

DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on 8/21/06)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on 8/21/06)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **8/2011**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **8/2011**

David Sachs, Department Head
Date signed: 8/27/06

Dennis Law, Dean
Date signed: 9/18/06

M. Duane Nellis, Provost
Date signed: 10/06/06

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

Evaluative Guidelines for Long-Term Development Toward Tenure and Promotion

**KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE**

Fall 2006

INCLUDING:

ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCESS

**EVALUATIVE GUIDELINES FOR LONG-TERM DEVELOPMENT
TOWARD TENURE AND PROMOTION**

EVALUATIVE GUIDELINES FOR CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT

EVALUATIVE GUIDELINES FOR PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARDS

Original Document
Approved by Architecture Faculty
1 March 1994

Modification to **Annual Evaluation Process**
Approved by Architecture Faculty, 5 November 1996;
revised and updated in accordance with *University Handbook*, 5 March 2004

Final draft of **Evaluative Guidelines for Chronic Low Achievement**
Approved by Architecture Faculty
11 November 1997; revised and updated in accordance with *University Handbook*, 5 March 2004

Modification to **Reappointment Procedures**
Approved by Architecture Faculty
16 March 1999; revised and updated in accordance with *University Handbook*, 22 August 2006

Modification to **Tenure Procedures**
Approved by Architecture Faculty
5 March 2002; revised and updated in accordance with *University Handbook*, 22 August 2006

Modification to **Promotion Procedures**
Approved by Architecture Faculty
16 April 2002; revised and updated in accordance with *University Handbook*, 22 August 2006

Evaluative Guidelines for Professorial Performance Awards
Approved by Architecture Faculty
9 May 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|--|---|-----------|
| INTRODUCTION | | 3 |
| ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCESS | | 5 |
| Part I | Background | 5 |
| Part II | Procedure for Merit Evaluation | 5 |
| Part III | Evaluation Activities and Documentation of Faculty Achievements | 8 |
| Part IV | Evaluative Guidelines for Chronic Low Achievement | 11 |
| Part V | Evaluative Guidelines for Professorial Performance Awards | 16 |
| EVALUATIVE GUIDELINES FOR LONG-TERM DEVELOPMENT TOWARD TENURE AND PROMOTION | | 21 |
| Part I | Justification | 21 |
| Part II | Four Criteria to Guide Long-Term Professional Aims & Efforts | 21 |
| Part III | Evaluative Guidelines for Tenure | 26 |
| Part IV | Evaluative Guidelines for Promotion | 28 |
| Part V | Monitoring Progress toward Tenure | 32 |
| SOLICITING FACULTY INPUT FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION | | 34 |
| Part I | Procedure for Tenure-Track Reappointments | 34 |
| Part II | Procedure for Mid-Term Review | 38 |
| Part III | Procedure for Tenure Decisions | 40 |
| Part IV | Procedure for Promotion Decisions | 44 |

INTRODUCTION

This document defines the procedures, guidelines and criteria for the evaluation of faculty in the Department of Architecture. The document includes guidelines for annual merit evaluation as well as guidelines for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The latter guidelines include procedures for soliciting faculty assessments in regard to reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

The mission statement of the Department of Architecture is as follows:

The Department of Architecture challenges and enables its members and collaborators to surpass their own expectations as they advance the quality of built and natural environments. The department is:

an international learning community;

engaging in exemplary architectural teaching, scholarship, creative endeavor, and service;

embracing and serving students, staff, faculty, professionals, and laypersons;

seeking the constructive participation of individuals and groups while striving to value their needs, talents, and contributions;

fostering the capacity of our members and the public to understand the past and present as preparation for responsible innovation;

aspiring to strengthen the quality of everything we do.

To accomplish this mission, the Architecture faculty pursue a wide range of activities in teaching, research, design, and service. For its part, the University has a responsibility to provide a rich environment in which the members of the faculty can develop their full productive potential and achieve excellence in these areas. To maintain progress toward productivity and excellence, the University must also periodically assess the performance of its members and use those assessments as the basis for decisions regarding salary increases, reappointment, promotion and tenure.

The significance of these reviews requires that the criteria and standards upon which the assessments are based, as well as the procedures for the evaluations themselves, be founded upon broad agreement among the people affected. In particular, the faculty must play a central role in developing the criteria and standards for the University as a whole as well as in establishing the goals, objectives and expectations of respective administrative units. Likewise, the individuals charged with implementing these policies must have a say in their formulation. In short, the creation of an effective system of evaluations must be the mutual responsibility of both faculty and administrators.

At Kansas State University, general guidelines for the evaluation system were established in 1974, when the Faculty Senate approved a policy statement regarding

the annual evaluation of unclassified tenured and tenure track personnel for purposes of determining merit salary increases. The policy mandated that each such system include three specific features:

1. Criteria and procedures will be developed jointly by faculty, department heads, and deans.
2. Unclassified personnel will provide an update of relevant information on a yearly basis pertaining to whatever merit salary criteria are established within their unit.
3. Unclassified personnel will be provided the opportunity to review the final written evaluation being used as the department head's recommendations for tenure, promotion, and merit salary increases before the recommendation is submitted to the dean.

These policies and procedures have been elaborated over time, but these three points remain fundamental to the system followed by the University as a whole.

As a professional program regularly reviewed by a national accreditation board (the National Architectural Accreditation Board, or NAAB), a Department of Architecture is different from more purely academic departments in that it incorporates professional training and real-world practice as well as scholarly theory and research. In this regard, architecture faculty are involved in a wide spectrum of activities that range from academic scholarship and writing, on one hand, to architectural design, creative work, and professional practice, on the other hand. The evaluation procedures that follow seek to allow for and support the diversity of activity that is meritorious in a university program like KSU's Department of Architecture.

ANNUAL EVALUATION FOR MERIT INCREASE

Part I Background

In the Department of Architecture, a merit evaluation procedure has been in place for more than two decades. This procedure takes into account requirements and recommendations presented in the University's *Faculty Handbook*.

Each December or January, all tenure-track and tenured faculty will meet with the department head to review professional accomplishments for the current calendar year and to clarify professional goals and objectives for the following calendar year. The basis for this discussion will be the *Annual Activity Report* (described in detail below).

The merit evaluation procedure is directed by the departmental head. In memoranda, he or she must remind architecture faculty of various evaluation deadlines and describe required materials and individual-faculty obligations. In turn, architecture faculty are responsible for providing satisfactory materials and for participating in meetings with the head. Failure on the part of architecture faculty to meet these responsibilities are grounds for evaluation penalties; these penalties must be documented in the narrative portion of the head's evaluation (see below).

In implementing the procedure that follows, it should be kept in mind that the head must provide each new tenure-track faculty member a general description of professional responsibilities at the time of the initial appointment. A change in any of these responsibilities should be confirmed in writing by the department head after discussion with the faculty member.

Part II Procedure for Merit Evaluation

Annual Activity Report

In December of each year, all tenure-track and tenured faculty will provide the head with an *Annual Activity Report*, the main purpose of which is to outline the faculty member's activities in the current year and his or her goals for the year ahead. As required by the *Faculty Handbook*, this document will be organized according to the three evaluative categories of *teaching, scholarly and creative work, and service*. These three categories are described in further detail below in Part III.

The Annual Activity Report should include two major sections:

- a. Statement of Annual Activities
- b. Goal Statement for the Coming Year

Each of these sections is discussed in turn.

- a. Statement of Annual Activities

This statement describes the faculty member's professional activities for the current calendar year. The statement should be organized in terms of teaching, scholarly and creative work, and service.

In addition to listing activities, the faculty member should provide information on each activity's purpose, scope and time involvement--for example, size of classes, number of advisees, scope of committee work, stage of completion of scholarly/creative work, etc.

At the conclusion of each of the sections on teaching, scholarly and creative work, and service, the faculty member should incorporate a brief narrative discussing how these activities compare with the goals in his or her goal statement for the year.

The statement should be accompanied by supporting materials--course outlines, teaching evaluations, student work, design work, publications, manuscript drafts, letters of information, etc.--documenting all activities.

Teaching is an integral part of faculty responsibility in the Department of Architecture, and all faculty, both tenure-track and tenured, should provide evidence of teaching effectiveness. The *Faculty Handbook* requires "multiple data sources for evaluations" (C33). In addition, the *Handbook* requires that tenure-track faculty be evaluated by students at least once a year in each course the faculty member teaches; tenured faculty should be evaluated in at least one course taught each year (the course to be chosen by the faculty member).

Therefore, each tenure-track and tenured faculty should provide at least two different forms of evidence for his or her teaching effectiveness. One of these forms of evidence should be student evaluations; the other(s) should be at the choosing of the faculty member (e.g., student work, class materials, student letters of support, etc.).

b. Goal Statement for the Coming Year

The second major part of the Annual Activity Report lists the faculty member's goals for the year ahead organized according to teaching, scholarly and creative work, and service.

These goals and objectives should be accompanied with an estimate of the share of time the faculty member plans to allocate to each area of activity during the following calendar year. The head will use these estimates in preparing each faculty member's end-of-the year merit evaluation (see "the Head's Merit Evaluation" below).

These estimates should outline anticipated courses to be taught, scholarly and creative work to be pursued, service to be performed, courses to be developed, advising responsibilities, etc. In establishing these estimates, faculty members should consider criteria described below in "Evaluative Guidelines for Long-Term Development Toward Tenure and Promotion."

During the course of the year, a faculty member's goals and priorities may change--e.g., opportunity may arise to participate in a project that had not been foreseen at the start of the year, he or she may be asked unexpectedly to teach a certain course, new undergraduate and graduate advisees may be assigned, a design competition may be canceled, etc. As soon as possible, any such changes in workload plan should be specified to the head in writing and attached to the initial goals for the current year.

It is recognized that the relative emphasis placed on the three evaluative categories may shift from year to year and may vary over the course of the faculty member's career.

Annual Evaluation Meeting with Head

In early December, each faculty member provides the department head with an Activity Statement, supporting documents, and Goal Statement for the coming year. Later in that month or in January, the head arranges to meet with each faculty member to discuss those materials.

The faculty member reviews with the head the current year's accomplishments and goals for the year ahead. The head and faculty member will reach agreement on the coming year's goals and responsibilities. Any changes will be noted in letters of memoranda attached to the goal statement.

The Merit Evaluation

The head prepares, by mid-March, a written evaluation of each tenure-track and tenured faculty member. This evaluation is based on:

- a. each faculty member's Activity Statement and supporting documents;
- b. the faculty member's Goal Statement and any modifications shared with the head during the evaluation year.

The head's evaluation will be composed of two parts:

- a. a succinct assessment of the faculty member's effectiveness in each of the three evaluative categories; this statement will include summaries of achievements and the evidence the faculty member has offered to support the achievements.
- b. an evaluation of each faculty member employing the evaluative categories of "meets expectations," "exceeds expectations," and "fails to meet expectations."

A copy of the head's evaluation will be forwarded to each faculty member for review. Each faculty member signs a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review and discuss the head's evaluation.

A faculty member who wishes to formally challenge an evaluation follows the procedure

outlined in the *Faculty Handbook*, Appendix G, "General Faculty Grievance Board." Before filing a formal grievance, the faculty member should have shared the concerns in writing to the head. The latter is required, within ten class days, to respond to the faculty member in writing (Appendix G, section C).

Calendar for Annual Merit Evaluation

The calendar and requirements for the annual faculty merit evaluation procedure are as follows:

December Faculty members submit Annual Activity Report and supporting materials.

Dec-Jan Faculty member and head meet to discuss Activity Report, including goals and responsibilities for the calendar year ahead.

Feb-March Head provides written and numerical evaluations to all tenured and tenure-track faculty members. The faculty member signs the evaluation document and returns it to the head.

Mid-March A faculty member who wishes formally to challenge the evaluation shares the concerns in writing (see "Merit Evaluation, last paragraph, above).

March The head forwards evaluations and recommendations for merit-salary increases to the dean.

Part III Evaluation Activities and Documentation of Faculty Achievements

The University *Handbook for Evaluation* requires that evaluation categories be organized under the headings of (1) teaching, (2) scholarly and creative activity, (3) service, and (4) extension.

Faculty in the Department of Architecture are involved with the first three categories, which are used as the outline device for presenting the faculty evaluation agreement and annual report. These three categories are described in turn. Following each description is a list of possible activities to be considered under each of the three general headings. This list is not all-inclusive; rather it is provided to serve as a reminder for the types of activities associated with each category. Faculty are free to add other related aims and achievements under the particular general category.

Teaching

Teaching is the fundamental mission of the University, the College and the Department of Architecture. Teaching includes both undergraduate and graduate level advising, lectures, seminars, and studios. It includes development of curricula and coordination of courses.

Documentation forming the basis for evaluation can include course evaluations by students, course materials (syllabi, project statements, exams, etc.), awards, peer review, student accomplishments, publications or presentations of teaching innovation, etc.

Possible activities related to teaching:

Undergraduate Teaching

- Assigned courses
- Assigned advising
- Course Coordination
- Contributions to General Education
- Preparation for course to be taught next semester
- Contributions to coordinated courses (writing project statements, lectures)
- Guest lecturer or critic (at KSU or elsewhere)
- Design 6 critic
- Dissemination of teaching innovations
- Other undergraduate teaching related activities

Graduate Teaching

- Assigned courses
- Interim Advisor for graduate student(s)
- Major advisor for graduate student(s)
- Minor advisor for graduate student(s)
- Member, Graduate Faculty
- Other graduate teaching related activities

Scholarly and Creative Activities

Creative work, be it professional, artistic, or scholarly, is fundamental to personal and departmental development. From a personal point of view, faculty expect the opportunity to engage in creative work. The department likewise expects that faculty are actively utilizing their time (exclusive of assigned tenths) engaged in creative work. It is somewhat more difficult to define creative work, and the possibilities are wide-ranging. One key characteristic is that the work should be done with the intention that it can be made public in some way.

Documentation of the quality of creative and research activities includes its public

dissemination (juried papers, publications, etc.), comments from peers, receipt of awards or grants, as well as the judgment of work in progress by the department head and/or peers.

Possible activities in the realm of creative and research activities:

Scholarly work

Writing (books, articles, reviews, monographs, bulletins, etc.)

Editing or reviewing articles, books, etc.

Presentation of papers at conferences

Submission of grant proposals for funded research

Funded research activities

Unfunded research activities

Other scholarly and research-related activities

Creative work

Architectural design and building

Exhibition of creative work

Entering a competition

Winning a competition

Creative work in progress or completed

Creative work featured or reviewed in a publication or other media

Other activity related to creative and design work

Juror for a competition or exhibition

Other professional activity

Service

Service is the application of knowledge and specialized skills to the benefit of the department, college, university, the public, and the professions. Evaluation of service is based on level of leadership supplied and the quality of service rendered, and may require comments from those served, from committee heads, or co-workers as well as other forms of documentation as appropriate.

Possible Activities related to Service:

Service to the University Community

Chair of departmental, college, or university committee or task force

Member of department, college or university committee to task force

Member, Faculty Senate or Graduate Council

Other assigned or unassigned service to the department, college, or university

Service to the Public

Written dissemination of professional knowledge or information through general interest publications

Oral dissemination of professional knowledge or information through talks to civic, religious or private groups

Consulting to local, state, national or international public and private groups

Consulting to individuals or corporations

Other public service which utilizes professional knowledge

Professional Service

Office holder or committee member or chair of professional associations and learned societies (AIA, ACSA, AAUP, SAH, etc.)

Member of professional organizations and learned societies

Organizing or chairing sessions at professional meetings or organizing the meeting itself

Editorial work for professional journals or newsletter

ACSA Faculty Councilor

Honors or special recognition from organization or profession

Professional consultation

Other professional activities and services

Part IV Evaluative Guidelines for Chronic Low Achievement

Tenure is essential for the protection of the independence of teaching and research faculty in institutions of higher learning in the United States. The faculty of the Department of Architecture affirms that the departmental guidelines and procedures currently in place to guide and evaluate tenure decisions are effective in identifying and protecting individuals who contribute to the aims and needs of the department. In addition, the department has regularly reevaluated and refined its criteria and procedures for granting tenure to its individual faculty members.

The faculty of the Department of Architecture also affirms that the departmental tenure procedure, in the vast majority of instances, effectively gives tenure to faculty members who are and will continue to be productive contributors to the department and university.

Nevertheless the KSU *Faculty Handbook* (C31.6) provides that, if a faculty member shows "*chronic failure to perform his or her professional duties*," as defined by the unit, this conduct would constitute "Professional Incompetence" and warrant consideration for "Dismissal for Cause."

Decisions about revocation of tenure, especially if the grounds are professional incompetence, should not be exclusively controlled or determined by and should not be unduly influenced by single individuals without input from the faculty. Moreover, "dismissal for cause" in cases of professional incompetence can only be based on departmental guidelines about minimal-acceptable levels of performance that apply to all members of the department or unit and are distinct from individually-determined annual goals.

The following are guidelines and procedures for determining the minimum acceptable level of productivity in the applicable areas of responsibility for the faculty in the Department of Architecture. It is not appropriate that these guidelines define the minimum level of productivity so as to *inhibit an intellectual environment that is favorable to substantive scholarship, long-range projects or critical and creative thinking or effective teaching*. Nor is it intended that these guidelines will inhibit individuality by defining a single model for a productive faculty member. What is not appropriate is the undue protection of non-contributing members of the faculty.

A WORKING DEFINITION OF CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT

According to the *Faculty Handbook*, the working definition of chronic low achievement must be grounded in the departmental head's annual-evaluation summary, which must be presented in terms of four levels of expectations in regard to professional productivity (31.8):

- . exceeded expectations;
- . met expectations;
- . fallen below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity;
- . fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity.

The "below-minimal-acceptable level" refers to the minimum standards associated with chronic low achievement as called for in the *Faculty Handbook* (C31.5). Section C31.8 of the *Faculty Handbook* requires that the department's guidelines explicitly state the point at which a faculty member's overall performance can bring a charge of chronic low achievement into play.

Drawing on the designations in Section C31.8b (3 & 4) of the *Faculty Handbook*, the Department of Architecture defines "overall performance" in terms of either:

- a. weaknesses not balanced by strengths; or
- b. pre-determined agreements with the faculty member about the relative importance of different areas of responsibility.

This definition of chronic low achievement is general. It is the responsibility of the department head to demonstrate, in specific terms, with accompanying evidence, that the work of the faculty member charged with chronic low achievement demonstrates that there is serious weakness not balanced by strength in the three evaluative categories or in predetermined agreements with the faculty member as to his or her long-term responsibilities.

Procedurally, in identifying a faculty member as a chronic low-achiever, the head must:

- a. demonstrate a range of evidence indicating chronic low achievement;
- b. demonstrate that this low achievement has occurred two consecutive years or three years within any five-year period where the faculty member's annual evaluation indicates fallen below minimum levels of productivity;
- c. consult with other eligible Architecture faculty as to their perceptions of the performance of the faculty member in question.

CRITERIA FOR CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT

The faculty of the Department of Architecture believes that there is no easy way to provide precise criteria as to what "fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity" means. As all academics know, professional life ebbs and flows. Some years bring success in professional responsibilities while other years mark average accomplishments or disappointment and even failure.

Nevertheless, the following are guidelines for assessment.

1. Evidence of chronic low achievement in teaching:
 - . extended poor performance or lack of evidence of effectiveness as demonstrated through students who are poorly prepared or through student work that is of weak quality;
 - . a consistent record of poor classroom evaluations by individuals qualified to judge, i.e., colleagues, students, and other appropriate individuals;
 - . a continued lack of evidence of teaching performance (in other words, the faculty member regularly refuses to provide evidence of teaching effectiveness, whether in terms of student evaluations, course materials, examples of student work, etc.);
 - . habitual failure to make conscientious preparations and efforts to deliver quality classroom instruction;
 - . an unexplained pattern of continued absenteeism in the classroom.
2. Evidence of chronic low achievement in scholarship and creative work:

- a continued failure to contribute to one's chosen field of professional, scholarly, or creative endeavor. Clearly, over time, faculty members may change their scholarly, creative, or professional focus; if that is the case, the faculty member must strive, in consultation with the head, to produce work that indicates the individual's mastery and success in regard to the new focus. It is also important that this policy should not mandate the blind following of fashion or change for its own sake;
 - a continued lack of professional recognition by peers, including department colleagues, outside colleagues, professional and scholarly groups:
3. Evidence of chronic low achievement in service:
- a continued lack of involvement in essential departmental, college, and university needs, such as the maintenance of curriculum or governance;
 - a continued failure to contribute to the normal collegial obligations of a faculty member that allow the free exchange of ideas.

Again, one may not be able to determine precisely (in the sense of an exact quantitative measure) whether a faculty member fails at one or several of these criteria. The head must use these criteria as indicative and, in the individual case, gather concrete evidence as to whether the individual in question has failed. There may be instances where a faculty member's performance in one area of responsibility is balanced by a strong performance in another area of responsibility. Nevertheless it is recognized that university life is multi-dimensional and that concentration in a particular area must not be used as an excuse for failure to contribute to the overall life of the department. In this case, especially, the head must seek out the perceptions of other eligible faculty.

It also must be emphasized that different individuals make different contributions in the three evaluative categories of teaching, scholarship and creative work, and service. In charging an individual with chronic low achievement, therefore, the head must demonstrate that the area of sustained poor performance is vital to the individual's agreed-upon responsibilities in relation to the three evaluative categories. In this regard, the head may draw on the individual's annual activity statements (including statements of annual goals and accomplishments) and other relevant evidence (discussions with other faculty, evaluations from colleagues, etc.).

PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINING CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT

The *Faculty Handbook*, in section C31.5, requires the following procedure for determining chronic low achievement:

1. When a tenured faculty member's overall performance falls below the minimum-acceptable level, as indicated by the annual evaluation, the head will indicate so

- in writing to the faculty member. The head must also indicate, in writing, a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member.
2. In subsequent annual evaluations, the faculty member will report on activities aimed at improving performance and any evidence of improvement. The names of faculty members failing to meet minimum standards for the year following the department head's suggested course of action will be forwarded to the dean.
 3. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which minimum standards are not met, then "dismissal for cause" will be considered at the discretion of the dean.

In addition:

4. Because chronic low achievement is not suddenly discovered, the head must demonstrate that the identified faults and problems of the faculty member are long-term--that is, indicated by evaluations of "fallen below expectations but has met minimum acceptable levels of productivity" in previous evaluations and must find that the faculty member has failed to respond to reasonable requests for correction.
5. In keeping with regular procedures in matters of tenure (C112.1 and C112.2), eligible departmental faculty members will have input into any decision on individual cases unless the charged faculty member requests otherwise. Therefore, the head will call a meeting of all eligible faculty members to gather their perceptions of the faculty member in question. These faculty members will discuss the faculty member's situation and vote on a ballot marked as follows:

- . I agree with the charge of chronic low achievement
- . I disagree with the charge of chronic low achievement.

By "eligible" faculty here is meant Full Professors evaluating a Full Professor, and Full and Associate Professors evaluating an Associate Professor.

6. The head must include this faculty input in his or her decision; if his or her decision goes against the majority vote of eligible faculty members, then both the faculty and the Head's recommendation will be forwarded to the dean.
7. If there is faculty agreement on the inadequate performance of the faculty member in question, the charge goes forward to the dean.
8. A faculty member who wishes to formally challenge a finding of chronic low achievement follows the procedure outlined in the *University Handbook*, Appendix M, "Procedure for Review of Dismissal of Tenured Faculty." Before filing a formal grievance, the faculty member should have shared his or her concerns in writing to the head. The latter is required, within ten class days, to respond to the faculty member in writing.

PREVENTING CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT

As the *Faculty Handbook* emphasizes in section C31.7, prior to the point at which “dismissal for cause” is considered, other less drastic actions should have been taken. In most cases, a faculty member’s deficient performance in one or more areas of responsibility will have been noted in prior written annual evaluations. At that point, the head should have:

1. Determined whether the duties assigned to the faculty member have been equitable in the context of the distribution of duties within the department and to correct any inequities affecting the faculty member under review;
2. Suggested potential ways to improve weaknesses--for example, requesting assistance from the Office of Educational Improvement, which provides help to strengthen teaching; or from the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, which assists with efforts of scholarship and creative work. On rare occasion, referral for other forms of assistance (for example, medical or psychological) may be warranted.

If the deficient performance continues in spite of these efforts and recommendations, the head and the charged faculty member may agree to a reallocation of the faculty member’s time so that he or she no longer has duties in the area(s) of deficient performance. This reallocation can only occur if there are one or more areas of better performance in the faculty member’s profile and if the reallocation is possible in the larger context of the department and college’s needs and resources.

Part V Professorial Performance Awards

As passed by the K-State Faculty Senate on February 2, 2006, the Professorial Performance Award (PPA) recognizes excellent and sustained performance of full professors at Kansas State University (*University Handbook*, C49.1). This award is not a form of promotion review, and it does not establish a “senior” professoriate. Furthermore, the award is not a right accorded to every faculty member at the rank of Professor, nor is it granted simply as a result of a candidate’s routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of deficiencies.

The *University Handbook* provides a set of minimal criteria for this award but also requires that each department establish more detailed performance criteria “according to its own disciplinary standards of excellence” (C49.2). This document presents the award criteria and procedure for the Department of Architecture. As required by the *University Handbook*, this document will be subject to departmental and college review at least every five years as part of the review of the procedures for annual merit evaluation (C49.3).

EVALUATIVE GUIDELINES FOR PPA

The following evaluative guidelines are based on PPA criteria presented in the *University Handbook* (C49.1-14), coupled with more specific departmental criteria developed for promotion to the rank of Professor (Departmental Evaluative Guidelines for Promotion, Department of Architecture—hereafter, *DEGP*). These evaluative guidelines are as follows:

1. The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at least six years since promotion or since his or her last professorial performance award.
2. The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to full professor according to current approved departmental standards.
3. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the PPA review.
4. Sustained productivity is defined as "continued attainment of excellence in assigned faculty responsibilities and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies" (*University Handbook*, C120.2).
5. The candidate must demonstrate a continued record of excellence in teaching, demonstrated by multiple sources of evidence that includes: (a) strong teaching evaluations; (b) leadership in developing instructional programs in the area(s) of his or her expertise; and (c) innovative techniques and/or materials that have been integrated into his or her teaching (*DEGP*, p. 21).
7. The candidate must demonstrate a continued record of excellence in his or her creative work, whether involving research, design, or artistic efforts. Excellence here refers to "national and international recognition for success in developing a mature and comprehensive contribution to a field of knowledge, creative effort, or professional work" (*DEGP*, p. 21).
8. The candidate must demonstrate a continued record of significant service, which includes: (a) significant contributions to the department, college, and university, including leadership positions; and (b) significant contributions to his or her academic, creative, and/or professional areas of concentration and interest (*DEGP*, p. 22).

PROCEDURE FOR EVALUATING AND RECEIVING PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARDS

0. All faculty members are encouraged to ensure that they communicate their activities and accomplishments to their colleagues through informal and formal means. For Professors planning to apply for a PPA, communication with other Professors is of particular importance.

Informal and formal counsel offered by the head and Professors in the months before the time of a PPA application should assist the potential candidate in reaching a decision on initiating a formal application for promotion. This counsel should not be construed as a pre-judgment on the PPA.

1. At the start of the fall term, an Architecture professor should inform the department head that he or she plans to become a PPA applicant. The head sends a memorandum to the candidate listing key dates and deadlines in the PPA application process, including the date by which applications materials are due. This memorandum also requests that the PPA candidate schedule an appointment with the head to discuss the evaluation materials that he or she will provide, including external recommendations from professional peers. The head must make sure these materials are available for faculty review at least two weeks before the faculty meeting described in step 2 below.
2. The head also provides the chair of the faculty affairs committee with the dates and deadlines for the PPA process. The chair is responsible for soliciting information and evaluations from other Professors. In writing, the chair informs Professors when the candidate's evaluation materials will be available for review and when Professors will meet to discuss PPA applications.
3. Professors review PPA materials.
4. No earlier than two weeks after evaluation materials are made available for review, Professors, as well as the department head as a non-voting participant, meet to discuss the PPA application. This meeting is led by the chair of the faculty affairs committee, who solicits discussion and commentary on each candidate being evaluated for a PPA.
5. At this meeting, the chair also distributes a ballot that elicits each Professor's evaluation of the PPA candidate. Within twenty-four hours, the chair also distributes ballots to all Professors not present at the meeting.
6. The ballot offers three voting choices: "in favor of PPA," "not in favor of PPA," and "I abstain." In addition, the ballot provides space for written comments if individual Professors so wish. Participation in the evaluation process is an important faculty responsibility, and all Professors are expected to return ballots. All ballots must be signed and returned to the chair of faculty affairs within two days of receipt. Unsigned ballots will not be accepted. The chair is responsible for counting these ballots. The ballot vote is confidential in the sense that only the chair sees individual ballot votes and compiles the aggregate count. The chair is also responsible for compiling any written comments from the ballots.
7. Within five days of the meeting described in step 4, the chair of the faculty affairs committee forwards to the department head a written summary of faculty discussion and ballot results. The chair also provides the head a copy of a typed transcript of any commentaries provided on the ballot (these commentaries are not to be shared with the candidate and are not to be seen by other Architecture faculty members). The written summary conveys the vote of the eligible faculty and any other appropriate information the faculty deems important for the head to have in making a

PPA recommendation to the dean and provost. The chair places a copy of the ballot tally and written summary in the Department of Architecture office. This written summary does not include any individual commentaries written on the individual ballots. The chair places all ballots in a sealed envelope, which the head delivers to the dean's office to be kept in each candidate's personnel file.

8. Based on the faculty input described in steps 5-7 and on other available materials, the departmental head writes an evaluation and recommendation. Each PPA candidate will have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the department head, and each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, each candidate has the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation to the department head and to the dean. A copy of the department head's written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate.
9. The department head must submit the following items to the dean:
 - a. A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award;
 - b. Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation;
 - c. Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation;
 - d. The candidate's supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award.
10. The dean forwards the PPA candidate's materials to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee, which reviews department documents and criteria to assess and vote on the candidate's performance. The Committee makes its recommendation to the Dean.
11. The dean reviews all evaluation materials and recommendations to ensure that the evaluations are consistent with the PPA criteria and procedures established by the department.
12. A dean who does not agree with recommendations for the PPA made by a department head must attempt to reach consensus through consultation. If this fails, the dean's recommendation will be used. If any change has been made to the department head's recommendations, the dean must notify the candidate, in writing, of the change and its rationale. Within seven working days after notification, such candidates have the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations to the dean and to the provost. All statements of unresolved differences will be included in the documentation to be forwarded to the next administrative level. All recommendations are forwarded to the provost.

13. The provost will review all evaluation materials and recommendations to ensure that: (a) the evaluation process was conducted in a manner consistent with departmental criteria and procedures; and (b) there are no inequities in the recommendations based upon gender, race, religion, national origin, age or disability.

14. If the provost does not agree with PPA recommendations made by subordinate administrators, an attempt must be made to reach consensus through consultation. If this fails, the provost's decision will prevail. The candidate affected by the disagreement must be notified by the provost, in writing, of the change and its rationale.

15. The Professorial Performance Award will be 8% of the average salary of all full-time faculty (instructor through professor excluding administrators at those ranks). However, funding for the award cannot come out of the legislatively-approved merit increment.

16. In the event that financial conditions in a given year preclude awarding the full amount as designated in C49.12, the Provost shall in concert with the Vice President for Administration and Finance adopt a plan to phase in the full award for all that year's recommended and approved candidates.

17. Upon official notification from the Office of the Provost, the dean will consolidate the Professorial Performance Award with salary increases resulting from annual evaluation and issue the candidate a contract that includes the candidate's salary for the next fiscal year. The Professorial Performance Award will become part of the professor's base salary.

EVALUATIVE GUIDELINES FOR LONG-TERM DEVELOPMENT TOWARD TENURE AND PROMOTION

Part I Justification

The Kansas State University Faculty Handbook requires that each unit of the University develop its own set of procedures, guidelines, and criteria for tenure and promotion (sections C30-C39). The present document works to establish guidelines and standards that identify long-term expectations and responsibilities for tenure-track and promotion-track faculty in the Department of Architecture.

In broadest terms, the University Faculty Handbook requires that a KSU faculty member's tenure-track and promotion-track efforts be guided by the three "major university endeavors" of teaching, research and other creative work, and service. The present document uses these three categories as a means to provide longer-term guidelines and expectations in terms of what tenure-track and promotion-track faculty are expected to aim toward and accomplish.

It is important to emphasize that each architecture faculty member is unique professionally and contributes a special set of strengths and abilities to the Department. The present document seeks to respect the uniqueness of each faculty by establishing a set of guidelines and standards that, on the one hand, are relatively flexible yet, on the other hand, offer enough rigor to allow a framework for guiding and evaluating abilities and accomplishments of each tenure-track or promotion-track faculty.

Because the Department of Architecture is, first of all, a professional program, it is crucial to recognize the importance of creative and professional efforts in regard to the records of tenure-track and promotion-track candidates. Unlike many other university departments that emphasize only scholarly efforts and research funding, the Department of Architecture must also recognize and, indeed, encourage design as well as artistic and professional-practice efforts and accomplishments. Thus, for example, winning a design competition, exhibiting a significant artistic work, or receiving a building commission can be judged to be of equal value to publishing an article or book, presenting at a conference, or receiving a research grant.

Part II Four Criteria to Guide Long-Term Professional Aims & Efforts

As emphasized above, each faculty member is unique and must be evaluated on the specific contributions and accomplishments that he or she provides the department, college, university, and professional and academic institutions. In this sense, each faculty must establish a long-term plan in terms of professional focus and goals.

This document identifies four broad standards--coherence, versatility, peer review, and collegiality -- in regard to professional aims and possibilities. The hope is that these

criteria will provide long-term guidance in regard to a faculty member's efforts and accomplishments. In consultation with the Departmental Head, tenure-track and promotion-track faculty should discuss these criteria as one way to establish and evaluate shorter-term efforts and aims in regard to longer-term faculty development, especially as identified through teaching, scholarly and creative work, and service..

As required by the KSU Faculty Handbook (C94-96), all faculty efforts and accomplishments must, *first of all*, be evaluated in terms of the three categories of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service (see the "Faculty Evaluation Agreement" described in note 1). The four criteria presented here do not supersede, contradict, or dilute the importance of these three evaluative categories; rather, these criteria are presented as one way to consider and to evaluate, in a systematic way, the relative effectiveness of a faculty member's teaching, scholarly and creative work, and service.

Coherence

Coherence refers to the idea that there is an underlying focus and direction in a faculty member's professional life and career. Coherence is crucial in that it provides each faculty member with a long-term aim and purpose that can give order and intent to specific efforts in regard to teaching, scholarly and creative work, and service.

Typically, coherence is most often related to the faculty member's scholarly, design, or creative interests and emphases. For tenure-track faculty, especially, it is important early on in the individual's probation period that he or she establish at least one area of professional interest and expertise that can become a long-term focus for scholarly and/or creative work. In addition, this focus should be considered as it might contribute to and enhance one's teaching and service responsibilities.

Clearly, a faculty member's sense of professional purpose and aim may change over time, and all evaluators must recognize, accept, and--when necessary--encourage these shifts. On the other hand, major shifts in a faculty member's professional emphases should be considered carefully and not happen arbitrarily or capriciously. A candidate considering a significant shift in professional aim or emphasis should discuss the possibility with Departmental Head, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, and other colleagues.

The crucial point in regard to coherence is that the faculty member, over the long term, should be able to demonstrate that his or her professional, creative and/or scholarly work has an internal consistency, pattern, and focus that makes the individual an accomplished designer, practitioner, creative artist, or scholar. In this sense, the faculty member must demonstrate progress toward some coherent area of scholarship, expertise and/or creative endeavor. The demonstration of this core of accomplishment is essential for tenure-track faculty, since it is in the early years of one's career that he or she establishes professional commitments and identity. A key aim of promotion-track faculty will typically be to extend and deepen their professional core, or to use it as a

base for related research and creative and professional efforts.

Versatility

The *KSU Faculty Handbook*, in regard to tenure-track faculty, requires that "versatility should be exhibited by the ability to function well across major areas of work (e.g., teaching, research and other creative endeavor [and] service) as well as in a variety of settings within one or more areas" (C101).

This quality of versatility is an important aim for both tenure-track and promotion-track faculty, and should be considered, as the *Handbook* suggests, in regard to two levels:

a. Versatility in regard to the three evaluative categories.

Faculty should seek to provide evidence of effort in teaching, research and creative work, and service. The university uses the three evaluative categories as a basis for university comparisons, and it is important that each faculty provide evidence of accomplishments in each category.

Clearly, no single individual can be exceptional in all three categories, and each candidate's record will involve a different proportion of activities. On the other hand, at least some effort in all three categories is an integral need for the long-term strength of Department, College, and University.

During his or her evaluative period for tenure and/or promotion, tenure- and promotion-track faculty should regularly evaluate their efforts and achievements to make sure there are examples from each category. If the faculty member is uncertain about his or her record of versatility in regard to the three categories, he or she should ask the advice of Departmental Head, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, and other colleagues.

b. Versatility in regard to one's major area(s) of scholarly, design, and/or professional focus.

Versatility here relates to coherence above and involves a range of scholarly and/or design work. Professional efforts at the departmental, university, local, and regional levels are important but the candidate should also make efforts that involve recognition at the national and international levels.

Candidates should regularly examine their records to make certain that in-house, local, and regional achievements are balanced with accomplishments at the national and wider levels (for example, presentations at national conferences, international design competitions, publications in an academic or professional institution's more prestigious journals). In other words, efforts and achievements should illustrate a range of public and peer acceptance, from the local university level to wider levels that include the state, regional, national and international recognitions.

Peer Evaluation

A central requirement in evaluating the relative worth of any tenure-track or promotion-track accomplishment in regard to creative work and service is peer evaluation--i.e., in some way, the work has been judged successful, effective, or good, whether in terms of peer review or peer jury. In this sense, it is important for all faculty who are tenure-track and promotion-track to consider all scholarly, creative, and professional endeavors as they will have some kind of public dissemination that can be evaluated by others, particularly by peers.

It is important that this peer review happen that both the local and wider levels. Opportunities for KSU colleagues to evaluate tenure-track faculty, especially, is important, since these colleagues have a major voice in conferring tenure and/or promotion. In this regard, candidates should take advantage of opportunities to present themselves publicly -- e.g., through participating in studio juries, doing presentations in the lunch-time research series, doing invited lectures in colleagues' classes, and so forth.

At the same time, peer review at the national level, particularly in regard to the faculty member's area(s) of scholarly and professional expertise, is important, since this evaluation establishes the faculty member's professional worth, particularly in regard to the standard of coherence. In this regard, candidates should make efforts to involve themselves regularly in projects that will be publicly visible and judged, in some way, by peers. Such efforts would include design competitions, publishing in referred journals, juried exhibits, and so forth.

Clearly, architecture faculty are often involved in projects and writings that may not involve peer review. This work is important and must be given weight in regard to coherence and versatility above. On the other hand, all faculty must recognize that non-evaluated work alone does not meet the requirement of peer review. Therefore, faculty must make the long-term effort to include some examples of peer-reviewed writings, work, and projects in their evaluation materials.

A related issue in regard to peer review is *collaboration* with other colleagues in scholarship, research and/or creative work. The key point is that tenure and promotion are granted to the individual, thus the tenure-track or promotion-track candidate should demonstrate some ability, as an individual, to initiate and carry through work under his or her own direction.

Collaborative work is central to research and creative work in professional programs like architecture, and a record emphasizing collaboration is entirely acceptable, provided that the candidate can also give some indication of work carried out alone. In most instances, tenure or promotion cannot be given to a faculty who provides evidence of collaborative work only.

In regard to collaborative work used toward tenure, the KSU Faculty Handbook requires that there be a complete accounting of the candidate's contribution to the

accomplishment: "When evaluating a candidate's work done in collaboration with others, evaluators shall carefully establish the candidate's role and contribution in the joint effort: (C96).

It is the responsibility of the candidate to explain clearly his or her "role and contribution in the joint effort" after each collaborative entry listed in evaluation materials for tenure. In the Department of Architecture, this requirement in regard to documenting collaboration will also hold for promotion.

Collegiality

Collegiality refers to good working relations among colleagues. Both tenure and promotion assume a long-term commitment to other members of the department. Collegiality is especially related to ethical issues, by which "ethics" refers to the system of values that enables university colleagues to work together with mutual respect, trust, and cooperation. Faculty members must adhere to high standards of conduct in their work with students, peers, and the general public.

A major strength of the department and college is the diversity of the faculty, both in terms of professional and academic backgrounds as well as philosophical and ideological perspectives in regard to design, practice, and scholarship. In this sense, collegiality also includes support for the diversity of other colleagues' viewpoints and philosophies.

It is important that a candidate should respect departmental and college diversity and have demonstrated his or her ability to be an effective departmental colleague. The "Handbook for Annual Evaluation" addresses this aspect of collegiality as follows:

Some departments have developed evaluation systems that provide elegant descriptions of responsibilities, criteria, and standards but find them inadequate to express the overall impact of a given individual. In the extreme, an individual may display behavior which is highly disruptive to the department but which does not seem to have an adverse effect on how well the individual performs his/her assigned responsibilities. As a result, collegiality and morale suffer. This is likely to remain an unsolved problem unless corrected by the system itself. A system might include a statement that behavior adversely affecting the ability of others to carry out their assignments in the department may be considered in the total evaluation.

This discussion illustrates that collegiality is a much more intangible and nebulous criterion than the other three standards. In most instances, candidates are professional and mature, and collegiality is not an issue. On the other hand, to protect departmental well-being, it is important to make this criterion explicit so that collegiality may be considered as a criterion for evaluation.

Part III Evaluative Guidelines for Tenure

The granting of tenure involves decisions at the departmental, college, university and ultimately, the regents level as outlined in the *KSU Faculty Handbook* (C70-116). The granting of tenure means that the person has been judged capable of continued exemplary creativity and productivity in some described area of professional activity. Tenure is granted only to faculty at the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor.

The *KSU Faculty Handbook* provides the following description of tenure:

Tenure is granted on the basis of sustained achievements that identify faculty members as being leaders in their fields, or as having demonstrated substantial potential for becoming so. Tenure is not acquired simply as a result of routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies....The promise of continued professional growth is especially important in tenure decisions (C92-C100).

The following standards are used in making tenure decisions at the departmental level for architecture faculty. These standards are organized in regard to the three areas of university responsibility established in the *Faculty Handbook*--i.e., teaching, scholarly and creative efforts, and service (C94-C100).

It is important to emphasize that these standards in regard to university responsibilities must be supplemented with the more general longer-term standards of coherence, versatility, peer evaluation, and collegiality--discussed in Part I of this report.

a. Departmental Standards for Tenure-Track Faculty in Regard to Major University Responsibilities

Teaching

The Department of Architecture affirms that educating future professional architects in the discipline of architecture is our primary and essential mission. Candidates for tenure must demonstrate ability to teach effectively in the area(s) of the professional curriculum for which they are responsible. This does not only imply general competence in the delivery of instruction but, more so, a sustained commitment and a coherent effort to approach teaching in a responsible, creative, and thoughtfully critical way which actively seeks to further students' skills and knowledge. Consequently, tenure candidates are expected to make a significant contribution to the overall quality of education offered in the Department of Architecture.

The means for demonstrating evidence of the achievements and the quality of teaching work include but are not limited to:

student work

student work exhibitions
student evaluation, both for teaching and advising
peer evaluation
course syllabi
teaching awards
student awards
participation in curriculum development
research on teaching disseminated through professional publications,
conference papers and lecture presentations.

Teaching evaluations for tenure-track faculty are required by the KSU Faculty Handbook, which provides the following general guidelines in regard to student ratings:

"Student ratings of classroom instruction are an important source of information in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Faculty members with classroom teaching responsibilities ought to include the results of student ratings in the documentation they submit for personnel decisions concerning annual merit salary, reappointment, tenure, and promotion"(C34.1).

"However, student rating should never be the *only* source of information about classroom teaching.... Data other than student ratings... include: Course materials such as reading lists, syllabi, and examinations; special contributions to effective teaching for diverse student populations; preparation of innovative teaching materials or instructional techniques; special teaching activities outside the University" (C34.2).

Scholarly and Creative Activities

The Department of Architecture is, first of all, a professional program. In regard to faculty academic development, professional practice (e.g., design, building and consulting activities) as well as other types of creative work (e.g., artistic efforts, art exhibits) are efforts that must be considered as equal to scholarly and research activities.

Whatever the form of a faculty member's scholarly and creative activities, they will be judged in regard to the criteria of coherence, versatility, and peer review described in Part I above.

In the first two years at KSU, the tenure-track faculty member should clearly establish the particular area(s) of interest in which he/she will continue to seek more focused involvement and development. While not sacrificing the full range of professional interests, the tenure-track faculty member should demonstrate promise for establishing a coherent body of work and expertise that, at least in part, has a clear relationship to teaching obligations.

Evidence of scholarly and creative work includes but is not limited to:

departmental peer evaluation
external evaluation by peers and professional institutions (including design
competition awards and similar recognitions)
refereed and non-referred publications of work in professional journals and
books (taking into account the quality and professional significance of
the particular publication outlet)
invited lectures
conference presentations
paper and design work presentations

In regard to many of these tenure-track efforts, the department recognizes that projects can work multi dimensionally -- i.e., a single project can demonstrate, for example, research, community and public service. In addition, the project might invigorate teaching and/or lead to gains in professional recognition among peers.

Service

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to engage in the activities of department, college, and university and to share his or her professional knowledge and competence professionally and with the larger community.

a. University Service:

It is expected that tenure-track faculty be able to show evidence of constructive participation in the affairs of the department, college, and university through participation in faculty committees. Faculty are also expected to encourage and facilitate the broader educational responsibilities of the university, by participation in lectures, seminars, conferences, and communication with colleagues in other programs as is possible and useful.

b. Professional and Community Service:

Tenure-track faculty should show evidence of participation in and contributions to professional organizations that take advantage of particular individual skills and intellectual and professional interests. Participation in governmental and community organizations where the individual's professional or scholarly contributions are evident is also desirable.

Part IV Evaluative Guidelines for Promotion

Like tenure, the granting of promotion involves decisions for the department, college, university and ultimately, the regents as outlined in the KSU Faculty Handbook (C120-156). Promotion in rank means that a person has demonstrated a level of creativity and productivity that is commensurate with the current rank and predicts success at the next higher level.

The KSU *Faculty Handbook* offers the following general comments on promotion:

"Promotion is based upon an individual's achievements related to the specific criteria, standards, and guidelines development by departmental faculty members in consultation with the departmental head and appropriate dean" (C12-0.1).

"Each higher rank demands a higher level of accomplishment"(C120).

As with tenure, promotion decisions must be considered in regard to the three areas of university responsibility established in the *Faculty Handbook* -- i.e., teaching, scholarly and creative efforts, and service.

In addition, accomplishments in regard to these three categories should be considered in regard to the more general longer-term criteria of coherence, versatility, peer evaluation, and collegiality, discussed in Part I.

Candidates for the various levels of promotion should, through evidence of teaching, research/creative work, and service, be able to justify their professional efforts in terms of the following evaluative descriptions.

Promotion to Associate Professor

The KSU *Faculty Handbook* provides the following description of promotion to associate professor:

"Promotion to associate professor rests on substantial professional contributions that reflect excellence in teaching, research, and other creative endeavor, directed service or extension" (C120.2).

In the Department of Architecture, qualification for promotion to Associate Professor must involve a clear demonstration of significant development beyond the level recognized by the initial appointment. Evidence must be submitted that documents a sustained effort to establish or add to an existing body of knowledge and/or creative work.

More specific achievements in regard to the above three university categories are as follows:

Teaching

The candidate has demonstrated strong ability as a teacher in the classroom and/or design studio.

The candidate possesses the necessary qualifications to be responsible for

the direction of courses within his/her field of specialization and to assist in curriculum and course development.

Scholarly and Creative Activities

The candidate has demonstrated a high degree of scholarly, creative and/or professional growth by creating and designing architectural projects, conducting research, and/or engaging in other creative endeavors of high caliber.

The candidate has documented the results of those efforts.

The candidate has demonstrated definite interest in continuing focused work in these areas.

Service

The candidate has assumed major responsibilities within the department and college for those service responsibilities assigned by the Department Head.

The candidate has served as an active member of departmental and college committees.

The candidate has made an active effort to provide service to scholarly and professional institutions and responsibilities outside the department, college, and university .

These efforts should relate in some way to the candidate's scholarly, creative, and/or professional aims.

Promotion to Professor

The KSU *Faculty Handbook* provides the following description of promotion to professor:

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

In the Department of Architecture, qualification for promotion to professor must involve a clear demonstration of significant development beyond the level recognized at the time of promotion to associate professor.

Particularly important for promotion to professor is a clear demonstration that the candidate has received national and international recognition for success in developing a mature and comprehensive contribution to a field of knowledge, creative effort, or professional work.

Teaching

The candidate is recognized for excellent teaching.

The candidate has provided leadership in developing the instructional programs in the area of his or her expertise.

The candidate has developed innovative techniques and/or new materials and integrated them into his or her teaching.

Scholarly and Creative Activities

The candidate has a recognized national/international record of research, creative work, and/or professional projects.

The candidate's record indicates that this work will continue into the future.

Service

The candidate has made significant contributions to the overall efforts and development of the department, college, and university, including positions of leadership.

The candidate has made significant service contributions in regard to his/her academic, creative, and professional areas of concentration and interest.

Part V Monitoring Progress Toward Tenure

For beginning tenure-track faculty, the university experience is sometimes difficult and uncomfortable. As part of its effort to make the tenure-track experience more manageable and fair, the Department of Architecture has established a two-part program that includes tenured-faculty mentors and a mid-term interim reviews.

Faculty Mentors

At the end of the tenure-track faculty member's first year at KSU, he/she will be assigned a "faculty mentor" -- a tenured faculty member of Associate Professor or Professor rank who will meet periodically with the tenure-track faculty and discuss his or her academic and professional progress in regard to tenure-track aims, responsibilities and accomplishments.

It is crucial that the mentor pay regular attention to the tenure-track faculty member's progress in regard to the three categories of teaching, scholarly and creative work, and service. If the mentor believes that the tenure-track faculty member's progress may be unsatisfactory, he or she should make this problem clear to the tenure-track faculty member and also discuss the situation with the Architecture Head.

The Architecture Head will be responsible for assigning each tenure-track faculty with a faculty mentor. Ideally, this pairing should develop through mutual interest and involvement on the part of the two individuals.

Otherwise, the Head should assign a tenured faculty to the tenure-track faculty member as the Head sees fit. If the faculty member feels that the relationship is not appropriate or helpful, he or she may request a different mentor.

Mentoring is voluntary and both tenure-track faculty as well as potential faculty mentors may decline to participate.

Mid-Term Review

The Faculty Handbook requires a formal review of the tenure-track faculty member midway through his or her probationary period (C91-92). Unless otherwise stated in the faculty member's contract, the mid-probationary review will take place during the third year of appointment.

This review, organized jointly by the Head and Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, should provide the faculty member with "substantive feedback from faculty colleagues and administrators regarding his or her accomplishments relative to departmental

tenure criteria" (C92.1). Annual reports of activities as well as faculty comments are used to evaluate a candidate's continuing appointment and progress toward tenure. For specific procedures for the mid-probationary review, see "Procedure For Tenure-Track Reappointment Decisions" below.

SOLICITING FACULTY INPUT FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION

Justification

A voice in the selection and retention of peers is a longstanding privilege and responsibility of university faculty. Kansas State University mandates no specific university-wide faculty evaluation procedures in regard to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Rather, the KSU *Faculty Handbook* suggests criteria and procedures be developed jointly by faculty, heads and deans, department by department. Following are two sets of procedures the Department of Architecture faculty have developed for departmental decisions. The first procedure is for reappointment and the second is for tenure and promotion.

Part I Procedure For Tenure-Track Reappointment Decisions [originally approved 16 March 1999; revised 22 August 2006]

The Department of Architecture at KSU uses the following procedure to evaluate the performance of tenure-track faculty members seeking reappointment.

0. Faculty members are appointed based upon their potential to advance the mission and expectations of the department. The department head writes a letter of expectation to each prospective appointee describing the general responsibilities of him or her. A copy of the letter is forwarded to the dean and the provost, along with the recommendation for appointment (C21.1)
1. In early fall, the head sends a memorandum to each tenure-track faculty member listing the key dates and deadlines relating to reappointment. A tenure-track faculty member's calendar for reappointment review varies from year to year, depending on the number of years the tenure-track faculty member has taught at KSU.

The most crucial deadline is the date by which the tenure-track faculty member's reappointment materials are due. These materials include evidence of performance during the current year (including all TEVALs) as well as:

- all annual activity reports, including the most recent. First-year tenure-track faculty members (who are reviewed in early February) will provide an activity report describing the faculty member's first semester. Continuing tenure-track faculty members whose evaluation schedule requires a December review will include an activity report for the current year.

- for all collaborative activities listed, a clear statement of the candidate's role and level of involvement.

It is the responsibility of the department head to make these materials available for faculty review *at least fourteen calendar days before* the faculty meeting described in step 4 below.

2. The head also provides the chair of the departmental faculty affairs committee with the dates and deadlines for each tenure-track faculty member's reappointment review. The chair is responsible for soliciting information and evaluations from tenured faculty members. The chair informs tenured faculty members in a memorandum when the tenure-track faculty member's evaluation materials will be available for review and when tenured faculty members will meet to discuss and evaluate the performance of the candidate.
3. Tenured faculty members review the tenure-track faculty member's reappointment materials.
4. No sooner than *fourteen calendar days* after reappointment materials are made available for review, tenured faculty members, including the department head as a non-voting participant, meet to discuss the performance of each reappointment candidate. During this meeting, the chair solicits discussion and commentary on the performance of each tenure-track faculty member being evaluated.
5. At this meeting, the chair distributes a ballot that elicits each tenured faculty member's reaction to the performance of each tenure-track faculty member being evaluated. Within twenty-four hours, the chair also distributes ballots to any eligible faculty member not present at the meeting.

The ballot offers three voting choices: "in favor," "not in favor," and "abstention." In addition, the ballot provides space for written comments if individual faculty members so wish.

Participation in the evaluation process is an important faculty responsibility, and all eligible faculty are expected to return ballots. All ballots must be signed and returned to the chair within two days of receipt. Unsigned ballots will not be accepted.

The chair is responsible for counting the ballots and compiling any written comments. These ballots are confidential in the sense that only the chair of the faculty affairs committee sees the ballots and any commentaries.

6. Within five days of the meeting described in step 4, the chair forwards to the head a written summary of faculty discussion and ballot results. The chair also provides the head a typed, unedited transcript of any commentaries provided on individual ballots (ballot commentaries are not to be shared with the candidate).

The written summary conveys the vote of the faculty and any other appropriate information the faculty deems important for the head to have in making a recommendation to the dean and provost.

A copy of the written summary (not including any individual commentaries written on the ballots) is placed in the Architecture office. This document is available for review by all tenured faculty members. The chair places all ballots in a sealed envelope, which the head delivers to the dean's office to be kept in the candidate's personnel file.

7. As required by the Faculty Handbook, any tenured faculty member may, prior to the submission of the reappointment recommendation of the head to the dean, request that a candidate meet with tenured faculty members to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by that candidate (C112.4). This request must be made within three days of the meeting described in step 4.
8. Based on the faculty input described above in step 5 and on other available materials, the departmental head forwards a written recommendation and accompanying explanation to the dean, along with the candidate's complete file, and the recommendation and unedited written comments of the tenured departmental faculty members. If a recommendation of the head differs from that of faculty members, the head must provide the dean and candidate with a written justification. The department head will also meet with the candidate to discuss the separate issue of the candidate's progress toward tenure. The department head's written recommendation and accompanying explanations alone will be made available to the candidate and will become part of the candidate's reappointment file (C53.3). This document presents the head's overall sense of the faculty member's performance, based on the inputs described above. In addition, the document includes a copy of the meeting summary provided by the chair of faculty affairs.
9. The dean, along with the recommendation of the department head and, on behalf of the college, forwards a written recommendation and accompanying explanation to the provost, and the majority recommendation and any unedited written comments of the faculty members in the department. The candidate's complete file will be available to the provost upon his/her request (C54). If a

recommendation of the dean differs from that of the head, the dean must provide the head, provost, and candidate with a written justification.

10. The dean informs each candidate of the recommendation prior to forwarding it and the file to the provost. At this time, the head also provides a written summary to each candidate being evaluated. This document presents the head's overall sense of the faculty member's performance, based on the inputs described above. In addition, the document includes a copy of the meeting summary provided by the chair. This summary does not include confidential comments tenured faculty members may have written on their ballots, or in the commentaries described in step 7.
11. The head asks each tenure-track faculty member being evaluated to schedule a meeting with the head. During this meeting, the head and faculty member review the latter's evaluation and discuss his or her academic and professional plans for the year(s) ahead.

Part II Procedure for Mid-Term Review [approved 22 August 2006]

As explained above (p. 32), the *University Handbook* requires a formal review of the tenure-track faculty member midway through his or her probationary period (C91-92). Unless otherwise stated in the faculty member's contract, the mid-probationary review will take place during the third year of appointment. The procedure for a candidate's mid-tenure review is similar to the procedure for the tenure review and is as follows.

1. The mid-term process is organized jointly by the Head and Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, who together are responsible for making the candidate's mid-probationary review file available to the tenured faculty members in the department at least fourteen calendar days prior to a meeting to discuss the candidate's progress. A cumulative record of written recommendations and accompanying explanations forwarded to the candidate from previous reappointment meetings, and any comments from individuals outside the department relevant to the assessment of the candidate's performance will also be made available to the eligible faculty (C92.2).
2. The department head may discuss the review and assessment of the tenured faculty members in the department with the dean, and shall provide a letter of assessment of the candidate, including a summary of faculty comments and suggestions. This letter of assessment and the faculty report will become a part of the candidate's reappointment and mid-probationary review file. The department head will discuss the review and assessment with the candidate. After receiving the assessment, the candidate has the right to submit a written response for the file (C92.2).
3. The candidate's mid-probationary review file as well as other materials specified in 1 above and a copy of the departmental criteria and standards will be forwarded to the college advisory committee. The committee's specific charge is to assure that all applicable mid-term procedures have been followed and that the department in arriving at a recommendation did so by fairly applying established criteria, standards, and guidelines for tenure. The committee, in advising the dean, will base its recommendation exclusively on a comparison of the candidate's credentials with the criteria, standards, and guidelines of the candidate's department (C92.2).
4. The committee will report its findings in writing to the dean. The committee's report must specifically contain a statement as to whether or not all applicable procedures for mid-term review were followed. The report must also explain the rationale behind the committee's recommendation by providing a detailed evaluation of the candidate's credentials with regard to how they meet or fail to meet the specific criteria, standards, and/or guidelines of the candidate's department. A minority

committee report is required when the committee's recommendation is not unanimous (C113.2).

5. The dean will provide a letter of mid-term assessment to the candidate that includes a summary of recommendations from the college advisory committee (C92.4).

III Procedure for Tenure Decisions [originally approved March 5, 2002; revised August 22, 2006]

The Department of Architecture at KSU uses the following procedure to evaluate the performance of tenure-track faculty members seeking tenure.

1. In early fall, the head sends a memorandum to each departmental faculty member seeking tenure in the academic year ahead. This memorandum lists key dates and deadlines for the candidate's tenure process, including the date by which the candidate's tenure-evaluation materials are due.

This memorandum also requests that the tenure candidate schedule an appointment with the head to discuss the evaluation materials that he or she will provide, including recommendations. The head must make sure these materials are available for faculty review *at least 14 calendar days* before the faculty meeting described in step 4 below.

2. The head also sends a memorandum to the chair of the faculty affairs committee, listing the dates and deadlines for the tenure process. The chair is responsible for soliciting information and evaluations from tenured faculty members. The chair informs tenured faculty members in a memorandum when each faculty member's evaluation materials will be available for review and when tenured faculty members will meet to discuss tenure for the faculty member.

3. Tenured faculty members review the faculty member's evaluation materials.

4. No sooner than *fourteen days* after evaluation materials are made available, tenured faculty members, including the department head as a non-voting participant, meet to discuss tenure for the candidate. This meeting is led by the chair of faculty affairs, who solicits discussion and commentary on the performance of each faculty member being evaluated for tenure.

5. At this meeting, the chair also distributes a ballot eliciting each tenured faculty member's evaluation of the performance of each faculty member seeking tenure. Within twenty-four hours, the chair also distributes ballots to all eligible faculty members not present at the meeting.

The ballot offers three voting choices: "in favor of tenure," "not in favor of tenure," and "abstention." In addition, the ballot provides space for written comments if individual faculty members so wish.

Participation in the evaluation process is an important faculty responsibility, and all eligible faculty are expected to return ballots. All ballots must be signed and returned to the chair within two days of receipt. Unsigned ballots will not be accepted.

The chair is responsible for counting the ballots. The ballot vote is confidential in the sense that only the chair sees individual ballot votes and compiles the aggregate count. The chair is also responsible for compiling any written comments from the ballots.

6. Within five days of the meeting described in step 4, the chair forwards to the department head the written summary of faculty discussion and ballot results. The chair also provides the head a typed transcript of any individual faculty members' commentaries provided on the ballot (these commentaries are not to be shared with the candidate and they are not to be seen by other Architecture faculty members).

The written summary conveys the vote of the faculty and any other appropriate information faculty members deem important for the head to have in making a tenure recommendation to the dean and provost.

The chair places a copy of the ballot tally and written summary in the Department of Architecture office. This written summary does not include any individual commentaries written on individual ballots.

This written summary is available for review by all tenured faculty. The chair places all ballots in a sealed envelope, which the head delivers to the dean's office to be kept in each candidate's personnel files.

7. As required by the Faculty Handbook, any member of the eligible faculty may, prior to the submission of the recommendation of the head, request that a tenure candidate meet with tenured faculty members to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by that candidate (C112.4). This request must be made within three days of the meeting described in step 4.

8. Based on the faculty input described above in step 5 and on other available materials, the departmental head forwards a tenure recommendation to the dean, accompanied by an explanation of his or her judgment. All recommendations and unedited written comments of the department's eligible tenured faculty members and the candidate's complete file are also forwarded to the dean (C112.5). If the recommendation of the head differs from that of the faculty members, the head must provide the dean with a written justification.

9. The tenure candidate's file as well as other materials specified in 1 above and a copy of the departmental criteria and standards will be forwarded to the college advisory

committee. The committee's specific charge is to assure that all applicable procedures have been followed and that the department in arriving at a recommendation did so by fairly applying established criteria, standards, and guidelines for tenure. The committee, in advising the dean, will base its recommendation exclusively on a comparison of the candidate's credentials with the criteria, standards, and guidelines of the candidate's department.

10. The committee will report its tenure findings in writing to the dean. The committee's tenure report must specifically contain a statement as to whether or not all applicable procedures were followed. The report must also explain the rationale behind the committee's recommendation by providing a detailed evaluation of the candidate's credentials with regard to how they meet or fail to meet the specific criteria, standards, and/or guidelines of the candidate's department. A minority committee report is required when the committee's recommendation is not unanimous.

11. The dean, after consultation and discussion with the department head and college advisory committee, submits his or her recommendation to the Dean's Council, accompanied by the recommendations and unedited written comments of the department head, the departmental faculty, and the college advisory committee; and the departmental promotion criteria documents, no sooner than seven calendar days following notification to the candidate (see C113.4). The recommendation of the dean and the recommendation of the college advisory committee will be copied to the department head and the candidate.

12. Candidates are to be informed of the college's recommendations no later than seven calendar days prior to when the file and recommendations are forwarded to the Dean's Council. Candidates may withdraw from further consideration for promotion by submitting to the dean a written request for withdrawal. This withdrawal must be done within seven calendar days following notification of the college's recommendation, and in this case the candidate's petition for promotion is not forwarded to the Dean's Council.

13. The Dean's Council meeting is chaired by the senior dean (longest serving), and the provost will not be a party to the discussions. The dean of the candidate's college will abstain from voting when the Council votes on the candidate, and notifies the candidate and the candidate's department head of the Council's vote. If the finding of the Dean's Council differs from those of the department and/or college dean, written justification must be provided as to how the candidate's credentials meet or fail to meet the departmental criteria, standards and/or guidelines, to the candidate, dean of the candidate's college, and the department head.

14. If the finding of the Dean's Council is to not grant tenure, the candidate may appeal this decision to the provost within a period of fourteen calendar days of receiving written notification. If the provost concurs with the finding of the Dean's Council to not grant promotion, the candidate then has the option to file a grievance with the General Grievance Board (See *University Handbook*, Appendix G, "General Faculty Grievance Procedures").

15. If the finding of the Dean's Council is to grant tenure, the case is then reviewed by the provost. If the provost does not concur with the finding of the Dean's Council, then the provost offers to hold a meeting with the candidate, the senior dean (longest serving), and a tenured faculty moderator mutually acceptable to the provost and the candidate, within a period of fourteen calendar days of notification of provost's decision. If no agreement is reached, then the provost provides the candidate, the department head, and the dean of the candidate's college, and the Dean's Council, written reasons for the decision. At that point, the candidate has the option to file a grievance with the General Grievance Board (see *University Handbook*, Appendix G).

16. The provost sends his or her recommendation of the cases that are to be granted tenure to the president. Decisions to deny promotion are not forwarded to the president. When the provost's recommendation disagrees with that of the Dean's Council, the provost provides a written explanation of her or his judgment to the Dean's Council, the dean, the department head, and the candidate.

17. The president has the final authority for granting tenure. Candidates are to be notified when the provost's recommendation to grant tenure is forwarded to the president.

IV Procedure for Promotion Decisions [originally approved 16 April 2002; revised 22 August 2006]

The Department of Architecture at KSU uses the following procedure to evaluate the performance of tenured faculty members seeking promotion. This procedure does not include the promotion process for tenure-track faculty members because, in most instances, tenure-track faculty members being considered for tenure will be concurrently considered for promotion.

The steps of the promotion procedure for tenured faculty members are:

1. All faculty members are encouraged to ensure that they communicate their activities and accomplishments to their colleagues through informal and formal means. For tenured faculty approaching promotion, communication with Professors is of particular importance.

Informal and formal counsel offered by the head and Professors in the months before the time of promotion application should assist the potential candidate in reaching a decision on initiating a formal application for promotion. This counsel should not be construed as a pre-judgment on promotion.

2. By September 15, the head sends a memorandum to the promotion candidate listing key dates and deadlines in the promotion process, including the date by which evaluation materials are due. This memorandum also requests that the promotion candidate schedule an appointment with the head to discuss the evaluation materials that he or she will provide, including recommendations. The head must make sure these materials are available for faculty review *at least fourteen days* before the faculty meeting described in step 2 below.

3. The head also provides the chair of the faculty affairs committee with the dates and deadlines for the promotion process. The chair is responsible for soliciting information and evaluations from eligible faculty members. In writing, the chair informs eligible faculty members when the candidate's evaluation materials will be available for review and when eligible faculty members will meet to discuss promotion for the faculty member.

4. Eligible faculty members review promotion materials.

5. No sooner than *fourteen days* after evaluation materials are made available for review, eligible faculty members, including the department head as a non-voting participant, meet to discuss the promotion of the candidate(s). This meeting is led by the chair of the faculty affairs committee, who solicits discussion and commentary on each

candidate being evaluated for promotion.

6. At this meeting, the chair also distributes a ballot that elicits each eligible faculty member's evaluation of the performance of each promotion candidate. Within twenty-four hours, the chair also distributes ballots to all eligible faculty members not present at the meeting.

7. The ballot offers three voting choices: "in favor of promotion," "not in favor of promotion," and "abstention." In addition, the ballot provides space for written comments if individual faculty so wish. Participation in the evaluation process is an important faculty responsibility, and all eligible faculty are expected to return ballots. All ballots must be signed and returned to the chair of faculty affairs within two days of receipt. Unsigned ballots will not be accepted. The chair is responsible for counting these ballots. The ballot vote is confidential in the sense that only the chair sees individual ballot votes and compiles the aggregate count. The chair is also responsible for compiling any written comments from the ballots.

8. Within five days of the meeting described in step 4, the chair of the faculty affairs committee forwards to the department head a written summary of faculty discussion and ballot results. The chair also provides the head a copy of a typed transcript of any commentaries provided on the ballot (these commentaries are not to be shared by the candidate and they are not to be seen by other Architecture faculty members). The written summary conveys the vote of the eligible faculty and any other appropriate information the faculty deems important for the head to have in making a promotion recommendation to the dean and provost. The chair places a copy of the ballot tally and written summary in the Department of Architecture office. This written summary does not include any individual commentaries written on the individual ballots. The chair places all ballots in a sealed envelope, which the head delivers to the dean's office to be kept in each candidate's personnel file.

9. Between the time candidates' evaluation materials go on departmental display in step 1 and two days after the meeting described in step 2, eligible faculty members may provide separate written comments to the departmental head on faculty members whose performance is being evaluated for promotion. The head will be the only faculty member in the department to read these commentaries.

10. As required by the Faculty Handbook, any member of the eligible faculty may, prior to the submission of the recommendation of the head, request that a promotion candidate meet with eligible faculty members to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by that candidate (C152.4). This request must be made within three days of the meeting described in step 2.

11. Based on the faculty input described in steps 5-7 and on other available materials, the departmental head forwards a promotion recommendation to the dean. If the recommendation from the head differs from that of the eligible faculty, the head must provide the dean a written justification. The head's promotion recommendation to the dean must include the summary document prepared by the chair of faculty affairs (step 7) and individual ballot commentaries (step 5).

12. The promotion candidate's file as well as other materials specified in 1 above and a copy of the departmental criteria and standards will be forwarded to the college advisory committee. The committee's specific charge is to assure that all applicable procedures have been followed and that the department in arriving at a recommendation did so by fairly applying established criteria, standards, and guidelines for tenure. The committee, in advising the dean, will base its recommendation exclusively on a comparison of the candidate's credentials with the criteria, standards, and guidelines of the candidate's department.

13. The committee will report its promotion findings in writing to the dean. The committee's tenure report must specifically contain a statement as to whether or not all applicable procedures were followed. The report must also explain the rationale behind the committee's recommendation by providing a detailed evaluation of the candidate's credentials with regard to how they meet or fail to meet the specific criteria, standards, and/or guidelines of the candidate's department. A minority committee report is required when the committee's recommendation is not unanimous.

14. The dean, after consultation and discussion with the department head and college advisory committee, submits his or her recommendation to the Dean's Council (subject to C153.4) accompanied by the recommendations and unedited written comments of the department head, the departmental faculty, and the college advisory committee, and the departmental promotion criteria documents, no sooner than *seven calendar days* after notification to the candidate (See C113.4). The recommendation of the dean and the recommendation of the college advisory committee is copied to the department head and the candidate.

15. Candidates are informed of the college's recommendations prior to the time the file and recommendations are forwarded to the Dean's Council. Candidates may withdraw from further consideration for promotion by submitting to the dean a written request for withdrawal. This must be done within seven calendar days following notification of the college's recommendation, and in this case the candidate's petition for promotion is not forwarded to the Dean's Council.

16. The Dean's Council meeting is chaired by the senior dean (longest serving), and the provost will not be a party to the discussions. The dean of the candidate's college

abstains from voting when the Council votes on the candidate, and notifies the candidate and the candidate's department head of the Council's vote. If the finding of the Dean's Council differs from those of the department and/or college dean, written justification must be provided as to how the candidate's credentials meet or fail to meet the departmental criteria, standards and/or guidelines, to the candidate, dean of the candidate's college, and the department head.

17. If the finding of the Dean's Council is to not grant promotion, the candidate may appeal this decision to the provost within a period of fourteen calendar days of receiving written notification. If the provost concurs with the finding of the Dean's Council to not grant promotion, the candidate then has the option to file a grievance with the General Grievance Board (See *University Handbook*, Appendix G, "General Faculty Grievance Procedures").

18. If the finding of the Dean's Council is to grant promotion, the case is then reviewed by the provost. If the provost does not concur with the finding of the Dean's Council, then the provost offers to hold a meeting with the candidate, the senior dean (longest serving), and a tenured faculty moderator mutually acceptable to the provost and the candidate, within a period of fourteen calendar days of notification of provost's decision. If no agreement is reached, then the provost provides the candidate, the department head, and the dean of the candidate's college, and the Dean's Council, written reasons for the decision. At that point, the candidate has the option to file a grievance with the General Grievance Board (See *University Handbook*, Appendix G).

19. The provost sends his or her recommendation of the cases that are to be granted promotion to the president. Decisions to deny promotion are not forwarded to the president. When the provost's recommendation disagrees with that of the Dean's Council, the provost will provide a written explanation of her or his judgment to the Dean's Council, the dean, the department head, and the candidate.

20. The president has the final authority for granting promotion. Candidates are to be notified when the provost's recommendation to grant promotions is forwarded to the president.