

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICAL ENGINEERING

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 9/07/2012)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 9/07/2012)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **9/2017**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **9/2017**

James H. Edgar, Department Head

Date signed: 9/07/2012

John English, Dean

Date signed: 9/12/2012

April C. Mason, Provost and Senior Vice President

Date signed: 10/4/2012

**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.*

PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATIONS

Department of Chemical Engineering

Kansas State University

1. Annual Evaluation for Reappointment and Salary

1.a. Procedures/Guidelines:

For new faculty, the Department Head will prepare a statement of initial assignment and goals. For continuing faculty, associated with each annual evaluation, the Department Head and the faculty member will compose a written statement of goals for the next year(s). The statement will include the expected distribution of effort for teaching, research, and service. Areas of work may be identified as “essential” (also referred to as “critical”); unless otherwise specified, any area of work with an expected effort of at least 25 percent will be deemed “essential”.

At the end of each calendar year, each faculty member will complete and return to the department head forms summarizing accomplishments for the past calendar year. All faculty members must submit a Faculty Activity Report which is normally due by January 15th of the following calendar year. Summary information is provided in the Faculty Activity Report, which has been approved by the faculty and which is presented as Appendix A. Information about teaching shall include the KSU IDEA short form for each course taught and copies of instructional materials and syllabi developed by the faculty. The Department may develop additional questions to be included on the IDEA forms. The Department Head may obtain other information about classroom effectiveness by visiting classes, by classroom review by other faculty, by interviews with students, or by evaluation of curriculum content. The faculty member shall provide access to research artifacts including papers, reports, proposals and reviews, and a self-assessment of research activities.

The department head reviews the information submitted by each faculty member and then prepares a Faculty Evaluation Form (Appendix B). Performance in various activities is reviewed and written comments for improvements are prepared by the department head. In finalizing the numeric scores of the faculty, the department head looks for consistency across the faculty.

A copy of the Faculty Evaluation Form is given to the faculty member and a meeting is held to discuss the evaluation and plans for the next year. The assignment of tenths for teaching, research, and service, for next year is reviewed in light of the future plans. Signed copies of the Faculty Evaluation Forms are then forwarded to the Dean of Engineering.

Annual merit increases in salary are determined in accordance with Sections C40 - C48.3 in the University Handbook. The sum of the numeric score from the Faculty Evaluation Form in the overall category is used as the criterion for annual merit salary adjustments.

1.b. Criteria

Criteria for the annual evaluation include contribution to Department activities, contribution to students, and contribution to the profession. Specific components of the criteria include the following (See also the Faculty Evaluation Form):

- 1.0 Teaching
 - 1.1 Contribution to departmental education programs
 - 1.2 Student-instructor relationships
 - 1.3 Student evaluations
 - 1.4 Teaching effectiveness
 - 1.5 Other
- 2.0 Research
 - 2.1 Unpublished research
 - 2.2 Generation of program support
 - 2.3 Published research
 - 2.4 Support of students
 - 2.5 Other
- 3.0 Service
 - 3.1 University promotion and support
 - 3.2 Department committees
 - 3.3 Professional service
 - 3.4 Other

The following are some examples of items to be considered in each of these categories:

- 1.0 Teaching:
 - 1.1 Contribution to departmental education programs –
description of new courses, new teaching materials,
teaching of “overload” seminars and topics courses
 - 1.2 Student-instructor relationships –
written comments from teaching evaluations,
advising for student clubs, help with university open house,
mentoring activities
 - 1.3 Student evaluations—
course evaluations
 - 1.4 Teaching effectiveness—
course syllabus, course assessment documents, course evaluations
 - 1.5 Other—
participation in learning enhancement programs
- 2.0 Research:
 - 2.1 Unpublished research—
Department technical reports, papers submitted
 - 2.2 Generation of program support—
grants and contracts
 - 2.3 Published research—

- papers, research articles in books
- 2.4 Support of students—
direction of graduate projects, funding of graduate students
- 2.5 Other—
technical presentations
- 3.0 Service:
- 3.1 University promotion and support—
work on recruiting visits,
visits to secondary schools and other universities
- 3.2 Department committees
- 3.3 Professional service -
service on technical and conference committees,
editing of journals
- 3.4 Other

In addition, the aspect of collegiality overlays each of the areas of teaching, research, and service. Collegiality is not explicitly ranked, but a failure of collegiality in a major area is grounds for a rating of unacceptable for that area.

1.c. Standards

For all faculty members, the primary standard is overall contribution to the Department as suggested by the year-end objectives (initial objectives for new faculty). For untenured faculty, the Department Head endeavors to provide a subjective evaluation that will be consistent with progress towards the standards defined for the mid-probationary and tenure reviews.

1.d. Minimum Acceptable Performance

During the annual review of all faculty members, the department head will determine whether any tenured faculty member fails to meet the “minimum acceptable level of productivity” as defined in this document. The decision will be based on the annual evaluation materials. If the department head determines that a tenured faculty member fails to meet the minimum standard in any area of assigned responsibility, a committee of full professors with departmental appointments of at least 50% will be convened (unless the faculty member requests otherwise) to review performance.

If the department head receives adequate evidence that an individual does not meet the minimum acceptable level of productivity in any substantial or critical area of work, then action will be initiated following procedures outlined in the KSU University Handbook. Specifically, the Department Head, in consultation with the faculty member, will prepare a plan to improve the performance of the faculty member during the next and following review years. As noted in the Faculty Handbook, if the faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which minimum standards are not met, then "dismissal for cause" will be considered at the discretion of the Dean of Engineering.

Standards All faculty members must perform all duties outlined in the KSU University Handbook and be in compliance with all University policies. The “minimum acceptable level of productivity” standards established in this document will apply to all tenured faculty members in the department. Decisions on acceptable performance levels must contain the individual judgments of the faculty and administrators involved in the decision. These individuals evaluate productivity in each area based on assigned activities and the percentage of the individual’s appointment allocated to that activity. Each tenured faculty member is expected to perform, as a minimum, the following activities, as assigned:

Teaching

1. Be conscientious about meeting classes on time; about the content, organization and presentation of lectures; and about the appropriate evaluation of students.
2. Strive to be consistent in content and depth of material covered in required courses such that the students earning a ‘C’ or better are appropriately prepared for following courses.
3. Work to keep course materials current. Ensure the appropriate mix of analysis, design, and computer tools is covered.
4. Perform student advising conscientiously.

Research

1. Engage in scholarly and other creative activities appropriate to the profession.
2. Serve as graduate student advisor and/or committee members.

Service

1. Serve on departmental committees.
2. Attend departmental meetings.
3. Attend an appropriate number of student-oriented functions such as Open House, Scholarship Days, and so forth.

REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

Chemical Engineering Department

Approved: July 6, 2007

Introduction

This document discusses issues related to reappointment, promotion and tenure within the Chemical Engineering Department. It serves as a supplement to the procedures and policies outlined in the University Handbook of Kansas State University. The purpose is to clarify issues related to ChE priorities on matters of reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

General Statement

As a Ph.D.-granting department, all faculty members are expected to participate in teaching, research, and service, including advising undergraduate students. Nevertheless, the extent of involvement in each category may vary from one member to another depending on circumstances and preference as defined on the Faculty Appraisal form. The faculty members are not expected to participate formally in the activities related to extension and directed service.

The College of Engineering and the ChE Department have historically placed a high value on excellence in the classroom. Thus one must be an effective teacher in order to expect reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

Research is important to the mission of Kansas State University and the ChE Department. Research performance will play an important role in reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions.

The extent of service assignments will vary among the academic ranks. Service contributions are important at all ranks, but teaching and research functions carry more importance in the determination of reappointment, tenure, and promotion to Associate Professor. For promotion to Professor, service contributions may be viewed as having an increasing influence.

The decisions on reappointment, promotion and tenure must contain the individual judgments of the eligible faculty as to whether the criteria have been met.

Reappointment Documents

Documents to be submitted are described in the University Handbook section C70 – C162.5. The most recent version of the forms can be quickly accessed via the Office of Academic Services, Policies and Forms listing. Failure to submit documentation may be grounds for non-reappointment.

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

To qualify for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor a candidate must:

1. Show evidence of effective teaching and undergraduate advising. Such evidence should include student feedback in various forms, including course evaluation reports.

2. Show evidence of scholarly work and the ability to support the candidate's graduate/research program. Such evidence must include publication of the candidate's research in peer reviewed journals, securing support for the candidate's work and successful supervision of graduate students. The candidate must also receive support from peer evaluators from outside K-State, as indicated by letters of evaluation (at least two from a list of names suggested by the candidate and two of the department head's choice).

3. Show evidence of service to the university community and contribution to the profession. Such evidence should include documented contribution to departmental and college activities.

To qualify for promotion to the rank of Professor a candidate must show substantial and sustained growth in professional leadership and stature. In addition to sustained excellence in the measures required for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate for promotion to Professor must:

1. Show evidence of leadership in the undergraduate and graduate programs, and

2. Show evidence of national recognition of scholarly work and of service to the profession. The documented evidence will be reviewed by peers from other institutions. The candidate must also receive support from peer evaluators from outside K-State, as indicated by letters of evaluation (at least two from a list of names suggested by the candidate and two of the department head's choice).

Teaching

The performance of a faculty member in teaching is evaluated both qualitatively and quantitatively based on the items listed below.

- ⌘ Student evaluation: All non-tenured faculty members working toward tenure and promotion and all associate professors working toward promotion must be evaluated for their teaching in every course. In addition, all full professors are expected to have their teaching evaluated yearly.
- ⌘ Survey of peers as well as current and former students.
- ⌘ Textbooks written.
- ⌘ Refereed articles published in recognized educational journals or proceedings of conferences on classroom teaching and laboratory instruction.
- ⌘ Grants for teaching innovations, undergraduate laboratory equipment, and development of laboratory experiments and design projects.
- ⌘ Development of new courses.
- ⌘ Presentations at educational or teaching conferences and meetings.
- ⌘ Originally-written supplementary notes, manuals and computer software distributed in classes and laboratories.
- ⌘ Other well-documented evidence of teaching contributions.
- ⌘ Advising of undergraduate and graduate students.

The quantitative evaluation is mainly in terms of the extent of involvement or accomplishments. The qualitative evaluation is mainly in terms of depth, currentness, and sophistication.

The following information may be used by the department head in formulating an evaluation:

- ⌘ Evaluations by students in classes. Recognition of differences between required and elective classes will be part of the process.
- ⌘ Observations of Department Head and/or other professors during pre-announced visits to the class.
- ⌘ Evaluation of course material (syllabus, exams, homework, handouts, etc.) by the department head and/or other professors.
- ⌘ Surveys of recent graduates who have had time to evaluate the quality of preparation for their careers.
- ⌘ Comments of graduating seniors in exit interviews.
- ⌘ Class grade point averages in line with the departmental average for similar courses.

Research

The performance of a faculty member in research is evaluated both qualitatively and quantitatively (e.g., numbers, impact factor, citations, etc.) based on the items listed below roughly in the descending order of importance.

- ⌘ Refereed articles published in recognized technical journals or proceedings of international technical conferences.
- ⌘ Authoring or editing: Technical books and monographs issued by reputable publishers.
- ⌘ Competitive research grants from external organizations of national stature, such as federal departments and agencies.
- ⌘ Patents awarded.

- ⌘ Refereed articles published in the proceedings or records of national or regional technical meetings.
- ⌘ Contributions to technical books or monographs.
- ⌘ Ph.D. degrees supervised.

- ⌘ M.S. degrees supervised.

- ⌘ Competitive research grants from regional, state, and local sources.
- ⌘ Non-refereed technical articles published or distributed widely.
- ⌘ Presentations made at international, national or regional technical meetings and invited seminars (universities, industry, and government laboratories).
- ⌘ Research proposals submitted.
- ⌘ Active advising of graduate students and effective reviews and critiques of their theses or dissertations through participation in graduate students' supervisory committees.
- ⌘ Non-competitive research grants and contracts.
- ⌘ Summer (sabbaticals) spent in industry or national laboratories.
- ⌘ Other well-documented evidence of research contributions.

Service

The performance of a faculty member in service is evaluated both qualitatively and quantitatively based on the items listed below in two areas -- institutional, and professional or public.

Professional and public service activities usually extend beyond the campus environment. These outreach activities may bring significant recognition to the University and to the individual; however, service to the profession and to the public may only indirectly impact the functioning of the faculty member's academic unit. It is important to clearly distinguish service to the public from civic and personal service.

1. Institutional

- a. Serving on committees for the department, college, and university.
- b. Advising undergraduate students apart from formal assignments
- c. Advising professional or honorary student organizations.
- d. Performing special functions assigned by the department head.
- e. Providing maintenance (or enhancement) of instructional and/or laboratory facilities.
- f. Making arrangements for seminars and hosting seminar speakers.
- g. Processing correspondence and applications for the graduate program.
- h. Participating in the recruitment of new faculty.
- i. Other documentable service to the institution.

2. Professional or Public

- a. Fostering cordial relations with prospective students, alumni, and industrial clients.
- b. Raising the technical awareness of the lay-public through direct interaction or through print and electronic media.
- c. Holding office or committee positions in professional / honorary societies.
- d. Serving on committees of international, national, and regional technical meetings.
- e. Editing professional journals, technical monographs and proceedings of conferences.
- f. Serving as peer-reviewer for journals, publishers of professional literature, and funding agencies.
- g. Other documentable service to the profession or public.

The quantitative evaluation is in terms of the extent of involvement. The qualitative evaluation is in terms of the intensity and effectiveness of involvement.

REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES
Chemical Engineering Department

Approved: July 6, 2007

Last Revised: July 6, 2007

I. The Reappointment, Promotion & Tenure (RPT) Committee

The members of the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) Committee are appointed annually by the Department Head. The Chair of the RPT Committee is elected for a three-year term by the ChE faculty from among the full professors. The Chair also serves on the College RPT Committee. The responsibilities of this committee include:

To review and develop departmental policies regarding tenure and promotion.

To facilitate the annual review of faculty on probationary appointments

To conduct a formal mid-probationary review of all untenured faculty.

To review untenured faculty who seek the committee's assessment about their progress toward earning tenure and, if ready, to see that all necessary forms are completed and forwarded in a timely manner.

To review all associate professors who seek the committee's assessment about their progress toward earning promotion and, if ready, to see that all necessary forms are completed and forwarded in a timely manner.

II. Eligible ChE Faculty for RPT Decisions

In this document the term "eligible faculty" identifies those ChE faculty members who are responsible for participating in the reappointment, promotion and tenure decisions. The conditions for eligible faculty members are:

Tenured faculty members with rank equal to or higher than the proposed promotion rank.

Faculty members that have a current departmental appointment of 50% or greater.

Eligible faculty members are expected to actively participate in the entire evaluation process of the candidate. This includes evaluation of the candidate's RPT materials and participation in the formal deliberations about the candidate's qualifications. Any eligible faculty member who does not actively participate is expected to refrain from voting.

III. Probationary Review

1. Each faculty member holding a probationary appointment must undergo annual evaluation in order to determine if he/she will be reappointed for the following year. As a result of the evaluation, each faculty member on probationary appointment is given feedback regarding their performance when judged according to the ChE Department's criteria and standards for tenure.
2. **During first year of academic service:** The department head evaluates the probationary faculty member. If the faculty member is not to be reappointed, then the department head must first meet with the eligible faculty and present and discuss the reasons for this decision. The faculty member is notified in writing on or before March 1 if his or her appointment is to be terminated at the end of that academic year. If the one year appointment expires during the academic year, then the department head must notify the faculty member of the decision to terminate at least 3 months before the appointment actually expires.
3. Each faculty member on probationary appointment, after the first year of service, must submit to the department RPT Committee material that documents the professional accomplishments since his or her initial appointment. This material must include, but is not limited to:
 - d. Completed University Promotion Forms
 - e. Evidence of effective teaching including evaluations of teaching.
 - f. Evidence of scholarly work which must include technical articles published or pending publication, summaries of research projects started and underway, copies of research proposals submitted, a list of supervised graduate students, and summaries of any other scholarly activities.
 - g. Evidence of service to the ChE Department, college, university, and profession, including participation in technical societies.
4. The date for submission of probationary faculty member's evaluation materials depends on the length of time that the faculty member has served as defined below.
 - a. **During the second year of academic service:**
 1. September, end of second week: Faculty member submits the evaluation materials (described in III.3.) to the RPT Committee. Upon review of the evaluation materials by the RPT Committee, the faculty member may change and/or modify the materials in response to suggestions provided by the RPT Committee

2. October, end of second week: The faculty member's materials are made available for review by the eligible departmental faculty.
3. November, end of first week: After the evaluation materials have been available to the eligible faculty for at least 14 days, the department head and the eligible faculty will meet to discuss the probationary faculty member's suitability for reappointment and advancement toward tenure. The RPT committee will make its recommendation to the eligible faculty members at this time. At this meeting, any eligible faculty member may request that the probationary faculty member (within 5 calendar days) meet with all the eligible faculty members to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the evaluation materials submitted by the probationary faculty member. After all discussions are complete, a ballot of the eligible faculty concerning the reappointment of the probationary faculty member will be submitted to the department head. The RPT committee chair writes a letter to the department head summarizing the faculty vote and the factors which influenced the outcome.
4. November, end of second week: Department head submits the final recommendation, explanations, and complete evaluation materials to the Dean. Included in the submitted materials to the Dean is the recommendation letter from the RPT committee chair. The department head will present to the probationary faculty member the written recommendation and the associated explanations. Also, the department head will discuss with the probationary faculty member their advancement toward tenure. These recommendations and explanations are kept in the probationary faculty member's confidential file.

b. **After two or more years of academic service:**

1. January, end of second week: Faculty member submits the evaluation materials (described in III. 3.) to the ChE RPT Committee. These materials must include the cumulative record of written recommendations and associated explanations given to the probationary faculty member from previous reappointment meetings and any other written comments from relevant individuals outside the department. Upon review of the evaluation materials by the RPT Committee, the faculty member may change and/or modify the submitted evaluation materials.
2. February, end of second week: The faculty member's materials are made available for review by the eligible departmental faculty.
3. March, end of first week: After the evaluation materials have been available to the eligible faculty for at least 14 days, the department head and the eligible faculty will meet to discuss the probationary faculty member's suitability for

reappointment and advancement toward tenure. The RPT committee will make its recommendation to the eligible faculty members at this time. At this meeting, any eligible faculty member may request that the probationary faculty member (within 5 calendar days) meet with all the eligible faculty members to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the evaluation materials submitted by the probationary faculty member. After all discussions are complete, a ballot of the eligible faculty concerning the reappointment of the probationary faculty member will be submitted to the department head. The RPT committee chair writes a letter to the department head summarizing the faculty vote and the factors which influenced the outcome.

4. March, end of second week: Department head submits the final recommendation, explanations, and complete evaluation materials to the Dean. Included in the submitted materials to the Dean is the recommendation letter from the RPT committee chair. The department head will present to the probationary faculty member the written recommendation and the associated explanations. Also, the department head will discuss with the probationary faculty member their advancement toward tenure. These recommendations and explanations are kept in the probationary faculty member's confidential file.

IV. Mid-Probationary Review

Midway through the probationary period, a formal review of a probationary faculty member is conducted. The mid-probationary review occurs during the faculty member's third year in the department. The purpose of this review is to provide substantial feedback to the probationary faculty member from both the faculty and the administration about how well the faculty member's accomplishments satisfy the department's criteria for obtaining tenure. A favorable mid-probationary review does not guarantee that tenure will be given in the future, nor does a negative review guarantee that tenure will not be given.

Each faculty member on probationary appointment must submit to the ChE Department Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee material that documents the professional accomplishments since his or her initial appointment.

This material is specified in Section III. 3. In addition, the Department Head will solicit evaluations from individuals outside of the KSU ChE department, at least two of whom are specified by the faculty member.

Procedures and time line for the mid-probationary review are those described in Section III. 4.b.

V. Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

By the first day of the fall semester, each untenured faculty member intending to seek tenure during the academic year (and, if an assistant professor, also promotion to associate professor) must write a letter to the Chair of the RPT Committee (with a copy to the Department Head) indicating the intention to seek tenure and promotion, if applicable. This letter must include completed University Promotion Forms responding to the Department's Promotion and/or Tenure Guidelines, as well as all supporting materials (copies of publications, teaching evaluations, etc.).

The RPT committee will review the letter, forms, and any supporting material as a committee and then meet with each candidate seeking tenure and/or promotion. The Department Head will participate in this meeting. Suggestions for improving the candidate's application and for addressing any concerns the committee perceives will be discussed with the candidate. The final decision to go forward rests with the candidate.

Faculty going forward for promotion will submit to the RPT Committee, by September 1, a list of four potential reviewers outside the University. At least two of these reviewers, plus at least two others selected by the Department Head, will be contacted for written evaluations. Faculty going forward for promotion will prepare the final documentation supporting their application, in consultation with the RPT Committee and the Department Head, by October 1.

Eligible ChE faculty members individually review each candidate's file, which will be available at least fourteen days prior to the meeting at which eligible faculty discuss the candidate's petition. Any eligible faculty, prior to the vote, may request to meet with the candidate to clarify any materials submitted by the candidate. A meeting of eligible faculty will be called. At this meeting, the RPT Committee will report to the eligible faculty its deliberations. The eligible faculty, less the Department Head, then submit their vote and written comments to the Department Head. The vote and unedited faculty comments are forwarded with the candidate's material to the Dean.

The Department Head will report to the eligible faculty the faculty vote tally and his or her recommendation to the Dean. If the Department Head's recommendation is contrary to the faculty vote, the Head will meet with the eligible faculty to explain the reasons for not accepting the faculty vote.

VI. Promotion to Full Professor

By the first day of the fall semester, each tenured associate professor intending to seek promotion during the academic year must write a letter to the chair of the RPT committee (with a copy to the Department Head) indicating the intention to seek promotion. This letter must include completed University Promotion Forms responding to the Department's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, as well as all supporting materials (copies of publications, teaching evaluations, etc.).

The RPT Committee will review the letter, forms, and any supporting material as a committee and then meet with each candidate seeking promotion. The Department Head will participate in this meeting. Suggestions for improving the candidate's application and for addressing any concerns the committee perceives will be discussed with the candidate. The final decision to go forward rests with the candidate.

Faculty going forward for promotion will submit to the RPT Committee, by September 1, a list of four potential reviewers outside the University. At least two of these reviewers, plus at least two others selected by the Department Head, will be contacted for written evaluations. Faculty going forward for promotion will prepare the final documentation supporting their application, in consultation with the RPT Committee and the Department Head, by October 1.

Eligible ChE faculty members individually review each candidate's file, which will be available at least fourteen days prior to the meeting at which eligible faculty discuss the candidate's petition. Any eligible faculty, prior to the vote, may request to meet with the

candidate to clarify any materials submitted by the candidate. A meeting of eligible faculty will be called. At this meeting, the RPT Committee will report to the eligible faculty its deliberations. The eligible faculty, less the Department Head, then submit their vote and written comments to the Department Head. The vote and unedited faculty comments are forwarded with the candidate's material to the Dean.

The Department Head will report to the eligible faculty the faculty vote tally and his or her recommendation to the Dean. If the Department Head's recommendation is contrary to the faculty vote, the Head will meet with the eligible faculty to explain the reasons for not accepting the faculty vote.

VII. Meetings of the RPT Committee

Meetings of the RPT Committee, when individual qualifications are considered, will be closed and any written responses will be confidential.

PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD

Department of Chemical Engineering

Approved: July 6, 2007

On February 14, 2006, Faculty Senate approved the final version of a 'Professorial Performance Award' policy. The procedures described below were approved by a majority vote of the Department of Chemical Engineering Faculty on May 12, 2006, for inclusion in the *Criteria and Procedures on Faculty Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion, Department of Chemical Engineering* document. These procedures will be subject to review at least every five years.

Professorial Performance Award Policy

To qualify to be recommended to the Dean of the College of Engineering for a Professional Performance Award, a faculty member must be a full-time, full professor, in rank at Kansas State for at least six years since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award, and must, over the previous six year period, have demonstrated sustained productivity within his/her areas of responsibility. It is not sufficient that a candidate merely compile a record free of notable deficiencies.

Minimum Criteria

The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental

standards. Additionally, over the preceding six-year time period, a candidate must consistently earn a merit evaluation of “exceeds expectations” in at least one area of professional responsibility. Supporting evidence might include—but not be limited to—College, University, and Professional Society awards related to performance of professorial duties (research, teaching or advising), sustained rate of publication in scholarly journals, external funding of research or educational activities, election to national office in professional societies such as AIChE, ASEE, leadership in faculty senate, etc. The six-year time frame will include the most recent performance review.

Process

Any candidate, who meets the minimum criteria, may apply for a performance award. To apply, a candidate must assemble a performance award file that documents his/her scholarly accomplishments over the past six years. A candidate should submit a file including the following elements to the Department Head:

- 1) a one-page summary of major achievements during the evaluation period,
- 2) a one-page summary of instructional productivity, including courses taught, student advisement, and thesis supervision, in addition to evidence of instructional quality such as ratings, peer evaluations, or evaluation of advising,
- 3) a one-page statement of research and other creative activities accompanied by a list of publications and a list of funded grants and contracts,
- 4) a one-page statement of service contributions, including evidence of leadership.

The Department Head will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's application in terms of these guidelines, along with a recommendation for or against the award. External reviews of the candidate's file are not required.

Time Line and Procedure

In accordance with Paragraph C49.2 of the University Handbook, this document constitutes the review mechanism and procedure for the Professorial Performance Award of the Chemical Engineering Department. This review mechanism and procedure document will be reviewed at

least every five years. Any Chemical Engineering (ChE) tenured full professor is eligible for the Professional Performance Award (PPA) provided at least six years have elapsed since the faculty member's initial appointment at the rank of Professor or since receiving the last PPA.

The procedure and time line for those faculty wishing to apply for the PPA are:

Fall Semester End (nominally December 15):

The candidate informs Department Head in writing of his/her wish to be considered for the PPA and consults with the Department Head.

Start of Spring Semester (nominally January 15):

After another consultation with the Department Head, if the candidate decides to continue the PPA application process, then the candidate forwards the documents and records concerning teaching, scholarship, and service occurring over the previous six years with the PPA Summary Table to the Department Head. 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 (all full professors with a departmental appointment of at least 50%) 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 eligible faculty will choose a Chairperson from its membership. It is the responsibility of the Chairperson 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 to the Department Head. The purpose of the meeting is for the eligible faculty to identify those candidates deemed worthy of the PPA and to forward to the Department Head within one week following the meeting of the eligible faculty a list containing the recommended candidates together with written evaluations attesting to why each individual is or is not worthy of the PPA. A transcript of the written comments pertaining to a particular candidate is 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 is 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 ChE 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 ChE Department Head must submit the following items to the Dean of Engineering:

- a) The candidate's supporting materials that served as the basis of evaluating eligibility for the award.
- b) The recommendation prepared by the Department Head.
- 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, the Chair of the ChE Promotion and Tenure Committee will fulfill the function of the Department Head in all of the above procedures for that individual.

APPENDIX A
FACULTY ACTIVITY REPORT
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICAL ENGINEERING

January 1 to December 31, 20____

Name: _____

Rank: _____

Fractional Assignment: _____ Teaching _____ Research _____ Service

I. TEACHING ACTIVITIES

A. Undergraduate courses taught

Spring

Summer

Fall

B. Graduate courses taught

Spring

Summer

Fall

Note: Append copies of student evaluations (IDEA Reports) to this document.

C. Graduate students advised (note if co-advised or off-campus).

M.S. candidates

Ph.D. candidates

D. Graduate students who obtained their degrees under your supervision.

M.S.

Ph.D.

E. New instructional approaches developed, preparation of instructional devices or aids, new courses and teaching laboratories developed (attach any appropriate documentation).

F. Additional training and education for enhancing teaching effectiveness (attach any appropriate documentation).

G. Mentoring of research associates.

II. RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

A. Books and monographs published (attach a copy each of the published work if available).

B. Journal articles and book chapters (attach copies or reprints)

Refereed Articles

Non-Refereed Articles

Book Chapter

C. Reports and bulletins

D. Material submitted or accepted for publication but not yet published (attach a copy each of the preprints)

- E. Papers presented (attach a copy each of the reprints, if available)
- F. Continuing grants (include title, co-PI's names, funding source, duration, total value, and an estimate of your share)
- G. Research proposals submitted (include title, co-PI's names, funding source, duration, total value, and an estimate of your share)
- H. Research grants received (include title, co-PI's names, funding source, duration, total value, and an estimate of your share)
- I. Patent applications filed and granted (attach appropriate documentation)
 - a. M.S. and Ph.D. Supervisory Committees on which you served
 - M.S. candidates
 - Ph.D. candidates

III. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

- A. Consulting services
- B. Summer employment
- C. Professional appearances and invited lectures
- D. Other professional activities

IV. INSTITUTIONAL AND PUBLIC SERVICE

- A. Committee assignments (department, college of engineering, and university)
- B. Other departmental and institutional services
- C. Public service assignments

V. HONORS

List all prizes, awards, fellowships, honor society memberships, honorary degrees, visiting professorships, etc. (attach any appropriate documentation)

VI. OTHER (list or indicate any additional activities and items not previously covered)

VII. PROFESSIONAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

- A. Provide a brief summary of the past year's accomplishments relative to the expectations set for the year in last year's activity report.
- B. Expectations for the current calendar year (please list major items you would like to accomplish in the coming year. For ongoing projects, service, etc., it is only necessary to state "continued current level of service" or something similar.)
 - 1. Teaching (Course development, equipment proposals, textbook or manual writing, etc.) Planned tenths: _____
 - 2. Research (Proposals, publications, conferences, etc.)
Planned tenths: _____
 - 3. Service (professional society, university committees, consulting, etc.)

Planned tenths: _____

Department Head's basis for the faculty member's performance ratings:

- I. Teaching (Classroom teaching, course development, advising, laboratory supervision and maintenance, etc.):

- II. Research (Scholarly research, publications, research grants or contracts, proposal and paper submission, research supervision, etc.):

- III. Service (Departmental, College and University committees, professional service, public service, etc.):

Faculty member's comments:

EXPECTATIONS FOR CURRENT CALENDAR YEAR

<u>Activities</u>	<u>Responsibility</u>
-------------------	-----------------------

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| I. Teaching | , |
|-------------|---|

II. Research	
III. Service	
TOTAL	

Note: The typical tenth-time assignment for a full time faculty member is 0.5 for teaching, 0.4 for research, and 0.1 for service. These will be appropriately scaled according to the actual assignment for an individual.

REMARKS ON EXPECTATIONS FOR CURRENT CALENDAR YEAR:

Department Head		Date	
Reviewed by Faculty Member		Date	