

Architectural Engineering & Construction Science

Department

College of Engineering

College

**Policy Statement Concerning:**

**Annual Evaluations  
(including Professorial Performance Award Criteria and  
Standards and Chronic Low Achievement Standards)**


Approved by Faculty Vote on (4/15/2014)

**Promotion, Tenure, Mid-Tenure Review and Reappointment**


Approved by Faculty Vote on (4/15/2014)

**Post-Tenure Review**

Approved by Faculty Vote on (4/15/2014)

  
Department Head's Signature

5/12/14  
Date

  
Dean's Signature

5/13/2014  
Date

  
Provost's Signature

16 May 14  
Date

For Office of Academic Services Use Only

Date Posted to Web: \_\_\_\_\_

## **ARCHITECTURAL ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION SCIENCE**

**ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES**  
**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 4/15/2014)**

**PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**  
**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 4/15/2014)**

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES \*(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **4/2019**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES\*: **3/2019**

**Raphael Yunk, Department Head**  
**Date signed: 5/12/2014**

**Gary Clark, Interim Dean**  
**Date signed: 6/4/2013**

**April C. Mason, Provost and Senior Vice President**  
**Date signed: 5/16/2014**

*\*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.*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Department Mission and Vision Statements

#### 1.0 Introduction

#### 2.0 Faculty Evaluation ([See University Handbook C30-C39](#))

##### 2.1 Faculty Evaluation System

##### 2.2 Annual Review Timelines

##### 2.3 Activity Plans

##### 2.4 Material to Be Submitted for Annual Evaluation

##### 2.5 Summary of Activities

##### 2.6 Department Head Evaluation

##### 2.7 Faculty Evaluation Criteria

##### 2.8 Responsibilities and Standards

##### 2.9 Annual Merit Salary Adjustments ([See UHB C40-C48.3](#))

#### 3.0 Criteria and Procedures for Annual Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

##### 3.1 Annual Reappointment of Non-Tenured Faculty Members ([See UHB C50.1-C66](#))

##### 3.2 Mid-Probationary Review of Tenure-Track Faculty Members ([See UHB C92.1-C93](#))

##### 3.3 Promotion ([See UHB C120-C156.2](#)) and Tenure ([See UHB C70-C116.2](#))

#### 4.0 Chronic Low Achievement Policy ([See UHB C31.1-C31.8](#))

##### 4.1 General Statement

##### 4.2 Minimum Acceptable Level of Productivity

##### 4.3 Chronic Low Achievement

#### 5.0 Professorial Performance Award ([See UHB C49.1- C49.14](#))

##### 5.1 Criteria

##### 5.2 Timeline and Procedures

#### 6.0 Departmental Guidelines, Policies, and Expectations

##### 6.1 Department Head Responsibilities

##### 6.2 Attendance and Office Hours

##### 6.3 Faculty Qualifications and Degree Requirements

##### 6.4 Conflict Resolution

##### 6.5 Mentoring

##### 6.6 Consulting

#### 7.0 Post-Tenure Review

##### 7.1 Departmental Procedures

##### Attachment A - Activity Plan

##### Attachment B - Summary of Activities

##### Attachment C - Annual Evaluation

##### Attachment D - Reappointment Evaluation Form

##### Attachment E – Post-Tenure Review Form

## DEPARTMENTAL DOCUMENTS

Department of Architectural Engineering and Construction Science  
College of Engineering, Kansas State University

### MISSION STATEMENT

Our mission is to provide a learning environment of value to students and of benefit to industry, the academic community, and society as a whole. We are committed to focusing individual attention and resources to achieve the highest standard of excellence in undergraduate education for Architectural Engineers and Constructors. We strive to prepare our students for successful life long careers and to provide leadership in the industry with our educational programs. We promote excellence in faculty and student performance related to instruction, research, and service.

### VISION STATEMENT

The Kansas State University Department of Architectural Engineering and Construction Science will be a recognized leader in providing a quality education to prepare students for successful careers in their respective professions.

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Evaluation of faculty performance and vitality is critical to institutional growth and development. The purposes of this evaluation are to assure that each faculty member contributes to the accomplishment of departmental goals and objectives; to guide faculty development; and to provide a sound basis for personnel decisions related to reappointment, tenure, promotion, and annual merit adjustments.

Each faculty member is unique and contributes a special set of strengths and abilities to the department. This document respects this uniqueness, and establishes a set of guidelines and standards that are flexible; yet offer enough rigors to allow a framework for guiding and evaluating abilities, accomplishments, responsibilities, and assignments of each member. Additionally, it is important to recognize that evaluation of faculty performance is complex and multi-dimensional. Within this environment, adequate evaluation requires a degree of professional judgment.

The department is committed to and structured with the express purpose of integrating two distinct, yet related degrees, 1) Architectural Engineering, and 2) Construction Science and Management, and further committed to the principle that building design and construction is enhanced through an overlapping knowledge of these two areas. These include the process and application of engineering design, knowledge of management procedures and operations used in the construction industry, and relevant professional practices associated with these uniquely different but intertwined professions.

We expect each faculty member to contribute to the achievement of the department's goals and objectives as reflected in our mission and vision statements. We realize that we cannot accomplish this without a faculty that is committed wholeheartedly to the education of our students. The quality and reputation of our programs depends on the quality and reputation of our faculty.

## 2.0 FACULTY EVALUATION ([See University Handbook C30-C39](#))

The performance of every faculty member is evaluated annually for the following purposes:

- Account for the member's activities
- Assure that each member's activities contribute to the departmental missions
- Develop a fair means to distribute merit salary increases
- Provide feedback to guide an individual's development and improvement efforts
- Provide a basis for decisions concerning reappointment, promotion, and tenure
- Assure that each member meets minimum performance expectations

### 2.1 FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEM

The period covered by the annual evaluation is the calendar year. The basis for the annual evaluation is the member's performance during the previous calendar year. The evaluation process consists of three sequential steps:

1. Coordinated planning of activities, responsibilities, goals, and objectives (at the beginning of the year - see Attachment A - Activity Plan)
2. Documentation of professional accomplishments (at the end of the year - see Attachment B - Summary of Activities)
3. The department head evaluation (at the end of the year - see Attachment C - Annual Evaluation).

Each annual evaluation considers the faculty member's contributions in teaching and advising, scholarly and creative endeavor and research, and service and outreach in proportion to the agreed workload allocation percentage in each area during the nine month contract.

Per the University Handbook, performance reviews of faculty members include consideration of overall contribution or detriment to the department/unit, which includes personal conduct affecting the workplace. Faculty are expected to have cooperative interactions with colleagues, show civility and respect to others with whom they work and interact, show respect for the opinions of others in the exchange of ideas, and demonstrate a willingness to follow appropriate directives from supervisors. Evaluations will therefore consider the faculty member's contributions in support of departmental responsibilities, standards, guidelines, policies, and expectations as described within this document and the University Handbook.

At the beginning of each calendar year, the department head will meet individually with each faculty member. Accomplishments will be reviewed and upcoming assignments will be discussed and determined. Activities, responsibilities, goals, and objectives will be reviewed and determined based on the faculty member's skills, specialization(s), and versatility and on that individual's part in meeting the needs of the department, college, and university. Faculty assignments are subject to modification should unanticipated needs or unusual circumstances occur.

Each faculty member's record may involve a different proportion of teaching and advising, scholarly and creative endeavor and research, and service and outreach as determined by the faculty member and the department head. At least some effort in all three areas is encouraged since they relate to the long-term strength of the department, college and university. Accordingly, each faculty member

submits a summary of activities for the previous year and an activity plan for the upcoming year. The process timeline and required information and documents to be submitted are detailed below.

## 2.2 ANNUAL REVIEW TIMELINES

- Mid-January: Each faculty member submits a Summary of Activities (See Attachment B), Student Classroom Evaluation Summaries (K-State standardized instruments for each class taught), and Advising Reports for the previous calendar year along with an Activity Plan (See Attachment A) for the upcoming year.
- Between mid-January and the first week of March: the following tasks are accomplished according to specific time lines determined by the department and college:
  - a) The department head completes evaluations for each faculty member and reviews a written copy with the faculty member.
  - b) The faculty member signs and returns the department head's evaluation or further discusses his or her evaluation with the department head. The department head may change the evaluation based on the discussion with the faculty member. The faculty member must sign the evaluation document to acknowledge receipt.
  - c) Within seven working days after the review and discussion, faculty or unclassified professionals have the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations which will only then be forwarded to the next administrative level.
  - d) The department head forwards evaluation materials and required documentation to the Dean of Engineering.

Details of subsequent processes may be found in the department head manual at: <http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/depthead/manual/unclass/unclass.html>.

## 2.3 ACTIVITY PLANS

Individual and institutional goals should be aligned to promote faculty growth and institutional accomplishment. Each faculty member will meet annually with the department head to jointly establish personal goals and objectives in teaching and advising, scholarly and creative endeavors and research, and service and outreach for the upcoming evaluation period and to discuss their relative importance within the context of the department's goals. This meeting will take place at the same time as the annual evaluation review. Each faculty member provides these materials annually in the Activity Plan document (See Attachment A).

In the Activity Plan, each faculty member will outline how he or she expects to spend his or her time during the coming year. Time may be divided between the areas of teaching and advising, scholarly and creative endeavor and research, service and outreach as jointly defined by the faculty member and department head. The percentage allocation for each area is to be documented. The relative emphasis placed on each area may vary from year to year and over the course of the person's career.

A primary component of the annual evaluation and documents is the workload allocation percentages. At the beginning of each year, an estimated workload allocation is given by each faculty member along with the activity plans. Because undergraduate education is the primary focus of the department, and due to available resources, a typical allocation for a tenured or tenure-track appointment is 70% to 80% teaching and advising, 10% to 20% scholarly and creative endeavors and research, and 5% to 10% service and outreach. The workload allocation must add up to 100%.

Work that entails external or additional compensation, such as consulting, overload teaching or administrative assignments, teaching summer courses, funded summer projects, or performing summer advising does not contribute to the percentage allocation in an area. Results from such activities may be reported on the annual and promotion and tenure review documents.

The department head will review the activity plan and validate the document and discuss it with the faculty member. The department head is responsible for ensuring that workload allocations are assigned and distributed across the faculty in a fair and reasonable manner consistent with departmental needs. Should a faculty member fail to participate in the process of developing his/her activity plans, then the department head is free to allocate the faculty member's time according to departmental needs.

A faculty member may request that the percent time allocation be reduced in one or more areas to allow time for the member to engage in other activities that benefit the department, college, and/or university. In such cases, the faculty member shall submit a written proposal outlining the activities that will be undertaken, the required funding of any "buy out" or release time, and the proposed adjusted workload allocation. The department head will review this proposal and decide on its acceptance.

The final workload allocation for the year reported in the summary of activities can be different from the planned activities workload if modified in advance by the faculty member and the department head. Such modifications would typically be done at mid-year and can be initiated by either the faculty member or the department head based on unusual circumstances or changes in assignments or activities. Both the faculty member and the department head must agree to these changes in workload allocation before they may be considered in the annual evaluations.

## 2.4 MATERIAL TO BE SUBMITTED FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION

All material is to be submitted to the department head by mid-January each year. Each faculty member must submit the following:

1. Summary of Activities (See Attachment B)
2. Student Classroom Evaluation Summaries (K-State Standardized Instruments, for each class taught)
3. Annual Academic Advising Report (most recent)
4. Activity Plan (See Attachment A)

Faculty members may also choose to submit supplemental information to the department head for consideration in the annual evaluation. Some common examples are listed in Sections 2.5.1 – 2.5.3 below.

## 2.5 SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES

The summary of activities document is presented in Attachment B. It is the responsibility of each member to clearly document their efforts and achievements in teaching and advising, scholarly and creative endeavor and research, and service and outreach related to furthering the missions of the department, college and university. Specific information in each section may include the following:

### 2.5.1 INFORMATION CONSIDERED IN EVALUATING TEACHING AND ADVISING

The purpose of this section is to provide evidence of the faculty member's quality of teaching and advising. Faculty members must submit student evaluation summaries of their teaching for each course assigned to them during the academic year. This evaluation must use a standardized K-State evaluation instrument. Faculty members must also submit a copy of their most recent academic advising report.

Besides student classroom evaluation summaries and academic advising reports, faculty members are encouraged to provide additional information regarding their teaching, advising, and mentoring effectiveness along with efforts to become better in these areas. The following are some additional items that may be used at the discretion of the faculty member:

1. Course syllabus and/or materials
2. Evidence of faculty contribution to course and curriculum development
3. Teaching, advising, or mentoring awards
4. Department head's or peers' in-class assessment of teaching (must be requested/arranged by the faculty member)
5. Evidence of efforts made to improve teaching/advising effectiveness such as participation in seminars or workshops related to teaching/advising methodologies
6. Student classroom evaluation comments (note: submission of evaluation comments is optional but if some comments are to be submitted then all comments for the evaluation period should be submitted)
7. Teaching innovations such as incorporation of new technology, service learning, and unique teaching methodologies
8. Statement of teaching philosophy

### 2.5.2 INFORMATION CONSIDERED IN EVALUATING SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ENDEAVOR AND RESEARCH

Faculty members are expected to contribute to the body of knowledge to advance the architectural, engineering, and construction industry and to enhance architectural engineering and construction education. Emphasis is placed on industry technical committees, publications and presentations, developing funding for new research, and advising graduate students pursuing reports and theses. Evidence of scholarly and creative endeavor and research may include but is not limited to:

1. Published works in journals, conference proceedings, or industry publications (refereed or non-refereed)
2. Authoring or editing technical books or industry publications
3. Competitive and non-competitive research grants, contracts, or proposals
4. Serving as major professor or committee member for M.S. students pursuing a report or thesis
5. Presentations made at international, national or regional technical meetings and invited seminars
6. Honors or awards for scholarly and creative endeavor and research
7. Active participation and/or leadership on industry technical committees
8. Review of articles and research proposals
9. Supporting and directing undergraduate research activities

### 2.5.3 INFORMATION CONSIDERED IN EVALUATING SERVICE AND OUTREACH

Service and outreach activity can involve varied types of work not directly related to teaching or research. These may include: administrative duties, serving on department, college, and university committees, or being active in professional societies. Evidence of service to the institution, the profession, and the general public may include:

1. Serving on committees for the department, college, and university.
2. Advising professional or honorary student organizations.
3. Performing special functions or extra departmental duties assigned by the department head.
4. Enhancement of departmental facilities.
5. Making arrangements for presentations/workshops/conferences and hosting speakers/presenters.
6. Processing correspondence and applications for the graduate program.
7. Participating in the recruitment of new faculty.
8. Departmental development with industry partners
9. Administrative duties and accomplishments to the department, college, or university.
10. Hosting prospective student visits.
11. Holding offices or committee positions in professional organizations or honor societies.
12. Supporting/assisting governmental, educational, or non-profit organizations.
13. Serving on external academic committees

## 2.6 DEPARTMENT HEAD EVALUATION

Annual evaluations are stated in terms of "expectations." These include the following: "exceeds expectations," "meets expectations," "falls below expectations," and "falls below minimum acceptable levels of productivity."

The department head's evaluation assigns a whole number rating between 1 and 4 for each area that the faculty member has a percentage of time allocation according to the following scale:

- 1 = falls below minimum acceptable levels of productivity
- 2 = falls below expectations
- 3 = meets expectations
- 4 = exceeds expectations

For examples of performance indicators at each level for each area please see Sections 2.7.1 – 2.7.3 below. The department head will prepare an evaluation report containing the following sections:

1. A narrative summary highlighting the faculty member's most significant accomplishments and contributions.
2. A "weight" based on the workload allocation percentages in the Activity Plan (Attachment A).
3. A rating from 1 to 4 on the performance of the work for each applicable area of responsibility per the Activity Plan, along with comments related to each rating.
4. A composite rating based on the total of the weighted ratings from the areas of time allocation

The department head's evaluation of a particular faculty member is presented only to that faculty member. The faculty member is given a written copy of the evaluation and should sign the evaluation to indicate that they have been given the opportunity to review the evaluation with the department head. If a faculty member disagrees with the evaluation that he/she has received, then he/she may discuss the issue with the department head. If they cannot come to a consensus the faculty member can follow the procedures outlined in the University Handbook. A summary table will be prepared by the department

head and submitted to the Dean of Engineering to show the evaluation ratings for all faculty members as described above.

## 2.7 FACULTY EVALUATION CRITERIA

### 2.7.1 TEACHING AND ADVISING

Competency in teaching is more than simply instructing students. All faculty members are expected to be skilled teachers at appropriate program levels consistent with their experience and assignments and the activities and practices enumerated in this document. Individual faculty members are encouraged to develop excellence in specific teaching areas along with a diversity of knowledge to broaden the faculty base. Additionally, each member is to be familiar with, and meet or exceed, the assessment criteria and procedures required by the department and by national accreditation bodies (ABET and ACCE).

Effective academic advising is critical to the success of the department and the students. As such, all members of the faculty are expected to develop core competencies and participate effectively in academic advising. This includes helping students with course selections and matters related to their academic plan and future professional careers.

Many key principles of effective teaching also apply to effective academic advising. These traits include availability, fairness, impartiality, effective communication, positive attitudes toward students, concern and respect for students, openness to ideas and opinions of students, and encouragement of questions and discussion.

The following descriptions of specific performance categories are based on 70% to 80% effort distribution for teaching and advising. The 70% to 80% teaching and advising allocation corresponds to a typical load of approximately 3 classes, 8-10 credit hours, 9-18 contact hours, and 25-50 advisees. The actual teaching and advising load for each faculty member may vary based on their assigned responsibilities to meet departmental needs and may vary from year to year and/or over the course of a person's career.

In an attempt to generate numerical scores to evaluate performance, the following descriptors are meant to serve as useful guidelines, though other items may be considered. The descriptors offer insight to the criteria used by the department head in performance evaluations.

#### **Exceeds Expectations (4 points)**

- Teaching awards or other recognition (national, university, college, department)
- Average raw faculty effectiveness ratings from teaching evaluations in the upper 30% (H or HM) in relative university comparisons\*
- Mean response for students' overall satisfaction with academic advising exceeding the departmental mean response
- Creative approaches to teaching (development of significant new or innovative course materials or approaches to teaching)
- Clear evidence of significant steps taken to enhance teaching or advising such as participation in teaching methodology workshops
- Supports departmental responsibilities, standards, guidelines, policies, and expectations as described within this document and the University Handbook

**Meets Expectations (3 points)**

- Average raw faculty effectiveness ratings from teaching evaluations in the middle 40% (M) in relative university comparisons\*
- Mean response for students' overall satisfaction with academic advising within one point of departmental mean response
- Evidence of efforts made to keep course content and materials current and in accordance with industry standards and accreditation guidelines
- Clear evidence of steps taken to enhance teaching or advising
- Effectively advises an appropriate number of undergraduate and graduate students
- Supports departmental responsibilities, standards, guidelines, policies, and expectations as described within this document and the University Handbook

**Falls Below Expectations (2 points)**

- Average raw faculty effectiveness ratings from teaching evaluations below the middle 40% (M) in relative university comparisons\*
- Mean response for students' overall satisfaction with academic advising more than one point below departmental mean response
- Little evidence that steps are being taken to improve courses or update course materials to be current with industry standards and accreditation guidelines.
- Excessive cancellation of classes
- Limited support of departmental responsibilities, standards, guidelines, policies, and expectations as described within this document and the University Handbook

**Falls Below Minimum Acceptable Levels of Productivity (1 point)**

- Average raw faculty effectiveness ratings from teaching evaluations in the lowest 10% (L) in relative university comparisons\*
- Mean response for students' overall satisfaction with academic advising below 2
- Evidence of problems in teaching or advising (justified and verified complaints)
- Lack of evidence in updating courses, materials, or improving teaching techniques
- Excessive cancellation of classes
- Fails to support departmental responsibilities, standards, guidelines, policies, and expectations as described within this document and the University Handbook

\*Note: IDEA (TEVAL) summary reports use comparative categories of upper 10% (H), next 20% (HM), middle 40% (M), next 20% (LM), and lowest 10%(L).

## 2.7.2 SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ENDEAVOR AND RESEARCH

Scholarship is fundamental to personal and departmental development. Faculty members should pursue professional development and intellectual growth and share those attributes, expertise, and discoveries with others. Faculty members are expected to contribute to the body of knowledge to advance the architectural engineering and construction industry and to enhance architectural engineering and construction education. In addition, strategic opportunities are encouraged in conventional research, graduate student research, and undergraduate student research.

In an attempt to generate numerical scores to evaluate performance, the following descriptors are meant to serve as useful guidelines, though other items may be considered. The descriptors offer insight to the criteria used by the department head in performance evaluations.

**Exceeds Expectations (4 points)**

- Published works in journals, conference proceedings, or industry publications (refereed or non-refereed)
- Authoring or editing technical books or industry publications
- Submission of external grant proposal(s) as a PI or Co-PI
- Internal or non-competitive funded grant/research proposal(s)
- Presentation(s) or posters at professional society or association conference, meeting, workshop, or seminar
- Honors or awards for scholarly and creative endeavor and research
- Leadership on academic or industry technical committees
- Authoring, reviewing, or editing technical books, articles, or research proposals
- Serving as major professor or committee member for multiple M.S. students pursuing a report or thesis
- Regional/national recognition related to coaching or advising student work projects, designs, or competitions that are not included as part of teaching assignments
- Supports departmental responsibilities, standards, guidelines, policies, and expectations as described within this document and the University Handbook

**Meets Expectations (3 points)**

- Work(s) submitted to journals, conference proceedings, or industry publications (refereed or non-refereed)
- Submission of internal or non-competitive funded grant/research proposal(s)
- Participation in professional society or association conference, meeting, workshop, or seminar
- Participation on academic or industry technical committees
- Serving as major professor or committee member for M.S. student pursuing a report or thesis
- Participation in undergraduate research projects
- Coaching or advising student work projects, designs, or competitions that are not included as part of teaching assignments
- Supports departmental responsibilities, standards, guidelines, policies, and expectations as described within this document and the University Handbook

**Falls Below Expectations (2 points)**

- No submission of work(s) or grant/research proposal(s)
- No participation in professional society or association conference, meeting, workshop, or seminar or academic or industry technical committees
- Limited participation in graduate or undergraduate research projects or student competition teams
- Little evidence of self-initiated scholarly and creative activity and research
- Limited support of departmental responsibilities, standards, guidelines, policies, and expectations as described within this document and the University Handbook

**Falls Below Minimum Levels of Productivity (1 point)**

- Despite the percent effort allocated to scholarly and creative activity and research, the faculty member exhibits little or no effort to engage in these areas

- Fails to support departmental responsibilities, standards, guidelines, policies, and expectations as described within this document and the University Handbook

### 2.7.3 SERVICE AND OUTREACH

All faculty members have a responsibility to play a role in departmental, college, university, 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 and by collaborating with other disciplines and organizations on and off campus. Service activities provided to professional and scholarly societies, and interaction with industry professionals, increase the visibility and reputation of the department, as well as make positive contributions to the faculty member's reputation and skills. Sharing the information attained in these activities with departmental colleagues is important to the growth and development of all faculty. Similarly, contributions to student welfare through service as an advisor to student organizations and mentoring will be recognized as evidence of service to the department.

In an attempt to generate numerical scores to evaluate performance, the following descriptors are meant to serve as useful guidelines, though other items may be considered. The descriptors offer insight to the criteria used by the department head in performance evaluations.

#### **Exceeds Expectations (4 points)**

- Significant leadership on committees for the department, college, or university
- Holds office or committee position in professional organizations or honorary societies
- Performance of significant extra departmental duties assigned by the department head
- Significant contributions on enhancement of departmental facilities
- Serves as an accreditation reviewer
- Serves as conference coordinator
- Provides significant outreach to industry and/or the public on topics within area of expertise for workshops and/or seminars
- Significant mentoring of colleagues
- Significant engagement of industry partners and/or members of the architectural engineering and/or construction industry
- Significant advising of student organizations
- Supports departmental responsibilities, standards, guidelines, policies, and expectations as described within this document and the University Handbook

#### **Meets Expectations (3 points)**

- Active participation on committees for the department, college, or university
- Active participation in professional organizations or honorary societies
- Performance of extra departmental duties assigned by the department head
- Contributions on enhancement of departmental facilities
- Outreach to industry and/or the public on topics within area of expertise for workshops and/or seminars
- Mentoring of colleagues inside and/or outside the department
- Engagement of industry partners and/or members of the architectural engineering and/or construction industry
- Advising or co-advising of student organizations or competition teams
- Appropriate level of hosting of prospective student visits
- Supports departmental responsibilities, standards, guidelines, policies, and expectations as described within this document and the University Handbook

**Falls Below Expectations (2 points)**

- Fails to meet at least 3 of the criteria identified in “Meets Expectations”
- Limited support of departmental responsibilities, standards, guidelines, policies, and expectations as described within this document and the University Handbook

**Falls Below Minimum Levels of Productivity (1 point)**

- Provides no evidence of service to the department, college, university, or profession
- Fails to support departmental responsibilities, standards, guidelines, policies, and expectations as described within this document and the University Handbook

## 2.8 RESPONSIBILITIES AND STANDARDS

Annual evaluations consider the faculty member’s contributions in support of departmental responsibilities, standards, guidelines, policies, and expectations as described within this document and the University Handbook. The following are key responsibilities and standards identified by the department that are also to be considered in the promotion and tenure process.

### 2.8.1 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Faculty personal development and improvement are of critical importance to the department, college, and university in pursuit of excellence. As such, faculty members have a personal responsibility to maintain or improve performance, and are encouraged to participate in professional development activities. Professional development activities also give faculty members the opportunity to expand their visibility, status, and reputation (locally, regionally, and nationally) and to strengthen their technical, ethical, and managerial knowledge base as both professionals and as educators. Faculty members are encouraged to engage in professional development activities consistent with their activities in the areas of teaching and advising, scholarly and creative endeavor and research, and service and outreach.

### 2.8.2 DEPARTMENTAL DEVELOPMENT AND PROMOTION

Faculty members are expected to regularly and consistently participate in departmental development and promotion activities. Positive representation of the department, university, and college in this regard is the responsibility of all faculty members. One of the strengths and hallmarks of the department is the continuous, highly successful interactions with the building design and construction industries. Faculty efforts in developing relationships with industry partners results in job placement opportunities for students, extramural funding, scholarship support, and guidance in direction for curriculum changes to keep current with trends in practice. Faculty assist in working with prospective students, their parents, and associated teachers and counselors, helping them understand the opportunities in design and construction, and the value of the education provided by the department. Faculty presence at college and university events, especially those that involve students, is important to the visibility of the department and its reputation of being student-centered and focused.

### 2.8.3 VERSATILITY

Versatility is exhibited by a faculty member’s ability to function well across major areas of work. It is important that each faculty member provide evidence of a range of individual accomplishments. The breadth of accomplishments can be attained through diversity in responsibility, level of exposure, and

expanded areas of knowledge. While each faculty member's record will involve a different proportion of activities, at least some effort in each of the areas of teaching and advising, scholarly and creative endeavor and research, and service and outreach is encouraged since they affect the long-term strength of the department, college, and university. Faculty members are expected to regularly examine their records to attempt to balance departmental, college, and university achievements with professional accomplishments at the local, regional, and national levels. While faculty members tend to focus on one particular specialization that is most often formed from their academic and professional backgrounds and interests, they must also be conversant with a broad range of issues engendered in the fields of engineering and construction. An integrated curriculum requires well-rounded faculty who are capable of making strong connections between their particular subject area(s) and other subject offerings.

#### 2.8.4 COHERENCE

Coherence refers to the idea that there is an underlying focus and direction in a faculty member's professional life and career. Coherence is crucial in that it provides each faculty member with a long-term aim and purpose that can give order and intent to specific efforts. A faculty member's sense of purpose and aim may change over time, and all evaluators must consider, and when necessary, encourage these shifts - particularly as they relate to the mission of the department.

Typically, coherence is related to a faculty member's scholarly, design, management, or creative interests and emphases. For untenured faculty it is important during the individual's probationary period that he or she establishes at least one area of professional interest and expertise that can become a long-term focus for scholarly and/or creative work. This focus will be considered in the evaluation process, as it contributes to and enhances one's fulfillment of responsibilities. Coherence also refers to how well a faculty member demonstrates responsibility in fulfilling professional roles. In the context of the department, this includes the complete, timely, and professional manner in which assigned duties and tasks are carried out.

#### 2.8.5 COLLEGIALITY

Collegiality refers to cooperative interaction with individuals and groups in the department, college, and university and with those at other universities. It also includes cooperative interaction with those in the building design and construction industries. Collegiality is a much more intangible and nebulous criterion than the other standards. In most instances, faculty members are professional and mature, and collegiality is not an issue. On the other hand, to assure departmental well-being, it is important to make this criterion explicit so that collegiality may be considered as a criterion for evaluation, tenure, and promotion.

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

A major strength of the department and college is the diversity of the faculty, both in terms of professional and academic backgrounds as well as philosophical and ideological perspectives in regard to professional practice and scholarship. In this sense, collegiality also includes support for the diversity of other colleagues' viewpoints and philosophies, whether tenured or untenured. It is important that all faculty respect inherent departmental and college diversity and continuously demonstrate the ability to

be an effective departmental colleague. Inappropriate behavior is considered to be highly disruptive to the department, and may adversely affect how well the individual performs his or her assigned responsibilities. As a result, collegiality and morale suffer. Such behavior adversely affecting the ability of others to carry out their assignments in the department is both undesirable and unacceptable.

## 2.9 ANNUAL MERIT SALARY ADJUSTMENTS ([See UHB C40-C48.3](#))

### 2.9.1 BASIS FOR SALARY INCREASES

The annual written evaluations as described above will form the basis for merit salary increases. These evaluations are based on the distribution of responsibilities assigned, the relative difficulty and importance of these responsibilities, and the level of success with which each was performed.

### 2.9.2 CRITERIA FOR DISTRIBUTION OF MERIT INCREASES

The department head will recommend a salary adjustment for each faculty member in the merit salary increase pool, if any, as determined by the university and college. The recommended percentage increases will be based on overall evaluation ratings and vary proportionally with those ratings (e.g. a faculty member with an overall evaluation rating that is 10% higher than the average rating for the pool will receive a recommended percentage salary adjustment that is approximately 10% higher than the average recommended percentage salary adjustment).

## 3.0 CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

The departmental criteria and procedures on annual reappointment, promotion and tenure are in accordance with the University Handbook and conform to the policies of the College of Engineering. The aspects specific to the department are described below.

All non-tenured faculty members are expected to participate in teaching and advising, scholarly and creative endeavor and research, and service and outreach in varying degrees according to their workload allocations. To be eligible for promotion and tenure, the faculty member should demonstrate substantial professional contributions in all assigned areas of responsibility. In addition, the candidate needs to demonstrate the ability to collaborate with existing faculty members, demonstrate collegiality, and support departmental responsibilities, standards, guidelines, policies, and expectations.

### 3.1 ANNUAL REAPPOINTMENT OF NON-TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS ([See UHB C50.1-C66](#))

Reappointment should be based on acceptable levels of performance for instructors on regular appointments and clear progress towards tenure for tenure-track faculty members. Effective classroom teaching, progress towards establishing credibility in scholarly and creative endeavor and research, and contributions in service and outreach are suitable criteria to consider for reappointment.

Each non-tenured faculty member is evaluated annually for progress toward earning tenure by all tenured faculty members in the department. The purpose of this evaluation is to help the faculty member prepare for the tenure process and to determine whether or not he or she will be reappointed for the next year. Thus, the candidate is evaluated based upon the department's expectations in teaching and advising, scholarly and creative endeavor and research, and service and outreach as well as departmental responsibilities, standards, guidelines, policies, and expectations. If it becomes clear that the candidate cannot meet the expectations to perform in the department, then he or she should not be reappointed.

For the purposes of these annual reappointment evaluations, each tenure-track faculty member will be expected to provide a copy of their materials (see Section 2.4) per the following typical schedule.

<u>Year of appointment</u>	<u>Materials required</u>	<u>Submit by</u>
First	Annual evaluation documents and self-evaluation forms	First week of February
Second	Annual evaluation documents and self-evaluation forms	First week of October
Third	Mid-probationary documents*	First week of February
Fourth and fifth	Annual evaluation documents and self-evaluation forms	First week of February
Sixth	Tenure documents*	First week of September

\* Applies to tenure-track faculty members only. Instructors on regular appointments will be expected to provide a copy of their annual materials per the first year of appointment schedule for each subsequent year of regular appointment after the second year.

Annual evaluation documents are the candidate’s Activity Plan and Summary of Activities. Self-evaluation forms are Reappointment Evaluation Forms (Attachment D) completed by the candidates. Tenured faculty members will have at least 14 days to evaluate these materials. They will complete a Reappointment Evaluation Form (Attachment D) before meeting to discuss and vote for the faculty member’s reappointment by secret ballot. If the vote is for reappointment, the department head will inform the faculty member of the decision in writing and also provide suggestions so that the individual can strengthen his/her tenure application. If the vote is to not reappoint, then the candidate must be notified in writing regarding the decision not to reappoint. A schedule of important dates and standards for notice of non-reappointment can be found in Appendix A of the University Handbook (<http://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/fhbook/fhxa.html>).

If the committee consisting of all tenured faculty, votes not to reappoint, then this recommendation is forwarded to the Dean of the College of Engineering with a letter from the department head. The dean forwards the written recommendation not to reappoint and an accompanying explanation to the provost. Final authority in resolving conflicting opinions regarding reappointment is delegated to the provost (see University Handbook, C53-C55). A non-tenured faculty member who receives a notice of non-reappointment has the right to file a grievance according to university policies.

### 3.2 MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY MEMBERS ([See UHB C92.1-C93](#))

The probationary appointment is a time to demonstrate that the candidate can become a department leader and successful in all aspects of professorial duties. The mid-probationary evaluation is an in-depth review of the probationary faculty member’s progress towards tenure.

During a candidate’s third year, he or she will have a mid-probationary review. The mid-probationary review follows similar procedures as the tenure process. The candidate submits his or her file with documentation (see <http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/documents/midtenure.doc>) and any other accompanying information to the department head by the first week of February.

Each tenured faculty member will individually review this material prior to meeting together for a discussion and vote by secret ballot. The department head may write an evaluation report, which is included in the candidate’s mid-probationary packet. The candidate’s mid-probationary packet and the

votes of the departmental tenured faculty are then sent to the College of Engineering for a complete review. This additional review process includes a review by the college's promotion and tenure committee and a review by the dean. This review is designed to provide the faculty member with substantial 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. This process may result in a nonrenewal of the individual's appointment.

### 3.3 PROMOTION ([See UHB C120-C156.2](#)) AND TENURE ([See UHB C70-C116.2](#))

#### 3.3.1 CRITERIA

The University Handbook establishes university criteria for promotion (see Section C120.2) and standards for tenure (see Sections C100.1-C102). The following are departmental criteria for promotion and tenure.

To be eligible for appointment at the rank of assistant professor, the faculty member must demonstrate an acceptable level of achievement and potential for progress towards tenure. For internal applicants this would include meeting reappointment criteria of effective classroom teaching, progress towards establishing credibility in scholarly and creative endeavor and research, and contributions in service and outreach. This level of professional contributions should be consistent with the "Meets Expectations" criteria for each area of responsibility as described in Sections 2.7.1-2.7.3.

To be eligible for promotion to associate professor, typically in conjunction with the granting of tenure, the faculty member must clearly demonstrate progress throughout the probationary period and substantial professional contributions in all assigned areas of responsibility. This level of professional contributions should be at or above the "Meets Expectations" criteria for each area of responsibility as described in Sections 2.7.1-2.7.3. To be granted tenure an individual must be an effective and dedicated teacher. Effective classroom teaching, established credibility in scholarly and creative endeavor and research, and a high level of contributions in service and outreach are expectations for tenure. Candidates for tenure must be committed to making the department, college, and university successful.

To be eligible for promotion to full professor, the faculty member must clearly demonstrate that he or she is highly accomplished in all assigned areas of responsibility. This level of professional contributions should be at or above the "Meets Expectations" criteria for each area of responsibility as described in Sections 2.7.1-2.7.3. The ideal full professor is a departmental leader, an excellent teacher, a productive scholar, and a recognized professional. "Time in grade" or longevity are not suitable reasons to promote to full professor. Furthermore, performance in any one aspect of assigned duties which falls below the "Meets Expectations" criteria as described in Sections 2.7.1-2.7.3 is an appropriate reason not to promote.

#### 3.3.2 PROCEDURES

A departmental committee of all the faculty members who have at least the rank/standing that the candidate is applying for evaluates the candidate's suitability for promotion and/or tenure. The committee considers external reviews that evaluate the candidates' potential and accomplishments in accordance with the University Handbook. Each evaluating faculty member submits a secret ballot with a recommendation for or against promotion and/or tenure to the department head along with written comments. After the committee meets to discuss the candidate, the finalized ballots and comments are

forwarded with the candidate's promotion and/or tenure documents to the college promotion and tenure committee.

A detailed description of the proposed time line which is used as a guide for the promotion and tenure process is published on the Office of Academic Personnel's web page, <http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/depthead/manual/promotion/promote.html>.

To summarize, the major steps in the departmental process for tenure and the process for promotion at any level are:

1. The candidate submits the promotion and/or tenure documents to the department head by the first week of September.
2. The department head requests outside evaluations based on discussions with, and recommendations from, the candidate. Outside reviewers are selected by the department head and the candidate based on these discussions and recommendations. A minimum of three outside evaluations are required, with at least one being from a full professor outside the university and at least one being from a nationally recognized industry professional in the candidate's area of expertise.
3. The departmental committee meets and votes on the promotion and/or tenure by the first week of November.
4. The department head forwards the package to the dean along with the unedited comments of the faculty and his/her recommendations by the second week of November.
5. The candidate will be notified of their tenure and/or promotion by the middle of March. If an individual is not granted tenure, then that individual may keep their appointment for the following fall and spring semesters.

#### 4.0 CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT POLICY ([See UHB C31.1-C31.8](#))

##### 4.1 GENERAL STATEMENT

This section establishes the minimum acceptable level for all tenured and tenure-track faculty members and serves as a supplement to the evaluation system described in Section 2 above. It also serves as a guideline for determining chronic low achievement per University Handbook Section C31.5. Productivity below the minimum acceptable level may lead to chronic low achievement and the process defined by the University Handbook. For tenured faculty members, failure to maintain a minimum acceptable level of productivity may result in a vote of professional incompetence by tenured faculty members, and potential loss of tenure and his or her faculty appointment according to the University Handbook.

##### 4.2 MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE LEVEL OF PRODUCTIVITY

The minimum acceptable level of productivity is based on the faculty member achieving a rating of 2 (Falls Below Expectations) or above on all applicable areas of responsibility (see Sections 2.7.1 – 2.7.3 above) and an overall rating of 2.25 or above on the annual evaluation. A faculty member is in low achievement if they receive an overall annual evaluation rating below 2.25 or a rating of 1 (Falls Below Minimum Levels of Productivity) in any applicable area of responsibility. The low achievement is determined each year and tenured faculty members with a low achievement may become a chronic low achiever.

##### 4.3 CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT

Chronic low achievement is only applicable to tenured faculty members as continued productivity below the minimum acceptable level may lead to chronic low achievement. A tenured member with chronic low achievement may be considered professionally incompetent and potentially lose tenure and his or her faculty appointment. In such situations, the procedure listed in the University Handbook (C31.5–C31.7) will be followed.

Chronic low achievement is a serious matter and should only be initiated in extreme cases for an underperforming tenured faculty member. Furthermore, chronic low achievement must be a persistent and consistent failure in duties.

## 5.0 PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD ([See UHB C49.1- C49.14](#))

### 5.1 CRITERIA

Full professors are expected to maintain their excellence and provide leadership in all aspects of the department mission including teaching and advising, scholarly and creative endeavor and research, and service. To be eligible for the Professorial Performance Award (PPA), the candidate must be a full-time tenured full professor, have served in that capacity for at least six years, and have not received a PPA in the last six years. The candidate must demonstrate significant sustained productivity of all the qualities required for promotion to the rank of full professor in the department since the last promotion (see Section 3.3.1 above).

### 5.2 TIME LINE AND PROCEDURE

This section constitutes the departmental review mechanism and procedure for the PPA. Tenured full professors holding at least a 50% appointment in the department are eligible to review the qualifications of the PPA candidates and report their findings and recommendations to the department head. This review committee is hereafter known as the eligible faculty. The procedure and time line for those faculty wishing to apply for the PPA are:

#### Fall Semester End (nominally December 15):

The candidate informs the department head in writing of his/her wish to be considered for the PPA and presents a draft version of the documents and records concerning teaching and advising, scholarly and creative endeavor and research, and service and outreach occurring over the previous six years. These PPA documents are to include a one-page summary of accomplishments in each area of responsibility and a curriculum vita detailing such accomplishments.

#### Start of Spring Semester (nominally January 15):

The candidate consults with the department head and provides the PPA documents as described above. External letters of reference and evaluation are not required.

#### Last week in January (nominally January 31):

The forwarded material is made available to the eligible faculty for the purposes of review.

#### At least 14 days following the previous step (nominally February 15):

The eligible faculty will meet to consider the merits of each PPA applicant and the materials submitted by that applicant. No candidate may participate in the review of his or her own application for the PPA. The department head is considered the chair of that forum. It is the responsibility of the chair to conduct the meeting, to assure the fairness of the proceedings, and to prepare and submit in a timely

fashion all documents regarding the review. The purpose of the meeting is for the eligible faculty to assess the merit of the PPA application, and to generate a list containing written evaluations attesting to why each individual is or is not worthy of the PPA, and a counted vote on the matter. A transcript of the written comments pertaining to a particular candidate will be given to that candidate by the department head. After considering the results of the review, the candidate may either choose to continue the application process or to withdraw from further consideration during that year by so notifying the department head in writing. If the candidate chooses to continue the application process, the department head prepares a written recommendation. A copy of the department head's written recommendation will be given to the candidate.

Approximately two weeks following the meeting of the eligible faculty (nominally March 1):

Each candidate will have the opportunity to discuss with the department head the written evaluation from the eligible faculty and the written recommendations. Each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to discuss and review the evaluation and recommendations. Within seven working days after the review and discussion of the recommendations and eligible faculty evaluation, each candidate has the opportunity to submit to the department head and to the Dean of Engineering written statements of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation by the eligible faculty and the recommendations.

End of the second week in March (nominally March 15):

At a minimum, the department head must submit the following items to the Dean of Engineering:

- a. The candidate's supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award.
- b. The recommendation prepared by the department head, with the comments from the evaluating faculty and the vote on the PPA award.
- c. A copy of the department's evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award.
- d. Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendations.
- e. Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation and recommendations.

If the department head wishes to apply for the PPA, a chair will be selected by all of the full professors in the department. The chair will fulfill the function of the department head in all of the above procedures for that individual.

## 6.0 DEPARTMENTAL GUIDELINES, POLICIES, AND EXPECTATIONS

The following are departmental guidelines, policies, and expectations that complement the annual evaluation system, departmental responsibilities and standards, and the reappointment, promotion and tenure criteria and procedures.

### 6.1 DEPARTMENT HEAD RESPONSIBILITIES

As described in Sections B30-31 of the University Handbook, the basic administrative unit of the university is the academic department and the administrative responsibilities of each department are given to a department head as appointed by the Dean of Engineering and Provost. The duties of the department head relative to annual evaluation and reappointment, tenure, and promotion are as specified in Section C of the University Handbook and as further detailed in the sections above.

Additional responsibilities of the department head related to this document include:

- Directing the work of the department
- Administering the department's budget
- Scheduling and conducting faculty meetings
- Recommending personnel actions
- Assigning faculty workloads including teaching and committee assignments and administrative duties
- Coordinating delivery of student support services such as advising, recruiting, employment, scholarships, etc.

### 6.1.1 TEACHING AND ADVISING ASSIGNMENTS

In order to meet the needs of the department, the department head is responsible for making teaching and advising assignments in a fair and reasonable manner based on course schedules, enrollment numbers, and the expertise and workload allocation of faculty members. As described above, a typical 70% to 80% teaching and advising allocation corresponds to a typical load of approximately 3 classes, 8-10 credit hours, 9-18 contact hours, and 25-50 advisees. It is recognized that these are only general ranges and that actual assignments, and their resultant workloads, will vary based on many factors.

When making assignments, the following factors will be considered by the department head related to a faculty member's teaching and advising workload:

- High enrollment numbers may require extensive student interaction and grading
- High contact hours and/or extensive project grading in graphic communication classes, labs, and upper level design courses may require additional faculty time commitment
- High numbers of new or transfer student advisees may require additional advising responsibilities
- Teaching introductory courses may require a higher level of student interaction/correspondence per student
- Teaching multiple sections of the same class may reduce faculty time commitment
- Teaching a course for the first time or developing a new course may increase faculty time commitment

### 6.2 ATTENDANCE AND OFFICE HOURS

Faculty members are expected to meet with their classes at the regularly scheduled times. Given the variety of responsibilities for our faculty, there will be occasions when a faculty member will be forced to miss class meeting times. If an event is known in advance then the faculty member should make appropriate alternative arrangements. When a conflict is discovered, the faculty member should notify the department head and office staff of the dates along with the planned alternative activities. Cancellation of the class should be done only as a last resort. In the event that it is necessary to cancel a class meeting due to an illness or unplanned event the faculty member should notify the department head and office staff as soon as possible.

Faculty members are expected to make time available for student conferences. An open door policy is encouraged and a minimum of six (6) office hours per week, convenient to both students and the faculty member, must be scheduled and other opportunities provided for prearranged appointments. Available office hours will be communicated to students and posted on the faculty member's office door and the departmental website.

Faculty members are expected to maintain a regular presence on campus during scheduled work days. For nine-month faculty, scheduled work days are closely tied to the presence of students on campus and are typically weekdays during the academic year, exclusive of student recesses and university holidays. For departmental purposes, the academic year typically starts with faculty and/or committee meetings during the two week period before the start of the fall semester and ends the week after spring final examinations upon submission of grades and completion of any additional responsibilities for the semester. If a faculty member is to be away from campus on a scheduled work day they should obtain prior approval from the department head. Faculty members are expected to fulfill professional responsibilities throughout the academic year regardless of scheduled work days. Related conditions of employment for nine-month faculty are detailed in the University Handbook (see Sections C22-23).

### 6.3 FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS AND DEGREE REQUIREMENTS

Because of the practice-based curriculums and required professions within the faculty of the department, faculty qualifications will include both industry experience and academic credentials. A tenure-track faculty member is generally expected to have a minimum of five years of relevant industry experience, appropriate professional credentials, and an appropriate terminal degree.

The terminal degree requirements per the General Guidelines for Promotion in the University Handbook (see Section C13) state that a doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree is a prerequisite for holding the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor. Because of the unique nature of the department and its professions, it is the department's policy and position that an appropriate terminal degree is an approved Masters in Architectural Engineering, Construction, Architecture, Engineering, or a Building Science related field accompanied by the required industry experience and professional credentials. Approval authority for the appropriate terminal degree rests with the department head and the dean.

In addition, per ABET requirements, the architectural engineering program must demonstrate that faculty teaching courses that are primarily engineering design in content are qualified to teach the subject matter by virtue of professional licensure, or by education and design experience. It must also demonstrate that the majority of the faculty members teaching architectural design courses are qualified to teach the subject matter by virtue of professional licensure, or by education and design experience.

### 6.4 CONFLICT RESOLUTION

The department believes that the best approach to conflict resolution is through communication. Faculty should deal directly with other faculty members and/or the department head as appropriate to achieve satisfactory resolution of issues through appropriate communication channels. In the event that there is communication difficulty between the faculty members and/or the department head and these measures do not satisfactorily resolve the issues, faculty are referred to Appendix G of the University Handbook.

### 6.5 MENTORING

It is the policy of the department to provide all untenured and/or new faculty members with a mentor who is a tenured faculty member. The role of the mentor is to provide insight into the working of the university, college, and department; including its history, expectations and general knowledge about the institution. This interaction is intended to aid the individual in the successful and efficient performance of their teaching and advising, scholarship and creative endeavors and research, and service and

outreach and also enhance their potential to obtain tenure and/or rank advancement. Mentors will be assigned by the department head after discussions with both the mentor and mentee and these assignments can be changed by the department head based on the request of either the mentor or mentee. It is the expectation that the mentor will schedule meetings regularly to address questions, facilitate awareness of university and department policies and procedures, etc. Mentoring of new faculty members is an important responsibility and as such will be included as a service contribution in the annual performance evaluation of the mentor.

## 6.6 CONSULTING

In accordance with the University Handbook (See Section D40 and Appendix S) faculty members may accept outside consulting assignments and opportunities that support professional growth, as long as these opportunities do not interfere with the effective discharge of university, college, and department responsibilities. Faculty members who perform consulting services outside the university must obtain prior approval from the department head, the dean, and the provost. Such outside activities are to be reported in writing on the consulting request form for inclusion in personnel files. Personal and professional activities that occur within a single 24-hour period need not have prior approval, but must be reported annually in writing on the Annual Declaration and Disclosure form. Normally, faculty members and unclassified professionals are allowed four working days per month on the average to participate in consulting activities. Consulting activities are to be reported annually in accordance with the university policy on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Time Commitment (Appendix S).

Consulting, when related to the technical areas valued by the department, is encouraged because of the potential benefits that it can bring to the department. These benefits include, but are not limited to, relationships developed with industry, personal professional development, and the opportunity to allow faculty to stay current with industry trends.

## 7.0 POST-TENURE REVIEW

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

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

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

## 7.1 DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES

| The department head will identify tenured faculty members who will undergo Post-Tenure Review during each evaluation period. In general, post tenure review shall be conducted for tenured faculty every six years in accordance with the timeline and exceptions as outlined in the University Handbook. To initiate the review process, the identified tenured faculty member will submit copies of the six previous annual evaluations. The six previous annual evaluations are to be submitted at the same time as the annual evaluation materials as described in Section 2.4 above and used as a basis for the review.

The department head will conduct the review concurrently with the tenured faculty member's annual evaluation. The review will assess the faculty member's strengths and areas for improvement to determine whether he/she is making appropriate contributions to the University or whether additional plans or activities need to be developed. If the tenured faculty member has met or exceeded expectations for the six previous annual evaluations, the current level of professional development should be considered sufficient to demonstrate "appropriate contribution to the University". A copy of the review (See Attachment E – Post-Tenure Review Form) will be provided and discussed in a face-to-face meeting between the department head and the tenured faculty member.

## ATTACHMENT A - ACTIVITY PLAN

Evaluation Period January \_\_\_\_ through December \_\_\_\_.

Faculty Member: \_\_\_\_\_

### ARE/CNS Mission and Vision Statements

Our mission is to provide a learning environment of value to students and of benefit to industry, the academic community, and society as a whole. We are committed to focusing individual attention and resources to achieve the highest standard of excellence in undergraduate education for Architectural Engineers and Constructors. We strive to prepare our students for successful life long careers and to provide leadership in the industry with our educational programs. We promote excellence in Faculty and student performance related to instruction, research, and service.

The Kansas State University Department of Architectural Engineering and Construction Science will be a recognized leader in providing quality education to prepare students for successful careers in their respective professions.

### Activity Plan

Individual and institutional goals should be aligned to promote faculty growth and institutional accomplishment. Each faculty member will meet annually with the department head to jointly establish personal goals and objectives in teaching and advising, scholarly and creative endeavors and research, and service and outreach for the upcoming evaluation period and to discuss their relative importance within the context of the department's goals.

Within the framework provided below each faculty member will outline how he or she expects to spend their time during the coming year. Time may be divided between the areas listed. At a meeting with the department head and faculty member this document will be jointly reviewed and approved.

Refer to the Departmental Documents (adopted \_\_/\_\_/\_\_) and the University Handbook for descriptors that offer insight to the criteria used by the department head in performance evaluations.

- I. Teaching and Advising % Allocation \_\_\_\_\_
  - a. List anticipated teaching assignments for Spring and Fall semesters
    - i.
    - ii.
    - iii.
  
  - b. List goals related to teaching and advising
    - i.
    - ii.
    - iii.

- II. Scholarly and Creative Endeavor and Research % Allocation \_\_\_\_\_
- a. List expectations and goals related to scholarly and creative endeavor and research for the upcoming year.
- i.
  - ii.
  - iii.

- III. Service and Outreach % Allocation \_\_\_\_\_
- a. List expectations and goals related to service and outreach for the upcoming year.
- i.
  - ii.
  - iii.

In support of the mission and vision statements of the College of Engineering and Architectural Engineering & Construction Science we have jointly established this Activity Plan for the upcoming evaluation period, consistent with established policies.

Faculty Member: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Department Head: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## ATTACHMENT B - SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES

Faculty Member: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_/\_\_/\_\_

Kansas State University, Department of Architectural Engineering and Construction Science  
 Faculty Evaluation for the period January 1, 20\_\_ to December 31, 20\_\_

### TEACHING AND ADVISING

**1. Listing of courses taught:**

Spring semester (20\_\_):

<u>Students/Hours</u>	<u>Courses Taught</u>
a.   xx   x	ARE____ – _____ Class Grade Distribution   A=XX       B= XX       C= XX       D=XX       F=XX
b.   xx   x	ARE____ – _____ Class Grade Distribution   A=XX       B= XX       C= XX       D=XX       F=XX
c.   xx   x	CNS____ – _____ Class Grade Distribution   A=XX       B= XX       C= XX       D=XX       F=XX
d.   xx   x	CNS____ – _____ Class Grade Distribution   A=XX       B= XX       C= XX       D=XX       F=XX

Fall semester (20\_\_):

<u>Students/Hours</u>	<u>Courses Taught</u>
a.   xx   x	ARE____ – _____ Class Grade Distribution   A=XX       B= XX       C= XX       D=XX       F=XX
b.   xx   x	ARE____ – _____ Class Grade Distribution   A=XX       B= XX       C= XX       D=XX       F=XX
c.   xx   x	CNS____ – _____ Class Grade Distribution   A=XX       B= XX       C= XX       D=XX       F=XX
d.   xx   x	CNS____ – _____ Class Grade Distribution   A=XX       B= XX       C= XX       D=XX       F=XX

**2. Summary Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness:**

Attach the Summary Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness from IDEA and/or TEVAL reports for each class to this document. Student comments are optional but they must meet the criteria set forth in the Departmental Documents.

**3. Academic advising:**

Total number of current advisees: \_\_\_\_\_. Attach most recent advising report.

**4. Course/curriculum development:**

List added/modified or developed course/curriculum content.

- a.
- b.

**5. Presented or attended teaching/advising workshops:**

- a.
- b.

**6. Teaching and instructional related awards:**

- a.

b.

**7. Other:**

a.

b.

**SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ENDEAVOR AND RESEARCH**

**1. Submission of external grant proposals:**

a.

b.

**2. External grants and funded projects:**

a.

b.

**3. Submission of internal grant proposals:**

a.

b.

**4. Internal grants and funded projects:**

a.

b.

**5. Published works in journals, conference proceedings, or industry publications:**

List all works and identify whether they are refereed or non-refereed.

a.

b.

**6. Presentations at seminars, meetings or conferences:**

a.

b.

**7. Honors or awards:**

a.

b.

**8. Leadership on academic or industry technical committees:**

a.

b.

**9. Reviewing or editing technical books, articles, or papers:**

a.

b.

**10. Serving as a major professor or committee member for M.S. students:**

Spring 20\_\_

Student

Topic

.....

Fall 20\_\_  
Student                      Topic

---

**11. Advising honors students:**

Spring 20\_\_  
Student                      Topic

---

Fall 20\_\_  
Student                      Topic

---

**12. Advising undergraduate research students:**

Spring 20\_\_  
Student                      Topic

---

Fall 20\_\_  
Student                      Topic

---

**13. Regional/National recognition related to coaching or advising student projects or competitions:**

- a.
- b.

**14. Other:**

- a.
- b.

**SERVICE AND OUTREACH**

**1. Participation on Department Committees:**

- a.
- b.

**2. Participation on College or University committees:**

- a.
- b.

**3. Offices held in professional organizations or honor societies:**

- a.
- b.

4. **Contributions on enhancement of departmental facilities:**
  - a.
  - b.
  
5. **Mentoring of colleagues:**
  - a.
  - b.
  
6. **Acted as an accreditation reviewer:**
  - a.
  - b.
  
7. **Presentations or assistance to academic-related organizations:**
  - a.
  - b.
  
8. **Advising of student groups:**
  - a.
  - b.
  
9. **Workshops/conferences coordinated, presented or administered:**
  - a.
  - b.
  
10. **Outreach to industry or public entities:**
  - a.
  - b.
  
11. **Performance of extra departmental duties:**
  - a.
  - b.
  
12. **Engagement of industry partners:**
  - a.
  - b.
  
13. **Service honors and awards:**
  - a.
  - b.
  
14. **Other:**
  - a.
  - b.

## **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

1. **List any additional information you would like to provide to demonstrate your support of Professional Development, Departmental Development and Promotion, Versatility, Coherence, and/or Collegiality:**

- a.
- b.

Submitted: Faculty Member: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewed: Department Head: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## ATTACHMENT C – ANNUAL EVALUATION

Evaluation Period January \_\_\_\_ through December \_\_\_\_.

Faculty Member: \_\_\_\_\_

Annual evaluations are stated in terms of "expectations." These include the following: "exceeded expectations," "met expectations," "fallen below expectations," and "fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity."

The department head's evaluation assigns a whole number rating between 1 and 4 for each area that the faculty member has a percentage of time allocation according to the following scale:

- 1 = falls below minimum acceptable levels of productivity
- 2 = falls below expectations
- 3 = meets expectations
- 4 = exceeds expectations

I. Teaching and Advising % Allocation \_\_\_\_\_

Rating \_\_\_\_\_

a. Comments

- i.
- ii.
- iii.

II. Scholarly and Creative Endeavor and Research % Allocation \_\_\_\_\_

Rating \_\_\_\_\_

a. Comments

- i.
- ii.
- iii.

III. Service and Outreach % Allocation \_\_\_\_\_

Rating \_\_\_\_\_

a. Comments

- i.
- ii.
- iii.

IV. Overall Evaluation Composite Rating \_\_\_\_\_

a. Comments

- i.
- ii.
- iii.

I have completed this evaluation based on the materials submitted by the faculty member and the procedures set forth in the Departmental Documents.

Department Head: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

I have been given the opportunity to review this evaluation with the department head.

Faculty Member: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## ATTACHMENT D - REAPPOINTMENT EVALUATION FORM

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Non-Tenured Faculty Evaluated: \_\_\_\_\_

Place an "X" in the block that you believe best describes the performance in each of the areas evaluated.

Area Evaluated	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Falls Below Expectations	Falls Below Minimum Acceptable Levels	Unable to Judge
Teaching & Academic Advising					
Scholarly & Creative Endeavor & Research					
Service & Outreach					
Departmental Development & Promotion					
Versatility					
Coherence					
Collegiality					

Note: These areas of evaluation are defined in the Departmental Documents. If a non-tenured faculty member is neither meeting expectations nor showing improvement in these areas, then the tenured faculty will recommend to the department head that the member's appointment not be renewed.

**Recommendation for Reappointment:**  Reappoint  
 Do Not Reappoint  
 Abstain

**Notable Strengths/Accomplishments:**

Use additional sheets if desired.

**Recommended Areas for Improvements:**

**Notable Weaknesses:**

Name of Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

## ATTACHMENT E – POST-TENURE REVIEW FORM

Evaluation Period January \_\_\_\_ through December \_\_\_\_.

Faculty Member: \_\_\_\_\_

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

All six annual evaluations meet or exceed expectations and the tenured faculty member is making appropriate contributions to the university.

OR

The following additional plans or activities need to be developed:

Notable strengths:

Areas for improvement:

I have completed this post-tenure review based on the materials submitted by the faculty member and the procedures set forth in the Departmental Documents.

Department Head: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

I have been given the opportunity to review this evaluation with the department head.

Faculty Member: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_