

DEPARTMENT OF ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on May 11, 2006)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on March 18, 2004)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARDS): **5/2011**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **5/2009**

John DeLeon, Department Head
Date signed: 5/12/06

Dennis Kuhlman, Dean
Date signed: 6/02/06

M. Duane Nellis, Provost
Date signed: 6/27/06

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

**Kansas State University-Salina
College of Technology and Aviation
Department of Engineering Technology**

**Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Evaluation,
Tenure, and Promotion**

**Approved by the Department Faculty
March 18, 2004**

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction.....	1
2.	Section I: Faculty Appointment Criteria.....	2
	Criteria for Appointment at Instructor Rank.....	2
	Criteria for Term Appointments	2
	Criteria for Appointment as Assistant Professor	2
	Criteria for Appointment as Associate Professor	3
	Criteria for Appointment as Full Professor.....	4
	Criteria for Reappointment	4
3.	Section II: Promotion Guidelines	5
	Assistant Professor to Associate Professor	5
	Associate Professor to Full Professor	6
4.	Section III: Procedures for Promotion and Tenure.....	8
	Promotion Procedures.....	8
	Procedures and Guidelines for Tenure.....	8
	Procedures and Timetable for Promotion/Tenure Evaluation.	9
5.	Section IV: Merit Evaluation Procedures	11
	Evaluation Categories	12
	Description of Evaluation Categories	13
	Chronic Low Achievement.....	16
6.	Appendix A: Faculty Activity Report.....	19
	Appendix B: Use of Student Ratings.....	20
	Appendix C: Recommendation for Promotion Form.....	23
	Appendix D: Recommendation for Tenure Form.....	24
	Appendix E: Merit Evaluation Form.. ..	25

INTRODUCTION

The general policy regarding faculty evaluation for appointments, promotion and tenure is composed of the policy of Kansas State University and that of the College of Technology and Aviation, Department of Engineering Technology. The University policy is presented in Section C of the Faculty Handbook Kansas State University. The Department of Engineering Technology policy regarding appointment, promotion and tenure is established by this document.

The policies listed in this document form the basis to be used for the evaluation of faculty activity in terms of appointment, promotion and tenure. Guidelines for appointment are listed in Section I of this document, while guidelines for promotion and tenure are listed in Section II. The process for promotion and tenure review is specified by the Procedures and Timetable presented in Section III of this document. Annual merit evaluation criteria are contained in Section IV.

The stipulations of this policy are intended to supplement and extend the University's tenure and promotion policies to account for the uniqueness of the College of Technology and Aviation's academic programs. These policies do not supersede or replace the University policy.

The implementation of this document must be mutually approved by a majority vote of the faculty members in the Department of Engineering Technology, the Dean of the College and by the Provost. The provisions of the document will be reviewed at least once every five years or more frequently if it is determined to be necessary by any one of the aforementioned parties. Dates of revision (or the vote to continue without revision) must appear on the first page. Copies are available to faculty members in their departmental or unit offices.

SECTION I: FACULTY APPOINTMENT CRITERIA

The basic criteria and procedures for appointment are contained in Section C10-C26.3 of the Faculty Handbook. The guidelines set forth in this document serve as the Department of Engineering Technology supplement to the University criteria.

Faculty appointed to a regular appointment in the College of Technology and Aviation are expected to have both an Academic and a professional preparation prior to their employment with the college.

The degree of academic background vs. the professional background will vary depending on the requirements of the specific program. The following guidelines are recommended in considering the initial rank of faculty assigned in a regular appointment in a faculty position in the Department of Engineering Technology. The head of an academic department in consultation with the eligible faculty (See note 1 below.) of the department and the dean may elect to make exceptions to these criteria or to de-emphasize certain categories if the candidate's background and potential in conjunction with the needs of the college warrant such consideration. Such exceptions should be made only in rare cases. (Note 1, eligible faculty are those tenured faculty in the department holding rank equal to or higher than the rank being considered for the candidate for appointment.)

Criteria for Appointment at Instructor Rank

Appointments at the instructor rank are governed by Section C12 of the Faculty Handbook. A regular appointment in the instructor rank is usually made in those instances when the candidate has extensive professional experience and/or licensing, certification, registration or ratings deemed to be necessary for a given technical program but may be lacking formal academic preparation.

Criteria for Term Appointments

Term appointments may be made at any of the faculty ranks. Section C11 of the Faculty Handbook governs these appointments.

Criteria for Appointment as Assistant Professor

Requirements

1. The basic academic credential is considered to be an earned master's degree and industrial experience in a field closely related to the area of teaching. A baccalaureate degree, experience and professional licensing, certification, registration or ratings meet the minimum criteria for certain areas of technology. The specific requirements shall be determined by the

eligible faculty of the academic department in consultation with the department head and the dean.

2. The candidate for appointment shall have significant industrial experience relevant to the area of teaching. The exact requirements are to be determined by the tenured faculty of the academic department in consultation with the department head and the dean.
3. Physical and psychological characteristics such that duties as a teacher can be effectively performed.

Desired Qualifications

1. Ability to work effectively with students, faculty and administrators in an academic environment.
2. Willingness to advance professionally by taking appropriate action to remedy technical deficiencies.
3. Participation in appropriate professional and scholarly societies related to their discipline.
4. Sufficient teaching experience, or other appropriate evidence, to ensure that the member is compatible with the teaching role and is able to motivate and direct students in the preparation for their careers.

Faculty appointment to the rank of assistant professor is usually based upon potential. There should be clear indication that the individual has the aptitudes of a successful teacher and will grow in stature and eventually qualify for the rank of associate professor.

Criteria for Appointment as Associate Professor

Requirements

1. Fulfillment of all of the requirements for appointment as assistant professor.
2. Demonstrated teaching or professional experience commensurate with criteria set forth in Section II.
3. Demonstrated ability to work effectively with students and professional colleagues.
4. Established record of scholarly growth or professional attainment.
5. Record of effective participation in professional and technical activities.

6. A record of public and institutional service.

Faculty appointment to the rank of associate professor is based on actual performance as well as future potential. Above all the individual should be growing technically and professionally.

Criteria for Appointment as Full Professor

Requirements

1. Fulfillment of the requirements for appointment as associate professor.
2. Significant teaching or professional experience commensurate with the criteria specified in Section II.
3. Established record of effective teaching in the technical subject area.
4. Demonstrated ability to work effectively with students and professional colleagues.
5. Established record in scholarly growth or professional attainment.
6. Demonstrated leadership in appropriate technical and educational societies.

Appointment to the rank of full professor implies that the individual is recognized as being an authority in his or her field and by associates and students as being a capable teacher and scholar. It is expected that this individual will be known in national educational and professional circles and recognized in such groups as a leader. In the area of public and institutional service it is expected that the individual will be recognized on campus for outstanding contributions to the development of his or her educational program.

Criteria for Reappointment

Faculty members on probationary appointments and faculty members on regular instructor appointments must be evaluated annually to determine whether or not they will be reappointed for another year. Sections C50.1-C56 and C60-C66 of the Faculty Handbook along with the criteria and guidelines listed in section I and II of this document apply. An important element of evaluation for reappointment is that of student ratings of the teaching effectiveness of non-tenured faculty members. This requirement and the time lines for administration are amplified in a memo from the provost office dated September 4, 1992 attached as Appendix B.

SECTION II: PROMOTION GUIDELINES

This section will serve to supplement the administrative and procedural requirements set forth in Section C of the Faculty Handbook, Kansas State University as revised and approved by the Faculty Senate on May 12, 1992. Supplemental information regarding essential elements of faculty evaluation may be found in "Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustment, Tenure and Promotion." The following guidelines are recommended in considering promotion of faculty in the Department of Engineering Technology. Satisfying these criteria will not necessarily ensure promotion. A candidate who shows strength in all of the categories should expect to be positively viewed for promotion. Lack of strength in some categories will not necessarily deny a candidate promotion.

The following criteria provide guidance concerning the categories of activities deemed to be important for promotion in the Department of Engineering Technology. In accordance with section C of the Faculty Handbook, the faculty of each academic department in consultation with the department head and the dean will develop the criteria, standards and guidelines for promotion for that department. (See C30-38: General Issues of Faculty Evaluation and C120-156.2: Promotion In Rank)

Assistant Professor to Associate Professor: Important Criteria

1. Fulfillment of the requirements for appointment to assistant professor.
2. Excellence in teaching.

The College of Technology and Aviation and Aviation by its nature is primarily a teaching institution. Above all, its faculty must provide superior instruction. Any criteria that evaluate the faculty for promotion and tenure must give sufficient weight to instructional proficiency. (See C34.1-C34.5) The activities list found on pages 7-9 of "Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustments, Tenure, and Promotion" provides guidance concerning the evaluation of effective teaching.

3. Program Development.

The faculty member should demonstrate the initiative and ability to:

- (a) Make innovative course and curriculum developments.
- (b) Continually revise, modify and improve the courses that he or she teaches.
- (c) Develop new courses to meet the changing needs of the subject area.
- (d) Design, modify and develop teaching aids and equipment.
- (e) Teach new courses or teach existing courses that he or she has not previously taught.

4. Research or Other Creative Activities.

As a teaching institution with primarily associate level programs, College of Technology and

Aviation faculty have limited opportunities and funding for research activity. Pages 9-10 of "Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustments, Tenure, and Promotion" provides a list of activities that offer opportunities for the professional growth and development.

Department of Engineering Technology faculty are expected to identify with an area of professional growth and scholarship relating to their primary teaching assignment and engage in activities that ensure continued development in the fields associated with their discipline.

Activities that may be appropriate include:

- (a) Areas of applied research
- (b) Technology transfer
- (c) Summer employment
- (d) Industrial internships
- (e) Industrial workshops and seminars
- (f) Factory service schools
- (g) Consulting for industry or governmental agencies
- (h) Advanced academic degrees
- (i) Developing and publishing text and laboratory materials
- (j) Contributions to technical literature
- (k) Acquiring professional licenses, registration, certification or ratings
- (l) Sabbatical leave or professional improvement leave.

5. Faculty members may have responsibility for areas of directed service and non-directed service. (See C5 and C6, also C32.5 and C32.6) Pages 10-11 of "Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustments, Tenure, and Promotion" provides some suggested activity lists for evaluation of these areas. Individual departments may wish to supplement these activities.

Page 11 of "Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustments, Tenure, and Promotion" provides an activity list for extension services. Although the college has a minimal extension mission, some activities from this list may be appropriate for evaluation of certain faculty activities.

Associate Professor to Full Professor: Important Criteria

1. Continued fulfillment of those requirements for promotion from assistant to associate professor.
2. Fulfilling a leadership role in the development of the program. Activities associated with this level of development include:
 - (a) Chairing departmental curriculum committees.
 - (b) Serving on college level curriculum committees.
 - (c) Developing and teaching new courses, implementing major changes and revisions to existing courses.

3. Fulfilling leadership roles in departmental, college or university level activities.
4. Demonstrated leadership in educational and professional circles. Examples of such activities include:
Participation in state or national groups
 - (b) Presenting papers
 - (c) Participation in the planning and implementation of technical sessions at conferences
 - (d) Writing journal articles and/or textbooks and laboratory manuals
 - (e) Developing seminars and workshops
 - (f) Participation as a member of an accrediting team, serving on a national level curriculum committee, performing proposal reviews or other related activities.
5. Interaction with Industry. Examples for this category may include:
 - (a) Coordinating plant visits for faculty and students
 - (b) Working with industrial advisory committees
 - (c) Developing and teaching adult or continuing education courses in the community or in industry
 - (d) Part-time consulting
 - (e) Liaison between industry and school for the purposes of:
6. Recognition as an outstanding educator.

SECTION III: PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

Promotion Procedures

Promotions in rank are governed by sections C120-156.2 of the Faculty Handbook and the guidelines set forth in Sections I and II of this document.

It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to engage in those activities that shall eventually result in promotion to the next higher academic rank. It is the responsibility of the department head to counsel and guide the faculty member into activities that shall increase the probability of promotion being granted. The department head is expected to meet with faculty on a frequent and regular basis in order to explore ways in which the College may support the faculty member's development in the areas of teaching, research or other creative endeavors and in directed and non-directed service. Annual merit performance evaluations provide an excellent opportunity for guidance and counseling. (See Section C40-48.3 Annual Merit Salary Evaluations.)

The department head will provide the faculty member with a written report assessing the faculty member's progress toward promotion in academic rank. This report shall be made at the end of the second year in rank and once again at such time as requested by the faculty member.

Each report shall be based upon detailed departmental promotion criteria, standards and guidelines as developed by the tenured departmental faculty in consultation with the department head and the dean.

Procedures and Guidelines for Tenure

Guidelines and requirements for tenure are set forth in Section C70-116.2 of the Faculty Handbook. The appointment and promotion criteria set forth in Sections I and II of this document along with those criteria and standards developed by the academic departments or units will form the basis for the evaluations required to substantiate a recommendation for the granting of tenure in the College of Technology and Aviation.

To be awarded tenure in the Department of Engineering Technology faculty members must be able to demonstrate professional competence and achievement in the areas of 1) teaching, 2) applied research or other creative activities as defined in Section II of this document and 3) in areas of directed and non-directed service which is reasonably judged to be of such recognizable merit as to justify the status and commitment of a continuing appointment. In considering tenure, the entire length of service that a faculty member has rendered in the College of Technology and Aviation will be considered.

It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to engage in those activities that will eventually result in the awarding of tenure. It is the responsibility of the department or unit head

to counsel and guide the faculty member into activities that will increase the probability of tenure being granted. The departmental responsibilities are outlined in C53 of the Kansas State University - Faculty Handbook, 1998 - 1999". Annual merit performance evaluations provide an excellent opportunity for such counseling and guidance. (See Section C40-48.3 Annual Merit Salary Evaluations.)

In addition to annual merit evaluations a mid-probationary review of tenure track faculty will be conducted midway through the probationary period. (See Section C92.1-92.2.) The faculty member shall be given a copy of departmental criteria and standards for tenure at the beginning of his or her employment.

Procedures and Timetable for Promotion and Tenure Evaluations

Evaluations pertaining to tenure and promotion fall under guidelines and standards set forth in the Faculty Handbook and this document. As noted in Section C30.1-38, General Issues of Faculty Evaluations, multiple sources of data shall be used to form the basis of the promotion or tenure recommendation. It is the responsibility of the candidate for promotion or tenure to compile and submit documentation of his or her professional accomplishments. The Faculty Activity Report listed in Appendix A presents the title page and the organizational structure for the promotion or tenure document. The Faculty Activity Report must describe, summarize and reference activities for the evaluation period using the criteria and guidelines set forth in this document in conjunction with the standards and the criteria established by the academic department or unit.

The following timetable presents the order of activities necessary to support the University Requirements of participation in the promotion and tenure process. The faculty member will be notified of the results of each evaluation step as it is performed. A faculty member may withdraw the request for promotion or early tenure evaluation at any time.

By May 1

A faculty member seeking promotion or early tenure will prepare a memo requesting an appointment with the department head expressing his or her intent to seek promotion and/or early tenure. Probationary tenure track faculty not seeking early tenure will be notified one year prior to the end of their probationary service that they will be considered for tenure during the next academic year (See Section C82.2.)

June-August

1. The faculty member shall prepare documents for the promotion or tenure process. These include a Faculty Activity Report summarizing activities for the evaluation period, a complete vita and other documents related to the faculty member's performance during the rated period.
2. The department head shall formally solicit comments and reviews from appropriate students, alumni and other individuals. (See sections C112.2 and C152.2.)

September 10

1. The candidate submits his/her completed dossier to the department head.
2. The department head solicits advice regarding the qualifications of the candidate from the eligible faculty in the department. (See Sections C112.3-C112.4 and C152.3 and C152.4)

October 1

The eligible departmental faculty members submit their written comments to the department head.

October 15

The department head forwards a written recommendation regarding the candidate's promotion/tenure to the dean along with the written comments (unedited) of the consulted faculty members. The candidate is informed of a negative recommendation prior to submitting the recommendation to the dean. The candidate's complete file is forwarded to the dean (See C152.5).

October 20

The dean forwards all promotion/tenure documents to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee (if formed see Sections C113 and C153).

November 15

The College Promotion and Tenure Committee completes and transmits its recommendations to the dean (See C153).

December 1

The dean informs each candidate of the College's decision regarding the promotion and tenure request prior to submitting the documents to the provost's office. Within the parameters set by Sections C115 and C155 the candidate may withdraw from further consideration prior to the submission of his or her file to the provost.

SECTION IV: MERIT EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The purpose of this document is to establish the criteria, standards, and guidelines for Merit Evaluations in the Department of Engineering Technology in the College of Technology and Aviation. The requirements set forth in this document are applicable to those faculty who hold the majority of their tenths time in the department. Those who hold five-tenths time in the department will be evaluated if their salary recommendations originate in the department.

The primary references to be used in the development of the criteria, standards, guidelines and administrative procedures include "Section C of the Kansas State University Faculty Handbook", latest version, "Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustments, Tenure and Promotion: A Resource for Faculty and Administrators" summer 1992 and the Kansas State University-Salina, Department of Engineering Technology Appointment, Tenure and Promotion Policy (draft).

The Department of Engineering Technology is responsible for delivering relevant, up-to-date instruction in a variety of technical fields vital to the economic activity in Kansas and surrounding states. Faculty activity and thus the criteria, standards and guidelines necessary for evaluation must be directed towards this responsibility.

Three major areas of activity have been selected for evaluation. The major areas include teaching, scholarly activity and service. Administrative responsibilities and extension services may also constitute evaluative categories when appropriate.

The Department of Engineering Technology by its nature is a "teaching" department. Above all, its faculty must provide superior instruction. For this reason the criteria standards and guidelines necessary for evaluation must be directed towards this responsibility.

Because of the need to provide relevant instruction in areas vital to the economic activity in the region, faculty are expected to identify with areas of professional growth and scholarship relating to their primary teaching assignment and engage in activities that ensure continued development in fields associated with their discipline.

Faculty frequently have knowledge and skills that can benefit others, therefore, service to the college, the profession or the community is expected. Service becomes the third element of evaluation.

EVALUATION CATEGORIES

Teaching (50-70%)*

(Reference: Section II, above)

- Academic Program Planning
- Instruction
- Instructional Support

Scholarly Activities (20-40%)*

(Reference: Section II, Paragraph 4, above).

- Applied Research
- Scholarship
- Creative Endeavor

Service (10-30%)*

(Reference: Section II, Paragraph 5, above)

- Institutional
- Professional
- Community

* In negotiation with the section head and in consultation with the department head, weighting ranges may vary when a faculty member's work load is significantly different than a normal assignment. Faculty with significant administrative, extension or other assignments may substitute some portion of these other assignments for elements in the three listed categories with the mutual consent of the department head.

Setting Goals and Objectives for the Coming Year

The foundation for the rating process begins with the development of a mutual understanding between faculty members and the department heads concerning the professional objectives for the coming year and for the assessment of faculty accomplishments. The following events are included in the evaluation processes. The department head will issue specific dates during the fall semester for these events.

The department head will meet with the faculty prior to January to develop departmental goals for the ensuing year within the resources available to them.

The faculty member prepares a written statement of proposed goals relevant to, but not limited to, the departmental goals and objectives. New faculty will submit proposed goals and objectives within 30 days from the date of their employment.

The faculty member and the section head discuss the proposed goals and assign each to one of the nine categories making up teaching, scholarly activity and service.

Faculty in consultation with the section head assigns each of the areas of teaching, scholarly activity and service a weight, the sum of which adds up to 100. These weights will reflect the assignments and objectives of the faculty member and the departmental needs.

Reporting Accomplishments for the Previous Year

By the first Monday after January 1, the faculty member submits a final report of the faculty member's accomplishments during the previous calendar year. The cover sheet for this report is found in the *Kansas State University-Salina, Department of Engineering Technology Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion*.

It is the faculty member's responsibility to fully document his or her activities in the evaluative areas.

Description of Evaluation Categories:

A. Teaching Activities

1. Typical Activities
 - a. Direct class instruction
 - b. Laboratory instruction
 - c. Independent instruction: Students are present in either the instructor's office, a small classroom, or laboratory
 - d. Class preparation
 - e. Paper grading and test construction
 - f. Student conferences and supervision
 - g. Innovation in the development of instructional materials and materials
 - h. Advisement
 - i. Developing and revising courses
 - j. Supervising and involving students in projects
 - k. Instructional leadership

2. Some measurements of teaching activities
 - a. Faculty will arrange for the administration of TEVAL for each course taught and submit the results to the department head. Exceptions are permitted in unusual circumstances. A score from a single TEVAL question should not form the entire basis of teaching effectiveness.
 - b. Student assessment of classroom performance and extra class activities (e.g., advisement, supervision, accessibility, and promptness.)
 - c. Peer assessment of classroom performance.
 - d. Administrator assessment of classroom performance.
 - e. Development and trial of new instructional materials and methods.
 - f. Extent of student learning as measured in such ways as tests, demonstrated

- competencies, and completed projects.
- g. Evidence of stimulating students in academic activities.
- h. Direction and advisement of both independent and group projects.

B. Scholarly Activities

1. Typical Activities
 - a. Areas of applied research
 - b. Technology transfer
 - c. Summer employment
 - d. Industrial workshops and seminars
 - f. Factory service schools
 - g. Consulting for industry or governmental agencies
 - h. Advanced academic degrees
 - i. Developing and publishing text and laboratory materials
 - j. Contribution to technical literature
 - k. Acquiring professional licenses, registration, certification or ratings
 - l. Sabbatical leave or professional improvement leave

2. Some Ways of Measuring Scholarly Activities
The faculty member demonstrates the initiative and ability to:
 - a. Make innovative curriculum developments
 - b. Continually revise, modify and improve the courses that he or she has taught
 - c. Develops new courses to meet the changing needs of the subject area
 - d. Designs, modifies and develops teaching aids and equipment
 - e. Teaches new courses or teaches existing courses that he or she has not previously taught
 - f. Maintain active contacts with industry
 - g. Engage in consulting or part-time employment activities that directly enhance his or her area of teaching
 - h. Applied research projects completed or under contract
 - i. Develop textbooks, laboratory manuals or publish papers relating to his or her area of expertise

C. Service

1. Activities
 - a. Directing and attending professional conferences and meetings
 - b. Presenting papers or appearing on programs at professional meetings
 - c. Speaking engagements and demonstrations relative to scholarly concerns
 - d. Engaging in professional self-improvement activities
 - e. Editorial activities for journals
 - f. Writing reviews on new textbooks and instructional materials
 - g. Serving in a leadership capacity in professional organizations

- h. Co-curricular activities such as sponsoring and advising student organizations
 - i. Intra-university committee assignments: Department, college university levels
 - j. Representative for college and university governance
 - k. Serving as a gratis or paid consultant to organizations and agencies concerning technology transfer or applications of technology
2. Some ways of measuring activity and service
- a. Professional conferences and meetings initiated and/or attended
 - b. Papers presented and/or speaking engagements at professional meetings
 - c. Speaking engagements and demonstrations to lay audiences
 - d. Involvement in in-service activities and post graduate study
 - e. Written reviews of published textbooks and instructional materials
 - f. Articles edited for journals
 - g. Leadership roles held in professional organizations
 - h. Membership on evaluation teams such as TAC/ABET and NCA
 - i. Proposals reader or evaluator for funding agencies
 - j. Sponsor for, or advisor to, student organizations
 - k. Membership on departmental, college, or university committees
 - l. Election to college or university governing bodies
 - m. Gratis or paid consultancies to organizations and agencies concerning technology transfer or applications of technology
 - n. Election or appointment to local, state, or national bodies which influence technical matters

Chronic Low Achievement

The Engineering Technology Department *Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion* is explicit in pointing out professional performance characteristics for tenured and tenure-track faculty appointed to professional ranks in the department. This section of the document sets forth minimum performance standards in the areas of Teaching, Scholarly Activities, and Service.

The basis for establishing minimum productivity standards is contained in Sections C31.5 - C31.8 of the *Faculty Handbook, Kansas State University* and applicable Board of Regents policies and procedures.

Minimum Acceptable Levels of Productivity

Teaching

For the period under review

1. Faculty will provide instruction appropriate to fulfill the needs of the department.
2. Faculty will provide students with the following information for each course taught:
 - a. The aims or purposes of the course.
 - b. How the course will be organized.
 - c. How the students will be evaluated. (This will be in writing)
3. Faculty will meet regularly scheduled classes except for:
 - a. Illness, accident or attendance at professional meetings (in cases when it is known in advance, the faculty member will make arrangements for alternative coverage of the class).
 - b. Occasional times when other forms of instruction are scheduled during, or in lieu of, class time; for example field trips, class projects, laboratory activities, library research, supervised internships and COOP activities, and other events appropriate to the purpose of the course.
4. Faculty will hold regularly scheduled office hours.
5. Faculty will arrange for student evaluation of teaching according to departmental and university policy.
6. Faculty will engage in appropriate course development and self-improvement activities.

Scholarly Activities

For the period under review faculty are expected to engage in scholarly activities. The extent and nature of this activity is to be determined by the faculty member in consultation with the department head and the section head during the annual goal setting process as listed in Section IV of this document.

Appropriate activities include those listed in Sections II and IV of this document or others as

agreed upon by the parties listed above.

Service

For the period under review faculty are expected to engage in departmental, college, university, or professional service. The extent and nature of this activity is to be determined by the faculty member in consultation with the department head and the section head during the annual goal setting process discussed in Section IV of this document.

Appropriate activities include but are not limited to the following:

1. Service activities as referenced in Sections II and IV of this document.
2. Other activities as determined by the parties listed above.

Chronic Low Achievement Standards

Teaching

The judgement that minimum expectations are not being met in teaching is a complex process and must be arrived at carefully. It is expected that multiple sources of information will be used to make this determination. To arrive at such a determination there must be a documented history of failure in areas pertaining to teaching. Among the indicators are those listed below:

1. Failing to meet the course administrative standards listed in number 2 on teaching.
2. Low scores on standardized instruments used to evaluate teaching. To establish a base line an average raw composite score for all classes of 2 on the TEVAL instrument is considered to be below minimum expectations.
3. A lengthy history of negative peer reviews of teaching performance and course supporting materials such as course syllabi, class and lab handouts, tests, etc.

Scholarly Activities

One consideration for low achievement in scholarly activities is a failure to maintain and upgrade the technical knowledge and skills that pertain to the delivery of effective and up-to-date classroom instruction. Failing to meet minimal acceptable level of performance is also indicated by a failure to meaningfully engage in professional development activities of the type indicated in Sections II and IV of this document.

Service

Falling below minimal acceptable levels of performance in service is indicated by a failure to perform service activities of the type indicated in Sections II and IV of this document that are vital to the functioning of the department, college and university.

Dismissal Under the Provisions of Section C31.5

Section C31.5 has provisions for dismissing a tenured faculty member in instances where there has been a chronic failure of the faculty member to perform his or her professional duties. The decision to award tenure is not taken lightly, therefore the decision to revoke tenure must receive equal weight.

The decision to dismiss under C31.5 is based on two successive evaluations or a total of ~~3~~ three evaluations in any five-year period in which minimum expectations are not met. When the department head has determined that a faculty member has not met minimum standards of productivity in teaching, scholarship and service he or she must inform the faculty member in writing and make recommendations for correction as required by section C31.5. In addition the department head must ensure that he or she has any assistance needed as noted in section C31.7.

With the faculty member's agreement, the department head will establish a peer mentoring committee consisting of eligible faculty from the department to assist the faculty member with the required improvements.

When it has been determined that a faculty member has failed to respond to required improvements as referenced in section C31.5, the department head will initiate the following actions:

1. Unless the faculty member requests otherwise, the department head will constitute a peer review committee consisting of not less than three eligible faculty members, at least one of which will be from the same discipline as the affected faculty member. In the event there are no other members from the same discipline in the department, the faculty member can request one outside member from his or her discipline.
2. The peer review committee will review the documentation pertaining to the allegations of chronic failure and solicit comments from other eligible faculty. Following the peer review the committee will submit a report to the department head with its recommendation. In any event, the findings of the peer review committee along with the department head's suggested course of action will be forwarded to the dean as per C31.5.

Suggested Performance Criteria

- | | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| 5 | Excels |
| 4 | Exceeds minimum expectations |
| 3 | Meets minimum expectations |
| 2 | Marginally meets expectations |
| 1 | Fails to meet minimum expectations |

APPENDIX A: FACULTY ACTIVITY REPORT

NOTE: This form will be used to document your annual evaluation and to serve as a historical record for your periodic reviews and/or promotion and/or tenure discussions.

DEPARTMENT:

NAME:

RANK:

DATE OF PREPARATION:

REPORTING PERIOD:

TIME IN PROFESSIONAL RANKS:

YEAR JOINED KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY:

1. Teaching and program development (Percent of effort ___%)
 - a. Student Evaluations
 - b. Peer Evaluations
 - c. Supervisors Evaluations
(Reference Section II, paragraph 2 and 3)

2. Research or other creative endeavor (Percent of effort ___%)
 - a. Scholarship
 - b. Professional Development
 - c. Activities (i.e., applied research, technology transfer, consulting, industrial contacts, etc.)
(Reference Section II, paragraph 4)

3. Service (Percent of effort ___%)
 - a. Non-Directed Service
 - b. Directed Service
 - c. Other
(Reference Section II, paragraph 5)

The percentages allocated to each area should be consistent with the allocations specified in the faculty member's annual statement of goals and accomplishments as mutually developed between the faculty member and the department head. In tenure and promotion considerations, significant deviation from the yearly averages for each must be documented. The total of all efforts should equal 100%.

APPENDIX C: RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION FORM

I have reviewed the materials submitted by _____ in support of a promotion. On the basis of these materials, supplemented where appropriate by my knowledge of the candidate and the candidate's work and/or relevant comments from colleagues whose opinions I have reason to value, I recommend as follows:

I believe the candidate **definitely should** be promoted for the following reasons.

I believe the candidate **probably should** be promoted for the following reasons.

I believe the candidate **probably should not** be promoted for the following reasons.

I believe the candidate **definitely should not** be promoted for the following reasons.

Date: _____

Signature:

APPENDIX D: RECOMMENDATION FOR TENURE FORM

I have reviewed the materials submitted by _____ in support of reappointment conferring tenure. On the basis of these materials, supplemented where appropriate by my knowledge of the candidate and the candidate's work and/or relevant comments from colleagues whose opinions I have reason to value, I recommend as follows:

I believe the candidate **definitely should** be tenured for the following reasons.

I believe the candidate **probably should** be tenured for the following reasons.

I believe the candidate **probably should not** be tenured for the following reasons.

I believe the candidate **definite should not** be tenured for the following reasons.

Date: _____

Signature:

APPENDIX E: MERIT EVALUATION FORM

Performance Evaluation Form
Unclassified Faculty

Faculty Member's Name:

Faculty Member's Title:

Faculty Member's Supervisor:

Period of Current Evaluation From _____ To

NOTE 1: Please consult section 4 of the KSU-S Engineering Technology Department *Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion* document (Section IV) and categories identified therein for comments pertaining to accomplishments and areas of improvement.

NOTE 2: Numerical Assignments: **5 = Excels; 4 = Exceeds minimum expectations; 3 = Meets minimum expectations; 2 = Marginally meets expectations; 1 = Fails to meet minimum expectations**

Score: _____ TEACHING (____%)
Accomplishments:

Areas for Improvement:

Score: _____ SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES (____%)
Accomplishments:

Areas for Improvement:

Score: _____ SERVICE (____%)

Accomplishments:

Areas for Improvement:

_____ AGGREGATE SCORE OF EVALUATION

SUMMARY COMMENTS BY THE EVALUATOR (optional):

COMMENTS BY THE FACULTY MEMBER (optional):

Evaluator

Date

Faculty

Date

_____Comments attached

Kansas State University at Salina Engineering Technology Department

Professorial Performance Award

Eligibility

University eligibility for the Professorial Performance Award is outlined in sections C49.1 through C49.14 of the *University Handbook*.

Procedures

Departmental guidelines applicable to this award shall be referenced. However, all subscribed departmental procedural delineations for this award shall be superseded by the *University Handbook*.

1. Evaluation timeline shall be consistent with the annual review process as specified in the current Engineering Technology *Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion* document.
2. The candidate shall prepare and submit written documentation consistent with guidelines established for promotion to full professor as defined in the current Engineering Technology *Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion* document.
3. The award shall be recommended for approval through use of secret ballot by a majority vote of the tenured and non-tenured faculty in the department.

Criteria

Candidates shall show evidence of continued fulfillment of those requirements for promotion to the rank of professor as stated in the current Engineering Technology *Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion* document. Specifically, candidates shall demonstrate sustained **and** meritorious accomplishment in at least two of the **following** five categories of responsibility:

1. Fulfill a leadership role in the advancement of their respective academic program option.
2. Fulfilling leadership roles in departmental, college or university level activities.
3. Demonstrated leadership in educational and professional circles.
4. Demonstrated leadership in relations with industry.
5. Peer recognition as an outstanding educator, as an exceptional achiever in the area of student learning outcomes, or as the developer of innovative **and** successful educational processes.