

# **DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURAL ENGINEERING & CONSTRUCTION SCIENCE**

## **ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 5/02/06)**

## **PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 5/02/06)**

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES \*(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **5/2011**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES\*: **5/2011**

**David Fritchen, Department Head**

**Date signed: 5/02/06**

**Terry King, Dean**

**Date signed: 5/02/06**

**M. Duane Nellis, Provost**

**Date signed: 7/24/06**

\*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.

**Department of Architectural Engineering and Construction Science**

**College of Engineering**

**Policy Statement Concerning:**

**Annual Evaluations**

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

Approved by Faculty Vote on (May 2, 2006)

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

Approved by Faculty Vote on (May 2, 2006)

# Evaluation Guidelines

Department of Architectural Engineering and Construction Science  
Kansas State University

2 May 2006

## CONTENTS

---

### **Highlights: “Evaluation Guidelines”**

**Mission Statements**

**Objective of the University Educational Program**

**Introduction**

---

### **Part 1: Description of Responsibilities and Standards**

Professional Development

Coherence

Versatility and Diversity

Peer Evaluation

Collegiality

---

### **Part 2: Evaluation Guidelines for Faculty**

Minimum Acceptable Level of Productivity

Faculty Portfolios

Goals

Scholarly Activities

Faculty Development

---

### **Part 3: Information Considered in Evaluating Teaching**

**Information Considered in Evaluating Research and Other Creative Endeavors**

**Information Considered in Evaluating Service**

---

### **Part 4: Guidelines for Allocation of Work Loads**

Responsibilities, Goals and Objectives

---

### **Part 5: Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation**

---

### **Part 6: Role of the Tenured Faculty in the Evaluation and Promotion Process**

---

### **Part 7: Professorial Performance Award**

---

**Attachment A: Summary of Activities**

**Attachment B: Responsibilities, Goals and Objectives**

**Attachment C: Department Head Appraisal Form**

---

## Highlights: “Evaluation Guidelines”

- A. All faculty in the Department, *both tenured and untenured*, will be evaluated *annually*.
- B. Evaluations will be made in the following areas:
1. **Teaching**
  2. **Research and Other Creative Endeavors**
  3. **Service**
- C. Evaluations will also be associated with the following responsibilities and standards:
1. **Professional Development**
  2. **Coherence**
  3. **Versatility and Diversity**
  4. **Peer Evaluation**
  5. **Collegiality**
- D. The following multiple data sources will be used for evaluations:
1. **Attachment A: “SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES.”**  
(*Activities associated with Teaching, Research, Service, and Professional Development*)
  2. **Student Classroom Evaluations.**
  3. **Department Head Observations.** (*May involve mentoring and peer review*)
- E. All faculty are required to outline how his or her time will be allocated *at the beginning of the Spring Semester*. A document of yearly activities, labeled “**Responsibilities, Goals and Objectives,**” shall be developed in conjunction with the Department Head. This document will become the basis of subsequent activities, assignments, and annual reviews.
- F. All faculty are required to submit documentation of activities and achievements during each academic year. Documentation is to be consistent with elements outlined in the summary of Responsibilities, Goals and Objectives, and shall be submitted *at the end of the Fall Semester*.
- G. All faculty are required to submit the following evaluative materials in a **Faculty Portfolio**:
1. **Attachment A: “SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES”**
  2. **Attachment B: “RESPONSIBILITIES, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES”**
  3. **Student Classroom Evaluations**
- Portfolios may also include the following additional sources of data / information:
1. **Course Materials**, such as: a) unique or innovative course materials and technologies utilized, b) evidence of the integration of contemporary design or management theory and practice into classroom instruction, or c) similar materials.
  2. Initiatives showing an integrated approach to **General Education**.  
(*Educating “across the curriculum”; bridging other disciplines*)
  3. **Peer / Colleague Evaluations.**
  4. **Student Advising Evaluations.**
  5. Other items outlined under Faculty Portfolios in Part 2 of this document.
- H. Faculty performance will be assessed—and ratings will be based—on **levels of performance compared to established Department expectations.**
- I. All faculty are to be familiar with the *University Handbook*—including modifications and updates.

# Evaluation Guidelines

## Department of Architectural Engineering and Construction Science and Management Kansas State University

### MISSION STATEMENTS

The mission of the Kansas State University College of Engineering is to provide the following:

1. *An educational environment where students can reach their full potential in their chosen discipline and as persons.*
2. *A world-class research and scholarly environment where the talents of faculty members and students are developed and used to generate new knowledge and technology for the benefit of society.*
3. *An effective outreach program that accelerates the adoption of technology and extends educational opportunities for practicing professionals in Kansas, the nation, and the world.*

Adopted by the College of Engineering Executive Committee on January 10, 2002



In support of the mission of the College of Engineering, the mission of the Department of Architectural Engineering and Construction Science, is stated:

*“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.”*

### OBJECTIVE OF THE UNIVERSITY EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

The objective of the educational program at Kansas State University—as described in the University General Catalog—is to develop individuals capable of applying enlightened judgment in their professional, personal, and social lives. To that end the university program is designed:

- I. To provide full and efficient counseling and guidance to students at the university. Specifically, this means to:
  - A. Learn and make known to students all that is possible and useful about their interests, aptitudes, and abilities.
  - B. Apply that knowledge to the students’ choice of courses and curricula as fully as possible without encroaching harmfully on their initiative and feeling of self-responsibility.
  - C. Provide continuing guidance for students according to their needs.

- II.** To prepare students for an occupation of a profession which includes an organized body of information and theory so they may realize their creative potential. More specifically this means that students should acquire:
  - A. The ability to recognize and master fundamental principles in their fields of specialization.
  - B. The knowledge basic to their special fields of study.
  - C. The ability to reason critically from facts and recognized assumptions to useful technical conclusions.
  - D. A professional attitude in their chosen work.
  
- III.** To provide all students with an opportunity to gain the knowledge and abilities members of a democratic society need, whatever occupation or profession they expect to enter. Specifically, this means that through its program the university undertakes to help the student:
  - A. Develop communication skills.
  - B. Develop the ability to apply critical and creative thinking to the solution of theoretical and practical problems.
  - C. Understand the basic concepts of the natural sciences, the interrelations of the natural and social sciences, and the impact of science on society.
  - D. Comprehend and evaluate the processes and institutions in society at home and abroad, and develop a dynamic sense of personal responsibility as effective citizens in a democratic society.
  - E. Develop habits of self-evaluation, responsibility, and enterprise that will increase the effectiveness of the educative process in college, and provide the basis for continued self-improvement.
  - F. Develop a well-adjusted personality, good character traits, and a sound philosophy of life.
  - G. Prepare for effective participation in family life.
  - H. Utilize actively and fully the capacity for aesthetic appreciation and enjoyment.
  
- IV.** To stimulate the faculty and students to extend the boundaries of knowledge through critical and creative thinking and experimentation.
  
- V.** To provide the facilities for extending education outside the boundaries of the campus to the members of the community that the institution serves.

Evaluation of faculty performance and assessment of faculty vitality are processes critical to institutional liveliness and renewal. The purpose of evaluation is to provide information that will assist with a faculty member's development, help improve instruction, and aid in personnel decisions related to tenure, promotion, retention and salary.

The *University Handbook* (<http://www.ksu.edu/academicservices/fhbook/fhsecc.html>) requires that each unit of the University develop its own set of procedures, guidelines and criteria related to tenure and promotion (Section C). In the broadest terms, the *Handbook* requires that a faculty member's tenure-track and promotion-track efforts be guided in the major university endeavors of **1) Teaching, 2) Research and Other Creative Endeavor, 3) Extension, 4) Directed Service, and 5) Non-directed Service.**

This *Evaluation Guidelines* document establishes standards of **long-term expectations and responsibilities** for tenure-track and promotion-track faculty in the Department—expectations and responsibilities that will be considered in decisions involving reappointment, tenure, promotion, and annual merit evaluations. It complements other University publications, and all faculty members shall be familiar with this document—including modifications and updates.

It is important to emphasize that each faculty member is unique, and contributes a special set of strengths and abilities to the Department. This document seeks to respect this uniqueness by establishing a set of guidelines and standards that are relatively flexible, yet offer enough rigor to allow a framework for guiding and evaluating abilities, accomplishments, responsibilities, and assignments of each member.

In addition to the categories outlined above, the Department emphasizes the importance of its relation with the building industry. Faculty members are encouraged to become involved in

- 1) the process and application of engineering design,
- 2) management procedures and operations used in the construction industry, and
- 3) professional practices associated with these uniquely different but related professions.

---

## PART 1

### DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES AND STANDARDS

The Department recognizes that each faculty member must be evaluated on the specific contributions and accomplishments that he or she provides the department, college, university, and professional and academic institutions. In this sense, each faculty member must establish a **long-term plan** related to professional focus and goals—particularly as they relate to the Mission of the Department.

This document identifies five broad responsibilities and standards associated with Department activities:

- 1) **Professional Development**
- 2) **Coherence**
- 3) **Versatility and Diversity**
- 4) **Peer Evaluation**
- 5) **Collegiality**

The *University Handbook* identifies the major endeavors associated with faculty appointments. The five standards presented here do not supersede, contradict, or dilute the importance of these endeavors. Rather, they are presented as a systematic way of considering and evaluating the relative effectiveness of a faculty member's teaching, research and other creative endeavor, extension, and service.

Faculty renewal, development and improvement are of critical importance to the University in its pursuit of excellence. Faculty members have a personal responsibility to maintain or improve performance, and are encouraged to participate in professional development activities. Professional development relates to an individual staying current in his or her field or discipline. This means being involved in the latest teaching, research and/or service activities and ideas associated with these specific disciplines. Professional development is also concerned with each faculty member's efforts to acquire the highest credentials of the profession—such as obtaining a terminal degree, acquiring a license, or serving on state, regional or national committees that formulate standards, specifications, and procedures for the profession. Consulting activities, compatible with the University's mission, are encouraged. These activities support professional growth as long as they do not interfere with the effective discharge of University responsibilities.

## 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.

Typically, coherence is most often related to a faculty member's scholarly, design, management, or creative interests and emphases. For tenure-track faculty, especially, it is important during the individual's probationary period that he or she establish at least one area of professional interest and expertise that can become a long-term focus for scholarly and/or creative work. This focus will be considered, in the evaluation process, as it contributes to and enhances one's teaching, research, and service 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.

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

## Versatility and Diversity

The quality of versatility is an important aim for both tenure-track and promotion-track faculty. The *University Handbook*—in regard to tenure-track faculty—requires that versatility should be exhibited by a faculty member's ability to function well across major areas of work (*e.g., teaching, research and other creative endeavor, service and extension*), as well as in a variety of settings within one or more areas. Since ability will be used as a basis of university comparisons, it is important that each faculty member provide evidence of a range of individual accomplishments.

Clearly, no single individual can be exceptional in all categories, and each candidate's record will involve a different proportion of activities. At least some effort in each of these categories is encouraged since they relate to the long-term strength of the department, college and university.

Candidates should regularly examine their records to attempt to balance in-house, local, and regional achievements with accomplishments at the national and wider levels. Efforts and achievements should illustrate a range of public and peer acceptance at state, regional, national and possibly international levels.

## Peer Evaluation

A central requirement in evaluating the relative worth of any tenure-track or promotion-track accomplishment is by peer evaluation. Peer evaluation—defined as a critical review by colleagues knowledgeable of the entire range of teaching activities—can be an important component of the university's teaching evaluation program since peers are often in the best position to interpret and understand the evidence and place it in its proper academic context. Peer review indicates whether an individual's work has been successful and effective. In this sense, it is important for all faculty who are tenure-track and promotion-track to consider all scholarly, creative, and professional endeavors, as they, in all likelihood, will need to provide some kind of public dissemination that will be evaluated by others.

It is important that peer review happen at both the local and wider levels. Colleagues will evaluate tenure-track faculty, and will have a major voice in conferring tenure and/or promotion. Therefore, candidates should take advantage of opportunities to present themselves publicly, such as through participating in departmental projects, research projects involving the department, and committee participation. (*See Part 6, "Role of the Tenured Faculty in the Evaluation and Promotion Process"*)

Peer review at the national level, related to the faculty member's area(s) of scholarly and professional expertise, is important, since this evaluation establishes the faculty member's professional worth, particularly in regard to the standard of coherence. Candidates should make efforts to involve themselves regularly in projects that will be judged by peers. Such efforts might include published articles in refereed journals.

Faculty are often involved in projects and written works that may not involve peer review. These projects and writings are important and must be given weight in regard to coherence and versatility. However, all faculty must recognize that non-evaluated work alone does not meet the requirement of peer review. Therefore, faculty must make the long-term effort to include some examples of peer-reviewed writings, work, and projects in their evaluation materials.

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

Collaborative work is central to research and creative work in professional programs. A record emphasizing collaboration is entirely acceptable, provided that the candidate can also give some indication of work carried out alone. In most instances, tenure or promotion cannot be given to a faculty member who provides evidence of collaborative work only. Work done in collaboration with others shall clearly identify individual roles and contributions as they relate to the joint effort, and these should be explicitly enumerated in evaluation materials submitted for tenure.

## Collegiality

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

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

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

It is important that all faculty respect 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.

---

## PART 2

### EVALUATION GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY

The performance of both tenured and untenured faculty members should be, and normally is, regularly evaluated for some or all of the following purposes: distribution of merit salary increases, promotion, and institutional academic rewards such as sabbaticals, research support, professorships, and teaching awards. Performance is commonly evaluated both *formatively* and *summatively*—where formative evaluations are used to improve teaching performance and summative evaluations are used to make personnel decisions.

The Kansas Board of Regents has adopted a set of principles which will be considered in the evaluation of both **tenured and untenured faculty**. Among them are:

1. Assuring the availability of superior advising and mentoring to prevent student anonymity.
2. Involving senior faculty in teaching lower division courses, and letting students know how deeply faculty care about their education.
3. Creating and maintaining an environment that facilitates and encourages commitment to undergraduate instruction.
4. Developing strategies which enhance professional development of faculty in charge of undergraduate instruction.

Similarly, the Board of Regents has developed an additional set of recommendations relative to faculty evaluations. One of these refers to instruments used in the evaluation process and states that instruments measuring student ratings of instruction should solicit, at a minimum, student perspectives on:

1. The delivery of instruction.
2. The assessment of learning.
3. The availability of the faculty member to students.
4. Whether the goals and objectives of the course were met.

Additionally, all faculty in the Department, *both tenured and untenured*, will be expected to submit an annual **Faculty Portfolio**. This Portfolio will address both the **responsibilities and goals** of the faculty member as well as associated **scholarly activities**. All faculty shall submit materials outlined in the Portfolio *for all courses taught during a single semester*. Faculty will be appraised annually as summarized on Attachment C.

### **Minimum Acceptable Level of Productivity**

Consistent with *University Handbook* Article C31.5 describing **Chronic Low Achievement**, the minimum level of acceptable productivity will be a department head overall rating of “3.0” on any one of the areas on the Department Head Appraisal Form. This form evaluates performance in the areas of teaching, research, service and professional development.

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 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.

### **Faculty Portfolios**

Portfolios are intended to provide authentic evidence of a faculty member’s strengths and accomplishments. They should include an organized set of documents that collectively suggest the scope and quality of individual performances (*efforts, skills, abilities, achievements—and contributions to his/her students, colleagues, institution, academic discipline or community*). Portfolios allow each individual faculty member the opportunity to outline his/her short-and long-term agenda—with reflection and self-assessment—clarifying his/her individual mission and purpose as it relates to the Mission of the Department.

Portfolios shall include, *at a minimum*:

1. Attachment A: “*SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES*”
2. Attachment B: “*RESPONSIBILITIES, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES*”
3. Student Classroom Evaluations (KSU standardized instruments only: TEVAL; IDEA)

Portfolios may also include the following additional sources of data/information:

1. **Course Materials**, such as a) unique or innovative course materials and technologies utilized, b) evidence of the integration of contemporary design or management theory and practice into classroom instruction, or c) similar materials.
2. Initiatives showing an integrated approach to **General Education**. (Educating “across the curriculum”; bridging other disciplines)
3. **Peer / Colleague Evaluations**.
4. **Student Advising Evaluations**.

Additional suggestions which follow might be useful in constructing a Portfolio. These suggestions are particularly appropriate since they relate specifically to undergraduate teaching, the principal focus of the Department.

Portfolios might include:

**Material from Oneself:**

1. A brief description of how each course was taught.
2. Representative course syllabi detailing course content and objectives, teaching methods, readings, and homework assignments.
3. Descriptions of steps taken to improve teaching, including changes resulting from attendance or participating in programs to sharpen instructional skill self-evaluation, and reading journals on teaching improvement.
4. Videotapes of classroom teaching.
5. Descriptions of instructional innovations and evaluation of their effectiveness.
6. A personal statement describing teaching goals for the next five years.

**Material from Others:**

1. Student course or teaching evaluation data that produces an overall rating of effectiveness or suggest improvements.
2. Statements from colleagues who have observed the faculty member in the classroom (peer/colleague evaluation).
3. Documentation of teaching development activity through the KSU Office for Educational Advancement, located in Fairchild Hall.
4. Statements from colleagues who have reviewed the faculty member’s teaching materials, such as course syllabi, assignments, and testing and grading practices.
5. Honors or other recognition, such as teaching awards.

**The Products of Good Teaching:**

1. A record of students who succeed in advanced study in the field.
2. Student publications or conference presentations on course-related work.
3. Testimonials from employers, students, and alumni about the faculty member’s influence on students’ career choice.
4. Student scores on pre-and post-course examinations.

**Goals:**

Goals are to be specific, measurable, realistic, time-related, challenging, and moderately difficult. They are intended to help faculty be reflective practitioners, enabling individuals to know where they are experiencing

success, where they need to improve, and exactly what they can do to enhance their effectiveness. Faculty members should develop both short-and long-term objectives in the areas of teaching, scholarship, service and professional development. They should be stated so that progress can be monitored, and final outcomes effectively evaluated. See also, Part 4, “*Responsibilities, Goals and Objectives.*”

**Scholarly Activities:**

Scholarship, as it relates to the Department Mission, can be associated with any or all of the following:

1. **Scholarship of Discovery:** Pursuing knowledge for its own sake; the advancement of knowledge in a particular field and the pursuit of original research.
2. **Scholarship of Integration:** Reaching across disciplinary boundaries and pulling differing views and information together in creative ways.
3. **Scholarship of Application:** Discovering knowledge through practice, and applying knowledge—grounded in systematic or scientific research—to the world of reality.
4. **Scholarship of Teaching:** Transforming knowledge so that active learning in students is stimulated; pulling together parts of disciplinary knowledge that helps students construct meaning.

**Faculty Development:**

The following broad categories of activities constitute what has come to be classified as faculty development:

1. Activities whose purpose is instructional improvement (*workshops on curriculum development, instructional evaluations*).
2. Activities such as team building, leadership, and management development that may affect the organizational climate.
3. Activities through which faculty growth is fostered (*counseling, training in interpersonal skills, career planning workshops, involvement with professional organizations and societies, professional consulting, expanding state-of-the-art technical abilities, workshops related to the building industry, etc.*).
4. Meeting the **continuing education requirements** of specific professional disciplines, including the following:
  - (a) Attending professional or technical presentations at meetings, conventions or conferences.
  - (b) Attending in-house programs sponsored by corporations or other organizations.
  - (c) Successfully completing seminars, tutorials, short courses, correspondence courses, televised courses or video-taped courses.
  - (d) Making professional or technical presentations at meetings, conventions or conferences
  - (e) Teaching or instructing as described in individual state licensing guidelines.
  - (f) Authoring published papers, articles or books.
  - (g) Actively participating in a technical profession society or organization.
  - (h) Successfully completing college or university sponsored courses.
  - (i) Successfully completing courses which are awarded continuing educational units.

*All of these activities shall be relevant to the practice of a technical profession and may include technical, ethical or managerial content.*

## **PART 3**

### **INFORMATION CONSIDERED IN EVALUATING TEACHING**

Effective teaching produces beneficial and purposeful student learning through the use of appropriate procedures. Many **characteristics of good teaching** are open to evaluation. Among them are the following attitudes and practices:

The Kansas Board of Regents has adopted a set of principles which will be considered in the evaluation of both **tenured and untenured faculty**. Among them are:

- Sensitivity to and concern with class level and progress
- Preparation and organization of the course
- Knowledge of the subject
- Enthusiasm (for the subject or for teaching)
- Clarity and understandability
- Availability and helpfulness
- Fairness
- Impartiality in evaluation of students
- Quality of examinations and fairness in grading
- Effective communication
- Positive attitudes toward students
- Flexibility in approaches to teaching
- Concern and respect for students
- Quality and frequency of feedback to students
- Openness to opinions of others
- Encouragement of questions and discussion
- Quality advising
- Maintain and encourage quality classroom environment consistent with Department policies

Measures of teaching evaluation include:

1. **Global Ratings of the Instructor:** Norm-referenced, student classroom evaluations.
2. **Course Syllabus and Materials:** Materials supplied by instructor about his or her approach to teaching, variety of courses taught, number of students enrolled, and level of course. materials selected for review may include course syllabi, course objectives, sequence of topics, time and appropriateness of topics, reading lists, textbooks, audiovisual materials, homework assignments, laboratory work, projects, quality of examinations, and grading.
3. **Student Performance:** Student performance as measured by their achievement tests, homework, laboratory work, studio work, and other assignments.
4. **Faculty Contribution to Course and Curriculum Development:** Contribution to new course development, revisions of courses, services on department and other curriculum committees, development of new or revised programs or curricula, leadership in maintaining a viable curriculum, instructional research, consultation with other faculty on teaching and instruction, and use of innovative approaches to teaching.

5. **Advising:** Contribution in academic advising (e.g., helping students on course selection, program of study, and career choices), thesis directorship, contribution on committees, sponsorship of student organizations and student projects, and advising colleagues on instruction.

6. **Awards:** Teaching and instructionally related awards such as those sponsored by the department, college, or university—as well as other awards sponsored by student groups, external agencies and professional societies.

## **INFORMATION CONSIDERED IN EVALUATING RESEARCH AND OTHER CREATIVE ENDEAVORS**

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

1. Publication in professional journals.
2. Unpublished papers or reports.
3. Papers at professional meetings.
4. Citations to published materials.
5. Books as sole or senior author.
6. Books as junior author or editor.
7. Monographs or chapters in books.
8. Grants or funding received.
9. Referee or editor of professional journal.
10. Honors or awards from profession.
11. Accomplishments of present and former graduate students.
12. Awards of special fellowships for research or artistic activities, or selection for assignment at special institutes for advanced study.
13. Invitations to testify before governmental or industry groups concerned with research or other creative activities.

## **INFORMATION CONSIDERED IN EVALUATING SERVICE**

Evidence of service to the institution, the profession, and the general public include:

1. Service on department teams and related activities; college, and university committees.
2. Service as student recruiter and/or liaison with industry.
3. Performance of unbudgeted administrative responsibilities at the departmental level.
4. Special assignments such as representing the University at national and international meetings.
5. Honors or special recognition for contributions to the department, college, or university, or to faculty governance.
6. Holding office in professional associations and learned societies.
7. Service on state, national, and international committees in professional organizations.
8. Organizing or chairing sessions at professional meetings, or organizing the meeting itself.
9. Service as a consultant on problems appropriate to the discipline.
10. Oral dissemination of professional knowledge or information to civic, religious, or private groups.
11. Providing expert testimony to courts or legislative bodies.
12. Job placement.
13. Fund raising.
14. Laboratory development.
15. Facility improvement(s).

## **PART 4**

### **GUIDELINES FOR ALLOCATION OF WORK LOADS**

#### **Responsibilities, Goals and Objectives:**

This concept has at its core the belief that individual goals and institutional goals can be aligned so as to promote faculty growth and institutional accomplishment. This is attained when an individual faculty member—in concert with the department head—develops a plan of work (including professional development activities and goals, as appropriate), defines methods of accomplishing work goals, establishes criteria against which the faculty member will be evaluated, establishes the timeline for accomplishing the goals, and determines needed institutional resources.

The purpose of this section is to provide a set of guidelines for determining faculty workloads.

1. At the start of the Spring Semester, each faculty member—in conjunction with the department head—will outline how his/her time will be spent during the coming year. Time will be proportionally divided between the areas of teaching, research, service and professional development. The percentage allocation for each area is to be documented, detailing the anticipated courses to be taught, anticipated numbers of students, research projects to be completed, proposals to be submitted, papers to be written, service work to be performed, courses/labs to be developed, advising responsibilities, professional development activities, industry development activities, etc.
2. This document of yearly activity, labeled *Responsibilities, Goals and Objectives* (Attachment B), must meet with the approval of the department head. Should it be necessary to alter the plan—owing to unforeseen circumstances—then revisions may be made by the department head. Any significant changes in the workload plan are to be specified in writing and attached to the original document.
3. Should a faculty member fail to participate in the process of developing this document, then the department head is free to allocate the faculty member's time according to department needs.
4. The teaching load of a faculty member may be reduced in order to allow time for the member to engage in other activities that benefit the department, such as course development, lab development, administrative work, proposal writing, teaching a course for the first time, auditing a course, etc. In such cases, the faculty member shall submit a written proposal outlining the activities that will be undertaken. The department head will then review this proposal and decide on its acceptance.

---

## PART 5

### GUIDELINES FOR THE ORGANIZATION AND FORMAT OF TENURE AND PROMOTION DOCUMENTATION

To provide a common format for reviewers at the College and University levels, guidelines have been issued to summarize and organize tenure and/or promotion documentation. These guidelines are used by all Colleges at KSU, but are not intended to direct departments or colleges in their determination of what is to be considered in evaluations for tenure and/or promotion. Promotion and Tenure Transmittal documentation can be accessed at: [www.ksu.edu/academicservices/depthead/promotion/promotio.html](http://www.ksu.edu/academicservices/depthead/promotion/promotio.html). Questions or comments can be accessed through: [academicservices@ksu.edu](mailto:academicservices@ksu.edu). More information is available at <http://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/depthead/promotion/promotecon.html>. This website outlines Candidate's, Department Head's, and Dean's Responsibilities in the tenure and promotion process.

## PART 6

### ROLE OF THE TENURED FACULTY IN THE EVALUATION AND PROMOTION PROCESS

Peer review and evaluation is essential to the mission and vitality of the department. Therefore, the following guidelines have been established:

1. *Tenured faculty* will review *tenure-track faculty*—each spring semester—during the tenure-track faculty’s probationary period. The goal of this process is to provide on-going constructive input so that tenure-track faculty will be eligible for tenure at the conclusion of the probationary period.
2. Consistent with university guidelines, tenure-track faculty shall remain on probation until the tenured faculty feel the candidate has met or exceeded the expectations of the department as described herein.
3. Tenured faculty will evaluate tenure-track faculty in the following areas and make recommendations for improvement to the department head:
  - Teaching
  - Research
  - Other Creative Endeavors
  - Professional Development
  - Coherence
  - Versatility and Diversity
  - Service
  - Advising
  - Collegiality
4. Following the spring review, the tenured faculty’s comments, concerns, and suggestions for improvement will be communicated, by the department head, to each tenure-track faculty.
5. Following peer feedback, if a tenure-track faculty is neither meeting expectations nor showing improvement during the probationary period, then the tenured faculty will recommend to the department head that this member’s appointment not be renewed.
6. Unless otherwise stated in the candidate's contract, the mid-probationary review will 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.

## **PART 7**

### **PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD**

## BACKGROUND

In February, 2006, KSU Faculty Senate approved the final version of a Professorial Performance Award policy. The procedures outlined below describe the qualifications and selection process that will be used in this department related to this award.

## MINIMUM CRITERIA

The criteria for this award must include the following:

1. The candidate must be a full-time, full professor, and have been in this rank at Kansas State for at least six years since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award.
2. The candidate must show evidence of sustained excellence, continued productivity, and high merit in the areas of teaching, scholarship (or creative activities), professional service, and academic leadership—for at least the last six years before the performance review.
3. The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to full professor, according to the "**Evaluation Guidelines**" adopted by the faculty in the Department of Architectural Engineering & Construction Science.

## NOMINATION AND SELECTION PROCESS

Any candidate, who meets the minimum criteria, may apply for a Professorial Performance Award. Additionally, any person affiliated with the University community (student, alumni, faculty, staff, administration, or industry representative) may nominate a faculty member for this award. To apply, a candidate must assemble a **Performance Award File** that documents his/her accomplishments over the past six years. A candidate's file should be similar in format to a typical promotion file and should, depending on the individual's responsibilities, include the following elements:

1. A one-page summary of **major achievements** during the evaluation period.
2. A one-page summary of **instructional productivity**, including courses developed, taught, students advised, thesis supervision, evidence of instructional quality such as ratings, peer evaluations, documented evidence of innovative curriculum, methods and technologies, and external recognitions for outstanding teaching (e.g., awards, invitations to conduct workshops or make presentations).

Implied within **instructional productivity** are two criterion: 1) *Exemplary teaching skills*, and 2) *exceptional concern for students*. The first is evidenced by his/her ability to make courses interesting, challenging, and rewarding. Characteristics of these skills include an unusually broad and comprehensive knowledge or understanding of a particular subject, and an extraordinary zest for teaching. The second, exceptional concern for students, is evidenced by his/her ability to motivate students toward their best work and a genuine openness to students' ideas—including a willingness to help students outside the classroom in student-oriented service and organizational activities.

3. A one-page summary of **scholarly activity** in his/her area of academic specialization. A nominee's scholarship may be collaborative, but his/her contribution must be clear and substantial. The scholarship may include refereed and invited publications, grants for the support of scholarship,

invited and contributed presentations, exhibition of creative work, and the impact of such scholarship at regional or national levels.

4. A one-page statement of **professional service and leadership**, providing evidence of productivity, quality, creativity, and originality—accompanied by a list of any related publications, meetings, workshops, etc. Professional service might include some combination of long-term institutional contributions and leadership at the departmental, college, and university-wide levels—as well as professional service at the regional or national level (e.g., holding office in professional organizations, editing national journals, reviewing for professional journals, participation on committees in professional organizations, or volunteer work directly related to one’s professional expertise). Professional service would also include liaison activities with industries and employers associated with the department. These activities might include scholarship development, sustained career and employment opportunities, coordinating direct contact of members of industry with students, and obtaining extramural funding for department and for college development.

## **DOCUMENT SUBMISSION**

The candidate will submit the Professorial Performance Award File to the Department Head who 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. External reviews of the candidate’s file are not required, although they may be submitted. External reviews should be prepared by persons of significant expertise and reputation in the candidate’s field of scholarship or professional service. The reviewers should not include persons who have such a close working relationship with the candidate that they might not be able to provide an objective assessment of the candidate’s work.

A copy of the Department Head’s written evaluation and recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate. The candidate will have an 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 (7) calendar 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 or to the Dean.

The Department Head will submit the following items to the Dean:

1. The Department Head’s written evaluation and recommendation.
2. A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award.
3. Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation.
4. Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation.
5. The candidate’s file and supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award.

As described in the University Handbook, the ultimate decision of whether a candidate is awarded a Professorial Performance Award will be made by the Provost. The timelines for this process will be established each year by the Provost’s office, but candidates should know that this process will begin in January of each year. Prospective candidates are encouraged to consult with the Department Head to help determine if he/she meets the minimum criteria prior to compiling the required submission documents.