

DEPARTMENT OF CLINICAL SCIENCES

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 9/01/06)

Bonnie Rush, Department Head

Date signed: 9/01/06

Ralph Richardson, Dean

Date signed: 9/01/06

M. Duane Nellis, Provost

Date signed: 9/11/06

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 6/07/04)

Gregory Grauer, Department Head

Date signed: 6/07/04

Ralph Richardson, Dean

Date signed: 6/07/04

James Coffman, Provost

Date signed: 6/21/04

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

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: 6/2009

***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.**

Introduction:

This document describes Guidelines for Annual Evaluation, Professorial Performance Awards, and Minimum Standards of Faculty Performance to be used for the faculty of the Department of Clinical Sciences. These guidelines are in conformance with Kansas State University policy. Components of this document have been drawn from the Faculty Handbook; the University Guideline for Evaluation of Unclassified Personnel; the Office of Unclassified Affairs and University Compliance; the Faculty Evaluation Document from the Department of Diagnostic Medicine / Pathobiology; as well as previous Departmental documents.

The purposes of the annual evaluation process are to 1) assess the performance of each faculty member and 2) evaluate and adjust the percent effort each faculty member applies to various areas of responsibility. During the annual review process, previous goals for each faculty member will be reviewed and new goals will be developed. Establishing goals is an important process that helps define the directions of each faculty member's professional development in relation to Departmental missions. It should be noted however, that the annual evaluation process assesses faculty performance and accomplishments independent of pre-established goals.

The Guidelines for Annual Evaluation, Professorial Performance Awards, and Minimum Standards of Faculty Performance are designed to reflect the unique aspects of the Department of Clinical Sciences in terms of its missions while recognizing the diversity of faculty interests, abilities, assignments, and academic/scientific disciplines. Within this context, the guidelines are designed to promote and recognize excellence in all areas of academic responsibility without favoritism or preference given to any activity or discipline. These guidelines are designed to balance the quality and quantity of a faculty member's contribution and to match the changing needs of the Department with the evolving talents of the faculty.

Given the diversity of faculty assignments, disciplines, and responsibilities within the Department (one of the broadest in the University), this evaluation system is founded on the understanding that evaluations should be based on multiple sources of input from different perspectives. It is important to recognize that evaluation of faculty performance in a professional environment is complex and multi-factorial and that even highly specific evaluation criteria may not accurately reflect a faculty member's contribution.

The Department's evaluation system is based on the precept that multiple professional judgments provided by academic peers as well as the Department Head will increase the likelihood of accurate assessments. Competent persons will ordinarily arrive at similar, although not identical, judgments regarding the merit of teaching activities, and the pooled judgment of several competent professionals tends to be more reliable than the judgment of any one person. Use of multiple raters enhances the reliability with which clinical and didactic teaching, instructional materials, and student rating of teaching effectiveness are evaluated. Although it is recognized that the use of peer review increases both the cost and complexity of the evaluation, the benefit of the additional input is a reasonable and desirable tradeoff.

Annual Evaluation Procedures:

Faculty assignments are set individually for each faculty member via an agreement between the Department Head and the faculty member at the beginning of each evaluation year and should reflect the faculty member's goals and objectives in relation to departmental programs and missions. It is important for the assignment to be established as early in the evaluation period as practically possible. Faculty assignments are subject to re-negotiation in the event of changes in the faculty member's responsibilities or to meet unanticipated needs of the department.

Annual Evaluation materials are due on December 7 each year. Faculty members will be notified in early October to provide ample opportunity to assemble and submit the required materials. If a faculty member, in spite of reasonable notice, fails to provide the necessary information, the Department Head will send a written reminder. If after being informed of the possible consequences, the faculty member still does not make the materials available, the Department Head may assign that faculty member a "fails to meet expectations" evaluation. Since annual evaluation provides the basis for salary adjustment recommendations, any faculty member who fails to submit materials in a timely fashion provides the Department Head with justification to recommend no increase in salary.

Two major communication requirements associated with the evaluation process are: 1) To establish an understanding of the plans of work in the coming year in terms of assignments and the relative importance of each assignment, and 2) To communicate the results of the evaluation clearly and constructively.

The Department Head's written evaluation of each faculty member will contain three parts: 1) a review of the individual's assignment and the weight attached to each responsibility during the preceding evaluation period; 2) succinct assessments of effectiveness in performing each responsibility and a statement of the overall evaluation, which must be consistent with the weights assigned to the individual ratings; and 3) where appropriate, suggestions for improvement. (See Appendix, Form 1)

For the purpose of annual salary adjustments, the overall performance of each faculty member will be rated using the following "Overall Performance Categories".

1. Fails to meet expectations
2. Meets expectations at a minimal level
3. Meets expectations
4. Meets expectations at a high level
5. Exceeds expectations

Each faculty member will review and be given the opportunity to discuss his or her final written evaluation with the Department Head. Before the Department Head submits the evaluation to the next administrative level, each faculty member must sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review and react to the Evaluation and Overall Performance category. Because the amount of funds available for merit salary increases is generally not known at the time, specific percent salary increases may not be discussed at this stage. When this information becomes available, the Dean or Department Head will inform each faculty member in writing of the recommended percent salary adjustment.

Annual Evaluation Materials:

Part 1: To be completed/compiled by the individual faculty member

1. Proposed Annual Plan of Work and Goals for Next Year (Appendix, Form 2)
 - Includes percents of time allocated to teaching, service, and scholarly activities
 - Agreed upon by both faculty member and Department Head
2. Approved Goal Statement for the Current Year
3. Electronic Standardized Curriculum Vitae (CV) with activities of the evaluated year highlighted.
4. Letter of Self-assessment
 - To allow the individual to review/personalize materials and responsibilities not quantifiable in the CV. Not to exceed two pages.
 - This letter should generally include: high points of your accomplishments, including major innovations; factors which may have precluded you from achieving all that you had planned; and other scholarly work or acknowledgments that have not been covered elsewhere.

Part 2: Materials from outside sources

1. Section Head Evaluation of Clinical Service and Clinical Teaching (Appendix, Form 3)
2. Intern/Resident Evaluation of Faculty Hospital Performance (Appendix, Form 4)
 - Optional at the discretion of the individual House Officer
 - Any House Officer can evaluate any faculty member
3. Student Evaluation of Instruction (TEVALs) of didactic and clinical teaching
 - It is strongly recommended that all faculty obtain TEVALs for every classroom course and clinical rotation.
4. Student Evaluation of Faculty Hospital Performance (Appendix, Form 5)
 - In addition to responding to questions 1-14 on the Student Evaluation of Instruction (TEVAL), a specific questionnaire will be used for questions 15-22.
 - It is strongly recommended that all faculty obtain this additional evaluation for each clinical rotation
5. Hospital Director Evaluation of Faculty Performance in the VMTH (Appendix, Form 6)
6. Peer-review of didactic activities (Appendix, Form 7)
 - Groups of three faculty will be randomly selected (although each group is a mix of junior and senior faculty), with each member evaluated by the other two.
 - a) Each evaluator will evaluate at least one lecture of each peer.
 - b) Each evaluatee will provide a lecture schedule to each evaluator, and he or she may indicate which lectures they feel may be more appropriate for evaluation.
 - c) Evaluations should be turned in to the DCS office as soon as completed, our office will provide a copy to the evaluatee.

d) Failure of an evaluator to perform this assignment may influence his or her own evaluation.

7. Peer-review of clinical teaching activities (Appendix, Form 8)

- To accomplish this goal, the faculty peer groups established above will be used.
 - a) At least one clinical teaching activity period will be evaluated.
 - b) Evaluations should be turned in to the DCS office as soon as completed.
- Failure of an evaluator to perform this assignment may influence his or her own evaluation.

Part 3: Form to be completed by the Department Head (Appendix, Form 1)

Part 4: Criteria to be evaluated by the Department Head and Hospital Director

Department Head

Hospital Director

Didactic Teaching

TEVALS
Peer Reviews
Student Comments
Self-Assessment Letter

Scholarship

Curriculum vitae
Self-Assessment Letter

Directed Clinical Service*

Section Head Evaluation of
Clinical Teaching
House Officer Evaluation of
Clinical Teaching
Student Evaluation of Clinical
Teaching
Self-Assessment Letter

Directed Clinical Service*

Section Head Evaluation of
Clinical Performance
House Officer Evaluation of
Clinical Performance
Student Evaluation of
Clinical Performance
Client and RDVM input

Non-Directed Service*

Curriculum vitae
Self-Assessment

Administration (Section Heads)*

Faculty Evaluation
(if applicable)
House Officer Evaluation
(if applicable)
Self-Assessment Letter

* 50% of the evaluation will come from the Department Head and 50% will come from the Hospital Director.

Professorial Performance Award:

The Professorial Performance Award (PPA) rewards strong performance and sustained productivity by a full-time Professor who has been in rank at least six years since the last promotion or PPA. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity during that time and the performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor by current departmental standards. The PPA award will provide a salary enhancement in accordance with University Handbook section C: Identity, Employment, Tenure (C49.1-49.14) and will be added to the base salary of the recipient. The award will be in addition to the merit raise provided by the annual evaluation process. Importantly, this award is not a form of promotional review and does not create a “senior” professoriate.

Evidence of strong performance and sustained productivity is based on the Professor's scholarship record, national and/or international recognition, and a distinguished career that demonstrates excellence in teaching, research, and/or service/outreach.

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 **Meets Expectations - High** or **Exceeds Expectations**.

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

- Faculty Evaluation Forms since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award
- Current electronic CV
- Current departmental standards for promotion to professor

The Department Head's recommendation contained on the Professorial Performance Award form (Appendix 9) and supporting materials will be forwarded to the Dean at the same time as the annual evaluations are forwarded to the Dean.

Minimum Standards of Faculty Performance:

When in the course of regular annual faculty evaluations, an individual tenured faculty member's annual evaluations are believed to have fulfilled the criteria of chronic poor performance in any critical area of responsibility as outlined in Section C 31.5-31.8 of the faculty manual, the following procedures shall constitute due process for review in the Department of Clinical Sciences. These procedures shall guide any departmental review of any tenured faculty member's performance when considering a recommendation of dismissal for cause, based upon chronic poor performance. It is DCS policy to assign an overall evaluation of Fails to Meet Expectations if a tenured faculty person receives a Fails to Meet Expectations in any of the evaluation categories.

I. Minimum Standards for Instruction:

Didactic and laboratory teaching must be routinely evaluated, reviewed, and judged to be adequate by the course coordinator, department head, and/or faculty peers. All faculty will adhere to the AVMA principles of Veterinary Medical Ethics as described in the Directory of the American Veterinary Medical Association, pp-38, 2002.

- Faculty should begin and end their assigned lectures and laboratories on time, and should be prepared for assigned lectures and laboratories. Course material should be appropriate and contemporary. Faculty will provide the course coordinator with information for the course syllabus and requested course materials in a timely fashion. Faculty serving as course coordinators will develop a course syllabus including class scheduling, topics, course grading standards, statements of academic honesty, and access for students with special needs.
- Clinical instruction must be routinely evaluated, reviewed, and judged to be adequate by the Section Head and/or Department Head. Faculty will be present and active where and when assigned to daily and emergency clinical service/teaching duties.

II. Minimum Standards for Directed Service

The Section Head and Veterinary Medical Teaching Hospital Director evaluate performance of clinical duties. In cases where clinical duty performance or clinical competence is in question, the VMTH Director may seek input from peers.

- Faculty with clinical responsibilities must be available and punctual for their clinical service assignment. Communication should be maintained with service staff, students and house officers during on duty time.
- Faculty should be available and willing to accept new cases as presented, and should seek ways to increase the caseload to support teaching. This is accomplished by providing exceptional service to clients and referring veterinarians and by continuing education and outreach activities. Consultation calls, general information calls, referral calls, client calls, and letters should be answered promptly. Faculty should remain available and in contact with the clinic when assigned to emergency duty.
- Clients must be provided with accurate estimates and timely updated estimates of their bills, and are expected to follow VMTH fiscal policies without exception. Faculty will

insure that clients are charged appropriately for all services that are provided. Medical records and reports are to be completed in a timely manner.

- Board certification directly applicable to the clinical activities of the faculty member must be obtained and maintained. When there are no directly applicable specialty boards, the candidate must seek continuing education, have advanced training, or a graduate degree relevant to the clinical specialty. Faculty are not only required to maintain clinical competency but will actively seek ways to maintain and improve clinical knowledge and skills. Faculty should offer state of the art practice within the constraints of facilities and instrumentation available.
- Faculty will demonstrate professionalism in all contacts with clients, clinicians, students, staff, and administrators, and will follow and implement all policies and procedures of the Veterinary Medical Teaching Hospital.

III. Minimum Standards for Non-Directed Service

- Faculty are expected to participate in some university, college, department, or hospital committees when requested.
- Faculty should provide continuing education seminars when requested as their schedule permits (see below).

IV. Minimum Standards for Scholarly Productivity

Faculty in the Department of Clinical Sciences contribute to the advancement of knowledge through publication in scientific journals, presentation at scientific meetings, contributions to textbook chapters or continuing education presentations. Minimum standards of performance in scholarly activity are based on the percentage of time each individual is assigned to research/scholarship. Although these requirements are based on a five-year period, it should be noted that if a tenured faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which minimum standards are not met, then “dismissal for cause” will be considered at the discretion of the Dean (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section C31.5). Therefore, progress towards scholarly productivity will be assessed on an annual basis.

Minimum expectations for publications in scientific journals are dependent on the annual appointment for scholarly activity (see table below). Requirements are based on a five-year period.

Scholarly/Research Commitment %	Multiplier for 5 year period
0-20%	1 X
21-40%	2 X
41-60%	3 X
61-80%	4 X
81-100%	5 X

- One first author (or senior) publication or two second author publications for every 1 X over 5 years. Faculty are considered senior authors when they serve as the clinical advisor, major professor, or mentor to the first author. Publications should be in a

refereed journal appropriate for veterinary medicine, science, or teaching methodology. Publications should contain original (discovery) research findings, and may include prospective/retrospective articles that contribute new knowledge.

- Two presentations of research findings, book chapters or continuing education for each 1 X of scholarship/research effort over 5 years. Any combination of two of the following are required for each 1 X of scholarship effort over 5 years.
 - a) One presentation of original research findings at a scientific meeting.
 - b) One hour of continuing education.
 - c) One book chapter.
 - d) One published scientific abstract (different material than scientific presentation).

V. Procedure for Review: Chronic Poor Performance

The Department Head will appoint a departmental committee consisting of tenured faculty (unless otherwise requested by the faculty member). A chairperson shall be elected by the committee membership to lead the review of the faculty member's performance.

This review shall consist at minimum of an examination of the tenured faculty member's annual evaluations and plans of work from the period of chronic poor performance. The review committee may request and consider any document in the faculty member's file pertaining to performance expectations or evaluations including administrative cautionary advisements. The review committee may interview members of the faculty, departmental staff or administration as part of their review. Committee recommendation will be forwarded to the Dean upon completion of their review.

Appendix, Form 1:

**Department of Clinical Sciences
Faculty Annual Evaluation
Calendar Year 2006**

Faculty Member:

Category	% Effort	Score	Final
Teaching			
Scholarship			
Non-Directed Service			
Directed, Clinical Service			
Total	100		

Overall Evaluation =

Comments Regarding Performance

Concurrence with Goals for Next Year

Distribution of Effort for Next Year

Teaching %
Scholarship %
Non-Dir Service %
Service %
Administration %

Department Head

Date

I have reviewed my annual evaluation and have had an opportunity to meet with the department administration.

Signature of Faculty

Date

Point Scale for overall performance categories:

12-15	Exceeds Expectations
9-11.99	Meets Expectations – High
6-8.99	Meets Expectations
3-5.99	Meets Expectations – Minimal
0-2.99	Fails to Meet Expectations

Using the discriminators outlined above, the Department Head will assign a numerical score for each category. Please note that failure to meet expectations in any category will result in an overall rating of “Fails to Meet Expectations”.

Example:

Teaching:	8	Meets Expectations
Scholarship:	5	Meets Expectations - Minimal
Non-Dir Service:	8	Meets Expectations
Service:	12	Exceeds Expectations

(Percent Effort) X (Score) = Point subtotal for category

Category	% Effort	Score	Final
Teaching	20%	8	1.6
Scholarship	15%	5	.75
Non-Directed Service	10%	8	.8
Directed, Clinical Service	55%	12	6.6
Total	100%		9.75

2006 Overall Evaluation = 9.75 = Meeting Expectations-High

Appendix, Form 2

Department of Clinical Sciences
Proposed Annual Plan of Work and Goals
for the Period January 1, 2006 to December 31, 2006

Faculty name:

Proposed Academic Plan % of time

- I. Teaching (includes: clinical, didactic, laboratory, and graduate student/intern/resident instruction)
- II. Directed clinical service
- III. Research
- IV. Non-directed university and public service

Academic Goals

- I. Teaching
 - A. Goals for:
 - 1. Specific changes proposed for lectures, if any
 - 2. Other teaching changes/innovations
 - 3. Other goals to change or improve teaching (i.e., attending seminars/courses on teaching)
 - B. Long-term goals
- II. Directed clinical service
 - A. Annual goals
 - B. Long-term goals
- III. Research
 - A. Annual goals
 - B. Long-term goals
- IV. Non-directed (university and public) service
 - A. Annual goals
 - B. Long-term goals

Appendix, Form 3

**Section Head Evaluation of Faculty Performance
Department of Clinical Sciences
College of Veterinary Medicine
Kansas State University**

Because most faculty members in the Department of Clinical Sciences have significant time percent assignments in clinical teaching and service, this form was developed to help evaluate these activities. Please fill out this form and provide a copy to both the Department Head and Hospital Director.

Faculty member being evaluated: _____ Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

Please comment on the following statements: 1 = exceeds expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = minimally meets expectations; 4 = does not meet expectations; 5 = not applicable or did not directly observe faculty performance.

<u>Clinical Service:</u>	1	2	3	4	5
1. Demonstrates professional competence. <u>Comments:</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Demonstrates efforts to improve clinical competence <u>Comments:</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Works productively and harmoniously with faculty, staff, interns/residents, and students. <u>Comments:</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Works productively and harmoniously with referring veterinarians and clients. <u>Comments:</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Adheres to hospital policies and procedures. <u>Comments:</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Seeks appropriate collaboration or consultation in regard to cases, clinical care, and diagnostic procedures. <u>Comments:</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Demonstrates a strong sense of professional compassion, integrity and respect. <u>Comments:</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Overall promotes a positive image for the KSU-VMTH. <u>Comments:</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Clinical Teaching:

- | | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. | Demonstrates effective clinical instruction of veterinary students.
<u>Comments:</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. | Undertakes methods to improve teaching effectiveness.
<u>Comments:</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. | Demonstrates effective instruction of interns/residents.
<u>Comments:</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. | Effectively contributes to and attends clinical rounds and seminars for students and interns/residents.
<u>Comments:</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. | Shows strong interest in and commitment to teaching of veterinary students and interns/residents.
<u>Comments:</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. | Treats students and residents/interns in a courteous, respectful, and professional manner.
<u>Comments:</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

General Comments:

1. Are there other matters relating to clinical service or clinical teaching which need to be addressed?
2. In what area, if any, should this faculty member focus their self-improvement efforts?
3. What can we do to assist this faculty member in being a more effective or successful faculty member?
4. Are there specific issues for which this faculty member is outstanding (is he/she a role model of positive, supportive behavior) or for which frank deficits exist? Please provide details.

Appendix, Form 4
Intern/Resident Evaluation of Faculty Hospital Performance
Department of Clinical Sciences
College of Veterinary Medicine
Kansas State University

Because most faculty members in the Department of Clinical Sciences have significant time percent assignments in clinical teaching and service, this document was developed to help evaluate these activities. It would be greatly appreciated if you would fill out this form and return it to the Department Head and Hospital Director. This evaluation is optional and will be anonymous to the faculty member being evaluated.

Faculty member being evaluated: _____ Date: _____

Please comment on the following statements: 1 = exceeds expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = minimally meets expectations; 4 = does not meet expectations; 5 = not applicable or did not directly observe faculty performance.

	1	2	3	4	5
1. The faculty member provided useful guidance in the skills of patient evaluation, surgery, anesthesia, and other medical specialty techniques or skills, and provided direct assistance when needed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Faculty member's assistance in helping interns and residents practice their case decision-making by being readily available and easily approachable to provide timely, constructive verbal consultation individually as needed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Faculty member's contributions to student/intern/resident consultations or rounds.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Faculty member provided a positive example of effective and compassionate verbal and written client communications, and provided feedback to me on my client communications.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. The faculty member is available and helpful when on assigned emergency duty and provided useful input regarding patient care, client consultation, and was available for direct assistance when requested.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Faculty member is a role model of positive, compassionate, and supportive behavior.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Overall effectiveness of faculty member as an instructor of interns and residents.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

General comments: are there any other specific issues for which this faculty member is outstanding or for which deficits exist? Please use other side of this page to provide details.

Appendix, Form 5

Student Evaluation of Faculty Hospital Performance Department of Clinical Sciences College of Veterinary Medicine Kansas State University

Because most faculty members in the Department of Clinical Sciences have significant time percent assignments in clinical teaching and service, this questionnaire was developed to help evaluate these activities. Therefore, in addition to responding to questions 1-14 on the TEVAL: Student Evaluation of Instruction form, please answer the following as TEVAL questions 15-22.

15. Faculty member taught methods of history taking, physical examination, and clinical decision-making by example and by supervising and directing me while performing these skills.
16. Faculty member helped me improve my understanding of principles and skills for diagnosis, treatment, and care and broadened my expertise in the application of specialty areas such as anesthesia, surgery, and medical procedures where appropriate.
17. Faculty member participated in sit-down, ward, or in-truck rounds. These rounds were effective in helping me integrate basic veterinary knowledge and clinical skills to improve my overall clinical ability.
18. Faculty member demonstrated effective and compassionate client communications both by example and by discussions with students on client communications.
19. Faculty member ensures that medical records are complete and current in terms of action, diagnostic rationale, and anticipated diagnostic and therapeutic plans.
20. Faculty member takes action to ensure patient comfort and balances client concerns, good medical practices for diagnosis and treatment, and fiscal responsibility.
21. Faculty member helped me in my case management by being readily available, easily approachable, quizzing me, and requesting my input.
22. Faculty member is a role model of positive, compassionate, and supportive behavior.

Appendix, Form 6

**Clinical Service Evaluation
Veterinary Medical Teaching Hospital
Kansas State University**

Faculty: _____

Date: _____

SCORE

I. Clinical Competence and Quality of Care

Demonstrates Clinical Competence

Efforts to Improve Clinical Competence

Seeks Appropriate Collaboration and Consultation

Current with Professional Literature and Clinical Techniques

Provides Appropriate, Timely and High-quality Medical Care

Comments:

II. Communication and Responsiveness

Client Communication

RDVM Communication

Staff Communication

Peer Communication

House Officer Communication

Comments:

III. Hospital Citizenship

Interactions with Peers are Positive, Collegial and Supportive

Interactions with Students, Staff and House Officers are Positive, Collegial, and Supportive

Works Constructively Within the System

Willingness to Collaborate and Assist in Case Care When Needed

Open, Direct and Straightforward Communication

Available and Willing to Provide Service When on Clinic Duty

Comments:

IV. House Officer Training

Clinical Supervision of House Officers

Availability For Back-up After Hours

Attendance and Contribution at House Officer Rounds and Seminars

Expectations for House Officers are Appropriate

Provides Appropriate Level of Case Management Opportunities for House Officers

Comments:

V. Outreach and Caseload Development

Efforts to Sustain or Build Caseload

Efforts to Promote KSU-VMTH Externally

Accepts Cases Willingly

Service to Referring Veterinarians

Comments:

VI. Hospital Policies and Procedures

Follows Client Communication Protocols

Follows RDVM Communication Protocols

Follows Estimate and Deposit Protocols

Follows Established Charging Protocols, Includes all Appropriate Fees

Medical Records Protocols

Comments:

Appendix, Form 7

**Peer Didactic Teaching Evaluation
Department of Clinical Sciences
College of Veterinary Medicine
Kansas State University**

Because most faculty members in the Department of Clinical Sciences have some assignment in didactic teaching, this document was developed to help evaluate these activities. Please fill out this form and return it to the Head, Department of Clinical Sciences.

Faculty member being evaluated: _____ Date: _____

Course title and number: _____ Lecture title: _____

Evaluator: _____

I. Teaching Styles/Strategies:

- A. What teaching strategies were used? (please describe)
- B. Were the teaching strategies appropriate for the learning objectives?
- C. Did the instructor provide an introduction and closure for the class?
- D. Was a good classroom environment achieved and maintained?
- E. How did the instructor manage the class atmosphere?
- F. Did the instructor involve the audience in the learning process?
If so, was this involvement conducive to learning?
- G. How did the teaching provide feedback to the students? (please explain)
- H. Did teacher-student or student-student interactions enhance or hinder learning?

Please comment on the following statements: 1 = exceeds expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = minimally meets expectations; 4 = does not meet expectations; 5 = not applicable or did not directly observe faculty performance.

II. Material and Presentation:

	1	2	3	4	5
Topic					
1. Did the instructor give you a reason to listen?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Were learning objectives clearly defined?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Was the subject matter up-to-date?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Were the topics logically arranged?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Were major points emphasized and appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Was the topic presented in the allotted time?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Was an accurate summary of the material presented?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Did the instructor maintain your interest?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Did the instructor know if students grasped major concepts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Did you (the evaluator) learn something of interest?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Delivery

1. Did the instructor speak at an acceptable volume and rate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Was correct grammar used?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Were the instructor's words distinct?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Did the instructor show enthusiasm for the topic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Did the instructor look at/talk to the audience?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Did the instructor avoid distracting movements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. What was the overall quality of visual aids?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Were the visual aids effective?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. What was the overall quality of the handouts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Were the handouts effective?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Tests (where available)

1. Did the question format fit the material/objectives?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Was the depth/breadth of the test applicable to the materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. All objectives equally assessed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Were distracting or irrelevant questions asked?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Questions easily understood.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

III. Summary:

1. Overall, how would you rate this educator?

2. Please provide suggestions for improvement or additional comments on the presentation.
- 3.

Appendix, Form 8

**Peer Clinical Teaching Evaluation
Department of Clinical Sciences
College of Veterinary Medicine, Kansas State University**

Because most faculty members in the Department of Clinical Sciences have significant time percent assignments to clinical teaching, this document was developed to help evaluate clinical teaching. Please fill out this form and return it to the Department Head.

Faculty member being evaluated: _____ Date: _____

Clinical Service/Rotation: _____ Evaluator: _____

I. Clinical Teaching Styles/Strategies:

- A. Please describe the teaching format (sit-down rounds, hospital case walk-through rounds, ambulatory truck discussions, etc)
- B. What teaching strategies were used in this clinical teaching?
- C. Were the teaching strategies appropriate?
- D. Was a good clinical teaching environment achieved and maintained?
- E. Did the instructor create an atmosphere in which students were willing to ask and answer questions?
- F. Did the instructor involve the students in the clinical teaching process?
If so was this involvement conducive to learning?
- G. Was feedback provided to the students? (please explain/describe)
- H. Did teacher-student or student-student interactions enhance learning?
- I. Was the instructor encouraging and constructive?

II. Summary:

- A. Overall, how would you rate this educator?
 - A. Please provide suggestions for improvement or additional comments on the clinical teaching observed.

Appendix, Form 9

**PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD EVALUATION FORM
DEPARTMENT OF CLINICAL SCIENCES
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	Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Expectations – High <input type="checkbox"/>	Exceeds Expectations <input type="checkbox"/>
mm/dd/yr	Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Expectations – High <input type="checkbox"/>	Exceeds Expectations <input type="checkbox"/>
mm/dd/yr	Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Expectations – High <input type="checkbox"/>	Exceeds Expectations <input type="checkbox"/>
mm/dd/yr	Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Expectations – High <input type="checkbox"/>	Exceeds Expectations <input type="checkbox"/>
mm/dd/yr	Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Expectations – High <input type="checkbox"/>	Exceeds Expectations <input type="checkbox"/>
mm/dd/yr	Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Expectations – High <input type="checkbox"/>	Exceeds Expectations <input type="checkbox"/>

RECOMMENDATION:

Signatures:

Faculty Member _____

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

Date _____ Department Head _____

Comments by Dean

Dean _____ Date _____

Procedures and Criteria for Tenure and Promotion in the

Department of Clinical Sciences

Kansas State University

Department of Clinical Sciences

College of Veterinary Medicine

(Scheduled for Review June 1, 2005)

Reviewed and Approved by:

1. Majority Vote of Department Faculty
(13 faculty approve and 2 faculty absent) DATE: 06/07/04
2. Gregory F. Grauer DATE: 06/07/04
Department Head's Signature
3. Ralph Richardson DATE: 06/07/04
Dean's Signature
4. James R. Coffman DATE: 06/21/04
Provost's Signature

Procedures and Criteria for Tenure and Promotion in the Department of Clinical Sciences

General

Tenure is granted in recognition that the faculty member has fulfilled in a preeminent fashion the qualities of a scholar and has demonstrated excellence in teaching, research, and/or directed service. By granting tenure only to such individuals, the continued excellence of the University is assured. Tenure implies a long-term commitment by the University to the qualified individual and requires the continuing dedication of the tenured faculty member to his/her discipline, Department, the College and the University. Tenure is granted only at the levels of Associate Professor and Full Professor.

Scholarship in the mission of the Department includes questioning and disciplined study within and beyond an area of specialized knowledge for the faculty member, and investigation, development, and disclosure of new information in that area. Scholarship is not limited to research efforts, but also includes development of new knowledge or methods in teaching and directed service and the synthesis and distribution of previous knowledge by unique, effective means. The quality and productivity of the candidate's scholarship are judged by several indicators, including the candidate's role in well-focused, significant investigations as project initiator and leader, and the ongoing publication of reports in high quality peer-reviewed journals.

Fulfillment of the major Departmental missions of directed service, research, and professional education results in faculty with widely varying time allocations to these missions. In particular, directed clinical service and teaching are major academic responsibilities of Department faculty in addition to the usual roles of faculty within the University, and involve additional expectation and performance criteria. Thus, specified criteria for faculty tenure and promotion cannot be rigidly applied regardless of faculty appointment, but must take into consideration responsibilities outlined in the initial letter of appointment to the tenure-track and modifications of these responsibilities recognized during annual evaluation and goal development.

There is no simple list of accomplishments that guarantee that a faculty member will obtain tenure and/or promotion. Instead, tenure and promotion are recommended based on the assessment of the tenured faculty of the University that a candidate has made outstanding contributions in appropriate academic endeavors. Scholarly productivity, teaching ability, clinical aptitude, academic citizenship, and collegiality are all factors that are considered in a tenure/promotion decision.

Teaching

Faculty who have a major time commitment to teaching are expected to demonstrate scholarship in these duties. In general, teaching includes instruction of veterinary medical students, graduate and postgraduate students and/or involvement with other educational programs appropriate to the mission of the Department (e.g. continuing veterinary medical education). Under specific circumstances tenure and promotion may be granted primarily on the basis of teaching provided that most of the individual's time is spent in this role; an unusual level of excellence has been demonstrated; the teaching fulfills a particularly important need for the Department or College; and the candidate has an active program in didactic, laboratory, or clinical education research.

Teaching commitments may include lecturing in courses for veterinary medical or graduate students; supervising laboratory sections; conducting veterinary medical student rounds;

supervising students/preceptors/externs, etc.; supervising residents, and/or graduate students (e.g., chairing the student's dissertation committee); supervising post-doctoral fellows; and/or other instructional experiences. Documentation of teaching participation must include a description of the teaching activities, lecture and/or student contact, and the candidate's relative importance to the teaching program (course director, developer, contributions as percent of course teaching hours, etc.) The quality of the teaching is more important than the quantity. Quality teaching is judged by (A) other faculty members, both within and outside the Department, (B) student questionnaires and evaluations, and (C) the Department Head.

Criteria

The scholarship of teaching is explicitly recognized in the College mission as being fundamentally important to the attainment of excellence and national prominence. Teaching productivity alone, in the absence of effectiveness in other assignments, will not be adequate for positive recommendations for promotion or tenure. Some indicants or sources of teaching effectiveness are listed below:

1. Student ratings from norm-referenced instruments that assess teaching effectiveness rather than popularity and that adjust for such known sources of bias as student motivation and class size.
2. Materials produced for individual courses such as reading lists, syllabi, and other instructional materials.
3. Tests and other materials and methods used to assess student achievement.
4. Depth, breadth, and currency of subject matter.
5. Appropriateness of course content.
6. Effective course administration, e.g., maintaining office hours and punctuality in performing teaching-related paperwork, such as turning in textbook orders, reporting grades, and filing syllabi.
7. Development of effective courses, preparation of innovative teaching materials or instructional techniques, or creative contributions to a Department's instructional program.
8. Assessment by informed faculty colleagues.
9. Successful direction of high quality individual student work (DVM, graduate, or post-graduate students), e.g., independent studies, theses or dissertations, and special student projects.
10. Effective and diligent advisement of students pursuing their academic programs work (DVM, graduate, or post-graduate students).
11. Successful performance of teaching responsibilities that are unusually demanding requiring special expertise or preparation.
12. Versatility in contributing to the Department's teaching mission, e.g., effective performance at all levels of instruction appropriate to the Department, including membership on the Graduate Faculty and certification to direct dissertations.
13. Special contributions to effective teaching of diverse student populations.
14. Compiled student comments (such as those obtained from program assessments or exit interviews) that address a teacher's abilities to arouse student interest and to stimulate work and achievement by students.
15. Letters of evaluation from former graduate and/or professional veterinary medical students.

16. Accomplishments of the teacher's present and former students work (DVM, graduate, or post-graduate students): i.e., information showing the students' success in learning the subject matter of the discipline and in pursuing it to a point of intellectual significance.
17. Students and/or faculty coming from other schools especially to study with the teacher.
18. Professional publications on the topic of teaching or materials prepared for use in teaching such as textbooks, published lectures, and audio-visual or computerized instructional materials.
19. Presentation of papers on teaching methods/techniques before learned societies and publication in appropriate peer-reviewed journals.
20. Adoptions of a faculty member's textbooks or other instructional materials, especially repeated use, by reputable institutions.
21. Honors or special recognition for teaching accomplishments.
22. Selection for special teaching activities outside of the University, especially in international assignments, e.g., Fulbright awards, special lectureships, panel presentations, seminar participation, and international study and development projects.
23. Membership on special bodies concerned with teaching, e.g., accreditation teams and special commissions.
24. Receipt of competitive grants or contracts to fund innovative teaching activities or investigations into effective teaching.
25. Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants or contracts.
26. Selection for teaching in special honors courses and programs.
27. Special invitations to testify before governmental groups concerned with educational programs.
28. Evidence of excellence in supervision of students being trained in clinical activities and practice: this includes, but is not limited to, work on campus in the Veterinary Medical Teaching Hospital and Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory, and other approved educational programs such as practice, internships, and preceptorships.

Research

Regardless of, but within the restraints of the level of research responsibility, candidates must demonstrate a consistent record of funded grants, research productivity, well-designed clinical trials or basic research projects, presentation of papers at scientific conferences, and publication of results in high quality, peer-reviewed journals. The research and the reports must reflect original, independent studies, which contribute new knowledge to the field. It is important to document that the candidate has an essential role in the formation and testing of new ideas and hypotheses. The quality of the research is more important than the quantity. Quality and impact of research are judged by the following: the quality of journals in which the work is published, with most emphasis being placed upon major peer-reviewed journals; peer-reviewed, external research support from national sources; nationally recognized eminent scholars outside the University (selected by the Department Head and the applicant) with expertise in the candidate's field; and presentation of peer-reviewed papers or special lectures of national or international import. Independence as a scholar is documented by the candidate's being: first or senior author on publications, the major creative or intellectual force in the planning and development of projects, and principal investigator on research grants. Candidates with a major research appointment should have a consistent record of research proposals, which receive excellent ratings by national funding agencies. While it is expected that these candidates will have

been successful in obtaining extramural research support from national agencies, evaluation must take into consideration that success in having these proposals funded continuously is subject to variables that may lie beyond the scientific and scholarly merit of the investigator. Candidates with major appointments in directed service or teaching are not expected to be principal investigators on grants obtained from national funding agencies, but should have a consistent record of proposal submission and support from local and regional agencies. These candidates may be co-investigators or consultants with other principal investigators on grants funded by national agencies. Nonetheless, evidence of a consistent funding and publishing record is of clear benefit and should be viewed as a positive factor in promotion and tenure.

Criteria

High quality research and publication are fundamental to attaining the goals of academic excellence and national prominence. The quality of contribution to the body of knowledge is a criterion in evaluation. The indices of quality include a consistent record of publication; membership on prestigious editorial boards; significant external funding for research; and application of information in prospective or retrospective studies. Original research is normally considered as evidence only after acceptance for publication. Both collaborative and individual contributions in research and publication are desirable. There is great diversity in the scholarly and creative achievement of Department faculty. Multiple indicators of research scholarship over an extended period of time, together with effectiveness in the other professional roles, are important components in the tenure and promotion process. Research productivity alone, in the absence of effectiveness in other assignments; will not be adequate for positive recommendations for promotion or tenure. The following are indicants of research scholarship:

1. Books, reviews, monographs, bulletins, articles, and other scholarly works published by reputable journals, scholarly presses, and publishing houses that accept works only after rigorous review and approval by professional peers.
2. Presentation of research papers before one's peers at scholarly meetings and learned societies.
3. Scholarly reviews of the faculty member's publications.
4. Citations of research in scholarly publication.
5. Reprinting or quoting of publications.
6. Accomplishments of the faculty member's present and former graduate students.
7. Competitive grants and contracts to finance the development of ideas, these grants and contracts being subject to rigorous peer review and approval.
8. Prizes and awards for excellence of work done.
9. Development of and where appropriate obtaining patents or copyrights for, processes or instruments useful in solving important problems.
10. Membership on important scholarly expeditions or explorations.
11. Awards of special fellowships for research or selection for assignment at special institutes for advanced study.
12. Invitations to testify before governmental groups concerned with research or other creative activities.
13. Serving on study sections, on editorial boards, or as reviewers for high quality journals.

Directed Service

Faculty in the Department of Clinical Sciences will usually have a major time commitment to directed service, including responsibility for patient care and clinical education. Excellence in directed service requires excellence in service to patients and excellence in service to customers, including clients, constituents, and referring veterinarians. Faculty with clinical responsibilities are recognized experts with in depth knowledge of the pathophysiology and treatment of most disorders related to their specialty. In addition, they will have special expertise about particular diseases or groups of diseases. These faculty are often involved in the discovery, organization, interpretation, and transmission of new knowledge related to patient care, disease entities, health care delivery, health care economics, professional ethics, medical legal issues and new educational patient care methodology. As scholars, their approach to problems will lead them to investigation in one or several areas of research with application to clinical problems. They will strive to share the knowledge or expertise gained from these studies through teaching and publication. Faculty with major time commitments to directed service are expected to maintain board certification directly applicable to the clinical activities of the faculty member. When there are no directly applicable specialty boards, the candidate must have advanced training or a graduate degree relevant to the clinical specialty.

Criteria

Directed service is work that furthers the mission of and is directly related to the goals and objectives of the Department and the College, that requires academic credentials or special skills, and that is a part of a faculty member's explicit assignment. Frequently, there is no clear separation between teaching, applied research, and directed service and the scholarship indicants for one may well overlap the scholarship indicants for the other.

Directed service is a critical component of the College's mission. College faculty service many constituencies to achieve excellence and national prominence including the academic profession, the veterinary profession, the public, the livestock industries, and business and industry in the state and region.

A variety of directed service roles contribute to the Department's mission. The Department explicitly understands that these roles can be scholarly and fundamentally important to excellence in its academic programs. The delivery of state-of-the-art high quality and efficient directed service in veterinary medical care and diagnostic investigations are major functions of the Department and College. It is one of the most important hallmarks of a superior Veterinary College. Productivity in directed service alone, in the absence of effectiveness in other assignments, will not be adequate for positive recommendations for promotion or tenure.

The following may be used as indicants of the quality of directed service:

1. Excellence in herd health management, individual animal preventative health care, medical and surgical management of cases, timely maintenance of case records, communications with clients and veterinarians, diagnostic services, and information transfer and implementation.
2. Excellence in the administration of directed service units (Veterinary Medical Teaching Hospital, Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory, and Animal Resource Facilities).
3. Excellent ratings by clients of satisfaction with service.
4. Assessment by practicing professionals who receive directed service from the faculty member.

5. Ratings by peers or supervisors who observe and are qualified to rate the delivery of professional services.
6. Documentation of improvement of the quality and efficiency of directed service programs.

As scholar teachers, faculty with major commitments to directed service are involved in educating veterinary medical students, residents, colleagues and peers. The settings in which these teaching activities occur are not confined to the classroom, but include the Veterinary Medical Teaching Hospital, ambulatory care sites, the diagnostic laboratory or other settings for those faculty who provide special services.

Non-Directed Service

Non-directed service may include meaningful contributions to committees at the Department, College, University, community, state, regional, national and international levels. Serving in administrative positions in the Department is an important contribution and offices held in national organizations indicate recognition for contributions to the discipline. The quality of service may be judged by soliciting evaluations from the chairs of committees, peers, and the Department Head. Service activities, while necessary, important and appreciated, are usually given less weight than teaching, research, and directed service in considering an individual's contributions and qualifications for promotion and tenure.

Criteria

Non-directed service (profession-based service, institution-based service, and public-based professional service) is important to the achievement of excellence in Department and College programs. Institution-based service is work that is essential to the operation of the University such as service on Department, College or University committees, acting as advisor to student organizations and serving on the Faculty Senate or the Graduate Council. Profession-based service is work that is directly related to the function of the unit and that provides leadership and service to the faculty's profession or discipline. Public-based service involves the application of a faculty member's professional time and expertise for the benefit of non-academic audiences. This category, does not include all activities a faculty member might perform for the public good, but only those that are job related; for example, serving as an expert witness, developing programs and providing training or providing consultation. Non-directed service is an indication of good academic citizenship; however, non-directed service cannot be the major grounds upon which tenure and promotion decisions are based. Several indicants of excellence in non-directed service follow:

Service to the Institution: This evidence encompasses evaluations of the performance of such activities by administrators, committee heads, and coworkers in the groups.

1. Chairing of, membership on, and contribution to standing or ad hoc committees of the University or any of its subordinate units.
2. Chairing of, membership on, and contribution to bodies participating in faculty governance, such as the Faculty Senate and its committees, the Graduate Council, and several College Committees on Planning.
3. Performance of unbudgeted administrative responsibilities at the Department level.

4. Special assignments such as representing the University at national and international meetings.
5. Honors or special recognition for contributions to the Department, College or University or to faculty governance.

Service to the Profession: This evidence encompasses evaluations of the performance of such activities by other members of, and leaders in, the organizations to which the service is rendered.

1. Holding office in professional associations and learned societies.
2. Service on state, national, and international committees in professional organizations.
3. General presentations or addresses at conventions and other professional meetings.
4. Organizing or chairing sessions at professional meetings or organizing the meeting itself.
5. Reviewing or editing for professional journals, e.g., writing book reviews for publication and service as editor, associate editor, book review editor, or member of an editorial board.
6. Membership on panels judging grant/contract proposals.
7. Service as a consultant on problems appropriate to the discipline.
8. Honors or special recognition for contributions to an organization, discipline, or profession.

Service to the Public: This evidence encompasses evaluations of the performance of activities by members and leaders of the groups served.

1. Written dissemination of professional knowledge or information to non-academic audiences through general interest publications.
2. Oral dissemination of professional knowledge or information to civic, religious, or private groups.
3. Providing expert testimony to courts or legislative bodies.
4. Consulting for state, national, and international public and private groups engaged in educational, scholarly, and artistic endeavors.
5. Consulting for individuals or corporations engaged in business or industry.
6. Providing technical consultation to professional or non-academic groups.
7. Engaging in the delivery of technology through involvement in development projects-especially in international assignments.
8. Appointment to city, county, state, or federal groups.

Tenure and Promotion Procedure

Departmental Review

The Department Head is advised by the tenured faculty members of the Department on tenure recommendations and by faculty at the ranks equal to or above that sought by candidate for promotion. The Department Head makes the candidate's file available for eligible faculty to review. Eligible faculty members should individually review the file, meet as a group to discuss the candidate's petition,

and then make a written independent recommendation to the Department Head. Any member of the eligible faculty may, prior to the submission of any recommendations to the Department Head, request that the candidate meet with the eligible faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by that candidate. The recommendation(s) and written comments of the faculty members are forwarded to the Department Head. The Department Head forwards the candidate's complete file along with his/her written recommendation and the unedited recommendations of the departmental faculty to the Dean.

College Review

The Dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine will be advised by a College Tenure and Promotion Committee consisting of one full or tenured-associate professor from each academic department elected at-large, and two full or tenured-associate professors selected by the Dean. The Faculty Council according to College-By-Laws will coordinate the election. Each faculty member will be elected to a three-year term of office. A person may not be elected for more than two consecutive terms. Faculty appointed by the Dean will serve staggered two-year terms and cannot serve more than two consecutive terms (including election by the faculty). It is important that the College Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure be balanced to represent the dimensions of teaching, research, and directed service. The committee will make recommendations in light of the departmental criteria, standards, and guidelines and the overall expectations of the College. The College Advisory Committee will elect a new Chair each year. The Chair will organize meetings of the committee and will make the candidate's complete file, including all Department recommendations, available to the committee members for their review. The Chair will make the recommendations of the committee available to the Dean. Recommendations will contain clearly stated reasons for or against tenure and/or promotion of the candidate under consideration. The College Advisory Committee will review the following minimal documentation for each candidate:

- 1) Original letter of appointment and amendments
- 2) Candidate Promotion and Tenure Document
- 3) Current curriculum vitae
- 4) Outside letters of evaluation
- 5) Department Head letter
- 6) Copies of annual evaluation w/ clear job description
- 7) Teaching evaluations
- 8) Recommendations and comments of Department faculty

University Review and Candidate Notification

The Dean notifies candidate and department head/chair of College and Dean's recommendations. Candidates may withdraw within 7 days. The Dean subsequently submits documents and a recommendation to Dean's Council of those candidates who have not withdrawn. The Dean's Council notifies the candidate and department head/chair of the council recommendation and provides a written report to candidate, department head/chair and dean if the finding differs from that of the college. The Dean's Council sends documents to the Provost for approval of tenure and promotion. The Provost sends recommendations for tenure and promotion to President. Finally, the Dean informs the candidates of the decision.

University guidelines do not provide candidates an opportunity to appeal either the Department or College recommendations prior to action by the University. At anytime during the

promotion and tenure process, the candidate may remove his or her file from further consideration. Candidates may withdraw from further consideration for tenure by submitting to the Dean a written request for withdrawal. This must be done within seven (7) days following notification of the College's recommendations. Withdrawal by a candidate who is in the final year of the probationary period may be done only by formal resignation.