

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR ARCHITECTURE AND PRODUCT DESIGN

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 9/12/06)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 9/12/06)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **9/2011**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **9/2011**

Stephen M. Murphy, Department Head

Date signed: 9/19/2006

Dennis Law, Dean

Date signed: 9/20/06

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.*

TENURE AND PROMOTION DOCUMENT

**DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR ARCHITECTURE
& PRODUCT DESIGN**

I. Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure in the Department of Interior Architecture & Product Design

Adopted by Interior Architecture Faculty Sept. 1993
Amended by Interior Architecture Faculty Nov. 1996

II. Guidelines for Minimum Yearly Expectations of Review for Tenured Faculty Members in the Department of Interior Architecture

Adopted by Interior Architecture Faculty May 7, 1997
Re-affirmed by Interior Architecture Faculty Jan. 17, 2001
Amended by Interior Architecture & Product Design Faculty Nov. 5, 2003
Amended by Interior Architecture & Product Design Faculty Feb. 16, 2005
Amended by Interior Architecture & Product Design Faculty Oct. 19, 2005
Adopted by Interior Architecture & Product Design Faculty Sept.12, 2006

Stephen M. Murphy _____ date _____
Department Head

Dennis L. Law _____ date _____
Dean

M. Duane Nellis _____ date _____
Provost

CONTENTS:

I	Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure in the Department of Interior Architecture & Product Design		
	A.	Teaching	pg. 3
	B.	Scholarship	pg. 5
	C.	Service and Leadership	pg. 7
II.	Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation		pg. 8
	A.	Yearly Review Process	pg. 9
	B.	Tenure and Promotion Procedures	pg. 11
		1. Pre-Tenure	
		a. Reappointment Process	pg. 12
		b. Mid-Tenure Process	pg. 14
		2. Tenure and Promotion	pg. 15
		3. Post Tenure Promotion	pg. 19
		4. Professorial Performance Award	pg. 23
III.	Guidelines for Minimum Yearly Expectations and Underachievement		pg. 25
	A.	Evidence of Underachievement in Teaching	pg. 25
	B.	Evidence of Underachievement in Scholarship	pg. 26
	C.	Evidence of Underachievement in Service	pg. 27
	D.	Evidence of Underachievement in Promoting Collegiality	pg. 27
	E.	Signals of Failure and Magnitude of Underachievement	pg. 27
	F.	Procedure for Assessing Underachievement	pg. 28
IV	Department of Interior Architecture & Product Design Evaluation Form		pg. 30
V	Department of Interior Architecture & Product Design Teaching and Professional Objectives		pg. 32
VI	Peer Faculty Evaluation Form		pg. 33

I. GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR ARCHITECTURE AND PRODUCT DESIGN

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Interior Architecture and Product Design as a unit within The College of Architecture, Planning and Design reveals its mission as collective and individual contributions of its faculty to allow students to achieve their professional degree and obtain the knowledge, experience and teamwork necessary to be successful in the global economic market. These contributions are categorized in three areas: (1) teaching students through classroom and studio assignments and evaluation; (2) research and scholarship that further the department's academic and professional capabilities; and (3) service and leadership to the college, university, professional societies and the public. Collegiality through mentorship, respect for all others in any group is the basis for professionalism. The faculty of The Department of Interior Architecture and Product Design adopted the following language from the American Association of University Professors, "On Collegiality as a Criterion for Faculty Evaluation," adopted from Statement and Reports <http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/collegia.htm>. Re: page 21.

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 that criteria and procedures be developed jointly by faculty, heads and deans, department by department.

The Department of Interior Architecture & Product Design at KSU has chosen to use the following process in providing a collective-peer evaluation in regard to faculty members seeking reappointment, tenure, or promotion. These steps of evaluation are as follows:

A TEACHING

Evaluation of Teaching

The guides of achievement for teaching are listed below. To document ability in teaching, a faculty member may present the following evidence:

Evaluations:

- External and internal peer evaluations including all departmental tenured faculty members which are arranged between the faculty member and the department chair
- Standardized, written teaching evaluations (TEVAL)
- Student letters and statements

Evidence of teaching activities:

- Videotaped classroom activities
- Sample syllabi, with a discussion of learning activities and sample student work
- Online courses, distance learning and computer-aided teaching that indicates skill in technological adaptations for pedagogy
- Specialized work for students such as independent studies and directed readings
- Written reports on interns supervised
- Results of student mentoring for project activity, advising, thesis and/or report supervision
- The development and implementation of a new course or a significant redesign of a course
- Course coordination
- Preparation of coursework to be taught in subsequent semesters
- Guest lecturer and/or critic at KSU or elsewhere
- Curricular innovation
- General Education teaching
- Other teaching related activities
- Major/Minor advisor for graduate students

Honors and awards:

- Honors, awards, grants, or news releases for teaching, studio, or class based projects
- Student awards and/or accomplishments

Professional development activities:

- Participation in professional development or skill enhancement training courses, workshops, study tours, or seminars.

B. SCHOLARSHIP AND SCHOLARLY CREATIVE, PROFESSIONAL AND ARTISTIC ACHIEVEMENT

Creative work, be it professional or artistic, is fundamental to personal and departmental scholarly development. From a personal point of view, faculty expect the opportunity to engage in creative work and the department likewise expects that faculty are actively utilizing their time (exclusive of assigned tenths) to pursue creative work. This work must be done with the intention that it can be made public.

Documentation of the quality of creative and research activities includes its public dissemination, comments from peers, receipt of awards or grants, as well as the judgment of work in progress by the department head and/or peers.

The faculty member needs to document evidence of continued and qualitative intellectual, professional and artistic growth in ways appropriate to their professional interests, expertise and departmental role, and to communicate to appropriate audiences, organizations or industry outside the department.

Department review of scholarly activities

Presentations:

- Presentation(s) and/or panel participation in regional workshops or conferences
- Presentation(s) at regional and national academic and professional society meetings
- Poster presentation(s) at national conferences
- Invited topic speaker or paper/project presentation(s) at regional, national or international conferences

Exhibitions:

- Acceptance into a juried or an invited exhibition
- Juror for a competition and/or exhibition
- Organizing an exhibition of student, faculty and/or professional work

Publications:

- Peer or non-peer selected publications in conference proceedings
- Peer or non-peer reviewed publications as book chapters, edited works, or texts
- Research studies, scholarly monographs and/or reports – either funded or non-funded
- Desktop publications intended for dissemination at the local or regional level

- Peer-reviewed grants, articles, methodologies, professional reports, professional monographs, studies, articles, methodologies, professional consultations
- Political acceptance of proposed plans and policies and other evidence of environmental or comprehensive planning and design influence
- Peer reviewed, single or multiple authored publication(s) in scholarly and/or professional journals
- Student or faculty work featured or reviewed in a publication or other media
- Review or edit peer publications
- Procurement of U.S or international patents

Grants:

- Submission of grant proposals for funded research
- Funded research activities
- Unfunded research activities

Evidence of creative endeavors:

- A portfolio of professional projects and studies demonstrating distinctive practice evaluated by qualified evaluators
- Development of programs, products, and methodologies that make a substantial contribution to the advancement of students and faculty
- Work in progress or completed

Honors and awards

- Scholarly and peer recognition for outstanding intellectual contributions
- Class or student awards, honors, or mentions under the direction or co-direction of the faculty member being considered for tenure and promotion
- Competition awards, honors, or mentions for entries and exhibits
- Professional awards, honors, and mentions

Professional development activities:

- Participation in college/university workshops and conferences and continuing education activities

C. SERVICE AND LEADERSHIP

All faculty members have a responsibility to play a role in university life, college and departmental governance, and professional service. Service is an important part in a faculty member's responsibilities as part of the university community. In professional programs, service can contribute to the visibility and perceived value of a department or discipline through the execution of specialized projects, collaboration with other disciplines on campus and through service activities provided to professional and scholarly societies. In addition, to impacting the visibility and reputation of the department, these activities can also make positive contributions to the faculty member's reputation and skill.

Faculty members also have the opportunity to provide support to their professions by serving as officers and as members of boards dealing with governance, professional testing, licensing and certification, and program accreditation at regional, state and national levels. Service of this type places them in leadership positions that impact future practitioners. In addition, these service activities give faculty members the opportunity to expand their department's visibility, their own status and reputation, and help connect the department and its disciplines with their respective professions. These connections are important to professional programs, their students, and the professional growth of the individual departmental member, and they should be given considerable weight in assessing a faculty member's contribution.

Departmental Review of Service Activities

The guides of achievement for service are listed below. Excellence is more important than the number of guides fulfilled.

Department, college and university service and leadership:

- Member or chair of standing or ad hoc college committee
- Member or chair of standing or ad hoc departmental committee
- Member or chair of standing or ad hoc university committee
- Member or chair of standing committees at departmental, college or university levels
- Leadership in university governance
- Evidence of involvement in other activities that contribute to the good of university or community

Mentoring:

- Mentor to younger faculty members
- Mentor or advisor to student organizations

Professional society service and leadership:

- Active membership in professional organizations, (e.g.) IDEC, IIDA, IDSA, etc.

- Leadership in professional organizations related to the practice of the respective disciplines
- Leadership in scholarly societies and teaching organizations in the respective areas
- Participation in regional and national professional society meetings

Community, regional, state and national service and leadership:

- Service to local community that directly reflects professional expertise
- Service to state or regional organizations which directly reflect professional expertise
- Consultations with public and private groups and individuals
- Direction of class projects that benefit communities while demonstrating a faculty member's expertise in management and professional judgment

II. GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

INTRODUCTION TO THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY

The Department of Interior Architecture & Product Design at Kansas State University is dedicated to imparting and expanding knowledge and to contributing to both the general welfare of the public and the profession. To achieve these ends, the faculty pursues a wide range of activities in teaching, scholarship, 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 to achieve excellence in these areas. To maintain progress toward productivity and excellence, the University must also annually 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 laid down in 1974,

when the Faculty Senate approved a policy statement regarding the annual evaluation of unclassified 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 recommendation for merit salary increases before it 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 reaffirmed in the latest report entitled "Handbook for Annual Evaluation of Unclassified Personnel" (hereafter referenced as "Handbook").

In the Department of Interior Architecture & Product Design, the present evaluation procedure has been in place for many years. While its implementation has been modified over time, the present statement is the first comprehensive revision with the Department of Interior Architecture & Product Design since the plan's original draft in 1974. The following plan seeks to take into account requirements and recommendations provided in the KSU Handbook.

As a professional program that is regularly reviewed by two national accreditation boards, Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA), and the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD), the Department of Interior Architecture & Product Design is different from more purely academic departments in that it incorporates professional training, real world practice as well as scholarly theory. The evaluation procedure that follows seeks to allow for and support the diversity of activity that is meritorious in a university program like KSU's Department of Interior Architecture & Product Design.

A. YEARLY REVIEW PROCESS

The three University-wide requirements described above are the basis for the evaluation procedure described here. This procedure will follow a calendar-year schedule that is directed by the departmental head. In memoranda, he/she must remind Interior Architecture & Product Design faculty of various evaluation deadlines and describe required materials and individual-faculty obligations.

In turn, Interior Architecture & Product Design faculty are responsible for providing in a timely manner satisfactory materials and participation in meetings with the head. Failure on the part of Interior Architecture & Product Design faculty to meet these responsibilities can be used as

grounds for evaluation penalties. The KSU "Handbook for Evaluation of Unclassified Personnel" (July 1990) allows for such penalties under paragraph 24; the Handbook requires that these penalties be documented in the narrative portion of the head's evaluation.

Materials for the Evaluation Process:

1. Faculty Evaluation Agreement for Coming Year

This agreement is a statement of professional goals for the coming year and is written by each faculty at the end of January (see appendix A of this report). Clearly, this statement is provisional, and individual faculty may need to make changes as the year proceeds. The major outline headings for this statement is described in Part III.

It is important for both head and individual faculty to understand that this document is the basis for merit decisions made in the coming year. In this statement, the faculty member must estimate the relative significance of the three evaluation categories---i.e., teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service (see the following "evaluation categories").

This estimate, followed by required changes in the course of the calendar year, is important in the head's establishing a threshold of meritorious performance for each faculty member.

2. Faculty Activities Report for Current Merit-Evaluation Year

This statement is submitted in December and lists each faculty member's accomplishments for the past calendar year (see appendix A). This report also includes a statement discussing how annual accomplishments compare with the goals projected in the Faculty evaluation Agreement. The format for this statement is described in Part III, below.

3. Update Materials to Support Activities Report

Each faculty member will annually provide the departmental head, with regard to teaching: **three or more** kinds of evidence---course outlines, teaching evaluations, (TEVAL and other approved forms of student evaluation). With regard to other activities, student work, design work, publications, letters of information, etc., that illustrate how his/her goals for the year are being actualized. The head is responsible for examining these materials and for placing them in the faculty member's departmental file.

Besides providing a general list of activities in his/her faculty evaluation agreement and annual report (1 and 2 above), each faculty should also provide information on the specific activity's purpose, scope and time involvement---for example, size of classes and number of advisees, scope of committee work, stage of completion of research, etc.

Calendar for Evaluation

The calendar and requirements for the annual faculty-evaluation procedure for merit increase and re-appointment are as follows:

By January 15	All faculty members must submit their Annual Activities Report and final supporting materials for evaluation by the Head.
By Late January	All faculty must submit Spring Syllabi and other relevant course material to Head.
By February 15	Head provides written evaluations to all faculty members and describes merit raise criteria. If either the Head or individual faculty member wishes, he/she can schedule a meeting to review the Head's evaluation of the individual faculty member. The faculty member signs one copy of the document and returns it to the head.
By Late February	The Head forwards his/her written evaluations and recommendations for merit salary increases to the Dean.
By March 1	All faculty members submit their Annual Teaching and Professional Objectives to the Head. If a faculty member wishes, he/she may schedule an appointment with the Head to discuss the evaluation agreement. Similarly, if the Head feels the need for clarification in regard to a faculty member's evaluation agreement, the Head may schedule a meeting with the faculty member.
By March 15	The Head reviews and signs a copy of the Teaching and Professional Objectives and returns a signed copy to each faculty member. As a faculty member's goals and Objectives for the year change, he/she should inform the Head of those changes.
By Late August	All faculty members will submit fall semester syllabi and other relevant course materials to the Head.

B. TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES

1. PRE-TENURE

With appointment at the rank of assistant professor, the maximum probationary period for gaining tenure and promotion to associate professor consists of six regular annual appointments at Kansas State University. In these cases, decisions of tenure must be made before or during the sixth year of probationary service. Candidates not approved for tenure during the sixth year of service, will be notified by the appropriate dean that the seventh year of service will constitute the terminal year of appointment. (C82.2)

For persons appointed at the rank of associate professor or professor, the maximum probationary period for gaining tenure consists of five regular annual appointments at Kansas State University at probationary ranks. Tenure decisions must be made before or during the fifth year of probationary service. Candidates not approved for tenure during the fifth year of service will be

notified by the appropriate dean that the sixth year of service will constitute the terminal year of appointment. (C82.3)

Faculty members on probationary appointments who have met the criteria and standards for tenure prior to the above maximum time, may be granted early tenure because candidates may be considered for tenure at any time during their probationary year, no time credit shall be granted for service prior to employment at Kansas State University. (C82.4)

Faculty members on probationary, tenure-track positions may request a one year delay of the tenure clock. Reasons for this delay are found in the University Handbook in sections (C83.1 through C83.6).

Upon initial employment of tenure tracking faculty, the department head will provide a copy of the Tenure and Promotion Guidelines to all candidates under final consideration and discuss the responsibilities the candidates will be expected to perform. When the candidate is hired, the discussion notes will be put in writing and become part of the basis for annual evaluation and later in the tenure/promotion review. Any changes in assignments should be documented by the faculty member and department head at the next annual review.

The department head will assign a senior faculty with the new employee after consulting each so the new faculty will be acclimated to the department, college and university procedures. It will be the mentor's responsibility to become knowledgeable of the new faculty's progress toward tenure. The relationship will be addressed in the annual evaluation of each. The mentor can be changed by the department head at the request of either faculty member.

a. Reappointment Process

Faculty members on probationary appointments are evaluated annually to determine whether or not they will be reappointed for another year. Faculty members must explicitly be informed in writing of a decision not to renew their appointments in accordance with The Standards of Notice of Non-Reappointment. (See Appendix A.) Annual evaluations shall serve as the general basis for feedback to a faculty member on probationary appointment about his or her performance in comparison to the department's criteria and standards for tenure. Notice for non-reappointment shall adhere to the following guidelines.

1. Not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if a one-year appointment termination.
2. Not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if an initial two-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.
3. At least 12 months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years in the institution. (C50.1)

It is the Department's responsibility to establish and provide criteria and standards to the candidate for advancement in appointment that would lead to tenure. Those criteria are specifically detailed

under section II of this document. (C51)

The candidate must compile and submit documentation each year that describes the contributions and professional accomplishments in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the department. (C52)

The Department Head will make the candidate's reappointment file available to all tenured faculty members in the department. A cumulative record of written recommendations and accompanying explanations forwarded to the candidate from previous reappointment meetings and any written comments from relevant individuals outside the department will also be made available to the eligible faculty. The department chair and eligible faculty will meet at least fourteen calendar days after the review documents are made available to discuss the candidate's eligibility for reappointment and progress toward tenure. Subsequent to this meeting, there will be a ballot of the eligible faculty on reappointment of the candidate. Any member of the eligible faculty may, prior to the submission of any recommendation to the department head, request the candidate meet with the eligible faculty to discuss, for the purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate. (C53.1)

The Department Head will forward a written recommendation and accompanying explanations to the dean along with the candidate's complete file, the majority recommendation and the unedited written comments from the department's tenured faculty members. 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. Faculty and unclassified professionals should expect that their peer evaluations gathered from individuals at Kansas State University and at other institutions will not be available to them, except in association with grievance proceeding (see Appendix G). (C53.3)

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 written comments (unedited) of the faculty members in the department. The candidate's complete file will be available to the Provost upon his/her request. Candidates are informed of the College's recommendation prior to the time that the file and recommendations are forwarded to the Provost. (C54, C56)

b. Mid-Tenure Review

The mid-tenure review shall take place during the third year of appointment unless stated otherwise in the faculty's contract. This allows substantial feedback from colleagues and administrators regarding accomplishments relative to departmental tenure criteria. A positive review does not guarantee that tenure will be granted nor does a negative review mean that tenure will be declined.

C92.2 of the University Handbook states that procedures for the mid-probationary review are similar to procedures for the tenure review and are established by the departmental faculty in consultation with the department chair/head and the dean.

The department chair/head is 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 collective 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 tenured faculty. 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 to the candidate, including a summary of faculty comments and suggestions. (See C35 regarding confidentiality of peer evaluations). This letter of assessment and the faculty report will become a part of the candidate's reappointment and mid-probationary review file. The department chair/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. (C92.4)

C92.3 Comments also may be solicited from students, and other relevant faculty members in the college or university, and from outside reviewers.

C92.4 College procedures. The candidate's mid-probationary review file as well as other materials specified in C92.2, and a copy of the departmental criteria and standards will be forwarded to the College Tenure & Promotion Committee. C153.1 is incorporated herein by reference as the evaluation procedure to be followed by the Tenure and Promotion Committee. The dean will provide a letter of assessment to the candidate that includes a summary of recommendations from the college advisory committee.

The University uses an extended probationary period to provide opportunity to assess a candidates' ability to contribute to the expertise and the versatility expected of the faculty at Kansas State University. Evaluation is conducted annually and feedback provided in a timely manner to each faculty member on a probationary appointment. The Mid-probationary review of a probationary faculty member is conducted midway through the probationary period. Unless otherwise stated in the candidate's contract the mid-probationary review shall take place during the third year of appointment. This review provides the faculty member with substantive feedback from faculty colleagues and administrators regarding his or her accomplishments relative to departmental tenure criteria. (C91-C92.1)

2. TENURE AND PROMOTION

Faculty Member Responsibilities

Faculty undergoing review for tenure and promotion should prepare a portfolio for evaluation by the department's tenured faculty; the department head, the dean of the college and outside reviewers. The portfolio is a collection of materials that support the candidate's request for tenure and/or promotion and is based on the requirements and

procedures contained in the University Handbook, sections C151-C152.5.

Portfolio Content

The candidate's portfolio is to be arranged following the university Promotion and Tenure Transmittal documentation format located at.

<http://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/forms/promotio.html>

- I. Cover Sheet
 - A. Recommendation by the Dean
 - B. Recommendation by the Department Head
- II. Description of Responsibilities during Evaluation Period
- III. Statement by Candidate
 - A. Candidate's statement of accomplishments (one page summary of justification for promotion/tenure)
 - B. Statement of Five-Year Goals
- IV. Instructional Contribution
 - A. Statement of activities (classes taught, student advisement)
 - B. Evidence of instructional quality (student ratings, peer evaluations, evaluation of advisement)
 - C. Other evidence of scholarship and creativity that promote excellence in instruction (multimedia presentations, computer-aided instruction, papers published or presented, awards received)
- V. Research and Other Creative Endeavors
 - A. One page statement
 - B. Listing of research publications and creative achievements
 - C. List of grants and contracts
- VI. Service Contributions (two page summary)

- VII. External Letters of Evaluation
 - A. At least three written reviews of the candidate's achievements and credentials by an appropriately ranked professor at another university generally equivalent to Kansas State University. The reviewers will be chosen from a list of five individuals by the department head, but the names of the potential reviewer(s) must be disclosed to the candidate for concerns or objections related to bias—facilitated by the department head.

VIII. Other Summary Information Considered Pertinent by the College

IX. Supporting Documents

- A. Teaching Evaluations (last three years)
 - 1. For candidates seeking tenure and promotion to associate professor, copies of standardized teaching evaluations for all semesters at Kansas State must be included.
 - 2. For candidates to full professor, standardized teaching evaluations for at least the preceding three years must be included – supplied by the candidate;
- B. A copy of the candidate's annual reviews by the department head for at least the preceding three years – supplied by the department head;
- C. Reprints and/or Manuscripts
- D. Evidence of creative endeavors
- E. Other Materials
 - 1. Any letters by members of the IAPD faculty commenting on the qualifications and readiness of the candidate for tenure and/or promotion.
 - 2. Associate and full professors evaluate candidates for full professor – facilitated by the department head or a designated faculty member
- F. Detailed Curriculum Vitae

Departmental Procedures

1. "Eligible faculty" in regard to reappointment and tenure decisions are those faculty members already tenured. "Eligible faculty" in regard to promotion are all those tenured faculty members at the considered rank and above.

Eligible faculty members review evaluation materials provided by the faculty members to be evaluated. The department head puts these materials in order and makes them available for faculty perusal at least 14 calendar days before the faculty meeting described in step 2 below.

These materials will vary depending on the particular evaluation---i.e., reappointment, tenure, or promotion. For each faculty member being evaluated, the department head must specify, in a memorandum, the nature and contents of these materials as required by University and College directives. For reappointment, merit increase, and mid-probationary review candidates, these materials shall include evidence of performance as well as:

- annual activity reports, including the most recent. First-year, tenure-track faculty (who are reviewed in late January), will provide an activity report describing the faculty member's first semester. For second year faculty members whose evaluation schedule for reappointment and those whose mid-probationary review requires a December review will provide an activity report for the **current** year.
- a clear statement of the candidate's role and level of involvement for all collaborative activities listed.
- assistance is available for the tenure-track faculty member at the mid-point of the tenure review process. In addition to complying with requirements noted in KSU Faculty Handbook C92.1-2 (Mid-probationary review), the Department's tenured faculty members meet personally with the non-tenured individual to offer suggestions regarding the preparation of evaluation materials, and direction concerning areas that remain to be addressed.

- . Fourteen calendar days after evaluation materials are made available for perusal, eligible faculty will meet to discuss candidates, including the department head who is a non-voting participant. This meeting is scheduled and led by the chair of the departmental Tenure and Promotion committee, who solicits group discussion and commentary on each faculty member being evaluated.
2. At this meeting, the chair of the Tenure and Promotion committee also distributes a ballot that elicits faculty reaction to faculty members being evaluated. The chair also distributes ballots to all eligible faculty members 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.

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 Tenure and Promotion. Unsigned ballots will not be accepted.

3. The chair of the Tenure and Promotion committee is responsible for counting these ballots and compiling any written comments. These ballots are **confidential** in the sense that only the chair of the Tenure and Promotion committee and one other member selected from among the other members of the committee sees them.
4. The Tenure and Promotion departmental committee chair forwards to the department head a written summary of group discussion and ballot results. This correspondence must

convey the vote of the faculty and any other appropriate information the faculty deems important for the head to know in making a recommendation to the dean and provost.

A copy of this written summary is placed in the Interior Architecture & Product Design office. This document is available for perusal by all eligible faculty.

The Tenure and Promotion departmental committee chair places all ballots from step 2 in sealed envelope, which the Interior Architecture & Product Design head delivers to the dean's office for the College's Tenure and Promotion committee's review.

5. Between the time that faculty-evaluation materials go on departmental display in step 1 and after the meeting of step 2 above, eligible faculty members may provide separate written comments to the departmental head on faculty being evaluated.
6. Based on the above faculty input and other available materials, the departmental head forwards recommendations to the dean. If a recommendation from the head should differ from that of the eligible faculty, he/she must provide a written explanation of the differences to the dean.
7. The head provides a written summary for each faculty member being evaluated. This document presents the head's overall sense of the faculty member's performance and/or progress, based on the inputs described above (steps 4 and 5). In addition, the document includes a copy of the meeting summary provided by the chair of the Tenure and Promotion committee. This summary does not include the confidential comment that eligible faculty members may have written on their ballots.
8. The head asks each faculty member evaluated to schedule a meeting with the head. During this meeting, the head and faculty member review the latter's evaluation.

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 the 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.

3. POST-TENURE PROMOTION

For Consideration of Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

For promotion to the rank of professor there is the expectation of continued and clear evidence of significant contribution to the professional development of the individual and enhancement of the department's reputation. As noted in the [University Handbook](#) in section C120

“Faculty members may expect to advance through the academic ranks on the basis of demonstrated individual merit in relation to their association with the university's mission and with their own disciplines. Each higher rank demands a higher level of accomplishment.”

The aforementioned standards and criteria continue to apply in evaluating this ongoing contribution. Particular attention should be given to special contributions that markedly and creatively enhance the growth and quality of the Department's programs and outreach, including achievements while serving as head.

For this level of advancement there should be evidence of leadership and national reputation in one or more areas of the candidate's field. Advancement to professor will reflect a faculty member's acknowledged excellence and achievements significant to interior architecture or product and furniture design, such as teaching, scholarship, professional practice, professional service and outreach. Criteria for promotion include both those achievements listed earlier and the following indicators:

Teaching Activities:

The guides of achievement for teaching are listed below. To document ability in teaching, a faculty member may present any of the following evidence:

Evaluations:

- External and internal peer evaluations including all departmental tenured faculty members which are arranged between the faculty member and the department chair
- Exemplary teaching supported by standardized, written teaching evaluations (TEVAL)
- Student letters and statements providing examples of the ability and excellence in teaching

Evidence of teaching activities:

- Leadership and innovation in the methodology of teaching
- Online courses, distance learning and computer-aided teaching that indicates skill in technological adaptations for pedagogy
- Specialized work for students such as independent graduate studies and directed readings
- The development and implementation of a new course or a significant redesign of a course
- Course coordination in a leadership role
- Invited guest lecturer and/or critic at KSU or elsewhere
- Curricular innovation
- Major/Minor advisor for graduate students

Honors and awards:

- Honors, awards, grants, or news releases for teaching, studio, or class based projects
- Student awards and/or accomplishments
- Students under the Professor's direction receiving honors, awards, and mentions from major design competitions

Scholarly Activities:**Evaluations:**

- Recognition among senior faculty, designers, professionals or public officials as a leading innovator

Publications, Presentations and Products:

- Solicitations to consult or lead in solving major (i.e. significant) design problems
- Invited and/or peer-reviewed presentations at conferences

- Solicitations to write or contribute to major scholarly books and compilations of important ideas and/or historical compendia
- Solicitations to write or contribute to professional monographs, studies, articles, methodologies
- Single or joint authored articles in journals widely recognized by interior architects and product designers as leading sources of scholarly or professional practice information, and/or innovative teaching practice
- Publication of books, reports or articles recognized to be innovative or of strong or seminal value in advancing the field
- Editorship of peer-reviewed journals or monograph series in the field
- Serving regularly as a peer reviewer for scholarly journals
- Invited testimony before major elected officials' committees

Honors and awards:

- Awards from professional, scholarly and government organizations
- Design awards of disciplines especially at a national level
- High placement in major design competitions, honors, awards. and mentions from major design competitions

Service and Leadership:

- Election to high office in professional and scholarly organizations and demonstrated evidence of substantial contributions
- Service projects that make a significant contribution to a community through faculty and/or student design solutions.
- Service to the department or college through design and construction of facilities and accessories.
- Service on juries for major design, professional, or research award competitions

- Elected faculty senate and other university or college committees/service

Professional development activities:

- Participation in professional development or skill enhancement training courses, workshops, study tours, or seminars.

4. PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD

PURPOSE: The Professorial Performance Award rewards strong performance at the highest rank with a base salary increase in addition to that provided for by the annual evaluation process. The Performance Award review, it is important to note, is not a form of promotion review. It does not create a “senior” professoriate. Furthermore, the Professorial Performance Award is not a right accorded to every faculty member at the rank of Professor. Nor is it granted simply as a result of a candidate’s routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies.

CRITERIA: The criteria for the award will adhere to the following guidelines: 1. The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at Kansas State at least six years since the last promotion or last Professorial Performance Award; 2. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review; and 3. The candidate’s productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards.

SELECTION PROCESS: The Professorial Performance Award document must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty in the department, by the department’s administrative head, by the dean and by the provost. Provision must be made for a review of the document at least every five years as a part of the review of the procedures for annual merit evaluation or whenever standards for promotion to professor change.

Recommendations for the Professorial Performance Award will follow the timeline associated with the annual evaluation review outlined in the University Handbook. By January 15, all eligible faculty members must submit their portfolio, statement of accomplishments and other activities over the previous six years.

Eligible candidates for review must compile and submit a file that documents her or his professional accomplishments for at least the previous six years in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the department in its tenure and promotion document. The department head will make the submission file available for review and recommendation by the faculty within the department at the rank of professor. A ballot will be taken including the vote and rationale of each eligible faculty member. A majority faculty vote will constitute a recommendation by the faculty to the department head of the merits of the candidate’s qualifications for the Professorial Performance Award.

The department head will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate’s materials in terms of the criteria, standards, and guidelines established, along with a recommendation for or against the award. Each candidate for the award will have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the department head, and each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, each candidate has the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation to the department head and to the dean. A copy of the department head’s written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate.

The department head must submit the following items to the dean by the way of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee:

- 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.

The College Tenure and Promotion Committee will review the department documents and criteria and assess the candidate's performance as to the merits of the submittal. The Committee will make a recommendation to the Dean.

The dean will review all evaluation materials and recommendations to ensure that the evaluations are consistent with the criteria and procedures established by the department for the Professorial Performance Award.

A dean who does not agree with recommendations for the Professorial Performance Award made by a department head regardless of the actions of the college Tenure and Promotion Committee 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 recommendation, 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.

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

If the provost does not agree with recommendation for Professorial Performance Awards 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.

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.

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.

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.

III. GUIDELINES FOR MINIMUM YEARLY EXPECTATIONS AND UNDERACHIEVEMENT

Introduction

A necessary precondition of a strong faculty is that it has a first hand concern with its own membership. This is properly reflected both in appointment to and in separation from the university community when the faculty agree on their several functions and complementary roles. The fundamental responsibilities of faculty exhibition of professional competence in the classroom, studio or laboratory, and in the public arena through activities such as discussions, lectures, consulting, publications and participation in professional organizations and meetings.

A "poor evaluation" for underachievement is a symptom of failure on the part of a faculty member to adequately perform the prime duties of teaching, scholarship, service, and collegiality mutually agreed upon by the university community and the members of the academic unit.

Criteria for Underachievement

Each faculty member must be evaluated on the basis of achievement in the areas of teaching and professional performance; scholarship and/or creative endeavors directed toward the maintenance and enhancement of lifelong development skills; service - at a minimum - to the unity, college and university; and, collegiality with faculty and students appropriate to maintaining a setting conducive to the free exchange of ideas, expression, and mutual trust.

It is a well-recognized fact that some faculty members will choose, over the course of their university careers and after consultation and full agreement with their faculty, department head, and dean, to place more emphasis and effort in a particular aspect of their professional development. Thus, it may be the choice of a faculty member - in concert with their yearly self development goals and evaluations - to dedicate a majority of their time to achieving innovation and excellence in the instructional mission of the Department. At the same time, others may propose to advance their development - and thus further their contribution to the instructional mission of the Department - by meaningfully contributing to the status of the profession through competitions, pure scholarship and writing, creative endeavors, funded research, professional practice, or professional service. However, it is equally well recognized that career development, which reflects the nature of university life, is multidimensional and that concentration in a particular endeavor must not be used as an excuse for failure to contribute to the overall advancement and growth of the educational unit.

A. Evidence of underachievement in teaching or professional performance may include, but are not always limited to:

1. A failure to supply students with teaching materials that reflect currency in a faculty member's chosen field such as course outlines, examinations, and supplementary materials.
2. A failure to meaningfully respond to a charge on a yearly evaluation clearly pointing to the need for self improvement.
3. Poor performance and/or lack of evidence of effectiveness in the direction of projects or research by undergraduate students; also, lack of participation in class examination activities.
4. Lack of innovations in program implementation and in the development of challenging curriculum courses.
5. Failure in the development and implementation of special projects, resource tools, and/or the use of creative techniques in the performance of classroom duties.
6. Habitual failure to make conscientious preparations or efforts to deliver quality classroom and studio (or special projects) instruction, including normal courtesies and due regard for the special obligation to attend to the instructional needs of students.
7. A consistent record of "poor" classroom evaluations by students, supervisors, and/or senior faculty.
8. An unexplained patter of absenteeism in the classroom or studio.

B. Evidence of underachievement in scholarship and/or creative activities demanded by the normal expectations of university life may include, but are not always limited to:

1. A consistent failure to contribute to the body of professional, scientific, or educational literature in a faculty member's chosen field of endeavor evidenced by a lack of attempt to produce books, papers, research reports, competitions and exhibitions, design experiences, documented classroom innovations, and similar items.
2. A failure to demonstrate professional competence through a lack of effort to remain at the front of the literature and knowledge of a faculty member's chosen field of expertise and teaching.
3. A consistent failure to engage in the discourse of professional thought and ideas as evidenced by a lack of effort to attend and actively participate in special seminars, conferences, and meetings of chosen professional societies.

4. In general, a consistent pattern of lack of professional recognition by peers, including outside agencies, professions, groups, or other individuals in the field.

C. Evidence of underachievement in service demanded by the normal expectations of university life may include, but are not always limited to:

1. A consistent pattern of lack of involvement in the maintenance of the curriculum and normal governing and developmental duties of the university, college, and the unit.
2. A failure to contribute to the normal obligations of faculty as members of a chosen profession - a persistent lack of contact with professional societies and a failure to acquaint students with the obligations of professional discourse and development.

D. Evidence of underachievement in promoting collegiality with faculty and students demanded by the normal expectations of university life may include, but are not always limited to:

1. A pattern of failure by a faculty member to exercise professional integrity in their everyday contacts with other faculty, students, and the public as evidenced by inaccuracy, inability to exercise appropriate restraint, or a willingness to listen to and show respect to others expressing different opinions.
2. Continuing or repeated failure to perform duties or meet responsibilities to the institution as defined in the hiring contract and/or yearly evaluations, and/or meet the normal obligations of courtesy in serving the needs of students.
3. A failure to protect the rights of privacy of students.

E. Signals of Failure and Magnitude of Underachievement Warranting Dismissal

Introduction

The concept of “chronic” underachievement flows from the notion of **persistent failure** to meet the minimum expectations of a profession. Chronic underachievement is not suddenly discovered; rather, it is an assessment of performance that follows fair warning and constructive notice that a faculty member’s actions, in whole or part, constitute a liability for the unit as a whole. Except on an emergency basis, all signs of failure and underachievement are indicated in the yearly evaluation and its supplemental or supporting materials. It is the clear responsibility of the department head, using the criteria supplied in these guidelines, to assess the severity or magnitude of faculty deficiency based on common reason and/or in comparison to faculty peers. Likewise, it is the department head’s responsibility to set forth actions or corrections that would assist the faculty member in mitigating actions or items that are singled out as “poor” or as underachievement. Important concepts leading to the assessment of a “poor” evaluation are:

1. To assess a faculty member’s overall evaluation as “poor” requires that the department head balance the total record of a faculty member’s yearly performance with

the particular actions(s) in question.

2. It must be recognized that certain failures spelled out in the guidelines above, may override faculty strengths. For instance, unexplained and persistent absences from assigned duties, including classes and studios, may well trigger an overall “poor” evaluation regardless of faculty strengths in other endeavors.

3. Several marginal evaluations, especially where a faculty member fails to respond to reasonable requests for correction, may lead to a “poor” evaluation or a series of poor evaluations. Therefore, a “poor” assessment is based less on an action itself than it is on lack of meaningful response to a reasonable request for change.

F. Procedure for Assessing Underachievement by Yearly Faculty Evaluation.

Introduction

In keeping with regular procedures in matters of tenure (see Faculty Handbook sections C112.1 and C112.2), when a tenured faculty member’s overall performance falls below the minimum, acceptable level, as indicated by the annual evaluation, the department or unit head shall indicate so in writing to the faculty member. The department head will also indicate, in writing, a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member. In subsequent annual evaluations, the faculty member will report on activities aimed at improving performance and any evidence of improvement. The names of faculty members who fail to meet minimum standards for the year following the department head’s suggested course of action will be forwarded to the appropriate dean. If the faculty member has two successive evaluation 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 Department Head of the Interior Architecture & Product Design and the Dean of the College of Architecture, Planning, and Design.

- a. Notification - If the Department Head and Dean notifies a faculty member of intent to dismiss for chronic underachievement, following the receipt of two successive or three “poor” evaluation in any five years. If the faculty member challenges the decision, the faculty member may follow the KSU Faculty Handbook for further guidance.

Applicable University Rules - KSU Faculty Handbook

C31.1 Criteria, standards, and guidelines. It is not possible at the University or college levels to establish detailed criteria and standards for annual merit salary adjustments, reappointment, promotion, and tenure. It is the provost’s responsibility to ensure that the faculty of each academic department or unit, in consultation with the department head or unit director and the dean develop and periodically review the criteria, standards, and guidelines. (See A30: Equal Employment Opportunity)

C31.5 Chronic Low Achievement. Chronic failure of a tenured faculty member to perform

his/her professional duties, as defined in the respective unit, shall constitute evidence of “professional incompetence” and warrant consideration for “dismissal for cause” under existing university policies. Each department or unit shall develop a set of guidelines describing the minimum-acceptable level of productivity for all applicable areas of responsibility for the faculty, as well as procedures to handle such cases. In keeping with regular procedures in matters of tenure (C112.1 and C112.2), eligible departmental faculty will have input into any decision on individual cases unless the faculty member requests otherwise. When a tenured faculty member’s overall performance falls below the minimum-acceptable level, as indicated by the annual evaluation, the department or unit head shall indicate so in writing to the faculty member. The department head will also indicate, in writing, a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member. In subsequent annual evaluations, the faculty member will report on activities aimed at improving performance and any evidence of improvement. The names of faculty members who fail to meet minimum standards for the year following the department head’s suggested course of action will be forwarded to the appropriate dean. 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 appropriate dean.

C31.8 To help clarify the relationship between annual evaluations for merit, salary, and promotion and evaluations that could lead to C31.5, the following recommendations are made:

1. When annual evaluations are stated in terms of “expectations”, then the categories should include at least the following: “exceeded expectations,” “met expectations,” “fallen below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity,” and “fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity,” with the “minimum-acceptable levels of productivity” referring to the minimum standards called for in C31.5.
2. The department’s or unit’s guidelines for “minimum-acceptable levels of productivity” should explicitly state the point at which a faculty member’s overall performance can bring C31.5 into play. The guidelines should reflect the common and dictionary meaning of “overall” as “comprehensive,” which may be based on any of the following:
 - a. A certain percentage of total responsibilities
 - b. Number of areas of responsibility
 - c. Weaknesses not balanced by strengths
 - d. Predetermined agreements with the faculty member about the relative importance of different areas of responsibility.

EVALUATION OF:
RANK:

FACULTY RANKINGS:
-Exceeded Expectations
-Met Expectations
-Needs Improvement
-Failed to Meet Expectations

I. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS: (____%)

A. Assignments: Cr hrs Cnt hrs Stnts FTE

B. Department Head Assessment:

1. Teaching Effectiveness:

2. Material Covered:

3. Impact:

II. RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ENDEAVORS: (____%)

A. Description of Project(s):

B. Department Head Assessment:

1. Quality of Endeavor:

2. Potential:

III. PUBLIC AND INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE: (____%)

A. Description:

1. University Service:

2. Professional Service:

3. Community Service:

B. Department Head Assessment:

IV. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY: (____%)

- A. Activity Description:
 - 1. Professional Memberships:
 - 2. Consultation Activities:
- B. Department Head Assessment:

V. SUMMARY COMMENTS:

- A. Department Head:
- B. Faculty Member:

**DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR ARCHITECTURE & PRODUCT DESIGN
TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL OBJECTIVES**

I. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS: (____%)

II. RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ENDEAVORS: (____%)

III. PUBLIC AND INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE: (____%)

IV. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES: (____%)

SATISFACTORY PROGRESS TOWARD PROMOTION AND
CONTINUED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

OVERALL RATING:

% TEACHING
% RESEARCH AND CREATIVE
% PUBLIC AND INSTITUTIONAL
% PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY

The annual written review is used to support recommendations for merit salary increases and to plan future commitments to the department. The report is based on each faculty member's self evaluation and on other data, and it is reviewed by each individual faculty member. A signature is required to acknowledge the opportunity for review and does not necessarily signify agreement.

Faculty Member

Date

Stephen M. Murphy, Department Head

Date

FACULTY EVALUATION

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR ARCHITECTURE & PRODUCT DESIGN KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Faculty Member Evaluated: _____

*This evaluation is to be used in conjunction with the individual faculty member's academic yearly activities report.

The following questions are being provided to you to serve as a guide for your evaluation of the individual member of the faculty of the Department of Interior Architecture & Product Design.

To what degree are you personally familiar with the activity and teaching schedule of the faculty member you are evaluating? (please check one)

Not at all ___ Slightly ___ Adequately ___ Considerably ___

Rating Scale: 1. Above average 2. Average 3. Below average

Questions

1. Does the faculty member contribute to the educational mission of the department, the professional education and development of the students in his/her classes?

1. above average ___ 2. average ___ 3. below average ___

2. Does the faculty member interact with the other members of the department when given an opportunity or as the need arises? Examples of this would be lectures, critiques, final student reviews, discussions, substitute teaching?

1. above average ___ 2. average ___ 3. below average ___

3. Does the faculty member participate in the collegial or "administrative life?" of the department, college, or university through his/her committee assignments, program coordination or directorship, professional associations and when necessary interdepartmental teaching assignments and activities?

1. above average ___ 2. average ___ 3. below average ___

4. Does the faculty member show evidence of professional development through such activities as research, participation in conferences, professional practice and/or community service?

1. above average ___ 2. average ___ 3. below average ___

COMMENTS

Evaluated by: _____