

DEPARTMENT OF ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 3/30/06)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 3/30/06)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **3/2011**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **3/2011**

Frank Blecha, Department Head

Date signed: 5/17/06

Ralph Richardson, Dean

Date signed: 5/17/06

M. Duane Nellis, Provost

Date signed: 5/17/06

***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.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INSTRUCTION	3
Instruction	4
Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness	4
Examples of High-Quality Teaching Effectiveness.....	8
Evaluation of the Scholarship of Teaching.....	8
Examples of Accomplishments.....	9
Research.....	10
Examples of Excellence in Research & Publication.....	11
Examples of Effectiveness in Research & Publication.....	12
Service.....	12
Examples of Excellence in Service.....	13
Examples of Effectiveness in Service.....	14
Criteria for Renewal, Tenure and Promotion.....	15
Assistant Professor.....	15
Associate Professor.....	15
Professor.....	15
Tenure.....	16
Mid-probationary review.....	17
Annual Department Head-Faculty Conference.....	18
Curriculum Vitae-Completed by Faculty.....	18
Faculty Effort Report-Completed by Faculty.....	19
Faculty Evaluation Summary-Prepared by Department Head.....	20
Faculty Plan of Work Form.....	20

Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee.....	20
Initiation of Tenure and Promotion Review.....	22
Outside Letters of Evaluation.....	22
Departmental Review.....	23
College Review.....	23
Criteria for The Professorial Performance Award.....	23
Merit Compensation.....	25
Chronic Low Achievement.....	26
Grievance Resolution.....	28
Summary.....	28
FORMS	29

GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION
Department of Anatomy and Physiology
College of Veterinary Medicine
Kansas State University

Introduction_____

The goals and objectives of the Department and individual faculty members are not static. Thus, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a universally applicable set of detailed or temporally unbounded valuative criteria. It is, however, both desirable and feasible to establish a general set of evaluation guidelines and criteria congruent with the long-range goals and objectives of the Department. This document is not intended to prescribe a single stereotype of effective performance. Rather, the intent is to suggest examples of excellence and effectiveness which will serve as benchmarks for individual planning, goal-setting and evaluation of performance.

The professorial role has three major dimensions: 1) instruction; 2) contribution to new knowledge via research and publication; and 3) service to the institution, the profession, and external constituencies. Each of these three dimensions is important to the attainment of College goals of excellence and national prominence. Faculty presenting themselves for tenure, promotion or merit compensation are expected to excel in at least two of the three areas.

The nature of faculty contribution is expected to vary as a function of skills, interests, assigned responsibilities and stage of career development. This document does not seek to specify a single stereotype of faculty contribution. However, it is

possible to describe modal patterns of emphasis which are most likely to lead to career development and to positive evaluations.

Instruction

The importance of high-quality instruction is explicitly recognized in the Department goals of excellence and national prominence. This dimension is fundamental to the professorial role. All faculty members that have time budgeted for teaching are expected to contribute in the area of instruction and student development, to be effective in the classroom, to continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness, and to contribute to the development of the Department instructional programs. Effectiveness in teaching and scholarship are an important component in decisions on merit compensation, tenure and promotion. The impact of teaching on these decisions will be directly affected by the budgeted time for teaching in an individual faculty member's job assignment. Of course job assignments in the areas of research and directed service are also of extreme importance and the impact on overall evaluation of the faculty member will depend on the budgeted time for these areas. In addition, all faculty members are expected to participate in non-directed service for the Department, College and University.

Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

1. Teaching and course effectiveness should be evaluated by current students, peers (other Faculty of the Department of A&P) and the Department Head. All procedures should conform to the College of Veterinary Medicine "Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation" and the "Kansas State University Faculty Handbook." The

term "student" refers to professional students of the College of Veterinary Medicine unless otherwise agreed upon by the Department Head and faculty member. The term "lecture" refers to the class meeting time utilized by the faculty member in teaching in the course in question. The evaluation procedures given in this section (Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness) refer only to the effectiveness of teaching, and not to the scholarship of teaching.

2. The relative weight of the input from the students, peers and Department Head in determining the teaching effectiveness of a faculty member should be: 50% student evaluation, 25% peer evaluation, and 25% department head evaluation.
3. For evaluations by students, the following procedures outlined in a. to c. should be followed. As per section C34.1 of the University Faculty Handbook "Faculty members with classroom teaching responsibilities ought to include the results of student ratings in the documentation they submit for personnel decisions concerning annual merit salary, reappointment, tenure and promotion." In the Department of Anatomy and Physiology all those with teaching responsibilities regardless of rank should submit this documentation to the Department Head.
 - a. The TEVAL form with the option of 15 individualized questions crafted by the instructor should be the instrument used by all faculty at the full time instructor level or above. If the instructor desires to use other forms for improving his/her teaching, this option is open, but these forms would be in addition to the TEVAL instrument. At the request of the course coordinator the TEVAL form can be utilized for a graduate student if the

principal assignment of the graduate student is lecturing rather than laboratory instruction.

- b. The "Department of Anatomy and Physiology Student Evaluation of Laboratory Instruction" instrument should be used for all laboratory instructors below the level of full time instructor, e.g., graduate students. If the laboratory instructor feels the need to be evaluated using the TEVAL instrument, then this option should be open but this would be in addition to the "Department of Anatomy and Physiology Student Evaluation of Laboratory Instruction" instrument.
 - c. As per section C34.1 of the KSU Faculty Handbook, the students will evaluate non-tenured faculty at least once per year in every course in which the non-tenured faculty member regularly teaches. The students will evaluate tenured faculty at least once per year in at least one course in which the tenured faculty member regularly teaches.
4. For evaluations by peers, the following procedures outlined in a. to d. should be followed.
- a. Each non-tenured faculty member will be peer-reviewed by two tenured faculty members. This evaluation should take place during at least one or more lectures.
 - b. Each tenured faculty member will be peer-reviewed by one tenured faculty member. This evaluation should take place during at least one or more lectures.

- c. At the request of the faculty member being reviewed additional faculty can be selected to perform a peer review. Regardless of the number of faculty used in the peer review, they should be selected by mutual agreement of the faculty member being reviewed and the Department Head.
 - d. The instrument for peer review ("Department of Anatomy and Physiology Peer Evaluation of Instruction") is a two-page form. The first page of this instrument ending with "**Explanations of Not Acceptable (NA) Ratings**" is confidential and goes only to the Department Head and not to the faculty member being evaluated. The second page of the document containing "**GENERAL COMMENTS**" and "**SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT**" goes to both the faculty member being reviewed and to the Department Head. This allows for a sincere evaluation by the reviewer, and compliance with section C35 of the "KSU Faculty Handbook" but yet also allow the person being reviewed to profit from the suggestions of the peer reviewer.
5. The Department Head evaluation of teaching should involve the following procedures (a. & b.).
- a. The Department Head will attend at least one lecture of each of the teaching faculty in the Department of Anatomy and Physiology.
 - b. The Department Head is at liberty to use whatever additional instrument(s) of evaluation he/she chooses to equitably evaluate the

teaching effectiveness of the faculty in the Department of Anatomy and Physiology. Some examples of high quality effectiveness in teaching are listed at the end of this section (Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness).

EXAMPLES OF HIGH-QUALITY TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS INCLUDING OUTSTANDING:

- Evaluations of teaching performance by students
- Evaluations based on classroom visitation by the Department Head
- Evaluations based on peer reviews of instruction
- Exit interviews with professional students or graduate students
- Results of surveys of previous graduates relative to knowledge gained and preparation for their chosen career
- Evaluation of students in terms of thorough and equitable grading
- Accomplishments in the area of awards for teaching, e.g., Norden Award, SCAVMA Award for Basic Science, University Awards
- Recognition for continuing education and extension activities
- Evaluations from previous employers of the faculty member or from employers of previous students of the faculty member
- Coordination of multidisciplinary courses

EVALUATION OF THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING

Evaluation of the scholarship of teaching is particularly important for those faculty members with large teaching assignments and is evaluated by the Department Head in consultation with the faculty member. Suggested areas of endeavor that may qualify as scholarship in teaching are given in items 1 to 28 under "Teaching" on pages 3 and 4 of the "College of Veterinary Medicine Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation." Some examples of the scholarship of teaching especially germane to the faculty of the Department of Anatomy and Physiology are listed at the end of this section ("Evaluation of the Scholarship of Teaching"). It is understood that, depending on the assignment of the faculty member and their contributions in the areas of scholarship in research and directed service, scholarship in teaching may impact the overall evaluation of the faculty member well beyond the Department Head's 25% input into the evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

Examples of Accomplishments in the area of Scholarship of Teaching include:

- Development of new teaching materials or radical improvement of current teaching materials
- Development of innovative pedagogical methodologies and materials
- Development of new undergraduate, professional, graduate or extension courses or major revision of existing courses
- Publication of instructional related materials, e.g., case reports, textbooks, autotutorials, results of surveys or articles on the theory of education
- Development of survey instruments for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness

- Contribution to the development of new instructional programs
- Record of speaking engagements on instructional related topics at local, regional, state, national and/or international meetings
- Completion of programs/workshops resulting in improved teaching methods
- Proof of significant self-development leading to enhanced instructional effectiveness
- Chair of MS and/or PhD committee(s)
- Member of MS and/or PhD committee(s)
- Direction of independent student research, e.g., summer projects by veterinary students

Research

High-quality research and publication are fundamental to attaining the goals of academic excellence and national prominence. Faculty contributions to the body of knowledge are critical to our academic reputation for excellence.

The quality of the research contribution to the body of knowledge is the major criterion in evaluation. Indices of quality include: a consistent record of publication in leading refereed journals in relevant disciplines; peer recognition via research or publication awards and membership on prestigious editorial boards.

Original research should normally be considered as evidence only after acceptance for publication. A given achievement should not be counted as an accomplishment justifying advancement of a faculty member if it has been employed in earlier justifications, except in the obvious sense of counting as part of a cumulative record. One permissible exception to this general rule is the occasional instance in

which a scholarly or creative work increases considerably in stature and importance after its initial publication. In such instances, the increase in stature must be shown through such evidence as reviews and significant citations.

Both collaborative and individual contributions in research and publications are desirable; however, individuals are encouraged to develop a balanced publication record. External funding of research will be an indicator of excellence when such research seeks to contribute to the body of knowledge and/or to student development. Externally funded research should serve as a means to quality publication and/or student development and not as an end in itself.

Effectiveness in research and publication is an important component in decisions on merit compensation, tenure and promotion. However, this productivity in the absence of quality of performance in other assignments will not be adequate for positive recommendations and action. Multiple indicators of excellence in research and publication over an extended period of time, together with effectiveness in instruction, and/or service usually represent the most important components in the tenure and promotion process.

Examples of Excellence in Research and Publication

- Recognition from peers in the field, e.g., fellowships, research awards, publication awards;
- Publications in the leading refereed journals of appropriate disciplines;
- Significant external funding for research;
- Publication of critically acclaimed book(s);
- Significant intellectual participation in patents and royalty/licensing agreements;

- Editorship of major journal;
- Board of editors of major journal(s);
- Grant/contract reviewer for research organizations and institutions, e.g., NIH, NSF, USDA.

Examples of Effectiveness in Research and Publication

- Publication of book(s);
- Publication of technical reports or monographs;
- Presentation of papers at professional meetings;
- Publication of significant review articles;
- Publication of chapters or sections in scholarly books;
- Publication of papers in proceedings of regional professional meetings;
- Ad hoc reviewer for major refereed journals;
- Consultant to industry;
- Publication in non-refereed but widely recognized professional journals;
- Clear contribution to the research of others;
- Significant self-development activities leading to increased research and publication effectiveness;
- Member of thesis/dissertation committees;
- Chair of Master's thesis and PhD dissertation committees;
- Direction of independent student research;
- Editor of published conference proceedings;
- Publication of case reports in refereed journals;
- Invited reviewer of professional books.

Service

The Department of Anatomy and Physiology must effectively serve several constituencies to achieve excellence and national prominence. The academic profession, the veterinary profession, the public, the agricultural community and the University are among our major constituencies.

A variety of service roles can contribute to attainment of our goals of excellence and national prominence. No attempt is made here to prescribe what specific service roles individual faculty members should play. However, all faculty members are expected to contribute in the service area. As will be noted in subsequent sections, the amount and nature of the service contributions are likely to differ as a function of individual skills, interests, and stage of career development.

Excellence in service will be an important component in decisions on merit compensation, tenure and promotion. However, this productivity alone, in the absence of quality of performance in other assignments, will not be adequate for positive recommendations and actions. Multiple indicators of excellence in service over an extended period of time, together with effectiveness in instruction, and/or research and publication usually represent the most important components in the tenure and promotion process.

Examples of Excellence in Service

- Officer in a national professional organization;
- Program, division, or area chair of a national meeting;

- Service on institutional, state or national commissions, task forces, committees or boards;
- Consultation with state, national or international governmental offices;
- Attraction of significant external development support;
- Evidence of leadership and outstanding contributions on University, College and Department committees and task forces;
- Invitations to speak at regional and national meetings;
- Editorship of major journal;
- Board of editors of major journal(s).

Examples of Effectiveness in Service

- Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced service proficiency and effectiveness;
- Consulting with industry, veterinary practitioners and client groups;
- Officer, program, or area chair in regional professional organizations;
- Service on University, College and Department committees and task forces;
- Contribution to external development efforts;
- Advisor to student organizations;
- Administrative roles within the Department or College;
- Publications of importance to the College with a local, regional or national distribution;
- Ad hoc reviewer for major refereed journals;
- Consultant to industry;

- Editor of published conference proceedings;
- Invited reviewer of professional books.

Criteria for Renewal, Tenure and Promotion_____

Assistant Professor

Primary emphasis should be placed on establishing a productive pattern of research and publication in leading academic journals and on developing competence in instruction. Promotion to Associate Professor will be based on evaluation of performance in assigned responsibilities in instruction, research and service.

Associate Professor

Continued emphasis should be placed on competence in instruction and research. For those with major service roles, continued excellence in service contributions is expected, along with the development of leadership in the individual's specialty area. Associate Professors will be expected to exhibit increased contributions, excellence and effectiveness in two or more of the areas of instruction, research and service. For Associate Professors aspiring to full Professorship, excellence in instruction and service contributions must be combined with a research and publication record demonstrating leadership, continued development and contributions to the field as judged by peers and external scholars.

Professors

Continued excellence and national recognition in at least two of the three areas of instruction, research and service are required. Leadership can be manifested in a variety of ways, such as continued major contributions to the body of knowledge;

contribution to the development of junior faculty; leadership in one or more of the areas of excellence in service; and leadership in one or more of the areas of excellence in instruction and student development. While there will likely be great heterogeneity in the nature of contributions of full professors, excellence in several areas are expected. Merit compensation will be the primary extrinsic means of recognizing such excellence.

Tenure

Individuals recommended for academic tenure will be those who are expected to earn the rank of full Professor in accordance with Department and College guidelines for promotion. Personal qualities, professional knowledge and competence, and standards of professional integrity are important factors. The individual must give promise to a continuing high level of productivity and scholarly activity.

The basic questions to be satisfied when the record of an individual is reviewed prior to the granting of tenure are:

1. Does this person have a high level of competence for the position at hand?
2. Is this an individual whose personal qualities, professional knowledge and competence, and standards of professional integrity measure up to the level desired for the Department and College of Veterinary Medicine.

Tenure and promotion are usually linked for persons hired as Assistant Professors. Thus, a recommendation for early promotion is usually coupled with a recommendation for early tenure and vice versa.

If it becomes clear at any time during the probationary period that a person is not going to qualify for tenure, the person will be terminated. Neither party benefits from prolonging an unsatisfactory situation.

Mid-probationary review. A formal review of a probationary faculty member is conducted midway through the probationary period; in most cases, during the third year of appointment. This review provides the faculty member with substantive feedback from faculty colleagues and administrators regarding his or her accomplishments relative to the institution's mission, goals and objectives. 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, except when notice of non-reappointment is given.

Procedures for the mid-probationary review are very similar to procedures for the tenure review and are established by the departmental faculty in consultation with the Department Head and the Dean. The Department Head is responsible for making the candidate's file available to tenured faculty members in the department and is advised by them regarding the candidate's progress. Comments may also be solicited from students, from other faculty members and Department Heads in the college or university, or from peers outside the university. The Department Head discusses the review with the candidate and provides a letter of advisement, including a summary of faculty comments and suggestions. A copy of the letter is forwarded to the Dean along with the faculty member's file.

Annual Department Head-Faculty Conference

Each year the Department Head meets individually with each faculty member early in the calendar year to review that member's performance and, as appropriate, progress toward tenure and promotion. At this meeting, the Department Head's evaluation of the faculty member's performance, as reflected on the department's "Faculty Evaluation Report", is to be reviewed. Disagreements may be noted on the form at that time. Faculty assignments and goals for the coming year will be discussed and agreed upon at the same meeting.

Curriculum Vitae – Completed by the Faculty

Each faculty member is required to submit a current curriculum vitae at the time of submission of the Faculty Effort Report. The style and format may be of the faculty's own choosing. Regardless of the format, however, the following information should be included:

Name

Date

Telephone numbers (office and home)

Universities attended, degrees and dates

Specialty board certification

Employment record

Professional organizations

Honors, awards, special recognitions

Academic committee experience

Government and other professional experience

Research grants, contracts, royalties, patents, license incomes

Consultative experience

Publications

Presentations

Abstracts

The above specifies only the minimum needed in a curriculum vitae. The inclusion of other information such as social security number, birthplace, date of birth, marital status, children, military service, areas of teaching, service and research competence and hobbies is optional. It is suggested that the curriculum vitae be developed in a format one would want to send to peer groups outside Kansas State University.

Faculty Effort Report – Completed by the Faculty

This document has been developed to provide an annual summation of faculty accomplishments in teaching, research and service. In this reporting activity, opportunity is also provided to report on student counseling activities, administrative and committee activities, professional activities, civic activities, honors and any other professional activities pertinent to the effectiveness of the faculty member during the year.

Faculty Evaluation Summary – Prepared by Department Head

This form is prepared annually by the Department Head after reviewing the faculty member's updated curriculum vitae and Faculty effort Report for the current year and any other pertinent information available. The annual Faculty Evaluation Summary is designed to evaluate progress in assigned areas of activity, to identify opportunities for professional development, and to serve as an instrument of communication between the Department Head and faculty member.

Faculty Plan of Work Form – Completed by Faculty Member and Department Head Jointly

This form is designed as a communication instrument for arriving at a joint understanding of duty assignments and expectations. Specific objectives, to be accomplished are stressed and resources available to accomplish the assignments, are identified.

Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee

All tenured faculty may vote on recommendations for tenure. Only faculty members with higher rank than the candidate may vote on recommendations for promotion. All voting Departmental tenured faculty are advisory to the Department Head.

Initiation of Tenure and Promotion Review

The Department Head initiates the process by convening the eligible departmental voting faculty. The Department Head is responsible for reviewing all persons eligible for tenure and/or promotion, and consulting with the voting faculty before transmitting tenure and/or promotion recommendations to the Dean. To give

well-informed advice, it is necessary that the departmental voting faculty be provided with appropriate information such as current curricula vitae and Faculty Effort Reports.

Those faculty members who are identified as candidates for tenure and/or promotion will be asked by the Department Head to submit the following:

1. a current curriculum vitae;
2. a representative sample of publications;
3. documentation of awards, honors, appointments;
4. documentation of service contributions;
5. documentation of pedagogical innovation, teaching effectiveness, and other materials relevant to effectiveness in instruction.

The Department Head will solicit and/or add to the file of candidates for tenure and/or promotion:

1. a minimum of three letters of evaluation from nationally respected extramural scholars in relevant disciplines;
2. such other letters of evaluation as may be useful;
3. copies of the latest Faculty Effort Report;
4. copies of the most recent Faculty Annual Evaluation Summary;
5. additional documentation required by the University to complete the file.

This file will be forwarded to the Dean together with the departmental recommendation on tenure and/or promotion and any other forms required by the College and University administration according to guidelines and schedules issued annually by the University.

Outside Letters of Evaluation

Letters of evaluation from scholars outside the Department with recognized distinction in the candidate's field of specialization are extremely helpful in arriving at a judgment concerning research capability and are required in cases of tenure or promotion. A minimum of three letters must be included. At least one of the letters should be solicited from a person on a list submitted by the candidate, if the candidate so chooses. Unless the candidate's list preempts all qualified persons, two or more referees can be designated independently by the Department Head. Candidate-designated referees should be identified. The value of outside letters depends on the choice of appropriate persons who are discriminating judges and who are familiar with the candidate's work or will take the trouble to evaluate it. Letters from the candidate's major professor, or the candidate's graduate student colleagues, are generally less persuasive to a case than more clearly objective sources, and should, therefore, as a rule, be avoided. Outside referees should be asked to comment on the candidate's research and other creative work. Where appropriate, referees may be asked to comment on teaching and service abilities and institutional citizenship. Copies of outside letters should accompany the individual file.

Departmental Review

The Department Head reviews all persons for eligibility for tenure and promotion, and then convenes the departmental voting faculty. Faculty recommendations relative to tenure and/or promotion are forwarded to the Department Head.

Department Heads are responsible for conveying the departmental recommendation concerning tenure and promotion to the Dean. If the recommendation of the voting faculty of the Department is at variance with the recommendation of the Department Head, both recommendations should be forwarded as clearly reasoned recommendations for or against tenure and/or promotion. The Department Head also notifies the faculty member of the departmental decision regarding tenure and/or promotion at this time.

College Review

The Departments review of tenure and promotion applications is followed by a College review process. Comments and recommendations resulting from the College Review are forwarded to the Dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine, who will then forward the Colleges recommendations to the Provost of the University.

Appeal process will be in accordance with the KSU Faculty Handbook.

CRITERIA FOR THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD _____

As explained in the University Handbook Section C: Identity, Employment, Tenure (C49.1 – C49.14), the Professorial Performance Award rewards strong performance at the highest rank with a base salary increase in addition to that provided for by the annual evaluation process.

Qualifying Guidelines and Criteria:

1. The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at Kansas State at least six years since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award.

2. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review.
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. In the last six years, the candidate must have received a minimum of four annual overall assessments for faculty performance of High Meets or Exceeds Expectations.

Supporting materials that will serve as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award:

The faculty member will provide each Faculty Evaluation Form since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award and a current curriculum vitae.

The Department Head's recommendation contained on the Professorial Performance Award form and the candidate's current curriculum vitae will be forwarded to the Dean at the same time as the annual evaluations are forwarded to the Dean.

Merit Compensation_____

Merit compensation represents an opportunity to reward short-term contributions of excellence, to recognize progress toward tenure and promotion, and to continue rewards for the contributions of tenured faculty and full professors. For non-tenured Assistant and Associate Professors, the basis of merit compensation evaluations will be

progress made toward tenure and/or promotion, i.e., continued development of a high-quality research and publication record, effectiveness in instruction, and high-quality service contributions. For tenured faculty, merit compensation evaluations will be based on the level of performance in at least two of the following areas: instruction, research, and/or service.

The evaluation period will be the same for all individuals in the Department, with the possible exception of first year appointees and individuals who have been on leave for all or part of the year. The Department's evaluation system will normally be based on performance during the 12-month evaluation period ending December 31st.

It is emphasized that accumulation of "activities" does not constitute the basis for favorable merit compensation. It is the degree of excellence that is crucial to the merit compensation decision. Again, it remains for individual faculty members, in consultation with his or her Department Head, to identify the specific contributions which will best integrate the individual's skills, interests, and goals, with the Department's goals of excellence and national prominence.

Chronic Low Achievement_____

Chronic failure of a tenured faculty member to perform his/her professional duties shall constitute evidence of "professional incompetence" and warrant consideration for "dismissal for cause" under existing University policies. In general the **Minimal Standard for Acceptable Teaching** requires competent and committed instruction as evidenced by appropriate professional behavior, being prepared for class relative to current information, conducting class and examination sessions as scheduled

and contributing to the overall teaching mission of the department. The **Minimal Standard for Research** performance involves the maintenance of a functional and productive research laboratory as evidenced by periodic scientific presentations at state and national scientific meetings, publications in appropriate scientific journals and sincere attempts to secure extramural funding to support their research efforts.

Should the Department Head conclude for two consecutive years, or for three years within a five-year period, that a faculty member's overall accomplishments do not meet the minimum expectations of the department, the Department Head will exercise one of two options:

A. The Department Head may recommend to the Dean that a set of corrective measures be established to help the faculty member attain success in his/her professional endeavors. These measures may include requiring the faculty member to specify a set of goals, a reasonable plan and timeline for attaining the stated goals, reassignment of responsibilities within the context of the needs of the department and the faculty member's talent, and/or establishing a mentoring relationship between the faculty member and a more successful faculty member who could provide advice and guidance. Should the Department Head choose this option, the following steps will be followed:

- 1) The Department Head will meet with the faculty member to inform him/her of the decision, and to define those corrective measures, which will be employed.

- 2) The faculty member has the right to request that additional faculty input be provided to the Department Head, to influence both the initial evaluation of the accomplishments and the set of corrective measures. The Department Head will then convene the tenured faculty in the department and solicit additional input from them.
- B. The Department Head may recommend to the Dean that the faculty member be dismissed from employment at the University. Should the Department Head choose this option, the following steps will be followed:
- 1) The Department Head will inform the faculty member of this decision.
 - 2) The Department Head will convene the tenured faculty in the department and request they examine the faculty member's credentials. After reviewing all appropriate documentation, the tenured faculty will provide a substantive rationale for their support, or non-support, of the Department Head's recommendation. The tenured faculty's report should include results of a numerical vote. The faculty member may request that the Department Head not seek this additional faculty input.
 - 3) The Department Head will forward the tenured faculty's recommendation, along with all the documentation used to formulate their recommendation, to the Dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine.

Grievance Resolution_____

In the event that serious disagreements arise (salary, promotion, tenure, or other employment conditions) between unclassified persons and their immediate or

higher level supervisors, a process for registering and hearing grievances is found in Appendix G of the KSU Faculty Handbook. All efforts should be made by the aggrieved person and the person's immediate, or one-level higher, supervisor to resolve the issue prior to a grievance being formally filed. An ombudsperson will be available for advice, counseling, and perhaps mediation during this phase of the issue resolution.

Summary

This document provides general guidelines for faculty evaluation. Since the nature of scholarly enterprise requires both flexibility and freedom, a single stereotype of effective performance is undesirable. The Departmental approach is to provide a general set of guidelines with specific examples and model patterns of emphasis as indicators of excellence and effectiveness. Within this general set of guidelines, a variety of contributions to our goals of excellence and national prominence are possible. Indeed, such heterogeneity of contribution is itself a component of our pursuit of excellence.

DEPARTMENT OF ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY
COLLEGE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE
FACULTY EFFORT REPORT FOR CALENDAR YEAR 200_

Name:

Date:

Budgeted Effort:

teaching

research

service

I. Teaching

Level of courses taught, competence as a teacher, student evaluation, peer evaluation, academic student counseling, availability to students, additional work with students (i.e., independent studies, thesis/dissertation committees), graduate student advisement.

II. Published Research and Grants Received

Quality and quantity of completed books, chapters, productions, exhibits, papers read, reviews, abstracts, etc. during this year; nature of the journal in which publications appear, originality and significance of the work; outside review of publications, grants received.

III. Works in Progress: Research and Academic Projects

Current research projects, grants, and research support applied for, development of teaching or other materials, editorial or review responsibilities, service on granting agency review panels, refereed panel presentations.

IV. Professional Development Service

Offices held in and other contributions to professional organizations, conferences attended, workshops given, panel presentations, other activities enhancing the College's reputation through professional service, honors received, future potential for professional development, patient or client service.

V. Other Service

Departmental, School and University service (committees, offices held), participation in student activities, responsible conduct in meeting scheduled classes, available for counseling, attending graduation, providing grades promptly, special circumstances contributing to an assessment of performance this year, organizations, communities, institutions outside KSUCVM, contributions to individuals.

PLAN OF WORK

DEPARTMENT OF ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY COLLEGE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE FOR CALENDAR YEAR 200_

Name:

Rank:

Date Rank Attained:

Years in Rank:

Date tenure attained:

Budgeted Effort: teaching:

research:

service:

administration

ASSIGNMENTS	GOALS
I. INSTRUCTION:	
II. RESEARCH:	
III. SERVICE:	

IV. Professional Development and Service

Offices held in and other contributions to professional organizations, conferences attended, workshops given, panel presentations, other activities enhancing the College's reputation through professional service, honors received, future potential for professional development, patient or client service.

DEPARTMENT HEAD SUMMARY AND COMMENTS:

V. OTHER SERVICE

Departmental, School and University service (committees, offices held), participation in student activities, responsible conduct in meeting scheduled classes, available for counseling, service during registration, attending graduation, providing grades promptly, special circumstances contributing to an assessment of performance this year, organizations, communities, institutions outside KSUVM, contributions to individuals.

DEPARTMENT HEAD SUMMARY AND COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Overall Assessment of Faculty Performance

**Below Expectations
Expectations**

Meets Expectations

Exceeds

FACULTY EXPECTATIONS RESPONSE:

Signatures:

Faculty Member _____

My signature signifies that I have seen the Department Heads evaluations. This does not mean that I agree with all of them.

Date _____ Department

Head _____

Comments by Dean

Dean _____ Date _____

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE
DEPARTMENT OF ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY

PEER EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION
(Page 1 of 2)

Please return both pages to the Department Head
Optional: Check the box if you want a copy of page 1 returned to the faculty member
being evaluated.

Responsible evaluations can help the instructor improve as well as provide salient information regarding teaching effectiveness.

NAME OF INSTRUCTOR: _____ NAME OF COURSE: _____

DATE: _____

Rating System for THE INSTRUCTOR relative to the issues set forth below:
1 = not acceptable (NA); 3 = meets expectations (ME); 5 = exceeds expectations (EE).

	<u>NA</u>		<u>ME</u>		<u>EE</u>
Preparedness for class	1	2	3	4	5
Clarity of presentation	1	2	3	4	5
Instructor/Student rapport	1	2	3	4	5
Challenging the student to think more deeply about the subject	1	2	3	4	5

OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS AS A TEACHER _____

Please explain reasons for any NA ("Not Acceptable") ratings given:

**KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE
DEPARTMENT OF ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY**

**PEER EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION
(Page 2 of 2)**

Page 2 will be copied and returned to the faculty member being evaluated.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:

SIGNATURE/DATE:

Professorial Performance Award Evaluation Form
Department of anatomy and physiology
 COLLEGE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE

Name:

Date:

Date of Promotion to Professor at K-State:

Date of Last Performance Review:

Overall Annual Assessment of Performance for the last six years:

mm/dd/yr	Below Expectations	Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Exceeds Expectations
mm/dd/yr	Below Expectations	Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Exceeds Expectations
mm/dd/yr	Below Expectations	Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Exceeds Expectations
mm/dd/yr	Below Expectations	Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Exceeds Expectations
mm/dd/yr	Below Expectations	Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Exceeds Expectations
mm/dd/yr	Below Expectations	Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Exceeds Expectations

RECOMMENDATION:

Signatures:

Faculty Member _____

My signature signifies that I have seen the Department Head's recommendation.

Date _____ Department Head _____

Comments by Dean

Dean _____ Date _____

DEPARTMENT OF ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY
STUDENT EVALUATION OF LABORATORY INSTRUCTION

Laboratory Instructor: _____ Course Number: _____

Please give honest and thoughtful answers to the following questions. Your responses will be appreciated. If a question “Doesn’t Pertain” to this instructor, circle DP.

RATE THE INSTRUCTOR USING THE FOLLOWING:

1 = Unsatisfactory to 5 = Excellent.

- | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1. | Were explanations of ideas & concepts clearly stated? | 1 2 3 4 5 DP |
| 2. | Did the instructor speak audibly & distinctly? | 1 2 3 4 5 DP |
| 3. | Was the instructor responsive to student questions? | 1 2 3 4 5 DP |
| 4. | Was the lab instructor available to help during lab? | 1 2 3 4 5 DP |
| 5. | Did the instructor appear familiar with the equipment used? | 1 2 3 4 5 DP |
| 6. | Did the instructor appear familiar with the daily assignment? | 1 2 3 4 5 DP |
| 7. | Did the instructor find ways to help you answer your own questions? | 1 2 3 4 5 DP |
| 8. | Did the instructor encourage you to express yourself freely and openly? | 1 2 3 4 5 DP |
| 9. | Did the instructor seem enthusiastic about the subject matter? | 1 2 3 4 5 DP |
| 10. | Was the importance and significance of the subject matter demonstrated? | 1 2 3 4 5 DP |
| 11. | Did the instructor realize when students did not understand? | 1 2 3 4 5 DP |
| 12. | Did the instructor introduce stimulating ideas about the subject? | 1 2 3 4 5 DP |
| 13. | Was the course material related to real life situations? | 1 2 3 4 5 DP |
| 14. | Was the instructor willing to help students outside the class? | 1 2 3 4 5 DP |

PLEASE PROVIDE CANDID ANSWERS TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS.

- 1) What characteristics of the laboratory instructor were helpful to you in the laboratory?

- 2) What aspects of this instructor's teaching could be improved?

RATE YOUR OVERALL IMPRESSION OF THE LAB INSTRUCTOR:

_____ EXCELLENT _____ GOOD _____ AVERAGE
_____ UNSATISFACTORY