



HLC Accreditation 2020-2021

Evidence Document

WSU Policies and Procedures Manual

Chapter 4 / Faculty Policies

Additional information: See this document at:
https://www.wichita.edu/about/policy/ch_04/ (accessed March, 5 2021)



WSU Policies and Procedures

Chapter 4 – Faculty Policies

- [4.01 / Faculty Appointments](#)
Effective: April 9, 2018
- [4.02 / Eligibility of Adjunct Faculty for Employer-Provided Health Insurance](#) Effective:
October 21, 2014
- [4.03 / Faculty Sabbatical Leave](#)
Effective: December 9, 2015 | Revised: March 18, 2016
- [4.04 / Resolution of Internal Disputes for Faculty](#)
Effective: July 1, 1997 | Revised: April 9, 2018
- [4.05 / Professional Development](#)
Effective: July 1, 1997
- [4.06 / Statements on the Professional Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty](#) Effective:
July 1, 1997
- [4.07 / Consultant Services to Other State Agencies](#)
Effective: July 1, 1997 | Revised: April 9, 2018
- [4.08 / Definition and Assignment of Credit Hours](#)
Effective: October 15, 2012
- [4.09 / Student Access to Faculty - Office Hours](#)
Effective: July 1, 1997
- [4.10 / Class Policies](#)
Effective: July 1, 1997 | Revised: April 9, 2018
- [4.11 / Commencement Policy](#)
Effective: July 1, 1997
- [4.12 / Teaching Loads](#)
Effective: July 1, 1997 | Revised: September 21, 2020
- [4.13 / Chair Policy and Procedures](#)
Effective: July 1, 1997 | Revised: November 15, 2011
- [4.14 / Faculty Personnel Records](#)
Effective: July 1, 1997 | Revised: June 4, 2019
- [4.15 / Subvention](#)
Effective: July 1, 1997
- [4.16 / Review Procedure for Alleged Violations of the Kansas Board of Regents' Social Media Policy](#)
Effective: February 13, 2017
- [4.17 / Graduate Faculty Membership](#)
Effective: July 1, 1997 | Revised: April 9, 2018



- [4.18 / Probationary Period](#)
Effective: July 1, 1997 | Revised: February 1, 2013
- [4.19 / Tenure Policy](#)
Effective: July 1, 1997 | Revised: April 9, 2018
- [4.20 / Post-Tenure Review for Faculty](#)
Effective: November 1, 2013 | Revised: September 21, 2020
- [4.21 / Tenure and Promotion - Guidelines and Criteria](#)
Effective: July 1, 1997 | Revised: September 21, 2020
- [4.22 / Tenure, Promotion, Professor Incentive Review and Post-Tenure Review Calendar](#)
Effective: July 1, 1997
- [4.23 / Tenure and Promotion - Outline of Process of Review](#)
Effective: July 1, 1997 | Revised: October 13, 2009
- [4.24 / Review for Tenure or Promotion: Procedures](#)
Effective: July 1, 1997 | Revised: April 9, 2018
- [4.25 / Full Professor Incentive Review Program](#)
Effective: September 24, 1999 | Revised: October 1, 2006
- [4.26 / Tenure and Promotion Committee](#)
Effective: July 1, 1997 | Revised: October 13, 2009
- [4.27 / Promotion for Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Guidelines and Criteria](#)
Effective: December 11, 2017
- [4.28 / Promotion for Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Outline of Process of Review](#)
Effective: December 11, 2017
- [4.29 / Review for Non-Tenure Track Faculty Promotion: Procedures](#)
Effective: December 11, 2017
- [4.30 / Teaching Professor Incentive Review Program](#)
Effective: December 11, 2017
- [4.31 / Faculty Evaluation](#)
Effective: July 1, 1997 | Revised: September 21, 2020
- [4.32 / Substance Abuse](#)
Effective: July 1, 1997 | Revised: April 9, 2018
- [4.33 / Procedures for Departing Faculty](#)
Effective: July 1, 1997 | Revised: April 9, 2018
- [4.34 / Dismissal For Cause](#)
Effective: July 1, 1997 | Revised: September 21, 2020
- [4.35 / Financial Exigency](#)
Effective: July 1, 1997 | Revised: August 4, 2000



4.01 / Faculty Appointments

Effective: April 09, 2018

I. Policy

A. Appointment Notice

Faculty appointments are formalized by an appointment form or notice that states the term of employment, salary, faculty rank, and appointment status. Appointment notices for the next academic year are issued by the President's Office as soon after the legislative session as possible.

B. Term of Appointment

Academic year appointments are for a period of approximately nine months beginning just prior to fall registration and extending through spring commencement. Faculty duties include teaching, advising and counseling, research, scholarly activities, other university duties, and community and public service. Periods when classes are not in session are normally devoted to the above-listed non-teaching functions or to other specially scheduled activities.

1. **Annual Appointments** - Some faculty and most administrative personnel receive annual appointments, including vacation and holidays.
2. **Summer Session Appointments** - Some members of the faculty are appointed to teach in the summer session. Assignment to summer session teaching is a matter of college and departmental policy and decision, subject to guidelines established by the director of the summer session.

C. Faculty Ranks

The ranks granted by the University to academic faculty are those normally bestowed by institutions of higher education: professor, associate professor and assistant professor.

D. Types of Appointments

Faculty appointments include: provisional, regular, temporary, probationary, and tenured. Temporary appointments are on an annual basis, are subject to renewal based on need for instruction, and carry no expectation of reappointment. Individuals with a temporary appointment may not be moved to a probationary appointment without review and specific authorization by the Provost. Provisional appointments are for unclassified teaching professionals and last for three years before being eligible for regular appointment status. Probationary appointments are tenure track faculty with consideration for tenure after the established probationary period. Note:



Lecturers/adjuncts are appointed on a semester to semester basis as needed and do not constitute faculty appointments.

Probationary appointments are those appointments that may, on the basis of continuing satisfactory performance, lead to review for the award of tenure. However, probationary appointments carry no expectation or promise that review for the award of tenure will be undertaken or that tenure will be awarded. Probationary appointments are reviewed on an annual basis and may or may not be renewed. Probationary appointments will not be continued for more than seven years. Tenured appointments will be annually renewed unless the faculty member is dismissed through proper actions and procedures.

E. Special Conditions of Appointment

Any special conditions of appointment will be included in the appointment form signed by the employee. Special conditions of appointment include but are not limited to: date by which a terminal degree and/or professional credentials is expected and the consequences of non-attainment, or special conditions for nomination for tenure review consideration (such as an additional degree or professional credentials). It is the responsibility of the employee to inform the department and dean of accomplishment of the conditions of appointment.

F. Joint Faculty Appointments

A primary academic objective of Wichita State University is the search for and development of new knowledge which will enhance institutional programs and contribute to the University's research responsibilities. Recognizing the contribution of interdisciplinary studies in meeting the objective, the University may offer joint appointments for faculty where appropriate.

The joint appointment may provide greater program flexibility, the enhancement of intellectual stimulation, and broader insights into matters under faculty investigation and research.

G. Joint Appointment Definition

Joint appointments as used herein shall mean either term or continuous appointments to at least one regular academic position in more than one academic department, research unit, or other administrative unit. Such appointments may be approved by the Provost, provided they do not total more than 1.0 full-time equivalent (FTE) and are recommended by all colleges, departments, and units involved.



H. Determination of Primary Department

Any joint appointment shall have one position assigned as the primary position and the department or unit (such as administrative and research units) within which that position is situated shall be deemed to be the primary department or unit as herein defined.

1. Each current joint appointment or joint title shall be assigned a primary position by the administrative officer having direct authority over all departments or units involved in the joint appointment or joint title. This administrative officer shall initially receive the recommendations of the administrative heads of the departments or units involved and shall recommend such an assignment for the holder of the joint appointment or title to the Provost.
2. Any new joint appointment or joint title shall be assigned a primary position at the time of such appointment by the appointing authority after this authority receives the recommendations of the administrative heads of the departments or units involved, who shall recommend the appointment creating such joint appointment or joint title.

I. Primary Department or Unit's Role

After receiving the recommendation of the other units involved, the primary department or unit shall be responsible for decisions or recommendations regarding salary, tenure, promotion, leaves, and other perquisites and shall be responsible for securing agreement among the departments or units involved on the sharing of salary and support funds.

J. Implementation

Before a faculty member first receives a joint appointment, the faculty member and the appropriate academic units must mutually determine, record in writing, and secure administrative approval for all conditions of the appointment. The offer of appointment should include the following:

1. Probationary period (if applicable);
2. Unit expectations for tenure and promotion;
3. Procedures for recommending salary increases and performance reviews;
4. Procedures for reappointment or non-reappointment decisions;
5. Procedures that apply in cases of financial exigency or the dissolution of one of the academic units, or if the joint appointment is dissolved. Unless otherwise specified, the faculty member will return to the primary department.

A copy of the offer of appointment will be given to the appointee and will be placed in his/her personnel file in the Office of Academic Affairs. Should any unresolved



disagreements arise among the participating units and/or faculty member, the joint appointment shall be dissolved in accordance with the provisions of the written agreements.

K. Standards for Non-Reappointment

The Kansas Board of Regents has adopted the following policy regarding timely notice of non-reappointment for faculty members holding probationary appointments.

Notice of non-reappointment should be given in writing in accordance with the following standards; however, such standards shall not be applicable to any administrative assignments held by the tenure track faculty member.

1. Not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination.
2. Not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if an initial two-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.
3. At least 12 months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years in the institution.

These statements shall apply even during periods of declared financial exigency, unless impossible, in which case notice shall be provided as early as possible.

Kansas Board of Regents Policy Manual, Chapter II, Section C, Item 7

4.02 / Eligibility of Adjunct Faculty for Employer-Provided Health Insurance

Effective: October 21, 2014

I. Purpose

The purpose of this statement is to set forth University policy with regard to eligibility of adjunct faculty members for health insurance benefits under the Affordable Care Act.

II. Preamble

The Affordable Care Act requires that employers establish reasonable standards for determining the number of hours of service by adjunct faculty, including other hours that are necessary to perform the adjunct faculty member's duties, such as class preparation time.

III. Policy

1. Adjunct faculty will be considered to spend two and one-half (2 1/2) hours of service (preparation, grading, etc.) for every one (1) credit hour taught. The total hours shall be entered when processing the Electronic Personnel Action Form (ePAF).
2. Circumstances may warrant a calculation based on hours not represented in the credit hour value. This includes but is not limited to those who teach applied courses, courses involving observation of students in the field, or adjuncts who teach classes without an assigned credit hour value. In this case the appropriate calculation shall be approved by the appropriate department chair and Provost's Office and entered into the ePAF. At no time shall this calculation be less than a credit of two and one-half hours (2.5) of service for every one (1) credit hour taught.

IV. Implementation

This policy shall be included in the *WSU Policies and Procedures Manual* and shared with appropriate constituencies of the University.

Academic Affairs shall have primary responsibility for publication, dissemination and implementation of this University policy.



4.03 / Faculty Sabbatical Leave

Effective: December 09, 2015 Revised: March 18, 2016

I. Policy

- A. In strictly meritorious cases, a faculty member who has served continuously for six years or longer may be granted a leave of absence with partial pay for a period up to one year. Wichita State University's policy on sabbatical leaves is based on Board of Regents policy that states, in part, that sabbatical leave may be granted under the following conditions.
- B. In strictly meritorious cases, a full-time faculty member on regular appointment at any of the Regents institutions of higher education who has served continuously for a period of six years or longer at one or more of these institutions, may, at the convenience of the institution and upon the approval of the president or chancellor of the institution with which connected, be granted not to exceed one such leave of absence for each period of regular employment for the purpose of pursuing advanced study, conducting research studies, or securing appropriate industrial or professional experience; such leave shall not be granted for a period of less than one semester nor for a period of more than one year, with reimbursement being made according to the following schedule:
 1. For nine-months faculty, up to half pay for an academic year, or up to full pay for one semester.
 2. For twelve-months faculty, up to half pay for eleven months, or up to full pay for five months.
- C. A faculty member applying for sabbatical leave is required to file an official Application for Sabbatical Leave and sign a Sabbatical Leave Agreement by which he or she agrees to return to Wichita State University for a period of at least one year immediately following expiration of the period of leave. In the event of failure to return, the faculty member agrees to refund all sabbatical pay, or, on failure to remain for at least one year, to refund that portion of sabbatical pay which is in proportion to the amount of time not served as required by the agreement.
- D. Sabbatical leave requests should be prepared on official forms which are available on the [Office of Academic Affairs web page](#). Leave requests are due in the deans' offices no later than the last Friday in September and in the Office of Academic Affairs no later than the second Friday of October of the academic year preceding the proposed leave. Leave requests are then referred to the



Faculty Support Committee (FSC), a committee whose charge is to review leave proposals in terms of merit, solicit additional information where needed, and make ranked recommendations to the Provost who performs the final evaluation. Each applicant is informed of University action on his/her sabbatical leave request on the third Friday in January.

- E. Procedures and policies established for sabbatical leaves are as follows:
1. The applicant prints or downloads the WSU Application for Sabbatical Leave and the Board of Regents Sabbatical Leave Agreement form.
 2. Each leave application form is completed in sufficient detail to permit review by the FSC and evaluation by the Provost. The application is first submitted to the applicant's chairperson, who transmits the form through his/her dean to the Provost for delivery to the FSC.
 3. Recommendations from the chairperson and the dean are included in the application when it is transmitted to the Provost. The recommendation must include a statement from the applicant's chairperson or dean concerning provisions to be made for the work load of the applicant during his/her absence. The statement should cover the direction of those graduate students for whom the applicant is the thesis or dissertation advisor. It should also indicate whether any additional expense to the University, apart from sabbatical salary, would occur if the leave were granted. Applications involving such additional costs are not ordinarily approved without special justification.
 4. If the proposed program of work is contingent upon the applicant's receiving additional financial aid from the University, apart from sabbatical salary, or from external sources, details concerning such contingency should be included in the application. The sources from which external support is being sought should be identified and the nature of any services required in connection with the receipt of such support should be related to the purpose of the leave.
 5. No later than 60 days from the first day of classes in the semester of the faculty member's return from sabbatical leave, he or she is required to submit a Final Report on the sabbatical projects. A form for filing this report will be sent to the faculty member early in the semester of his/her return to campus. The completed Final Report is to be submitted, through the chairperson and dean, to the Provost. It will be filed in the faculty member's permanent faculty record. If appropriate, the Final Report should include a description of specific plans for sharing the



results of the sabbatical leave with the recipient's departmental colleagues or other groups on campus.

- F. The Sabbatical Leave Policy of the Regents system, and Wichita State University in particular, is based on the assumption that such leaves do not occur automatically at stated intervals, but are awarded on merit and are clearly designed to encourage scholarly and professional achievement for the mutual benefit of the faculty member and the University.
- G. The scope of activities that may be undertaken by WSU faculty on sabbatical leaves is quite broad, encompassing not only the traditional purpose of scholarly research, but the more nontraditional purposes of professional development or redevelopment. At WSU, leaves have been granted for advanced study, for specific research projects, for creative projects, for curriculum/instructional development, for residencies to observe the programs and methods of other institutions, for travel related to academic and professional development, for occupational experience designed to enhance professional qualifications, and many other similar purposes. Work toward a graduate degree does not normally qualify as an acceptable program for a sabbatical leave.
- H. Sabbatical leave programs properly serve the interests of the faculty member and the university as a whole. Faculty who have accumulated service with the University benefit from having a period away from normal campus obligations in order to pursue special interests or projects related to their professional lives. The period of renewal offered by such leave also benefits the University, which welcomes back at the conclusion of a successful leave a faculty member with new ideas, enthusiasm, and accomplishments.
- I. The sabbatical leave application process contains some features designed to enhance the probability of successful sabbatical leaves. In the application materials, faculty are asked to demonstrate special aptitude for their proposed projects, indicating previous professional or scholarly work related to the area of activity proposed for the leave. Sufficient documentation must be presented to enable the University to conclude that the goals of the leave probably will be accomplished and that the project cannot be completed without such a leave.
- J. A particular concern of the University is the difficulty of granting leaves to faculty in small departments. A disproportionate negative effect may be felt by students and colleagues when a faculty member who is the only person with programmatic expertise needed on a regular basis by the department takes a sabbatical or other type of leave. Faculty in small departments, therefore, need to plan their leaves in advance, and obtain assurance from their department and college that arrangements can be made to cover their responsibilities while



absent. As previously indicated, Regents policy limits the number of sabbatical leaves in any fiscal year to not more than four percent of the equivalent full-time faculty with rank of instructor or higher. The University further stipulates that the number of leaves in any fiscal year may not be so great in any department, division, or college, or on the campus as a whole, as to disrupt the continued and regular course offerings, or to affect the quality of education offered to the students. Final approval of the sabbatical leave for a faculty member being reviewed for continuous tenure is contingent upon the awarding of tenure. Questions regarding the sabbatical leave policies and procedures of the University may be addressed to the Provost.



4.04 / Resolution of Internal Disputes for Faculty

Effective: July 01, 1997 Revised: April 09, 2018

I. Introduction

The collegial atmosphere of the University community is best served through informal resolution of disputes. To resolve internal disputes, to assure careful consideration of personnel actions and complaints, and to safeguard academic freedom, Wichita State University provides for the review of grievances filed by faculty members of the University. Faculty members should turn to the grievance process only after informal means of resolution have been utilized. The term "faculty member" refers to all employees who, at the time the grievance is filed, have teaching/research/library responsibilities of 50% or more and .5 FTE or greater including: temporary faculty, probationary faculty, tenured faculty, contingent unclassified professionals, provisional unclassified professionals, and regular unclassified professionals (who have the e-class designation of FA or F2).

II. Policy

A. Informal Means of Resolution

Any faculty member who has a grievance must first make a bona fide effort to resolve the matter through University established lines of authority. In most instances this should involve the chair, and if appropriate, the dean. If discrimination is alleged, the faculty member shall seek resolution by contacting the Executive Director of Equal Opportunity. In the event that the complaint is directed against the Provost, the faculty member is encouraged to seek resolution of the dispute with the President of the University. If a faculty member appeals to agencies outside the University before the internal grievance procedure has been completed, the President of the University may tell the Faculty Senate Rules Committee to stop the review.

B. Right of Consultation

A faculty member may invite a faculty colleague to attend a discussion or meeting with his or her chair, dean, or other supervisory administrator at which the faculty member's professional activity or performance will be discussed, and should notify the administrator accordingly. The invited colleague may act as an advisor or witness, and may participate in the discussion if invited.

The invited colleague is not a representative of the faculty member and shall not be nor serve as legal counsel. His or her limited role is that of colleague and advisor, assisting in the consultations to produce a satisfactory resolution of the dispute. Responsibility for any decisions reached or actions taken remains with the parties to the dispute. Any other administrative officer invited to such a meeting or discussion has the same limited role as an

invited colleague, unless he/she has regular, pre-existing administrative responsibilities for the issues being discussed.

When a faculty member invites a colleague to attend such a meeting or discussion, the faculty member assumes responsibility for any loss of confidentiality that results from that colleague's actions. The presence of an invited colleague does not imply that a written record of the meeting must be kept; it does not preclude any participant from submitting a summary memorandum to others who were present for their authentication.

C. Faculty Senate Ombudsperson

Faculty Senate Ombudspersons are available to provide assistance to faculty members in the identification or articulation of internal disputes that arise within the University. The Ombudsperson's role is to listen to concerns arising from disputes within the University, provide resources and clarify procedural options and, as such, may facilitate a satisfactory settlement of the dispute without necessitating the filing of a grievance. The decision whether to file a grievance is, however, the prerogative of the faculty member with the concern. A list of the current Ombudspersons shall be posted on the Faculty Senate's website. Faculty members are encouraged to contact an Ombudsperson before filing a grievance. The president-elect of the Faculty Senate shall assist the faculty member in connecting with an Ombudsperson if necessary.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee shall nominate three tenured faculty members, from a pool of previous faculty senate presidents, to serve as Ombudspersons for three-year staggered terms. The appointments will be confirmed by a vote of the Faculty Senate. By virtue of their prior service, those chosen to serve as Ombudspersons will possess significant knowledge of University structure and operations.

A person may not be in the grievance pool during the time of service as Ombudsperson. Administrators, as defined in the Faculty Senate Constitution, shall not be eligible for appointment. Administrators include those persons holding the title of President, Provost, Senior Vice President, Vice President, Associate Vice President, Assistant Vice President, Dean, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean, and Directors of all non-academic programs including, but not limited to, Director of the Office of Institutional Research, Director of Physical Plant, Registrar, and Director of Cooperative Education.

III. Policies and Procedures for Processing Grievances for Faculty

A. Grievance General Information

1. Filing the Complaint

If the dispute is not settled through the required informal means, the faculty member may invoke the University's grievance policy by contacting the Chair of the Faculty Senate Rules

Committee and submitting a formal complaint. In matters alleging discrimination, if contacted first, the Faculty Senate Rules Committee Chairperson will direct the faculty member to the Executive Director of Equal Opportunity.

2. Complaints Excluded from the Grievance Procedure

Complaints based on the following are excluded from this grievance procedure:

- Tenure and Promotion
- Retrenchment
- Hiring Decisions
- Traffic Fines
- Library Fines
- Dismissal for Cause
- Sexual Harassment
- Complaints of Unlawful Discrimination

3. Time Limits

The complaint form should be filed within three months from the date on which the act/s or omission/s which are the basis of the grievance occurred or the date on which the act/s or omission/s reasonably would have become known. All grievance procedures, including but not limited to grievance hearings, are suspended from May 18 to August 18. Grievances filed during that period will be processed as if filed on August 18. The time requirements in this grievance policy shall be followed to the extent reasonably possible. When used, the term "class days" refers to weekdays, when classes are in session.

4. Administrative Leave for Faculty During the Proceedings

A faculty member may be placed on administrative leave during a grievance if the Executive Director of Human Resources, in consultation with the appropriate Dean, deem there is an immediate danger to the faculty member or to others. The administrative leave may be with or without compensation as determined on a case by case basis.

5. Complaint Form

The complaint form requires the faculty member to describe the nature of the complaint, the date on which the act/s or omission/s which is/are the basis of the grievance occurred, and shall state the alleged improper action and explain the desired remedy. This statement will serve as a petition submitted to the Faculty Senate Rules Committee requesting it to call together a Review Committee to review the matter. Submission of a petition does not

guarantee a Review Committee will be called, that an investigation will occur or a detailed review of the problem will be undertaken.

6. Review by the Faculty Senate Rules Committee

The Committee must decide whether the faculty member has made a good faith effort to resolve the problem through informal means. The Committee will decide within ten class days whether the grievance should be processed and a Review Committee formed. A decision not to process the grievance may be appealed to the Faculty Senate President who will decide within five class days of receiving the appeal whether to overrule the decision. If the petition is accepted, the Rules Committee Chair shall appoint a Convener from the Panel of Conveners and a Review Committee from the faculty members who are on the Grievance Board (See Section III.G. below). It is the responsibility of the Chair of the Faculty Senate Rules Committee to ensure that the review complies with all established timelines.

7. Convener

The Panel of Conveners will consist of ten individuals, selected from faculty members who are eligible for Faculty Senate membership by the Rules Committee of the Senate in consultation with the Chair of the Faculty Senate Rules Committee. The Convener is not a voting member of the Grievance Review Committee. The Convener's role is that of an administrator and executive secretary. The Convener shall have the following responsibilities:

- a. Send a copy of the complaint form and supporting documents to all parties to the action, to the dean, and to the Provost.
- b. Schedule all meetings of the Review Committee. The first hearing meeting is to be scheduled no later than 15 class days after the appointment of the Review Committee.
- c. Chair all meetings of the Review Committee.
- d. Keep all parties informed.
- e. Ensure that fair and proper procedures are followed.
- f. File the final report with the office of the Provost and with the Chair of the Faculty Senate Rules Committee.
- g. Act as secretary for all appeals of the grievance.

8. The Review Committee

A Review Committee of five will be chosen from the Grievance Board by the Chair of the Faculty Senate Rules Committee. Faculty may remove themselves from the case for bias or conflict of interest. In addition, each party to the grievance will have a total of two challenges. If any member of the Review Committee is unable to continue because of illness or for other good

and sufficient reasons, the hearing shall proceed with fewer members unless one or more of the parties has a compelling reason for requesting that another person from the Grievance Board be selected to replace the Review Committee member who is unable to continue, in which case the Convener shall request the Chair of the Faculty Senate Rules Committee to select a replacement. The Review Committee has the following responsibilities:

- a. To attend all meetings called by the Convener.
- b. To ensure that fair, proper, and confidential procedures are followed.
- c. To consider all pertinent and relevant evidence in the case.
- d. To decide whether the allegations have been sustained by the evidence, determine whether a wrong has occurred, and to make recommendations concerning possible redress.

B. Pre-Hearing Procedures

i. Meeting of the Convener and the Parties

The parties to the dispute will submit written summaries of the major issues to be decided to the Convener, and the Convener will then schedule a meeting with the parties to:

- a. Clarify and, where possible, simplify the issues.
- b. Stipulate to the facts, if possible.
- c. Arrange for the exchange by the parties of all documents which each party intends to present to the Review Committee, and establish a deadline for that exchange which shall be no later than five class days before the formal hearing. A party to the grievance may not present any documents to the Review Committee at the grievance hearing unless they have been provided to the other parties to the grievance by the foregoing deadline.
- d. Identify the witnesses whom each party intends to call at the grievance hearing.
- e. Discuss the participation of advisors to the parties who are not and shall not act nor serve as legal counsel.
- f. To notify either or both parties of specific material/information requested by the Review Committee.

2. Meeting of the Convener and the Review Committee

The Convener will call the Review Committee to its first meeting to review the procedures and responsibilities of the Review Committee.



3. Cooperation of the Parties

All parties should make every effort to cooperate with the Convener and each other during these preliminary activities. If there are unjustifiable delays in the proceedings, the Convener may so advise the Review Committee. At its discretion the Review Committee may determine that one or more of the parties are not cooperating, report this fact to the Faculty Senate Rules Committee, and adjourn. If the adjournment is accepted by the Rules Committee, the Convener will declare the proceedings closed and the grievance process shall be terminated.

C. Hearing Procedures

The faculty member may elect to submit the grievance to a hearing before the Review Committee or to waive a hearing. If a hearing is waived, the Review Committee will evaluate the evidence and base its findings and recommendations on the documents and materials provided by the parties to the grievance. If the faculty member elects a hearing before the Review Committee, the following procedures for the hearing shall be followed:

1. The Convener shall establish a time for the hearing, taking into account the needs of the parties. However, unless there are extenuating circumstances, the hearing shall be held no later than forty-five calendar days after the Faculty Senate Rules Committee determines that the grievance should be processed.
2. The Review Committee will determine what information it needs to decide the case and may request that either or both parties provide such additional information as it deems appropriate. The Review Committee has no power of subpoena and participation in the hearing is voluntary on the part of the parties. Unless good cause is shown, the hearing shall be closed. Upon request from either party, witnesses may be excluded from the hearing room while not testifying.
3. The hearing is not a court of law and should not be expected to follow the rules and procedures of a court. However, the hearing should ensure a thorough, fair, open, and impartial review.
4. At the Review Committee's discretion, during the course of the hearing the faculty member may be invited to amplify the statement of complaint; the other party may be asked to speak in defense; both parties may call witnesses; the Review Committee and the Convener may question both parties and all witnesses.
5. The parties to the grievance may invite an advisor from the Wichita State University community to be present and give advice, but such advisor, including those with legal training, shall not be nor serve as legal counsel.
6. No recording or transcript of the hearing will be made, but the Convener and each Review Committee member may keep notes to assist in preparing a report describing the proceedings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Review



Committee. A committee member's notes will be confidential and the work product of the committee member.

7. When the Review Committee is satisfied that all reasonably available pertinent information has been presented, the Convener shall declare the hearing closed.

D. Decision of the Review Committee

The Review Committee shall deliberate in private in order to review the information presented and arrive at its recommendations. The Review Committee must submit a final written report of proceedings, conclusions, and recommendations no later than ten class days after the close of the hearing. The Convener shall send the report to the parties of the dispute, the dean, the Provost, and to the Chair of the Faculty Senate Rules Committee, who shall file the report in the Faculty Senate office. The report should (1) restate the charges, (2) present the finding of facts, (3) indicate whether a wrong occurred, and (4) recommend what should be done. The Review Committee will make its recommendations to the Provost who will decide to accept, reject, or modify those recommendations. In the event that the Provost is the subject of the grievance, the recommendation will be sent to the President of the University. The existence of the grievance procedure assumes that the Review Committee's recommendations will generally be accepted or will be rejected or modified only for compelling reasons.

E. Appeal to the Provost

Either party has the right to make a final statement in writing to be sent to the Provost. The statement must be submitted no later than five class days after receipt of the Review Committee's recommendations. The Provost will act on the matter within ten class days after the deadline of receipt of final statements. Notice of acceptance, rejection or modification of the Review Committee's shall be sent to the Convener, the parties, the dean, the Review Committee, and the Chair of the Faculty Senate Rules Committee who shall file the notice, with identifying information deleted, in the Faculty Senate office. The written material presented by both parties to the Review Committee and the Review Committee's final report will be kept on file by the Provost for three years from the date of the final report. This material will be held in confidence as personnel related material.

F. Appeal to the President

Either party to the grievance may appeal the decision of the Provost by submitting a letter to the President of the University within ten class days from the date of the receipt of the Provost's decision, requesting an appeal of that decision. A copy of the appeal letter shall be submitted to the Review Committee Convener, who will assure that the dean, the Provost, Review Committee members, and the other parties to the grievance receive copies.

The letter requesting the appeal must state the basis for seeking the appeal. An appeal must be based on one or more of the following reasons:



1. The decision was not substantiated by the evidence;
2. The decision was erroneous in light of applicable University standards, policies, and/or procedures;
3. The procedures as outlined in this policy and/or as modified by the Review Committee (as allowed by the policy) were not followed; or
4. Actual bias on the part of the Review Committee and/or Provost.

The other parties to the dispute and the Review Committee may submit written comments to the President regarding the appeal no later than five class days after receipt of the notice of the appeal. The President shall review the original materials, any statements sent by the parties to the Provost or the President regarding the grievance, and the Provost's final action. The President shall notify the Provost, both parties to the dispute, the Convener of the Review Committee, and the Chair of the Faculty Senate Rules Committee of his or her final action within ten class days of receipt of material. A copy of this notification, with identifying information deleted, shall be filed in the Faculty Senate office.

G. Grievance Board

Each year a Grievance Board consisting of a representative panel of members who are eligible for faculty senate membership will be selected to serve in the grievance pool. Temporary, probationary, contingent unclassified professionals will be given the opportunity to opt out with no questions asked within a month of receiving notification regarding their membership in the grievance pool. Those identified to act as potential Review Committee members will be selected at random from the grievance board in proportion to the numbers in each rank, race/ethnicity, and sex. None of the Grievance Board members may be members of the Faculty Senate Rules Committee. Persons who serve on a grievance Review Committee are exempt from serving on another grievance committee for a three year period. Persons selected for serving on the grievance board must petition the Provost to be excused.



4.05 / Professional Development

Effective: July 01, 1997

I. Policy

Professional development and continuing professional education are essential elements in an institution's quest for academic quality. At Wichita State University, the primary responsibility for professional development rests with the individual. Increasing effectiveness in teaching, research, and service is expected of each member of the faculty.

In an era of limited resources, however, the institution is developing a variety of opportunities for faculty to obtain the resources needed for professional growth. Within the limits of its capabilities, the University provides some funds for travel to professional meetings. Each fall and spring, the University research committee awards small grants to faculty who need some support to initiate or complete a research project.

Various offices throughout the institution offer programs directed at the improvement of instruction such as the University College advising offices and the Testing Center within the Counseling Center. The Counseling Center staff is available to faculty and staff who wish to discuss personal and professional issues. Each year, a number of seminars and dialogue groups are provided in which professional and instructional issues are discussed. The Office of Academic Affairs can also arrange part-time administrative internships for faculty seeking new perspectives on the institution.

Finally, faculty are advised to take advantage of the many seminars, workshops, and presentations provided often on an informal and ad hoc basis by a number of academic units and interest groups.



4.06 / Statements on the Professional Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty

Effective: July 01, 1997

I. Policy

A. Academic Freedom

The teacher is entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of the teacher's academic duties. The faculty member is entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing the subject, but the faculty member should be careful not to introduce controversial matter which has no relation to the subject.

The faculty member is a citizen, a member of a learned profession, and an officer of an educational institution. When the faculty member speaks or writes as a citizen, the faculty member should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but the faculty member's special position in the community imposes special obligations. As a person of learning and an educational officer, the faculty member should remember that the public may judge the profession and the institution by the faculty member's utterances. Hence, the faculty member should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should always indicate that the faculty member is not an institutional spokesperson, unless they have been approved as an institutional spokesperson prior to any utterance.

B. Rights and Responsibilities of Academic Professionals and Collegiality

Faculty members are at one and the same time employees of the University, members of learned professions, and members of the Faculty of the Wichita State University. Each of these roles carry various rights, responsibilities, and privileges. Together, these rights, responsibilities, and privileges define the profession of the University professor as teacher, scholar, and public servant.

As employees of the University, faculty members are subject to policies adopted by the University; policies, procedures, and regulations adopted by the Kansas Board of Regents; and various laws and regulations established by the municipality, State of Kansas and United States Government governing the conduct of its employees.

As members of learned professions, faculty members share with colleagues throughout the nation and the world, including members of the University administration, responsibility for the discovery, dissemination, and preservation of knowledge in their chosen fields. They also enjoy the rights and privileges necessary to the work of scholars and teachers, many of which have been



explicitly recognized and sanctioned by the Kansas Board of Regents in its enactments. These include academic freedom, as defined in the American Association of University Professors 1940 Statement of Principles, and its various interpretative statements.

As members of the Faculty of the Wichita State University, faculty members have specific rights and responsibilities with respect to the academic rules, regulations, and programs of the University, University governance, and faculty governance. These rights and responsibilities are outlined and summarized in the University Policies and Procedures Manual. These specific provisions reflect standards and expectations recognized by the academic professions throughout the United States.

The principles that govern the resolution of disputes at Wichita State University are those of collegiality and consultation. Preferably, the consultation is among the parties directly involved in the dispute, and results in a decision which all parties accept. When this fails, for whatever reason, the parties involved may wish to bring in other members of the University community, either informally, by invitation, or formally, by invoking specific rights of appeal provided by University policies.

Collegial relationships among faculty members, and between faculty members and administrative officers of the University, are based on a mutual recognition of, and respect for, the various roles that faculty members and administrators play, and the rights, responsibilities and privileges involved in these roles. For example, faculty members should respect the lawful authority of administrative officers of the University, who exercise supervisory responsibility for the University, on behalf of the Kansas Board of Regents and the State of Kansas. At the same time, administrative officers should respect the scholarly, creative, and professional rights of faculty members, based on their status as members of the learned professions.

When disputes arise over the proper interpretation of faculty rights, responsibilities, and privileges, the expectation is that these disputes will be resolved after consultation between the parties involved, and generally within the framework of established lines of authority. Normally, disputes are resolved in consultation with the chair of the department; failing that, in consultation with the dean of the college; failing that, in consultation with the Provost; and failing that, in consultation with the President of the University. Extraordinary circumstances will dictate appropriate modifications consistent with these expectations.

When disputes cannot be resolved through such informal consultation, University policies provide other means of resolving various disputes. These



include (but are not limited to): appeal of tenure and promotion recommendations to college- or University-level committees, or to the President; appeals of curricular and academic policy questions to the faculty of a college, or to the University Faculty; placing an issue before the Faculty Senate; employing the Faculty Grievance Procedure. In each of these cases, the matter in dispute is placed before colleagues and peers for their consideration, judgment, and recommendation. There are few, if any, matters for which the University does not provide some formal means of appeal for review or reconsideration of a decision affecting a faculty member.

C. Faculty Ethics Statement

The Faculty Senate adopted the following statement on faculty ethics on November 8, 1982:

1. Faculty members, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end they devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although they may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise a faculty member's freedom of inquiry.
2. As teachers, faculty members encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before the student the best scholarly standards of their discipline. They demonstrate respect for the student as an individual and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. They make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that they evaluate students according to their true merits. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between teacher and student. They avoid any exploitation of students for private advantage and acknowledge significant assistance from them. They protect the student's academic freedom.
3. As colleagues, faculty members have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. They respect and defend the free inquiry of their associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas they show due respect for the opinions of others. They acknowledge their academic debts and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. They accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.
4. As members of their institution, faculty members seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although they observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided these do not contravene academic freedom, they



maintain their rights to criticize and seek revision of them. Faculty members determine the amount and character of the work they do outside their institution with due regard to their paramount responsibilities within it. When considering interruption or termination of their service, they recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intention.

5. As members of their community, faculty members have the rights and obligations of any citizen. They measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, their students, their profession, and their institution. When faculty members speak or act as private persons, they avoid creating the impression that they speak or act for their college or University. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, faculty members have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

D. Board of Regents Mandated Statement on the Use of Controversial Material, Including Sexually Explicit Materials in Instruction

Students are entitled to an atmosphere conducive to learning and to even-handed treatment in all aspects of the teacher-student relationship. Faculty members may not refuse to enroll or teach students on the grounds of students' beliefs or the possible uses to which students may put the knowledge to be gained in a course. Students should not be forced by the authority inherent in the instructional role to make particular personal choices as to political action or their own social behavior. Evaluation of students and the award of academic credit must be based on academic performance professionally judged and not on matters irrelevant to that performance, whether personality, race, religion, degree of political activism, or personal beliefs.

It is the mastery faculty have of their subjects and their own scholarship that entitles them to their classrooms and to freedom in the presentation of their subjects. Thus, it is improper for an instructor persistently to intrude material that has no relation to the subject, or to fail to present the subject matter of the course as announced to students and as approved by the faculty in their collective responsibility for the curriculum [See KBOR Policy Chapter II, F. Item 7 as excerpted from the AAUP's 1970 Statement on Freedom and Responsibility⁶].

Revision Date

January 30, 2004

April 9, 2018



4.07 / Consultant Services to Other State Agencies

Effective: July 01, 1997 | Revised: April 09, 2018

I. Policy

It is the responsibility of the University, which employs a faculty member on a regular basis, to authorize in advance of actual service a faculty member to serve as a consultant to another state agency. If a WSU faculty member is contacted by another state agency to serve as a consultant and if the faculty member is to be reimbursed for these services, the following steps should be followed.

- A. The WSU faculty member through the departmental chairperson must submit a memo to the Provost giving the name of the faculty member, dates of employment, reason for employment, and the rate of compensation.
- B. When the matter has been approved by the Provost, the Vice President for Finance and Administration will notify the counterpart at the state agency requesting the services of the WSU faculty member so the requesting state agency can initiate the appropriate paper work to pay the WSU faculty member.
- C. Faculty members serving as a consultant for another state agency, whether approved for reimbursement for consultant services or not, are still expected to perform all duties and responsibilities of their position with the University. If serving as a consultant reduces the faculty member to less than 1.0 full time equivalent (FTE) the faculty member may find their University compensation to be adjusted, accordingly.

4.08 / Definition and Assignment of Credit Hours

Effective: October 15, 2012

I. Purpose

The purpose of this statement is to set forth University policy with regard to the definition of "credit hour" and the assignment of credit hours to courses and other types of academic work.

II. Preamble

Regulations of the U.S. Department of Education require institutions of higher education to define "credit hour" and to develop policies and procedures for assignment of credit hours to courses and other types of academic work consistent with the institution's definition.

III. Policy

- A. A "credit hour" is a measure of graduate or undergraduate academic work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that reasonably approximates not less than one hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction¹ and a minimum of two hours of out-of-class student work for each week of instructional time for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester, or an equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time. This unit of measure, commonly referred to as the "Carnegie unit," is a reasonable approximation of a minimum amount of student work for an on-campus course.

¹ A class hour at Wichita State University is typically 50 minutes.

- B. For purposes of laboratory work, internships, practica, clinical rotations, ensemble, studio work, distance learning and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours, each credit hour should reasonably approximate an equivalent amount of work as described in Paragraph 1 above. The following definitions are provided as general guidance for approximating a minimum amount of student work in the learning formats described below:

1. Distance learning

One credit hour for distance learning is defined as three (3) hours of instruction and/or student work per week that leads to equivalent learning outcomes required for an on-campus course.



2. Field placement, internship, practicum, or clinical rotation

One (1) credit hour for field placement, internship, practicum or clinical rotation is defined as at least forty-five (45) hours of supervised work each semester.

3. Laboratory

One (1) credit hour for laboratory credit is defined as a minimum of two (2) class hours of work each week in a laboratory under the supervision of a lab supervisor/instructor and an expectation of one (1) class hour of additional out-of-class student work each week.

4. Individual study

One (1) credit hour for individualized study (e.g. thesis and independent study) is defined as a minimum of three (3) class hours of direct instruction and/or individual work each week.

As studio and ensemble work varies between fine art disciplines, assignment of credit hour should be according to discipline standards and/or accreditation criteria.

- C. The following procedures describe the University's process for determining the assignment of credit hours to courses:
1. In the process of developing a new course, faculty will propose the appropriate assignment of credit hours to a course on the Curriculum Change Form.
 2. The proposed assignment of credit hours must be submitted to the following administrators and committees, in sequential order, for review and approval:
 - a. Department Chair;
 - b. College Curriculum Committee;
 - c. Dean of the College; and
 - d. Academic Affairs Committee (for undergraduate courses) or Graduate Council (for graduate courses)
 3. The Provost or designee will provide final verification of the assignment of credit hours, and will be responsible for the interpretation of policies and procedures pertaining to the assignment of credit hours to a course or other types of academic work.



4. The Provost or designee will consult with departmental faculty to make changes when the assignment of credit is inconsistent with this policy.
5. Courses and/or academic work must be scheduled in a way that conforms to the above definition of credit hour.
6. Faculty must provide sufficient information and detail in syllabi to establish that the minimum amount of work expected of students is consistent with the assignment of credit hours to the course.

IV. Implementation

This policy shall be included in the *WSU Policies and Procedures Manual* and shared with appropriate constituencies of the University.

The Office of Academic Affairs shall have primary responsibility for publication, dissemination and implementation of this University policy.



4.09 / Student Access to Faculty - Office Hours

Effective: July 01, 1997

I. Policy

All members of the faculty shall file office hours with the dean of the college not later than the beginning of the second week of each semester. The schedule of office hours should be posted at the faculty member's office and should be announced to each class. The office hours should be extensive enough to provide ample opportunity for scheduled and unscheduled conferences with students. Every reasonable effort should be made to maintain the office hours as scheduled and announced.



4.10 / Class Policies

Effective: July 01, 1997 | Revised: April 09, 2018

I. Policy

A. Classroom Assignments and Class Time

Classrooms are assigned for each class in accordance with the quota submitted by the department. Although departments may request specific classrooms when needed for special equipment, the Registrar's Office is authorized to make room assignments without consultation. All classes will be held in the rooms scheduled unless a change is requested from and granted by the Registrar's Office. Requested class times are changed only upon consultation with the dean and chairpersons. All classes will begin and dismiss promptly as scheduled.

B. Class Lists

Class lists are available using online resources and can be viewed starting several weeks before the semester begins. Students whose names are on the class list are officially registered. If a student's name does not appear on the list, he or she should be advised to contact the Registrar's Office immediately. Only students who are officially enrolled are permitted to attend class.

C. Student Attendance Obligation

Students are expected to attend all classes in which they enroll and to withdraw from any class they are not attending. Failing grades can be assigned to a class that is not withdrawn even if the student never attended.

4.11 / Commencement Policy

Effective: July 01, 1997

I. Policy

The annual Commencement exercise is organized by a Commencement Committee with student, faculty, and administrative representation. Members of the faculty are expected to attend Commencement. Academic regalia is worn and may be rented through the University Bookstore.



4.12 / Teaching Loads

Effective: July 01, 1997 | Revised: September 21, 2020

I. Initiating Authority

The Faculty Senate serve as the initiating authority.

II. Purpose

A. Faculty work in three areas: student-centered work (e.g., teaching), disciplinary/professional-centered work (e.g., research/scholarship), and community-centered work (e.g., service). These are referred generally as the following three categories: (1) TEACHING; (2) RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY; AND (3) SERVICE.

B. Workload refers to total professional effort, which includes the time (and energy) devoted to class preparation, student work, curriculum and program deliberations, scholarship/research, participation in governance activities, and a wide range of community services.

III. Policy

The standard teaching load normally shall be no more than the equivalent of a 12-credit hour maximum per semester, with no more than three (3) different course preparations (based on a three (3) credit hour course).

IV. Administrative Procedure

A. More than three different course preparations should be considered exceptional. Equivalency standards for comparison between a normal three-credit hour course and non-standard teaching activities, like badge courses and graduate supervision, should be determined at the department level. Workload in the areas of: (1) research, scholarship, or creative activity, and (2) service are based on a faculty member's position/role.

B. Faculty members are to discuss workload expectations with their Chair and/or Dean at least annually in conjunction with the standard annual review and whenever revisions are made. The Chair or Dean should provide a written summary of decisions concerning the faculty member's workload expectations.



4.13 / Chair Policy and Procedures

Effective: July 01, 1997 | Revised: November 15, 2011

I. Policy

The six undergraduate degree-granting colleges are organized by departments and schools headed by chairs or directors. A statement of University-wide policies and procedures on the role, selection, review and evaluation of department chairs has been adopted by the University faculty. Throughout this policy, any reference to "chair" also applies to directors, and any reference to "department" also applies to schools.

A. Title of the Office

The term "chair" as opposed to "head" is used herein to suggest consultative and open administrative procedures.

B. Role of the Chair

Appropriate functions of the chair include the following duties:

1. Academic Leadership

- a. To inspire and to facilitate departmental staff action that identifies and moves effectively toward the realization of goals of the department.
- b. To create and maintain an environment conducive to continuous departmental development by employing carefully considered and highly selective recruitment practices and by encouraging and facilitating professional growth in all members of the staff.

2. Representation

- a. To represent to appropriate groups beyond the departmental staff, such as students, college administration, University administration and the general public, the academic, professional and economic needs and interests of the department and its staff.
- b. To represent to the staff the interests of identified relevant groups beyond the departmental staff, such as university administration, college administration, students, the academic discipline and the general public.



c. To act on all budgetary matters of the department in consultation with representative staff and the dean.

d. To act on personnel problems of the department, and, in consultation with representative staff, to make decisions on or transmit to the dean recommendations regarding:

- i. assignment of staff
- ii. evaluation of staff
- iii. level and equity of financial reward
- iv. tenure
- v. promotion
- vi. nonrenewal of employment

The role of the chair is important to the well being, morale and development of the professional staff and to the operation of the University. The departmental staff, the dean, the Provost and the President all share an interest in developing and following procedures to facilitate the selection of chairs who will foster the highest standards of professional performance, or when necessary, infuse new life into a department. The following procedures will be utilized in the selection, appointment and evaluation of chairs.

C. Eligibility for Chair

No eligibility requirements as to age or length of University service are recommended. However, in no instance may a nominee for the position of chair be of a rank less than assistant professor, but the electorate may by majority vote establish a policy further limiting eligibility requirements.

D. Term of the Chair

The term of the chair shall be set by a majority of the departmental electorate at not less than three years nor more than five years. The chair may serve more than one successive term on the vote of a majority of the departmental electorate. A chair shall have the prerogative of resigning the office at any time, with reasonable notice. The departmental electorate may, by a petition signed by a majority of the total electorate, ask the dean to consider removal of the chair, but in no instance shall such request be made prior to the first annual evaluation of the chair. If so requested, the dean shall initiate a hearing. If an agreement cannot be reached, procedures stated under "IMPASSES" below shall be followed.

The dean may request, at any time, for good and sufficient reason, that the department consider removal of the chair. When removal is considered, the chair shall be accorded



an opportunity for a full hearing, before the electorate and the dean, on his or her alleged shortcomings and have opportunity to respond.

A majority vote of the department electorate is required to support removal from office. If an agreement cannot be reached, procedures stated under "IMPASSES" below shall be followed.

Nothing in this document shall preclude the President from removing a chair from the position and/or appointing an interim chair if the President is convinced, beyond reasonable doubt, that the integrity of the University and its effective functioning requires such action and if the President has explored the situation, insofar as time permits, with faculty members and the chair of the department involved, and with the dean and appropriate committees of the college in which the department is housed. In keeping with the consultative spirit of this document, it is recommended that in reaching such decisions the President also seek the advice, insofar as practicable, of representatives of faculty and administration.

In the event of termination of a chair (due to completion of the term of office, resignation or removal), he or she shall be accorded the same professional rights as any other faculty member of like academic status.

If it is necessary to appoint an acting or interim chair for longer than one semester, the dean shall make the appointment, except that on petition of a majority of the departmental electorate, he or she shall institute the same selection procedure as is used in naming a chair for a full term. If the appointment of an interim or acting chair is for a semester or less or for serving for a chair who will return to his or her position, the dean and the regular chair shall decide on the interim appointee.

E. Electorate

The electorate for nominating a department chair shall, as a minimum, include all those serving as full-time (1.0 EFT) professors, associate professors, assistant professors and tenured instructors, who provide at least 50 percent of their University duties within the department. This group may, by majority vote, establish as a policy the extension of the electorate to (but no farther than) all those in the department enfranchised to vote under the Faculty Senate Constitution.

Administrators, as defined by the Faculty Senate Constitution, are excluded from the electorate for the purposes of voting for a chair. A faculty member who has resigned or who is serving in the last year of a terminal appointment shall also be excluded from the electorate for the purposes of voting for a chair.



In departments with an electorate of five or fewer persons, departures from the stated procedures may be made. In such instances, the dean shall utilize methods that conform to the spirit of democratic and consultative procedures implicit herein.

The dean shall ensure that the electorate is convened only after due notice. On convening, the electorate shall choose a presiding officer to serve until the selection of a chair is completed.

The electorate, as defined above, may, by majority vote, assign to a committee of its choosing the function of nominating a candidate or slate of candidates for chair. In the final selection of a nominee for chair, the total electorate shall be accorded the right to vote. In all votes provided for pursuant to these procedures, measures shall be taken to ensure the anonymity of each voter.

The electorate of a department recommends a nominee to the dean of the college. The dean, with the concurrence of the Provost, unless there is an impasse, may proceed to appoint the individual as chair of the department.

In the event that a new department is created and has no staff, the dean shall have the prerogative of appointing the initial chair for a term not to exceed three years.

F. Impasses

In the event of an impasse between the dean and the departmental electorate over the selection or removal of a chair, the dean shall meet with the entire departmental electorate, give reasons for and discuss his or her position regarding the decision, and respond to questions and discussion from the faculty. An attempt shall be made to find a mutually acceptable solution.

Failing a solution, the departmental electorate shall proceed through the nomination procedure a second time and make a nomination or nominations to the dean.

If an impasse persists, the issue shall be submitted for fact finding and mediation to an ad hoc committee of five faculty members. This committee shall consist of one person named by the dean, one person named by the departmental electorate, and three persons named from the full-time teaching faculty of WSU, by the two previously appointed representative members. If the fact-finding and mediation activities of the committee do not resolve the impasse, the committee will transmit its findings of fact and its recommendations, which shall be made public, to the dean, to the President and to the Provost for their action. In addition, a vote by secret ballot shall be conducted among the department electorate to determine the number that support or oppose the recommendation of the dean. The record of this vote shall accompany the recommendation. Any member or group of the electorate shall be accorded the



opportunity to make a statement in writing, support or opposing the recommendation, to the Provost.

G. Evaluation of the Chair

There shall be an annual, anonymous, written evaluation of the performance of chairs instituted by the dean and conducted by the electorate of the department as previously defined. The evaluation instrument used by the departmental electorate shall include questions submitted by the dean, by the chair and by representatives chosen by the departmental electorate from its membership. The results of the evaluation shall be available to the dean and to the chair; on the initiative of the chair, the results may be made available to others as designated by the chair.



4.14 / Faculty Personnel Records

Effective: July 01, 1997 Revised: June 04, 2019

I. Policy

Faculty members must submit current curriculum vitae prior to the end of their first semester of service at the University. An official transcript of the highest degree completed is also required. Faculty academic records are maintained in the Office of Academic Affairs.

(See also [Employment Files](#) at Section 3.37 of this manual.)



4.15 / Subvention

Effective: July 01, 1997

I. Purpose

It is the policy of Wichita State University to encourage publication of books authored or co-authored by members of the faculty in fulfillment of the responsibility to engage in scholarly activity. To that end, recognizing the increased frequency of requests by publishers for subventions, Wichita State University may in some circumstances provide subventions from nonstate funds to aid members of the faculty engaged in substantive negotiations with publishers. The University reserves the right to recover the sum of the subvention when such recovery is possible.

II. Policy

1. Eligibility

Subvention may be requested by an author(s) who is full-time tenured probationary member of the faculty of WSU. If a member of the faculty co-authors a book with a member(s) of the faculty of another institution(s), the institution(s) shall negotiate concerning shared responsibility for subvention.

2. Application Procedures

The author(s) shall prepare a written request for subvention, and include a letter from the editor stating that the book has undergone professional evaluation and that substantive negotiations are under way.

The application must be submitted to the appropriate department chair(s) for review and approval. If approved, the chair(s) submits the application, with a letter of approval, to the dean(s) for review and approval. If approved, the dean(s) will submit the application, the chair(s) approval letter and his/her own letter of approval to the Faculty Support Committee.

The Faculty Support Committee shall evaluate the proposal for the relevance of the book to the area or areas of expertise of the author(s), the scholarly merits of the book and the quality of the press. The committee may invite an additional reviewer(s) to participate in the discussion of the merits of the book or of the press. If the committee approves the application, it will be transmitted to the Provost, along with a letter of recommendation, for final action.



Should the application be rejected at any level, the author(s) will receive an explanation in writing. The applicant(s) may seek a review of a negative recommendation by the Faculty Support Committee from the Provost.

Should the application be approved, the Provost or designee will negotiate with the author(s) and the publisher. An agreement stating the exact terms of the subvention, including the amount of the subvention and terms for recovery of the amount, when recovery is possible, will be added to the contractual record of the book by adding an addendum to the contract or by an exchange of letters of understanding added to that record.

3. Recovery of Costs

This University shall recover the amount of its subvention, when recovery is possible. If the University provides the entire subvention, it shall recover the sum of the subvention before the author(s) receives royalties.

If the University and the author(s) share in the subvention, the University shall receive a share of the royalties proportional to its share, until the amount of the University's contribution to the subvention has been recovered.

4. Taxation

The author(s) acknowledges and agrees that he/she will be solely responsible for any and all tax consequences which may result or arise as a result of the payment of subvention support.

5. Acknowledgment

The author(s) shall acknowledge the University's subvention in the preface, introduction or acknowledgments.



4.16 / Review Procedure for Alleged Violations of the Kansas Board of Regents' Social Media Policy

Effective: February 13, 2017

I. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to outline the procedure that will be followed when a faculty member is alleged to have violated the Kansas Board of Regents' Social Media Policy.

II. Procedure

A. The following procedure shall be used to address the alleged improper use of social media as defined in the [Kansas Board of Regents' Policy Manual](#) Chapter II: Governance-State Universities, F. 6. b. Social Media Policy. The procedure will apply to any non-student employee in any constituent group (University support staff, faculty, or unclassified professionals), in a manner consistent with First Amendment Constitutional rights and [academic freedom principles](#).

1. The University President, or President's designee, identifies an incident that potentially violates the KBOR use of Social Media Policy.
2. The decision to implement this review procedure is made by the President, or President's designee, in consultation with the University's General Counsel respecting constitutional rights and academic freedom principles.
3. Once the President and the General Counsel have made the determination to proceed with a review, the University President or President's designee will:
 - a. notify the employee in writing of the alleged violation of policy; and
 - b. form an ad-hoc Committee of Peers to determine the severity of the alleged infraction and to make recommendations as to the resolution of the matter.

The Committee of Peers will be composed of five members:



i. three members appointed by the President of the constituent group of which the affected employee is a member;

ii. two members appointed by the Presidents of the other two constituent groups of which the affected employee is not a member; one from each group.

Thus, for example, if the affected employee is a member of the faculty, then three faculty members and one university support staff plus one unclassified professional would be members of the committee.

The constituent groups will determine the method for selection of potential members of the Committee of Peers. An employee may request replacement of any member due to conflict of interest.

4. The University President, or designee, charges the committee to review the incident.
5. Within thirty calendar days of receiving the charge, the committee will investigate the incident and make a written recommendation to the President or President's designee that includes:
 - a. whether or not there has been a violation of the KBOR Social Media Policy; and
 - b. a recommendation of what disciplinary action might be taken if a policy violation has occurred.
6. The University President, or the President's designee, shall make the final determination regarding any disciplinary action. In these instances, the applicable procedure described in the *WSU Policies & Procedure Manual* shall be followed for administering disciplinary action. This procedure assumes that the committee's recommendation will generally be accepted, or modified only for compelling reasons.

B. This procedure shall not preclude an employee from using a formal grievance procedure adopted by other University policies whenever they are applicable. Individuals assigned to the Committee of Peers are exempt from serving on any related grievance or termination committees.



4.17 / Graduate Faculty Membership

Effective: July 01, 1997 Revised: April 09, 2018

I. Preamble

Graduate faculty develop curricula, teach graduate courses, guide student research, Mentor graduate students, participate in the governance of graduate education, and determine criteria for Graduate Faculty membership.

II. Policy

Remaining current in one's discipline is a special responsibility of faculty who teach at the graduate level. In particular, research, scholarship, creative activities, and performance serve as models for graduate students. What constitutes a program of original work varies considerably from discipline to discipline. Quantity is not the sole criterion, and may not even be a major criterion. However, periodic evidence that one's work has undergone independent peer review and is part of an ongoing scholarly agenda is expected. In some disciplines, graduate faculty are also expected to generate external funding through grants and contracts to support their research and scholarly activities as well as to support graduate students.

There are two categories of Graduate Faculty membership in Wichita State University. Candidates for Graduate Faculty membership must meet all department specific criteria and the following University specified eligibility criteria. All nominations for Graduate Faculty status must originate from a Wichita State University academic department.

A. Categories

1. Graduate Faculty

1. Eligibility

- Possess terminal degree in the discipline or its equivalent in training and/or experience (documentation is required when equivalency is claimed from a combination of training and experience)
- Tenured or tenure-track WSU faculty with assistant professor or higher rank or meet established criteria for the academic unit

2. Duties and responsibilities

- Teach graduate courses
- Serve on master's and doctoral committees



- Chair capstone (project, thesis, and dissertation) committees
- Mentor graduate students
- 3. **Duration of membership in category**
 - Ongoing till separation from the University
- 2. **Affiliate Graduate Faculty**
 - 1. **Eligibility**
 - Demonstrated departmental needed Earned graduate degree or qualified by education and/or professional achievement
 - 2. **Possible duties and responsibilities**
 - Teach graduate courses
 - Serve on and chair master's thesis and terminal committees for practice doctorates
 - Serve on PhD dissertation committees
 - Other duties as appropriate
 - 3. **Duration of membership in category**
 - Appointment length suggested by chair of the department and approved by the Dean of the Graduate School
 - Membership may be renewed through the submission of a nomination form by the academic department recommending the appointment, which should document successful performance in the preceding term

B. Granting Of Graduate Faculty Privileges

Research productivity, scholarship, and creative activities are best evaluated by graduate faculty at the departmental/college level. The Graduate School and Graduate Council provide oversight and due process for faculty seeking grievances in this matter, but the units are best equipped to make informed decisions regarding graduate faculty membership. Based on the rigorous process used to hire, review, and promote faculty, all members of the tenure-track faculty are eligible for regular Graduate Faculty standing. The procedure below is to be used to identify non-tenure track graduate faculty members.

Each graduate program, either individually or collectively by department and/or college, can establish regular Graduate Faculty criteria for non-tenure track faculty. These criteria must be approved at the department, college, and Graduate Council levels, and should be updated at least every five years.

1. Departmental/College Level

Faculty who seek graduate faculty status for the first time are responsible for submitting a completed nomination form along with pertinent supporting information/documents to the department chair. The department chair will forward the candidate's material to the Departmental/College Graduate Faculty Status Committee (see below) for



consideration. After the appropriate faculty status committee has reviewed, it will inform its recommendation to the chair who will send the nomination form (with supporting information/documents) to the Academic Dean with his/her own recommendation and signature.

Each department and/or college should have a committee (minimum of three members) comprised of Graduate Faculty. Using the Graduate School's graduate faculty categories as a guideline, the college or department committee will submit criteria for each graduate faculty category to the Graduate Dean for approval. In order to stay current, departments/colleges will re-evaluate the criteria and submit them to the Graduate School every five years. The committee will also assess faculty who seek to have graduate faculty status (including re-appointment). A positive recommendation is defined by a simple majority vote, after which the nomination and supporting information are forwarded to their respective department chair or college dean. Faculty (including departmental chairs) whose material is under consideration cannot serve or vote on the departmental/college committee during consideration of the candidate's material.

The College Dean has the right to request from the departmental/college committee additional justification in regards to the committee's vote or candidate's material. In the case of a positive vote by the College Dean, the completed nomination form and supporting information/documents are forwarded to the Graduate School.

2. Graduate Dean and Graduate Council Level

The Graduate Dean has the responsibility to evaluate and approve the departmental/college committee's criteria for each graduate faculty status. In cases where the Graduate Dean has disagreement with criteria established by the departmental/college committee, the Graduate Dean may return the criteria to the departmental/college committee for revision or further justification, and may also ask the Graduate Council for their recommendation.

The Graduate School will maintain records of current graduate faculty, including their status category and date of term completion (if applicable). The Graduate School will notify graduate faculty members (and their respective department chairs) whose terms will expire in a timely manner. Review/renewal would then occur at the departmental/college level by the end of the fall semester. In addition, the Graduate School will notify the chairs to nominate newly hired faculty if they wish them to have graduate faculty status.



Once the nomination form is received by the Graduate School, the Graduate School Dean may elect to confirm or deny the requested graduate faculty status. The Graduate School Dean may also forward the candidate's material to the Graduate Council for further discussion and recommendation. The Graduate School Dean informs the faculty member and department chair as to the final decision made regarding the granting of status.

3. Faculty Due Process

Each level of review should occur in a timely manner. When a negative recommendation is made (at any recommendation level), the denied recommendation form (which includes the justification for denial) is returned to the candidate (including the candidate's materials), and a copy of the denied recommendation form is forwarded to bodies who previously granted approval.

Recommendations at all levels are based on a judgment of whether the faculty member meets the criteria set by the particular department or college. Faculty who receive a negative decision from the departmental or college committee, college dean, or Graduate School Dean may petition the Graduate School Dean to have their material reviewed by the Graduate Council. As part of their petition, faculty may elect to write a rebuttal to the vote justification of the departmental/college committee, college dean, or Graduate School Dean and may include additional material in support of their grievance.

C. Revocation or Loss of Status or Suspension of Privileges

1. Conditions under which changes in membership status or loss of privileges may take place:

Membership status may be terminated or changed when an affiliate graduate faculty member no longer meets the eligibility requirements, or the affiliate graduate faculty member does not renew his/her membership. Nonrenewal of status, other than in cases of revocation or suspension of privileges may be appealed to the Graduate Council and the Graduate Council's disposition of appeal is final. Membership of either status may be revoked or privileges may be suspended in certain extreme cases, such as those of professional incompetence as a Graduate Faculty member, academic dishonesty, scholarly/scientific/creative misconduct, or gross failure to fulfill duties related to graduate faculty membership.



2. Procedure for status revocation or suspension of privileges:

Revocation of status or suspension of privileges of a graduate faculty may only result from graduate Council action following a complaint lodged with the Graduate Dean in writing and only if the complaint includes appropriate documentation as evidence of cause for removal of status or suspension of privileges. The complaint will be investigated by a faculty committee formed by the Graduate Council (comprising of at least three regular Graduate Faculty members). If further action on the complaint is deemed appropriate by the investigating committee, Graduate Council will make the final decision about the action to be taken. The accused graduate faculty member will have the right to a hearing before the investigating committee and the Graduate Council.

4.18 / Probationary Period

Effective: July 01, 1997 | Revised: February 01, 2013

I. Policy

A. Time Limit

The Regents tenure policy defines the time limit for the probationary period in [Section 4.13](#) of this manual. The following University regulations apply to the probationary period as defined in Kansas Board of Regents policy:

1. At the time of initial probationary appointment, agreement between the appointee and the institution must be reached on the prior service, if any, to be applied against the probationary period. This agreement shall be contained in the initial letter offering the position and in the initial appointment letter.
2. When a probationary period is interrupted by a leave of absence other than a scholarly leave, such leave will not be counted toward eligibility for tenure. A scholarly leave will count toward tenure unless the faculty member and the university agree in writing to the contrary at the time the leave is granted. If a faculty member takes a part-time administrative or other nonacademic appointment during the probationary period, that time is counted toward eligibility for tenure if he/she maintains at least a half-time (.5 FTE) academic appointment and is not counted if the academic appointment is less than half-time.
3. If a faculty member terminates and subsequently returns to the university, rules for tenure consideration will apply as they do for previous service at other institutions of higher education.
4. During the probationary period a teacher will have the academic freedom that all other members of the faculty have.

B. Annual Evaluation of Nontenured Faculty

All faculty members holding half-time or more appointments who have not attained tenure will be evaluated at least once a year. Faculty members will have the opportunity to present documentation of performance for the purpose of this evaluation. The evaluation will be recorded by the department chair on official University forms provided by the Office of Academic Affairs to department chairs. In addition to reviewing the faculty member's performance



during the preceding year, these annual reviews will also contain a section on "progress toward tenure" in which the faculty member's overall performance at WSU will be evaluated in the context of the tenure review which will occur at the end of the probationary period. All annual reviews should be submitted for tenure and promotion consideration: however, these annual reviews do not constitute a definitive review for tenure. The chair will review with the faculty member the results of the evaluation and transmit them to the dean. Copies will be retained by the faculty member, the department, the college/school/University Libraries dean's office and the Office of Academic Affairs.

In order to ensure as consistent a review process as possible prior to tenure decision, the annual review of probationary members of a department is to be conducted exclusively by the tenured members of the department or the elected tenure committee of the department. The chair of the department will be present. Abstentions will not be registered except when a faculty member declares he/she has a conflict of interest concerning a case. The chair of the committee of tenured members records the evaluation and the vote of the group. The department chair shall provide a separate evaluation and recommendation. The vote count, evaluations, and recommendation will be shared with the person being reviewed, who shall be afforded the opportunity to submit a written rebuttal to the evaluations. In departments in which two or fewer members are tenured, an ad hoc review committee, consisting of tenured faculty members who might be involved in the ultimate tenure decision, shall be appointed by the dean of the appropriate college/school/University Libraries. Untenured chairs shall not participate in their own reviews.

The annual evaluation is an important activity for which faculty members should be well prepared. It is a cumulative record of performance that in the case of probationary faculty shows progress toward consideration for continuous tenure.

C. Early Consideration for Tenure

1. Within the usual probationary period, a faculty member who believes he/she demonstrates exceptional merit may be afforded one opportunity to stand for tenure prior to mandatory review. In such cases, the faculty member, in consultation with the chair and the dean, shall determine the advisability of early nomination according to the following criteria of eligibility:

a. The faculty member shall hold the rank of assistant professor or above.



b. The faculty member without prior higher education service shall have completed two years of full-time service at Wichita State University before early review may be undertaken at the departmental level.

2. Should the faculty member decide to stand for early tenure review, the following conditions shall apply:

a. The tenure review shall be conducted under the standard deadlines, policies, and procedures governing tenure considerations at that time.

b. A faculty member who is unsuccessful in the early application for tenure shall have the right to continue on probationary status and stand for mandatory tenure review without prejudice.

D. Initial Appointment with Tenure

In exceptional circumstances an individual may be awarded tenure at the time of initial appointment. Individuals being considered for appointment to an administrative position can be granted tenure at the time of appointment only on the basis of their scholarly and academic credentials. Review for the award of tenure with initial appointment shall be initiated by the tenured faculty of the relevant academic department in accord with college/school/University Libraries and University guidelines in force at the time.

Department faculty recommendations for award of tenure with initial appointment shall be forwarded for action through the chair to the dean and the Provost. In such cases where additional consultation is deemed desirable, the dean or Provost may convene the college/school/University Libraries or University-level committees to effect an *ad hoc* tenure review panel.

The Provost shall convey the recommendations to the President who shall review the recommendations and make the final decision. The President shall notify the individual in writing of the final decision.



4.20 / Post-Tenure Review for Faculty

Effective: November 01, 2013 Revised: September 21, 2020

I. Initiating Authority

Faculty Senate serves as the initiating authority.

II. Purpose

The purpose of this statement is to set forth University policy regarding a post-tenure review process for tenured faculty.

III. Policy

Kansas Board of Regents policy requires that each state university implement a plan to supplement its annual faculty evaluation system to assist faculty members with identifying opportunities that will enable them to reach their full potential for contribution to the university.

IV. Administrative Procedure

A. In accordance with the *Kansas Board of Regents Policy*, Chapter II, C.8d(iv), post-tenure reviews of all tenured faculty members shall be conducted at five-year intervals, with the first review to take place five years after tenure is awarded. All of the faculty evaluation aspects of this Post-Tenure Review Policy will be conducted in accordance with the applicable *WSU policies* published in the *WSU Policies and Procedures Manual*. The following guidelines shall apply:

- If a tenured faculty member receives a promotion in rank or a successful Professor Incentive Review (PIR), the five year timeline will begin with the date of that promotion or PIR.
- If a tenured faculty member takes an administrative appointment, the schedule of post-tenure reviews shall be suspended until the faculty member returns to faculty status. If the term of administrative duties exceeds two years, the next review will be scheduled five years after the resumption of faculty duties.
- The schedule for reviews may be delayed by one year in order to accommodate an approved leave as defined in the *WSU Policies and Procedures Manual*.



B. The post-tenure review shall be based upon an evaluation of the materials submitted by the faculty member for the previous five annual Faculty Performance Evaluations. Based on a review of these materials, the faculty member's current academic supervisor shall provide an assessment of the faculty member's performance over the past five years in each area of the faculty member's responsibility. The faculty member shall be given a copy of the academic supervisor's evaluation.

C. After completing the Review, the department academic supervisor must select one of the following three outcomes:

4. The faculty member's overall performance meets expectations and no further action is necessary.

5. The faculty member's overall performance does not meet expectations in two of the past four annual evaluations, and remediation is recommended in accordance with [WSU Policy 4.34 / Low Performance and Dismissal for Cause](#). The faculty member may request a review of the recommendation to be conducted as specified in [WSU Policy 4.34 / Low Performance and Dismissal for Cause](#).

6. The faculty member's overall performance does not meet expectations in three of the last five annual evaluations, and the Chair and the Dean may recommend Dismissal for Cause to the Provost, as specified in [WSU Policy 4.34 / Low Performance and Dismissal for Cause](#).

V. Implementation

This policy shall be included in the *WSU Policies and Procedures Manual* and shared with appropriate constituencies of the University.

The Provost shall have primary responsibility for publication and implementation of this University policy.

VI. Applicable Laws and Additional Resources

[WSU Policy 4.34 / Low Performance and Dismissal for Cause](#).

4.21 / Tenure and Promotion - Guidelines and Criteria

Effective: July 01, 1997 | Revised: September 21, 2020

I. Initiating Authority

Faculty Senate serves as the initiating authority.

II. Purpose

1. Acting under the provisions of the Kansas Board of Regents “Tenure for Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments” and “Promotions in Academic Rank” policies, the University may award tenure and promotion to faculty members based on demonstrated excellence in scholarship, teaching/librarianship, and community and professional service. The granting of tenure and promotion is at the initiative of the University and is based on sustained achievements demonstrating that the faculty member meets the qualitative and quantitative standards of the appropriate discipline and the requirements of the University. Tenure and promotion is not acquired simply by meeting assigned duties with a record free of deficiencies.
2. Guidelines and criteria related to tenure and promotion are developed by the College / School / University Libraries faculty and in some instances the department faculty. They are approved by all the constituencies involved in the review process, including initiating faculty, the College / School / University Libraries faculty, the College / School / University Libraries dean, the University Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Provost. The subsections that follow identify the guidelines and criteria that are operative at the University level. Reference is also made to College / School / University Libraries guidelines and criteria.

III. Policy

A. General Policies for the Awarding of Tenure

1. The judgments of all faculty committees in tenure decisions are to be based on the academic credentials, qualifications, and merits of the candidate. These judgments will always be made primarily at the departmental and College / School / University Libraries levels. Ranking of candidates for tenure is neither necessary nor appropriate.



2. In the case of both mandatory and non-mandatory reviews for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, candidates must meet the criteria for tenure and promotion as established in University policy. A favorable recommendation for tenure automatically carries a favorable recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor.

B. College Guidelines and Criteria

1. Detailed guidelines and statements of criteria for tenure and promotion have been adopted by all the Colleges / Schools / University Libraries, and in some instances at the departmental level. Each statement should include explicit statements of expectation for teaching, librarianship, research, scholarship, or creative activities, and academic and professional service. These statements should define the relative significance of different activities within each area and the nature of documentation which candidates must provide to establish their accomplishments in each area. The statements may specify guidelines for faculty with unusual appointments, consistent with the University guidelines for tenure and promotion contained below. It is acceptable to establish differential criteria for tenure and promotion for faculty with different assignments, so long as the differential criteria and the nature of the faculty assignments are clearly identified and recorded on the annual evaluation form.
2. Guidelines and statements of criteria for College / School / University Libraries and in some cases departments shall be submitted in the spring for review by the University Tenure and Promotion Committee on a three-year cycle. The purpose of this review is to ensure that the guidelines and statements are consistent with University guidelines and provide an adequate degree of clarity and specificity so that candidates for tenure and promotion will understand the criteria which will be utilized to evaluate their cases.
3. The College / School / University Libraries guidelines and statements of criteria developed for tenure and promotion shall be distributed annually to all untenured faculty at the time of their annual evaluation. The evaluation of individual candidates at the University level should take into account the degree to which the individual has met the guidelines as well as his/her role statement and annual performance criteria identified in the annual evaluation of untenured faculty. Consideration, in context of the candidate's entire career, will be given to teaching, librarianship, research, scholarship, creative activities, and the service conducted while the candidate has been employed at the University. If the guidelines in effect at the time of initial appointment differ from those in place at the



time a tenure case comes forward for consideration, the current guidelines can be used in place of the earlier guidelines only if both the candidate and the department agree.

4. In cases where department and/or College / School / University Libraries policy contradicts University Policy, the appropriate department administrator, the dean of the College / School / University Libraries, the College / School / University Libraries Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Provost will be notified by the University Tenure and Promotion Committee that the contradiction needs to be corrected, and that the University policy will take precedence until the correction is in place.

C. University Guidelines and Criteria

1. Tenure / Promotion

a. All probationary faculty must undergo review for tenure during their sixth year of employment at Wichita State University unless their employment at the University is to be terminated at the end of their seventh year of service. Exceptions are for individuals who were given credit for prior experience in higher education at the time of initial appointment (Policy 4.19) or demonstrate exceptional merit (policy 4.18) meeting Department and College criteria for Tenure. These individuals may apply for a review earlier than their sixth year of employment (the normal review occurs after five years in rank). Other exceptions to the probationary period would include an approved leave of absence or extensions. (Policy 4.19)

b. Expectations of performance in and the relative importance of A) teaching/ librarianship, B) research, scholarship, or creative activities; and C) service will be defined at the time of the initial appointment. The UniScope Scholarship Model may be used as a framework to enhance the description of faculty activities. Each academic unit (College and/or Department) will have its own performance and assessment criteria, which may make use of the UniScope Model. These expectations and their relative weight may be modified annually during the probationary period. Specific performance goals will be established each year during the annual evaluation of untenured faculty. These expectations and goals form the foundation for evaluation for tenure in the context of the tenure criteria established by the faculty of the College / School / University Libraries, but do not constitute a definitive review for tenure. A terminal degree in a field appropriate to the discipline in which the



candidate teaches or conducts research, scholarship, or creative activities is normally required for appointment or promotion to the rank of assistant professor, associate professor or professor. Exceptions to this guideline will require careful documentation based upon an adequate rationale. The award of tenure normally requires documented evidence of effective teaching/librarianship and a record of research, scholarship, or creative activities which has earned recognition in professional circles at the regional or national level.

c. A faculty member should not expect to be considered for promotion with less than six years in rank. The only exceptions are for individuals who were given credit for prior experience in higher education at the time of initial appointment as an Associate Professor or individuals who document exceptional merit meeting Department and College criteria. A faculty member who believes they demonstrate exceptional merit may be afforded an opportunity to apply for a review earlier than their sixth year in rank (the normal review occurs after five years in rank). In such cases, the faculty member, in consultation with the chair and the dean, shall determine the advisability of early nomination. The standards for teaching, librarianship, scholarship, and service for each rank are indicated below. The relative significance of teaching; librarianship; research, scholarship, or creative activities; and service may vary from case to case. Consideration, in context of the candidate's entire career, will be given to teaching, librarianship, research, scholarship, creative activities, and the service conducted while the candidate has been employed at the University.

i. Assistant Professor - Evidence is normally expected of the following:

1. demonstrated adequacy in teaching/librarianship;
2. potential for achievement in research, scholarship, or creative activity; and
3. some University service appropriate to the mission of the department and College / School / University Libraries.

II. Associate Professor - Evidence is normally expected of the following:

1. documented effectiveness of teaching/librarianship;
2. a record of research, scholarship, or creative activities which has earned recognition in professional circles at the regional or national level; and

3. some professional or University service.

iii. Professor - Evidence is normally expected of the following:

1. sustained effectiveness in teaching/librarianship;
2. a record of substantial accomplishment in research, scholarship, or creative activities which has led to recognition in professional circles at the national level; and
3. demonstrated academic leadership in the form of service to the University and the profession.

2. University Committee Procedures

In the process of reviewing tenure and promotion cases according to its charge, the University Tenure and Promotion Committee applies the respective College and department guidelines as approved by the College / School / University Libraries and University Tenure and Promotion Committees. It is important to emphasize that these guidelines are not rigid rules.

3. Tenure and Promotion Review Process

The tenure and promotion review process is governed by the "Tenure, Promotion, and Appeals Procedures" document in this manual. Individual units may adopt by vote of the faculty of the College additional procedures, policies, and interpretive statements to govern their internal review of tenure and promotion cases, so long as those procedures, policies, and interpretive statements are consistent with all higher level procedures, policies, and interpretive statements, as determined in the triennial review of policies and procedures conducted by the University committee. These additional statements should be provided in writing to all candidates for tenure and promotion and to all probationary faculty at the time of their initial appointment and at each annual review.

4. Presidential Review of Nominees for Tenure or Promotion

- a. The laws of the State of Kansas provide that, subject to policies approved by the Board of Regents, the President shall appoint employees and administer the affairs of Wichita State University. In



matters of tenure and promotion, the President has delegated the authority to make recommendations to certain faculty committees and administrators. However, the President retains the authority to make the final decision on the tenure and promotion of faculty members.

b. A person dissatisfied with committee or administrator recommendations concerning his/her tenure or promotion may, after exhausting the procedures and appeals in the tenure and promotion review process, petition the President of Wichita State University for a favorable decision on tenure or promotion.

IV. Definitions

For the purpose of this policy only, the following definitions shall apply:

A. See [Uniscope: The Forms of Scholarship](#).

V. Applicable Laws and Additional Resources

A. [WSU Policy 4.18 / Probationary Period](#)

B. [WSU Policy 4.19 / Tenure Policy](#)

C. Kansas Board of Regents “Tenure for Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments” and “Promotions in Academic Rank” policies



4.22 / Tenure, Promotion, Professor Incentive Review and Post-Tenure Review Calendar

Effective: July 01, 1997

I. Policy

A Tenure and Promotion Calendar, giving actual dates, will be developed and publicized each year by the Provost or designee, based on the following "generic calendar."

Generic Calendar

September

2nd Friday — Deadline for completion of basic documents and secondary dossiers.

2nd Friday — Deadline for chair to notify eligible faculty tenure and/or promotion files are available for review.

4th Friday — Deadline for inclusion of letters from external reviewers.

October

1st Friday — Deadline for departmental reviews and votes on tenure and/or promotion and PIR.

2nd Friday — Deadline for department to notify dean of recommendations and within three (3) working days after the department's notification, the dean will notify nominees of the department's recommendation, the chair's independent recommendation, and the candidate's right to appeal a negative decision.

2nd Friday — Deadline for department chair/academic supervisor to complete post-tenure review with faculty member.

3rd Friday — Deadline for candidates to sign departmental cover sheet in dean's office indicating they have reviewed all documents being forwarded by the department.

4th Friday — Deadline for submission of appeals or rebuttals to department-level recommendations to the dean.



November

3rd Friday — Deadline for College/School/University Libraries committee to transmit recommendations to dean.

3rd Friday — Deadline for department chair/academic supervisor to communicate with the dean about any post-tenure review outcomes resulting with faculty members not meeting expectations.

December

1st Friday — Deadline for dean to notify candidates and department chairs of committee's and dean's independent recommendations and the candidate's right to appeal a negative decision or to rebut an evaluation statement.

2nd Friday — Deadline for candidates to sign College cover sheet in the dean's office indicating that they have reviewed all documents being forwarded by the College and within two (2) working days after the signing, the dean will transmit materials to the Provost.

Thursday — (prior to the 3rd Friday) Deadline for appeal of or rebuttal to College-level recommendations to the Provost.

3rd Friday — Deadline for Provost to transmit materials to the University Tenure and Promotion Committee.

3rd Friday — Deadline for adding materials to the secondary dossier.

January

2nd week — Regular meeting of University Tenure and Promotion Committee.

4th Friday — Deadline for University Tenure and Promotion Committee to report recommendations to the Provost and to notify candidates and department chairs of the committee's recommendations and the candidate's right to rebut the committee's evaluation.

February

1st Friday — Deadline for submission of rebuttal statements by candidates to the Provost of the University Committee's evaluation.

3rd Friday — Deadline for notification of candidates of recommendations to be made by the Provost to the President.



4th Friday — Deadline for University Committee to identify problems in tenure policies and tenure promotion guidelines for the Faculty Affairs Committee.

March

1st Friday — Deadlines for appeals, rebuttals and/or petitions to the President of negative recommendations.

April

1st Friday — Final transmittal of Wichita State University decisions to the candidates.

Subsequent Academic Year Tenure, Promotion and Professor Incentive Review (PIR) Calendar

January

2nd Friday — Office of Planning and Analysis notifies deans that information on faculty eligibility for tenure and post-tenure review is available in Reporting Services in a folder labeled "OPA - Faculty Teaching History Tenure and Rank."

March

3rd Friday — Deadline for Office of Planning and Analysis to notify deans of faculty scheduled for mandatory tenure review.

3rd Friday — Deadline for faculty applying for promotion, PIR and/or early tenure review to notify chair.

April

1st Friday — Deadline for dean of College to notify faculty scheduled for mandatory tenure review and post-tenure review with copies to the Provost.

2nd Friday — Deadline for chair to notify dean of faculty applying for tenure and/or promotion or PIR.

3rd Friday — Deadline for candidates needing an external review to provide reviewer and documents to chair and dean.

May

3rd Friday — Deadline for dean's office to send initial request for external reviews as required for all tenure and promotion cases (not PIR cases).



3rd Friday — Deadline for dean of College to notify the Provost of faculty scheduled for early tenure review and/or promotion or PIR.

Revision Date

September 29, 1998

April 16, 1999

October 4, 2001

April 1, 2005

April 1, 2006

October 13, 2009

July 1, 2014

January 19, 2016

April 9, 2018



4.23 / Tenure and Promotion - Outline of Process of Review

Effective: July 01, 1997 Revised: October 13, 2009

I. Policy

A. Any faculty member may nominate himself or herself for review for tenure or promotion. Nominations may also be made by the chairperson. For faculty members with probationary appointments, review for tenure must occur during or before the year prior to the last year of the probationary period. No review for tenure will occur during the last year of a faculty member's probationary period.

B. The process of review for tenure and promotion involves these steps:

1. Nomination for review.
2. Departmental review of nominees by the departmental committee and by the chair.
3. In favorable or appealed cases, college/school/University Libraries review of department nominations by the college/school/University Libraries tenure and promotion committee, and by the college/school/University Libraries dean.
4. In favorable or appealed cases, University review of college/school/University Libraries nominations by the Tenure and Promotion Committee and by the Provost.
5. In favorable or appealed cases, review of recommendations by the University President for final decision.

C. Procedures have been established for appeal in the case of an adverse tenure or promotion recommendation at the department and at the college level.



4.23 / Tenure and Promotion - Outline of Process of Review

Effective: July 01, 1997 | Revised: October 13, 2009

I. Policy

A. Any faculty member may nominate himself or herself for review for tenure or promotion. Nominations may also be made by the chairperson. For faculty members with probationary appointments, review for tenure must occur during or before the year prior to the last year of the probationary period. No review for tenure will occur during the last year of a faculty member's probationary period.

B. The process of review for tenure and promotion involves these steps:

1. Nomination for review.
2. Departmental review of nominees by the departmental committee and by the chair.
3. In favorable or appealed cases, college/school/University Libraries review of department nominations by the college/school/University Libraries tenure and promotion committee, and by the college/school/University Libraries dean.
4. In favorable or appealed cases, University review of college/school/University Libraries nominations by the Tenure and Promotion Committee and by the Provost.
5. In favorable or appealed cases, review of recommendations by the University President for final decision.

C. Procedures have been established for appeal in the case of an adverse tenure or promotion recommendation at the department and at the college level.



4.24 / Review for Tenure or Promotion: Procedures

Effective: July 01, 1997 | Revised: April 09, 2018

Policy

A. Nomination for Review for Tenure and Promotion

1. The department chair will write to all full-time faculty members of the department to tell them that nominations of persons to be reviewed that year for tenure or for promotion must be given to the chair by a specified date. The chair must nominate all faculty whose tenure review is mandatory for that year. All others may be nominated by the chair or by the faculty member himself or herself.
2. The department chair will send copies of the list resulting from step 1 to all full-time departmental faculty and specify a second date by which any additional nominations must be provided in writing to the chair.
3. The department chair will confer individually with all nominated faculty members and provide information about departmental, College/School/University Libraries, and University criteria for tenure or promotion.
4. Except for those whose review for tenure is mandatory, faculty who have been nominated must inform the department chair in writing by a date specified by the department chair (which will be no sooner than two days after their conference) of the faculty member's decision to remain in nomination or to withdraw.
5. The final, typed list of those nominated will be sent to the dean and to all members of the department electorate. Each person on the list will be notified in writing by the dean that he or she is officially a candidate for promotion or tenure. In addition, the dean will inform the candidate of the criteria for tenure or promotion and will instruct the candidate to give his/her supporting materials to the department chair by a specified date.

B. Preparation of the Primary and Secondary Dossier

The candidate will present a primary dossier and may prepare a secondary dossier. Only material contained in the primary and secondary dossiers and additional materials appropriately obtained and added to the dossiers may be used by the Tenure and Promotion Committee at each level.

The candidate is responsible for assembling the materials and reviewing the entire dossier to determine that it is complete and accurate. Adherence to established



deadlines should ensure that the final dossier is complete at the time of submission. The candidate then submits the copy of the primary dossier and supplemental materials to the chair of her/his department. Once they have been submitted to the chair, these original materials cannot be changed or rewritten.

As the review proceeds through the various levels, the primary dossier and the secondary dossier will be in the custody of the administrator at each level. Items are added as attachments to the primary dossier by the administrator as called for in these procedures, but the administrator must give the candidate a copy of the additions and provide the candidate an opportunity to write a rebuttal that will also be added to the primary dossier.

C. Primary Dossier

The primary dossier consists of the basic document, the required cover sheet which records each step of the review process, copies of the annual reviews (and rebuttals if filed) for untenured faculty, the chair's nonevaluative role statement, statements of evaluation by the committee and administrator at each level of review (and rebuttals if filed), letters of external review (and rebuttals if filed), and items added during the review process. The basic document will follow the standard format recommended by the University Tenure and Promotion Committee and approved by the Faculty Senate. Deviations from the established format should be clearly explained. The basic document may be no more than 25 pages. The chair will provide a statement of the role of the candidate in the department which is purely descriptive and not evaluative. If the candidate's role involves a weighted distribution of responsibility among the three categories of professional activity, that should be indicated in the role statement. The chair will make copies of the primary dossier available for all voting faculty.

D. Secondary Dossier

A secondary dossier may be submitted to the chair by the candidate. It consists of such additional materials as the candidate wishes to submit. Examples might include, but are not limited to, copies of publications or other evidence of scholarship, copies of student evaluations or course materials, etc. The candidate may add items to the secondary dossier during the review process (see calendar in [Section 4](#) of this manual). Should documentation significant to the candidate's case arrive after the deadline for adding materials to the secondary dossier, the candidate should notify the dean and the chair of his/her College/School/University Libraries committee who will add the material to the dossier. The chair of the committee will bring it to the attention of the next higher committee. The secondary dossier will not be duplicated but will be available to committee members.



E. Department Review for Promotion and Tenure¹

The complete files of all faculty members under review in the department must be available for a reasonable time (at least five working days) to all voting faculty.

Tenure cases will be reviewed at a meeting of the tenured faculty of the department or a committee of tenured faculty chosen by these faculty members. In departments having fewer than three voting tenured faculty members, the College/School/University Libraries faculty will develop appropriate procedures for the review, subject to the approval of the College/School/University Libraries dean. Each eligible person except the department chair will vote on each case under consideration and will sign the tally sheet. The tally sheet will not identify individual voters with their votes but must account for all eligible voters. If a committee wishes, straw ballots may precede the final ballot. Only the votes on the final ballot are binding and recorded. Abstentions will not be registered except when a faculty member on a committee declares he/she has a conflict of interest concerning a case. A positive recommendation by the committee results when more than 50 percent of those casting ballots other than abstention have voted to recommend tenure. A copy of the tally sheet will be kept in the departmental office for three years.

Promotion cases will be reviewed at a meeting of the departmental faculty who hold rank equal to or higher than that for which the candidate is being considered or of a committee of those with appropriate rank chosen by these faculty members. The limitation of voting to persons of equal or higher rank need not apply to votes at the College/School/University Libraries or University level. In departments having fewer than three faculty members with appropriate rank, the College/School/University Libraries faculty will develop appropriate review procedures subject to approval of the College/School/University Libraries dean. Each eligible person, excluding the department chair, will vote on each case under consideration and will sign the tally. The tally will not identify individual voters with their votes but must account for all eligible votes. Straw ballots may precede the final ballot. Abstentions may occur only in cases involving declared conflict of interest. A positive recommendation will result when more than 50 percent of those casting ballots (i.e., other than abstentions) have voted to recommend promotion. Copies of the tally sheets will be kept in the departmental office for three years.

Chairs do not participate in their own evaluation or in evaluations of faculty when the chair has a conflict of interest. Such cases automatically go forward without prejudice for review at the next level.

The results of the departmental deliberations and the chair's separate recommendation will be sent to the dean by the department chair. When the committee's discussion of a candidate is complete, the committee chair will summarize in writing the committee's evaluation of the candidate. The department chair will also provide a written evaluation



to accompany his/her recommendation for each case. These statements will be included in the primary dossier. The candidate will be provided an opportunity to review these statements and to file a written rebuttal in the primary dossier. In cases where the chair's recommendation differs from that of the voting faculty, the case will go forward to the next higher level without prejudice, and that transmittal will not constitute an appeal. The chair will also send forward the copies of the primary dossier and the secondary dossier.

The dean will inform each candidate in writing of the department's recommendations, the chair's recommendation, the right to appeal, and the procedures for appeal. The dean will also notify the candidate that he/she may request meetings with the department chair and/or the chair of the departmental tenure and promotion committee, at the candidate's option, to discuss the decision.

¹ By action of the College/School/University Libraries faculty and as incorporated in the college/school/University Libraries handbook, a group of departments may decide to act as a division rather than as a single department. Such a decision must be approved by the dean of the unit and by the Provost.

F. College/School/University Libraries Review of Nominees for Tenure or Promotion

The dean will give a copy of the primary dossier of each faculty member favorably recommended for promotion and/or tenure and of all appealed cases to each member of the College/School/University Libraries committee and will indicate the location of the secondary dossiers. These materials must be available to the committee for at least five working days prior to deliberation.

The committee will meet with the dean to receive information about the schedule of meetings and about administrative matters related to the cases to be reviewed. The dean may also request other meetings with the committee. Each College/School/University Libraries shall adopt procedures regarding the role of the dean in these other meetings. If the committee discovers that information is lacking in a dossier, it can ask the dean to acquire the information. Consistent with the department procedures, the dean must provide the candidate a copy of the material and allow the candidate to write a rebuttal. The College/School/University Libraries committee may, at its option, adopt a policy which prohibits a committee member from the same department as a candidate for tenure or promotion from speaking about the case during the committee's deliberations. If such a rule is adopted, it must apply to all cases before the committee. If additional information about the departmental committee's deliberations is desired, the committee may request explanatory information to be submitted in writing from the chair of the departmental committee. This statement will be added to the primary dossier, and the candidate will be provided an opportunity to place a rebuttal in the primary dossier.



The committee will then consider the cases before it, whether regular or appealed. Straw ballots may be taken, but these are neither binding nor recorded. Abstentions will not be registered except when a faculty member on a committee declares he/she has a conflict of interest concerning the case. At a final meeting without the dean each case will be discussed and the committee will conduct its final vote. A positive recommendation by the committee will result when more than 50 percent of those casting ballots other than abstention vote to recommend tenure or promotion.

The committee must notify the dean in writing of its final ballot on each case. (Note: The College/School/University Libraries committee may meet with the dean as it sees fit but it must hold a discussion on each case and take its final vote in the absence of the dean.)

The results of the College/School/University Libraries deliberations and the dean's separate recommendations will be sent by the dean to the Provost. When the committee's discussion of a candidate is complete, the committee chair will summarize in writing the committee's evaluation of the candidate. The dean will also provide a written evaluation to accompany his/her recommendation for each case. These statements will be included in the primary dossier. The candidate will be provided an opportunity to review these statements and to file a written rebuttal in the primary dossier. In cases where the College/School/University Libraries committee's recommendation differs from that of the dean, the case will go forward to the next higher level without prejudice and the transmittal will not constitute an appeal. A positive recommendation requires the affirmative vote of more than 50 percent of those voting. The dean will also send forward the primary dossier and the secondary dossier.

The dean will notify each candidate in writing of the College/School/University Libraries committee's recommendation, the dean's recommendation, the right to appeal, if any, and the procedures for appeal. The dean will also notify the candidate that he/she may request in writing meetings with the dean and/or the chair of the college/school/University Libraries committee, at the candidate's option, to discuss the recommendation.

G. University Review of Nominees for Tenure or Promotion

The Provost will give a copy of the primary dossier of each faculty member favorably recommended for tenure or promotion and of each appealed case to each member of the University committee. In addition, the Provost will indicate the location of the secondary dossiers. The materials must be available to the committee for at least five working days prior to deliberations.

If the committee discovers that information is lacking in a primary dossier, it can ask the Provost to acquire the information, which will be placed in the primary dossier. Consistent with College/School/University Libraries procedures the Provost must



provide the candidate a copy of the material and allow the candidate to write a rebuttal, which will also be placed in the primary dossier.

The committee will then consider the cases before it, whether regular or appealed. The committee may request a written response from the dean on matters of interpretation of evidence, the academic needs of the unit, or its current resources, but the committee will not invite the dean or other outside persons to meet with the committee.

Consistent with College/School/University Libraries procedures, the candidate shall be provided a copy of any additional written material provided to the committee and shall be provided an opportunity to write a rebuttal. Both the statement and the rebuttal will be placed in the primary dossier. Straw ballots may be taken, but these are neither binding nor recorded. Abstentions will not be registered except when a faculty member on a committee declares he/she has a conflict of interest concerning a case. At a meeting without either the Provost or the Dean of the Graduate School present, each case will be discussed and the committee will conduct its final vote. A positive recommendation will result when more than 50 percent of those casting ballots other than abstention vote to recommend tenure or promotion.

The committee must notify the Provost in writing of its final ballot on each case. Any person not recommended by the University committee may request meetings with the Provost and/or the chair of the University committee, at the candidate's option, to discuss the recommendations. The candidate may invite a faculty colleague to accompany him/her.

The results of University committee deliberations and the Provost separate recommendations will be sent by the Provost to the President. When the committee's decision on a candidate is complete, the committee chair will summarize in writing the committee's evaluation of the candidate. The Provost will also provide a written evaluation to accompany his/her recommendation for each case. These statements will be included in the primary dossier. The candidate will be provided an opportunity to review these statements and to file a written rebuttal in the primary dossier. In any case where the proposed vice presidential recommendation differs from that of the University committee, the Provost will meet with the committee to discuss the reasons for his/her position.

The President will notify the candidate, the candidate's dean, and the chair, in writing, of his/her decision by the calendar date. Any person not recommended by the President may request a meeting with the Provost and the President to discuss the recommendations. The candidate may invite a faculty colleague to accompany him/her, in either case.



H. Use of External Evaluation

The use of external reviews is required in all promotion and tenure reviews to demonstrate earned recognition in professional circles. External reviews are not part of the Professor Incentive Review process. The dean's office will assume responsibility for obtaining the reviews in accordance with the procedures described below. The same questions will be asked of all reviewers. In general, the dean may ask reviewers to comment on (1) the originality and creativity displayed in the candidate's research, scholarship, or creative work and (2) the significance of the work and its impact on the field. Reviewers will be specifically instructed not to remark on the promotability or tenurability of candidates. Candidates will receive a copy of the reviews which identifies the reviewer. If they wish to do so, candidates may provide their written rebuttal to the external reviews in the primary dossiers.

External reviewers should be distinguished scholars or recognized authorities in their fields capable of providing an unbiased professional assessment of the quality of the candidate's work.

The process for obtaining external reviews should be started at least two months before the campus review begins. The following process should be followed for external reviews:

1. The candidate will give the departmental chair the names and addresses of five potential external reviewers, six sets of reprints or copies of work that the candidate believes best represents his/her research, scholarship, or creative work, and six copies of a complete bibliography that clearly delineates the candidate's research, scholarship, or creative work. Any material that the candidate wishes to have returned should be so marked.
2. The department chair will forward to the dean information provided by the candidate along with five additional names and addresses of potential external reviewers. The department chair may wish to seek the counsel of the faculty in developing this list. For cause, the candidate may challenge to the dean the names selected by the department chair.
3. The dean will draw by lot three reviewers from each list of names supplied. Individual Colleges/Schools/University Libraries shall develop their own policies regarding pursuit of non-responding or late evaluators; these policies shall be applied consistently whenever external review is sought. If fewer than three responses are obtained within a reasonable time, the dean may send additional requests for reviews to other persons named on the original lists, in rotating order from both lists.



4. The dean will send to each reviewer a letter requesting a professional opinion of the quality of the candidate's work following the guidelines stated above, along with the material supplied by the candidate.
5. Copies of the reviewers' comments will be returned to the department chair and the candidate immediately upon receipt by the dean. The department chair will add the reviews to the candidate's primary dossier. The chair, in consultation with the candidate, will place in the primary dossier a brief summary of the reviewers' academic credentials. Candidates are permitted to place in the primary dossier comments on or rebuttals to the letters provided by reviewers.
6. Reviews can be added to the candidate's primary dossier up until the time that the College committee begins its deliberations on the candidate.

I. Appeal of Decisions Related to Tenure or Promotion

A candidate may make only one appeal during the entire review process. The appeal is made to the next higher level. No hearing is provided, and the appeal must be written. Some typical reasons for appeal are violation of academic freedom, failure to follow procedures concerning time periods or committee operations, inadequate consideration, discrimination, etc.

The committee to which the appeal is made will give full consideration without prejudice to the case in that the committee will review it in the same manner as favorably recommended cases and will apply similar standards.

If the candidate's one appeal results in an unfavorable recommendation, the candidate's dossier will be forwarded directly to the President. The President will make the final decision regarding the candidate as provided in Regents policy without further recommendations.

J. No Publication of Names

Names of faculty being considered for tenure or promotion will not be published. The right of privacy of such faculty members was affirmed by vote of the faculty on March 6, 1978.

K. Confidentiality of Proceedings

All deliberations are confidential. However, confidentiality cannot be guaranteed if the case goes to litigation.



L. Disposition of Dossiers

The Provost in each case will keep a copy of the primary dossier for three years and return to the candidate the remaining copies of the primary dossier and the secondary dossier.

M. Precedence of University Procedures

If department and College/School/University Libraries tenure or promotion procedures differ from those of the University, University procedures take precedent.

N. Student Members

Students will not cast a vote regarding the award of tenure or promotion to individual faculty members.

O. Definition of Terms

- **Committee**

The tenure review committee at the departmental level will consist of all tenured members of the department or a committee of tenured faculty chosen by those faculty members and reported in writing to the dean. In departments with fewer than three tenured members, the College/School/University Libraries faculty will develop appropriate procedures for the review subject to the approval of the College/School/University Libraries dean.

The review committee at the College/School/University Libraries level is the College/School/University Libraries Tenure and Promotion Committee. Members of this committee are all tenured, full-time faculty with the rank of assistant professor or higher. The total membership of the committee is an odd number, with a minimum of five members. The majority of the committee are elected by the faculty, according to a representational formula adopted by the college/school/University Libraries. Members are elected or appointed for either two- or three-year terms (depending upon the College/School/University Libraries policies), staggered to maintain continuity. If a replacement is required due to a resignation, the replacement is selected only for the duration of the unexpired term. The committee chair is elected by the committee. No person can serve on the committee in a year in which he or she is considered for promotion or for more than two consecutive terms.



The review committee at the University level is the Faculty Senate Tenure and Promotion Committee, whose general charge is established in the Faculty Senate rules. No person may serve on the University-level review committee in a year in which he or she is considered for tenure or promotion.

- **Administrator**

The administrator at the departmental level is the department chair. The dean is the administrator at the College/School/University Libraries level, and the Provost is the administrator at the University level.

- **Calendar**

A Tenure and Promotion Calendar will be developed and published each year by the Provost or their designee.

- **Cover sheet**

It is the policy of the University to require that all tenure and promotion documents use a uniform cover-sheet style. These cover sheets should be attached to the front of the primary document and should not be considered a part of the 25 pages. Sample cover sheets are available from the College office or from the Office of Academic Affairs.

At the departmental and College levels, the candidate should sign after the action at each level indicating that he/she has seen all materials that have been forwarded to the committee for consideration. This signature will not constitute agreement with the action at that level but will merely indicate that the candidate has seen the materials.

- **Documents**

The basic document consists of the 25-page statement prepared by the candidate in accordance with the standard format. The primary dossier consists of this basic document, the required cover sheet, copies of annual reviews (and rebuttals if filed) for untenured faculty, the chair's nonevaluative role statement, statements of evaluation by the committee and administrator at each level of review (and rebuttals if filed), letters of external review (and rebuttals if filed), and items added during the review process. Candidates must be notified of any items added to the primary dossier and be provided an opportunity to submit a written rebuttal to such items, which will be included in the primary dossier. At each level of review, each committee member has a copy of the primary dossier. The secondary dossier consists of such additional materials as the candidate wishes to submit. Examples might include, but are not limited to, copies of



publications or other evidence of scholarship, and copies of student evaluations or course materials, etc. Only one copy of the secondary dossier is maintained.

- **Mandatory Review Year**

The next to the last year of the allowable probationary period is the mandatory review year.

- **Straw Ballot**

A non-binding vote taken for the purpose of monitoring progress toward a final decision is a straw ballot.

- **Favorable Case**

A favorable case occurs at any level of review if either the faculty committee or the administrator makes a positive recommendation concerning the case. Such cases automatically move forward for review at the next level.

- **Probationary Appointment**

A probationary appointment is an appointment that may, on the basis of continuing satisfactory performance, lead to review for the award of tenure. However, probationary appointments carry no expectation or promise that review for the award of tenure will be undertaken or that tenure will be awarded. Probationary appointments are reviewed on an annual basis and may or may not be renewed. Probationary appointments may not be continued for more than seven years.

- **Refereed**

An article counts as "refereed" when it has been reviewed and evaluated before publication by scholars or experts in the research topic of the manuscript.

- **Temporary Appointments**

A temporary appointment is for a fixed term. Such appointments carry no rights to the consideration for the award of tenure.

4.25 / Full Professor Incentive Review Program

Effective: September 24, 1999 | Revised: October 01, 2006

I. Purpose

Establish a voluntary incentive review program for tenured faculty holding the rank of Full Professor.

II. Preamble

The voluntary incentive review program is intended to provide an opportunity for a (1.0 EFT) tenured faculty member holding the rank of Full Professor at Wichita State University for six (6) years to be eligible for salary supplements based on the faculty member's continuing professional work. Any Full Professor, including those holding administrative positions, may apply for the merit award if they feel that they meet the criteria provided in paragraph five below.

III. Policy

A. The voluntary incentive review program is available to all tenured faculty members who have held the rank of Full Professor at Wichita State University for a minimum of six (6) years (whose appointment is 1.0 EFT) and who have not received an incentive supplement under this policy in the last six years.

B. Eligible faculty members interested in participating in the voluntary incentive review program shall submit their names to the Chair of the department by the 3rd Friday in April of their fifth (5th) year as a Full Professor at WSU, at the same time as faculty seeking promotion to Full Professor as noted in the [Tenure and Promotion Calendar](#). The candidate for the voluntary incentive review will present a primary dossier comparable to a promotion dossier to the department, highlighting work completed since the last review; the candidate may prepare a secondary dossier.

C. Chairs interested in participating in the voluntary incentive review submit their dossiers to the Full Professors of the department for review. Chairs who are candidates for the Full Professor Incentive Review Program do not participate in their own evaluation or in evaluations of candidates in the Full Professor Incentive Review Program, or when the Chair has a conflict of interest. Such cases automatically go forward without prejudice for review at the next level.

D. Salary supplements under this policy are part of the merit pay system, not the tenure and promotion process. The criteria for award of a salary supplement are the same as the criteria for promotion to Full Professor (in effect at the time the candidate

files an application for full professor incentive review). In the interests of fairness and to assure comparable standards across campus, the process for review is the same as for promotion to Full Professor, and will process through the stages of the tenure and promotion review process.

The process of review involves these steps:

1. Nomination for review.
2. Departmental review of nominees by the departmental committee* and by the Chair.
3. In favorable or appealed** cases, college/school/University Libraries review of departmental nominations by the college/school/University Libraries tenure and promotion committee and by the college/schools/University Libraries dean.
4. In favorable or appealed** cases, University review of college/school/University Libraries nominations by the tenure and promotion committee and by the Provost.
5. In favorable or appealed** cases, approval by the president of the University.

*In departments having fewer than three faculty members with appropriate rank, the college/school/University Libraries faculty will develop appropriate review procedures subject to the approval of the college/school/University Libraries dean.

**Procedures have been established for appeal in the case of an adverse promotion recommendation at the department, college/school/University Libraries and University levels.

E. The requirements for a successful full professor incentive review merit award require that a candidate demonstrate all of the following:

6. The candidate must have established and maintained a sustained, successful program in research, publication, or creative activity that has led to national visibility as judged by the standards of the discipline. It is the responsibility of the candidate to supply clear and convincing evidence in this area.
7. The candidate must be able to demonstrate sustained, successful teaching at the undergraduate and/or graduate level as determined by the mission of the department. It is the responsibility of the candidate to supply clear and convincing evidence in this area.



8. The candidate must be able to demonstrate sustained, successful service to the University and to the profession commensurate with the rank of professor. It is the responsibility of the candidate to supply clear and convincing evidence in this area.

F. E. Satisfactory completion of the voluntary incentive review program will result in payment of a salary supplement to the participating faculty member that equals the salary supplement paid to a person promoted to Full Professor at the same time.

IV. Implementation

This policy shall be included in the *WSU Policies and Procedures Manual* and shared with appropriate constituencies of the University.

The Provost shall have primary responsibility for publication and implementation of this University Policy.



4.26 / Tenure and Promotion Committee

Effective: July 01, 1977 | Revised: October 13, 2009

I. Policy

A. Composition (12 members)

- 7 Chairs of the Tenure and Promotion Committees of the degree-granting college/school and for University Libraries
- 2 Faculty-at-large
- 1 Student (non-voting)
- 2 Ex officio: (non-voting) Provost, Dean of the Graduate School. Ex officio members shall not be present at the meeting when final votes are taken.

B. Selection

Chairs of tenure and promotion committees in the degree-granting colleges/schools and for University Libraries are chosen according to procedures established in their respective college/school/University Libraries, or unit. They are elected to two-year staggered terms. Faculty-at-large are selected according to standard procedures for naming members to faculty senate committees, except that they shall be from different Faculty Senate divisions, and shall be full-time, tenured faculty members with the rank of associate professor or higher. Faculty-at-large serve three-year terms. Ex officio and faculty at-large members may not serve while a candidate for promotion or incentive review, or while on sabbatical leave. Replacement appointments shall be made as needed, following standard procedures.

C. Charge

1. Implement University-wide policies and procedures for awarding tenure and promotion.
2. Coordinate the [Tenure and Promotion Calendar](#)
3. Specify the format for documentation in support of Tenure and Promotion Review, with a view to developing comparable standards throughout the University while recognizing essential college/school/University Libraries differences.
4. Formulate transmittal, reporting, and appeals procedures for awarding tenure and promotion.



5. Ensure that there are University-wide procedures for notifying the relevant administrators and those faculty members for whom tenure decisions must be made before reappointment.
6. Review tenure and promotion cases in accordance with the [University Tenure, Promotion and Appeals Procedure](#).
7. Review every three years the college/school/University Libraries guidelines for tenure and promotion.
8. Report to the full Faculty Senate for review issues of concern in tenure policies and tenure and promotion guidelines.

4.27 / Promotion for Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Guidelines and Criteria

Effective: December 11, 2017

I. Policy

A. Non-tenure track faculty are significant members of the university who are critical department members broadly engaged in an academic program's curriculum, evolution, and impact. Non-tenure track faculty need to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching/librarianship and service, as defined in the role statement. Although there is no research expectation for non-tenure track faculty, the faculty member's appropriate mix and extent of responsibilities is defined within their department by a role statement.

B. A terminal degree in a field appropriate to the discipline in which the candidate teaches is normally required for appointment or promotion for the following advancement levels: Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, and Teaching Professor; and Assistant Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor, and Clinical Professor. Candidates may be hired to the following levels in the absence of a terminal degree: Assistant Educator, Associate Educator, and Senior Educator. Exceptions to this guideline will require careful documentation based upon an adequate rationale.

C. Under normal circumstances, a faculty member should not expect to be considered for promotion with less than six years in advancement levels. For each level of promotion, successively higher levels of achievement are expected.

D. The standards for teaching/librarianship and service, as defined in the role statement, for each level are indicated below. The relative significance of teaching/librarianship and service, as defined in the role statement, may vary from case to case. Consideration, in context of the candidate's entire career, will be given to teaching/librarianship and service, as defined in the role statement, conducted while the candidate has been employed at the University.

1. Assistant Teaching Professor / Assistant Clinical Professor / Assistant Educator

Evidence is normally expected of the following:



- a. demonstrated adequacy in teaching/librarianship; and
- b. some University service, as defined in the role statement, appropriate to the mission of the department and college/school/University Libraries.

2. Associate Teaching Professor / Associate Clinical Professor / Associate Educator

Evidence is normally expected of the following:

- a. documented effectiveness of teaching/librarianship; and
- b. some professional or University service, as defined in the role statement.

3. Teaching Professor / Clinical Professor / Senior Educator

Evidence is normally expected of the following:

- a. sustained effectiveness in teaching/librarianship; and
- b. demonstrated academic leadership in the form of service, as defined in the role statement, to the University and the profession.



4.28 / Promotion for Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Outline of Process of Review

Effective: December 11, 2017

I. Policy

A. Any faculty member may nominate himself or herself for review for promotion or incentive review after five years of service in the current level. The review takes place during the sixth year. Nominations may also be made by the chairperson.

B. The process of review for promotion or incentive involves these steps:

1. Nomination for review.
2. Departmental review of nominees by the departmental committee and by the chair.
3. In favorable or appealed cases, college/school/University Libraries review of department nominations by the college/school/University Libraries Promotion Committee, and by the college/school/University Libraries dean.
4. In favorable or appealed cases, University review of college/school/University Libraries nominations by the Promotion Committee and by the Provost.
5. In favorable or appealed cases, review of recommendations by the University President for final decision.

C. Procedures have been established for appeal in the case of an adverse promotion recommendation at the department and at the college level.

4.29 / Promotion for Non-Tenure Track Faculty Promotion: Procedures

Effective: December 11, 2017

I. Policy

A. Nomination for Review for Promotion

1. The department chair will write to all full-time faculty members of the department to tell them that nominations of persons to be reviewed that year for promotion must be given to the chair by a specified date. All others may be nominated by the chair or by the faculty member himself or herself.
2. The department chair will send copies of the list resulting from step 1 to all full-time departmental faculty and specify a second date by which any additional nominations must be provided in writing to the chair.
3. The department chair will confer individually with all nominated faculty members and provide information about departmental, college/school/University Libraries, and University criteria for promotion.
4. Faculty who have been nominated must inform the department chair in writing by a date specified by the department chair (which will be no sooner than two days after their conference) of the faculty member's decision to remain in nomination or to withdraw.
5. The final, typed list of those nominated will be sent to the dean and to all members of the department electorate. Each person on the list will be notified in writing by the dean that he or she is officially a candidate for promotion. In addition, the dean will inform the candidate of the criteria for promotion and will instruct the candidate to give his/her supporting materials to the department chair by a specified date.

B. Preparation of the Primary and Secondary Dossier

The candidate will present a primary dossier and may prepare a secondary dossier. Only material contained in the primary and secondary dossiers and additional materials appropriately obtained and added to the dossiers may be used by the Promotion Committee at each level.

The candidate is responsible for assembling the materials and reviewing the entire dossier to determine that it is complete and accurate. Non-tenure track



candidates are *not* required to have any external letters of review as part of their primary dossier. Adherence to established deadlines should ensure that the final dossier is complete at the time of submission. The candidate then submits the copy of the primary dossier and supplemental materials to the chair of her/his department. Once they have been submitted to the chair, these original materials cannot be changed or rewritten.

As the review proceeds through the various levels, the primary dossier and the secondary dossier will be in the custody of the administrator at each level. Items are added as attachments to the primary dossier by the administrator as called for in these procedures, but the administrator must give the candidate a copy of the additions and provide the candidate an opportunity to write a rebuttal that will also be added to the primary dossier.

1. Primary Dossier

The primary dossier consists of the basic document, the required cover sheet which records each step of the review process, copies of the annual reviews (and rebuttals if filed) for non-tenure track faculty, the chair's non-evaluative role statement, statements of evaluation by the committee and administrator at each level of review (and rebuttals if filed), and items added during the review process. The basic document will follow the standard format recommended by the University Promotion Committee and approved by the Faculty Senate. Deviations from the established format should be clearly explained. The basic document may be no more than 15 pages. The chair will provide a statement of the role of the candidate in the department which is purely descriptive and not evaluative. If the candidate's role involves a weighted distribution of responsibility among the categories of professional activity, that should be indicated in the role statement. The chair will make copies of the primary dossier available for all voting faculty.

2. Secondary Dossier

A secondary dossier may be submitted to the chair by the candidate. It consists of such additional materials as the candidate wishes to submit. Examples might include, but are not required or limited to evidence of teaching, copies of student evaluations or course materials, evidence of service contributions, etc. The candidate may add items to the secondary dossier during the review process (see calendar in [Section 4.15](#) of this manual). Should documentation significant to the candidate's case arrive after the deadline for adding materials to the secondary dossier, the candidate should notify the dean and the chair of his/her college/school/University Libraries committee who will add the material



to the dossier. The chair of the committee will bring it to the attention of the next higher committee. The secondary dossier will not be duplicated but will be available to committee members.

C. Reviews for Promotion

1. Department Review for Promotion

The complete files of all faculty members under review in the department must be available for a reasonable time (at least five working days) to all voting faculty.

2. Department Committee

The Non-tenure track Faculty Promotion Committee at the departmental level should have at least three members and will consist of at least one voting non-tenure track faculty member, and at least one voting tenured faculty member of the department. Promotion cases will be reviewed at a meeting of the departmental faculty who hold level equal to or higher than that for which the candidate is being considered or of a committee of those with appropriate level chosen by these faculty members. (The limitation of voting to persons of equal or higher level need not apply to votes at the college/school/University Libraries or University level.) In departments with fewer than the requisite members, the college/school/University Libraries faculty will develop appropriate procedures for the review subject to the approval of the college/school/University Libraries dean.

Each eligible person, excluding the department chair, will vote on each case under consideration and will sign the tally. The tally will not identify individual voters with their votes but must account for all eligible votes. Straw ballots may precede the final ballot. Abstentions may occur only in cases involving declared conflict of interest. A positive recommendation will result when more than 50 percent of those casting ballots (i.e., other than abstentions) have voted to recommend promotion. Copies of the tally sheets will be kept in the departmental office for three years.

Chairs do not participate in their own evaluation or in evaluations of faculty when the chair has a conflict of interest. Such cases automatically go forward without prejudice for review at the next level.



The results of the departmental deliberations and the chair's separate recommendation will be sent to the dean by the department chair. When the committee's discussion of a candidate is complete, the committee chair will summarize in writing the committee's evaluation of the candidate. The department chair will also provide a written evaluation to accompany his/her recommendation for each case. These statements will be included in the primary dossier. The candidate will be provided an opportunity to review these statements and to file a written rebuttal in the primary dossier. In cases where the chair's recommendation differs from that of the voting faculty, the case will go forward to the next higher level without prejudice, and that transmittal will not constitute an appeal. The chair will also send forward the copies of the primary dossier and the secondary dossier.

The dean will inform each candidate in writing of the department's recommendations, the chair's recommendation, the right to appeal, and the procedures for appeal. The dean will also notify the candidate that he/she may request meetings with the department chair and/or the chair of the departmental promotion committee, at the candidate's option, to discuss the decision.

3. College/School/University Libraries Review of Nominees for Promotion

The dean will give a copy of the primary dossier of each faculty member favorably recommended for promotion and of all appealed cases to each member of the college/school/University Libraries committee and will indicate the location of the secondary dossiers. These materials must be available to the committee for at least five working days prior to deliberation.

4. College Promotion Committee for Non-tenure track Faculty

This committee will consist of at least one voting non-tenure track faculty member and at least one voting tenured faculty member from the college. The total membership of the committee is an odd number, with a minimum of five members.

The majority of the committee are elected by the faculty, according to a representational formula adopted by the college/school/University Libraries. Members are elected or appointed for either two- or three-year terms (depending upon the college/school/University Libraries policies), staggered to maintain continuity. If a replacement is required due to a resignation, the replacement is selected only for the duration of the unexpired term. The committee chair is elected by the committee. No



person can serve on the committee in a year in which he or she is considered for promotion or for more than two consecutive terms.

The committee will meet with the dean to receive information about the schedule of meetings and about administrative matters related to the cases to be reviewed. The dean may also request other meetings with the committee. Each college/school/University Libraries shall adopt procedures regarding the role of the dean in these other meetings. If the committee discovers that information is lacking in a dossier, it can ask the dean to acquire the information. Consistent with the department procedures, the dean must provide the candidate a copy of the material and allow the candidate to write a rebuttal. The college/school/University Libraries committee may, at its option, adopt a policy which prohibits a committee member from the same department as a candidate for promotion from speaking about the case during the committee's deliberations. If such a rule is adopted, it must apply to all cases before the committee. If additional information about the departmental committee's deliberations is desired, the committee may request explanatory information to be submitted in writing from the chair of the departmental committee. This statement will be added to the primary dossier, and the candidate will be provided an opportunity to place a rebuttal in the primary dossier. The committee will then consider the cases before it, whether regular or appealed. Straw ballots may be taken, but these are neither binding nor recorded. Abstentions will not be registered except when a faculty member on a committee declares he/she has a conflict of interest concerning the case. At a meeting without the dean each case will be discussed and the committee will conduct its final vote. A positive recommendation by the committee will result when more than 50 percent of those casting ballots other than abstention vote to recommend promotion.

The committee must notify the dean in writing of its final ballot on each case. (Note: The college/school/University Libraries committee may meet with the dean as it sees fit but it must hold a discussion on each case and take its final vote in the absence of the dean.) The results of the college/school/University Libraries deliberations and the dean's separate recommendations will be sent by the dean to the Provost. When the committee's discussion of a candidate is complete, the committee chair will summarize in writing the committee's evaluation of the candidate. The dean will also provide a written evaluation to accompany his/her recommendation for each case. These statements will be included in the primary dossier. The candidate will be provided an opportunity to review these statements and to file a written rebuttal in the primary dossier. In



cases where the college/school/University Libraries committee's recommendation differs from that of the dean, the case will go forward to the next higher level without prejudice and the transmittal will not constitute an appeal. A positive recommendation requires the affirmative vote of more than 50 percent of those voting. The dean will also send forward the primary dossier and the secondary dossier.

The dean will notify each candidate in writing of the college/school/University Libraries committee's recommendation, the dean's recommendation, the right to appeal, if any, and the procedures for appeal. The dean will also notify the candidate that he/she may request in writing meetings with the dean and/or the chair of the college/school/University Libraries committee, at the candidate's option, to discuss the recommendation.

5. University Review of Nominees for Promotion

The Provost will give a copy of the primary dossier of each faculty member favorably recommended for promotion and of each appealed case to each member of the University committee. In addition, the Provost will indicate the location of the secondary dossiers. The materials must be available to the committee for at least five working days prior to deliberations.

The review committee at the University level is composed of the same members as the Faculty Senate Tenure and Promotion Committee, with the exception that the two at-large tenured members will be replaced by two at-large non-tenure track faculty. No person may serve on the University-level review committee in a year in which he or she is considered for tenure or promotion.

If the committee discovers that information is lacking in a primary dossier, it can ask the Provost to acquire the information, which will be placed in the primary dossier. Consistent with college/school/University Libraries procedures the Provost must provide the candidate a copy of the material and allow the candidate to write a rebuttal, which will also be placed in the primary dossier. The committee will then consider the cases before it, whether regular or appealed. The committee may request a written response from the dean on matters of interpretation of evidence, the academic needs of the unit, or its current resources, but the committee will not invite the dean or other outside persons to meet with the committee. Consistent with college/school/University Libraries procedures, the candidate shall be provided a copy of any additional written material provided to the committee and shall be provided an



opportunity to write a rebuttal. Both the statement and the rebuttal will be placed in the primary dossier. Straw ballots may be taken, but these are neither binding nor recorded. Abstentions will not be registered except when a faculty member on a committee declares he/she has a conflict of interest concerning a case. At a meeting without either the Provost or the Dean of the Graduate School present, each case will be discussed and the committee will conduct its final vote. A positive recommendation will result when more than 50 percent of those casting ballots other than abstention vote to recommend promotion. The committee must notify the Provost in writing of its final ballot on each case. Any person not recommended by the University committee may request meetings with the Provost and/or the chair of the University committee, at the candidate's option, to discuss the recommendations. The candidate may invite a faculty colleague to accompany him/her.

The results of University committee deliberations and the Provost's separate recommendations will be sent by the Provost to the President. When the committee's decision on a candidate is complete, the committee chair will summarize in writing the committee's evaluation of the candidate. The Provost will also provide a written evaluation to accompany his/her recommendation for each case. These statements will be included in the primary dossier. The candidate will be provided an opportunity to review these statements and to file a written rebuttal in the primary dossier. In any case where the proposed vice presidential recommendation differs from that of the University committee, the Provost will meet with the committee to discuss the reasons for his/her position.

The President will notify the candidate, the candidate's dean, and the chair, in writing, of his/her decision by the calendar date. Any person not recommended by the President may request a meeting with the Provost and the President to discuss the recommendations. The candidate may invite a faculty colleague to accompany him/her, in either case.

D. Appeal of Decisions Related to Promotion

A candidate may make only one appeal during the entire review process. The appeal is made to the next higher level. No hearing is provided, and the appeal must be written. Some typical reasons for appeal are violation of academic freedom, failure to follow procedures concerning time periods or committee operations, inadequate consideration, discrimination, etc. The committee to which the appeal is made will give full consideration without prejudice to the



case in that the committee will review it in the same manner as favorably recommended cases and will apply similar standards.

If the candidate's one appeal results in an unfavorable recommendation, the candidate's dossier will be forwarded directly to the President. The President will make the final decision regarding the candidate as provided in Regents policy without further recommendations.

E. No Publication of Names

Names of faculty being considered for promotion will not be published. The right of privacy of such faculty members was affirmed by vote of the faculty on March 6, 1978.

F. Confidentiality of Proceedings

All deliberations are confidential. However, confidentiality cannot be guaranteed if the case goes to litigation.

G. Disposition of Dossiers

The Provost in each case will keep a copy of the primary dossier for three years and return to the candidate the remaining copies of the primary dossier and the secondary dossier.

H. Precedence of University Procedures

If department and College/School/University Libraries tenure or promotion procedures differ from those of the University, University procedures take precedent.

I. Student Members

Students will not cast a vote regarding the award of tenure or promotion to individual faculty members.

II. Definition of Terms

• Administrator

The administrator at the departmental level is the department chair. The dean is the administrator at the College/School/University Libraries level, and the Provost is the administrator at the University level.



- **Calendar**

A Promotion Calendar will follow the same schedule as the Tenure and Promotion Calendar, developed and published each year by the Provost or their designee.

- **Documents**

The basic document consists of the 15-page statement prepared by the candidate in accordance with the standard format. The primary dossier consists of this basic document, the required cover sheet, copies of annual reviews (and rebuttals if filed) for faculty, the chair's non-evaluative role statement, statements of evaluation by the committee and administrator at each level of review (and rebuttals if filed), and items added during the review process. Candidates must be notified of any items added to the primary dossier and be provided an opportunity to submit a written rebuttal to such items, which will be included in the primary dossier. At each level of review, each committee member has a copy of the primary dossier. The secondary dossier consists of such additional materials as the candidate wishes to submit. Examples might include, but are not required or limited to evidence of teaching, copies of student evaluations or course materials, evidence of service contributions, etc. Only one copy of the secondary dossier is maintained.

- **Straw Ballot**

A non-binding vote taken for the purpose of monitoring progress toward a final decision is a straw ballot.

- **Favorable Case**

A favorable case occurs at any level of review if either the faculty committee or the administrator makes a positive recommendation concerning the case. Such cases automatically move forward for review at the next level.



4.30. Teaching Professor Incentive Review Program

Effective: December 11, 2017

I. Purpose

Establish a voluntary incentive review program for non-tenure track faculty holding the level of Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor or Senior Educator.

II. Preamble

The voluntary incentive review program is intended to provide an opportunity for a (1.0 EFT) non-tenure track faculty member holding the level of Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor or Senior Educator at Wichita State University for six (6) years to be eligible for salary supplements based on the faculty member's continuing professional work. Any Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor or Senior Educator, including those holding administrative positions, may apply for the merit award if they feel that they meet the criteria provided in paragraph five below.

III. Policy

A. The voluntary incentive review program is available to all faculty members who have held the level of Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor or Senior Educator at Wichita State University for a minimum of six (6) years (whose appointment is 1.0 EFT) and who have not received an incentive supplement under this policy in the last six years.

B. Eligible faculty members interested in participating in the voluntary incentive review program shall submit their names to the Chair of the department by the appropriate Spring deadline of their fifth (5th) year as a Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor or Senior Educator at WSU, at the same time as faculty seeking promotion to Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor or Senior Educator as noted in the [Tenure and Promotion Calendar](#). The candidate for the voluntary incentive review will present a primary dossier comparable to a promotion dossier to the department, highlighting work completed since the last review; the candidate may prepare a secondary dossier.

C. Chairs interested in participating in the voluntary incentive review submit their dossiers to the Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor or Senior Educator of the department for review. Chairs who are candidates for the Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor or Senior Educator Incentive Review Program do not participate in their own evaluation or in evaluations of candidates in the Teaching Professor,



Clinical Professor or Senior Educator Incentive Review Program, or when the Chair has a conflict of interest. Such cases automatically go forward without prejudice for review at the next level.

D. Salary supplements under this policy are part of the merit pay system, not the tenure and promotion process. The criteria for award of a salary supplement are the same as the criteria for promotion to Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor or Senior Educator (in effect at the time the candidate files an application for full professor incentive review). In the interests of fairness and to assure comparable standards across campus, the process for review is the same as for promotion to Full Professor, and will process through the stages of the tenure and promotion review process.

The process of review involves these steps:

1. Nomination for review.
2. Departmental review of nominees by the departmental committee* and by the Chair.
3. In favorable or appealed** cases, college/school/University Libraries review of departmental nominations by the college/school/University Libraries tenure and promotion committee and by the college/schools/University Libraries dean.
4. In favorable or appealed** cases, University review of college/school/University Libraries nominations by the tenure and promotion committee and by the Provost.
5. In favorable or appealed** cases, approval by the president of the University.

*In departments having fewer than three faculty members with appropriate rank, the college/school/University Libraries faculty will develop appropriate review procedures subject to the approval of the college/school/University Libraries dean.

**Procedures have been established for appeal in the case of an adverse promotion recommendation at the department, college/school/University Libraries and University levels.

Note: The applicable policies and procedures may be found in the [WSU Policies and Procedures Manual, Chapter 4](#).

E. The requirements for a successful Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor or Senior Educator incentive review merit award require that a candidate demonstrate sustained, successful performance in the areas of responsibility as defined in their role statement. This might include teaching at the undergraduate and/or graduate level, as well as service to the University and to the profession commensurate with



the level of Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor or Senior Educator. It is the responsibility of the candidate to supply clear and convincing evidence in each area.

F. Satisfactory completion of the voluntary incentive review program will result in payment of a salary supplement to the participating faculty member that equals the salary supplement paid to a person promoted to Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor or Senior Educator at the same time.

IV. Implementation

This policy shall be included in the WSU Policies and Procedures Manual and shared with appropriate constituencies of the University.

The Provost shall have primary responsibility for publication and implementation of this University Policy.

4.31. Faculty Evaluation

Effective: July 01, 1997 | Revised: September 21, 2020

I. Initiating Authority

Faculty Senate serves as the initiating authority.

II. Purpose

The following policy provisions are established from the perspective that variety in academic schools/departmental (hereinafter referred to as "Department") evaluation procedures shall be preserved, subject to providing a fair evaluation for each individual and subject to departmental mission.

III. Policy

A. All faculty, with half-time or more appointments, and those unclassified professionals who have teaching responsibilities amounting to 50 percent or more of their workload are to be evaluated at least once a year regardless of whether or not they are in the Academic Affairs division of the University.

B. There shall be a common calendar for the evaluation of untenured faculty and for annual merit evaluation.

c. Department evaluation procedures shall focus on the year in question while providing for at least two contiguous years in each review, in order to make appropriate adjustments in salaries based on previous years with limited or no salary allocation moneys and to determine patterns and continuity in academic accomplishments.

D. The Department shall be established as the primary site of evaluation. The chair of the department is responsible for maintaining the current departmental evaluation policy in an open file. The following records shall be established and maintained in individual faculty files kept in the departmental office:

1. Departmental instructions to persons being evaluated including the requirement to discuss flexible performance goals for the coming year with the chair. The understanding is that these goals can be revisited and modified during the course of the year.



2. Departmental evaluations for each person, including assessment of success in attainment of performance goals.
3. The relationship between evaluation and departmental pay recommendation for each person.
4. The rationale for changes in departmental evaluations and pay recommendations made by persons outside the Department.

E. There shall be no information requested for annual evaluation that is not intended for that purpose.

F. Persons being evaluated should be informed of any submitted information that was not reviewed by the evaluators involved in the evaluation process.

G. There shall be developed procedures for an open information flow between affected parties as per the procedure outlined below and an opportunity for the person being evaluated to appeal at each stage of the process that will meet the prevailing budget time line requirements.

H. The majority of any departmental review committee, if established according to the following procedure, must be tenured faculty.

IV. Administrative Procedure

A. Departmental Faculty

1. The faculty of each department shall establish a written policy for annual evaluation of all faculty with half-time or more appointments and those unclassified professionals who have teaching responsibilities amounting to 50 percent or more of their workload.
2. Chairs and deans shall review departmental policy and meet with the departmental faculty in the interest of any changes that should be made.
3. The faculty of each department shall cast a secret ballot at least every third year on whether they desire to elect annually a faculty evaluation committee for the purpose of evaluating the department members with teaching/librarianship responsibilities and providing merit pay recommendations to the department chair. If such a committee is established, its chair will meet with the department chair to report on the committee's recommendations for merit pay distribution within the department. If the departmental faculty elect not to establish a committee, the department chair will have sole responsibility of evaluating the department's teaching personnel/librarian personnel and generating the department recommendation for merit pay distribution within the department.

B. Department Chairs\Directors (*hereafter referred to as "Chairs"*)

1. Chairs shall transmit departmental pay recommendations for the entire department, according to faculty established policy, to each person being evaluated as soon as these are developed and ready for transmittal to the dean. At that time, each person being evaluated may appeal his/her individual pay recommendations to the department chair.
2. Chairs shall transmit departmental pay recommendations to their dean along with a prioritized list of individuals they recommend for any additional salary increases.

C. Provost and Deans

1. Deans shall transmit their pay recommendations to the Provost for the entire department. At the same time, the dean will explain to the Chairs any changes recommended by the dean in the department's salary recommendations. The Chairs are responsible for immediately informing the person being evaluated.
2. The Provost shall transmit that office's departmental pay recommendations for the entire department to each dean who has the responsibility of informing the Chairs as soon as soon as these are developed. The Chair is responsible for informing the person being evaluated at that time.
3. Administrators above the department level shall prepare a written explanation, attaching any relevant documents, of all changes they make in pay recommendations sent to their office. The explanation shall be transmitted to the person being evaluated and to the department chair.

D. Evaluation of Teaching

1. It is the policy of the Kansas Board of Regents that merit increases for faculty shall be based on an annual evaluation of performance. In compliance with these policy statements, the University has developed the following guidelines for the evaluation of all University faculty with half-time or more appointments who have teaching responsibilities amounting to 50 percent or more of their workload, **including: temporary faculty, probationary faculty, tenured faculty, contingent unclassified professionals, provisional unclassified professionals, and regular unclassified professionals.**
2. Departments, colleges or units must review and develop a comprehensive, and flexible approach to teaching evaluation, where several types of evidence will be collected, presented and evaluated as a portfolio. The types of information evaluated shall be appropriate for the discipline or various sub-disciplines represented in the department, college or unit. It shall be the responsibility of the department, college or unit to insure that evaluations are conducted in accordance with the established procedure. In addition to normed student evaluations such as

SPTe or IDEA, evidence of teaching effectiveness may include, but is not limited to, some combination of the following:

- a. Course materials such as reading lists, syllabi, classroom or community activities, and examinations;
- b. Special contributions to effective teaching for diverse student populations;
- c. Development of innovative and effective teaching methods;
- d. Development of new courses or substantial modification of existing courses;
- e. Evidence of impact on students and faculty;
- f. Student outcome assessments such as before/after quantitative or qualitative testing, or results from standardized exams;
- g. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments;
- h. Peer evaluations;
- i. Special teaching activities outside the university;
- j. Advising and mentoring students;
- k. Exit interviews, and alumni interviews and surveys to obtain information about teaching effectiveness.

3. Departments, colleges and unit should determine the appropriate criteria used to judge the information presented.

4. The results for student perceptions of teaching evaluations and student comments are owned by the faculty teaching the class. Departments and/or colleges should not have access to the results and student comments prior to faculty. Only a quantitative summary for any normed evaluations is required. Only the two summary pages are required for evaluations if SPTes are used, but faculty are free to include student comments in their entirety. SPTe results should be available to faculty before the annual review deadlines.

5. Since all faculty with half-time or more appointments and those unclassified professionals who have teaching responsibilities amounting to 50 percent or more of their workload must be rated by students at least once a year, the department faculty shall determine the form or forms appropriate to its discipline among those which conform to the criteria stated in the policies of the Board of Regents). Surveys intended for faculty evaluation must conform to certain administrative practices:



- a. Persons being evaluated do not have access to blank survey forms and they have no responsibilities to administer the survey nor to tally survey results.
- b. Personnel who distribute and collect the surveys will acknowledge by their signature that they conducted the survey for a particular class and they recorded the number of students present at the time the survey was taken.
- c. Persons being evaluated shall have access to a copy of raw scores of any survey used for evaluation.

Note: The Provost will establish procedures in consultation with the Faculty Senate for implementation of this policy. These procedures will pertain only to the time and form of the evaluation policy.

4.32. / Substance Abuse

Effective: July 01, 1997 | Revised: April 09, 2018

I. Purpose

This policy for dealing with faculty members with substance abuse problems is intended to enhance and encourage a cooperative effort between faculty and the University and to serve and protect the interests of both. The policy recognizes that professional assistance can often return an individual to full productivity and is based on the premise that it is the faculty member's right and responsibility to seek professional assistance for a substance abuse problem.

II. Scope

A faculty member with a possible substance abuse problem, even in its early stages, is encouraged to seek diagnosis and treatment. The faculty member should be assured that seeking assistance, pursuant to this policy, for an actual or potential substance problem, will not interfere with job status, promotional opportunities or other privileges. A substance abuse problem is defined as one in which a faculty member's use or misuse of alcohol or drugs is reasonably believed to be affecting the faculty member's job performance.

III. Policy overview

The goal of this policy is to assist individuals in seeking professional help so they may return to full productivity. All faculty members, especially department chairpersons, should work to engender a University-wide enlightened attitude and a realistic recognition of the nature of substance abuse problems.

IV. Responsibility

A. Responsibility for implementing this policy rests with faculty. Care must be taken to follow procedures so that no faculty member with a substance abuse problem will be penalized for implementing the policy.

B. Supervisors will seek to do everything reasonably possible, consistent with applicable laws and University procedures, to make certain that information revealed by the faculty member receiving professional assistance relating to an actual or potential substance abuse problem will remain confidential.



C. Implementing this policy will not require, or result in, any special treatment, privileges, or exemption from the standard administrative practices applicable to job performance requirements.

V. Action Guidelines

The steps listed below are suggested guidelines only. Department chairpersons, deans, and other faculty supervisors should not attempt diagnosis, even if they have professional qualifications to judge that a faculty member's work has been affected by a substance abuse problem.

A. Before attempting intervention in a situation involving a faculty member with a substance abuse problem, the concerned supervisor should discuss with his/her supervisor and the Director of Equal Opportunity the pertinent rules and requirements concerning protection of rights of the person believed to be suffering from a substance abuse problem. It may also be helpful for the supervisor to consult with a professional in substance abuse treatment without identifying the concerned faculty member before meeting with him or her. The University's Counseling and Testing Center is staffed with professional counselors who may be able to assist supervisors.

B. The supervisor should meet with the faculty member informally and discuss the observed job performance problems. Supervisors should not attempt diagnosis. If the faculty member references a substance abuse problem as a causative factor for the job performance problems, the supervisor should advise the faculty member of this substance abuse policy, activate the policy and encourage the faculty member to seek professional counseling for the problem. In this discussion, a date will be set by which improvement in job performance will be assessed. A list of professional agencies will be available to supervisors. This list may be obtained by contacting the Office of Human Resources.

C. The supervisor and the faculty member may also wish to consider the following options which may be pursued in connection with or in addition to professional counseling:

1. A faculty member with accrued sick leave may take sick leave. This option would allow the faculty member to enter an inpatient treatment center and adopt a treatment program.
2. A faculty member may request, pursuant to applicable University and Board of Regents policies, to be placed on leave of absence without pay.

D. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to follow up the suggested professional counseling, to cooperate with prescribed treatment, and to assume financial responsibility for the cost of the treatment. The University, while concerned for the well-being of the faculty member, also expects the faculty



member to address the job performance problems presented at the informal meeting.

E. Between the initial meeting wherein this policy is activated and the date agreed upon in the second action guideline to assess improvement in job performance, the supervisor will continue to monitor job performance but will in all other respects leave the initiative for further discussions to the faculty member. However, progress reports and continuing dialogue between the supervisor and faculty member are encouraged.

F. If the faculty member's job performance has improved to an acceptable level by the date prescribed by the supervisor, and as agreed to by the faculty member, the member should be so informed and no further action is required or necessary. On the other hand, if the faculty member's job performance remains below acceptable standards, the supervisor and the University will follow normal procedures with regard to unacceptable job performance, including, but not necessarily limited to, non-reappointment or dismissal.

This policy is supplemental to and subject to all existing University policies, Board of Regents policies, and applicable state and federal laws.



4.33 / Procedures for Departing Faculty

Effective: July 01, 1977 | Revised: April 09, 2018

I. Procedure

A. Resignation

Resignations should always be submitted in writing to the faculty member's department Chairperson or Dean. The Dean will acknowledge the resignation on behalf of the University. Unless an alternate date is specified, the effective date of a resignation shall be the termination date of the faculty member's appointment, current as of the date of submission of the resignation.

Faculty members must submit a written resignation notice. Except in instances of medical necessity, or as otherwise agreed upon between faculty member and Chairperson or Dean, resignations should be submitted by May 1 or within 30 days of the date of the most recent appointment notice.

B. Final Departure

Prior to final departure from campus, faculty members are expected to make arrangements for determining the final grades of their students and make arrangements to collect personal property and return University property.

4.34 / Dismissal for Cause

Effective: July 01, 1977 | Revised: September 21, 2020

I. Initiating Authority

Faculty Senate serves as the initiating authority.

II. Purpose

This policy is intended to establish a specific and clear procedure for identifying and addressing instances of a Tenured Faculty Member failing to meet the minimum level of performance or expectations of Professional Fitness and guidelines for remediation where appropriate. When a Tenured faculty member, who does not meet the minimum acceptable level of performance or when reason to question a Tenured faculty's Professional Fitness is documented, the process outlined below is provided to allow a fair, unbiased, non-retaliatory and non-discriminatory remediation and/or dismissal for cause. Faculty members who are not tenured and whose term of appointment has not expired, would follow applicable University policies in chapter 3.

III. Policy

- A. Each University department/unit shall use established criteria for minimum acceptable levels of performance that have been communicated to the members within the department/unit as the basis for annual evaluations.
- B. The Chair and the Performance Evaluation Forms (FAR) Review Committee (or similar committee) shall determine if the "overall" performance (as indicated on the FAR form) of a Tenured Faculty Member in their department falls below the minimum level of role expectations. If there is no FAR Review Committee, the decision is based on the Chair's statement. If there is disagreement between the Chair and the FAR Review Committee, the decision to enact the procedures for low performance review will be decided by the college Dean.
- C. It is highly recommended that the Chair and/or Dean utilize the expertise and experience of the Human Resources Department in working with issues of Low Performance and/or dismissal for cause.
- D. Faculty Senate Ombudspersons are available to provide assistance to faculty.



IV. Definitions

For the purpose of this policy only, the following definitions shall apply:

A. Chair: Denotes the administrator of the Unit (i.e. Director or other title of educational unit: Department, School, Center, etc.).

B. College Faculty Review Committee: a committee made up of three (3) Tenured Faculty Members from the college reviewing the Tenured Faculty Member's performance, jointly named by the Tenured Faculty Member and Chair, as set forth in this policy.

C. Low Performance: the "overall" performance category (as indicated on the FAR form) where a Tenured Faculty Member does not meet the minimum level of performance.

D. Professional Fitness: three (3) Annual Low Performance Ratings in any five (5) year period, or improper behavior that demonstrates: incompetence or dishonesty in teaching or research; dereliction of essential duties and responsibilities; or personal conduct which substantially impairs the individual's fulfillment of their essential institutional responsibilities. Allegations of harassment, discrimination, sexual misconduct and protected class discrimination will be investigated pursuant to the applicable university policy.

E. Performance Evaluation Forms (FAR) Review Committee (or similar committee such as T&P committee): made up of Tenured Faculty Members from the department (or an ad-hoc committee in place for faculty reviews within the department).

F. Tenured Faculty Member: anyone who is classified within the eclass or egroup of Tenured Faculty in the WSU system of record "Banner."

G. University Review Committee: made up of Tenured Faculty Members (not less than 3), jointly named by the president of the Faculty Senate and the University President.

V. Administrative Procedure for Low Performance

A. First Annual Low Performance Rating

1. The Chair shall discuss with the Tenured faculty member the specific area(s) of responsibility with Low Performance related to their role statement/job description and mutually develop a plan of action to



improve performance and/or remediation. A summary of this discussion, that includes the plan of action, will be added to the annual evaluation documents and a copy provided to the Tenured Faculty Member.

2. If the Tenured Faculty Member disagrees (rejects) the finding of a first Low Performance rating, they may submit a written rebuttal with justification/documentation within five (5) business days. The dean will then review the low performance judgement and make a final decision within ten (10) business days.

B. Second Annual Low Performance Rating in the Last Four-Year Period

1. A Tenured Faculty Member receives a second annual evaluation which reflects a finding in that department/unit that they have failed to meet the minimum level of performance.

2. The Chair shall meet with the Tenured Faculty Member to clearly document areas of low performance that need to improve and develop a plan for remediation.

- a. Remediation may include appropriate provisions for faculty development, such as coaching, leave of absence, or a change in teaching assignments. Other remediation steps may be offered, subject to review by the Dean or the Provost. Remediation should begin as soon as possible and will be funded by the University. The Tenured Faculty Member's annual review document for the subsequent year should reflect the method of remediation and document its level of success.

- b. A summary of this meeting, that includes the plan for remediation, will be added to the annual evaluation documents and a copy provided to the Tenured Faculty Member.

3. If the Tenured Faculty Member disagrees (rejects) the finding of a second low performance rating or cannot reach agreement with the Chair on a plan for remediation, a College Faculty Review Committee will be selected (as explained below at section V.A.4) to review the Tenured Faculty Member's annual evaluations and other relevant documents.

4. A College Faculty Review Committee

- a. A College Faculty Review Committee shall be convened in the event a Tenured Faculty Member rejects the findings of a second low performance rating or the Faculty Member and Chair cannot reach an agreement on a plan for remediation.



b. The College Faculty Review Committee shall consist of three Tenured Faculty Members from outside that department/unit but within the same college. Two committee members must be in the same teaching category as the Tenured Faculty being evaluated.

c. The Tenured Faculty Member and the Chair shall each select one reviewer, and they shall jointly select the third person. If the Tenured Faculty Member and Chair cannot agree on the third committee member, the Dean will make the selection. The College Faculty Review Committee will elect their Chairperson.

d. The College Faculty Review C shall meet separately with the Tenured Faculty Member and department Chair, review the details, and provide a report to the college dean within one month from the time the committee is selected. The meetings are convened by the committee chair.

e. The College Faculty Review Committee shall submit a written report to the Tenured Faculty Member, the Chair, and the dean, stating that by majority vote concluded either that (a) there is sufficient evidence of low performance and remediation is necessary; or (b) there is insufficient evidence of low performance. The dean will then make the final decision regarding chronic low performance and appropriate remediation after meeting with the Tenured Faculty Member and the Chair.

C. Dismissal for Cause

A Tenured Faculty Member may be dismissed for cause upon the recommendation to the Provost from the Chair and Dean and:

1. The Tenured Faculty Member has documented Chronic Low Performance – which is at least three annual Low Performance ratings in any consecutive five- year time period; OR
2. There is documented behavior that questions the Professional Fitness of the Tenured Faculty Member.

D. Notice of Dismissal and Faculty Member's Right to Review

1. The Tenured Faculty Member shall be advised of the decision to dismiss for cause in writing. The Tenured Faculty Member will be informed that they



have ten (10) business days to contest the decision in writing and request a formal review.

2. The Tenured Faculty Member shall be deemed to have accepted the decision of dismissal, and his/her employment shall be separated, unless the Tenured Faculty Member requests a formal review of the decision within ten (10) business days from the date the written notice of dismissal was delivered to the Tenured Faculty Member.

a. If the Tenured Faculty Member disagrees with (rejects) the finding of Dismissal for Cause and requests a review, a University Review Committee is formed. The Tenured Faculty Member may be placed on Administrative Leave with Pay until the conclusion of the review meeting.

E. Review of Dismissal - Review Committee Process

1. Membership of the University Review Committee

a. Tenured Faculty Members (not less than 3) will be jointly named by the president of the Faculty Senate and the University President (or designee) within ten (10) business days) after the Tenured Faculty member contests the decision in writing and requests a formal review.

b. The members of the review committee will be chosen on the basis of their objectivity and competence.

c. The committee will elect its own Chairperson.

2. Committee Charge

a. Evaluate annual reviews or documentation of low performance or Professional Fitness.

b. Set a hearing date in collaboration with the Provost to review Dismissal for Cause Recommendation.

c. Notify Tenured Faculty Member when the review meeting will take place. The review meeting shall be scheduled so that the Tenured faculty member will have at least 20 business days to prepare for the review meeting after receiving notice of the scheduled review meeting date and time.



3. Review Meeting

- a. Tenured Faculty Member may have an advisor of their own choosing who may act as counsel during the review. The advisor or the Tenured Faculty Member will present verbally why the dismissal for cause should not happen.
- b. The Provost should designate a representative to present verbally why the dismissal for cause should happen.
- c. There shall be a full record of the hearing available to the parties concerned.

4. Review Conclusion

1. The University Review Committee will make one of the following recommendations within one month after the review meeting(s), which includes rationale, to the Tenured Faculty Member, the Provost, and the President of the University:

- i. Recommends dismissal for cause.
- ii. Does not recommend dismissal for cause.

5. Final Decision

- a. After reviewing the recommendation of the University Review Committee, the President of the University, or his or her designee, will make the final decision to either uphold or reverse the dismissal for cause decision. The President shall notify the Tenured Faculty Member in writing of the President's decision.
- b. If the decision is to dismiss the Tenured Faculty Member for cause, the letter shall state the grounds for dismissal, and indicate the effective date of the end of the Tenured Faculty Member's employment, and any specific arrangements to be made regarding separation salary or other relevant matters.
- c. If the decision is to retain the Tenured Faculty Member, the letter will state that they will be reinstated with the effective date to return to the University.



4.35 / Financial Exigency

Effective: July 01, 1977 | Revised: August 4, 2000

I. Financial Exigency Background

Recent higher education enrollment trends have made educators increasingly aware of the need to anticipate possible needs for budget and staff reductions (known commonly as retrenchment) by developing orderly procedures for making such reductions. Like governing boards in many other states, the Kansas Board of Regents recognized that advance planning for such contingencies would serve the best interests of everyone in the academic community; it adopted the following definition of financial exigency for the Regents system. ([Kansas Board of Regents Policy Manual, Chapter II, Section C, Item 5](#))

II. Definition

Financial exigency is the formal recognition by a Regents institution that prior reductions in budget or authorized number of positions have required the elimination of nontenured positions and operating expenditures to such a point that further reductions in these categories would seriously distort the academic programs of the institution; hence, further budget or position reductions would require the nonreappointment of tenured members of the faculty or the failure to meet the standards of notice for nonreappointment of faculty. It is not a requirement of financial exigency that all nontenured positions throughout the University be first eliminated.

III. Procedure

A. It shall be the responsibility of the chief executive officer of each Regents institution, in consultation with appropriate campus groups, to develop a plan for reductions in personnel as necessitated by conditions of financial exigency.

B. In the event that financial conditions at a Regents institution may warrant the declaration of financial exigency, the chief executive officer shall notify the board of that fact and shall provide a complete statement of the circumstances that may warrant the declaration of financial exigency. The statement shall also include a review of all reasonable alternatives to financial exigency. If the board and the chief



executive officer concur as to the existence of a financial exigency, it shall be the responsibility of the chief executive officer to so declare.

IV. Policy

In response to the Regents action, the faculty of Wichita State University adopted a document entitled, "[Policies and Procedures for the Reduction of Unclassified Staff for Reasons of Financial Exigency](#)" on September 15, 1980.