that an adequate system of summative evaluation of teaching must include at least two kinds of information: classroom effectiveness, and student assessment practices. To demonstrate classroom effectiveness, each Faculty member should provide a summary report of teaching activities inside and outside of the classroom, to include both formal instruction and advising. The Faculty member should report, in executive summary form, data regarding instructional work during the evaluation period: examples of such data may include revision or reorganization of course content, development of new courses, efforts to introduce innovations into the curriculum or into a specific course, and advising activities. To demonstrate student assessment practices, each Faculty member should provide a collection of formal data about student perceptions of instructional quality for each regularly scheduled course taught. Formal data on courses taught should be gathered via the University's TEVAL or IDEA standardized evaluation systems. Anecdotal observations gathered via open-ended questions on either TEVAL or IDEA may supplement standardized ratings. Faculty should include copies of official instruments and system-generated reports along with all student comments. Independent study courses and advising credits are excluded from the requirement to collect anonymous evaluation data.

- **Scholarship**

The University expects all faculty, and particularly so at the graduate level, to systematically engage in scholarly productivity. Scholarship includes a broad range of definition, including but not limited to publications in refereed journals. Clearest examples of scholarly works include authored or co-authored books, reviews, monographs, grant proposals, articles in peer reviewed journals, products of impactful field work, and so forth. Works that advance the teaching, development, research, and service missions of the University, that have the likelihood to be disseminated widely to relevant publics, and that are available for peer review also qualify as scholarship. To demonstrate scholarly productivity, the Faculty member's annual merit portfolio should provide, in executive summary form, a bibliography of scholarly works completed during the past year. This can include evidence of publications as well as oral presentations at conferences or other recognized professional gatherings. Other appropriate artifacts could include published reviews of articles or grant proposals submitted, awards and recognitions for scholarship, reviews of books included in professional journals, and so forth.

- **Service**

The University expects all faculty to engage the field and to provide support to external and internal constituencies. Almost all Faculty members have directed service responsibilities which sometimes constitute a significant part of their Load Assignments. These can include specific assignments made by the Department or College, activities through funded grants, or major offices held in national associations. Non-directed service can include activities that contribute to the University community, the profession, or to the public. Faculty members will vary in terms of the focus of their contributions, but in all cases significant roles are expected. To demonstrate service productivity, the Faculty member's merit portfolio should provide, in executive summary form, a record of all service completed during the evaluation year. Appropriate artifacts may include any evidence documenting the Faculty member's work by external or internal peers such as awards for service to an organization, letters documenting the contributions made through service, and so forth.

OVERALL CHAIR EVALUATION RESPONSIBILITIES

Based on the materials supplied by each Faculty member, the Chair will evaluate performance on the individual areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, along with determining an overall performance rating. For each area of evaluation, the Chair will rate the Faculty member in terms of four rankings: Exceeds Standards, Meets Standards, Fails to Meet Standards but Meets Minimum Standards, or Fails to Meet Standards. These rankings are required by the University and are derived from the institutionally

required *Minimum Acceptable Levels of Productivity Standards* also contained in this *Policy and Procedures Manual* (see Appendix B). The Chair is then institutionally required to link annual performance ratings and any associated annual salary increases by tying the percentage of time shown in the Load Assignment to each performance category (i.e., weighted categories). These results provide the primary contents of the Chair's letter of merit evaluation for each Faculty member. As indicated previously, the individual Faculty member will be provided opportunity to review the evaluation letter prior to submission to the Dean and to acknowledge receipt via signature. In the event of a disagreement between the Faculty member and the Chair concerning the evaluation rating, the Faculty member will have the right to append his/her viewpoint to the Chair's evaluation letter.

For more information on evaluation, refer to the *University Handbook* Appendix Q.¹⁷

¹⁷ *University Handbook* Appendix Q <http://www.k-state.edu/provost/universityhb/fhxq.html>

Faculty Evaluation Policy

Faculty of the Staley School of Leadership Studies

TENURED/TENURE-TRACK FACULTY EVALUATION POLICY

Mary Lynn and Warren Staley School of Leadership Studies

**First adopted by the Staley School of Leadership Studies May 14, 2009
Approved by the Faculty of Educational Administration May 18, 2009
Jointly approved EDLEA/EDACE/LEAD October 2017**

The Mary Lynn and Warren Staley School of Leadership Studies (SSLS) at Kansas State University recognizes and supports the purpose and goals of evaluating the performance of tenured and/or tenure-track faculty. SSLS further supports the goals and processes identified in memorandum by the Provost dated 2/12/09 (attached) indicating that all SSLS tenure-track and tenured faculty positions are to be reviewed for tenure/promotion purposes through the Department of Educational Leadership in the College of Education until such time that the university agrees that tenure/promotion responsibilities should be permanently transferred to SSLS.

The faculty in SSLS therefore delineate below an annual evaluation policy based on *Scholarship, Teaching, and Service*. These categories can be understood as distinct, and also integrated, as demonstrated through forms of community-engaged scholarship. The evaluation process calls for SSLS tenured and/or tenure-track faculty to annually engage in peer review at the first level; followed by joint review by the Director of the Staley School of Leadership Studies and the Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership at the second level; and (in the case of annual reappointment of tenure-track faculty) by the Faculty of Educational Leadership at the third level. All subsequent evaluation activities shall continue thereafter to follow College of Education procedures, including mid-tenure review and ultimately tenure and/or promotion recommendations.

Other Evaluation Circumstances

The evaluation policy that follows is designed and intended in letter and spirit for application to 'regular' full-time tenure-track faculty. However, the School is additionally comprised of other full-time term faculty and professional staff wherein the standard teaching/scholarship/service triad is not applicable. Consequently, persons holding non-tenure track positions will be evaluated by a similarly structured, but separate policy that addresses the diversity of service, scope, and appointment in the Staley School of Leadership Studies.

SSLS therefore states its tenured and/or tenure-track evaluation policy as follows:

GENERAL ELEMENTS

- (1) Faculty in the Staley School of Leadership Studies will engage in peer review on an annual basis according to time-lines set forth by the University, Staley School of Leadership Studies, College of Education, and Department of Educational Leadership. As adopted in this School, peer evaluation will encompass the period January through December.
- (2) Faculty in the Staley School of Leadership Studies will base all peer review on performance contracts prepared in advance of the evaluation period. A performance contract is defined as an agreement between relevant parties outlining the goals and objectives that the evaluatee intends to accomplish during the evaluation period. Performance contracts will be individualized for each faculty member, showing the percentage of time assigned to the areas of *scholarship, teaching, and service* and showing the expected performance outcomes of work in each area. Such contracts shall be collaboratively established between the tenured/tenure-track faculty as a whole and the individual, and the individual and the Director and Department Chair, to comprise 100% of each person's time. However, the final decision on assignment of each individual's time shall be made by the Director after taking into consideration the recommendation of the tenured/tenure-track faculty and any justified circumstances, including but not limited to, unusual financial condition.

- (3) Tenured/tenure-track faculty in the Staley School of Leadership Studies will review and pass judgment on faculty productivity in the area of *scholarship* as defined by evidence submitted by each faculty member on publications and/or other scholarly activities as specified in the individual's performance contract. Those activities include, but are not limited to, published media, textbooks, refereed scholarly artifacts associated with forms of community-engaged scholarship, refereed journal articles, grants, book chapters, and so forth. Actual materials to be submitted shall be identified in individual performance contracts.
- (4) Tenured/tenure-track faculty in the Staley School of Leadership Studies will review and pass judgment on faculty productivity in the area of *Teaching* as defined by evidence submitted by each faculty member, including evaluations for classes taught (e.g., TEVAL, IDEA or other forms) and data on advisement responsibilities as specified in the individual's performance contract. Those activities include, but are not limited to, submission of syllabi in which expected course and student learning outcomes are stated along with evidence of how courses/expectations are aligned with the School's mission and goal statements; evidence that courses taught conform to the School's Learning Outcomes; evidence of new coursework established and/or curriculum improvement activities; systematic review of teaching process and pedagogy from peers and students, and so forth. Actual materials to be submitted shall be identified in individual performance contracts.
- (5) Tenured/tenure-track faculty in the Staley School of Leadership Studies will review and pass judgment on faculty productivity in the area of *Service* as defined by evidence submitted by each faculty member on service to the Staley School of Leadership Studies, service to Kansas State University, and service to local, state, national and international constituencies as specified in the individual's performance contract. Actual materials to be submitted shall be identified in individual performance contracts.

PROCEDURES

- (1) In keeping with University, School of Leadership Studies, College of Education, and Department of Educational Leadership timelines, each tenured/tenure-track faculty member shall submit for peer review executive summaries (with availability of full collections of materials) addressing the areas of Scholarship, Teaching, and Service.
- (2) Material collections in the area of Scholarship shall include all such refereed and practitioner publications as the evaluatee shall choose to submit and may include nonprint publications. The evaluatee shall also have the option to include publicly engaged scholarship. Grant activity shall fall under the nonprint publications category. Peer reviewed presentations and poster sessions at professional conferences and meetings may also be counted in the area of scholarship. Actual materials to be submitted shall be identified in individual performance contracts. The evaluatee shall submit an accompanying narrative description of the relationship between any documentation supplied and his/her performance contract.
- (3) Faculty will be expected to have demonstrated teaching effectiveness by producing scholarship on teaching/learning and participating in reviews of teaching that includes faculty, staff, and student representatives. Material collections in the area of Teaching shall include assessment and evaluation of teaching that align with standards established in the field, refereed scholarship on teaching tied to instructional activities, and artifacts associated with a peer review of teaching. Faculty may also include solicited student evaluation independently derived by the tenured/tenure-track faculty member, and a record of student advisement responsibilities when applicable. The evaluatee shall submit an accompanying narrative description of the relationship between any documentation supplied and his/her performance contract. Course syllabi identifying course objectives and learning outcomes which are defensibly connected to the School's mission and goals shall be included and considered as evidence of teaching performance. Actual materials to be submitted shall be identified in individual performance contracts. Faculty will be expected to provide IDEA or TEVAL for each of their courses.

- (4) Material collections in the area of Service shall include all such documentation regarding School, University, local, state, regional, national, and international service as the evaluatee shall choose to submit and may include consulting activities bringing recognition to the School and/or the University. Actual materials to be submitted shall be identified in individual performance contracts. The evaluatee shall submit an accompanying narrative description of the relationship between any documentation supplied and his/her performance contract.
- (5) Material collections shall be reviewed by SSSLs tenured/tenure-track peers, assessing documentation submitted against the individual's performance contract criteria, with written confidential evaluations of the same to be submitted to the Director. Peer evaluations must reflect differential weightings attributable to percentage assignment of time per individual.
- (6) The Director shall take the confidential peer evaluations and condense them into a summative evaluation letter addressed to each faculty member, with said letter faithfully preserving the intent of peer review. The Director shall consult with the Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership about each such letter prior to actual delivery—such consultation shall be for the purpose of assessing progress toward tenure and/or promotion. At appropriate times, the Department Chair shall carry forward reappointment, mid-tenure, and tenure and/or promotion recommendations to the Faculty of Educational Leadership and to the Dean of Education.
- (7) Individual faculty members' evaluation letters shall remain confidential between the Director, the Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership, and the evaluatee, except where the same are required to be submitted to administrators in the University or when otherwise compelled by force of law.
- (8) This policy shall be effective as of the date first written above and shall be reviewed by the tenured/tenure-track SSSLs faculty as a whole not more than five years from the date of first adoption and reviewed on the same basis thereafter.
- (9) All other applicable University, School, College, and Department policy shall be observed.

EVALUATEE RESPONSIBILITIES

- (1) Each tenured/tenure-track faculty member shall be given the opportunity to meet with peer faculty as a whole and the Director annually for the purpose of constructing a performance contract. The Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership should be regularly consulted and available to assist with aligning performance contracts with tenure/promotion expectations.
- (2) Upon receipt of annual written evaluations, each evaluatee shall sign an acknowledgment indicating that an opportunity was provided to discuss and review with the Director and peer faculty the evaluation and any relative merit ranking. The evaluatee must respond in writing, if desired, within seven working days regarding any disagreement with the evaluation.

EVALUATOR RESPONSIBILITIES

- (1) In keeping with the evaluation calendar published by the Staley School of Leadership Studies, the Director, with appropriate involvement by the Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership, will prepare a written evaluation (usually in February) for each faculty member according to the procedures described above. The evaluation shall identify the basis for any numeric quantification of performance, and the evaluation shall summarize achievements on which assessment and/or quantification is based.
- (2) The Director, in consultation with the Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership, shall identify in the summative evaluation letter the relative merit ranking upon which salary increases will be recommended so that each successively higher performance ranking will result in a recommendation for a higher salary increase. The only exception shall be in the event of market/equity adjustments, which must be justified and documented separately and determined jointly through discussion between the Director and the Provost or Provost designees.

- (3) The Director, in making a summative evaluation, shall take into account the percentage of time identified in each performance contract and weight the total evaluation by those same percentages so that a person's evaluation shall be weighted by area of responsibility in direct relationship to the percentage of time assigned to each function. Likewise, the ranking shall take into consideration the professorial rank of the individual (see the School's published *Minimum Performance Standards* which explicate the different expectations according to the ranks of assistant, associate, and full professor).
- (4) The Director shall provide an opportunity for each evaluatee to discuss his/her evaluation in person, shall secure signatures indicating occurrence of the same, and shall allow for disagreement within the same seven days required by the University.
- (5) The Director shall forward to the Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership copies of the following items: (a) the evaluation policy as adopted by the tenured/tenure-track faculty; (b) a written evaluation of each tenured/tenure-track faculty member identical to the copy given to the evaluatee; (c) a recommendation on salary adjustment consistent with other provisions in this policy; and (d) any responses by the evaluatee to the evaluation.

APPENDIX B

MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE LEVELS OF PRODUCTIVITY

**Joint Policy of the
Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership
and
Faculty of Educational Leadership**

MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE LEVELS OF PRODUCTIVITY

FACULTIES OF ADULT LEARNING AND LEADERSHIP and EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Jointly approved October 2017

DEFINITIONS OF CATEGORIES

EXCEEDS STANDARDS (ES)

This rating is available only when a Faculty member demonstrates exceptional overall performance. Exceptional is defined as:

- *Research*: Recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having been cited or depended on as a national authority.
- *Service*: Recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having secured significant external funding or national recognition for service to the profession.
- *Teaching*: Recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having been recognized for excellence in teaching through awards from Kansas State University, the College of Education, or nationally recognized organizations.

MEETS STANDARDS (MS)

This rating is available only when a Faculty member meets and exceeds minimal standards for his or her respective academic rank. For purposes of definition, the rating of MS will be used when all the performance contract goals were achieved.

FAILS TO MEET STANDARDS, BUT MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS (MMS)

This rating is used to notify a Faculty member that s/he has not met the terms of the annual individual performance contract, but that minimum standards have been met. The upper and lower limits of the rating of MMS are defined as follows. The upper limit shall be invoked when the individual has not met the terms of his/her annual performance contract. The lower limit shall be crossed when the individual has not met one or more of the standards on the minimum standards matrix. (See attached matrix).

FAILS TO MEET MINIMUM STANDARDS (FMS-MMS)

This rating is used to notify a Faculty member that s/he has failed to satisfy one or more of the criterion on the matrix. (See matrix below). For more information on chronic low achievement, refer to the *University Handbook* C31.1 – C31.8¹⁸

CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT

The procedures which follow next are in keeping with Section C31.5-8 of the *University Handbook*:

A Faculty member whose overall performance falls below these levels of minimum acceptability during one evaluation year will be so informed in writing, and will meet with the Department Chair to establish a written plan of action to bring performance up to stated standards. Monthly meetings will be held with the Chair to monitor progress on the agreed upon plan. If the plan is not completed, resulting in a second year of below minimum performance, the Faculty member and the-Chair will meet with the Dean of the College of Education to outline specific remedial action. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which minimum standards are not

¹⁸ <http://www.k-state.edu/provost/universityhb/fhsecc.html#31.5>

met, then "dismissal for cause" will be considered at the discretion of the appropriate dean (*University Handbook* Section C31.5).

CRITERIA SATISFYING THE DESIGNATION OF MEETS STANDARDS (MS)

TEACHING

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

- Posts office hours and is regularly available for advising.
- Places conforming syllabi on file for all didactic courses.
- Utilizes TEVAL or IDEA standardized measurements for appropriate courses.
- Achieves graduate faculty membership within two years.
- Achieves full graduate faculty membership within three years.
- Provides effective supervision of internships.

TEACHING

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

- Posts office hours and is regularly available for advising.
- Places conforming syllabi on file for all didactic courses.
- Utilizes TEVAL or IDEA standardized measurements for appropriate courses.
- Serves as an effective advisor for masters students.
- Serves as an effective member on doctoral committees.
- Holds full graduate faculty status with certification to direct dissertations.
- Serves as an effective major professor for doctoral advisees if assigned to this role.
- Provides effective supervision of internships.

TEACHING

FULL PROFESSOR

- Posts office hours and is regularly available for advising.
- Places conforming syllabi on file for all didactic courses.
- Utilizes TEVAL or IDEA standardized measurements for appropriate courses.
- Serves as an effective advisor for masters students.
- Holds full graduate faculty status with certification to direct dissertations.
- Serves as an effective advisor for doctoral advisees if assigned to this role.
- Provides effective supervision of internships.

RESEARCH

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

- Shows evidence of submitting research for publication, with publications in print within three years.
- Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the teaching field.

RESEARCH

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

- Demonstrates ability to produce a research agenda.
- Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the teaching field.
- Provides evidence of successful involvement in scholarship and research (*e.g.*, refereed publications, funded grants, or product development).

RESEARCH

FULL PROFESSOR

- Produces a mature research agenda.
- Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the teaching field.
- Provides evidence of successful sustained involvement in scholarship and research (*e.g.*, refereed publications, funded grants, or product development).

SERVICE

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

- Attends local, state, regional, national, or international meetings.
- Participates in the development of curriculum.
- Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating in Department activities and College and/or University committees.

SERVICE

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

- Provides service to local, state, national, or international constituencies.
- Participates in the development of curriculum.
- Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating in Department activities and College and/or University committees.

SERVICE

FULL PROFESSOR

- Provides service to local, state, national, or international constituencies.
- Participates in the development of curriculum.
- Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating in Department activities and College and/or University committees.
- Positively and proactively mentors new and mid-career colleagues.

Faculty of the Staley School of Leadership Studies

School of Leadership Studies
Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty, School of Leadership Studies

First adopted by the School of Leadership Studies May 14, 2009
Approved by the Faculty of Educational Administration May 18, 2009
Jointly approved EDLEA/EDACE/LEAD October 2017

DEFINITIONS OF CATEGORIES

EXCEEDS STANDARDS (ES)

This rating is available only when a faculty member demonstrates exceptional overall performance. To qualify for this rating, the School will judge the evidence and demonstrate formal support by nominating the individual for this rating. Exceptional is defined as:

- Scholarship:* Recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having been cited or depended on as a national authority.
- Service:* Recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having secured significant external funding or national recognition for service.
- Teaching:* Recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having been recognized for excellence in teaching from Kansas State University, the Staley School of Leadership Studies, or nationally recognized organizations.

MEETS STANDARDS (MS)

This rating is available only when a faculty member meets and exceeds minimal standards for his or her respective academic rank. Standards will be developed annually through a peer review process for determining performance contracts and evaluating performance for merit. For purposes of definition, the rating of MS is synonymous with the provisions of the annual individual performance contract.

FAILS TO MEET STANDARDS, BUT MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS (MMS)

This rating is used to notify a faculty member that he or she has not met the terms of the annual individual performance contract, but that minimum standards have been met. The upper and lower limits of the rating of MMS are defined as follows. The upper limit (MMS) shall be invoked when the individual has not met the terms of his/her annual performance contract. The lower limit (FMS, see below) shall be crossed when the individual has not met one or more of the standards on the minimum standards matrix. (See attached matrix).

FAILS TO MEET MINIMUM STANDARDS (FMS)

This rating is used to notify a faculty member that he or she has failed to satisfy one or more of the criterion on the matrix. (See attached matrix).

PROCEDURES FOR FMS

1. If a faculty member receives a ranking of **FMS** in one evaluation year, the person will be notified in writing by the Director and will be required to meet with the Director to establish a written plan of action to bring performance up to stated standards. Monthly meetings will be held with the Director to monitor progress on the plan.
2. If the plan is not completed and if the faculty member receives an overall ranking of **FMS** in a second consecutive evaluation year, the person will be notified in writing and will meet with the Director, the Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership, the Dean of the College of Education, and the Provost or Provost's designee to outline specific remedial action.
3. Failure to meet the plan constructed at that time or if three evaluations in any five-year period result in a FMS ranking, this will result in consideration of "dismissal for cause" at the discretion of the Director, the Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership, the Dean of the College of Education, and the Provost or the Provost's designee.

4. Any faculty member whose evaluation indicates failure to meet minimum levels of performance in a critical area of responsibility will participate in the above procedures.

**MATRIX OF CRITERIA SATISFYING THE DESIGNATION OF
MEETS STANDARDS (MS)**

TEACHING

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

- Posts office hours and is regularly available for advising.
- Places conforming syllabi on file for all didactic courses.
- Utilizes School-approved standardized measurement of instructional effectiveness for appropriate courses.

TEACHING

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

- Posts office hours and is regularly available for advising.
- Places conforming syllabi on file for all didactic courses.
- Utilizes School-approved standardized measurement of instructional effectiveness for appropriate courses.
- Achieves graduate faculty status when appropriate to the candidate's teaching assignment.
- Serves as an effective member on doctoral committees when applicable.
- Serves as an effective advisor for masters students when applicable.

TEACHING

FULL PROFESSOR

- Posts office hours and is regularly available for advising.
- Places conforming syllabi on file for all didactic courses.
- Utilizes School-approved standardized measurement of instructional effectiveness for appropriate courses.
- Achieves graduate faculty status when appropriate to the candidate's teaching assignment.
- Serves as an effective advisor for doctoral students when applicable.
- Serves as an effective advisor for masters students when applicable.
- Provides effective supervision of internships when applicable.

SCHOLARSHIP

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

- Shows evidence of submitting research for publication.
- Shows evidence of presenting at state, regional, national, or international conferences.
- Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the leadership field.

SCHOLARSHIP

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

- Demonstrates ability to produce a research agenda.
- Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the leadership field.
- Provides evidence of successful involvement in scholarship and research (*e.g.*, refereed publications, funded grants, or product development).

SCHOLARSHIP

FULL PROFESSOR

- Produces a coherent research agenda with demonstrated impact.
- Provides evidence through syllabi, class assignments, and other materials of currency in research related to the leadership field.
- Provides evidence of successful involvement in scholarship and research (*e.g.*, refereed publications, funded grants, or product development).

SERVICE

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

- Attends local, state, regional, national, or international meetings.
- Participates in the development of curriculum.
- Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating on community, Staley School of Leadership Studies and/or University committees.

SERVICE

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

- Provides service to local, state, national, or international constituencies.
- Participates in the development of curriculum.
- Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating on community, School of Leadership Studies and/or university committees.

SERVICE

FULL PROFESSOR

- Provides service to local, state, national, or international constituencies.
- Participates in the development of curriculum.
- Demonstrates academic citizenship by participating on community, School of Leadership Studies and/or university committees.
- Positively and proactively mentors junior colleagues.

APPENDIX C

**STANDARDS FOR TENURE AND
PROMOTION**

and the

MID-TENURE REVIEW

**Joint Policy of the
Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership
and
Faculty of Educational Leadership**

**MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR
TENURE AND PROMOTION, AND THE MID-TENURE REVIEW**

**FACULTIES OF
ADULT LEARNING AND LEADERSHIP
and
EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

Jointly approved October 2017

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

The Department of Educational Leadership recognizes and supports the acts of measuring, evaluating, and rewarding performance of all faculty. The Faculty values a wide range of contributions to the Department's assigned mission of teaching, scholarship, and service and asserts that the award of tenure and the award of promotion in rank are performance events that should be linearly connected to the greater institution's advancement. The Faculty therefore concludes that quality and versatility in performance, together with meaningful contribution to the Department's mission, are the appropriate metrics for decisions about tenure and/or promotion.

The Faculty declares that there can be no simple list of accomplishments that, when completed, will result in performance levels sufficiently meritorious to meet or exceed standards for tenure/promotion purposes. Rather, the Faculty declares that the true litmus test is a careful and informed judgment by knowledgeable tenured Faculty *en banc* regarding a candidate's overall performance in the total context of 'quality', 'versatility', and 'mission'. More specifically, Faculty holding expertise in the candidate's broad field (i.e., Department peers) must judge whether a candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service commendably advances the Department's reputation and whether the candidate's contributions advance the Department's overall mission. In sum, a candidate will be affirmed through the evaluation process and/or recommended for tenure and/or promotion only when his/her tenured peers holding equal or higher rank affirm through the balloting process that s/he has taught well, served well, and engaged in scholarship in substantial ways that bring lasting credit and visibility to the institution.

STATEMENT OF STANDARDS

The Department of Educational Leadership as established a set of standards for tenure/promotion which are conditioned upon accelerating performance by academic rank—i.e, each higher rank demands a higher level of accomplishment. More specifically, promotion to *Assistant Professor* reflects an acceptable level of achievement for time in rank and evidence of continuing trajectory for quality in teaching, scholarship, and service. Promotion to *Associate Professor with tenure* rests on evidence of substantial professional contributions given time in rank that reflect quality in teaching, scholarship or other creative endeavor, and service. Promotion to *Full Professor* is based on attainment of superior quality in the assigned responsibilities of the candidate, recognition of excellence by relevant external constituencies, and clear indication of continuing sustained contributions over an entire career. These same watershed expectations apply to annual evaluation as well, so that to that end, the Faculty has enacted a minimum performance matrix by academic rank, with all Faculty held accountable for continual quality, versatility, and contribution to overall mission. See the *University Handbook* for information on mid-tenure,¹⁹ tenure,²⁰ and promotion.²¹

PERFORMANCE MATRIX

The Faculty strongly supports new and expanded models of teaching, scholarship, and service. Accordingly, the Faculty has constructed a performance matrix that values a wide range of contributions to organizational goals. In sum, faculty may expect institutional rewards for outstanding performance on the dimensions illustrated in chart form:

¹⁹ <http://www.k-state.edu/provost/universityhb/fhsecc.html#92.1>

²⁰ <http://www.k-state.edu/provost/universityhb/fhsecc.html#70>

²¹ <http://www.k-state.edu/provost/universityhb/fhsecc.html#120>

EDLEA AND EDACE PROMOTION AND TENURE CHART

A candidate will be affirmed through the evaluation process and/or recommended for tenure and/or promotion only when his/her peers affirm that he or she has taught well, served well, and engaged in scholarship in substantial ways that bring lasting credit and visibility to the University. All candidates are expected to integrate the components of technology, diversity, and field-based engagement, as well as to provide evidence of student performance. Affirmation shall be by balloting of tenured Faculty holding equal or higher rank—a simple majority shall be sufficient to advance a candidate to consideration by the Department Chair; the Chair may not vote at the Faculty level, as his/her vote is recorded separately as part of the Chair’s recommendation to the College and Dean.

FOR SUCESSFUL MID-TENURE REVIEW

Teaching and Advising	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Advisement	Does not maintain office hours or meet and/or communicate with students	Maintains office hours and meets students (face-to-face and/or electronically)	Develops regular office hours and engages in continuous communication (face to face and/or electronically)
Syllabi	Uses syllabi that lack goals and objectives reflecting Department/ College guidelines	Creates course syllabi aligned to Department and College mission statements and accreditation guidelines	Creates comprehensive teaching agenda that is aligned to course syllabi and Department and College mission statements and accreditation guidelines
Evaluation	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department (e.g., TEVAL, IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of below average rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department (e.g., TEVAL, IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of average or above rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department (e.g., TEVAL, IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of excellent rankings
Self-Reflection	Demonstrates no evidence of self-reflection activities	Demonstrates adequate evidence of self-reflection activities	Demonstrates high quality evidence of self-reflection activities
Teaching Agenda	Demonstrates no teaching agenda, or an agenda which is poorly conceived	Creates a written teaching agenda	Creates a bold, comprehensive teaching agenda that is aligned to course syllabi
Research/Scholarship	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Publications and/or Grants	Demonstrates no activity related to publications or grants	Seeks mentoring for writing and publishing articles, books, and/or grants, and generates a publication and/or grant record appropriate to time in rank	Publishes articles, books, or receives local, state, national or international grants aligned with research agenda and Department and College missions

Research Agenda	Does not provide evidence of a written research agenda	Creates written research agenda, appropriate to time in rank, that achieves focuses on attaining graduate faculty membership and certification to direct dissertations	Creates a sustained written research agenda that focuses on enhancing and/or expanding previous works
Currency	Has no new publications or grants since last review	Provides evidence of new scholarly efforts, appropriate to time in rank, since last review	Provides evidence of significant and current scholarly efforts since last review
Service	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Service Agenda	Possesses no written service agenda	Creates and implements a written service agenda appropriate to time in rank	Carries out a strong service agenda at local, state, national, and/or international levels
Department/ College Contributions	Does not engage in Department or College committee work or curriculum development	Engages in Department and/or College committee work and curriculum development	Engages in activities at several levels of the organization (Department, College), and contributes to positive social-emotional culture
University, State, Regional, National or International Professional Organizations Participation	Demonstrates little or no activity in University, state, regional, or national/international professional organizations	Demonstrates record, appropriate to time in rank, of attending and presenting at state, regional, and national/international meetings	Regularly attends and presents at professional meetings at University, state, regional, and/or national/international levels

FOR SUCCESSFUL TENURE WITH PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Teaching and Advising	Unsatisfactory	Meets expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Advisement	Does not maintain office hours or meet and/or communicate with students	Maintains office hours and meets students (face-to-face and/or electronically). Achieves full graduate faculty membership with certification to direct dissertations	Develops regular office hours and engages in consistent, continuous communications with advisees and is appropriately available for advisee appointments
Syllabi	Uses syllabi that lack goals and objectives reflecting Department/ College guidelines	Updates course syllabi aligned to Department and College mission statements and accreditation guidelines	Implements a comprehensive teaching agenda that is aligned to course syllabi and Department and College mission statements and accreditation guidelines

Evaluation	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department (e.g., TEVAL, IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of below average rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department (e.g., TEVAL, IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of average or above rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department (e.g., TEVAL, IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of excellent rankings
Self-reflection	Demonstrates little evidence of self-reflection activities	Demonstrates adequate evidence of self-reflection activities	Demonstrates high quality evidence of self-reflection activities
Teaching Agenda	Demonstrates only a poorly conceived teaching agenda	Pursues teaching agenda with attention to currency and creativity	Engages in teaching practices reflecting current research and creativity
Research/Scholarship	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Publications and/or Grants	Demonstrates limited publications and/or grants	Publishes articles or books, and/or receives state or national or international grants	Publishes multiple articles or books and/or receives state, national, or international grants over a sustained time
Research Agenda and Methodology	Does not pursue a written research agenda; provides no evidence of research methodology knowledge	Publishes articles or books and/or receives state, national or international grants; provides evidence of research methodology expertise; co-directs or directs doctoral dissertations	Publishes respected scholarly materials and successfully guides students through the dissertation process including multiple hoodings
Currency	Has generated no new research or publications since the last review	Provides evidence of publications, appropriate to time in rank, since last review	Provides evidence of significant multiple publications since last review
Service	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Service Agenda	Demonstrates only limited or no evidence of attending to a written service agenda	Attends to a service agenda appropriate to time in rank	Updates and pursues a comprehensive written service agenda
Department/ College Contributions	Does not engage in leadership roles in Department or College committee work and/or curriculum development	Engages in and assumes leadership roles in Department and/or College committee work and/or curriculum development	Assumes visible leadership roles and builds relationships and contributes to positive social-emotional culture in the Department and/or College
University, State, Regional, National or International Participation	Demonstrates little or no activity in University, state, regional, or	Provides a record, appropriate to time in rank, of attending and presenting at state,	Regularly attends and presents at professional meetings at University, state, regional, and/or

national/international
professional organizations

regional, and national/
international meetings

national/international
levels

FOR SUCCESSFUL PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

Teaching and Advising	Unsatisfactory	Meets expectations	Exceeds expectations
Advisement	Does not maintain office hours or meet and/or communicate consistently with students	Maintains office hours and meets students (face-to-face and/or electronically) and is regularly available to students and other faculty	Maintains office hours, advises a full case load of advisees, and is available to students and faculty
Syllabi	Uses syllabi that lack periodic updating of goals, objectives, grading, etc.	Updates course syllabi based on evaluations and self-reflections that are aligned to Department and College mission statements and accreditation guidelines	Engages in innovative teaching practices reflecting attention to diversity issues, use of technology, field-based partnerships
Evaluation	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department (e.g., TEVAL, IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of below average rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department (e.g., TEVAL, IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of average or above rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the Department (e.g., TEVAL, IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of excellent rankings
Self-reflection	Demonstrates inadequate evidence of self-reflection activities	Demonstrates evidence of self-reflection activities on a regular basis	Demonstrates high quality evidence of self-reflection activities
Teaching Agenda	Demonstrates weak or no implementation of a teaching agenda	Demonstrates strong implementation of a teaching agenda, with attention to currency and creativity	Demonstrates strong implementation of innovative teaching practices reflecting current research and creativity
Research/Scholarship	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Publications and/or Grants	Demonstrates only limited or erratic success with refereed publications and/or grants since last promotion	Regularly publishes multiple articles and/or books, and/or receives state, national, or international grants since last promotion	Publishes articles and/or books, and/or receives state, national, or international grants over a sustained period of time
Research Agenda and Research Methodology	Does not update and adjust written research agenda according to changes in field of expertise; exhibits only a limited grasp and application of valid,	Updates and adjusts written agenda according to changes in field of expertise; recognizes legitimacy of different methods and/or provides support to College (expertise)	Documents a research agenda that contributes to current needs in the field and/or engages futuristic or cutting-edge lines of research; recognized by colleagues, as demonstrated by such artifacts as having

	rigorous research methodologies		been cited or depended on as a national authority); regularly and successfully guides students through the completed dissertation process
Currency	Has generated little research or publication since the last promotion	Provides evidence of a systematic record of publications since last promotion	Provides evidence of a record of significant and sustained publications since last promotion
Service			
Service Agenda	Exhibits only limited or no evidence of attending to a written service agenda beyond date of last promotion	Regularly updates written service agenda since last promotion	Regularly updates and pursues a written comprehensive service agenda that results in a state, national, and/or international reputation
Department/ College contributions	Engages in only limited leadership roles in Department and College committee work and/or curriculum development	Engages in and assumes appropriate leadership roles in Department and/or College committee work and/or curriculum development	Demonstrates role model behavior in Department and/or College committee work and/or curriculum development
University, State, Regional, National or International Professional Organizations	Exhibits limited or no participation in professional organizations at state, regional, national, or international levels since last promotion	Maintains a record of attending/presenting at state, regional, and national, and/or international professional meetings on a regular basis	Appropriately assumes leadership roles in state, regional, national, and/or international professional organizations which lead to external recognition

The Mid-Tenure Review

All processes leading to the tenure and/or promotion event as described above shall be applied in the same form to the mid-tenure review, so that candidates are assessed at the mid-tenure point as if approaching the final decision except that the mid-tenure review shall be for the purpose of measuring the candidate's progress toward a total portfolio that will be acceptable at the final tenure/promotion time.

Faculty of the Staley School of Leadership Studies

**STANDARDS FOR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
AND
TENURE AND PROMOTION**

**School of Leadership Studies
Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty of School of Leadership Studies
First adopted by the Staley School of Leadership Studies May 14, 2009
Approved by the Faculty of Educational Administration May 18, 2009
Jointly approved EDLEA/EDACE/LEAD October 2017**

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

The tenured/tenure-track Faculty of the Staley School of Leadership Studies at Kansas State University recognizes and supports the acts of measuring, evaluating, and rewarding performance of all faculty. The faculty values a wide range of contributions to the School's assigned mission of teaching, scholarship, and service and asserts that annual evaluation, the award of tenure, and the award of promotion in rank are performance events that should be linearly connected to the greater institution's advancement. The faculty therefore concludes that quality and versatility in performance, together with meaningful contribution to the School's mission, are the appropriate metrics for decisions about evaluation of both tenured and tenure-track faculty and about the actual award of tenure and/or promotion.

The tenured/tenure-track faculty declares that there can be no simple list of accomplishments that, when completed, will result in performance levels sufficiently meritorious to meet or exceed standards for annual evaluation and/or tenure/promotion purposes. Rather, the faculty declares that the true litmus test is a careful and informed judgment by knowledgeable faculty en banc regarding a candidate's overall performance in the total context of 'quality', 'versatility', and 'mission'. More specifically, faculty holding expertise in the candidate's broad field (i.e., School peers, subject to additional review by the Faculty of Educational Leadership in the Department of Educational Leadership and the wider College of Education) must judge whether a candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service advances the School's reputation and whether the candidate's contributions advance the School's overall mission. In sum, a candidate will be affirmed through the evaluation process and/or recommended for tenure and/or promotion only when his/her peers and the supporting Department/College affirm that he or she has taught well, served well, and engaged in scholarship in substantial ways that bring lasting credit and visibility to the institution.

STATEMENT OF STANDARDS

The tenured/tenure-track Faculty in the School of Leadership Studies has established a set of standards for evaluation and tenure/promotion which are conditioned upon performance by academic rank—i.e, each higher rank demands a higher level of accomplishment. More specifically, promotion to *Assistant Professor* reflects an acceptable level of achievement for time in rank and evidence of continuing potential for quality in teaching, scholarship, and service. Promotion to *Associate Professor with tenure* rests on evidence of substantial professional contributions given time in rank that reflect quality in teaching, scholarship or other creative endeavor, and directed service. Promotion to *Professor* is based on attainment of superior quality in the assigned responsibilities of the candidate, recognition of excellence by relevant external constituencies, and clear indication of continuing sustained contributions over an entire career. These same watershed expectations apply to annual evaluation as well, so that the faculty has enacted a performance matrix by academic rank, with all faculty held accountable for continual quality, versatility, and contribution to overall mission.

PERFORMANCE MATRIX

The tenured/tenure-track Faculty of the Staley School of Leadership Studies strongly supports new and expanded models of teaching, scholarship, and service that addresses each activity in isolation, in integration, and produces forms of community-engaged scholarship. Accordingly, the faculty has constructed a performance matrix that values a wide range of contributions to organizational goals. In sum, tenured/tenure-track faculty may expect institutional rewards for outstanding performance on the dimensions illustrated next in matrix form:

SSLS PROMOTION AND TENURE RUBRIC

A candidate will be affirmed through the evaluation process and/or recommended for tenure and/or promotion only when his/her peers and the supporting Department/College affirm that he or she has taught well, served well, and engaged in scholarship in substantial ways that bring lasting credit and visibility to the institution. All candidates are expected to integrate the components of technology, diversity, and field-based partnerships, as well as to provide evidence of satisfactory student performance.

For successful mid-tenure review

Teaching and Advising	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Advisement	Does not maintain office hours or meet and/or communicate with students	Maintains office hours and meets students (face-to-face and/or electronically)	Develops regular office hours and engages in continuous student communication (face to face and/or electronically)
Syllabi	Uses syllabi that lack goals and objectives reflecting the School's guidelines	Creates course syllabi aligned to the School's mission statements and accreditation guidelines	Creates comprehensive teaching agenda that is aligned to course syllabi and the School's mission statements and accreditation guidelines
Evaluation	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department (e.g., TEVAL or IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of below average rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department; peer evaluation of teaching and produces scholarship on teaching (e.g., TEVAL or IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of average or above rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department; peer evaluation of teaching and produces scholarship on teaching (e.g., TEVAL or IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of excellent rankings
Self-Reflection	Demonstrates no evidence of self-reflection activities	Demonstrates adequate evidence of self-reflection activities	Demonstrates high quality evidence of self-reflection activities
Teaching Agenda	Demonstrates no teaching agenda, or an agenda which is poorly conceived	Creates a written teaching agenda	Creates an innovative, comprehensive teaching agenda that is aligned to course syllabi

Research and/or Scholarly Activity	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Publications and/or Grants	Demonstrates no activity related to publications or grants	Seeks mentoring for writing and publishing articles, books, and/or grants, and generates a publication and/or grant record appropriate to time in rank	Publishes articles, books, or receives local, state or national grants aligned with research agenda and School's mission
Research Agenda	Does not provide evidence of a written research agenda	Creates written research agenda, appropriate to time in rank, that focuses on attaining graduate faculty membership and certification to direct dissertations (as appropriate)	Creates written research agenda that focuses on enhancing and/or expanding previous works
Currency	Has no new publications or grants since last promotion or review	Provides evidence of new scholarly efforts, appropriate to time in rank, since last promotion or review	Provides evidence of significant and current scholarly efforts since last promotion or review
Service	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Service Agenda	Possesses no written service agenda	Creates and implements a written service agenda appropriate to time in rank	Carries out a strong service agenda at School, University, local, state, and/or national levels related to the mission of the School
School of Leadership Studies/University Contributions	Does not engage in School, University committee work or curriculum development	Engages in School, University committee work, and curriculum development	Engages in activities at several levels of the organization (School or University), and contributes to positive social-emotional culture in the department
State, Regional, National or International Professional Organizations Participation	Demonstrates little or no activity in state, regional, or national/international professional organizations	Demonstrates record, appropriate to time in rank, of attending state, regional, and national/international professional meetings	Regularly attends and presents at professional meetings at state, regional, and/or national/international levels

For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure

Teaching and Advising	Unsatisfactory	Meets expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Advisement (office hours)	Does not maintain office hours or meet and/or communicate with students	Maintains office hours, meets students (face-to-face and/or electronically), and achieves graduate faculty status	Develops regular office hours and engages in consistent, continuous communications with advisees and is appropriately available for non-advisee appointments
Syllabi	Uses syllabi that lack goals and objectives reflecting department/college guidelines	Updates course syllabi aligned to School mission statements and accreditation guidelines	Implements a comprehensive teaching agenda that is aligned to course syllabi and School mission statements and accreditation guidelines
Evaluation	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department (e.g., TEVAL or IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of below average rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department; peer evaluation of teaching and produces scholarship on teaching (e.g., TEVAL or IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of average or above rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department; peer evaluation of teaching and produces scholarship on teaching (e.g., TEVAL or IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of excellent rankings
Self-reflection	Demonstrates little evidence of self-reflection activities	Demonstrates adequate evidence of self-reflection activities	Demonstrates high quality evidence of self-reflection activities
Teaching Agenda	Demonstrates only a poorly conceived teaching agenda	Pursues teaching agenda with attention to currency and creativity	Engages in teaching practices reflecting current research and creativity
Research and/or Scholarly Activity	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Publications and/or Grants	Demonstrates limited publications and/or grants	Publishes articles or books, or receives state or national grants	Publishes multiple articles or books and/or receives state or national grants over a sustained period of time

Research Agenda and Methodology	Does not pursue a written research agenda; provides no evidence of research methodology knowledge	Publishes articles or books and/or receives state or national grants; provides evidence of research methodology expertise; co-directs or directs doctoral dissertations (as appropriate)	Publishes respected scholarly materials and successfully guides students through the dissertation process (as appropriate)
Currency	Has generated no new research or publications since the last promotion or review	Provides evidence of publications, appropriate to time in rank, since last promotion or review	Provides evidence of significant multiple publications since last promotion or review
Service	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Service Agenda	Demonstrates only limited or no evidence of attending to a written service agenda	Attends to a service agenda appropriate to time in rank	Updates and pursues a comprehensive written service agenda
School/University Contributions	Does not engage in leadership roles in School committee work and/or curriculum development	Engages in and assumes leadership roles in School and/or University committee work and/or curriculum development	Assumes visible leadership roles and builds relationships and contributes to positive culture in the School
State, Regional, National or International Participation	Demonstrates little or no activity in state, regional, or national/international professional organizations	Provides a record, appropriate to time in rank, of attending state, regional, and national/international professional meetings	Regularly attends and presents at professional meetings at state, regional, and/or national/international levels

For promotion to Professor

Teaching and Advising	Unsatisfactory	Meets expectations	Exceeds expectations
Advisement (office hours)	Does not maintain office hours or meet and/or communicate consistently with students	Maintains office hours and meets students (face-to-face and/or electronically) and is regularly available to students and other faculty	Maintains office hours, advises a full case load of advisees, and is available to students and faculty

Syllabi	Uses syllabi that lack periodic updating of goals, objectives, grading, etc.	Updates course syllabi based on evaluations and self-reflections that are aligned to School mission statements and accreditation guidelines	Engages in innovative teaching practices reflecting attention to diversity issues, use of technology, field-based partnerships
Evaluation	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department (e.g., TEVAL or IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of below average rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department; peer evaluation of teaching and produces scholarship on teaching (e.g., TEVAL or IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of average or above rankings	Uses multiple evaluation forms as required by the department; peer evaluation of teaching and produces scholarship on teaching (e.g., TEVAL or IDEA, peer evaluation, and/or self-evaluation) with results revealing a pattern of excellent rankings
Self-reflection	Demonstrates inadequate evidence of self-reflection activities	Demonstrates evidence of self-reflection activities on a regular basis	Demonstrates high quality evidence of self-reflection activities
Teaching Agenda	Demonstrates weak or no implementation of a teaching agenda	Demonstrates strong implementation of a teaching agenda, with attention to currency and creativity	Demonstrates strong implementation of innovative teaching practices reflecting current research and creativity
Research and/or Scholarly Activity	Unsatisfactory	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Publications and/or Grants	Demonstrates only limited or erratic success with refereed publications and/or grants since last promotion	Regularly publishes multiple articles and/or books, and/or receives state or national grants since last promotion	Publishes articles and/or books, and/or receives state or national grants over a sustained period of time
Research Agenda and Research Methodology	Does not update and adjust written research agenda according to changes in field of expertise; exhibits only a limited grasp and application of valid, rigorous research methodologies	Updates and adjusts written agenda according to changes in field of expertise; recognizes legitimacy of different methods and/or provides support to college (expertise)	Documents implementation of a research agenda that contributes to current needs in the field and/or engages futuristic or cutting-edge lines of research; regularly and successfully guides students through the completed dissertation process (as appropriate)

Currency	Has generated little research or publication since the last promotion	Provides evidence of a systematic record of publications since last promotion	Provides evidence of a record of significant and sustained publications since last promotion
Service			
Service Agenda	Exhibits only limited or no evidence of attending to a written service agenda beyond date of last promotion	Regularly updates written service agenda since date of last promotion	Regularly updates and pursues a written comprehensive service agenda that results in a state and/or national reputation
School/University Contributions	Engages in only limited leadership roles in School committee work and/or curriculum development	Engages in and assumes appropriate leadership roles in School and/or University committee work, and/or curriculum development	Demonstrates role model behavior in School and/or University committee work, and/or curriculum development
State, Regional, National or International Professional Organizations	Exhibits limited or no participation in professional organizations at state, regional, or national levels since last promotion	Maintains a record of attending/presenting at state, regional, and national professional meetings on a regular basis	Appropriately assumes leadership roles in state, regional, and/or national professional organizations which lead to national recognition

APPENDIX D

PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD

**Joint Policy of the
Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership
and
Faculty of Educational Leadership**

PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD POLICY

Department of Educational Leadership

FACULTIES OF ADULT LEARNING AND LEADERSHIP EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Jointly approved October 2017

Purpose

The policies and procedures that appear in this document govern the manner in which candidates in the Department of Educational Leadership are recommended for the Professorial Performance Award. These policies and procedures are governed by *University Handbook* and conform to the guidelines issued by the Office of the Provost.²²

Philosophy

The Department of Educational Leadership supports the language of the *University Handbook* which states, "...the Professorial Performance Award is not a right accorded to every faculty member at the rank of Professor. Nor is it granted simply as a result of a candidate's routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies."²³ The Faculties further support the concept that the Professorial Performance Award shall be based on "...evidence of sustained productivity... and... of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards"²⁴ in the areas of teaching, research and service.

Award Eligibility

The foregoing statement of philosophy therefore governs the performance aspects of a candidate's initial eligibility for the Professorial Performance Award in the Department of Educational Leadership. The *University Handbook* imposes additional limits on eligibility. Specifically, the University requires that an eligible candidate must be a full-time faculty member holding the rank of Professor and must have been in rank at least six years since the last promotion or last receipt of the Professorial Performance Award; further, the eligible candidate must show sustained productivity for at least the last six years prior to review for the Professorial Performance Award. Using these metrics, the following statements of Department-level eligibility and procedures detail how the Department of Educational Leadership considers candidates' worthiness for this award.

Department-level Eligibility, Criteria, and Procedures

In order to be considered for the Professorial Performance Award, the Department of Educational Leadership requires that a faculty member: (1) must meet the eligibility criteria established in the *University Handbook*, (2) must follow the procedures which are outlined in this same section of the *Handbook*; and (3) must adhere to any additional Department requirements and procedures outlined below.

The candidate shall inform the Department Chair in writing of his/her intention to apply for the Professorial Performance Award and shall submit "...a file that documents her or his professional accomplishments for at least six years in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the Department. Upon receipt of such a request and supporting documentation, the Chair shall notify all eligible voting members of the Faculties. For the singular purpose of the Professorial Performance Award, the Department of Educational Leadership defines eligible voting members of the Faculties as those persons who presently

²² <http://www.k-state.edu/provost/universityhb/fhsecc.html#ppa>

²³ *University Handbook* C49.1

²⁴ *University Handbook* C49.2

hold the rank of Professor and whose full-time academic budgeted appointment is in the Department, excluding the Chair should s/he hold the rank of Professor (exception: if, in any given year there are less than four full-time Department Faculty holding the rank of Professor after excluding the Chair, the eligible voting Faculties shall include all tenured budgeted full-time faculty members in the Department holding the rank of Associate or Full Professor). The Chair shall then both make each candidate's materials available for review and call a meeting for obtaining a vote concerning the worthiness of each candidate's materials for the Professorial Performance Award. Such meeting may be by the most convenient majority agreeable means, including in person or by synchronous or asynchronous distance. The vote shall occur by dated individual ballots showing the signature of each voting member present indicating **Yes/ No/ Abstain**; the Chair shall further make a record of any eligible Faculty not voting and shall include all such results when reporting on the outcome. A simple majority affirmative vote by eligible Faculty shall be sufficient to advance the candidate for consideration by the Department Chair.

If the Department Chair is willing to support the Faculties' affirmative recommendation for the candidate, the Chair shall prepare his/her own ballot for each candidate and affirmatively sign and transmit all ballots to the Dean of Education. At the same time, a letter of support will also be sent by the Chair to both the Dean and to the candidate. If the Chair cannot support the Faculties' affirmative recommendation, then the Chair will notify the voting Faculties and the candidate in writing. The voting Faculties shall have the option to select a spokesperson to convey and explain the majority position to the Dean. If the eligible voting Faculties cannot recommend the candidate, the Chair will inform the applicant in writing and the process for seeking recourse as described in the *University Handbook* will be followed.

The Department of Educational Leadership has established minimum performance standards to be used in annual merit evaluation. These standards are stated by academic rank and form the initial basis both for satisfactory annual performance review *and* as the minimum threshold for favorable review whenever a candidate indicates intent to seek promotion to the next highest academic rank. By logical extension, those same minimum performance standards at the Full Professor level have a direct linear relationship to minimum favorable consideration for the Professorial Performance Award by satisfying the spirit and requirements of Paragraph 2 of this present Professorial Performance Award policy. The criteria for favorable recommendation for the Professorial Performance Award are therefore declared to be identical to the **Exceeds Standards** category for the rank of Full Professor as delineated in the Department's merit evaluation systems for the respective Faculties. Doing so ensures that the Professorial Performance Award is objectively based on "the attainment of excellence in the assigned duties of the Faculty member and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies."²⁵

For more information on the Professorial Performance Award, refer to the *University Handbook*.²⁶

²⁵ *University Handbook C120.1*

²⁶ <http://www.k-state.edu/provost/universityhb/fhsecc.html#ppa>

Faculty of the Staley School of Leadership Studies

PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD

Staley School of Leadership Studies Jointly approved EDLEA/EDACE/LEAD October 2017

Purpose

The policies and procedures that appear in this document govern the manner in which candidates in the Staley School of Leadership Studies are recommended for the Professorial Performance Award. These policies and procedures are governed by Sections C49.1 through C49.14 of the University Handbook and conform to the guidelines issued by the Office of the Provost on February 15, 2006.

Philosophy

The Faculty of the Staley School of Leadership Studies support the language in Section C49.1 of the University Handbook which states, "...the Professorial Performance Award is not a right accorded to every faculty member at the rank of Professor. Nor is it granted simply as a result of a candidate's routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies." [C49.1] The Faculties further support the concept that the Professorial Performance Award shall be based on "...evidence of sustained productivity... and... of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards" [C49.2] in the areas of teaching, research and service.

Award Eligibility

The foregoing statement of philosophy therefore governs the performance aspects of a candidate's initial eligibility for the Professorial Performance Award in the Department of Educational Leadership. The University Handbook imposes additional limits on eligibility. Specifically, the university requires that an eligible candidate must be a full-time faculty member [C49.2] holding the rank of Professor and must have been in rank at least six years since the last promotion or last receipt of the Professorial Performance Award; further, the eligible candidate must show sustained productivity for at least the last six years prior to review for the Professorial Performance Award [C49.2]. Using these metrics, the following statements of department-level eligibility and procedures explicate how the Staley School of Leadership Studies considers candidates' worthiness for this award.

Department-level Eligibility, Criteria, and Procedures

In order to be considered for the Professorial Performance Award, the Staley School of Leadership Studies requires that a faculty member: (1) must meet the eligibility criteria established in the University Handbook [C49.1-C49.14]; (2) must follow the procedures which are outlined in this same section of the Handbook; and (3) must adhere to any additional department requirements and procedures outlined below.

The candidate shall inform the director in writing of his/her intention to apply for the Professorial Performance Award and shall submit "...a file that documents her or his professional accomplishments for at least six years in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the department" (C49.5). Upon receipt of such a request and supporting documentation, the director shall notify all eligible voting members of the Staley School faculty. For the singular purpose of the Professorial Performance Award, the Staley School of Leadership Studies defines eligible voting members of the faculty as those persons who presently hold the rank of Professor and whose full-time academic budgeted appointment is in the Staley School of Leadership Studies, excluding the director should he/she hold the rank of Professor (exception: if, in any given year there are less than four full-time department faculty holding the rank of Professor after excluding the director, the eligible voting faculty shall include all tenured budgeted full-time faculty members in the school holding the rank of Associate or Full Professor). The director shall then both make each candidate's materials available for review and call a meeting for obtaining a vote concerning the worthiness of each candidate's materials for the Professorial Performance Award. Such meeting may be by the most convenient majority agreeable means, including in person or by synchronous or asynchronous distance. The vote shall occur by dated individual ballots showing the signature of each voting member

present indicating **Yes/ No/ Abstain**; the director shall further make a record of any eligible faculty not voting and shall include all such results when reporting on the outcome. A simple majority affirmative vote by eligible faculty shall be sufficient to advance the candidate for consideration by the department chair.

If the director is willing to support the Faculty's affirmative recommendation for the candidate, the department chair shall prepare his/her own ballot for each candidate and affirmatively sign and transmit all ballots to the Dean of the College of Education. At the same time, a letter of support will also be sent by the department chair to both the dean of the college and to the candidate [C49.5-C49.6]. If the chair cannot support the Faculty's affirmative recommendation, then the chair will notify the voting Faculty and the candidate in writing [C49.5]. The voting Faculty shall have the option to elect a spokesperson to convey and explain the majority position to the dean of the college. If the eligible voting Faculty cannot recommend the candidate, the director and department chair will inform the applicant [C49.6] in writing and the process for seeking recourse as described in the University Handbook will be followed [C49.9-C49.11].

The Staley School of Leadership Studies has established minimum performance standards to be used in annual merit evaluation. These standards are stated by academic rank and form the initial basis both for satisfactory annual performance review and as the minimum threshold for favorable review whenever a candidate indicates intent to seek promotion to the next highest academic rank. By logical extension, those same minimum performance standards at the full professor level have a direct linear relationship to minimum favorable consideration for the Professorial Performance Award by satisfying the spirit and requirements of Paragraph 2 of this present Professorial Performance Award policy. The criteria for favorable recommendation for the Professorial Performance Award are therefore declared to be identical to the **Exceeds Standards** category for the rank of full professor as delineated in the school's merit evaluation system. Doing so ensures that the Professorial Performance Award is objectively based on "the attainment of excellence in the assigned duties of the faculty member and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies" [University Handbook, C120.1].

For more information on the Professorial Performance Award, refer to the University Handbook C49.1 – C49.14.

APPENDIX E

POST-TENURE REVIEW STANDARDS

**Joint Policy of the
Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership
and
Faculty of Educational Leadership**

POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY

Department of Educational Leadership

FACULTIES OF ADULT LEARNING AND LEADERSHIP and EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Jointly approved October 2017

Statement of Philosophy and Purpose

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

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

The Department of Educational Leadership's policy on post-tenure review follows the overarching purpose, principles, objectives, and procedures in the University's policy on post-tenure review.²⁷

Procedures

Post-tenure review shall be conducted for tenured Faculty in the Department every six years and shall conform to the timeline associated with the annual evaluation review as outlined in the *University Handbook*. The six-year post-tenure review clock shall be further defined to mean that post-tenure review will be conducted for each tenured Faculty member either every six years or in the sixth year following promotion or awarding of a major University performance award. More specifically, the following events shall modify and reset the post-tenure review clock:

- a. Application for promotion to the rank of Full Professor;
- b. Application for the Professorial Performance Award;
- c. Receipt of a substantial College, University, national or international award requiring multi-year portfolio-like documentation, such as University Distinguished Professor, University Distinguished Teaching Scholar, an endowed chair or other national/international awards.²⁸

Other exceptions to post-tenure review are as follows:

- a. If the Faculty member is already undergoing the review process for chronic low achievement, that process will be considered to serve in lieu of post-tenure review;
- b. Any Faculty member who has formally announced retirement through a written letter to the Department/Unit Head, or has begun phased retirement, is exempt from post-tenure review.

²⁷ *University Handbook Appendix W* <http://www.k-state.edu/provost/universityhb/fhxw.html>

²⁸ See list of Faculty Awards <http://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/natlawards.html>

The post-tenure review clock shall operate as follows:

- a. The academic year 2014-2015 serves as the first year of post-tenure review implementation;
- b. Faculty holding the rank of Full Professor will be reviewed during the 2014-2015 cycle;
- c. Faculty holding the rank of Associate Professor will be reviewed during the 2015-2016 cycle;
- d. The review cycle will repeat in the respective academic years 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 for those Faculty who have not received intervening promotions in rank or approved external awards;
- e. The College will maintain a database indicating the review year for each affected Faculty member.

Faculty undergoing a regular post-tenure review must submit the following materials:

- a. The individual annual merit evaluation reviews received across each of the preceding six years.

Faculty submitting the individual six-year collection of merit evaluation reviews shall be reviewed as follows:

- a. The Faculty member submits required documents to the Department chair;
- b. The Chair reviews the materials collection and summarizes the cumulative annual ratings in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.
- c. The Chair meets with the candidate to discuss findings.
- d. If no overall annual rating across the six-year review period falls below MEETS STANDARDS, the post-tenure review process shall be declared complete and the Chair shall issue a letter indicating satisfactory completion of the post-tenure review requirement. Such letter shall bear a signature line for the Faculty member showing agreement or disagreement.
- e. If one or more annual ratings across the six-year review period falls below MEETS STANDARDS, the Faculty member shall be required to construct and file a professional development plan to be reviewed and approved by the Chair.

Faculty of the Staley School of Leadership Studies

POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY

Staley School of Leadership Studies
Approved September 28, 2017

Jointly approved EDLEA/EDACE/LEAD October 2017

Statement of Philosophy and Purpose

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

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

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

Procedures

1. Post-tenure review shall be conducted for tenured faculty every six years and shall conform to the timeline associated with the annual evaluation review as outlined in the *University Handbook*. The six-year post-tenure review clock shall be further defined to mean that post-tenure review will be conducted for all tenured faculty either every six years, or in the sixth year following promotion or awarding of a major university performance award. More specifically, the following events shall modify and reset the post-tenure review clock:
 - A. Application for promotion to full professor;
 - B. Application for the Professorial Performance Award (University Handbook C49);
 - C. Receipt of a substantial college, university, national or international award requiring multi-year portfolio-like documentation, such as University Distinguished Professor, University Distinguished Teaching Scholar, an endowed chair or other national/ international awards (see list of Faculty Awards <http://www.kstate.edu/provost/resources/natlawards.html>).
2. Other exceptions to post-tenure review are as follows:
 - A. If the faculty member is already undergoing the review process for chronic low achievement, that process will be considered to serve in lieu of post-tenure review.
 - B. Any faculty member who has formally announced retirement through a written letter to the department/unit head, or has begun phased retirement, is exempt from post-tenure review.
3. The post-tenure review clock shall operate as follows:
 - A. The academic year 2018-2019 shall be the first year of post-tenure review implementation.
 - B. Faculty holding the rank of full professor will be reviewed during the 2018-2019 cycle.
 - C. Faculty holding the rank of associate professor will be reviewed during the 2019-2020 cycle.
 - D. The review cycle will repeat in the respective academic years 2024-2025 and 2025-2026 for those faculty who have not received intervening promotions in rank or approved external awards.
 - E. The department will maintain a database indicating the review year for each affected faculty member.

4. Faculty undergoing a regular post-tenure review must submit the following materials collection:
 - A. The individual annual merit evaluation reviews received across each of the preceding six years.

5. Faculty submitting the individual six-year collection of merit evaluation reviews shall be reviewed as follows:
 - A. The faculty member submits required documents to the director.
 - B. The director reviews the materials collection and summarizes the cumulative annual ratings in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

 - C. The director meets with the candidate to discuss findings.
 - D. If no overall annual rating across the six-year review period falls below MEETS STANDARDS, the post-tenure review process shall be declared complete and the director shall issue a letter indicating satisfactory completion of the post-tenure review requirement. Such letter shall bear a signature line for the faculty member showing agreement or disagreement.
 - E. If one or more annual ratings across the six-year review period falls below MEETS STANDARDS, the faculty member shall be required to construct and file a professional development plan to be reviewed and approved by the director.

APPENDIX F

**PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS TITLES
FOR
NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY**

**Joint Policy of the
Faculty of Adult Learning and Leadership
and
Faculty of Educational Leadership**

NON-TENURE-TRACK PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS TITLES

Department of Educational Leadership

FACULTY OF ADULT LEARNING AND LEADERSHIP FACULTY OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Jointly approved December 7, 2015

Positions and Ranks

In addition to the tenure-track and tenured positions that are described elsewhere in this *Policy and Procedures Manual*, the Department of Educational Leadership includes the non-tenure-track professional positions of Instructor, Professor of Practice, Teaching Professor, and Research Professor. The *University Handbook* governs and describes these positions.²⁹

The following ranks are further refined within each of these positions:

- *Instructor*--Instructor, Advanced Instructor, Senior Instructor
- *Professor of Practice*--Professor of Practice, Senior Professor of Practice
- *Teaching Professor*--Teaching Assistant Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, Teaching Professor
- *Research Professor*--Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Professor

Primary Responsibilities

Individuals holding the positions of any Instructor ranks or any Teaching Professor rank will be primarily responsible for instruction. Individuals holding the position of Professor of Practice or Senior Professor of Practice may have responsibilities concerning instruction, research, outreach and service or a combination of these duties. Those who hold any rank within the position of Research Professor will be responsible for engaging in research or creative endeavors. Research Professors at the Associate or Professor ranks will be governed by the language found in Section C12.1 of the *University Handbook* that applies specifically to these two roles.³⁰

In all cases, exact duties and expectations for individuals holding non-tenure track appointments in the Department of Educational Leadership will be defined in the letter of appointment. Likewise, responsibilities may vary between individuals depending upon the specific needs of the Department at the time that an offer of employment is made.

Appointment

Individuals holding non-tenure track professional positions in the Department of Educational Leadership may be appointed on a full or part-time basis and generally will be term employees. Regular appointments to non-tenure track positions in the Department are also possible. The exact nature of the appointment will be determined at the time that an offer of employment is made.

Academic rank at the time of the initial appointment is administratively based both upon such factors as advanced degree(s) held, experience, performance and achievement overtime and the exact needs of the Department. More specifically, candidates for the positions of Teaching and Research Professor at all ranks are expected to hold a terminal degree at the doctoral level in an appropriate discipline that is clearly related to their work within the Department. Candidates for the position of Instructor at all ranks are expected to hold a minimum of a masters degree in a field that is clearly related to their work within the

²⁹*University Handbook* <http://www.k-state.edu/provost/universityhb/fhsecc.html>

³⁰ *University Handbook Section C12.1*

Department. Candidates for the position of Professor of Practice at both ranks must hold a minimum of a masters degree in a field that is clearly related to their work within the Department and have substantial appropriate related professional experience.

Annual Evaluation and Reappointment

Regular and term non-tenure track faculty will be evaluated as part of the annual evaluation process. Faculty on regular appointments will also be evaluated for reappointment purposes at this time. The Department Chair will provide each Faculty member with the timeline for evaluation/reappointment as well as a description of materials that are to be submitted for evaluation. The materials and timeline for the annual evaluation and reappointment of non-tenure track Faculty will be those used for tenure track Faculty in the Department and which are described elsewhere in this *Policy and Procedures Manual*.

All materials that are used for both annual evaluation and reappointment of non-tenure track faculty members will be submitted to the Department Chair. Criteria to be used in this process will be those employed in the annual reappointment process of tenure-track faculty that are described elsewhere in this policy manual. After consultation with the members of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the Department, the Chair will make recommendations concerning reappointment/non-reappointment of an individual holding a regular appointment or the continuance/discontinuance of a term employee to the Dean for final decision. The Chair will then provide a written letter of annual evaluation, reappointment or continuance to each Faculty member.

Promotion Process

The process for promotion of individuals holding the non-tenure track positions at any rank of Instructor, Professor of Practice, Senior Professor of Practice, Teaching Assistant/Associate/Full Professor, or Research Assistant/Associate/Full Professor are similar to the processes for tenure-track/tenured Faculty that are described in the *University Handbook*. The average time in rank is five years although longer or shorter periods of time in rank are possible. Each candidate who is seeking promotion will submit both a current curriculum vitae and a portfolio that follows the general outline for tenure consideration (i.e., teaching/research/service) as identified in University policy,³¹ therein documenting related professional achievements and activities to the Department Chair. For each rank, the focus of the portfolio shall be:

Instructor (all ranks)

- Course syllabi
- Student evaluation materials
- Student and/or peer course evaluations (TEVAL or IDEA)

Teaching Professor (all ranks)

- Course syllabi
- Student evaluation materials
- Student and/or peer course evaluations (TEVAL or IDEA)

Research Professor (all ranks)

- Publications or presentations
- Grant proposals that have been submitted
- Involvement with graduate student research
- Evidence of other related creative activities

Professor of Practice (all ranks)

- Evidence of interaction with external groups and organization
- Feedback from clients/stakeholders
- Other evidence of professional and community collaboration

³¹ <http://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/dhmanual/promotion/promotio.html>

In addition to the curriculum vitae and portfolio, a statement of professional goals and objectives for the following five-year period is to be submitted. If a promotion is recommended, it may either be a regular appointment of one year that is entitled to Notice of Non-Reappointment or a term appointment for a period of one to three years with no Notice of Non-Reappointment being required.

After consultation with the members of the tenured and tenure track Faculty of the Department, the-Chair will make recommendations concerning promotion of an individual(s) holding a non-tenure track regular or term appointment/s to the Dean of the College of Education for final decision.

Faculty of the Staley School of Leadership Studies

PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS TITLES FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY
Staley School of Leadership Studies
Non-Tenure-Track Professional Positions

Staley School of Leadership Studies
Approved September 28, 2017
Jointly approved EDLEA/EDACE/LEAD October 2017

Positions and Ranks

In addition to the tenure-track and tenured positions that are described elsewhere in departmental documents for the Staley School of Leadership Studies, the School includes the non-tenure-track professional positions of Instructor, Professor of Practice, Teaching Professor, and Research Professor. Section C10-C12 in the University Handbook governs and describes these positions.

The following ranks are further refined within each of these positions:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| 1) <i>Instructor</i> : | Instructor, Advanced Instructor, Senior Instructor |
| 2) <i>Professor of Practice</i> : | Professor of Practice, Senior Professor of Practice |
| 3) <i>Teaching Professor</i> : | Teaching Assistant Professor, Teaching Associate Professor,
Teaching Professor |
| 4) <i>Research Professor</i> : | Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research
Professor |

Primary Responsibilities

Usually, individuals holding the positions of any Instructor rank or any Teaching Professor rank will be primarily responsible for instruction. Individuals holding positions of any Research Professor rank will be primarily responsible for producing research. Individuals holding the position of Professor of Practice or Senior Professor of Practice may have responsibilities concerning instruction, research, outreach and service or a combination of these duties. In all cases, exact duties and expectations for individuals holding non-tenure track appointments in the Staley School of Leadership Studies will be defined in the letter of appointment. Likewise, responsibilities may vary between individuals depending upon the specific needs of the Department at the time that an offer of employment is made.

Appointment

Individuals holding non-tenure track professional positions in the Staley School of Leadership Studies may be appointed on a full or part-time basis and generally will be term employees. Regular appointments to non-tenure track positions in the School are also possible. The exact nature of the appointment will be determined at the time that an offer of employment is made. The rank at the time of the initial appointment is administratively based both upon such factors as advanced degree(s) held, experience, performance and achievement overtime and the exact needs of the School. More specifically, candidates for the positions of Teaching and Research Professor at all ranks are expected to hold a terminal degree in an appropriate discipline that is clearly related to their work within the School. Candidates for the position of Instructor at all ranks are expected to hold a minimum of a master's degree in a field that is clearly related to their work within the School. Candidates for the position of Professor of Practice at both ranks must hold a minimum of a master's degree, or a bachelor's degree plus ten years of substantial appropriate related senior experience.

Annual Evaluation and Reappointment

Regular and term non-tenure track faculty will be evaluated as part of the annual evaluation process. Faculty on regular appointments will also be evaluated for reappointment purposes at this time. The Director will provide each faculty member with the timeline for evaluation/ reappointment as well as a description of the materials that are to be submitted for evaluation. The materials and timeline for the annual evaluation and reappointment of non-tenure track faculty will be those used for tenure-track faculty in the School and which are described elsewhere in this policy manual. All materials that are used for both

annual evaluation and reappointment of non-tenure track faculty members will be submitted to the Chair of Academic Affairs of the Department. Criteria to be used in this process will be those employed in the annual reappointment process of tenure-track faculty that are described elsewhere in this policy manual. After consultation with the voting members of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Department, the Chair of Academic Affairs will make recommendations concerning reappointment/non-reappointment of an individual holding a regular appointment or the continuance/discontinuance of a term employee to the Director of the School for the final decision. The Chair of Academic Affairs will then provide a written letter of annual evaluation, reappointment or continuance to each faculty member.

Promotion Process

The process for promotion of individuals holding the non-tenure track positions at any rank of Instructor, Professor of Practice, Senior Professor of Practice, Teaching Assistant/Associate/Full Professor or Research Assistant/Associate/Full Professor are similar to the processes for tenure-track/tenured faculty that are described in Section C110 - C116.2 and C150 - C156.2 of the University Handbook. The average time in rank is five years although longer or shorter periods of time in rank are possible. Each candidate who is seeking promotion will submit both a current curriculum vitae and a portfolio, therein documenting related professional achievements and activities to the Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee. Examples of possible portfolio contents follow.

- **Instructor (all ranks)**
 - Course syllabi
 - Student evaluation materials
 - Student and/or peer course evaluations (TEVAL or IDEA)

- **Teaching Professor (all ranks)**
 - Course syllabi
 - Student evaluation materials
 - Student and/or peer course evaluations (TEVAL or IDEA)

- **Research Professor (all ranks)**
 - Publications or presentations
 - Grant proposals that have been submitted
 - Involvement with graduate student research
 - Evidence of other related creative activities

- **Professor of Practice (all ranks)**
 - Evidence of interaction with external groups and organizations
 - Feedback from clients/stakeholders
 - Other evidence of professional and community collaboration

In addition to the curriculum vitae and portfolio, a statement of professional goals and objectives for the following five-year period is to be submitted. If a promotion is recommended, it may either be a regular appointment of one year that is entitled to Notice of Non-Reappointment or a term appointment for a period of one to three years with no Notice of Non-Reappointment being required.

After consultation with the members of the Academic Affairs Committee of the School, the Chair of the Academic Affairs committee will make recommendations concerning promotion of an individual(s) holding a non-tenure track regular or term appointment/s to the Director for final decision.

APPENDIX G

PROVOST MEMORANDUM ON SCHOOL OF LEADERSHIP STUDIES SUPERVISION



Office of the Provost
106 Anderson Hall
Manhattan, KS 66506-0113
785-532-6224
Fax: 785-532-65

February 12, 2009

Dean Michael Holen
College of Education
Bluemont Hall
CAMPUS

Dear Dean Holen:

Thank you for your letter dated January 28, 2009, in which you provided a number of suggestions relative to setting and implementing policies and procedures for our new School of Leadership Studies. I have carefully reviewed your proposals, and they seem to incorporate most of the elements raised by the committee on selected interdisciplinary programs, chaired by Dean Moxley, and in discussions with the faculty and the leadership of the School. I am comfortable enough with the basics of the document to encourage you to take the steps included in the plan to now approach the appropriate faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership and the tenure-track faculty otherwise associated with the School of Leadership Studies to seek their formal endorsement of its curriculum and promotion and tenure provisions. Please communicate to the faculty that I am pleased they seem willing to accept these responsibilities; committing to long-term support for the development of an emerging discipline is a clear mark of their professionalism. Naturally, if the faculty members, for whatever reasons, decide not to formally endorse these proposals, we will attempt to address their concerns or design some different approaches.

I know everyone is busy and pre-occupied with many other responsibilities, but if you could encourage relatively timely action, the School of Leadership Studies can enter the next academic year with far fewer uncertainties. Thank you for your continuing efforts on behalf of this important program.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. Duane Nelms".

M. Duane Nelms

Provost and Senior Vice President

sa

cc: Ruth Dyer, Associate Provost
Mary Tolar, Interim Director, School of Leadership Studies

January 28, 2009

Duane Nellis, Provost
Kansas State University
Anderson Hall 006 Campus

Dear Provost Nellis:

Thank you for providing me the opportunity to review and comment on the alternative proposals crafted by the committee headed by Dean Moxley related to organizational matters affecting the School of Leadership Studies (SLS). The committee obviously spent considerable amounts of time and talent reviewing and analyzing the many issues to be addressed. I believe they have identified most key points and provided some sound approaches to their resolution.

As part of my consideration of these proposals, I have appreciated the opportunity to meet with you, Ruth Dyer, Susan Scott, and Mary Tolar. I also spent several hours with all of the faculty and staff of the School of Leadership Studies during their retreat on January 13, 2009. At this meeting I presented most of the following thoughts; I also solicited and received input and answered many questions.

At the risk of being repetitive with other documents, I am sharing my suggestions relative to assumptions organizational structure, and practical implementation.

Assumptions:

- Decisions made about SLS must assure their employees the opportunity for full participation in the academic and service life of the university;
- Policies and procedures relating to SLS employees must be consistent with the provisions of the University Handbook;
- The SLS is to function as an independent university unit for budgetary and operational purposes and its Director is to report directly to the Provost of the university;
- Any organizational structure created should minimize the need for additional administrative personnel and expenditures;

Organizational structure:

The SLS should remain an independent university unit with the Director reporting directly to the Provost of the university;

- The Director should be responsible for oversight and approval of all matters related to personnel assignment, budget management and allocation, recruitment and hiring of all non-tenure-track faculty/staff, annual merit evaluation of all SLS faculty/staff (with input and consultation with the department chair of the unit in which tenured and tenure-track faculty members' appointments reside), student affairs, externally funded projects generated through SLS, and advising the Provost of SLS -related needs;
- For purposes of curriculum and course approvals and for promotion and tenure considerations (including mid-tenure review), SLS should maintain its decade-long relationship as an academic strand of the Department of Educational Leadership in the College of Education (where both present tenure-track faculty already reside for these purposes);

All SLS curriculum and course actions should be processed following University Handbook requirements through the course and curriculum policies and processes approved for the College of Education;

- Faculty in tenure or tenure-track positions should be reviewed for progress (including mid-tenure review) and for promotion and/or tenure following University Handbook requirements through the policies and procedures of the Department of Educational Leadership and the College of Education. This approach assigns unit authority and responsibility for hiring, retention, and sponsorship of tenure-track faculty to the Department of Educational Leadership and the Dean of Education, acting with the advice of the Director of SLS;
- All faculty and staff of SLS identified as eligible under University Handbook and College of Education policies should be encouraged and supported to participate fully in both college and university level governance, generally through the Department of Educational Leadership and the College of Education, including election to Faculty Senate and to service and leadership roles on College of Education standing committees. SLS faculty and staff already participating in university governance through the nature or unit of their assignment (e.g. administrative) should continue that status.

Practical Implementation:

- The Provost should authorize and inform all relevant authorities and offices that the Director of SLS has signatory status for all approvals normally requiring approval from a college dean (e.g. Pre-awards Services, Human Resources, KSU Foundation, Registrar, Financial Aid), except in matters of curriculum and course approvals, promotion and tenure actions, and recruitment and hiring of tenure-track faculty

(reserved to the faculty and chair of the Department of Educational Leadership and the Dean of Education, acting with advice from the Director of SLS);

Course prefixes for SLS courses should be changed through present College of Education and university course and curriculum policies to identify them clearly with SLS;

The faculty and staff of the SLS should develop an annual merit evaluation document consistent with the requirements of the University Handbook, including the identification of minimal levels of performance.

- The tenured faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership should assist the two present tenure-track faculty, in consultation with all interested SLS faculty, with the construction of promotion and tenure standards; the tenure-track faculty in the department (including the SLS tenure-track faculty) should explicitly (in writing) agree that the tenured faculty will serve as the departmental reviewing and recommending body for promotion and tenure policies and practices (including mid-tenure review) following University Handbook and College of Education policies; this approach to the promotion and tenure process should be viewed as transitional, but will likely exist for an extended period, until the Leadership Studies faculty has developed a membership at all ranks which can support an independent process. The Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership will provide his/her recommendation following the department's normal practices;
- The college level Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of Education should be assigned responsibility to perform the collegiate review of tenure-track faculty in SLS and to follow the college processes to inform the Dean of the College of Education, who will recommend on and represent SLS promotion and tenure cases to the Council of Deans;
- Present SLS non-tenure-track faculty on regular appointments (budgeted), who wish to do so, should consult with the Director, initially, and subsequently the Dean of Education, about seeking tenure-track status. Converting any position to tenure-track status would require a recommendation by the Director and Dean, and approval by the Provost. Generally any such conversion would include implementing all normal university Affirmative Action procedures, including delineation of responsibilities, required and preferred qualifications, and, typically, a nationally competitive search;
- Tenured/tenure-track faculty serving a primary budgetary assignment to SLS, who, for some professionally appropriate reason, wish to be tenured in, or seek tenure in an academic department outside the College of Education should be provided the opportunity to do so, following all policies and procedures in the University Handbook and in the college in which tenure would be held or considered. Seeking tenure in an academic department outside the College of Education requires approval by the Director of the SLS. Any such faculty member should be accorded full access to participation in faculty governance and university service consistent with the policies of that college.

- While annual merit salary increases should be determined by the Director of the SLS, tenured and tenure-track faculty should also submit annual merit materials for review to the chair of the department in which tenure and promotion decisions would reside (generally the Department of Educational Leadership) to permit informed input from the chair to the SLS Director.

Duane, I believe the fundamentals of this plan have the following attributes:

- Preservation of the School of Leadership Studies as an independent university unit;
- Low or little additional administrative costs;
- Adherence to present University Handbook and college policies and procedures (I believe no University Handbook changes would be required);

Protection of faculty and staff rights and interests, including participation opportunities in university governance;

- Ease of administration and removal of potential ‘conflicts of interest’ for the Provost in matters of promotion, tenure, and university governance;
- Placement of promotion, tenure, and course and curriculum matters for faculty in the School in a well-established, mature, familiar and supportive environment which emphasizes Leadership as an academic discipline.

I am certain elements of this plan need refinement; I support review of the plan by any interested parties. It is important to remember that I have advanced this plan to you for your analysis and reaction prior to initiating formal consideration by the faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership and the faculty governance groups of the College of Education. I have received inputs suggesting general support of the concepts by these entities, but need to know your disposition before approaching them.

Awaiting your reaction.

Sincerely,

Michael C. Holen
Skeen Professor and Dean of Education

cc: Ruth Dyer
Mary Tolar
Susan Scott