

## **DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE**

### **ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 10/9/2012)**

### **PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 10/9/2012)**

**REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES \*(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): 10/09/2017**

**REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES\*: 10/09/2017**

**Matthew Knox, Department Head**

**Date signed: 2/19/2013**

**Tim de Noble, Dean**

**Date signed: 2/20/2013**

**April C. Mason, Provost and Senior Vice President**

**Date signed: 2/28/2013**

\*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.



ARCHITECTURE  
THE COLLEGE of  
ARCHITECTURE, PLANNING & DESIGN // K-STATE

Department of Architecture

**Faculty Policies and Procedures Including:**

- I. Annual Evaluations (including Professorial Performance Award Criteria and Standards for Chronic Low Achievement)
- II. Evaluative Guidelines for Long-term Development toward Tenure and Promotion
- III. Soliciting Faculty Input for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

Approved by Faculty Vote on 9 October 2012

\_\_\_\_\_  
Department Head's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Provost's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

# Department of Architecture Faculty Policy and Procedure Documents

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCESS</b>	
A. Background	4
B. Procedure for Merit Evaluation	4
C. Evaluation Activities and Documentation of Faculty Achievements	6
D. Evaluative Guidelines for Chronic Low Achievement	9
E. Evaluative Guidelines for Professorial Performance Awards	12
<b>II. EVALUATIVE GUIDELINES FOR LONG-TERM DEVELOPMENT TOWARD TENURE AND PROMOTION</b>	
A. Justification	16
B. Four Criteria to Guide Long-Term Professional Aims & Efforts	16
C. Evaluative Guidelines for Tenure	19
D. Evaluative Criteria for Tenure-Track Reappointments	21
E. Evaluative Guidelines for Promotion	22
F. Monitoring Progress toward Tenure	23
<b>III. SOLICITING FACULTY INPUT FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION</b>	
A. Procedure for Tenure-Track Reappointments	25
B. Procedure for Mid-Probationary Review	27
C. Procedure for Tenure Decisions	28
D. Procedure for Promotion Decisions	31
E. Post-tenure Review	34
<b>IV. APPENDIX: REVISION AND APPROVAL HISTORY OF DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE FACULTY POLICY AND PROCEDURES</b>	<b>34</b>

# INTRODUCTION

This document defines the procedures, guidelines, and criteria for the evaluation of faculty in the Kansas State University Department of Architecture. The document includes guidelines for annual merit evaluation as well as guidelines for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and the Professorial Performance Award (PPA). These guidelines include procedures for soliciting faculty assessments in regard to reappointment, tenure, promotion, and PPA.

In their professional and academic efforts, the Architecture faculty pursues a wide range of activities in teaching, research, design, and service. For its part, the university has a responsibility to provide a rich environment where faculty members can develop their full productive potential and achieve excellence in these areas. To maintain progress toward productivity and excellence, the university must also periodically assess the performance of its members and use those assessments as the basis for decisions regarding salary increases, reappointment, promotion, tenure, and PPA.

The significance of these performance reviews requires that the criteria and standards upon which the assessments are based, as well as the procedures for the evaluations, be founded upon broad agreement among the people affected. In particular, the faculty must play a central role in developing the criteria and standards for the university as a whole as well as in establishing the goals, objectives, and expectations of respective administrative units. Likewise, the individuals charged with implementing these policies must have a say in their formulation. In short, the creation of an effective system of evaluations must be the mutual responsibility of both faculty and administrators.

At K-State, general guidelines for the evaluation system were established in 1974, when the Faculty Senate approved a policy statement regarding the annual evaluation of unclassified tenured and tenure-track personnel for purposes of determining merit salary increases. The policy mandated that each such system include three specific features:

1. Criteria and procedures will be developed jointly by faculty, department heads, and deans (C31.1; C31.4).
2. Unclassified personnel will provide an update of relevant information on a yearly basis pertaining to whatever merit salary criteria are established within their unit (C40; C41.1).
3. Unclassified personnel will be provided the opportunity to review the final written evaluation being used as the department head's recommendations for tenure, promotion, PPA, and merit salary increases before the recommendation is submitted to the dean (C45.3; C49.6).

These policies and procedures have been elaborated over time, but these three points remain fundamental to the system followed by the university as a whole. As a professional program regularly reviewed by a national accreditation board (the National Architectural Accreditation Board, or NAAB), Department of Architecture is different from more purely academic departments in that it incorporates professional training and real-world practice as well as scholarly theory and research. In this regard, architecture faculty are involved in a wide spectrum of activities that range from academic scholarship and writing, on the one hand, to architectural design, creative work, and professional practice, on the other hand. The evaluation procedures that follow seek to allow for and support the diversity of activity that is meritorious in a university program like K-State's Department of Architecture.

# I. ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCESS

## A. Background

In the Department of Architecture, a merit evaluation procedure has been in place for more than three decades. This procedure takes into account requirements and recommendations presented in the *University Handbook*.

Each December or the following January, all tenure-track and tenured faculty will meet with the department head to review professional accomplishments for the evaluation year and to clarify professional goals and objectives for the following evaluation year. The basis for this discussion will be the *Annual Activity Report* (described in detail below).

The merit evaluation procedure is directed by the departmental head. In memoranda, he or she must remind architecture faculty of various evaluation deadlines and describe required materials and individual faculty obligations. In turn, architecture faculty are responsible for providing satisfactory materials and for participating in meetings with the head. Failures on the part of architecture faculty to meet these responsibilities are grounds for evaluation penalties; these penalties must be documented in the narrative portion of the head's evaluation (see below).

In implementing the procedure that follows, it should be kept in mind that the head must provide each new tenure-track faculty member a general description of professional responsibilities at the time of the initial appointment. A change in any of these responsibilities should be confirmed in writing by the department head after discussion with the faculty member.

## B. Procedure for Merit Evaluation

### 1. Annual Activity Report

In December or the following January of each year, tenure-track and tenured faculty will provide the head with an *Annual Activity Report*, whose main purpose is to outline the faculty members' activities in the evaluation year and their goals for the year ahead. As required by the *University Handbook*, this document will be organized according to the three evaluative categories of *teaching, scholarly and creative work*, and *service* (C32.1-C32.7). These three categories are described in further detail below in Part C.

The Annual Activity Report should include two major sections:

- a. Statement of Annual Activities
- b. Goal Statement for the Coming Year

#### a. Statement of Annual Activities

This statement describes the faculty member's professional activities for the evaluation year. The statement should be organized in terms of the three major categories of teaching, scholarly and creative work, and service (C32.1-7).

In addition to listing activities, the faculty member should provide information on each activity's purpose, scope, and time involvement--for example, size of classes, number of advisees, scope of committee work, stage of completion of scholarly/creative work, etc. At the conclusion of each of the sections on teaching, scholarly and creative work, and service, the faculty member should incorporate a brief narrative discussing how these activities compare with the goals in his or her goal statement for the year. The statement should be accompanied by supporting materials--course outlines, teaching evaluations, student work, design work, publications, manuscript drafts, letters of information, etc.--documenting all activities.

Teaching is an integral part of faculty responsibility in the Department of Architecture, and all faculty, both tenure-track and tenured, should provide evidence of teaching effectiveness. The *University Handbook* requires "multiple data sources for evaluations" (C33). According to the *Handbook*, all faculty members shall be evaluated by students in all courses the faculty member teaches (C34.1). In addition, each tenure-track and tenured faculty member should provide at least two different forms of evidence for his or her teaching effectiveness. One of these forms of evidence should be student evaluations; the other(s) should be at the choosing of the faculty member (e.g., student work, class materials, student letters of support, etc.).

### **b. Goal Statement for the Coming Year**

The second major part of the Annual Activity Report lists the faculty member's goals for the evaluation year ahead organized according to teaching, scholarly and creative work, and service. These goals and objectives should be accompanied with an estimate, in percentages, of the share of time the faculty member plans to allocate to each area of activity during the following evaluation year. The head will use these estimates in preparing each faculty member's end-of-the-year merit evaluation (see "the Head's Merit Evaluation" below). These estimates should outline anticipated courses to be taught, scholarly and creative work to be pursued, service to be performed, courses to be developed, advising responsibilities, etc. In establishing these estimates, faculty members should consider criteria described below in "Evaluative Guidelines for Long-Term Development Toward Tenure and Promotion."

During the course of the year, a faculty member's goals and priorities may change—e.g., opportunity may arise to participate in a project that has not been foreseen when setting goals; he or she may be asked unexpectedly to teach a course; new undergraduate and graduate advisees may be assigned; a design competition may be canceled, etc. As soon as possible, any such changes in workload plan should be specified to the head in writing and attached to the initial goals for the current year. It is recognized that the relative emphasis placed on the three evaluative categories may shift from year to year and may vary over the course of the faculty member's career.

## **2. Annual Evaluation Meeting with Head**

In December or the following January, each faculty member provides the department head with an Activity Statement, supporting documents, and Goal Statement for the coming year. The head arranges to meet with each faculty member to discuss those materials and the faculty member reviews with the head the evaluation year's accomplishments and goals for the year ahead. The head and the faculty member will reach agreement on the coming year's goals and responsibilities. Any changes will be noted in a letter of memorandum attached to the goal statement.

## **3. The Merit Evaluation**

The head prepares, by January 31, a written evaluation of each tenure-track and tenured faculty member. This evaluation is based on:

- a. each faculty member's Activity Statement and supporting documents;
- b. the faculty member's Goal Statement and any modifications shared with the head during the evaluation year.

The head's evaluation will be composed of two parts:

- a. a succinct assessment of the faculty member's effectiveness in each of the three evaluative categories; this statement will include summaries of achievements and the evidence the faculty member has offered to support the achievements;
- b. an evaluation of each faculty member employing the evaluative categories of "met expectations," "exceeded expectations," and "fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity."

A copy of the head's evaluation will be forwarded to each faculty member for review. Each faculty member signs a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review and discuss the head's evaluation. If a faculty member wishes to change his or her evaluation, he or she has seven working days (after receiving the evaluation) to discuss the evaluation with the head and submit a written statement of unresolved differences to the head and dean (C45.3, C46.3). A dean who does not agree with the head's decision must attempt to reach a consensus through consultation. If this fails, the dean's recommendation is used (C47.2). A faculty member who wishes to formally challenge an evaluation follows the procedure outlined in the *University Handbook*, Appendix G, "Administrative Appeal and Grievance Policy and Hearing Procedures."

#### 4. Evaluative Criteria for Annual Merit-Salary Adjustments for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

In the Department of Architecture, criteria for annual merit-salary adjustments are based on the criteria used by the Head of the Department for the annual reappointment evaluation of tenure-track and tenured faculty (see section I.B.3). The departmental head rates the faculty member for each of the three evaluative categories (teaching; scholarly, and creative activity; and service), using the goal statements that the Head and the faculty members agreed upon in regard to forthcoming annual performance in each category. Faculty members are required to include these goal statements in their annual activity report (see I.B.1.b).

In determining which faculty members are eligible for a merit-salary adjustment, the Head will use the following rating scale:

- Exceeds expectations = + 1
- Meets expectations = 0
- Falls below expectations in a category = - 1

In this rating scale, “exceeds” has the following range:

- +3: Exceeds in three categories (i.e., teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service).
- +2: Exceeds in two categories;
- +1: Exceeds in one category **or** exceeds in two categories but falls below expectations in a third category.

Faculty members who have a rating of +3 will be given a merit increase in the **highest category**; faculty members who have a rating of +2 will be given a merit increase in the **intermediate category**; and faculty members who have a rating of +1 will be given a merit increase in the **lowest category**. As required by the *University Handbook*, “average percentage increases in the highest category are expected to be about twice those in the lowest category” (C4.6.2).

#### 5. Calendar for Annual Merit Evaluation

The calendar and requirements for the annual faculty merit evaluation procedure are as follows:

Dec/Jan	Faculty members submit Annual Activity Report and supporting materials.
Dec/Jan	Faculty member and head meet to discuss Activity Report, including goals and responsibilities for the evaluation year ahead.
By January 31	Head provides evaluations to all tenured and tenure-track faculty members. The faculty member signs the evaluation document and returns it to the head.
Early February	faculty member who wishes formally to challenge the evaluation shares the concerns in writing.
Early February	The head forwards evaluations and recommendations for merit-salary increases to the dean.

#### C. Evaluation Activities and Documentation of Faculty Achievements

The *University Handbook* requires that evaluation categories be organized under the headings of (1) teaching, (2) scholarly and creative activity, (3) service, and (4) extension (C32.1 - C32.7). Faculty in the Department of Architecture are involved with the first three categories, which are used as the outline device for presenting the faculty evaluation agreement and annual report. These three categories are described in turn. Following description is a list of possible activities to be considered under each of the three general headings. This list is not all-inclusive; rather it is provided to serve as a reminder for the types of activities associated with each category. Faculty are free to add other related aims and achievements under the particular general category.

##### 1. Teaching

Teaching is the fundamental mission of the university, the college and the Department of Architecture. Teaching includes both undergraduate and graduate level advising, lectures, seminars, and studios. It includes development of curricula and coordination of courses. Documentation forming the basis for evaluation can include course evaluations by students, course materials (syllabi, project statements, exams, etc.), awards, peer review, student accomplishments, publications or presentations of teaching innovation, etc. As detailed in I.B.1.a above, the *University Handbook* requires all faculty members every semester be evaluated by students for each course and section taught (C34.1).

Possible activities related to teaching:

#### **Undergraduate Teaching**

- Assigned courses
- Assigned advising
- Course coordination
- Contributions to General Education
- Course preparation
- Contributions to coordinated courses (writing project statements, lectures, etc.)
- Guest lecturer or critic (at K-State or elsewhere)
- External critic for 5th year studios
- Dissemination of teaching innovations
- Other undergraduate teaching related activities

#### **Graduate Teaching**

- Assigned courses
- Interim Advisor for graduate student(s)
- Major advisor for graduate student(s)
- Minor advisor for graduate student(s)
- Member, Graduate Faculty
- Member, Doctoral Faculty
- Other graduate teaching related activities

## **2. Scholarly and Creative Activities**

Creative work, be it professional, artistic, or scholarly, is fundamental to personal and departmental development. From a personal point of view, faculty expect the opportunity to engage in creative work. The department likewise expects that faculty are actively utilizing their time (exclusive of assigned tenths) engaged in creative work. It is somewhat more difficult to define creative work, and the possibilities are wide-ranging. One key characteristic is that the work should be done with the intention that it can be made public in some way. Documentation of the quality of creative and research activities includes its public dissemination (juried papers, publications, etc.), comments from peers, receipt of awards or grants, as well as the judgment of work in progress by the department head and/or peers.

Possible activities in the realm of creative and research activities:

#### **Scholarly Work**

- Writing (books, articles, reviews, monographs, bulletins, etc.)
- Editing or reviewing articles, books, etc.
- Presentations at conferences (papers, posters, workshops, etc.)
- Submission of grant proposals for funded research
- Funded research activities
- Unfunded research activities
- Other scholarly and research-related activities

#### **Creative Work**

- Architectural design and building
- Exhibition of creative work
- Entering a competition
- Winning a competition



- Creative work in progress or completed
- Creative work featured or reviewed in a publication or other media
- Other activities related to creative and design work
- Juror for a competition or exhibition
- Other professional activities

### 3. Service

Service is the application of knowledge and specialized skills to the benefit of the department, college, university, the public, and the professions. Evaluation of service is based on level of leadership supplied and the quality of service rendered, and may require comments from those served, committee heads, or co-workers as well as other forms of documentation as appropriate.

Possible activities related to service:

#### **Service to the University Community**

- Chair of departmental, college, or university committee or task force
- Member of department, college, or university committee or task force
- Member of Faculty Senate or Graduate Council
- Other assigned or unassigned service to the department, college, or university

#### **Service to the Public**

- Written dissemination of professional knowledge or information through general-interest publications
- Oral dissemination of professional knowledge or information through talks to civic, religious, or private groups
- Consulting to local, state, national, or international public and private groups
- Consulting to individuals or corporations
- Other public service utilizing professional knowledge

#### **Professional Service**

- Office holder, committee member, or chair of professional associations and learned societies (AIA, ACSA, AAUP, SBSE, SAH, EDRA, etc.)
- Member of professional organizations and learned societies
- Organizing or chairing sessions at professional meetings or organizing the meeting itself
- Editorial work for professional journals or newsletter
- ACSA Faculty Councilor
- Honors or special recognition from organizations or profession
- Professional consultation

## D. Evaluative Guidelines for Chronic Low Achievement

Tenure is essential for the protection of the independence of teaching and research faculty in institutions of higher learning in the United States. The faculty of the Department of Architecture affirm that the departmental guidelines and procedures currently in place to guide and evaluate tenure decisions are effective in identifying and protecting individuals who contribute to the aims and needs of the department. In addition, the department has regularly reevaluated and refined its criteria and procedures for granting tenure.

The faculty of the Department of Architecture also affirm that the departmental tenure procedures, in the vast majority of instances, effectively give tenure to faculty members who are and will continue to be productive contributors to the department and university. Nevertheless the *University Handbook* provides that, if a tenured faculty member shows "*chronic failure to perform his or her professional duties*," as defined by the unit, this conduct would constitute "professional incompetence" and warrant consideration for "dismissal for cause" (C31.5).

Decisions about revocation of tenure, especially if the grounds are professional incompetence, should not be exclusively controlled or determined by and should not be unduly influenced by single individuals without input from the faculty. Moreover, "dismissal for cause" in cases of professional incompetence can only be based on departmental guidelines about minimum-acceptable levels of performance that apply to all members of the department and are distinct from individually-determined annual goals.

The following are guidelines and procedures for determining the minimum-acceptable level of productivity in the applicable areas of responsibility for the faculty in the Department of Architecture. It is not appropriate that these guidelines define the minimum level of productivity so as to *inhibit an intellectual environment that is favorable to substantive scholarship, long-range projects or critical and creative thinking or effective teaching*. Nor is it intended that these guidelines will inhibit individuality by defining a single model for a productive faculty member. What is not appropriate is the undue protection of non-contributing faculty members.

### 1. A Working Definition of Chronic Low Achievement

According to the *University Handbook*, the working definition of chronic low achievement must be grounded in the department head's annual evaluation summary, which must be presented in terms of four levels of expectations in regard to professional productivity (C31.8):

- exceeded expectations;
- met expectations;
- fallen below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity;
- fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity.

The "below minimum-acceptable level" refers to the minimum standards associated with chronic low achievement as called for in the *University Handbook* (C31.5). Section C31.8 of the *University Handbook* requires that the department's guidelines explicitly state the point at which a faculty member's overall performance can bring a charge of chronic low achievement into play. Drawing on the designations in Section C31.8b (3 & 4) of the *University Handbook*, the Department of Architecture defines "overall performance" in terms of either:

- a. weaknesses not balanced by strengths; or
- b. predetermined agreements with the faculty member about the relative importance of different areas of responsibility.

This definition of chronic low achievement is general. It is the responsibility of the department head to demonstrate, in specific terms, with accompanying evidence, that the work of the faculty member charged with chronic low achievement demonstrates that there are serious weaknesses not balanced by strengths in the three evaluative categories or in predetermined agreements with the faculty member as to his or her long-term responsibilities.

Procedurally, in identifying a faculty member with chronic low achievement, the Head must:

- a. demonstrate a range of evidence indicating chronic low achievement (C31.7);
- b. demonstrate that this low achievement has occurred two consecutive years or three years within any five-year period where the faculty member's annual evaluation indicates fallen below minimum levels of productivity (C31.5);
- c. consult with other eligible Architecture faculty as to their perceptions of the performance of the faculty member in question (C31.5).

## **2. Criteria for Chronic Low Achievement**

The faculty of the Department of Architecture believes that there is no easy way to provide precise criteria as to what "fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity" means. As all academics know, professional life ebbs and flows. Some years bring success in professional responsibilities while other years mark average accomplishments or disappointment and even failure.

Nevertheless, the following are guidelines for assessment:

### **1. Evidence of Chronic Low Achievement in Teaching:**

- extended poor performance or lack of evidence of effectiveness as demonstrated through students who are poorly prepared or through student work that is of weak quality;
- a consistent record of poor classroom evaluations by individuals qualified to judge, i.e., colleagues, students, and other appropriate individuals;
- a continued lack of evidence of teaching performance (in other words, the faculty member regularly fails to provide evidence of teaching effectiveness, whether in terms of student evaluations, course materials, examples of student work, etc.);
- habitual failure to make conscientious preparations and efforts to deliver quality classroom instruction;
- an unexplained pattern of continued absenteeism in the classroom.

### **2. Evidence of Chronic Low Achievement in Scholarship and Creative Work:**

- a continued failure to contribute to one's chosen field of professional, scholarly, or creative endeavor. Clearly, over time, faculty members may change their scholarly, creative, or professional focus; if that is the case, the faculty member must strive, in consultation with the head, to produce work that indicates the individual's mastery and success in regard to the new focus. It is also important that this policy should not mandate the blind following of fashion or change for its own sake;
- a continued lack of professional recognition by peers, including department colleagues, outside colleagues, and professional and scholarly groups.

### **3. Evidence of Chronic Low Achievement in Service:**

- a continued lack of involvement in essential departmental, college, and university needs, such as the maintenance of curriculum or governance;
- a continued failure to contribute to the normal collegial obligations of a faculty member that allow the free exchange of ideas.

Again, one may not be able to determine precisely (in the sense of an exact quantitative measure) whether a faculty member fails at one or several of these criteria. The head must use these criteria as indicative and, in the individual case, gather concrete evidence as to whether the individual in question has failed. There may be instances where a faculty member's weak performance in one area of responsibility is balanced by a strong performance in another area of responsibility. Nevertheless, it is recognized that university life is multidimensional

and that concentration in a particular area must not be used as an excuse for failure to contribute to the overall life of the department. In this case, especially, the head must seek out the perceptions of other eligible faculty. Eligible faculty refers to faculty members holding a rank equal to or higher than the rank of the faculty being evaluated.

It also must be emphasized that different individuals make different contributions in the three evaluative categories of teaching, scholarship and creative work, and service. In charging an individual with chronic low achievement, therefore, the head must demonstrate that the area of sustained poor performance is vital to the individual's agreed-upon responsibilities in relation to the three evaluative categories. In this regard, the head may draw on the individual's annual activity statements (including statements of annual goals and accomplishments) and other relevant evidence (discussions with other faculty, evaluations from colleagues, etc.).

### **3. Procedure for Determining Chronic Low Achievement**

The *University Handbook*, in section C31.5, requires the following procedure for determining chronic low achievement:

1. When a tenured faculty member's overall performance falls below the minimum-acceptable level, as indicated by the annual evaluation, the head will indicate so in writing to the faculty member. The head must also indicate, in writing, a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member.
2. In subsequent annual evaluations, the faculty member will report on activities aimed at improving performance and any evidence of improvement. The names of faculty members failing to meet minimum standards for the year following the department head's suggested course of action will be forwarded to the dean.
3. If the 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.

In addition:

4. Because chronic low achievement is not suddenly discovered, the head must demonstrate that the identified faults and problems of the faculty member are long-term--that is, indicated by evaluations of "fallen below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity" in previous evaluations and must find that the faculty member has failed to respond to reasonable requests for correction.
5. In keeping with regular procedures in matters of tenure (C112.1 and C112.2), eligible departmental faculty members will have input into any decisions on individual cases unless the charged faculty member requests otherwise. Therefore, the head will call a meeting of all eligible faculty members to gather their perceptions of the faculty member in question. These eligible faculty members will discuss the faculty member's situation and vote on a ballot marked as follows:
  - I agree with the charge of chronic low achievement.
  - I disagree with the charge of chronic low achievement.
6. The head must include this faculty input in his or her decision; if the decision goes against the majority vote of eligible faculty members, then both the eligible faculty and the head's recommendation will be forwarded to the dean.

7. The head forwards the charge of chronic low achievement to the dean.
8. A faculty member who wishes to formally challenge a charge of chronic low achievement follows the procedure outlined in the *University Handbook*, Appendix M, "Procedure for Review of Dismissal of Tenured Faculty." Before filing a formal grievance, the faculty member should have shared his or her concerns in writing to the head.

#### **4. Preventing Chronic Low Achievement**

As the *University Handbook* emphasizes in section C31.7, prior to the point at which "dismissal for cause" is considered, other less drastic actions should have been taken. In most cases, a faculty member's deficient performance in one or more areas of responsibility will have been noted in prior written annual evaluations. At that point, the head should have:

1. Determined whether the duties assigned to the faculty member have been equitable in the context of the distribution of duties within the department and to correct any inequities affecting the faculty member under review;
2. Suggested potential ways to improve weaknesses--for example, requesting assistance from the Office of Educational Improvement, which provides help to strengthen teaching; or from the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, which assists with efforts of scholarship and creative work. On rare occasions, referral for other forms of assistance (for example, medical or psychological) may be warranted.

If the deficient performance continues in spite of these efforts and recommendations, the head and the charged faculty member may agree to a reallocation of the faculty member's time so that he or she no longer has duties in the area(s) of deficient performance. This reallocation can only occur if there are one or more areas of better performance in the faculty member's profile and if the reallocation is possible in the larger context of the department and college's needs and resources (C31.7).

### **E. Professorial Performance Awards**

As passed by the K-State Faculty Senate in 2006, the Professorial Performance Award (PPA) recognizes excellent and sustained performance of full professors at Kansas State University (*University Handbook*, C49.1). This award is not a form of promotion review, and it does not establish a "senior" professoriate. Furthermore, the award is not a right accorded to every faculty member at the rank of Professor, nor is it granted simply as a result of a candidate's routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of deficiencies.

The *University Handbook* provides a set of minimal criteria for this award but also requires that each department establish more detailed performance criteria "according to its own disciplinary standards of excellence" (C49.2). This document presents the award criteria and procedure for the Department of Architecture. As required by the *University Handbook*, this document will be subject to departmental and college review at least every five years as part of the review of the procedures for annual merit evaluation (C49.3).

#### **1. Evaluating Guidelines for PPA**

The following evaluative guidelines are based on PPA criteria presented in the *University Handbook* (C49.1 - C49.14), coupled with more specific departmental criteria developed for promotion to the rank of Professor (See Part III, p. 24). These evaluative guidelines are as follows:

1. The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at least six years since promotion or last Professorial Performance Award.
2. The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to what would merit promotion to full professor according to current approved departmental standards.
3. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the PPA

review.

4. Sustained productivity is defined as “continued attainment of excellence in assigned faculty responsibilities and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies” (*University Handbook*, C120.2).
5. The candidate must demonstrate a continued record of excellence in teaching, demonstrated by multiple sources of evidence that includes: (a) strong teaching evaluations; (b) leadership in developing instructional programs in the area(s) of his or her expertise; and (c) innovative techniques and/or materials that have been integrated into his or her teaching (p. 23).
6. The candidate must demonstrate a continued record of excellence in his or her creative work, whether involving research, design, or artistic efforts. Excellence here refers to “national and international recognition for success in developing a mature and comprehensive contribution to a field of knowledge, creative effort, or professional work” (p. 23).
7. The candidate must demonstrate a continued record of significant service, which includes: (a) significant contributions to the department, college, and university, including leadership positions; and (b) significant contributions to his or her academic, creative, and/or professional areas of concentration and interest (p. 24).

## **2. Procedure for Evaluating and Receiving Professorial Performance Awards**

1. All eligible faculty members are encouraged to ensure that they communicate their activities and accomplishments to their colleagues through informal and formal means. For professors planning to apply for a PPA, communication with other full professors is of particular importance.
2. Informal and formal counsel offered by the head and full professors in the months before the time of a PPA application should assist the potential candidate in reaching a decision on initiating a formal application. This counsel should not be construed as a pre-judgment on the PPA.
3. At the start of the fall term, an Architecture professor should inform the department head that he or she plans to become a PPA applicant. The head sends a memorandum to the candidate listing key dates and deadlines in the PPA application process. This memorandum also requests that the candidate schedule an appointment with the head to discuss the evaluation materials that he or she will provide, including external recommendations from professional peers. The head must make sure these materials are available for faculty review at least two weeks before the faculty meeting described in step 6 below.
4. The head also provides the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee with the dates and deadlines for the PPA process. The chair is responsible for soliciting information and evaluations from other full professors. In writing, the chair informs full professors when the candidate’s evaluation materials will be available for review and when full professors will meet to discuss PPA applications.
5. Professors review PPA materials.
6. No earlier than two weeks after evaluation materials are made available for review, full professors, as well as the department head as a non-voting participant, meet to discuss the PPA application. This meeting is led by the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, who solicits discussion and commentary on each candidate being evaluated for a PPA.
7. At this meeting, the chair also distributes a ballot that elicits each professor’s evaluation of the PPA candidate. Within twenty-four hours, the chair also distributes ballots to all professors not present at the meeting.

8. The ballot offers three voting choices: "in favor of PPA," "not in favor of PPA," and "I abstain." In addition, the ballot provides space for written comments if individual professors so wish. Participation in the evaluation process is an important faculty responsibility, and all professors are expected to return ballots. All ballots must be signed and returned to the chair of faculty affairs within two days of receipt. Unsigned ballots will not be accepted. The chair is responsible for counting these ballots. The ballot vote is confidential in the sense that only the chair sees individual ballot votes and compiles the aggregate count. The chair is also responsible for compiling any written comments from the ballots.
9. Within five days of the meeting described in step 6, the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee forwards to the department head a written summary of faculty discussion and ballot results. The chair also provides the head a copy of a typed transcript of any commentaries provided on the ballot (these commentaries are not to be shared with the candidate and are not to be seen by other Architecture faculty members). The written summary conveys the vote of the eligible faculty and any other appropriate information the faculty deem important for the head to have in making a PPA recommendation to the dean and provost. The chair places a copy of the ballot tally and written summary in the Department of Architecture office. This written summary does not include any individual commentaries written on the individual ballots. The chair places all ballots in a sealed envelope, which the head delivers to the dean's office to be kept in each candidate's personnel file.
10. Based on the faculty input described in steps 6-8 and on other available materials, the department head writes an evaluation and recommendation. Each PPA candidate will have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the department head, and each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, each candidate has the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation to the department head and to the dean. A copy of the department head's written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate.
11. The department head must submit the following items to the dean:
  - a. A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award;
  - b. Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation;
  - c. Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation;
  - d. The candidate's supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award.
12. The dean reviews all evaluation materials and recommendations to ensure that the evaluations are consistent with the PPA criteria and procedures established by the department.
13. A dean who does not agree with recommendations for the PPA made by a department head must attempt to reach consensus through consultation. If this fails, the dean's recommendation will be used. If any change has been made to the department head's recommendations, the dean must notify the candidate, in writing, of the change and its rationale. Within seven working days after notification, such candidates have the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations to the dean and to the provost. All statements of unresolved differences will be included in the documentation to be forwarded to the next administrative level. All recommendations are forwarded to the provost.
14. The provost will review all evaluation materials and recommendations to ensure that: (a) the evaluation process was conducted in a manner consistent with departmental criteria and procedures approved by the unit; and (b) there are no inequities in the recommendations based upon race, color, ethnic or

national origin, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, age, ancestry, disability, military status, or veteran status.

15. If the provost does not agree with PPA recommendations made by subordinate administrators, an attempt must be made to reach consensus through consultation. If this fails, the provost's decision will prevail. The candidate affected by the disagreement must be notified by the provost, in writing, of the change and its rationale.
16. The Professorial Performance Award will be 8% of the average salary of all full-time faculty (instructor through professor excluding administrators at those ranks). However, funding for the award cannot come out of the legislatively-approved merit increment.
17. In the event that financial conditions in a given year preclude awarding the full amount as designated in C49.12, the provost shall in concert with the Vice President for Administration and Finance adopt a plan to phase in the full award for all that year's recommended and approved candidates.
18. Upon official notification from the Office of the Provost, the dean will consolidate the Professorial Performance Award with salary increases resulting from annual evaluation and issue the candidate a contract that includes the candidate's salary for the next fiscal year. The Professorial Performance Award will become part of the professor's base salary.



## II. EVALUATIVE GUIDELINES FOR LONG-TERM DEVELOPMENT TOWARD TENURE AND PROMOTION

### A. Justification

The *University Handbook* requires that each unit of the university develop its own set of procedures, guidelines, and criteria for tenure and promotion (sections C30-C38). The present document works to establish guidelines and standards that identify long-term expectations and responsibilities for tenure-track and promotion-track faculty in the Department of Architecture. In broadest terms, the *University Handbook* requires that a faculty member's tenure-track and promotion-track efforts be guided by the three "major university endeavors" of teaching, research and other creative work, and service. The present document uses these three categories as a means to provide long-term guidelines and expectations in terms of what tenure-track and promotion-track faculty are expected to aim toward and accomplish.

It is important to emphasize that each architecture faculty member is unique professionally and contributes a special set of strengths and abilities to the department. The present document seeks to respect the uniqueness of each faculty member by establishing a set of guidelines and standards that, on the one hand, are relatively flexible yet, on the other hand, offer enough rigors to allow a framework for guiding and evaluating abilities and accomplishments of each tenure-track or promotion-track faculty member.

Because the Department of Architecture is, first of all, a professional program, it is crucial to recognize the importance of creative and professional efforts in regard to the records of tenure and promotion candidates. Unlike many other departments that emphasize only scholarly efforts and research funding, the Department of Architecture must also recognize and, indeed, encourage design as well as artistic and professional-practice efforts and accomplishments. Thus, for example, winning a design competition, exhibiting a significant artistic work, or receiving a building commission can be judged to be of equal value to publishing an article or book, presenting at a conference, or receiving a research grant.

### B. Four Criteria to Guide Long-Term Professional Aims and Efforts

As emphasized above, each faculty member is unique and must be evaluated on the specific contributions and accomplishments that he or she provides the department, college, university, and professional and academic institutions. In this sense, each faculty member must establish a long-term plan in terms of professional focus and goals.

This document identifies four broad standards—coherence, versatility, peer review, and collegiality—in regard to professional aims and possibilities. The hope is that these criteria will provide long-term guidance in regard to a faculty member's efforts and accomplishments. In consultation with the department head, tenure-track and promotion-track faculty should discuss these criteria as one way to establish and evaluate short-term efforts and aims in regard to long-term faculty development, especially as identified through teaching, scholarly and creative work, and service.

As required by the *University Handbook* (C32.1-C32.7), all faculty efforts and accomplishments must, *first of all*, be evaluated in terms of the three categories of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. The four criteria presented here do not supersede, contradict, or dilute the importance of these three evaluative categories; rather, these criteria are presented as one way to consider and to evaluate, in a systematic way, the relative effectiveness of a faculty member's teaching, scholarly and creative work, and service.

#### 1. Coherence

Coherence refers to the idea that there is an underlying focus and direction in a faculty member's professional life and career. Coherence is crucial in that it provides each faculty member with a long-term aim and purpose

that can give order and intent to specific efforts in regard to teaching, scholarly and creative work, and service.

Typically, coherence is most often related to the faculty member's scholarly, design, or creative interests and emphases. For tenure-track faculty, especially, it is important early on in the individual's probation period that he or she establishes at least one area of professional interest and expertise that can become a long-term focus for scholarly and/or creative work. In addition, this focus should be considered as it might contribute to and enhance one's teaching and service responsibilities.

A faculty member's sense of professional purpose and aim may change over time, and all evaluators must recognize, accept, and—when necessary—encourage these shifts. On the other hand, major shifts in a faculty member's professional emphases should be considered carefully and not happen arbitrarily or capriciously. A candidate considering a significant shift in professional aim or emphasis should discuss the possibility with the department head, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, and other colleagues.

The crucial point in regard to coherence is that the faculty member, over the long term, should be able to demonstrate that his or her professional, creative and/or scholarly work has an internal consistency, pattern, and focus that makes the individual an accomplished designer, practitioner, creative artist, or scholar. In this sense, the faculty member must demonstrate progress toward some coherent area of scholarship, expertise, and/or creative endeavor. The demonstration of this core of accomplishment is essential for tenure-track faculty, since it is in the early years of one's career that he or she establishes professional commitments and identity. A key aim of promotion-track faculty will typically be to extend and deepen their professional core, or to use it as a base for related research and creative and professional efforts.

## **2. Versatility**

Versatility refers to the ability to function well across major areas of work (e.g., teaching, research and other creative endeavor, and service) as well as in a variety of settings within one or more areas. This quality of versatility is an important aim for both tenure-track and promotion-track faculty, and involves two performance aspects:

### **a. Versatility in regard to the three evaluative categories.**

- Faculty should seek to provide evidence of effort in teaching, research and creative work, and service. The university uses the three evaluative categories as a basis for university comparisons, and it is important that each faculty provide evidence of accomplishments in each category.
- No single individual can be exceptional in all three categories, and each candidate's record will involve a different proportion of activities. On the other hand, at least some effort in all three categories is an integral need for the long-term strength of the department, college, and university.
- During their evaluative period for tenure, promotion, or PPA, faculty should regularly evaluate their efforts and achievements to make sure there are examples from each category. If a faculty member is uncertain about his or her record of versatility in regard to the three categories, he or she should ask the advice of the department head, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, and other colleagues.

### **b. Versatility in regard to one's major area(s) of scholarly, design, and/or professional focus.**

- Versatility here relates to coherence above and involves a range of scholarly and/or design work. Professional efforts at the departmental, university, local, and regional levels are important but the candidate should also make efforts that involve recognition at the national and international levels.
- Candidates should regularly examine their records to make certain that in-house, local, and regional achievements are balanced with accomplishments at the national and broader levels (for example, presentations at national conferences, international design competitions, publications in an academic or professional institution's prestigious journals). In other words,

efforts and achievements should illustrate a range of public and peer acceptance, from the local university level to broader levels that include the state, regional, national, and international recognitions.

### 3. Peer Evaluation

A central requirement in evaluating the relative worth of any tenure-track or promotion-track accomplishment in regard to creative work and service is peer evaluation—i.e., in some way, the work has been judged successful, effective, or good, whether in terms of peer review or peer jury. In this sense, it is important for all faculty who are tenure-track or promotion-track to consider all scholarly, creative, and professional endeavors as they will have some kind of public dissemination that can be evaluated by others, particularly by peers.

It is important that this peer review happen at both local and broader levels. Opportunities for K-State colleagues to evaluate tenure-track faculty is especially important, since these colleagues have a major voice in conferring tenure and/or promotion. In this regard, candidates should take advantage of opportunities to present themselves publicly—e.g., through participating in studio juries, doing invited lectures in colleagues' classes, and so forth.

At the same time, peer review at the national level, particularly in regard to the faculty member's area(s) of scholarly and professional expertise, is important, since this evaluation establishes the faculty member's professional worth, particularly in regard to the standard of coherence. In this regard, candidates should make efforts to involve themselves regularly in projects that will be publicly visible and judged, in some way, by peers. Such efforts would include design competitions, publishing in referred journals, juried exhibits, and so forth.

Architecture faculty are often involved in projects and writings that may not involve peer review. This work is important and must be given weight in regard to coherence and versatility above. On the other hand, all faculty must recognize that non-evaluated work alone does not meet the requirement of peer review. Therefore, faculty must make the long-term effort to include some examples of peer-reviewed writings, work, and projects in their evaluation materials.

A related issue in regard to peer review is *collaboration* with other colleagues in scholarship, research, and/or creative work. The key point is that tenure and promotion are granted to the individual, thus the tenure-track or promotion-track candidate should demonstrate some ability, as an individual, to initiate and carry through work under his or her own direction.

Collaborative work is central to research and creative work in professional programs like architecture, and a record emphasizing collaboration is entirely acceptable, provided that the candidate can also give some indication of work carried out independently. In most instances, tenure or promotion cannot be given to a faculty who provides evidence of collaborative work only. It is the responsibility of the candidate to explain clearly his or her "role and contribution in the joint effort" after each collaborative entry listed in evaluation materials for tenure. In the Department of Architecture, this requirement in regard to documenting collaboration will also hold for promotion and PPA.

### 4. Collegiality

Collegiality refers to good working relations among colleagues. Both tenure and promotion assume a long-term commitment to other members of the department. Collegiality is especially related to ethical issues, by which "ethics" refers to the system of values that enables university colleagues to work together with mutual respect, trust, and cooperation. Faculty members must adhere to high standards of conduct in their work with students, peers, and the general public.

A major strength of the department and college is the diversity of the faculty, both in terms of professional and academic backgrounds as well as philosophical and ideological perspectives in regard to design, practice, and scholarship. In this sense, collegiality also includes support for the diversity of other colleagues' viewpoints and philosophies.

Collegiality is a much more intangible and nebulous criterion than the other three standards. In most

instances, candidates are professional and mature, and collegiality is not an issue. On the other hand, to protect departmental well-being, it is important to make this criterion explicit so that collegiality may be considered as a criterion for evaluation.

## C. Evaluative Guidelines for Tenure

The granting of tenure involves decisions at the departmental, college, university and ultimately, the regents level as outlined in the *University Handbook* (C70-C78; C100-C116.2). The granting of tenure means that the person has been judged capable of continued exemplary creativity and productivity in some described areas of professional activity. Tenure is granted only to faculty at the ranks of associate professor and professor. The *University Handbook* states that tenure is based on “the assessment of the tenured faculty that a candidate has made outstanding contributions in appropriate academic endeavors. By granting tenure only to such individuals, the continued excellence of the university is ensured” (C100.1).

The following standards are used in making tenure decisions at the departmental level for architecture faculty. These standards are organized in regard to the three areas of university responsibility established in the *University Handbook*—i.e., teaching, scholarly and creative efforts, and service (C1-C7). It is important to emphasize that these standards in regard to university responsibilities must be supplemented with the more general long-term standards of coherence, versatility, peer evaluation, and collegiality—discussed in Part B of this report.

### 1. Departmental Standards for Tenure-Track Faculty in Regard to Major University Responsibilities

#### a. Teaching

The Department of Architecture affirms that educating future professional architects in the discipline of architecture is our primary and essential mission. Candidates for tenure must demonstrate ability to teach effectively in the area(s) of the professional curriculum for which they are responsible. This does not only imply general competence in the delivery of instruction but, more so, a sustained commitment and a coherent effort to approach teaching in a responsible, creative, and thoughtfully critical way which actively seeks to further students' skills and knowledge. Consequently, tenure candidates are expected to make a significant contribution to the overall quality of education offered in the Department of Architecture.

The means for demonstrating evidence of the achievements and the quality of teaching work include but are not limited to:

- student work
- student work exhibitions
- student evaluation, both for teaching and advising
- peer evaluation
- course syllabi
- teaching awards
- student awards
- participation in curriculum development
- research on teaching disseminated through professional publications

Teaching evaluations for tenure-track faculty are required by the *University Handbook*, which provides the following general guidelines in regard to student ratings:

In most cases, documentation submitted by faculty members with teaching responsibilities would be

considered incomplete and presumed inadequate, unless evidence of teaching effectiveness is included (C34.1).

Student ratings should never be the only source of information about classroom teaching. Departments or units should be encouraged to develop a comprehensive, flexible approach to teaching evaluation, where several types of evidence can be collected, presented, and evaluated as a portfolio. Peers, administrators, and other appropriate judges also can offer useful insights about a faculty member's teaching performance. Peer evaluation, defined as a critical review by colleagues knowledgeable of the entire range of teaching activities, can be an important component of the university's teaching evaluation program since peers are often in the best position to interpret and understand the evidence and place it in its proper academic context. Data other than student ratings that provide relevant evidence of teaching effectiveness are described in "Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustment, Tenure and Promotion." Examples include: course materials such as reading lists, syllabi, and examinations; special contributions to effective teaching for diverse student populations; preparation of innovative teaching materials or instructional techniques; special teaching activities outside the university; exit interviews, and graduate interviews and surveys to obtain information about teaching effectiveness (C34.2).

#### **b. Scholarly and Creative Activities**

The Department of Architecture is, first of all, a professional program. In regard to faculty academic development, professional practice (e.g., design, building and consulting activities) as well as other types of creative work (e.g., artistic efforts, art exhibits) are efforts that must be considered as equal to scholarly and research activities.

Whatever the form of a faculty member's scholarly and creative activities are, they will be judged in regard to the criteria of coherence, versatility, and peer review described in Part B above.

In the first two years at K-State tenure-track faculty members should clearly establish the particular area(s) of interest in which they will continue to seek more focused involvement and development. While not sacrificing the full range of professional interests, tenure-track faculty members should demonstrate promise for establishing a coherent body of work and expertise that, at least in part, has a clear relationship to teaching obligations.

Evidence of scholarly and creative work includes but is not limited to:

- departmental peer evaluation
- external evaluation by peers and professional institutions (including design competition awards and similar recognitions)
- refereed and non-refereed publications of work in professional journals and books (taking into account the quality and professional significance of the particular publication outlet)
- invited lectures
- conference presentations
- paper and design work presentations

In regard to many of these tenure-track efforts, the department recognizes that projects can work multidimensionally—i.e., a single project can demonstrate, for example, research, community and public service. In addition, the project might invigorate teaching and/or lead to gains in professional recognition among peers.

#### **c. Service**

It is the responsibility of faculty members to engage in the activities of the department, college, and

university and to share their professional knowledge and competence professionally and with the larger community.

**1) University Service**

It is expected that tenure-track faculty be able to show evidence of constructive participation in the affairs of the department, college, and university through participation in faculty committees. Faculty are also expected to encourage and facilitate the broader educational responsibilities of the university by participation in lectures, seminars, conferences, and communication with colleagues in other programs as is possible and useful.

**2) Professional and Community Service**

Tenure-track faculty should show evidence of participation in and contributions to professional organizations that take advantage of particular individual skills and intellectual and professional interests. Participation in governmental and community organizations where the individual's professional or scholarly contributions are evident is also desirable.

## **D. Evaluative Criteria for Tenure-Track Reappointments**

In the Department of Architecture, the evaluative criteria for tenure-track reappointment are as follows:

- Demonstrated evidence of acceptable progress in teaching (student evaluations for all courses taught, and other sources of teaching evidence; including course syllabi, student work, student awards etc.; see II.C.1.a).
- Demonstrated evidence of acceptable progress in scholarly and creative activity (design awards, published peer-reviewed work, grant applications, conference presentations etc., see II.C.1.b)
- Demonstrated evidence of acceptable progress in service (membership on departmental, college, and university committees; professional, and public service accomplishments; etc.; see II.C.1.c)
- Demonstrated evidence of acceptable progress in regard to the department's four criteria to guide long-term professional aims and efforts (see section II.B for details):
  - Coherence (demonstrating an underlying academic and professional focus and direction)
  - Versatility (demonstrating the ability to function well across major areas of academic and professional work)
  - Peer evaluation (offering evidence that one's scholarly and creative activity has been judged publicly successful and worthy)
  - Collegiality (demonstrating good working relations with colleagues)

For these criteria, "acceptable progress" is evaluated in two ways (see section IIIA for full explication of this procedure):

1. For each annual review, the candidate's progress is discussed in a meeting consisting of tenured faculty. For this meeting, the chair of the departmental faculty affairs committee summarizes colleagues' comments and provides a ballot for tenured faculty that evaluates the candidate in terms of "acceptable for reappointment," "not acceptable for reappointment," or "I abstain" (III.A.5).
2. These evaluative materials are provided to the head, who then makes a final determination as to the candidate's reappointment based on the above criteria (see section III.A.8 for details).

## **E. Evaluative Guidelines for Promotion**

Like tenure, the granting of promotion involves decisions for the department, college, university and,

ultimately, the regents as outlined in the *University Handbook* (C120; C130-C132; C150-C156.2). Promotion in rank means that a person has demonstrated a level of creativity and productivity that is commensurate with the current rank and predicts success at the next higher level. The *University Handbook* offers the following general comments on promotion:

Promotion is based upon an individual's achievements related to the specific criteria, standards, and guidelines developed by departmental faculty members in consultation with the department head and the appropriate dean (C120.1).

Each higher rank demands a higher level of accomplishment (C120).

As with tenure, promotion decisions must be considered in regard to the three areas of university responsibility established in the *University Handbook*—i.e., teaching, scholarly and creative efforts, and service. In addition, accomplishments in regard to these three categories should be considered in regard to the more general long-term criteria of coherence, versatility, peer evaluation, and collegiality, discussed in Part B. Candidates for the various levels of promotion should, through evidence of teaching, research/creative work, and service, be able to justify their professional efforts in terms of the following evaluative descriptions.

## **1. Promotion to Associate Professor**

The *University Handbook* provides the following description of promotion to associate professor:

Promotion to associate professor rests on substantial professional contributions that reflect excellence in teaching, research and other creative endeavor, directed service, or extension (C120.2).

In the Department of Architecture, qualification for promotion to associate professor must involve a clear demonstration of significant development beyond the level recognized by the initial appointment. Evidence must be submitted that documents a sustained effort to establish or add to an existing body of knowledge and/or creative work. More specific achievements in regard to the above three university categories are as follows:

### **a. Teaching**

- The candidate has demonstrated strong ability as a teacher in the classroom and/or design studio.
- The candidate possesses the necessary qualifications to be responsible for the direction of courses within his or her field of specialization and to assist in curriculum and course development.

### **b. Scholarly and Creative Activities**

- The candidate has demonstrated a high degree of scholarly, creative and/or professional growth by creating and designing architectural projects, conducting research, and/or engaging in other creative endeavors of high caliber.
- The candidate has documented the results of those efforts.
- The candidate has demonstrated definite interest in continuing focused work in these areas.

### **c. Service**

- The candidate has assumed major responsibilities within the department and college for those service responsibilities assigned by the department head.

- The candidate has served as an active member of departmental and college committees.
- The candidate has made an active effort to provide service to scholarly and professional institutions and responsibilities outside the department, college, and university.
- These efforts should relate in some way to the candidate's scholarly, creative, and/or professional aims.

## 2. Promotion to Professor

The *University Handbook* provides the following description of promotion to professor:

Promotion to professor is based on attainment of excellence in the assigned responsibilities of the faculty member and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies (C120.2).

In the Department of Architecture, qualification for promotion to professor must involve a clear demonstration of significant development beyond the level recognized at the time of promotion to associate professor. Particularly important for promotion to professor is a clear demonstration that the candidate has received national and international recognition for success in developing a mature and comprehensive contribution to a field of knowledge, creative effort, or professional work.

### a. Teaching

- The candidate is recognized for excellent teaching.
- The candidate has provided leadership in developing the instructional programs in the area of his or her expertise.
- The candidate has developed innovative techniques and/or new materials and integrated them into his or her teaching.

### b. Scholarly and Creative Activities

- The candidate has a recognized national/international record of research, creative work, and/or professional projects.
- The candidate's record indicates that this work will continue into the future.

### c. Service

- The candidate has made significant contributions to the overall efforts and development of the department, college, and university, including positions of leadership.

The candidate has made significant service contributions in regard to his or her academic, creative, and professional areas of concentration and interest.

## F. Monitoring Progress Toward Tenure

For beginning tenure-track faculty, the university experience is sometimes difficult and uncomfortable. As part of its effort to make the tenure-track experience more manageable and fair, the Department of Architecture has established a two-part program that includes tenured faculty mentors and a mid-tenure review.

### 1. Faculty Mentors

At the end of the tenure-track faculty member's first year at K-State, he or she will be assigned a "faculty mentor"—a tenured faculty member of Associate Professor or Professor rank who will meet periodically with the tenure-track faculty member and discuss his or her academic and professional progress in regard to tenure-track aims, responsibilities, and accomplishments.



It is crucial that the mentor pay regular attention to the tenure-track faculty member's progress in regard to the three categories of teaching, scholarly and creative work, and service. If the mentor believes that the tenure-track faculty member's progress may be unsatisfactory, he or she should make this problem clear to the tenure-track faculty member and also discuss the situation with the department head.

The department head will be responsible for assigning each tenure-track faculty member with a faculty mentor. Ideally, this pairing should develop through mutual interest and involvement on the part of the two individuals.

Otherwise, the head should assign a tenured faculty to the tenure-track faculty member as the Head sees fit. If the faculty member feels that the relationship is not appropriate or helpful, he or she may request a different mentor.

Mentoring is voluntary and both tenure-track faculty as well as potential faculty mentors may decline to participate.

## **2. Mid-Tenure Review**

The *University Handbook* requires a formal review of the tenure-track faculty member midway through his or her probationary period (C92.1). Unless otherwise stated in the faculty member's contract, the mid-probationary review will take place during the third year of appointment.

This review, organized jointly by the head and chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, should provide the faculty member with "substantive feedback from faculty colleagues and administrators regarding his or her accomplishments relative to departmental tenure criteria" (C92.1). Annual reports of activities as well as faculty comments are used to evaluate a candidate's continuing appointment and progress toward tenure. For specific procedures for the mid-probationary review, see "Procedure For Tenure-Track Reappointment Decisions" below.

In preparing for their mid-probationary review, candidates must address university documentation guidelines that include a series of questions for which the candidate must summarize professional accomplishments and goals. These guidelines occasionally change, and candidates should make use of current guidelines (provided at [www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/index.html](http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/index.html)) to make sure current university requirements and formats are followed.

### III. SOLICITING FACULTY INPUT FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

#### Justification

A voice in the selection and retention of peers is a longstanding privilege and responsibility of university faculty. Kansas State University mandates no specific university-wide faculty evaluation procedures in regard to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Rather, the *University Handbook* suggests criteria and procedures be developed jointly by faculty, heads, and deans, department by department. Following are the department procedures for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The procedure for Professorial Performance Awards is included in Section II, Part E.

#### A. Procedure For Tenure-Track Reappointment Decisions

The Department of Architecture at K-State uses the following procedures to evaluate the performance of tenure-track faculty members seeking reappointment. (Criteria for tenure-track reappointment are provided in section II. D).

- o. Faculty members are appointed based upon their potential to advance the mission and expectations of the department. The department head writes a letter of expectation to each prospective appointee describing the general responsibilities of him or her. A copy of the letter is forwarded to the dean and the provost, along with the recommendation for appointment (C21.1)
1. In early fall, the head sends a memorandum to each tenure-track faculty member listing the key dates and deadlines relating to reappointment. A tenure-track faculty member's calendar for reappointment review varies from year to year, depending on the number of years the tenure-track faculty member has taught at K-State. Typically, first-year tenure-track faculty are reviewed in the spring of their first academic year of teaching. They are then reviewed each fall term, including the fall term immediately following their first-year spring review.

The most crucial deadline is the date by which the tenure-track faculty member's reappointment materials are due. These materials include evidence of performance during the current year (including all student evaluations) as well as:

- all annual activity reports, including the most recent. First-year tenure-track faculty members (who are usually reviewed in spring, first academic year) will provide an activity report describing the faculty member's first semester. Continuing tenure-track faculty members whose evaluation schedule requires a December review will include an activity report for the current year.
- for all collaborative activities listed, a clear statement of the candidate's role and level of involvement.

It is the responsibility of the department head to make these materials available for faculty review *at least fourteen calendar days before* the faculty meeting described in step 4 below.

2. The head also provides the chair of the departmental Faculty Affairs Committee with the dates and deadlines for each tenure-track faculty member's reappointment review. The chair is responsible for soliciting information and evaluations from tenured faculty members. The chair informs tenured faculty members in a memorandum when the tenure-track faculty member's evaluation materials will be

available for review and when tenured faculty members will meet to discuss and evaluate the performance of the candidate.

3. Tenured faculty members review the tenure-track faculty member's reappointment materials.
4. No sooner than *fourteen calendar days* after reappointment materials are made available for review, tenured faculty members, including the department head as a non-voting participant, meet to discuss the performance of each reappointment candidate. During this meeting, the chair solicits discussion and commentary on the performance of each tenure-track faculty member being evaluated.
5. At this meeting, the chair distributes a ballot that elicits each tenured faculty member's reaction to the performance of each tenure-track faculty member being evaluated. Within twenty-four hours, the chair also distributes ballots to any eligible tenured faculty member not present at the meeting. The ballot offers three voting choices: "in favor of reappointment", "not in favor of reappointment", and "abstention." In addition, the ballot provides space for written comments if faculty members so wish. Participation in the evaluation process is an important faculty responsibility, and all eligible faculty are expected to return ballots. All ballots must be signed and returned to the chair within two days of receipt. Unsigned ballots will not be accepted. The chair is responsible for counting the ballots and compiling any written comments. These ballots are confidential in the sense that only the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee sees the ballots and any commentaries.
6. Within five days of the meeting described in step 4, the chair forwards to the head a written summary of faculty discussion and ballot results. The chair also provides the head a typed, unedited transcript of any commentaries provided on individual ballots (ballot commentaries are not to be shared with the candidate). The written summary conveys the vote of the faculty and any other appropriate information the faculty deem important for the head to have in making a recommendation to the dean and provost. A copy of the written summary (not including any individual commentaries written on the ballots) is placed in the Architecture office. This document is available for review by all tenured faculty members. The chair places all ballots in a sealed envelope, which the head delivers to the dean's office to be kept in the candidate's personnel file.
7. As required by the *University Handbook*, any tenured faculty member may, prior to the submission of the reappointment recommendation of the head to the dean, request that a candidate meet with tenured faculty members to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by that candidate (C53.1). This request must be made within three days of the meeting described in step 4.
8. Based on the faculty input described above in step 5 and other available materials, the department head forwards a written recommendation and accompanying explanation to the dean, along with the candidate's complete file, and the recommendation and unedited written comments of the tenured faculty members. If a recommendation of the head differs from that of faculty members, the head must provide the dean and candidate with a written justification. The department head's written recommendation and accompanying explanations alone will be made available to the candidate and will become part of the candidate's reappointment file (C53.3). This document presents the head's overall sense of the faculty member's performance, based on the inputs described above. In addition, the document includes a copy of the meeting summary provided by the chair of faculty affairs. This summary does not include confidential comments tenured faculty members may have written on their ballots, or in the commentaries described in step 7.

9. The dean, along with the recommendation of the department head and, on behalf of the college, forwards a written recommendation and accompanying explanation to the provost, and the majority recommendation and any unedited written comments of the faculty members in the department. The candidate's complete file will be available to the provost upon his or her request (C54). If a recommendation of the dean differs from that of the head, the dean must provide the head, provost, and candidate with a written justification.
10. The dean informs each candidate of the recommendation prior to forwarding it and the file to the provost.
11. The head asks each tenure-track faculty member being evaluated to schedule a meeting with the head. During this meeting, the head and faculty member review the latter's evaluation and discuss his or her academic and professional plans for the year(s) ahead.

## B. Procedure for Mid-Probationary Review

The *University Handbook* requires a formal review of the tenure-track faculty member midway through his or her probationary period (C91-92.4). Unless otherwise stated in the faculty member's contract, the mid-probationary review will take place during the third year of appointment. The procedure for a candidate's mid-tenure review is similar to the procedure for the tenure review and is as follows.

- i. The mid-term process is organized jointly by the head and chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, who together are responsible for making the candidate's mid-probationary review file available to the tenured faculty members in the department at least fourteen calendar days prior to a meeting to discuss the candidate's progress. A cumulative record of written recommendations and accompanying explanations forwarded to the candidate from previous reappointment meetings, and any comments from individuals outside the department relevant to the assessment of the candidate's performance will also be made available to the eligible faculty (C92.2).  
In preparing for their mid-probationary review, candidates must address university documentation guidelines that include a series of questions for which the candidate must summarize professional accomplishments and goals. These guidelines occasionally change, and candidates should make use of current guidelines (provided at [www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/index.html](http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/index.html)) to make sure current university requirements and formats are followed.
- ii. The department head may discuss the review and assessment of the tenured faculty members in the department with the dean, and shall provide a letter of assessment of the candidate, including a summary of faculty comments and suggestions. This letter of assessment and the faculty report will become a part of the candidate's reappointment and mid-probationary review file. The department head will discuss the review and assessment with the candidate. After receiving the assessment, the candidate has the right to submit a written response for the file (C92.2).
- iii. The candidate's mid-probationary review file as well as other materials specified in i above and a copy of the departmental criteria and standards will be forwarded to the college advisory committee. The committee's specific charge is to ensure that all applicable mid-tenure procedures have been followed and that the department arrives at a recommendation by fairly applying established criteria, standards, and guidelines for tenure. The committee, in advising the dean, will base its recommendation exclusively on a comparison of the candidate's credentials with the criteria, standards, and guidelines of the candidate's department (C92.2).

- iv. The committee will report its findings in writing to the dean. The committee's report must specifically contain a statement as to whether or not all applicable procedures for mid-tenure review were followed. The report must also explain the rationale behind the committee's recommendation by providing a detailed evaluation of the candidate's credentials with regard to how they meet or fail to meet the specific criteria, standards, and/or guidelines of the candidate's department. A minority committee report is required when the committee's recommendation is not unanimous (C113.2).
- v. The dean will provide a letter of mid-tenure assessment to the candidate that includes a summary of recommendations from the college advisory committee (C92.4).

## C. Procedure for Tenure Decisions

The Department of Architecture at K-State uses the following procedure to evaluate the performance of tenure-track faculty members seeking tenure.

1. In early fall, the head sends a memorandum to each departmental faculty member seeking tenure in the academic year ahead. This memorandum lists key dates and deadlines for the candidate's tenure process, including the date by which the candidate's tenure-evaluation materials are due.  
This memorandum also requests that the tenure candidate schedule an appointment with the head to discuss the evaluation materials that he or she will provide, including recommendations. The head must make sure these materials are available for faculty review *at least fourteen calendar days* before the faculty meeting described in step 4 below.  
In preparing materials for tenure review, candidates must address university documentation guidelines that include a series of questions for which the tenure candidate must summarize professional accomplishments and goals. These guidelines occasionally change, and tenure candidates should go to current guidelines ([www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/index.html](http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/index.html)) to make sure current university requirements and formats are followed.
2. The head also sends a memorandum to the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, listing the dates and deadlines for the tenure process. The chair is responsible for soliciting information and evaluations from tenured faculty members. The chair informs tenured faculty members in a memorandum when each tenure candidate's evaluation materials will be available for review and when tenured faculty members will meet to discuss tenure for the candidate.
3. Tenured faculty members review the candidate's evaluation materials.
4. No sooner than *fourteen days* after evaluation materials are made available, tenured faculty members, including the department head as a non-voting participant, meet to discuss tenure for the candidate. This meeting is led by the chair of faculty affairs, who solicits discussion and commentary on the performance of each candidate being evaluated for tenure.
5. At this meeting, the chair also distributes a ballot eliciting each tenured faculty member's evaluation of the performance of each faculty member seeking tenure. Within twenty-four hours, the chair also distributes ballots to all eligible faculty members not present at the meeting.  
The ballot offers three voting choices: "in favor of tenure," "not in favor of tenure," and "abstention." In addition, the ballot provides space for written comments if individual faculty members so wish.  
Participation in the evaluation process is an important faculty responsibility, and all eligible faculty are expected to return ballots. All ballots must be signed and returned to the chair within two days of receipt. Unsigned ballots will not be accepted.

The chair is responsible for counting the ballots. The ballot vote is confidential in the sense that only the chair sees individual ballot votes and compiles the aggregate count. The chair is also responsible for compiling any written comments from the ballots.

6. Within five days of the meeting described in step 4, the chair forwards to the department head the written summary of faculty discussion and ballot results. The chair also provides the head a typed transcript of any individual faculty members' commentaries provided on the ballot (these commentaries are not to be shared with the candidate and they are not to be seen by other Architecture faculty members).

The written summary conveys the vote of the faculty and any other appropriate information faculty members deem important for the head to have in making a tenure recommendation to the dean and provost.

The chair places a copy of the ballot tally and written summary in the Department of Architecture office. This written summary does not include any individual commentaries written on individual ballots.

This written summary is available for review by all tenured faculty. The chair places all ballots in a sealed envelope, which the head delivers to the dean's office to be kept in each candidate's personnel files.

7. As required by the University Handbook, any member of the eligible faculty may, prior to the submission of the recommendation of the head, request that a tenure candidate meet with tenured faculty members to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by that candidate (C112.4). This request must be made within three days of the meeting described in step 4.
8. Based on the faculty input described above in step 5 and on other available materials, the department head forwards a tenure recommendation to the dean, accompanied by an explanation of his or her judgment. All recommendations and unedited written comments of the department's eligible tenured faculty members and the candidate's complete file are also forwarded to the dean (C112.5). If the recommendation of the head differs from that of the faculty members, the head must provide the dean with a written justification.
9. The tenure candidate's file as well as other materials specified in 1 above and a copy of the departmental criteria and standards will be forwarded to the college advisory committee. The committee's specific charge is to ensure that all applicable procedures have been followed and that the department arrives at a recommendation by fairly applying established criteria, standards, and guidelines for tenure. The committee, in advising the dean, will base its recommendation exclusively on a comparison of the candidate's credentials with the criteria, standards, and guidelines of the candidate's department.
10. The committee will report its tenure findings in writing to the dean. The committee's tenure report must specifically contain a statement as to whether or not all applicable procedures were followed. The report must also explain the rationale behind the committee's recommendation by providing a detailed evaluation of the candidate's credentials with regard to how they meet or fail to meet the specific criteria, standards, and/or guidelines of the candidate's department. A minority committee report is required when the committee's recommendation is not unanimous.
11. The dean, after consultation and discussion with the department head and college advisory committee, submits his or her recommendation to the Deans Council, accompanied by the recommendations and unedited written comments of the department head, the departmental faculty, and the college advisory committee; and the departmental promotion criteria documents, no sooner than seven calendar days following notification to the candidate (see C113.3). The recommendation of the dean and the

recommendation of the college advisory committee will be copied to the department head and the candidate.

12. Candidates are to be informed of the college's recommendations no later than seven calendar days prior to when the file and recommendations are forwarded to the Deans Council. Candidates may withdraw from further consideration for tenure by submitting to the dean a written request for withdrawal. This withdrawal must be done within seven calendar days following notification of the college's recommendation, and in this case the candidate's petition for tenure is not forwarded to the Deans Council (C113.4).
13. The Deans Council meeting is chaired by the senior dean (longest serving), and the provost will not be a party to the discussions. The dean of the candidate's college will abstain from voting when the Council votes on the candidate, and notifies the candidate and the candidate's department head of the Council's vote. If the finding of the Deans Council differs from those of the department and/or college dean, written justification must be provided as to how the candidate's credentials meet or fail to meet the departmental criteria, standards and/or guidelines, to the candidate, dean of the candidate's college, and the department head.
14. If the finding of the Deans Council is to not grant tenure, the candidate may appeal this decision to the provost within a period of fourteen calendar days of receiving written notification. If the provost concurs with the finding of the Deans Council to not grant tenure, the candidate then has the option to file a grievance with the General Grievance Board (See *University Handbook*, Appendix G, "Administrative Appeal and Grievance Policy and Hearing Procedures").
15. If the finding of the Deans Council is to grant tenure, the case is then reviewed by the provost. If the provost does not concur with the finding of the Deans Council, then the provost offers to hold a meeting with the candidate, the senior dean (longest serving), and a tenured faculty moderator mutually acceptable to the provost and the candidate, within a period of fourteen calendar days of notification of provost's decision. If no agreement is reached, then the provost provides the candidate, the department head, and the dean of the candidate's college, and the Deans Council, written reasons for the decision. At that point, the candidate has the option to file a grievance with the General Grievance Board (see *University Handbook*, Appendix G).
16. The provost sends his or her recommendation of the cases that are to be granted tenure to the president. Decisions to deny tenure are not forwarded to the president. When the provost's recommendation disagrees with that of the Deans Council, the provost provides a written explanation of her or his judgment to the Deans Council, the dean, the department head, and the candidate.
17. The president has the final authority for granting tenure. Candidates are to be notified when the provost's recommendation to grant tenure is forwarded to the president.

## D. Procedure for Promotion Decisions

The Department of Architecture at K-State uses the following procedure to evaluate the performance of tenured faculty members seeking promotion. This procedure does not include the promotion process for tenure-track faculty members because, in most instances, tenure-track faculty members being considered for tenure will be concurrently considered for promotion.

The steps of the promotion procedure for tenured faculty members are:

1. All faculty members are encouraged to ensure that they communicate their activities and accomplishments to their colleagues through informal and formal means. For tenured faculty approaching promotion, communication with full professors is of particular importance.  
Informal and formal counsel offered by the head and full professors in the months before the time of promotion application should assist the potential candidate in reaching a decision on initiating a formal application for promotion. This counsel should not be construed as a pre-judgment on promotion.
2. By September 15, the head sends a memorandum to the promotion candidate listing key dates and deadlines in the promotion process, including the date by which evaluation materials are due. This memorandum also requests that the promotion candidate schedule an appointment with the head to discuss the evaluation materials that he or she will provide, including recommendations. The head must make sure these materials are available for faculty review *at least fourteen days* before the faculty meeting described in step 5 below.  
In preparing materials for promotion review, candidates must address university documentation guidelines that include a series of questions for which the promotion candidate must summarize professional accomplishments and goals. These guidelines occasionally change, and promotion candidates should go to current guidelines ([www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/index.html](http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/index.html)) to make sure current university requirements and formats are followed.
3. The head also provides the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee with the dates and deadlines for the promotion process. The chair is responsible for soliciting information and evaluations from eligible faculty members. In writing, the chair informs eligible faculty members when the candidate's evaluation materials will be available for review and when eligible faculty members will meet to discuss promotion for the faculty member. "Eligible faculty" is meant colleagues holding a rank equal to or higher than the rank of colleague evaluated.
4. Eligible faculty members review promotion materials.
5. No sooner than *fourteen days* after evaluation materials are made available for review, eligible faculty members, including the department head as a non-voting participant, meet to discuss the promotion of the candidates. This meeting is led by the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, who solicits discussion and commentary on each candidate being evaluated for promotion.
6. At this meeting, the chair also distributes a ballot that elicits each eligible faculty member's evaluation of the performance of each promotion candidate. Within twenty-four hours, the chair also distributes ballots to all eligible faculty members not present at the meeting.
7. The ballot offers three voting choices: "in favor of promotion," "not in favor of promotion," and "abstention." In addition, the ballot provides space for written comments if individual faculty so wish. Participation in the evaluation process is an important faculty responsibility, and all eligible faculty are expected to return ballots. All ballots must be signed and returned to the chair of faculty affairs within



two days of receipt. Unsigned ballots will not be accepted. The chair is responsible for counting these ballots. The ballot vote is confidential in the sense that only the chair sees individual ballot votes and compiles the aggregate count. The chair is also responsible for compiling any written comments from the ballots.

8. Within five days of the meeting described in step 5, the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee forwards to the department head a written summary of faculty discussion and ballot results. The chair also provides the head a copy of a typed transcript of any commentaries provided on the ballot (these commentaries are not to be shared by the candidate and they are not to be seen by other Architecture faculty members). The written summary conveys the vote of the eligible faculty and any other appropriate information the faculty deem important for the head to have in making a promotion recommendation to the dean and provost. The chair places a copy of the ballot tally and written summary in the Department of Architecture office. This written summary does not include any individual commentaries written on the individual ballots. The chair places all ballots in a sealed envelope, which the head delivers to the dean's office to be kept in each candidate's personnel file.
9. Between the time candidates' evaluation materials go on departmental display in step 1 and two days after the meeting described in step 5, eligible faculty members may provide separate written comments to the departmental head on promotion candidates. The head will be the only faculty member in the department to read these commentaries.
10. As required by the University Handbook, any member of the eligible faculty may, prior to the submission of the recommendation of the head, request that a promotion candidate meet with eligible faculty members to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by that candidate (C152.4). This request must be made within three days of the meeting described in step 5.
11. Based on the faculty input described in steps 5-7 and other available materials, the department head forwards a promotion recommendation to the dean. If the recommendation from the head differs from that of the eligible faculty, the head must provide the dean a written justification. The head's promotion recommendation to the dean must include the summary document prepared by the chair of faculty affairs (step 8) and individual ballot commentaries (step 7).
12. The promotion candidate's file as well as other materials specified in 1 above and a copy of the departmental criteria and standards will be forwarded to the college advisory committee. The committee's specific charge is to ensure that all applicable procedures have been followed and that the department arrives at a recommendation by fairly applying established criteria, standards, and guidelines for promotion. The committee, in advising the dean, will base its recommendation exclusively on a comparison of the candidate's credentials with the criteria, standards, and guidelines of the candidate's department.
13. The committee will report its promotion findings in writing to the dean. The committee's promotion report must specifically contain a statement as to whether or not all applicable procedures were followed. The report must also explain the rationale behind the committee's recommendation by providing a detained evaluation of the candidate's credentials with regard to how they meet or fail to meet the specific criteria, standards, and/or guidelines of the candidate's department. A minority committee report is required when the committee's recommendation is not unanimous.

14. The dean, after consultation and discussion with the department head and college advisory committee, submits his or her recommendation to the Deans Council (subject to C153.4) accompanied by the recommendations and unedited written comments of the department head, the departmental faculty, and the college advisory committee, and the departmental promotion criteria documents, no sooner than *seven calendar days* after notification to the candidate (See C153.3). The recommendation of the dean and the recommendation of the college advisory committee are copied to the department head and the candidate.
15. Candidates are informed of the college's recommendations prior to the time the file and recommendations are forwarded to the Deans Council. Candidates may withdraw from further consideration for promotion by submitting to the dean a written request for withdrawal. This must be done within seven calendar days following notification of the college's recommendation, and in this case the candidate's petition for promotion is not forwarded to the Deans Council (C153.4).
16. The Deans Council meeting is chaired by the senior dean (longest serving), and the provost will not be a party to the discussions. The dean of the candidate's college abstains from voting when the Council votes on the candidate, and notifies the candidate and the candidate's department head of the Council's vote. If the finding of the Deans Council differs from those of the department head and/or college dean, written justification must be provided as to how the candidate's credentials meet or fail to meet the departmental criteria, standards and/or guidelines, to the candidate, dean of the candidate's college, and the department head.
17. If the finding of the Deans Council is to not grant promotion, the candidate may appeal this decision to the provost within a period of fourteen calendar days of receiving written notification. If the provost concurs with the finding of the Deans Council to not grant promotion, the candidate then has the option to file a grievance with the General Grievance Board (See *University Handbook*, Appendix G, "Administrative Appeal and Grievance Policy and Hearing Procedures").
18. If the finding of the Deans Council is to grant promotion, the case is then reviewed by the provost. If the provost does not concur with the finding of the Deans Council, then the provost offers to hold a meeting with the candidate, the senior dean (longest serving), and a tenured faculty moderator mutually acceptable to the provost and the candidate, within a period of fourteen calendar days of notification of provost's decision. If no agreement is reached, then the provost provides the candidate, the department head, and the dean of the candidate's college, and the Deans Council, written reasons for the decision. At that point, the candidate has the option to file a grievance with the General Grievance Board (See *University Handbook*, Appendix G).
19. The provost sends his or her recommendation of the cases that are to be granted promotion to the president. Decisions to deny promotion are not forwarded to the president. When the provost's recommendation disagrees with that of the Deans Council, the provost will provide a written explanation of her or his judgment to the Deans Council, the dean, the department head, and the candidate.
20. The president has the final authority for granting promotion. Candidates are to be notified when the provost's recommendation to grant promotions is forwarded to the president.

## E. Post-Tenure Review

The purpose of Kansas State University's post-tenure review is to enhance the continued professional development of tenured faculty. The process aims to encourage intellectual vitality and professional proficiency for all members of the faculty throughout their careers, so they may more effectively fulfill the mission of the university. Post-tenure review is also designed to enhance public trust in the University by ensuring that the faculty community undertakes regular and rigorous efforts to hold all of its members accountable for high professional standards.

Kansas State University recognizes that the granting of tenure for university faculty is a vital protection of free inquiry and open intellectual debate. It is expressly recognized that nothing in post-tenure review alters or amends the University's policies regarding removal of tenured faculty members for cause. Post-tenure review and any actions taken under it are separate from and have no bearing on chronic-low-achievement or annual evaluation policies and procedures.

The University Handbook emphasizes that post-tenure review be "generally developmental and supported by available resources for professional development or a change of professional direction" (Appendix W, 1.a.iii). The Handbook states "Post-tenure review should be flexible enough to acknowledge different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers" (Appendix W, 1.a.iv). The Handbook points out that the standard of appraisal for post-tenure review should not be defined by "whether the faculty member meets the current standards for the award of tenure or promotion" (Appendix W, 1.a.ii).

The post-tenure review process developed by the Department of Architecture follows the overarching purpose, principles, objectives, and procedures in the university policy on post-tenure review, approved by Faculty Senate on February 11, 2014. For the Department of Architecture, the post-tenure review process is organized around the following outline:

1. Post-tenure review evaluation criteria;
2. Post-tenure review materials;
3. Post-tenure review procedure;
4. Post-tenure review scheduling and implementation.

### 1. Post-Tenure Review Evaluation Criteria

The University Handbook emphasizes that each department is to develop specific review standards and requires that, "at a minimum, the post-tenure review should assess the faculty member's strengths and areas for improvement to determine whether he or she is making appropriate contribution to the University or whether additional plans or activities need to be developed" (Appendix W, 2.c).

In developing evaluative criteria for post-tenure review, the Department of Architecture draws on the "basic standard for appraisal" delineated in the University Handbook:

**"Whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position"** (Appendix W, 1.a.ii).

The faculty member's contributions to the University will be deemed "appropriate" so long as:

- the faculty member's classroom performance has been acceptable;
- he or she maintains an ongoing program of research and/or creative work;
- his or her service duties have been carried out.

## **2. Post-Tenure Review Materials**

Materials to be submitted include:

- A statement summarizing the faculty member's professional activities for the evaluation period, organized in terms of teaching, research/creative activity, and service;
- A copy of the faculty member's current curriculum vitae;
- Copies of the faculty member's six most recent annual activity reports (summary statements only);
- Copies of the department head's six most recent performance evaluations of the faculty member.

## **3. Post-Tenure Review Procedure**

- (1) The faculty member submits post-tenure review materials.
- (2) The department head reviews the materials submitted by the faculty member. He or she then writes a summary of the faculty member's strengths and areas for improvement, if any, citing previous annual performance evaluations. The head concludes his or her assessment by selecting one of two statements:

*The faculty member has discharged conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position.*

Or

*A development plan is in place, which outlines additional plans or activities to be undertaken by the faculty member.*

- (3) The department head signs the review and provides the faculty member with two copies.
- (4) The faculty member provides the department head with a signed copy, acknowledging receipt of the review. This copy is placed in the faculty member's file.
- (5) If the department head's review indicates that a development plan is in place, the faculty member schedules a meeting with the head to discuss progress toward any goals set in the plan.
- (6) A copy of the faculty member's post-tenure review written by the head is submitted to the college dean, who ensures that the review was conducted in a manner consistent with departmental and university criteria and procedures.
- (7) The college dean forwards a summary of all post-tenure reviews conducted in the college to the provost.

## **4. Post-Tenure Review Scheduling and Implementation**

- In general, post-tenure review is conducted for tenured faculty every six years and conforms to

the timeline associated with the annual evaluation review as outlined in the University Handbook.

- However, the following shall modify and reset the post-tenure review clock:
  - Application for promotion to full professor;
  - Application for a Professorial Performance Award (PPA) (University Handbook C49);
  - Receipt of a substantial college, university, national or international award requiring multi-year portfolio-like documentation—e.g., University Distinguished Professor, University Distinguished Teaching Scholar, an endowed chair or other national/international awards (see list of faculty awards, <http://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/natlawards.html>).
- The schedule for post-tenure review is delayed for one year to accommodate sabbatical leave, a major health issue, or some other compelling reason, provided that both the faculty member and department head approve the delay.
- If the faculty member has already been identified as not meeting minimum standards according to the policies and department procedures relating to chronic low achievement, that process shall serve in lieu of post-tenure review.
- Those who have formally announced their retirement through a written letter to the department head, or have begun phased retirement, are exempt from post-tenure review.
- In implementing post-tenure review, faculty members who have the longest running post-tenure review clock will be reviewed first. Implementation will continue by incorporating faculty each year thereafter until all are through the post-tenure review process.

## IV. APPENDIX

### Approval History of Department of Architecture Faculty Policy and Procedure Documents

#### Original Document

Approved by Architecture Faculty 1 March 1994

#### Modification to Annual Evaluation Process

Approved by Architecture Faculty 5 November 1996; revised and updated in accordance with *University Handbook*, 5 March 2004; revised and updated in accordance with *University Handbook*, 17 October 2011.

#### Final draft of Evaluative Guidelines for Chronic Low Achievement

Approved by Architecture Faculty 11 November 1997; revised and updated in accordance with *University Handbook*, 5 March 2004; revised and updated in accordance with *University Handbook*, 17 October 2011.

#### Modification to Reappointment Procedures

Approved by Architecture Faculty 16 March 1999; revised and updated in accordance with *University Handbook*, 22 August 2006; revised and updated in accordance with *University Handbook*, 17 October 2011.

#### Modification to Tenure Procedures

Approved by Architecture Faculty 5 March 2002; revised and updated in accordance with *University Handbook*, 22 August 2006; revised and updated in accordance with *University Handbook*, 17 October 2011.

#### Modification to Promotion Procedures

Approved by Architecture Faculty 16 April 2002; revised and updated in accordance with *University Handbook*, 22 August 2006; revised and updated in accordance with *University Handbook*, 17 October 2011.

#### Evaluative Guidelines for Professorial Performance Awards

Approved by Architecture Faculty 9 May 2006; revised and updated in accordance with *University Handbook*, 17 October 2011.

#### Five-Year Review

Full document updated and approved by the Department of Architecture Faculty 17 October 2011.

Five-year document received from Provost Office 2 April 2012; request for additions.

Five-year review revised and approved by Department of Architecture Faculty 9 October 2012.

Revised five-year review approved by Provost Office 28 February 2013.

#### Addition of Post-Tenure Review Policy

Approval by Architecture Faculty 22 April 2014.