

**DEPARTMENT OF
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE / REGIONAL AND COMMUNITY PLANNING**

**ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on 8/18/06)**

**PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on 8/18/06)**

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**

**Dan Donelin, Department Head
Date signed: 8/22/06**

**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.*

FACULTY EVALUATION - 2005
DEPARTMENT OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE / REGIONAL AND
COMMUNITY PLANNING

Evaluation of:

EXAMPLE

Rank:

Evaluator: Dan W. Donelin, Department Head

INTRODUCTION

The evaluation system utilizes a four-point scale based on expectations for performance within the ranks.

- 1.0 Performance has fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity
- 2.0 Performance has fallen below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity
- 3.0 Performance met expectations
- 4.0 Performance exceeded expectations

Each category in the evaluation, i.e., Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarship and Creative Endeavors, etc., was evaluated using the four-point scale. At the end of each category following the phrase "Department Head Assessment," the evaluation for that category is made by a statement and the point value associated with it. A summary statement assessing the performance within the category follows.

Under "Summary" at the end of the evaluation, an overall assessment is made which is the sum of the points awarded to each category weighted to reflect the percentage assigned by the faculty member and approved by the Department Head to that category.

"Objectives for 2006" and Summary Comments provide specific Department Head and faculty member agreed upon expectations for the 2006 evaluation period. These expectations may also have required adjustments in percentage of effort related to accomplishing these assignments.

Note: It is important to realize that Kansas State University has made an educational commitment to the citizens of Kansas and its students and faculties. This commitment emphasizes:

- teaching excellence;
- research with relevance to the university and the department's mission;
- scholarship of faculty research;
- the inclusion of scholarship into the classroom; and
- the use of updated technology for the delivery of that information.

The directions and expectations stated in the 2005 evaluation will have a direct impact on the evaluation for 2006.

Please schedule an appointment to meet with me sometime between now and 23 February, if you have any questions concerning this evaluation and expectations for 2006. Thank you.

FACULTY EVALUATION - _____
**DEPARTMENT OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE/
 REGIONAL AND COMMUNITY PLANNING**

EVALUATION OF:

RANK:

PART 1. To be completed by faculty member.

I. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS: (%)

Service Code A: Undergraduate Instruction

Service Code B: Graduate Instruction

Service Code C: Academic Advising of Undergraduate Students

Service Code D: Academic Advising of Graduate Students

A. Workload (Assignments:)

Spring, _____ Cr. Hrs. Cont. Hrs. Students FTE

1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				

Fall, _____ Cr. Hrs. Cont. Hrs. Students FTE

1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				

B. Student Advisement and Supervision:

1. Number of undergraduate advisees
2. Names of graduate advisees (Major Professor):
3. Names of graduate advisees (Minor Professor):
4. Other advising responsibilities:

C. Participation in classes outside the department, college or university:

D. Other:

II. SCHOLARSHIP: (_%)

Service Code E: Departmentally Funded Scholarship

Service Code F: Other Funded Scholarship

- A. Title and Brief Description of Proposals Submitted:
- B. Title of Proposals funded:
- C. Publications in Past Year:
- D. Professional Lectures, Workshops, Papers, Panels given:
- E. Participation in Design Competitions:
- F. Attendance to Professional Conferences:

III. PUBLIC AND INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE: (_%)

Service Code G: Public Service

Service Code H: University/Department Service

- A. Description:
 - 1. University Service:
 - a. Committee Assignments (denote leadership roles):
 - b. Faculty Senate, Graduate Council, etc.:
 - c. Other:
 - 2. Professional Service:
 - a. Memberships:
 - b. Leadership roles:
 - c. Promotion of Profession:
 - 3. Community Service:
 - a. Description of Community Service Projects:
 - b. Involvement in Community Organizations:
- B. Honors:

IV. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY: (_%)

Service Code I: Professional Service

Service Code J: Professional Development

- A. Activity Description:
 - 1. Consultation activities:

2. Design or other Awards:

V. ADMINISTRATION: (_%)

Service Code L: Academic Administration

SUMMARY COMMENTS:

A. **Faculty Comments:**

Faculty response related to satisfying “**Teaching and Professional Objectives**” for this evaluation period. (Please reference to last evaluation, department head comments and self-stated objectives.)

PART 2. To be completed by Department Head

EVALUATION

Statements by Department Head: Code areas will be reviewed based upon “Teaching and Professional Objectives for Calendar Year _____.”

- Service Code A: Undergraduate Instruction
- Service Code B: Graduate Instruction
- Service Code C: Academic Advising of Undergraduate Students
- Service Code D: Academic Advising of Graduate Students
- Service Code E: Departmentally Funded Scholarship
- Service Code F: Other Funded Scholarship
- Service Code G: Public Service
- Service Code H: University/Department Service
- Service Code I: Professional Service
- Service Code J: Professional Development
- Service Code L: Academic Administration

Categories	% Weight	Evaluation	Total
A. Undergraduate Instruction B. Graduate Instruction			
C. Academic Advising - Undergraduates D. Academic Advising - Graduates			
E. Departmentally Funded Scholarship F. Other funded Scholarship			
G. Public Service H. University/Departmental Service			
I. Professional Service			
J. Professional Development			
L. Academic Administration			
TOTAL			

Utilizing the evaluation system described in the introduction, evaluation for _____ is _____

PART 3. To be completed by both Faculty Member and Department Head.

**TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL OBJECTIVES
FOR CALENDAR YEAR _____**

Objectives should be described in sufficient detail that their outcomes are measurable.

I. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS: (_%)

Service Code A: Undergraduate Instruction

Service Code B: Graduate Instruction

Service Code C: Academic Advising of Undergraduate Students

Service Code D: Academic Advising of Graduate Students

II. SCHOLARSHIP: (_%)

Service Code E: Departmentally Funded Scholarship

Service Code F: Other Funded Scholarship

III. PUBLIC AND INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE: (_%)

Service Code G: Public Service

Service Code H: University/Department Service

IV. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES: (_%)

Service Code I: Professional Service

Service Code J: Professional Development

V. ADMINISTRATION: (_%)

Service Code L: Academic Administration

PART 4. To be completed by Department Head

DEPARTMENT HEAD'S SUMMARY AND DIRECTIONS FOR _____.

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

Department Head

Date: _____

Date: _____

Department of Landscape Architecture and Regional & Community Planning

Adopted November 30th and December 7th of 2004

Amended 15 April 2005

Amended 12 May 2005

TENURE AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Landscape Architecture/Regional & Community Planning believes its mission as a unit within The College of Architecture, Planning and Design is reflected in the contributions of individual members of its faculty. These contributions fall into three broad areas: (1) teaching students through professional direction in the classroom and studio; (2) research and scholarship that extends the department's academic and professional capabilities; and (3) service and leadership to the college, university, professional societies and the public in general. Collegiality, in the form of responsible college citizenship, courtesy and respect for others, and the stewardship of junior faculty and students is the underpinning of the three broad areas discussed above. The faculty of The Department of Landscape Architecture/Regional & Community Planning adopts by reference the following language from the American Association of University Professors, "On Collegiality as a Criterion for Faculty Evaluation," adopted from [Statements and Reports](http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/collegia.htm) <http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/collegia.htm>

The following descriptions address the venues of achievement recognized by the department. The level or degree of achievement required for promotion to each rank is addressed in sections specific to those topics.

TEACHING AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT

Competency in teaching is a base criterion for tenure. Candidates for tenure are expected to be skilled teachers at all appropriate program levels, using standards agreed upon by the tenured faculty and the national accreditation organizations. Department and college-wide standards include excellence in classroom teaching, in non-classroom settings, in academic and professional standards, in professional relations with students, and in the scholarship of teaching.

While faculty tend to focus on a specialization most often formed from their academic and professional backgrounds and interest, they must be conversant with the broad

content of the landscape architecture and planning professions and be able to make reinforcing connections between their subject courses and other subject offerings. Teaching assignments often shift within a person's general area of interest and expertise. This may be especially true in planning because of the need for a relatively small number of faculty to cover the breadth of the profession. Thus, both versatility and specialization are to be valued along with a capacity for cooperation and collegiality in sustaining an effective ensemble of teachers. Versatility demands both an ability to cover more than one subject area and broad instructional range, i.e. the ability to teach beginning, advanced, undergraduate and graduate classes and to participate as major professors and members of thesis committees.

Departmental Review of Teaching and Student Activity

The indicators of achievement for teaching, not in any priority ranking, are listed below. For teaching, progression and growth is more important than the number of indicators engaged. Whatever indicators are presented, two points are central to review of faculty performance:

1. Because teaching occurs in many ways and in many settings, its evaluation should encompass the full range of a faculty member's activities.
2. Teaching is more than the instruction of students. Competency in teaching must also include a faculty member's integrity, treatment of student and care for their careers, and the critical need for collegiality that creates an atmosphere conducive to cooperative learning.

To document skill in teaching a faculty member may present the following evidence:

Evaluations:

- External and internal peer evaluations including all departmental tenured faculty members (to be arranged between the faculty member and the department chair)
- Standardized, written teaching evaluations (required by the university)
- Student letters and statements

Evidence of teaching activities:

- Video taped 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

Honors and awards:

- Honors, awards, grants, or mentions for teaching, studio, or class based projects

Professional development activities:

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

And any other evidence illustrating a faculty member's particular skills and strengths in pedagogy and classroom related activities.

RESEARCH & SCHOLARSHIP: SCHOLARLY PUBLICATION, CREATIVE, PROFESSIONAL AND ARTISTIC ACHIEVEMENT

Landscape architects and community planners conceive and undertake research and scholarship in a variety of ways. Research is a directed form of scholarship involving assembly, documentation, and dissemination of information. Research efforts may be classified as either extra mural within a competitive field for funding, or as non-competitive that eventually leads to scholarly publication or presentation. Within both fields, contributions that advance the discipline in the form of creative activities and professional growth are characterized as a form of scholarship. Creative activities and professional growth are peer judged endeavors that receive recognition external to the university.

The central question is whether a faculty member documents evidence of continued and qualitative intellectual, professional and artistic growth in ways appropriate to their professional interests, expertise and departmental role, and whether products of this growth are being communicated to appropriate audiences outside the department. Due to the professional nature of the field, landscape architecture and community planning faculty may be less highly specialized than in the arts and sciences, but are expected to make significant contributions to the advancement of some area(s) of landscape architecture/community planning inquiry or expertise. The important questions are:

1. To what extent is the work recognized in the field?
2. To what extent has it had or is expected to have an impact on others in the field?
3. To what extent is it seen by peer reviewers as substantive and significant?

The peer review of landscape architecture and community planning research, scholarly, professional and creative work requires a process specific to the nature and mix of the faculty member's work. It should be noted that currently there are fewer scholarly journals that frequently publish landscape architecture articles than there are community planning and related journals. At the same time, more of a demand exists for both minor and major textbooks in landscape architecture than in community planning. Publication in both disciplines often takes the form of research reports, agency publications, and monographs that generally require peer review as a condition of agency support.

Although the nature of the two disciplines is similar, expectations of the tenure track faculty assigned to each may be somewhat different. The typical entering faculty

member in landscape architecture will hold either a bachelor's or master's of landscape architecture or a related master's degree. The typical entering faculty member in planning will have a doctorate, or be in the process of finalizing a dissertation, from an accredited planning program, a professional master's degree (Master of Urban or Community Planning), along with an undergraduate degree. There are exceptions in both fields where some faculty in landscape architecture will have dual master degrees, or a doctorate in landscape architecture or an allied field. Most planning and some landscape architecture faculty members will hold the teaching/research doctorate without or in addition to a professional masters degree. There is a greater expectation for faculty holding the doctorate to engage in traditional scholarly publication

Department review of research and scholarship

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

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

Professional publications and products:

- Desktop publications intended for dissemination at the local or regional level
- Peer- reviewed grants, commissions, plans, 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

Referred publications:

- Peer reviewed, single or multiple authored publication(s) in scholarly and/or professional journals

Evidence of creative endeavors:

- A portfolio of professional projects and studies demonstrating distinctive practice evaluated by qualified outside evaluators
- Development of software, digital laboratories and other substantial contributions to the rapid advancement of student and faculty computer use
- Other creative works and endeavors

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 of designs, drawings and models
- Professional awards, honors, and mentions

Professional development activities:

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

SERVICE AND LEADERSHIP

Service is an important component in a faculty member's responsibilities as part of the university community. All faculty members have a responsibility to play a role in university life, college and departmental governance, and professional service. 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.

The service activities of the landscape architecture and community planning faculty are often closely related to professional growth, scholarship and teaching. Faculty members actively engage in work to aid efforts to solve environmental problems in Kansas and surrounding states through pro bono consultations, and community based projects. Since faculty members at Kansas State University play a strong role in department governance and program development, it is especially important in evaluations to give appropriate consideration to particular faculty assignments in this area.

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 indicators of achievement for service are listed below and they are not in any priority ranking. Significant achievement is more important than the number of indicators engaged.

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 based organizations

Professional society service and leadership:

- Active membership in professional organizations, e.g., ASLA, APA
- Leadership in professional organizations related to the practice of the respective disciplines
- Leadership in scholarly societies and teaching organizations in the respective fields
- 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, e.g., community or county planning commission
- Service to state or regional organizations which directly reflect professional expertise; e.g., state boards, regional review commissions, etc.
- Consultations with public and private groups not leading to publications or design products
- Direction of class projects that benefit communities while demonstrating a faculty member's expertise in management and professional judgment

THE TENURE PROCESS

Initial Information

Two things related to the tenure and promotion process will be part of the initial employment of all faculty: the department head will provide a copy of this document to all candidates under serious consideration and discuss the anticipated instructional, scholarship and service responsibilities the candidate will be expected to fulfill.

If the candidate accepts the position with the department, this briefing will be put in writing and will become part of the basis for annual evaluation and, later, in the tenure and promotion review. It is only reasonable that on occasion, shifts in assignments may take place and faculty may be asked to pursue endeavors that take them away from their research, scholarly or creative work in favor of a more immediate need in the department or one of its programs. In such a case, the shift in assignment and the resulting impact on the faculty member's ability to pursue their special interest should be noted by the faculty member and acknowledged by the department head at the time of the next annual review.

Progress toward Tenure and Promotion

Not only is it imperative that all faculty members have a clear understanding of the expectations for their performance as they move toward tenure and promotion, but it is equally important that they understand the process to attain tenure and promotion in rank. The following steps address procedures at the departmental level designed to ensure that candidates for tenure and promotions are kept advised of their progress

toward those goals. These processes do not address university or year to year changes in the University Handbook

Mentoring

The department head, in consultation with senior and new faculty, will establish a mentoring partnership between a senior faculty and a new employee with an expectation that the mentor will provide appropriate assistance in acclimating the new faculty to processes and procedures within the department and/or university. The mentor serves as an advisor to the new faculty member and should be knowledgeable of the faculty's progress toward tenure and advancement in rank. The mentor/mentoree relationship will be addressed in the annual evaluation of each and the department head may appoint a different mentor at the request of either party.

Mid-Tenure Review

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. A positive mid-probationary review does not insure that tenure will be granted in the future nor does a negative review mean that tenure will be denied.

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 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 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.

C92.3 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 &

Promotion Committee. The dean will provide a letter of assessment to the candidate that includes a summary of recommendations from the college advisory committee.

At Time of Tenure and Promotion

A faculty member undergoing review for tenure and promotion to associate professor, or from associate to professor, must 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 compilation of representative 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.

[C153.1](#) of the University Handbook is the evaluation procedure to be followed by the college advisory committee. The dean will provide a letter of assessment to the candidate that includes a summary of recommendations from the college advisory committee.

Portfolio Content, Procedure and Responsible Party

The candidate's portfolio is to be organized following the university Promotion and Tenure Transmittal documentation format found at <http://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/forms/promotio.html>. Specific departmental requirements are noted in the outline below in italics:

I. Cover Sheet

- A. Recommendation by the Dean (to be completed by the Dean)
- B. Recommendation by the Department Head (to be completed 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 why a candidate feels he/she should be promoted/tenured)
- B. Statement of Five-Year Goals

IV. Instructional Contribution

- A. Statement of activities (classes taught, student advisement, etc.)
- B. Evidence of instructional quality (student ratings, peer evaluations, evaluation of advisement, etc.)
- C. Other evidence of scholarship and creativity that promote excellence in instruction (multimedia presentations, computer-aided instruction, papers published or presented)

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. Cooperative Extension

VIII. External Letters of Evaluation

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.

IX. Other Summary Information Considered Pertinent by the College

X. Supporting Documents

- A. Teaching Evaluations (last three years)
For candidates seeking tenure and promotion to associate professor, copies of standardized teaching evaluations for all semesters at Kansas State must be included. 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
Any letters by members of the LArch/RCP faculty commenting on the qualifications and readiness of the candidate for tenure and/or promotion. Associate and full professors evaluate candidates for associate professor and full professors evaluate candidates for full professor – facilitated by the department head or a designated faculty member;
- F. Detailed Curriculum Vitae

For Consideration of Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor with Indefinite Tenure

The granting of tenure and promotion to associate professor is recognized as an indication of a career commitment on the part of the university to an individual faculty member. According to the [University Handbook](#) C100:

There can be no simple list of accomplishments that, when achieved, guarantee that a faculty member will obtain tenure. Instead, tenure is granted. This action, taken by the Kansas Board of Regents, is based on

the assessment of the tenured faculty of the university that a candidate has made outstanding contributions in appropriate academic endeavors. By granting tenure only to such individuals, the continued excellence of the university is ensured.

Tenure and promotion to associate professor, therefore, should be based upon clear evidence of the potential for sustained contribution and leadership over a candidate's career. There should be evidence of continuous intellectual inquiry and professional development of sufficient quality to provide a basis of confidence in future growth and performance. Professional achievement(s) should also be considered significant, especially when related to professional growth, scholarship and influence. C140 of the [University Handbook](#) states:

"C140 General Principles. [The] Successful candidates for promotion will demonstrate superior professional accomplishment and excellence in the performance of their assigned duties. The assessment of a faculty member's performance upon which a recommendation regarding promotion will be based must reflect the professional expectations conveyed during annual evaluations."

Evidence of achievement for promotion to associate professor with indefinite tenure will vary, depending upon a faculty member's professional interests and role in the department. There are distinct expectations for faculty members engaged in traditional academic endeavors and for those focused on professional practice related practical and integrative problem solving. However, all landscape architecture and regional & community faculty are expected to engage in written scholarship and/or creative work. The expectations addressed in a candidate's initial hiring and in subsequent annual evaluations will serve as the foundation for this review.

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 broad 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 landscape architecture or regional & community planning, such as research, scholarship, professional practice, professional service and outreach. Criteria for promotion include both those achievements listed earlier and the following indicators:

Evaluations:

- Recognition as a reputed scholar in evaluations by other senior faculty and professionals in the field
- Recognition among designers, professionals or public officials as a leading innovator

Publications and products:

- 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 landscape architects and planners 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
- Solicitations to consult or lead in solving major (i.e., important and/or high-profile) planning, design and policy problems

Presentations:

- Invited plenary speeches to conferences
- Invited testimony before major elected officials' committees

Honors and awards:

- Awards from professional, scholarly and government organizations
- Design and planning awards of disciplines especially at a national level
- High placement in major design competitions; honors, awards, and mentions from major design competitions
- Service on juries for major design, professional, or research award competitions
- University and national recognition awards for teaching, service, achievement, scholarship or teaching.

Service:

- Election to high office in professional and scholarly organizations and demonstrated evidence of substantial contributions

NOTES AND REFERENCES

Adoption By Reference

"Few if any responsible faculty members would deny that collegiality, in the sense of collaboration and constructive cooperation identifies important aspects of a faculty member's overall performance. A faculty member may legitimately be called upon to participate in the development of curricula and standards for the evaluation of teaching, as well as in peer review of the teaching of colleagues. Much research, depending on the nature of the particular discipline, is by its nature collaborative and requires teamwork as well as the ability to engage in independent investigation. And committee service of a more general description, relating to the life of the institution as a whole, is a logical outgrowth of the Association's view that a faculty member is an "officer" of the college or university in which he or she fulfills professional duties.¹

Understood in this way, collegiality is not a distinct capacity to be assessed independently of the traditional triumvirate of scholarship, teaching, and service. It is rather a quality whose value is expressed in the successful execution of these three functions. Evaluation in these three areas will encompass the contributions that the virtue of collegiality may pertinently add to a faculty member's career."

1. American Association of University Professors, "On Collegiality as a Criterion for Faculty Evaluation," adopted from Statements and Reports, <http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/collegia.htm>

**PROCESS FOR REAPPOINTMENT: FACULTY
ON
PROBATIONARY APPOINTMENTS
FOR
THE DEPARTMENT OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE/REGIONAL
AND COMMUNITY PLANNING**

Adopted 11 May 2006

Effective 11 May 2006

C50.1 Definition. Faculty members on probationary appointments are evaluated annually to determine whether or not they will be reappointed for another year. Faculty members must be explicitly informed in writing of a decision not to renew their appointments in accordance with The Standards of Notice of Non-Reappointment. (See [Appendix A](#).) These annual evaluations also serve as an opportunity to provide feedback to a faculty member on probationary appointment about his or her performance in comparison to the department's criteria and standards for tenure.

C52 Candidate's responsibilities. The candidate compiles and submits documentation of his or her professional accomplishments in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the department.

C53.1 Departmental procedures. It is the responsibility of the department chair/head to make the candidate's reappointment file available to all tenured faculty members in the department and other eligible faculty as determined by departmental policy. 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 (See [C53.2](#)). As part of this process, the department chair/head and the 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 chair/head, request the candidate meet with the eligible faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate.

C53.3 The department chair/head will forward a written recommendation and accompanying explanations to the dean, along with the candidate's complete file, the majority recommendation and unedited written comments of each of the department's tenured faculty members. The department chair/head will also meet with the candidate to discuss the separate issue of the candidate's progress toward tenure. The department chair/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. (See [C35](#) regarding confidentiality of peer evaluations.)

C54 College procedures. 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.

C55 University procedures. Final authority in resolving conflicting opinions regarding reappointment is delegated to the provost.

C56 Notification of candidates. Candidates are informed of the college's recommendation prior to the time that the file and recommendations are forwarded to the provost.

The above information has been taken from the Kansas State [University Handbook, 2005-2006](#)

LA/RCP Departmental Requirements for submittal of an Academic Portfolio

See C52 Candidate's responsibilities.

Non Tenured faculty within the Department of Landscape Architecture/Regional and Community Planning on Probationary Appointments will be required:

- To develop and submit their Academic Portfolio in a timely manner to the department head following Kansas State University's calendar for Promotion and Tenure submittals; and
- The Academic Portfolio will include but is not limited to the following materials:

I. Statement by Candidate

- A. Candidate's statement of accomplishments (One page summary)
- B. Statement of five-year goals (One page summary)

II. Instructional Contribution

- A. Statement of activities (classes taught, student advisement, thesis supervision, etc.) (Two page summary)
- B. Evidence of instructional quality (student ratings, peer evaluations, evaluation of advisement, etc.) (One page summary) University-wide (standardized) student evaluations are a necessary, but not sufficient description of a faculty member's progress toward tenure and promotion. It is an obligation of the individual faculty member to supply alternative evidence of teaching effectiveness in the Academic Portfolio.
- C. Listing of scholarship and creativity that promote excellence in instruction (multimedia presentations, computer-aided instruction, papers published or presented) (Two page summary)

III. Research and Other Creative Endeavors

- A. Listing of research publications and creative achievements (One page summary)
- B. List of grants and contracts submitted as proposals with notation of funding received (if any) (One page summary)

IV. Service Contributions (One page summary)

V. Supporting Documents

- A. Teaching Evaluations (last three years for all courses)
- B. Reprints and/or Manuscripts
- C. Other Supporting Materials
- D. Detailed Curriculum Vitae

Non tenured faculty on a Probationary Appointment will maintain all previous submittals of their Academic Portfolio and update their information for annual review.

Non Tenured faculty on a Probationary Appointment should familiarize themselves with the department's Tenure and Promotion Guidelines as Amended 12 May 2005

As described in the Faculty Handbook C53.1, *“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. As part of this process, the department chair/head and the 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.”* Kansas State University Handbook, 2005-2006

Dan W. Donelin
Department Head
LA/RCP

Dennis L. Law
Dean
College of Architecture, Planning & Design

May 15, 2006

GUIDELINES FOR MINIMUM YEARLY EXPECTATIONS OF REVIEW FOR TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS

Adopted 12 May 1997
Readopted 11 May 2006

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 members as teachers and scholars include maintenance of competence in their field of specialization and the 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 “fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity” is an indication 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 will be evaluated on the basis of achievement in the areas of teaching and professional performance; scholarship, creative endeavors, advising and/or administration directed toward the maintenance and enhancement of lifelong development skills; service - at a minimum - to the unit, 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.

Annual faculty evaluations will be based upon the yearly and long-term objectives of the faculty member, as agreed to by the department head and faculty member. It is also expected faculty may, in agreement with the department head, restate their objectives during an evaluation period, to meet unforeseen opportunities or circumstances.

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 and department head, 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 College. At the same time, others may propose to advance their development - and thus further their contribution to the instructional mission of the College - through evidence of a body of work contributing to the profession, the university, college and department missions. Evidence can be exhibited through competitions, scholarship and writing, preparing research proposals, funded research, or professional work or 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.

1. Evidence of underachievement in teaching or professional performance should include, but is not always limited to:

- i. 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.
- ii. A failure to meaningfully respond to a charge on a yearly evaluation clearly pointing to the need for self improvement.
- iii. Poor performance and/or lack of evidence of effectiveness in the direction of projects or research of undergraduate and graduate students; also, lack of willingness to participate in unit examination activities, such as written and oral examinations for graduate degree candidates and critique of undergraduate projects.
- iv. Lack of innovations in program implementation and in the development of challenging curriculum courses.
- v. Failure in the development and implementation of special projects, resource tools, and/or the use of creative techniques in the performance of classroom duties.
- vi. 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.
- vii. An unexplained pattern of absenteeism in the classroom or studio.

Note: TEVAL and other measures of classroom evaluations, including peer teaching observation, faculty developed questionnaires and syllabus reviews, as agreed to by a faculty member and the department head, will be used to support instructional achievements and teaching effectiveness.

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

- i. A consistent failure to contribute to the body of professional, scientific, or educational literature in a faculty member's chosen field of endeavor, as evidenced by a lack of attempt to produce books, papers, research reports, competitions and exhibitions, professional design experiences, documented classroom innovations, or other similar items that advance the state of either professions.
- ii. A failure to demonstrate professional competence through a lack of effort to remain current in the literature and knowledge of a faculty member's chosen field of expertise and teaching.
- iii. 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 continuing education, special seminars, conferences, and meetings of chosen professional societies.

3. Evidence of underachievement in service demanded by the normal expectations of university life should include, but is not always limited to:

- i. 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.
- ii. A failure to interact with or contribute to the profession or discipline and a failure to acquaint students with the obligations of professional discourse and development.

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

- i. 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.
- ii. Continuing or repeated failure to perform duties or meet responsibilities to the institution as defined in the hiring contract and/or yearly objectives, and/or to meet the normal obligations of courtesy in servicing the needs of students.
- iii. A failure to protect the rights of privacy of students and faculty.

5. 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 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 “fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity” or as underachievement. Important concepts leading to the assessment of a “fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity” evaluation are:

- i. To assess a faculty member’s overall evaluation as “fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity” requires that the department head balance the total record of a faculty member’s yearly performance with the particular action(s) in question.

ii. 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 “fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity” evaluation regardless of faculty strengths in other endeavors.

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

6. Procedure for Assessing Underachievement by Yearly Faculty Evaluations.

Introduction

In keeping with regular procedures in matters of tenure (see Faculty Handbook sections C31.5, C31.7 and C31.8) 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 Dean of the College of Architecture, Planning and Design. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations following the initial evaluation that indicated “fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity” 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 of the College of Architecture, Planning and Design.

i. Notification: The dean will notify a faculty member of intent to dismiss for chronic underachievement, following the receipt of three successive or three “fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity” evaluations in any five years.

ii. Burden of Proof and Procedure: The burden is on the College Dean and Department Head to show clear and convincing evidence warranting dismissal. Evidence shall include, but is not limited to, yearly departmental evaluations, supporting course materials and other material objects used in classroom or studio instruction, and testimony of students and faculty. At the charged faculty member's request, the dean or department head will present evidence warranting dismissal to eligible departmental faculty (those faculty at the same rank and above). Each eligible departmental faculty may then provide written and confidential input to the dean or department head for their consideration.

iii. Administrative Decision: The dean or department head, acting through the dean, shall decide the effective date of termination. In cases of professional incompetence or willful neglect of duty, the effective date of termination shall not be less than one year from the date of notification. In cases of gross personal or professional misconduct, the effective date of termination may coincide with the final decision of the General Faculty Grievance Board.

iv. Rights of the Faculty Member: The faculty member has a right to present a defense against the specified causes for his/her termination as described in Appendix G, General Faculty Grievance Board, KSU Faculty Handbook, 1996.

Credits

1. Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors, **Supplemental to the Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure**, 1990.
2. Kansas State University, **Minutes of the Provost's Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure and Promotion**, 1989.
3. Keller, John W and Cornelia Flora, **Draft Statement on Professional Incompetence to the Faculty Affairs Committee on the University Faculty Senate**, January 1987.
4. Kansas State University Faculty Senate, **Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure and Promotion Review**, Unpublished Recommendations, 1986 [John Keller, John Eck, and Orma Linford].
5. **Promotion and Tenure Review Guidelines**, American Association of Higher Education, unpublished presentation at the Conference of the Association of Higher Education, Atlanta, Georgia - 1996.
6. **Promotion and Tenure Review Guidelines**, Oregon State University - published by Oregon State University and based on documents submitted to Oregon State University as a peer institution by the Kansas State University Provost Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion and Tenure, 1989.
7. **Faculty Handbook**, The University of Tulsa, 1995.

Applicable University Rules - 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 or 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:

a) 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.

b) 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:

1. A certain percentage of total responsibilities
2. Number of areas of responsibility
3. Weaknesses not balanced by strengths
4. Predetermined agreements with the faculty member about the relative importance of different areas of responsibility.

Professorial Performance Award Process

Department of Landscape Architecture/Regional & Community Planning

Adopted: 6 April 2006

The faculty handbook policy for the Professional Performance Award states:

*C49.2 Development and Revisions of the Professorial Performance Award Process. Departments develop their own mechanisms for review as they have for annual merit evaluation. As is the case in merit review, it may be that responsibility for the evaluation of materials involves personnel of any rank or several ranks. **Each department will also specify criteria according to which candidates qualify for the award according, to its own disciplinary standards of excellence.** Nonetheless, all such 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 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.*

C49.4 Recommendations for the Professorial Performance Award will follow the timeline associated with the annual evaluation review outlined in the University Handbook.

Department's Nomination Criteria for the Professorial Performance Award

To apply for the Professorial Performance Award, a candidate must provide evidence of leadership and broad reputation in one or more areas of the candidate's field. The supporting materials will reflect a faculty member's acknowledged excellence and achievements significant to landscape architecture or regional & community planning, such as research, scholarship, professional practice, professional service and outreach. Criteria for the Professorial Performance Award will be based upon the applicant's demonstrated performance over the previous six years. Materials to be provided for evaluation will come from the following areas of productivity.

Evaluations:

- Recognition as a reputed scholar in evaluations by other senior faculty and professionals in the field
- Recognition among designers, professionals or public officials as a leading innovator
- Teaching evaluation for classes taught

Publications and Products:

- 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 landscape architects and planners 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
- Solicitations to consult or lead in solving major (i.e., important and/or high-profile) planning, design and policy problems

Presentations:

- Invited plenary speeches to conferences
- Invited papers/presentations at professional conferences
- Preparation of training sessions for continuing education of professionals
- Invited testimony before major elected officials' committees

Honors and Awards:

- Awards from professional, scholarly and government organizations
- Design and planning awards of disciplines, especially at a national level
- High placement in major design competitions, honors, awards, and mentions from major design competitions
- Service on juries for major design, professional, or research award competitions
- University and national recognition awards for teaching, service, achievement, scholarship or teaching.

Service:

- Election to high office in professional and scholarly organizations and demonstrated evidence of substantial contributions

Applicants for the Professorial Performance Award will submit their application no later than the first Monday in September of that year.

Materials shall be presented in the following order.

I. Description of Responsibilities during the Six Year-Period

- A. One-page summary

II. Statement by Candidate

- A. Candidate's statement of accomplishments (one-page summary of why a candidate feels he/she should be recognized for a Professorial Performance Award)

III. Instructional Contribution

- A. Statement of instructional goals and achievements (classes taught, student advisement, etc.) One-page summary
- B. Evidence of instructional quality (student ratings, peer evaluations, evaluation of advisement, etc.) Appendix
- C. Other evidence of scholarship and creativity that promote excellence in instruction (multimedia presentations, computer-aided instruction, papers published or presented) Appendix

IV. Research and Other Creative Endeavors

- A. One-page statement
- B. Listing of research publications and creative achievements
- C. List of grants and contracts

V. Service Contributions

- A. One-page summary

VI. External Letters of Evaluation from Three Advocates

- A. No more than three letters
- B. Resume must be provided for each of the three advocates

VII. Supporting Documents

- A. Teaching Evaluations (last three years)
- B. Reprints and/or Manuscripts
- C. Other Materials
- D. Detailed Curriculum Vitae

Upon receipt of the Candidate's information, the department head will:

- A. Make the Candidates application 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. Upon the department head's review of the Candidates application and the recommendations from the department's faculty at the rank of professor 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. (C49.6)

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. (C49.7)*

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. (C49.8)

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 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. (C49.9)

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. (C49.10)

If the provost does not agree with recommendations 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. (C49.11)

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. (C49.12)

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. (C49.13)

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. (C49.14)

D: Professorial Performance Award Process