

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTING AND INFORMATION SCIENCES

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 5/12/06)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 10/10/05)

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*: **10/2010**

Virgil Wallentine, Department Head

Date signed: 5/12/06

Terry King, Dean

Date signed: 5/16/06

M. Duane Nellis, Provost

Date signed: 11/02/06

*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.

The Department of
Computing and Information Sciences
Kansas State University

**Policies and Procedures:
Annual Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure,
and Professorial Performance**

Approved October 20, 2004, revised January 2006, extended May 12, 2006
<http://www.cis.ksu.edu/Department/Policies/FacultyEvaluation.html>

0. General

This document states the policies and procedures of the Department for evaluation of faculty for determination of reappointment and salary and for recommendations for tenure, promotion, and nomination for the Professorial Performance award. The document serves as a supplement to the policies and procedures stated in the Kansas State University Faculty Handbook.
(<http://www.ksu.edu/academicservices/fhbook/fhsecc.html>)

The terms “procedures”, “guidelines”, “criteria”, and “standards” are used in the University and Regents requirements. The CIS department interprets these as follows. “Procedures” and “guidelines” mean the steps of progress, time schedules, uses of forms and evaluation instruments, and responsibilities of the Department Head, the subject faculty member, and the peer members of the faculty. “Criteria” denotes the specific and observable activities, both general (as teaching, research, service) and detailed (as preparing curriculum materials, publishing papers) that form the basis for evaluation and the measures, both objective and subjective, that are used to rate faculty performance. Example measures are student evaluation of effectiveness of the instructor, number and level of papers published, and amount and effectiveness of service activities. “Standards” are embodied in the descriptors used to rank performance of activities.

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, faculty will provide to the Department Head information about their teaching, research, and service. Summary information is provided in the Faculty Evaluation Information Form, 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.

For each faculty member, the Department Head completes a Faculty Evaluation Form (see Appendix B) and a written evaluation, based on the categories listed on the Evaluation Form. For each category, a rating of “outstanding”, “above satisfactory”, “satisfactory”, “needs improvement”, “unacceptable”, or “NA” (for not applicable) is assigned. The overall evaluation is based upon the evaluation of each category weighted by the agreed distribution of effort over the three major categories. A rating of “unacceptable” on any one of the essential areas will result in an overall rating of “unacceptable”. During the evaluation, the Department Head and the faculty member may jointly adjust the distribution numbers in consideration of actual distribution of activities. The Department Head and the faculty member both sign the Evaluation Form and indicate either agreement about the evaluation or disagreement on specific points.

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

If the Department Head makes an initial evaluation of “unacceptable” in any essential area of work for a faculty member, the Department Head will consult with all other tenured faculty of equal or higher rank to arrive at a final evaluation. When a tenured faculty member receives an evaluation of “unacceptable”, 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.

In the area of teaching, unacceptable performance is any continuing pattern of failure to provide an environment of learning. Examples include presentation of technically incorrect or obsolete content, failure to meet classes on time, failure to meet classes as scheduled, failure to monitor and direct progress of graduate students for whom the faculty member is the major professor, and failure to treat students with respect.

In the area of research, unacceptable performance is failure to produce sufficient evidence of an on-going, quality research program. Examples of such evidence include continuing funding of work, support of graduate students, peer reviewed publications, professional participation, and direction of graduate research and Ph.D. dissertations.

In the area of service, unacceptable performance is any pattern of failure to meet minimum requirements of assigned service duties. Examples include failure to meet minimum requirements of committees on which the faculty member is assigned to serve, avoidance of assigned advising, and incorrect advising.

In the area of collegiality, unacceptable performance is any pattern of disruptive relationships with university colleagues, technical and office staff, or students.

2. Mid-Probationary Review

2.a. Procedures

For new faculty at the assistant professor level, the Department Head will appoint an appropriate faculty member to serve as a mentor to provide guidance and feedback during the probationary period. Nevertheless, it is the faculty member's responsibility to achieve the standards defined for tenure and promotion.

A mid-probationary review will be conducted as part of the annual review during the third year of employment. The faculty member will supply review materials to the Department Head during September of the review year. The review will be over all work of the previous two years and the current semester. The faculty member will provide access to:

- i) All publications and identification of the three or four best publications.
- ii) Grant proposals together with reviewer's comments.
- iii) Descriptions of distinguishing aspects of classes taught. (For example, information about content of new courses and laboratory materials, description of methods of teaching.)
- iv) Self-evaluation of research results and expectations for the next three years.
- v) List of several persons who could serve as outside peer reviewers.

The Department Head will provide:

- v) Letters of review by at least two outside reviewers with strong credentials in the area of focus of the faculty member.
- vi) A summary of previous annual evaluations.

All materials of scholarly work submitted by the faculty member will be sent to at least two outside reviewers. The above materials will be available for review by the tenured faculty members, who then meet to discuss (i) how the faculty member may be expected to progress towards tenure and (ii) how the faculty member can best prepare for future tenure review. The tenured faculty individually report evaluation and recommendations to the Department Head. The Department Head will prepare a letter of evaluation and recommendations for progress. If there is any aspect of performance that would not merit tenure, the Department Head will indicate what level should be achieved. He will report the results to the tenured faculty and then to the faculty member. A complete packet of materials and recommendations will be forwarded to the Dean of Engineering, who will provide the faculty member with letter of results of the mid-probationary review.

2.b. Criteria

The criteria are the same as for the annual salary review, namely, contribution to the Department programs through teaching, research, and service.

2.c. Standards

The standards of evaluation for mid-probationary review are based upon judgment by peers including the tenured faculty of the Department and at least two persons outside of Kansas State University. The faculty member must show substantial progress towards the standards for tenure and promotion.

3. Tenure and Promotion

3.a. Procedures

The overall procedure for the review of a faculty member for tenure and/or promotion is summarized as follows:

1. The faculty member provides materials for review as for the mid-probationary review. In addition the faculty member must complete the promotion and tenure form provided at the Academic Services web site <http://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/forms/promotio.html>
2. The Department Head provides external review letters and summary of past evaluations.
3. Tenured faculty of higher rank discuss the review materials.
4. The faculty forward their recommendations to the Department Head.
5. The Department Head makes his own recommendation.
6. The recommendations are reported to the faculty of higher rank.
7. The recommendations and the review materials are forwarded to the Dean.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to submit the review materials in a timely manner to meet the university schedules for review of candidates for promotion and tenure. The procedures

for review for promotion to Professor are essentially the same as that for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Both cases are covered by this section. When possible, the review materials are sent to at least three outside reviewers (not necessarily those recommended by the faculty member).

3.b Criteria

These criteria are contribution to the Department programs through contribution to teaching, research, and service, including contribution to students and to the computing profession.

3.c Standards

The standards of evaluation for tenure and promotion are based upon judgment by peers including the tenured faculty of the Department and at least three persons outside of Kansas State University.

For tenure and promotion to rank of associate professor, the faculty member must show at least acceptable performance in all three areas of teaching, research, and service and must have shown very good contribution in at least one of these areas. For positive evaluation of teaching, the faculty member must give evidence of contribution to the teaching program of the Department. For positive review of the research assignment, the faculty member must give evidence of contribution to the national body of knowledge in computer science, must show evidence of potential for national recognition of the member's research, and must be seeking to establish a continuing program of external funding to support graduate students and research activity. It is expected that most candidates for tenure will have established research funding. For positive review of service, the faculty member must give evidence of contribution at the national level. Overall, the guiding standard prescribed by the University is that if there is doubt about overall contribution, then tenure should not be recommended.

For promotion to rank of professor, the faculty member must demonstrate acceptable performance in all three areas and excellent performance in at least one of the areas. For excellence in the teaching assignment, the faculty member must give evidence of significant national contribution to the teaching of computer science. For excellence in the research assignment, the faculty must establish national recognition of research work. For excellence in service, the faculty must show contribution at the national or international level.

4. Nomination for Professorial Performance Award

4a. Procedures

General procedures for nomination for the Professorial Performance Award are described in the Kansas State University Faculty Handbook, Section C49. Faculty with full-time appointment at the rank of Professor and who have held the rank for at least six years since their last promotion or Professorial Performance Award may submit documents for review for nomination for the Performance Award. Documentation should follow the format required for promotion to the rank of Professor and should focus on (but not be limited to) work performed during the previous six years. Copies of the candidate's annual statement-of-goals and annual performance-evaluation for each the past six years must be included in the documentation. The faculty

candidate must also submit a list of names of referees, from which at least one internal referee (a member of KSU) and one external (non KSU) referee are selected to review the documentation. Documents should be submitted at the beginning of the fall semester so as to conform with the usual timelines for evaluation for promotion.

The Department Head will convene an evaluation committee comprised of faculty at the rank of Professor who are not currently to be considered for the Professorial Performance Award. The Department Head is the default chair of the committee. If the Department Head is in consideration for the Performance Award, then a separate chair of the committee will be appointed. The committee should have at least three members. If necessary, the Department Head may invite faculty who retired at the rank of Professor or faculty from related departments to join the committee. The committee will collect the review letters, prepare a written evaluation, and vote on the Performance Award request. The results will be processed following the procedures in the Faculty Handbook, Section C49.

4b. Criteria

To be recommended for the Performance Award, the faculty candidate must show sustained productivity during the six-year review period (Section C49 notes possible extension of the six year period). While the level of effort and achievement of the nominee should be comparable to that required for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, the specific achievements of the candidate need not be of the same genre as those achievements required of an Associate Professor seeking promotion. It is understood that Professors may undertake efforts of direction, management, and support of the Department's mission, that may not be required for persons at the Associate Professor rank.

The candidate's annual statement-of-goals will be given strong weighting for the Professorial Award. In addition, annual performance evaluations must indicate that the candidate has demonstrated acceptable performance in all areas with excellent performance in at least one area of performance. The overall performance must have been above the acceptable level for at least four of the six years. In addition, judgment of excellence and impact must be supported and validated by the letters of review from the internal and external reviewers.

Appendix A Faculty Evaluation Information Form

Appendix B Faculty Evaluation Form

Reference

<http://www.idea.ksu.edu/forms/ShortForm-NewScale.pdf>

<http://www.idea.ksu.edu/forms/DiagnosticForm-NewScale.pdf>