

**DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRICAL AND COMPUTER ENGINEERING**

**ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 9/28/06)**

**PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 9/28/06)**

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES \*(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **9/2011**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES\*: **9/2011**

**Anil Pahwa, Department Head**

**Date signed: 10/17/06**

**Richard Gallagher, Dean**

**Date signed: 10/19/06**

**M. Duane Nellis, Provost**

**Date signed: 11/16/06**

\*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.

**Kansas State University  
Electrical and Computer Engineering**

**Faculty Evaluation Procedures**

**Approved: September 9, 1993**

**Last Revised: September 28, 2006**

This is a summary of the procedures used in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering for annual merit evaluation of tenured or tenure-track faculty members of the department. This evaluation is used to determine recommendations for annual merit salary increases for all faculty, identify professors for the Professorial Performance Award, and to identify tenured faculty with Chronic Low Achievement.

1. At the end of each calendar year each faculty member is asked to complete and return to the department head forms summarizing accomplishments for the past calendar year and plans for the coming year. All faculty members must submit a Faculty Accomplishments/Plans form. All faculty must submit student evaluations of their teaching. Assistant and Associate Professors must have at least one course evaluated each semester. Professors must have at least one course evaluated each year. These evaluations must be done with forms that meet Board of Regents guidelines. All faculty members must submit assessment data for all classes as required by the ABET and KSU assessment plans.
2. The department head reviews the information submitted by each faculty member and then prepares an evaluation of the performance of each faculty member. The evaluation is summarized on a Faculty Appraisal form. Criteria are established in the areas of teaching, research and service, and the evaluation is based on these criteria. The criteria are established by the EECE Promotion and Tenure document. The merit factor is a weighted sum of the performance levels in each of the three areas of effort. The performance level is numbered from one to four with two corresponding to meets expectations and four being the best possible rating. The weighting factors in each of the areas are the tenths time a faculty member is assigned to work in the respective area. A typical assignment in the department might be 0.6 teaching, 0.3 research and 0.1 service.
3. The department head computes percent merit salary increases as a function of faculty merit factors based on monies available.
4. A copy of the department head's evaluation is given to the faculty member and a meeting is held to discuss the evaluation and plans. Signed copies of the Faculty Accomplishments/Plans and Faculty Appraisal forms are then forwarded to the Dean of Engineering.

## 5. Professorial Performance Award

**Documents:** Faculty at the professor level will use their annual evaluation documents to collect data needed to apply for a Professorial Performance Award. When a decision has been made to apply for the PPA, the candidate must compile a file that documents her or his professional accomplishments for the previous six years. These accomplishments should be in accordance with department-level criteria, standards, and guidelines for productivity associated with promotion to full professor. External letters of candidate's performance evaluation are not required.

**Evaluation:** University policies together with department-level annual evaluations will be used to determine a professor's eligibility for the PPA. To be eligible for consideration, the individual must have overall annual evaluation ratings of at least 4.0 in at least five of the last six years. Professors who were not evaluated by the department head due to significant administrative appointments during the last six years must have overall annual evaluation ratings of at least 4.0 in the years they were on non-administrative appointments. All the candidates must also satisfy the performance criteria specified in section C.49 of the University Handbook.

The department head may appoint a 3-person committee from the department faculty to assist in the review. This committee will have access to the material submitted by the candidate.

## 6. Chronic Low Achievement

**Procedure:** If the Department Head determines that a tenured faculty member appears not to meet the minimum standard in any area of assigned responsibility, a committee of Professors 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 Faculty Handbook.

**Standards:** All faculty members must perform all duties outlined in the KSU Faculty 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. Exceptions will be documented and signed by the faculty member and the Department Head.

Decisions on acceptable performance levels must contain the individual judgments of the faculty and administrators involved in the decision.

Productivity in each area will be evaluated based on assigned activities and the percentage of the individual's appointment allocated to that activity. Each 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 appropriate functions such as graduation.

Attachments: Faculty Appraisal Form  
Faculty Accomplishments/Plans Form  
EECE Promotion, Tenure, Mid-Tenure Review, and Reappointment Guidelines

**Kansas State University**  
**Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering**

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

**Approved: September 9, 1993**

**Last Revised: September 28, 2006**

**Introduction**

This document discusses issues related to promotion, tenure, mid-tenure review and reappointment within the Electrical and Computer 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 EECE priorities on matters of reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

**General Statement**

The issues discussed in this document are consistent with the University's expectations for the EECE Department. It is expected that faculty will perform at different levels in the various activities enumerated in this document. Significant variance is to be expected due to differences in responsibilities and assignments of individual faculty members.

It is essential that all faculty members are able to work well with their colleagues, technical and office staff, and students. Continued disruptive or anti-social behavior which is objectionable to other persons within the department would constitute grounds for denying reappointment, promotion, or tenure.

The College of Engineering and the EECE Department have historically placed a high value on excellence in the classroom. It should be recognized that 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 EECE 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 it should be recognized that 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 faculty as to whether the criteria have been met.

### **Eligible Faculty**

The faculty who are eligible to participate in reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions in the EECE Department are those tenured faculty that have a current departmental appointment of at least fifty percent. In addition, for promotion, only tenured faculty with an equal or higher rank than the proposed promotion rank may participate.

Eligible faculty are expected to actively participate in the entire evaluation process. This includes evaluation of the candidate's material and participation in the discussions of the candidate's qualifications. Any eligible faculty member who does not actively participate is expected to abstain from voting.

### **Reappointment Documents**

All untenured faculty will be expected to prepare documentation for consideration for reappointment on an annual basis. This must be done so that the deadlines defined in the University Handbook for notice of non-reappointment can be met. Failure to submit documentation may be grounds for non-reappointment. Documentation will consist of the university promotion and tenure documents.

### **Reappointment Evaluation**

Reappointment decisions will be based on the EECE Departments criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. Positive recommendations will indicate that the faculty member under consideration is making adequate progress to achieve promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

### **Promotion, Tenure, and Mid-Tenure Review Documents**

All Assistant Professors and Associate Professors will be expected to prepare the documentation for promotion, tenure and/or mid-tenure review on an annual basis as part of the promotion and tenure process. This ongoing effort will not only raise their awareness of the requirements for promotion and/or tenure, it will help build a record of their contributions. The Department Head will discuss each individual's progress and plans during the annual merit review.

All Assistant Professors and Associate Professors will be required to submit student evaluations of their classes. These evaluations must be done with forms that meet Board of Regents Guidelines.

### **Promotion, Tenure, and Mid-Tenure Review Evaluation**

The three sections that follow discuss the contributions to teaching, research, and service

that are of importance to the EECE Department. Higher levels of performance are expected for promotion to Professor than for promotion to Associate Professor. This can take the form of higher performance in a single area or more contributions over a wider area of responsibility.

### **Teaching Evaluation**

There are many ways to contribute to the teaching effort of the department. Items in Group I are expected of all faculty. Items in Group II are important, but not all faculty are expected to perform in all of these areas.

#### **Group I**

1. Integrating design topics into appropriate courses.
2. Advising undergraduate students.
3. The guiding of design projects for Honors students.
4. The development of new courses and revisions of existing courses to reflect advances in the state of the art.
5. The development, maintenance, and use of computer software as an aid in appropriate courses.
6. Content and depth of material covered in required courses in line with that of other teachers in the same course and appropriate to the needs of following courses.
7. Execution of responsibility for an area of study or for a laboratory course (e.g., preparing experiments and supervising graduate students).
8. Ability to recruit an adequate number of students into elective classes for the class to be offered. (consistent with popularity of area)
9. Performing and documenting all student assessment required for the ABET and KSU assessment plans.

#### **Group II**

1. Journal and conference papers on teaching, laboratory development, design projects, etc.
2. Proposals and grants for teaching innovations, laboratory development, or design projects.
3. The use of outside people as guest lecturers or team members in a design project.
4. The writing and classroom testing of a new textbook.
5. Involvement in interdisciplinary courses.

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 during exit interviews, possibly including the assignment of a letter grade by students to each instructor the student had for a course.

Class grade point averages in line with the departmental average for similar courses.

## **Research Evaluation**

The items below are listed more or less in the order of importance. Evidence of activity in those areas listed first will carry greater weight than effort in the areas appearing lower on the list. Claims that a paper is refereed should be supported with hard evidence when there is likely to be a question. Papers presented at ASEE meetings and published in the IEEE Transactions on Education are normally considered as part of a faculty member's teaching evaluation. Consideration as a research contribution requires justification.

The quality and quantity of the following are generally accepted measures of the candidate's performance as a researcher:

1. Journal Papers - refereed.
2. External research funding (research, not equipment or course development support).
3. Patents awarded.
4. Conference papers - refereed.
5. Books or contributions to books (if research oriented).
6. AMI and EES or other university funding in support of research.
7. Research reports and other non-reviewed works.
8. Ph.D. students.
9. M.S. students.
10. Proposals prepared
11. Graduate student committees
12. Other: presentations, short courses, etc.

## Service Evaluation

University service involves the formulation and implementation of departmental, college, and University policies. It is important to recognize the impact of these service activities on the work environment of colleagues.

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.

### **Service to the Institution: Examples may include:**

- 1) Chairing of, membership on, and contribution to departmental, college, and University committees.
- 2) Chairing of, membership on, and contribution to committees involving faculty governance.
- 3) Serving as faculty advisor to a recognized student group or organization.
- 4) Special assignments such as representing the University at national and international meetings.
- 5) Honors or special recognition for contributions to the department, college, University or to faculty governance.

### **Service to the Profession: Examples may include:**

- 1) Holding office in professional societies.
- 2) Service on state, national, and international committees.
- 3) Giving presentations at professional meetings.
- 4) Chairing and organizing technical sessions at professional meetings.
- 5) Reviewing or editing for professional journals and publishers.
- 6) Membership on review panels.
- 7) Honors or special recognition for contributions to an organization, discipline, or profession.

### **Service to the Public: Examples include only those activities that are job related.**

- 1) Providing expert testimony to courts or legislative bodies.
- 2) Consulting for individuals or corporations engaged in related industry, educational, or scholarly endeavors.
- 3) Providing technical consultation to professional or non-academic groups.