

## **DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL AND MANUFACTURING SYSTEMS ENGINEERING**

### **ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 4/06/07)**

### **PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 4/06/07)**

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES \*(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **4/2012**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES\*: **4/2012**

**Bradley A. Kramer, Department Head**

**Date signed: 6/05/07**

**Richard Gallagher, Interim Dean**

**Date signed: 6/06/07**

**M. Duane Nellis, Provost**

**Date signed: 6/08/07**

\*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.

# Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

Department of Industrial & Manufacturing Systems Engineering  
Kansas State University

Approved: April 6, 2007

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	ii
IMSE DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT .....	1
1.0 INTRODUCTION .....	1
2.0 ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES FOR IMSE FACULTY .....	1
2.1 Calendar of Events in Annual Evaluations .....	2
2.2 Material to Be Submitted for Annual Evaluations .....	2
2.3 Summary of Activities .....	3
2.4 Information Considered in Evaluating Instructional Activity .....	3
2.5 Information Considered in Evaluating Research .....	4
2.6 Information Considered in Evaluating Service .....	4
3.0 GUIDELINES FOR ACTIVITY PLANS .....	4
4.0 DEPARTMENT HEAD EVALUATION .....	5
5.0 CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE .....	5
5.1 Annual Review and Reappointment of Non Tenured Faculty Members .....	5
5.2 Midtenure Review .....	6
5.3 Promotion and Tenure Procedure .....	6
5.4 Teaching .....	7
5.5 Research .....	7
5.6 Service .....	8
6.0 MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE FACULTY PERFORMANCE .....	8
6.1 General Statement .....	8
6.2 Minimum Acceptable Faculty Performance .....	9
6.3 Procedures .....	9
7.0 PROFESSORAL PERFORMANCE AWARD .....	10
ATTACHMENT A - SUMMARY OF INFORMATION INCLUDED IN DOCUMENTING FACULTY ACHIEVEMENTS .....	13
ATTACHMENT B - SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES .....	14
ATTACHMENT C - ACTIVITY PLANS .....	19
ATTACHMENT D - APPRAISAL FORM FOR FACULTY PERFORMANCE .....	21

## **IMSE DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT**

*We prepare students for successful life-long careers and provide leadership in industry and our profession through our research and educational programs. To accomplish these objectives, we commit ourselves to each of the following activities:*

- 1) educate students to become industrial and manufacturing systems engineers who can design, analyze, and improve production systems and processes;*
- 2) educate students at the graduate level to become masters of Industrial & Manufacturing Systems Engineering so that they can apply current IMSE skills and tools and lead the quest to advance the state-of-the-art in IMSE;*
- 3) perform research in our discipline that is of fundamental importance, of value to industry, our profession, or society as a whole.*
- 4) serve our institution, community and profession by using our time and skills to help these groups achieve their objectives.*

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

The evaluation of faculty performance and vitality is critical to institutional livelihood and renewal. The purposes of this evaluation are to assure that each faculty member contributes to the accomplishment of departmental missions, to guide the development of each individual member of the faculty, and to provide a sound basis for personnel decisions related to salary, promotion and tenure.

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.

We expect each faculty member to contribute to the achievement of the department's goals and objectives as reflected in our mission statement. We realize that we cannot accomplish this mission without a faculty that is committed whole heartedly to the education of our students. The quality and reputation of the IMSE programs depends on the quality and reputation of our faculty. To establish and maintain reputable programs requires commitment from each individual to perform to the best of their ability now and in the future and to work together to accomplish the goals and objectives established by the department's faculty. To this end, we believe each faculty should annually perform a self-assessment of their professional activities. This self-assessment will provide the basis for the Department Head's annual evaluation of each faculty member and, when appropriate, shall provide the basis for recommendations concerning promoting and the award of tenure to faculty members.

### **2.0 ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES FOR IMSE FACULTY**

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

- \* Assure that each faculty member's activities contribute to the departmental missions
- \* Account for faculty activities
- \* Develop a fair means to distribute merit salary increases
- \* Provide feedback to faculty members to guide their development and improvement efforts
- \* Provide a basis for decisions concerning promotion and tenure
- \* Assure that no faculty member regularly fails to meet minimum performance expectations

The period covered by the annual evaluation is the calendar year. The basis for the annual evaluation is the faculty member's performance during the previous calendar year. The faculty evaluation process consists of three sequential steps: coordinated faculty activity planning (at the beginning of the year), faculty self-appraisal, and department head evaluation. Each merit evaluation considers the faculty member's contributions in instruction, research, and service in proportion to the percent of effort in each area to which the faculty member is assigned. Work that entails external remuneration, such as consulting, is not considered part of the annual review process.

Clearly, no single individual can be exceptional in all categories, and each faculty member'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. This focus will be considered, in the evaluation process, as it contributes to and enhances one's teaching, research, and service responsibilities.

Each faculty member in the IMSE Department is expected to annually submit a summary of activities for the previous year and an activity plan for the next year. The process timetable and the required information and documents to be submitted by each faculty member are detailed below.

## **2.1 Calendar of Events in Annual Evaluations**

1. The department head prepares a two-year tentative teaching schedule .....January 1
2. Each faculty member submits an Activity Summary (Attachment A) for the previous calendar year along with an Activity Plans Document (Attachment B) for the coming year ..... Mid-January)
3. The following tasks are accomplished according to specific time lines determined by the Department and College .....(Between mid-January and 3rd week of March)
  - a) Department Head completes evaluations for each faculty member.
  - b) Department Head discusses the evaluation with each individual faculty member.
  - c) Department Head forwards evaluation materials to the Dean of Engineering.
4. The Dean forwards evaluation materials to the Provost .....(Prior to 3rd week of March)
5. The Provost returns evaluation comments and evaluations to Deans ..... (3rd week of April)
6. Evaluation ratings are finalized. A list of individual faculty evaluation ratings and recommended percentage adjustments are submitted to the Provost.....(April/May)

## **2.2 Material to Be Submitted for Annual Evaluation**

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

1. Attachment A: "Summary of Activities"
2. Student Classroom Evaluations. (KSU Standardized Instruments Only For Each Class Taught)
3. Attachment B: "Activity Plans"

Faculty members may choose to submit supplemental information to the department head for consideration in the annual review. Examples of this type of information follow.

### **Material from Oneself:**

1. Unique or innovative course materials and technologies utilized
2. A brief description of how each course was taught.
3. Representative course syllabi detailing course content and objectives, teaching methods, readings, and homework assignments.
4. 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
5. Videotapes of classroom teaching.
6. Descriptions of instructional innovations and evaluation of their effectiveness.
7. Reviewers comments from articles submitted for publication
8. Reviewers comments from proposals submitted

### **Material from Others:**

1. Statements from colleagues who have observed the faculty member in the classroom (peer /colleague evaluation).
2. Documentation of teaching development activity through the Office for Educational Advancement, located in Fairchild Hall.
3. Statements from colleagues who have reviewed the faculty member's teaching materials such as course syllabi, assignments, and testing and grading practices.
4. Honors or other recognition, such as teaching awards.
5. Testimonials from employers of our graduates
6. Testimonials from colleagues

### **2.3 Summary of Activities**

The summary of activities document is presented in Appendix A. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to clearly document their efforts and achievements in teaching, research, and service.

The Summary of Activities document consists of two parts. The first part is a detailed list of accomplishments in each of the three major functions: teaching, research, and service. The workload allocation percentages shown in this section are negotiated with the department head at the beginning of the year and documented in the activity plan. The second part is a narrative self-assessment statement which discusses the faculty members most significant accomplishments during the year.

Specific information to be included in each section may include the following:

### **2.4 Information Considered in Evaluating Instructional Activity**

Instructional activity includes the development of new instructional approaches or courses and the teaching of existing courses. Faculty members must submit student evaluations of their teaching for each course assigned to them during the academic year. This evaluation must use a standardized KSU evaluation instrument.

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:

- \* sensitivity to and concern with class progress
- \* preparation and organization of the course
- \* knowledge of the subject
- \* enthusiasm (for the subject or for teaching)
- \* clarity and understandability
- \* availability and helpfulness
- \* effective communication
- \* professional attitude toward students
- \* flexibility in approaches to teaching
- \* concern for students
- \* quality and frequency of feedback to students
- \* openness to opinions of others
- \* encouragement of questions and discussion

Measures of teaching evaluation may include:

1. Global Ratings of the Instructor: Norm-referenced, student classroom evaluations & graduating senior exit interviews.
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. 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. 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.

4. Awards: Awards related to Teaching such as those sponsored by the department, college, or university--as well as other awards sponsored by student groups, external agencies and professional societies.
5. Department Head's assessment of teaching (must be requested by the faculty member).
6. Efforts made to improve effectiveness in the classroom.

## **2.5 Information Considered in Evaluating Research**

Significant research generally culminates in peer reviewed publications. Therefore, primary emphasis is placed on publications that have completed the peer review process within the last year. However, significant work toward developing funding for new research is regarded as an important accomplishment in the research area. Indications of the significance of a research proposal development effort will be determined in part from the comments of the reviewers when available. Evidence of scholarly and creative work includes but is not limited to:

- \* publication of research results
- \* presentation of research results
- \* generation of funding for research
- \* submission of proposals to generate funds for research
- \* invention disclosures, patent applications, and patents
- \* graduate student research supervised
- \* honors or awards for research

## **2.6 Information Considered in Evaluating Service**

Service activity can involve many varied types of work not directly related to instruction or research. These include: advising undergraduate students, serving on graduate student committees, serving on department, college, and university committees, being active in professional societies, or by serving the profession through the review of articles and research proposals. Evidence of service to the institution, the profession, and the general public include:

- \* student advising
- \* department, college, and university committees
- \* graduate student committees
- \* reviewing articles
- \* journal advisory boards
- \* conference sessions organized
- \* workshops presented
- \* professional society offices held, committee work, etc.
- \* extra departmental duties such as graduate program chair, network administrator, graduate seminar coordinator, organization advisor, etc.
- \* fund raising

## **3.0 GUIDELINES FOR ACTIVITY PLANS**

The purpose of this section is to provide a set of guidelines for department faculty to gain approval for their annual work plan.

Our belief is 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), methods of accomplishing work goals, establishes criteria against which the faculty member will be evaluated, establishes the time line for accomplishing the goals, and determines needed institutional resources. Each faculty member provides these materials annually in the Activity Plans document.

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, 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. This process is outlined below:

At the beginning of the Spring Semester - Each faculty member will outline how his/her time will be spent during the coming year. Time may be divided between the three areas of teaching, research, and service. The percentage allocation for each area is to be documented, 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, etc.

Each faculty member will submit their plan in the form of the "Activity Plans" document to the department head. The department head will review the document and discuss it with the faculty member. Approval will be signified by the head's signature on the document. After its approval, requests for major changes to the plan must be submitted to the department head in writing for review and approval.

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.

#### **4.0 DEPARTMENT HEAD EVALUATION**

The department head's evaluation should include three major components for each mission area:

1. A narrative summary highlighting the most significant accomplishments.
2. A "weight" based on the percentages of effort in the faculty self-appraisal.
3. A score (on a range 0 to 4) rating the performance of the work.
4. A summary table will be prepared to anonymously show the faculty evaluation ratings.

The evaluation also contains an overall narrative summary and a composite evaluation score that is based on the total of the weighted scores from the three mission areas. The department head evaluation of a particular faculty member is presented only to that faculty member. The faculty member is given a written copy of the evaluation and should sign the evaluation to indicate that they have been given the opportunity to review the evaluation with the department head. If a faculty member disagrees with the evaluation that he/she has received, then he/she should follow the procedures outlined in the faculty handbook.

#### **5.0 CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW, PROMOTION AND TENURE**

The criteria and procedures of the Department of Industrial and Manufacturing Systems Engineering on annual review, promotion and tenure are in accordance with those given in the Faculty Handbook and conform to the policies of the College of Engineering regarding external peer review. The aspects specific to the department are described in the following.

As a Ph.D. granting department, all faculty members are expected to participate in TEACHING, RESEARCH, and SERVICE including advising undergraduate students. To be eligible for promotion and tenure, the faculty member should provide evidence of excellence in all three main areas in which the faculty member is assigned. Nevertheless, the extent of involvement in each category may vary from one member to another depending on circumstances and preference. In addition to the technical excellence, the candidate needs to demonstrate ability to collaborate with the existing faculty members, and demonstrate collegiality and adherence to the departmental spirit.

The faculty members are not expected to participate formally in the activities related to EXTENSION and DIRECTED SERVICE.

#### **5.1 ANNUAL REVIEW OF TENURE TRACK FACULTY MEMBERS**

A non-tenured faculty member is evaluated annually for progress toward earning tenure by the committee comprising of all tenured faculty members in the department. The purpose of these evaluations is to help the faculty member prepare for the tenure process and to provide guidance so that the faculty member can obtain tenure. Thus, the candidate is evaluated based upon the department's expectations in research, teaching and service (see Sections 5.4-5.6) according to the faculty member's appointment. This evaluation also determines whether or not the non-tenured faculty member's appointment will be renewed.

If the committee votes for nonreappointment, then this recommendation is forwarded to the Dean of the College of Engineering with a letter from the Department Head. Reasons for nonreappointment can include: professional incompetence, misconduct, unethical behavior, persistent violation of university rules and/or policies, financial exigency, program discontinuance and incongeniality among faculty members. A non-tenured faculty member, who receives a nonreappointment, has the right to file a grievance according to KSU's policies.

In the first year of the appointment, the committee shall vote on the non-tenured faculty member's renewal before the second week of the faculty member's second semester. From the second year until an individual is tenured, the non-tenured faculty member should submit the tenure forms, along with any other accompanying information to the Department Head by the second week of the Fall semester. The committee will then have at least 2 weeks to evaluate these forms. The committee will meet and vote for the faculty member's reappointment. If the vote is for reappointment, then the Department Head will inform the faculty member of the decision in writing and also provide suggestions so that the individual can strengthen his/her tenure application. If the vote is to not reappoint, then the candidate must be notified in writing regarding the decision not to reappoint. A schedule of important dates relating to when the faculty member's appointment ends can be found in Appendix A of KSU's Handbook (<http://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/fhbook/fhxa.html>).

## **5.2 MIDTENURE REVIEW OF TENURE FACULTY MEMBERS**

During a candidate's third year, he or she will have a midtenure review. The midtenure review follows the same deadlines as the annual review with the exception that after the departmental committee votes, the Department Head may write a letter, which is included in the candidate's midtenure packet. The candidate's midtenure packet and the votes of the committee are then sent to the college for a complete review. This additional review process includes a review by the college's promotion and tenure committee and a review by the Dean. This review is designed to provide the faculty member with substantial feedback from faculty colleagues and administrators regarding his or her accomplishments relative to departmental tenure criteria. A positive mid-probationary review does not insure that tenure will be granted in the future nor does a negative review mean that tenure will be denied. This process may result in a nonrenewal of the individual's appointment.

## **5.3 PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURE**

Within the department, a committee of all the faculty members who are at least one rank above the candidate evaluates the candidate's suitability for promotion and tenure. The committee considers external reviews that evaluate the candidates' potential and accomplishments in accordance with the Faculty Handbook. Written comments of each faculty member are forwarded with the Promotion and/or Tenure documents prepared by the candidate.

A detailed description of the time line is published in the Provost's web page.

(<http://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/depthead/promotion/promote.html>).

To summarize, the major steps in the departmental process are:

1. The candidate compiles the promotion documents required by September 1.
2. Department Head requests outside evaluations.
3. Departmental committee meets and votes on the promotion by November 1.
4. Department Head forwards the package to the Dean along with the unedited comments of the faculty and his/her recommendations around November 10.
5. The candidate will be notified of their tenure and/or promotion by the middle of March. If an individual is not granted tenure, then that individual may keep their appointment for the coming fall and spring semesters.

The specific items to be evaluated in the three categories of contributions, TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE, are described in the succeeding sections.

## **5.4 TEACHING**

Evidence of excellence in teaching can include the following items:

1. Student evaluation.
2. Survey of peers as well as current and former students.
3. Textbooks written.
4. Refereed articles published in recognized educational journals or proceedings of conferences on classroom teaching and laboratory instruction.
5. Grants for teaching innovations, undergraduate laboratory equipment, and development of laboratory experiments and design projects.
6. Development of new courses.
7. Presentations at educational or teaching conferences and meetings.
8. Originally-written supplementary notes, manuals and computer software distributed in classes and laboratories.
9. Other well-documented evidence of teaching contributions.

Promotion to an Associate Professor requires that the candidate be recognized as a good instructor. The candidate should demonstrate high level of acceptance by the students combined with high level of technical expectations of the students. Promotion to a Full Professor implies consistent and repeated high-level performance in the classroom.

## **5.5 RESEARCH**

Evidence of excellence in research can include the following items:

1. Refereed articles published in recognized technical journals or proceedings of international technical conferences.
2. Authoring or editing: Technical books and monographs issued by reputable publishers.
3. Competitive and non-competitive research grants and contracts.
4. Patents awarded.
5. Refereed articles published in the proceedings or records of national or regional technical meetings.
6. Contributions to technical books or monographs.
7. Dissertations and theses supervised.
8. Non-refereed technical articles published or distributed widely.
9. Presentations made at international, national or regional technical meetings and invited seminars (universities, industry, and government laboratories).
10. Research proposals submitted.
11. Active advising of graduate students and effective reviews and critiques of their theses or dissertations through participation in graduate students' supervisory committees.
12. Summer (sabbaticals) spent in industry or national laboratories.
13. Other well-documented evidence of research contributions.

A candidate for promotion to Associate Professor needs to demonstrate ability to conduct independent research at a high level of mastery in his area(s). This mastery should be translated to publications and recognition. In addition the candidate needs to be able to guide graduate students and help them achieve mastery of the research area.

For a promotion to a full professor level, the candidate needs to demonstrate a clear record of performance, leadership in his area, as well as national and international recognition.

## **5.6 SERVICE**

Evidence of excellence in service is measured in two areas - institutional, and professional or public. This evidence can

include the following items:

1. Institutional
  - a. Serving on committees for the department, college, and university.
  - b. Advising undergraduate students.
  - 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.

A candidate for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure should demonstrate excellence in service activities assigned by the department head. The candidate could show active support of the departmental mission, as well as the college and the university. For a promotion to Professor the candidate could demonstrate excellence in service by involvement in national and international societies or activities.

## **6.0 MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE FACULTY PERFORMANCE**

### **6.1 General Statement**

This document establishes the minimum acceptable level for the faculty members in the Industrial and Manufacturing Systems Engineering Department. It serves as a supplement to the “Annual Evaluation Guidelines” established within the Department and the “University Faculty Handbook.” It also further clarifies the issues related to the University Faculty Handbook, Section C31.5.

## **6.2 Minimum Acceptable Faculty Performance**

The minimum acceptable level of performance established in this document will apply to all tenured faculty members in the department. In addition to the requirements of the University Faculty Handbook, all tenured faculty members in the department are expected to satisfy the following minimum performance requirements:

### **Teaching**

1. Consistently meet regularly scheduled classes
2. Start and stop classes at the scheduled times
3. Teach information that is appropriate for the assigned course
4. Evaluate students' performance uniformly and fairly with professionally- accepted methods
5. Set standards for student performance that challenge students to learn and are consistent with the level of the class
6. Maintain reasonable office hours during which help is available to students

### **Research**

1. Advise and supervise graduate students
2. Perform and participate in research projects

### **Service**

1. Participate in assigned committees (departmental, college or university) and perform tasks assigned within such committees
2. Advise undergraduate students appropriately
3. Attend departmental meetings

## **6.3 Procedures**

If the Department Head receives adequate evidence that an individual, whether tenured or not, does not meet the minimum acceptable level of performance in any substantial or critical area of work as listed above, then action will be initiated following procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

The following statements supplement the rules and procedures outlined in Section C31.5 of the Faculty Handbook. If the Department Head received adequate evidence that a tenured faculty does not meet the minimum acceptable level of performance; for a tenured Full Professor, a committee of Full Professors within the department will be convened to review the performance of the tenured Full Professor; for a tenured Associate Professors, a committee of Full and Associate Professors within the department will be convened to review the performance of the Associate Professor.

## **7.0 PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD**

### **Award Criteria**

Professors in the Industrial and Manufacturing System Engineering Department at Kansas State University are expected to maintain their excellence and provide leadership in all aspects of the educational community including teaching, research and service.

To be eligible for the Professorial Performance Award, the candidate must have obtained the rank of Professor and served as a Professor for at least six years and have not received a Professorial Performance Award (PPA) in the last six years. The candidate must have demonstrated all the qualities required for promotion to the rank of Professor in the IMSE department since the last promotion or award, namely:

1. Show evidence of excellence in undergraduate and graduate teaching, as stated in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines document. Such evidence includes student feedback, senior exit interviews, and course reports. It may also include success in securing resources to support course, laboratory, and curriculum development/enhancement.
2. Show evidence of nationally recognized scholarly work and the ability to support the graduate/research program in an area sustainable by the candidate, as stated in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines document. Such evidence includes publications of the candidate's research in peer-reviewed journals, securing support for the candidate's work, and successful supervision of graduate students. It may also include development and teaching of graduate courses, securing resources for graduate student support, laboratory development, equipment procurement, as well as other documentation of scholarly excellence.
3. Show evidence of service to the university community and of contributions to the Engineering and Teaching professions, as stated in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines document. Such evidence includes leadership in the operation and development of the undergraduate and graduate programs, contributions in departmental and college committee and service assignments. It may also include participation in university governance, nationally recognized leadership and participation in technical and professional society activities. But it does not include consulting.

Examples of such evidence might include a substantial body of published work in archival journals, sustained support for research programs, successful supervision of doctoral students, presentation of research at prestigious conferences, significant citations in published work, authorship of texts, monographs, and other special publications, significant application of research results for the advancement of technology, leadership in professional and technical society activities, organization of sessions at professional meetings, committee leadership and editorial board service for professional societies, proposal and technical paper review services, service on governmental panels, attainment of prestigious honors and awards and other recognition of prominent professional leadership. It is recognized that these examples of desirable activities may vary greatly from candidate to candidate and that the merit of each activity must be evaluated separately for each candidate.

### **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 Industrial and Manufacturing Systems Engineering (IMSE) Department. This review mechanism and procedure document will be reviewed at least every five years. Any IMSE tenured full professor is eligible for the Professional Performance Award (PPA) provided that at least six years have elapsed since the faculty member's initial appointment at the rank of Professor or since receiving the last PPA. Tenured faculty holding at least a 50% appointment in IMSE are eligible to review the qualifications of the PPA candidates and report their findings and recommendations to the IMSE Department Head. This review committee is hereafter known as the eligible faculty.

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

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

The candidate informs Department Head in writing of his/her wish to be considered for the PPA and presents a draft

version of the Accomplishment Summary Table.

Start of Spring Semester (nominally January 15):

The candidate consults with the Department Head and provides the documents and records concerning teaching, scholarship, and service occurring over the previous six years with the PPA Accomplishment Summary Table. External letters of reference and evaluation are not required.

Last week in January (nominally January 31):

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

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

The eligible faculty will meet to consider the merits of each PPA applicant and the materials submitted by that applicant. No candidate may participate in the review of his or her own application for the PPA. The Department Head is considered as the Chairperson of that forum. 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. The purpose of the meeting is for the eligible faculty to assess the merit of the PPA application, and to generate a list containing written evaluations attesting to why each individual is or is not worthy of the PPA, and a counted vote on the matter. A transcript of the written comments pertaining to a particular candidate will be given to that candidate by the Department Head. After considering the results of the review, the candidate may either choose to continue the application process or to withdraw from further consideration during that year by so notifying the Department Head in writing. If the candidate chooses to continue the application process, the Department Head prepares a written recommendation. A copy of the Department Head's written recommendation will be given to the candidate.

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

Each candidate will have the opportunity to discuss with the Department Head the written evaluation from the eligible faculty and the written recommendations. Each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to discuss and review the evaluation and recommendations. Within seven working days after the review and discussion of the recommendations and eligible faculty evaluation, each candidate has the opportunity to submit to the IMSE 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 IMSE Department Head must submit the following items to the Dean of Engineering:

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

If the Department Head wishes to apply for the PPA, a Chair will be selected by all of the Full Professors in the department. The chair will fulfill the function of the Department Head in all of the above procedures for that individual.

## IMSE Department Professorial Performance Award Accomplishment Summary Table

Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Ph.D. Degree Institution and Time: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date Hired at KSU: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date Promoted to Full Professor: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date of Last Professorial Performance Award: \_\_\_\_\_

The candidate should complete the following table, provide a sufficiently detailed CV, and a one page accomplishment summary for each area of assigned responsibility: Research, Teaching and Service.

		Past 6 Years or since last PPA award
<b>Books</b>		
<b>Book Chapters</b>		
<b>Journal Papers</b>		
<b>Refereed Conference Papers</b>		
<b>Non-Refereed Conference Papers</b>		
<b>Technical Reports</b>		
<b>Invited Lectures/Seminar Talks</b>		
<b>Patents Filed</b>		
<b>Patents Issued</b>		
<b>Proposals Submitted (Unfunded)</b>		
<b>Proposals Funded</b>		
<b>Scholarship Funding (\$)</b>		
<b>Awards and Honors</b>		
<b>New Courses Developed</b>		
<b>Others</b>		
<b>Courses Taught</b>	Undergrad ( $\leq 599$ )	
	Split Level (600)	
	Graduate ( $\geq 700$ )	
<b>Students</b>	Ph.D. Maj. Prof.	
	MS Chair	
	UG Res. Support	
	Honor Students	

## ATTACHMENT A: SUMMARY OF INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED IN DOCUMENTING FACULTY ACHIEVEMENTS

The following is a sample of the information that may be provided by each faculty member to document their activities and accomplishments during the evaluation period.

### Information to Be Included Under Teaching

- \* Describe Any Laboratory Development Efforts:
- \* List Each Sr. Design Team Supervised, Include Project Title and Supervising Company:
- \* List Each Honor Student Supervised:
- \* List Educational Articles, and Chapters in Books Published this Year:
- \* List Each Educational Project That You Worked on During this Year. Include Agency, Project Funds for Which You Are Responsible, Principal Investigator(s) and Your Role (I.e., Principal Investigator, Co-investigator, Etc.)
- \* List Each Educational Submitted this Year. Include Agency, Requested Funds, Principal Investigator(s) and Your Role
- \* List Other Educational Efforts Undertaken this past Year:

### Information to Be Included Under Research

- \* List Bibliographic Reference for Each Refereed Journal Articles Published this Year:
- \* List Bibliographic Reference for Each Research Monograph Published this Year:
- \* List Bibliographic Reference for Each Article Published in Refereed Conference Proceedings this Year:
- \* List Bibliographic Reference for Each Non-refereed Article Published this Year:
- \* List Bibliographic Reference for Each Refereed Journal Article Accepted for Publication this Year:
- \* List Article Title and Journal for Each Article Submitted for Review this Year:
- \* List Each Professional Presentation of Your Research Given this Year:
- \* List Each Research Proposal Submitted this Year. Include Agency, Requested Funds, Principal Investigator(s) and Your Role (I.e., Principal Investigator, Co-investigator, Etc.)
- \* List Each Research Project That You Worked on During this Year. Include Agency, Project Funds for Which You Are Responsible, Principal Investigator(s) and Your Role (I.e., Principal Investigator, Co-investigator, Etc.)
- \* List Any Patents That You Received During the Year.
- \* List the Graduate Students for Which You Are Major Advisor:
- \* List Any Special Awards, Honors, or Recognition Earned for Your Research:

### Information to Be Included Under Service

- \* Number of Undergraduates Advised:
- \* Number of Graduate Student Committees upon Which You Currently Sit:
- \* Graduate Seminar Coordinator?
- \* Organization Advisor?
- \* Network Administrator?
- \* List College, Department, and University Committees of Which You Are a Member.
- \* List College, Department, and University Committees of Which You Are the Chair.
- \* List Journals for Which You Reviewed Article During the past Year.
- \* List Journals and Newsletters for Which You Are the Editor.
- \* List the Editorial Advisory Boards on Which You Serve.
- \* List Any Professional Society Committees on Which You Serve or Offices That You Held During this Year.
- \* List Any Conference Sessions That You Chaired or Conference That You Helped to Organize.
- \* List Any Professional Workshops That You Presented.
- \* List Any Other Professional Service That You Provided During this Year.



# ATTACHMENT B - SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES

## Department of Industrial & Manufacturing Systems Engineering Faculty Activity Worksheet

YEAR

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Rank: \_\_\_\_\_

### I. Instruction (Workload: %)

List Courses Taught During this Year.

Course	Semester	Enrollment		Taught on Video?	1st Time Taught?	New Course For the Dept.?
		Ug	Grad			

Provide a Course Syllabus, Representative Examples of Exams, Quizzes, Homework, Projects, Etc. for Each Course.

Teaching Activities and Achievements during the calendar year -- One item per line.

---

### II. Research (Workload: %)

Research Activities and Achievements during the calendar year -- One item per line.

**III. Service (Workload: %)**

**Service Activities and Achievements during the calendar year -- One item per line.**

**IV. Other (Workload: %)**

**Other Contributions You Made to the Department's Missions During this Year.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Faculty Member                      Date**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Department Head                      Date**

**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS**  
**YEAR**

*Please detail below a summary of your most significant accomplishments during the YEAR. Describe how these accomplishments relate to the department's mission.*

**ATTACHMENT C - ACTIVITY PLANS FOR THE COMING YEAR**  
**YEAR \_\_\_\_\_**

**NAME \_\_\_\_\_**

**RANK \_\_\_\_\_**

**I. Instruction (Workload: \_\_\_\_\_ %)**

**II. Research (Workload: \_\_\_\_\_ %)**

**III. Service (Workload: \_\_\_\_\_ %)**

**IV. Other (Workload: \_\_\_\_\_ %)**

**Summary of Significant Activities Planned for the Coming Year**

*Please detail below a summary of some of your most significant activities planned for the coming year.*

**ATTACHMENT D - APPRAISAL FORM FOR FACULTY PERFORMANCE**

**YEAR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FOR**

**IMSE Faculty Member**

**SUMMARY OF MAJOR ACTIVITIES**

**PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE**

<b>1.0 - 2.49</b>	<b>Failed to meet expectations</b>
<b>2.5 - 2.99</b>	<b>Met minimum expectations, but needs improvement</b>
<b>3.0 - 3.49</b>	<b>Met expectations</b>
<b>3.5 - 4.0</b>	<b>Exceeded expectations</b>

**INSTRUCTION:**

**Explanation of ratings.**

**WEIGHT:**

**EVALUATION:**

**RESEARCH:**

**Explanation of ratings.**

**WEIGHT:**

**EVALUATION:**

**SERVICE:**

**Explanation of ratings.**

**WEIGHT:**

**EVALUATION:**

**CONCLUSIONS**

**Summary of the evaluation.**

**COMPOSITE SCORE:**

**Submitted By:**

**Reviewed By:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Department Head**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Faculty**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**