

DEPARTMENT APPAREL, TEXTILES, AND INTERIOR DESIGN

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on 11/28/2006)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on 11/28/2006)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **11/2011**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **11/2011**

Carol Ann Holcomb, Department Head
Date signed: 11/30/2006

Virginia Moxley, Dean
Date signed: 12/04/2006

M. Duane Nellis, Provost
Date signed: 12/06/2006

**Each academic department is required by University Handbook policy to develop department documents containing criteria, standards, and guidelines for promotion, tenure, reappointment, annual evaluation and merit salary allocation. These documents must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty members in the department, by the department head or chair, by the dean concerned, and by the provost. In accordance with University Handbook policy, provision must be made to review these documents at least once every five years or more frequently if it is determined to be necessary. Dates of revision (or the vote to continue without revision) must appear on the first page of the document.*

**Department of Apparel, Textiles, and Interior Design
College of Human Ecology
Kansas State University**

**Documentation Guide for
Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment***

*This guide includes the following:

- I. Procedures for the annual evaluation of faculty for merit salary allocation
- II. Procedures for the evaluation of faculty for promotion, tenure, and reappointment (including performance criteria for graduate faculty status, for promotion to the rank of associate professor, and for promotion to the rank of professor)
- III. Minimum levels of productivity for faculty for implementation of the KSU policy on chronic low achievement.
- IV. Criteria for the Professorial Performance Award

The information in this document is consistent with Section C of the KSU Faculty Handbook and the KSU Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation.

November 28, 2006

W:atid/atidadm/promotionandtenure/P&T Doc approved by ATID11-28-06

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Part I: Annual Faculty Evaluation for Merit Salary Allocation.....	1
I.A Individualized Assignments	1
I.B Annual Evaluation Procedures	1
Faculty Annual Evaluation Notebook	2
I.C Evaluation of Instructional Activities.....	4
I.C.1 Evaluating Instructional Productivity.....	5
I.C.2 Documentation of Instructional Activities in the Faculty Activity Report.....	6
I.C.3 Summary of Student Evaluations of Teaching	6
I.C.4 Documentation of Advising Activities in the Faculty Activity Report	6
I.D Evaluation of Scholarship	6
I.D.1. Evaluating Scholarship Productivity	7
I.D.2 Documentation of Scholarly Productivity in the Faculty Activity Report.....	8
I.D.3 Evaluating Scholarship Quality, Impact, and Significance in the Faculty Activity Report	9
I.E Evaluation of Service.....	9
I.E.1 Evaluating Service Productivity	10
I.E.2 Documentation of Service in the Faculty Activity Report.....	10
I.F Evaluation of Collegiality	11
Part II: Evaluation for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment.....	11
II.A Procedures.....	11
II.A.1 Evaluation for Reappointment of Non-tenured Faculty.....	11
II.A.2 Evaluation for Tenure and/or Promotion	12
II.B Criteria for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment (including Graduate Faculty Status).....	14
II.B.1 Criteria for Graduate Faculty Status.....	14
II.B.2 Criteria for Reappointment	15
II.B.3 Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor and the Granting of Tenure.....	15
II.B.4 Criteria for Promotion to Professor.....	15
Part III: Chronic Low Achievement	16
Part IV: Criteria for the Professorial Performance Award	16
Appendix A: Annual Faculty Goals	19
Appendix B: Faculty Evaluation Rating Sheet	20
Appendix C: Faculty Recommendation Form for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Decisions in the Department of Apparel, Textiles, and Interior Design	21

Note: References to sections in the University Handbook are given in parentheses throughout this document.

Introduction

Academic and scholarship programs in the Department of Apparel, Textiles, and Interior Design (ATID) focus on the relationship between people and their near environment. There are two undergraduate programs in ATID: 1) Apparel and Textiles and 2) Interior Design – a professional program accredited by the Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA) formerly known as Foundation for Interior Design Education Research (FIDER) and the National Association for Schools of Art and Design. There is a Master's program and doctoral specialization in Apparel and Textiles. ATID benefits from the diverse academic and professional cultures represented by faculty and students within the Department. The scholarly culture of each area differs enough to merit individualized promotion and tenure considerations. While each area is distinctly different, there are many commonalities, and each area is respected and valued by faculty and staff in the Department.

Part I: Annual Faculty Evaluation for Merit Salary Allocation

I.A Individualized Assignments

Each tenure-track faculty member is unique professionally and contributes a special set of strengths and abilities to the Department. Thus, the proportion of time assigned to instruction (teaching and advising), scholarship, and service may vary within and across programmatic areas according to faculty strengths, priorities at different points in an individual's career, needs of the program, and source of salary (i.e., KSU instructional budget, Agricultural Experiment Station, grant or contract sponsor, etc.). Time assignments for tenure-track faculty shall range from 10% to 80% for teaching, scholarship, and service, with the following exception – new assistant professors may be limited to 10% scholarship and 5% service during their first semester of employment. Teaching roles and advising activities are assigned separate percentages for the allocation of time for instruction. Assignments for the upcoming year are negotiated with the Department Head during the annual evaluation. However, the Department Head or faculty members may request an adjustment to these ratios during the academic year in the event that unforeseen opportunities or obligations arise. Decisions regarding tenure, promotion, and financial reward for faculty members must be made on the basis of the individual's contributions in relation to his or her time assignments.

It is in the best interests of faculty, the Department, and the University to individualize assignments so that the various strengths of each faculty member are utilized while meeting the needs of the programmatic areas. However, it is important for the Department to maintain a critical mass of faculty actively engaged in scholarship in each program area so that excellence may be achieved.

First Year Appointees and Faculty on Leave

The expectations for faculty who have worked for only one semester will be reduced by half in the annual evaluation process.

I.B Annual Evaluation Procedures

Documentation Notebooks

Faculty members shall prepare a “**Faculty Annual Evaluation Notebook**” to document their overall job performance. The notebook shall be organized as follows:

Faculty Annual Evaluation Notebook (Label with Faculty Member's Name and Year)

<p>Tab Section I:</p> <p>Updated Vita</p>	<p>1. Faculty members shall provide an updated copy of their vita. The vita should list work that has been completed – including papers accepted for publication. All items should be dated.</p> <p>Note: An electronic file of your updated vita shall be emailed to the department head each year. It will be used to update your vita on the ATID web site.</p>
<p>Tab Section II:</p> <p>Faculty Activity Report (Summary of Activities for the Year)</p>	<p>2. Faculty members shall prepare a Faculty Activity Report that is no more than five typed pages in length using a minimum 11 pt. font size. (See Sections I.C.2, I.D.2, I.D.3, I.E.2, and I.F.2 of this document for details.) Include the following sections (clearly identified with headings), indicating the percent time assignment allocated to each:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Self assessment and summary of instructional activities during the past year. This section is used for discussing overall teaching activities, as well as internal and external factors that impacted the classroom environment or outcomes for the current year. The Department Head will use this information and the results of student teaching evaluations to evaluate the faculty member's performance in teaching. ▪ Description of advising activities for the past year (if applicable). ▪ Self assessment and summary of scholarship activities and accomplishments during the current evaluation year and the previous year (i.e., 2 years). This section is used for discussing scholarship activities, including a discussion of the quality, impact, and significance of scholarship work – completed and in progress. A list of completed scholarship is on the vita and does not need to be repeated here. ▪ Description of service activities for the past year. ▪ Description of administrative activities for the past year (if applicable).
<p>Tab Section III:</p> <p>Results of Students' Evaluations of Teaching and Course Syllabi</p>	<p>3. Faculty members shall submit the original computer summary reports of the IDEA teaching evaluations for all courses taught during the calendar year with their report. (See I.C.3.) They should also include a copy of the course syllabus for each course taught.</p>
<p>Tab Section IV:</p> <p>Statement of Goals for Current and Following Year</p>	<p>4. Faculty members shall submit a list of job performance goals for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the current evaluation year and ▪ the following (next) evaluation year. <p>Faculty shall follow the format in Appendix A.</p>
<p>Tab Section V:</p> <p>Any Supporting Materials or Appendices</p>	<p>5. Faculty members may include supporting materials such as copies of articles or abstracts, letters of acceptance, news articles about their work, etc.</p>

Evaluation Rating Procedures

Each faculty member will be evaluated in each of the areas specified in his/her time assignment using the following continuous scale:

- 7 = Exceptional performance
- 6 = Very good performance
- 5 = Good performance
- 4 = Average performance
- 3 = Minimal acceptable performance
- 2 = Unsatisfactory performance
- 1 = No evidence of accomplishment

The Department Head will record the ratings on the **Faculty Evaluation Rating Sheet** (Appendix B) for each type of activity (e.g., scholarship). The ratings will be multiplied by the percent time allocation for each activity and summed for a total overall rating. The total evaluation score establishes a faculty member's overall ranking in the Department and will be used in determining merit salary increases.

According to the University Handbook, the annual evaluation ratings should place faculty in one of the following categories (C38): "exceeded expectations," "met expectations," "fallen below expectations, but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity," or "fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity," with the last category referring to the level of performance associated with *low achievement* (C31.5). Using the 7 point scale, the categories are designated as follows in ATID:

- exceeded expectations – scores between 5.5 and 7.0
- met expectations – scores between 4.0 and 5.4
- fallen below expectations, but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity – scores between 2.5 and 3.9
- fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity (C31.5) – scores between 1 and 2.4.

Evaluation Process

The Department Head will meet with faculty members individually during the first six weeks of spring semester to help them set goals relative to their time assignments, to assess their job performance for the previous year, and to prepare a basis for merit pay increases. (Note: Department Head discusses progress toward tenure with non-tenured faculty also.) After the Department Head has met with the entire faculty, he/she will give each person a completed Faculty Evaluation Rating Sheet and a written explanation of the ratings. If the faculty member disagrees with the Department Head's evaluation, he/she may request another meeting with the Department Head and/or may write comments on the bottom of the rating sheet. The faculty member will sign the rating sheet and return it to the Department Head.

The Department Head will forward the faculty ratings and salary recommendations to the Dean of the College of Human Ecology. The Department Head should give a similar percent raise to all of the faculty members whose total evaluation score places them in the same category (i.e., one of the four university categories listed above). If there is a wide distribution of scores within a category, the highest and lowest ranking faculty members may be given a slightly higher or lower raise, respectively, if appropriate. Each faculty member will be notified of his/her salary for the following academic year in his/her University contract. Note: Pay increases at KSU are dependent upon the meritorious job performance of faculty members. The across-the-board salary increase passed by the Kansas legislature each year for KSU faculty is not a minimum raise guaranteed to all faculty who are performing as expected in their job.

Calendar for Annual Merit Evaluation

Mid-Jan.	Faculty member submits a Faculty Annual Evaluation Notebook to the Department Head.
Jan.-Feb.	Faculty member meets with Department Head.
Feb.-Mar.	Department Head provides written evaluations and numerical ratings to all faculty members. Each faculty member signs the Faculty Evaluation Rating Sheet and returns it to the Head.
Mar.	Department Head forwards evaluations and recommendations for merit salary increases to the Dean.
June	Faculty are notified of their salary raises in their contracts for the following academic year. Documentation materials are returned to the faculty member.

I.C Evaluation of Instructional Activities

The University Handbook defines teaching as those instructional activities which assist undergraduate and graduate students in gaining knowledge, understanding, or proficiency (e.g., planning and teaching courses, curriculum development, advising undergraduates, and supervising graduate students) (C2). Although classroom teaching is the most common activity, small group or individual instruction, such as independent studies, honors projects, study tours, and internships are also important forms of teaching. Professional performance in teaching is exceptionally complex and cannot be evaluated adequately based on a single source of information. Effective teaching addresses the teaching roles of instructional content, instructional methods, instructional delivery skills, management of instructional activities, and advising.

Teaching Roles

Instructional content refers to that body of skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area in which the faculty member has received advanced education, training, and/or experience. The faculty compiles and delivers appropriate use of relevant and current content to meet the established course objectives.

Instructional methods include those skills in teaching methodology that encompass: 1) developing, sequencing, and utilizing appropriate experiences which induce student learning, 2) developing and organizing instructional materials which may include utilizing appropriate instructional media and technologies to accomplish student learning objectives, and 3) designing, developing, and implementing tools and procedures for assessing student learning outcomes.

Instructional delivery skills include those human interactive skills and characteristics which 1) make for clear communication of information, concepts, and attitudes, 2) promote or facilitate learning by creating an appropriate affective learning environment, and 3) provide adequate assistance for in-class and out-of-class instructional activities.

Management of instructional activities includes those skills necessary for operating and managing a course including, but not limited to: following University policies regarding teaching (e.g., final exam policy), timely grading of examinations and other course requirements, timely completion of drop/add and incomplete grade forms, timely submission of SLO reports, maintaining published office hours, arranging for and coordinating guest lecturers, and generally making arrangements for facilities and resources required in the teaching of a course.

Student advising includes skills and knowledge that link the student and University and assist students throughout their academic career. The effective adviser 1) is familiar with curriculum and courses

necessary to meet program requirements, 2) is acquainted with various resources available under the Student Services program and elsewhere within the University, 3) posts and maintains reasonable office hours during which students may meet with them to discuss any aspect of their scholastic career, and 4) is familiar with administrative, University, and departmental regulations, procedures, and scheduled activities relating to the advising process (*F4 and F5*).

I.C.1 Evaluating Instructional Productivity

The following activities are indicators of productivity in teaching and advising for ATID faculty. The activities are organized with respect to the teaching roles discussed earlier.

- 1) Activities of Instructional Content
 - Keeps current in subject area by reading, networking, and attending professional development workshops and presentations in content area, and applying knowledge to course content.
 - Creates appropriate and reasonable course objectives.
 - Contributes to curriculum development and revision.
 - Creates new course, redesigns an existing course, or teaches a course for the first time.
- 2) Activities of Instructional Methods
 - Develops and/or uses appropriate and up-to-date materials, teaching methods, assessment measures, and experiences.
 - Utilizes appropriate alumni and industry contacts.
- 3) Activities for Instructional Delivery Skills
 - Gives a guest lecture or seminar/workshop.
- 4) Management of Instructional Activities
 - Follows Departmental and University policies regarding teaching (e.g., final exam policy).
 - Grades exams and assignments and gives feedback to students in a timely manner.
 - Completes forms (e.g., grade change forms) in a timely manner.
 - Maintains scheduled office hours and class times.
 - Makes extra learning materials (e.g., articles, standards) accessible to students.
 - Arranges for guest lecturers or special activities (e.g., field trip).
 - Submits a report on student learning outcomes for courses included in the departmental report.
- 5) Activities of Advising
 - Advises students concerning academic programs and enrollment.
 - Completes forms (e.g., substitutions, drop/add) in a timely manner.
 - Advises students concerning career planning and professional development.
 - Advises students conducting honor's projects or independent problems/readings courses.
 - Advises student internships and practicum.
 - Advises student exchange programs (FIT, AIU, etc.).
 - Advises students for competitions, papers, and other related events.
 - Serves as a member of a graduate student's committee.
 - Serves as a major professor for a graduate student.
 - Serves as an outside chair of a doctoral student's supervisory committee.
- 6) Funding for Instructional Activities
 - Seeks and obtains competitive internal or external funding for the activities listed above. (Funding for the *scholarship of teaching* is listed under scholarship.)
- 7) Faculty Development Activities Related to Instruction
 - Attends workshop or training for activities listed above.

I.C.2 Documentation of Instructional Activities in the Faculty Activity Report

The section of the Faculty Activity Report entitled, “Self Assessment and Summary of Instructional Activities” should document instructional productivity and include a self assessment from the faculty member regarding quality and effectiveness of instructional activities. The following information should be included, as applicable to the evaluation period.

- Percent of time assigned to teaching.
- A list of all courses taught (course number, name, credit hours, contact hours, and enrollment).
- List of applicable instructional activities described in I.C.1.
- Discussion of each course that includes a self assessment of the quality of your teaching roles described in section I.C.
- Interpretation of data from the summary of student ratings.
- A discussion of unique circumstances in or out of the classroom that contributed either positively or negatively to the overall classroom experience.
- Other appropriate evidence of instructional activities.
- Awards/recognition received for excellence in teaching, advising, and student work performed under the faculty member’s supervision.

The Department Head will evaluate 1) the student evaluations of teaching, 2) the documentation and self assessment provided by the faculty member regarding courses taught and involvement in curriculum activities, and 3) other evidence indicating whether the faculty member followed (or did not follow) established university and departmental policies in managing their courses.

I.C.3 Summary of Student Evaluations of Teaching

Faculty members will have a person designated by the Department Head (i.e., an administrative associate) administer the long IDEA evaluation form to the students enrolled in all of their classes taught during the year. Students should answer one additional question on the form:

#48. The instructor is well prepared for class.

The form should be administered to students anytime after the 10th week of the semester. The summary report and corresponding course syllabi should be submitted in Section III of the Faculty Annual Evaluation Notebook.

I.C.4 Documentation of Advising Activities in the Faculty Activity Report

The section of the Faculty Activity Report entitled, “Description of Advising Activities” should document the following (refer to I.C.1):

- Percent of time assigned to advising.
- Number of undergraduate students advised and type of advising activities, if applicable.
- Number of graduate students advised and the type of advising activities, if applicable.

I.D Evaluation of Scholarship

Guidelines set by the University establish the value and definition of scholarship to be conducted by faculty.

“Excellence in research and other creative endeavors is a primary criterion by which . . . important constituents (e.g., the national and international scholarly community) judge the stature of a Department, School, or University. Research and other creative endeavors encompass a broad spectrum of scholarship and other activities that require critical

analysis, investigation, or experimentation. These endeavors are directed toward discovery, interpretation, or application of knowledge and ideas. The results of research, scholarship, and other creative activity should be shared with others through publication, performance, or other media appropriate to the discipline.” (Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation - K.S.U., Chapter 2).

Scholarship involves a broad spectrum of activities and forms and is based on a high level of professional expertise. It is characterized by clear goals and purpose, originality, and appropriate methods for the project goals. Scholarship achieves stated goals, is documented and evaluated, and is communicated or made public in appropriate ways *so as to have an impact on the discipline and significance beyond the University.*

The scholarship activities conducted by ATID faculty members are quite diverse, but they generally fall into one or more of the following categories:

- Scholarship of discovery. Creating new knowledge (e.g., traditional theoretical/empirical research, design-related creative work);
- Scholarship of integration. Considering and explaining the relationships of existing knowledge and thought (e.g., textbook writing or synthesizing literature in a field);
- Scholarship of teaching. Systematically investigating questions related to identifying and enhancing student learning and advancing teaching practices in the field (e.g., testing and evaluating a new teaching method and publishing or presenting a paper on the results); and
- Scholarship of application. Using professional expertise in art/science/design to solve stakeholder needs/problems (e.g., development of new products/procedures, professional consulting, design-related professional practice).

Expectations. *Faculty members are not expected to engage in all categories of scholarship or participate in all types of activities. However, faculty members should choose scholarship activities that meet the levels of rigor expected in their own professional field and make significant contributions to the Department, University, and profession. In addition, a faculty member should be able to demonstrate (over the long term) that his/her body of scholarly work has focus and coherence and that the faculty member is achieving recognition as an expert in his/her focus area. Finally, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to document the amount of scholarship accomplished relative to his/her time assignment and to describe the quality of the scholarly work and its impact on or value to the field. Faculty in the department have agreed that a minimum of one major accomplishment in scholarship per year (on average) is expected for every 0.2 (20%) of a faculty member’s time assignment to scholarship. Therefore, at least two major accomplishments are needed in the faculty member’s documentation for a two-year rolling average of scholarship activities for a 20% assignment (see below).*

I.D.1. Evaluating Scholarship Productivity

Scholarship productivity is assessed in accordance with individual appointments. Individuals having higher percentages of scholarship appointments are expected to exhibit proportionately more productive scholarship programs than those having smaller percentage appointments. Because scholarship often requires years to complete, evaluation of **scholarship productivity is based on a rolling average over the last two years** (i.e., the current evaluation year and the previous year).

The following activities are indicators of productivity in scholarship for ATID faculty; they include, but are not limited to:

- 1) Publications
 - Publishes manuscripts in peer-reviewed, professional journals and proceedings.
 - Publishes books (including textbooks and research-based monographs and edited volumes).

- Publishes abstracts in peer-reviewed documents.
 - Publishes museum exhibition catalogs.
 - Publishes in editor-reviewed outlets (e.g., chapter in book, some journals).
 - *Publishes peer reviewed materials in web-based outlets.*
 - Publishes in non-refereed outlets.
 - Provides evidence of manuscripts “in press” (i.e., officially accepted, but not yet published).
 - Submits manuscripts for publication.
- 2) Presentations
- Presents papers and posters at juried international, national, and regional conferences and meetings.
 - Presents invited papers or workshops at professional meetings or events.
 - Submits abstracts/papers for presentation.
- 3) Exhibitions
- Exhibits creative scholarship in juried international, national, and regional exhibitions.
 - Exhibits creative scholarship in curator-reviewed outlets.
 - Exhibits creative scholarship in non-juried outlets.
 - Exhibits creative scholarship in invited outlets.
 - Submits creative scholarship for exhibition.
 - Curates an exhibition.
- 4) Grantsmanship
- Seeks and obtains external funding (i.e., grants and contracts) to support scholarly activities.
 - Seeks and obtains competitive internal funding (i.e., grants and contracts) to support scholarly activities.
 - Seeks and obtains donations of equipment and/or supplies to support scholarly activities.
- 5) Professional Practice
- Engages in professional practice on a project that requires specialized knowledge related to the faculty member’s scholarly expertise.
 - Develops laboratory procedures, computer software, or other products / technology, and obtaining patents/copyrights where appropriate.
 - Consults on complex problems requiring a depth of specialized knowledge.
- 6) Mentoring
- Mentors students and faculty in scholarship.
- 7) Scholarship in Progress
- 8) Faculty Development Activities Related to Scholarship

I.D.2 Documentation of Scholarly Productivity in the Faculty Activity Report

The section of the Faculty Activity Report entitled, “Self Assessment and Summary of Scholarship Activities” should document productivity in scholarship and include a self assessment from the faculty member regarding quality, impact, and significance of the faculty member’s work. The following information related to productivity should be included.

- Percent of time assigned to scholarship (% for current year and % for previous year).
 - List of applicable scholarly activities described in I.D.1. (Note: completed work should be listed on the vita and does not have to be repeated in the Faculty Activity Report.)
- Note: In cases of work conducted jointly, faculty members should briefly explain their specific contributions to the work.

- Discussion of the quality, impact, value, and significance of scholarship activities conducted during the evaluation period. (See I.D.3.)
- Copies of scholarship that has been completed, submitted, accepted, published, or exhibited during the evaluation period.
- Other appropriate evidence of scholarship activities.

In addition, scholarly activities providing direct compensation to the faculty member (e.g., consulting fees, royalties from book sales, etc.) may be included if these income generating activities also benefit the Department, College, and University.

If faculty members meet the minimum scholarship goals that were negotiated with and approved by the Department Head a year earlier, they should expect to receive a score of at least **4** – indicating average performance and “met expectations” on their annual evaluation. These scholarship goals should include the accomplishment of an activity or activities that represent one major accomplishment per year for a 20% time assignment. Additional activities in scholarship and a high assessment of the quality, significance, impact, and value of the activities will result in higher ratings. In addition, tenured faculty will have input regarding the goals of non-tenured faculty throughout the reappointment evaluation process.

I.D.3 Evaluating Scholarship Quality, Impact, and Significance in the Faculty Activity Report

High quality scholarship is fundamental to attaining a national reputation in the field and academic excellence in a land grant university. Excellent faculty members maintain consistent scholarship programs focused in a particular area(s) and regularly engage in a variety of rigorous scholarly activities. The following are examples of indicators of excellence in scholarship.

- Journal or exhibition acceptance/rejection rates, rigor of the review process, etc.
- National ranking (stature of the journal, exhibition, publisher, organization, juror).
- Impact (circulation, where indexed, ISI impact rating, book sales)
- Awards/recognition received for scholarship, including student work performed under the faculty member’s supervision.
- Value of grants, number of graduate students supported, equipment obtained.
- Post-occupancy evaluations.
- Citations by other scholars, use of work in other publications or standards.
- Featured articles, reviews of faculty/student scholarship in the media.
- Other evidence of high quality, significant scholarship provided by the faculty member.
- School-solicited external letters of support from experts in the discipline (for promotion and tenure).

It is the responsibility of faculty members to discuss the quality of their scholarship activities – including strengths and weaknesses – in a one-page self-assessment document. In addition, the impact and the value of the scholarship to the profession and the public are important and should be justified. Faculty should also explain how their scholarship activities focus in a particular area and support the mission and/or goals of the Department, College, and/or University. (See departmental web site.) Note: The level of productivity in scholarship may be discussed in the one-page self-assessment also.

I.E Evaluation of Service

The amount and nature of a faculty member's service contributions are likely to differ as a function of the individual's skills, interests, and stage in career development. However, all faculty are expected to participate in 1) institutional committees and activities and 2) professional organizations related to the

field. Faculty may also choose to document public service activities that are directly related to their academic areas of expertise.

Institutional service includes contributions to program groups, the Department, the College of Human Ecology, and the University as a whole. **Professional service** encompasses contributions to the academic profession beyond campus. This includes contributions to professional organizations, government bodies, and industry. **Public service** includes both the sharing of information and knowledge with the public and the application of knowledge to solving problems.

1.E.1 Evaluating Service Productivity

The following activities are indicators of productivity in service for ATID faculty.

- 1) Institutional Service
 - Serves as chair of a Department, College, or University committee.
 - Serves as a member of a Department, College, or University committee.
 - Advises a student interest group.
 - Participates in institutional activities (e.g., career fairs; Open House, commencement).
 - Attends and participates in curriculum group meetings (e.g., AT or ID).
 - Attends and participates in Departmental and College faculty meetings.
 - Actively participates in recruitment/retention of students and new faculty (e.g., prepares information for recruitment brochures/website; participates in faculty interview activities, etc.).
 - Participates in fund-raising activities for the Department and College.
 - Acquires donations of equipment or other physical resources for the Department.
- 2) Professional Service
 - Holds an elected or appointed office in a state, regional, national, or international professional organization.
 - Serves as a journal editor, editorial board member, or review committee member of a professional organization or an accreditation/certification body.
 - Serves as committee member for a professional organization at the state, regional, national, or international level.
 - Serves as a peer reviewer of manuscripts submitted to refereed journals or book publishers.
 - Serves as a peer reviewer of proposals submitted to public/private funding sources.
 - Serves as a peer reviewer of papers/abstracts for inclusion in proceedings and/or presentation at a professional meeting.
 - Serves as an organizer of workshops, panels, or meetings in areas of professional expertise.
 - Serves as a professional consultant to a public or private organization.
 - Represents the profession in public forums (e.g., expert testimony).
 - Attends professional meetings.
 - Serves as an external reviewer of candidates for tenure, promotion, or awards.
- 3) Professionally-Related Public Service
 - Uses his/her expertise to facilitate or implement a project for community enhancement.
 - Gives talks/lectures/workshops to the public on topics related to his/her area of expertise.
 - Serves as resource for the media (e.g., gives interviews, provides information).
- 4) Faculty Development Activities Related to Service

1.E.2 Documentation of Service in the Faculty Activity Report

The section of the Faculty Activity Report entitled, “Description of Service Activities” should document faculty involvement and accomplishments in service including:

- Percent of time assigned to service.
- Level of involvement in Department, College, and University activities.
- Current (paid) memberships in professional organizations and level of involvement.
- Other activities described in I.E.1.
- Awards/recognition for service activities.

I.F Evaluation of Collegiality

Collegiality or institutional citizenship refers to the commitment and ability of a faculty member to work effectively and cooperatively with others in achieving the goals of the Department, College, University, and profession. Personal qualities such as integrity, leadership, objectivity, candor, fairness, willingness to cooperate, and a positive attitude are vital. Faculty members must seek to maintain open communications with colleagues and administrators and to work toward solutions of shared problems. In the absence of collegiality and good institutional citizenship, other evidences of academic excellence will not suffice to offset this deficiency in the pursuit of merit pay increases, tenure, and promotion. There should be no effort by the Department to discourage debate or disagreement on policies; rather, it is vital to foster and maintain an environment conducive to vigorous debate and inquiry. Faculty disagreement with colleagues and administrators is not to be taken as evidence of lack of collegiality, but should proceed in a manner consistent with civil debate, constructive criticism, and the resolution of differences.

Part II: Evaluation for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment

II.A Procedures

II.A.1 Evaluation for Reappointment of Non-tenured Faculty

A **first year** employee will be informed of the decision concerning reappointment for the following year (or termination at the end of the first year) by March 1 of the first year of service. A **second year** employee will be informed of the decision concerning reappointment for the following year (or termination at the end of the second year) by December 15 of the second year of service. **After two or more years** of service at the University, an employee will be notified one year before the expiration of an appointment. For example, a third year employee would be notified at the end of the third year regarding reappointment for the fifth year of service. (Essentially, faculty members are given one year's notice if their appointment is to be terminated.)

The evaluation process for reappointment will occur simultaneously with the annual evaluation for merit pay increases (except for second year faculty who will be evaluated in November). Documentation for both reappointment and annual merit pay increases should be compiled in a single notebook. Faculty will prepare a Faculty Annual Evaluation Notebook as described in section I.B covering up to five years of employment at Kansas State University. The documents should be organized by year with all of the current year's tab sections first, followed by the previous year's tab sections, etc. Tenure-track faculty should indicate the ***date that they will be evaluated for tenure*** on the title page of their notebook. (See II.A.2.)

Tenured faculty members in the Department (regardless of rank) will evaluate all non-tenured faculty for reappointment each year – beginning with the second annual evaluation. (However, the Department Head may ask for feedback from the tenured faculty at any time, if needed.) The Department Head will send a **Faculty Recommendation Form** (Appendix C) to each tenured faculty member and notify him/her of a meeting to discuss the reappointment decisions. A tenured faculty member will be appointed to take detailed notes of the discussion and submit them to the Department Head. Faculty will be required to

write their recommendations (votes) and comments on the forms and submit them to the administrative assistant designated by the Department Head soon after this meeting. Faculty responses will be anonymous. The administrative assistant will prepare a list of faculty eligible to vote and assign a number to each one randomly. When the faculty members submit the Faculty Recommendation Forms, they will sign next to their name on the list, and the assistant will put the corresponding number on the form. The list of names and signatures will be kept in a separate locked file. Based on votes and feedback from faculty, the Department Head will notify the person of re-appointment.

The Department Head will summarize the written and oral comments from the tenured faculty in a letter to the non-tenured faculty member. The letter will discuss the faculty member's progress toward tenure. The Department Head will give tenured faculty the opportunity to review the letter before it is given to the faculty member. The Department Head will discuss strategies for improvement with the faculty member during the annual evaluation conference or at another appropriate time.

II.A.2 Evaluation for Tenure and/or Promotion

Mid-probationary review. A formal review of a probationary faculty member is conducted during spring semester of the third year of his/her appointment (C92). This **mid-probationary review** is designed to give the faculty member substantive feedback from faculty colleagues and administrators regarding his/her accomplishments relative to departmental tenure criteria. The outcome of this review is a letter from the department head that summarizes the views of the faculty, and it does not include a vote of the tenured faculty. (This letter is separate from the outcome of the annual evaluation process and re-appointment process.) A positive mid-probationary review does not insure that tenure will be granted in the future; nor does a negative review necessarily mean that tenure will be denied.

Candidates should prepare their documentation following the **Guidelines for Organization of Documentation for Promotion and Tenure** which can be found on the KSU web page at: <http://www.ksu.edu/academicsservices/forms/promotio.html>. According to these instructions, faculty are required to prepare summaries of their accomplishments in the areas of their appointment (i.e., teaching, scholarship, service) during their first three years at KSU.

Tenure review. Faculty hired at the rank of Assistant Professor must submit their documentation for tenure at the beginning of their **sixth** year of employment (C82.2). After the evaluation process is complete (during spring semester), the faculty member will be notified whether he/she will be granted tenure at the beginning of the seventh year of employment or whether the seventh year of employment will constitute the terminal year of appointment at KSU. Faculty hired at the rank of Associate Professor or above (without tenure) will be evaluated for tenure at the beginning of their **fifth** year of employment and receive tenure at the beginning of the sixth year (or notification that the sixth year is their last) (C82.3). In special circumstances, a one year delay of the tenure clock may be requested by the probationary faculty member (C83). Faculty members in the final year of probation will be automatically reviewed for tenure unless they resign.

A faculty member, in consultation with the Department Head, may request a review for promotion to a higher rank. Promotion to a higher rank is usually granted to deserving individuals after serving **six** or more years at a given rank. For individuals of outstanding performance, promotion may be granted with four years in a rank. However, much greater justification in terms of demonstrable accomplishments is required. Upon promotion, the faculty member will receive a standard raise in addition to his/her merit salary increase for the year.

Candidates for promotion and tenure should prepare their documentation following the **Guidelines for Organization of Documentation for Promotion and Tenure** which can be found on the KSU web page at: <http://www.ksu.edu/academicsservices/forms/promotio.html>. According to these instructions, faculty

are required to prepare summaries of their accomplishments in the areas of their appointment (i.e., teaching, scholarship, service) during the last five years. The Council of Deans has restricted the size of the documentation to 100 pages or materials that are less than 1 inch in thickness. Therefore, the size of the notebook may need to be decreased before it leaves the college – particularly after letters from the external reviewers and comments from faculty have been added.

External reviewers who are recognized as leaders in the candidate's discipline or profession will be asked to discuss the candidate's job performance. Comments from a candidate's major professor or graduate school classmates are generally less persuasive and should not be solicited (C36.2). A list of three possible reviewers will be prepared by the candidate and a list of three will be prepared by the Department Head in consultation with the KSU faculty in the candidate's area of specialization. The Department Head will send a letter, the candidate's vita, and other supporting materials* to two reviewers selected by the candidate and to two reviewers selected by the faculty (i.e., four total). If an external expert declines the request to review the candidate's credentials, another reviewer will be selected from the appropriate list. No other reviews will be solicited. The reviewers will be informed of the proportion of time devoted by the candidate to research, teaching, service, etc. during the probationary period. The candidate will not be permitted to see the external reviews.

*Supporting materials should be determined by the faculty member in consultation with the Department Head. However, costs for duplicating documents, photographs, disks, etc. for supporting materials should be paid by the candidate – not the Department. Express mail costs will be paid by the Department.

Calendar for Promotion and Tenure (deadline dates are set by the College P & T Committee each year)

- Aug. Department Head gives candidates for tenure and/or promotion the College of Human Ecology Promotion and Tenure Calendar.
- Aug. A faculty member, after consultation with the Department Head, may request an early tenure review, a review for promotion to a higher rank. **Candidates prepare documentation materials for review.**
- Beg-Sept. Department Head solicits letters from external reviewers in accordance with departmental policies.
- Beg-Sept. Each candidate submits a notebook of documentation materials to the Department Head. The Department Head checks the materials to make sure that the required materials are there and that the correct University format has been used. The Department Head sends the appropriate materials to the external reviewers.
- Oct. The Department Head notifies departmental faculty that the notebooks are available for review. A cumulative record of recommendations from the reappointment and mid-probationary review meetings, and the external reviews that have been solicited by the Department Head will also be made available to the eligible tenured faculty in the notebook (C112). Tenured faculty members in the Department review the materials for the probationary faculty seeking tenure. Faculty members in the Department who hold a rank equal to or higher than the rank being sought by the candidate are eligible to review the materials of a faculty member seeking a promotion. The Department Head will send a **Faculty Recommendation Form** (Appendix C) to each eligible faculty member and notify him/her of a meeting to discuss the tenure, promotion, and reappointment decisions. Faculty will have at least 14 days to review the documentation materials prior to the meeting.

- Oct.-Nov. The Department Head will hold a meeting with the Department's eligible faculty to discuss the candidates' job performance relative to their time assignment and departmental criteria.
- Nov. Each faculty member submits a written recommendation (vote) and comments to the Department Head on the **Faculty Recommendation Form** (Appendix C). The Department Head writes his/her recommendation for each candidate. The Department Head submits each candidate's notebook of materials, the written recommendations and unedited comments of the faculty, and his/her recommendation to the Dean. The Department Head sends a copy of his/her recommendation to the candidate.
- Mid-Nov. The Dean notifies the College Promotion and Tenure Committee that the notebooks of materials are available for review. The Dean also provides a copy of each Department's criteria for earning tenure and promotion with the notebooks. College Promotion and Tenure Committee reviews each candidate's notebook of materials, the written recommendations and unedited comments of the faculty, and the Department Head's written recommendation. The Committee meets to discuss the candidate's credentials and compare them to the Department's criteria for earning tenure and/or promotion to a particular rank (*C113*).
- End-Nov. The Committee submits one written recommendation and comments (for each candidate) to the Dean. Each letter must contain a statement as to whether or not all applicable procedures were followed. The committee sends a copy to the candidate and to the Department Head.
- Mid-Dec. The Dean, after discussing his/her recommendations with the Department Head and the Promotion and Tenure Committee, will notify the candidate and the Department Head of his/her recommendation. The candidate may withdraw from further consideration for tenure and/or promotion by submitting a written request to the Dean within seven days of notification. The Dean submits his/her recommendation and the candidate's complete file to the Dean's Council (for the candidates who have not withdrawn from further consideration) (*C114*).
- Spring The candidate is notified whether or not he/she was granted tenure and/or promotion.

II.B Criteria for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment (including Graduate Faculty Status)

II.B.1 Criteria for Graduate Faculty Status

Membership:

A faculty member must accomplish at least one of the following requirements:

1. A faculty member must have a minimum of one research paper accepted for publication in a refereed publication. The published paper must be from a project other than the faculty member's thesis or dissertation.
2. A faculty member must have a minimum of one design/artwork accepted for exhibition at a national juried competition. The design must be from a project other than the faculty member's thesis or dissertation.
3. A faculty member must have a creative project reviewed in a national publication, such as *Interior Design*, *Interiors*, or *Contract*.

Certification to direct doctoral students in the Ph.D. program in Human Ecology:

A faculty member should 1) direct one master's thesis to completion or serve on one Ph.D. committee to completion, and 2) be sole, senior, or second author on at least one publication in a refereed journal (not to include brief communications, research notes, book reviews, newsletters, bulletins, patents, or grants).

II.B.2 Criteria for Reappointment

The faculty member should be making progress in achieving the criteria listed in 2.B.3 (as applicable to their time assignments) and demonstrate good institutional citizenship (collegiality).

II.B.3 Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor and the Granting of Tenure

Candidates for tenure should demonstrate **versatility** – the ability to function well in instruction, scholarship, and service.

Tenure is not a right accorded to every faculty member. Nor is it granted simply as a result of a candidate's routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies (*C100.3*). To be awarded tenure, faculty members must be experts in their chosen fields (*C90*) and have made outstanding contributions in appropriate academic endeavors (instruction, scholarship, and institutional and professional service) (*C100.1*). Promotion to associate professor is usually granted simultaneously with tenure.

Promotion to associate professor requires substantial professional contributions that reflect excellence in teaching, scholarship, service (*C120.2*). Specifically, faculty members should document the following:

- Outstanding and innovative teaching as evidenced by student evaluations (TEVALs), course materials, awards.
- Outstanding scholarship as evidenced by the quantity, quality, and significance of a focused body of work including refereed publications, invited or peer reviewed presentations at national or international meetings, design work selected for national or international juried exhibitions, professional practice, extramural funding, awards. (Note: the minimum expectations for average performance on the annual review may not be sufficient for the award of tenure.)
- Outstanding contributions to institutional service and collegiality as evidenced by participation and/or leadership roles on committees, task forces, etc.
- Outstanding contributions to the profession as evidenced by participation and/or leadership roles in regional, national, and international organizations; lucrative contacts with companies in the field.

II.B.4 Criteria for Promotion to Professor

Promotion to full professor is based on attainment of excellence in the assigned responsibilities of the faculty member and recognition of **excellence** by all appropriate constituencies (*C120.2*). The faculty member's record of achievements should be extensive and well known. Faculty should surpass the criteria given for promotion to associate professor, particularly in the areas of scholarship and professional service. A key objective for a candidate for rank of professor is to make a significant contribution to the knowledge base of the discipline and to develop a national and perhaps international reputation in the field. In addition, Apparel and Textile faculty should be certified to direct doctoral students in the Textile and Apparel Specialization of the Human Ecology Ph.D. program.

Note: Faculty should not assume that after they have served six years at the rank of associate professor that they can apply for promotion to full professor and automatically get it. A truly excellent record of achievements is required.

Part III. Chronic Low Achievement

Chronic failure of a tenured faculty member to perform his or her professional duties shall constitute evidence of "professional incompetence" and warrant consideration for "dismissal for cause" under existing university policies. Each Department shall develop a set of guidelines describing the minimum-acceptable level of productivity for all applicable areas of responsibility for the faculty member (C31.5). The assessment of faculty productivity is performed by the Department Head during the annual evaluation process using the procedures and rating scale given in section 1.B. The Department Head will notify the faculty member in writing that he/she has failed to meet the minimum levels of productivity in one or more of the areas represented in the faculty member's time assignment. **In ATID, a faculty member who receives a score of 2.4 or less on a 7-point scale in any assignment area (e.g., instruction, scholarship, or service) will be identified as a low achiever in that area (i.e., one who has fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity).**

The Department Head will indicate, in writing, a course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member in the area of low achievement. In subsequent annual evaluations, the faculty member will report on activities aimed at improving performance and any evidence of improvement. In addition, the Department Head may advise the faculty member to seek other forms of assistance and/or reassign a portion or all of the faculty member's time to another activity in an effort to solve the problem.

The names of faculty members who fail to meet minimum standards for the year following the Department Head's suggested course of action will be forwarded to the Dean. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which minimum standards in an area are not met, then "dismissal for cause" will be considered at the discretion of the Dean (C31.5). If this decision is made, the faculty will be given one more year of employment during which he/she may seek other employment.

Part IV. Criteria for Professorial Performance Award

The Professorial Performance Award rewards exceptional performance at the highest rank with a base salary increase in addition to the merit increase provided through the annual evaluation process. The funding of the award will come from sources other than legislatively-approved funding for merit salary increases. Each award will be 8% of the average salary of KSU full-time faculty, excluding administrators (Refer to Section C49 of the University Handbook for details.)

Criteria

1. The candidate must be a full professor and have been in the rank at least six years since his/her last promotion or professorial performance award.
2. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years since before the performance review for the award.
3. 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.

4. The candidate must show evidence of outstanding and sustained scholarship in a focused area in the discipline, and demonstrate that he/she has a sustained national and international reputation in this area. The significance and impact of the candidate's contributions to the field should be documented.

5. The candidate must show evidence of outstanding teaching.

6. The candidate must show evidence of outstanding institutional service and/or professional service at the national level.

Note: In the absence of collegiality and good institutional citizenship, other evidences of academic excellence will not suffice to offset this deficiency in the pursuit of this award.

Procedures

Eligible candidates for consideration for this award will prepare a file that documents his/her professional accomplishments for at least the previous six years. Accomplishments from a longer period may be included as long as they occurred after the candidate's promotion or professorial award. This file will be submitted to the department head at the same time the file of materials for annual evaluation is submitted (in January). The file should be a separate notebook of materials containing the following:

- The candidate's current vita.
- A one-page summary of the candidate's accomplishments in a focused area of scholarship and a discussion of the significance and impact on the field.
- A one-page summary of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching and a discussion of the significance to the academic program.
- A one-page summary of the candidate's professional service activities and their significance to the field.
- Supporting materials.

Faculty with the rank of professor in the department will review the file and supporting materials and make a recommendation to the department head. The department head will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials with respect to the departmental criteria for the award and make a recommendation for or against the award to the Dean. And upon Dean's recommendation, the Department Head will share the recommendation with the candidate. A copy of the department head's written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate. Each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, each candidate has the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation to the department head and to the dean.

The department head must submit the following items to the appropriate dean:

- a. A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award,
- b. The candidate's file and supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award.
- c. Department Head's recommendation letter to the Dean.

If the dean and provost approve the recommendation of the department head, the professor will receive the award. The dean will consolidate the Professorial Performance Award allocation with the professor's salary increase resulting from the annual evaluation process and issue the candidate a contract that

includes the candidate's salary for the next year. The Professorial Performance Award will become part of the professor's base salary.

Appendix A
Department of Apparel, Textiles, and Interior Design
Annual Faculty Goals

Name _____ Evaluation Year:
20_____

(Select all that apply to your appointment.)

Teaching (% time assignment)

Minimum goals for achieving average performance: List courses to be taught and instruction-related goals

Additional goals for striving for excellence:

Advising (% time assignment)

Minimum goals for achieving average performance:

Scholarship (% time assignment)

Minimum goals for achieving average performance: List expected outcomes

Additional goals for striving for excellence: List work in progress and expected outcomes

Service (% time assignment)

Minimum goals for achieving average performance: List professional and institutional service activities and level of involvement

Additional goals for striving for excellence:

Administration (% time assignment)

Minimum goals for achieving average performance:

Additional goals for striving for excellence:

Note: If a faculty member can document that the quantity, quality, impact, and significance of their instruction, scholarship, and service activities is high, he/she will be given a higher rating than average (4) when meeting his/her minimum goals. Achieving additional goals will increase a faculty member's rating also.

Appendix C
Faculty Recommendation Form for
Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Decisions in the
Department of Apparel, Textiles, and Interior Design

Based on the information available to me, I recommend that

_____ be
_____reappointed,
_____given tenure and promoted to associate professor,
_____promoted to professor.

_____yes

_____no

_____abstain

Justification for my recommendation is given below.

Return to the Administrative Assistant to the Department Head by
