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RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LA | RCP REVIEWS AND EVALUATIONS

ANNUAL REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION & TENURE REVIEWS

preliminary goals + objectives

definition of teaching, scholarship and service strategy

ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

YEAR 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  .  .  .
INTRODUCTION
The annual Faculty Evaluation provides an opportunity for the faculty member and department head to reflect upon the faculty member’s accomplishments and challenges during the year. The intent is to provide assessment that rewards achievement and assists with improving shortcomings. Each faculty member will submit their evaluation materials by the University deadline (typically the end of the second week in January immediately following the year to be evaluated) on the flash drive provided by the department. The flash drive is property of the department and is to be used only for transmitting evaluation materials. The department head’s evaluation of the materials will be provided to the faculty member prior to a meeting to review the evaluation materials and discuss the goals for the upcoming year.

The evaluation system utilizes a six-point scale based on expectations for performance within the ranks.

1.0 Unacceptable
2.0 Performance has fallen below minimum levels of productivity
3.0 Performance falls below expectations but meets minimum acceptable levels of productivity
4.0 Performance meets expectations agreed upon by faculty member and Department
5.0 Performance exceeded expectations agreed upon by faculty member and Department Head
6.0 Extraordinary performance; superlative/without equal

There are five parts to the evaluation document:

Part 1, Strategy: A one page statement prepared by the faculty member providing an overview of the faculty member’s strategy for teaching, scholarship, service and, if appropriate, professional activity and/or administration.

Part 2, Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarship and Creative Endeavors, Public and Institutional Service, Professional Activity: The faculty member’s self-report of annual activities supported by university approved teaching evaluations, examples of student work, reappointment/promotion and tenure documentation (if appropriate).

Part 3, Department Head Assessment: Assessment of each category is made by a statement and by an assigned point value on the six-point scale related to the written evaluation. The Department Head has the authority to assign any value, including non-whole numbers, between 1.0 and 6.0. At the end of the “Summary Evaluation,” an overall assessment is made which is the sum of the points awarded to each category weighted to reflect the percentage assigned by the faculty member and approved by the Department Head for each category in the previous year’s Faculty Evaluation. When merit-based salary increases are available, the Department Head will employ the “Summary Evaluation” scores to determine salary increase distribution according to the following guidelines:

Those faculty deserving of merit increases will be identified.

The group of faculty identified in the first step will be divided into thirds/tiers based upon summary scores.

The top third/tier faculty will receive a greater percentage merit-based salary increase than the middle third/tier faculty who will receive a greater percentage merit-based salary increase than the lower third/tier faculty.
Part 4, Teaching and Professional Objectives for the subsequent calendar year: Statement to include the percentage of time allotted to each category is drafted by the faculty member and finalized by the Department Head.

Part 5, Department Head’s Summary and Directions: The department head’s summary comments combined with Part 4 comprise the faculty member’s assignment, goals and objectives for the subsequent year.

Note: It is important to realize that Kansas State University has made an educational commitment to its students and faculties and to the citizens of Kansas. This commitment emphasizes:

- teaching excellence;
- research with relevance to the university and the department’s mission;
- efforts to make original intellectual or artistic contributions through scholarship;
- inclusion of scholarship into the classroom;
- service to the university, to our respective professions, and to the public or broader communities;
- and the use of updated technology for the delivery of teaching, research, and service.

The directions and expectations stated in the previous year’s evaluation will have a direct impact on the evaluation for the subsequent year.
The following materials should be included in the appropriate folders on your annual evaluation flash drive:

☐ Faculty Evaluation, completed Parts 1 and 2 and draft of Part 4.

☐ Support Materials
  o Research, scholarship and creative activity documents

☐ University Approved Teaching Evaluations
  o PDFs for each class taught (excepting report, thesis and dissertation credits LAR 705, LAR 899 and PLAN 899) are to be included in your submittal. Comments from students are helpful in the evaluation process.

☐ Mentoring Meeting Report(s), PDF of signed report(s); see departmental mentoring policies (at the end of this document) for more information regarding these reports.

The following materials are to be uploaded to the college Resource Space digital asset management system, tagged with the keywords **eval20__ (year of evaluation) and your last name**.

☐ At least three examples of student work for each class taught, including:
  o Images
  o Problem statements
  o Supplemental information
PART 1. STRATEGY
Please provide a one page introduction summarizing your overall strategy related to teaching, scholarship, service and, if appropriate, professional activities and/or administration. Bulleted lists and concise statements are appropriate.
PART 2. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS, SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ENDEAVORS, PUBLIC AND INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE, PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY:
(Except for “Workload Assignments” table, to be completed by Faculty Member, % of assignment from PART 4 of previous year’s evaluation.)

I. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS:
Service Code A: Undergraduate Instruction (%)
Service Code B: Graduate Instruction (%)
Service Code C: Academic Advising of Undergraduate Students (%)
Service Code D: Academic Advising of Graduate Students (%)

A. Workload Assignments: Provided by department head and confirmed by faculty member.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cr. Hrs.</th>
<th>Cont. Hrs.</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>UG or G</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Other Faculty</th>
<th>Share of FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 20__</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 20__</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 20__</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following sections of Part 2 are to be completed by faculty member. If applicable, the faculty member may use an updated reappointment document. The referenced sections (http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/promotion.pdf) may be used as the record for the remainder of Part 2.

B. Student Advisement and Supervision:
1. Names of graduate advisees (Major Professor): (or reappointment binder, section IV.A.)
2. Names of graduate advisees (Minor Professor): (or reappointment binder, section IV.A.)
3. Other advising responsibilities: (or reappointment binder, section IV.A.)

C. Participation in classes outside the department, college or university: (or reappointment binder, section IV.A.)

D. Teaching Awards:

E. Other:

II. RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ENDEAVORS:
Service Code E: Departmentally Funded Scholarship (_%)
Service Code F: Other Funded Scholarship (_%)
A. Title and Brief Description of Grant Proposals Submitted, denote those funded with an * (provide complete list here if not in reappointment binder, section V.C.)

B. Publications in Past Year, denote those accepted by peer-review: (or reappointment binder, section V.B.)
   1. Abstracts
   2. Conference proceedings
   3. Journals
   4. Professional publications

C. Professional Lectures, Workshops, Papers, Panels given: (provide complete list here if not in P&T outline reappointment binder, section V.B.)

D. Participation in Design Competitions: (or reappointment binder, section V.B.)

E. Juried Exhibitions: (or reappointment binder, section V.B.)

F. Research, Scholarship and/or Creative Activities Awards:

G. Other Research, Scholarship and/or Creative Activities:

III. PUBLIC AND INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE:
Service Code G: Public Service (_%)
Service Code H: University/Department Service (_%)

A. University Service:
   1. Committee Assignments (denote leadership roles): (or reappointment binder, section VI.)
   2. Faculty Senate, Graduate Council, etc.: (or reappointment binder, section VI.)
   3. Other:

B. Professional Service:
   1. Memberships, denote leadership roles:
   2. Promotion of Profession:

C. Community Service:
   1. Description of Community Service Projects: (or reappointment binder, section VI.)
   2. Involvement in Community Organizations: (or reappointment binder, section VI.)

D. Honors and Awards

IV. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY:
Service Code I: Professional Service (_%)
Service Code J: Professional Development (_%)

A. Professional Service and/or Consultation activities:

B. Professional Awards: (V.B)
C. Attendance at Professional Conferences:

D. Other Professional Development Activities:

V. ADMINISTRATION: ( _%)
Service Code L: Academic Administration

SUMMARY COMMENTS:
Statement addressing how you satisfied your “Teaching and Professional Objectives” for this evaluation period. Reference objectives stated in last evaluation, self-stated objectives and department head comments, and refer to your overall strategy related to teaching, scholarship and service. (Maximum three pages.)
PART 3. DEPARTMENT HEAD ASSESSMENT
To be completed by Department Head

SUMMARY EVALUATION
Statements by Department Head: Code areas reviewed based upon “Teaching and Professional Objectives for Calendar Year 20__.”

Teaching
Service Code A: Undergraduate Instruction
Service Code B: Graduate Instruction
Service Code C: Academic Advising of Undergraduate Students
Service Code D: Academic Advising of Graduate Students

Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities
Service Code E: Departmentally Funded Scholarship
Service Code F: Other Funded Scholarship

Service
Service Code G: Public Service
Service Code H: University/Department Service

Professional Activity
Service Code I: Professional Service
Service Code J: Professional Development

Administration
Service Code L: Academic Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>% Weight</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Undergraduate Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Graduate Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Academic Advising - Undergraduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Academic Advising - Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Departmentally Funded Scholarship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Other funded Scholarship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Public Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. University/Departmental Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Professional Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Academic Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilizing the evaluation system described in the introduction, the overall evaluation for 20__ is ____
PART 4. TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL OBJECTIVES FOR CALENDAR YEAR 20__

Initial draft to be prepared by the Faculty Member and finalized by the Department Head. Objectives should be described in sufficient detail that their outcomes are measurable.

I. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS:
Service Code A: Undergraduate Instruction (%)
Service Code B: Graduate Instruction (%)
Service Code C: Academic Advising of Undergraduate Students (%)
Service Code D: Academic Advising of Graduate Students (%)

II. RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, OTHER CREATIVE ACTIVITY:
Service Code E: Departmentally Funded Scholarship (%)
Service Code F: Other Funded Scholarship (%)

III. PUBLIC AND INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE:
Service Code G: Public Service (%)
Service Code H: University/Department Service (%)

IV. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES:
Service Code I: Professional Service (%)
Service Code J: Professional Development (%)

V. ADMINISTRATION:
Service Code L: Academic Administration (%)

PART 5. DEPARTMENT HEAD’S SUMMARY AND DIRECTIONS FOR 20__.
To be completed by Department Head

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The annual written review is used to support recommendations for merit salary increases and to plan future commitments to the department. The report is based on each faculty member’s self-evaluation and on other data, and it is reviewed by each individual faculty member. A signature is required to acknowledge the opportunity for review and does not necessarily signify agreement.

_________________________________________  _________________________________________
Faculty Member                                  Department Head
Date:________________________________________  Date:___________________________
INTRODUCTION
The Department of Landscape Architecture/Regional and Community Planning believes its mission as a unit within The College of Architecture, Planning and Design is reflected in the contributions of individual members of its faculty. These contributions fall into three broad areas: (1) teaching students through professional direction in the classroom and studio; (2) research, scholarship and creative activities that extend the department’s academic and professional capabilities; and (3) service and leadership to the college, university, professional societies and the public in general. Civility, in the form of responsible college citizenship, courtesy and respect for others, and the stewardship of students and emerging faculty is expected in carrying out these duties. The following descriptions address the venues of achievement recognized by the department. The level or degree of achievement required for promotion to each rank is addressed in sections specific to those topics.

TEACHING AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT
Competency in teaching is a base criterion for tenure. Candidates for tenure are expected to be skilled teachers at all appropriate program levels, using standards agreed upon by the tenured faculty and the national accreditation organizations. Department and college-wide standards include excellence in classroom teaching, in non-classroom settings, in academic and professional standards, in professional relations with students, and in the scholarship of teaching.

While faculty tend to focus on a specialization most often formed from their academic and professional backgrounds and interest, they must be conversant with the broad content of the landscape architecture and planning professions and be able to make reinforcing connections between their subject courses and other subject offerings. Teaching assignments often shift within a person’s general area of interest and expertise. This may be especially true in planning because of the need for a relatively small number of faculty to cover the breadth of the profession. Thus, both versatility and specialization are to be valued along with a capacity for cooperation and collegiality in sustaining an effective ensemble of teachers. Versatility demands both an ability to cover more than one subject area and broad instructional range, i.e. the ability to teach beginning, advanced, undergraduate and graduate classes and to participate as major professors and members of masters’ thesis, report, and project committees.

Departmental Review of Teaching and Student Activity
The indicators of achievement for teaching, not in any priority ranking, are listed below. For teaching, progression and growth is more important than the number of indicators engaged. Whatever indicators are presented, two points are central to review of faculty performance:

1. Because teaching occurs in many ways and in many settings, its evaluation should encompass the full range of a faculty member’s activities.
2. Teaching is more than the instruction of students. Competency in teaching must also include a faculty member’s integrity, treatment of student and care for their careers, and the critical need for collegiality that creates an atmosphere conducive to cooperative learning.

To document skill in teaching a faculty member may present the following evidence:

Evaluations:
- External and internal peer evaluations including all departmental tenured faculty members (to be arranged between the faculty member and the department chair)
- Standardized, written teaching evaluations (required by the university)
Evidence of teaching activities:
• Videotaped classroom activities
• Sample syllabi, with a discussion of learning activities and sample student work
• Online courses, distance learning and computer aided teaching that indicates skill in technological adaptations for pedagogy
• Specialized work for students such as independent studies and directed readings
• Written reports on interns supervised
• Results of student mentoring for project activity, advising, thesis and/or report supervision
• The development and implementation of a new course or a significant redesign of a course

Honors and awards:
• Honors, awards, grants, or mentions for teaching, studio, or class based projects

Professional development activities:
• Participation in professional development or skill enhancement training courses, workshops, study tours, or seminars. Achievement of or progress towards licensure or certification in the faculty member’s field(s) of expertise.

And any other evidence illustrating a faculty member’s particular skills and strengths in pedagogy and classroom related activities.

RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, CREATIVE ACTIVITY: SCHOLARLY PUBLICATION, CREATIVE, PROFESSIONAL AND ARTISTIC ACHIEVEMENT

Landscape architects and community planners conceive and undertake research and scholarship in a variety of ways. Research is a directed form of scholarship involving assembly, documentation, and dissemination of information. Research efforts may be classified as either extramural within a competitive field for funding, or as non-competitive that eventually leads to scholarly publication or presentation. Within both fields, contributions that advance the discipline in the form of creative activities and professional growth are characterized as a form of scholarship. Creative activities and professional growth are peer-judged endeavors that receive recognition external to the university. Rigorous peer recognition of creative work is regarded as analogous to scholarly publication.

The central question is whether a faculty member documents evidence of continued and qualitative intellectual, professional and artistic growth in ways appropriate to their professional interests, expertise and departmental role, and whether products of this growth are being communicated to appropriate audiences outside the department. Due to the professional nature of the field, landscape architecture and community planning faculty may be less highly specialized than in the arts and sciences, but are expected to make significant contributions to the advancement of some area(s) of landscape architecture/community planning inquiry or expertise. The important questions are:

1. To what extent is the work recognized in the field?
2. To what extent has it had or is expected to have an impact on others in the field?
3. To what extent is it seen by peer reviewers as substantive and significant?

The peer review of landscape architecture and community planning research, scholarly, professional and creative work requires a process specific to the nature and mix of the faculty member’s work. Publication in both disciplines often takes the form of research reports, agency publications, and monographs that generally require peer review as a condition of agency support.
Department review of research, scholarship and other creative activity
The indicators of achievement for research and scholarship are listed below and they are not in any priority ranking.

Presentations:
- Presentation(s) and/or panel participation in regional workshops or conferences
- Presentation(s) at regional and national academic and professional society meetings
- Poster presentation(s) at national conferences
- Invited topic speaker or paper/project presentation(s) at regional, national or international conferences

Publications:
- Peer or non-peer selected publications in conference proceedings
- Peer or non-peer reviewed publications as book chapters, edited works, or texts
- Research studies, scholarly monographs and/or reports – either funded or non-funded

Professional publications and products:
- Desktop publications intended for dissemination at the local or regional level
- Peer-reviewed grants, commissions, plans, professional reports, professional monographs, studies, articles, methodologies, professional consultations
- Political acceptance of proposed plans and policies and other evidence of environmental or comprehensive planning and design influence

Refereed publications:
- Peer-reviewed, single or multiple authored publication(s) in scholarly and/or professional journals

Evidence of creative endeavors:
- A portfolio of creative or professional projects and studies demonstrating distinctive practice appraised by qualified evaluators external to the university
- Competitively refereed, juried, and awarded recognition through design competitions, juried exhibitions, and selection for competitive awards and residencies.

Honors and awards:
- Scholarly and peer recognition for outstanding intellectual contributions
- Class or student awards, honors, or mentions under the direction or co-direction of the faculty member being considered for tenure and promotion
- Professional awards, honors, and mentions

Professional development activities:
- Participation(s) in college/university workshops and conferences and continuing education activities
- Achievement of professional licensure.

SERVICE AND LEADERSHIP
All faculty members have a responsibility to play a role in university life, college and departmental governance, and professional service. In professional programs, service can contribute to the visibility and perceived value of a department or discipline through the execution of specialized projects, collaboration with other disciplines on campus and through service activities provided to professional and scholarly societies. In addition to impacting the visibility and reputation of the department, these activities can also make positive contributions to the faculty member’s reputation and skill set.

The service activities of the landscape architecture and planning faculty are often closely related to professional growth, scholarship and teaching. Faculty members actively engage in work to aid efforts to
solve environmental problems in Kansas and surrounding states through pro bono consultations and community based projects. Because faculty members at Kansas State University play a strong role in department governance and program development, it is especially important in evaluations to give appropriate consideration to particular faculty assignments in this area.

Faculty members also have the opportunity to provide support to their professions by serving as officers and as members of boards dealing with governance, professional testing, licensing and certification, and program accreditation at regional, state and national levels. Service of this type places them in leadership positions that impact future practitioners. In addition, these service activities give faculty members the opportunity to expand their department’s visibility, their own status and reputation, and help connect the department and its disciplines with their respective professions. These connections are important to professional programs, their students, and the professional growth of the individual departmental member, and they should be given considerable weight in assessing a faculty member’s contribution.

Departmental Review of Service Activities
The indicators of achievement for service are listed below and they are not in any priority ranking. Significant achievement is more important than the number of indicators engaged.

Department, college and university service and leadership:
• Member or chair of standing or ad-hoc college committee
• Member or chair of standing or ad-hoc departmental committee
• Member or chair of standing or ad-hoc university committee
• Leadership in university governance
• Evidence of involvement in other activities that contribute to the good of university or community

Mentoring:
• Mentor to younger faculty members
• Mentor or advisor to student groups and organizations

Professional society service and leadership:
• Active membership in professional organizations
• Leadership in professional organizations related to the practice of the respective disciplines
• Leadership in scholarly societies and teaching organizations in the respective fields
• Participation in regional and national professional society meetings

Community, regional, state and national service and leadership:
• Service to local community that directly reflects professional expertise
• Service to state or regional organizations which directly reflect professional expertise
• Consultations with public and private groups not leading to publications or design products
• Direction of class projects that benefit communities while demonstrating a faculty member’s expertise in management and professional judgment

THE TENURE PROCESS
Initial Information
Two things related to the tenure and promotion process will be part of the initial employment of all faculty: the department head will provide a copy of this document to all tenure track faculty and discuss the anticipated instructional, scholarship and service responsibilities that the candidate will be expected to fulfill.

If the candidate accepts the position with the department, this briefing will be put in writing and will become part of the basis for annual evaluation and, later, in the tenure and promotion review. It is only reasonable that on occasion, shifts in assignments may take place and faculty may be asked to pursue endeavors that take them away from their research, scholarly or creative work in favor of a more immediate need in the department or one of its programs. In such a case, the shift in assignment and the resulting impact on the faculty member’s ability to pursue their special interest should be noted by the faculty member and acknowledged by the department head at the time of the next annual review.
Progress toward Tenure and Promotion
Not only is it imperative that all faculty members have a clear understanding of the expectations for their performance as they move toward tenure and promotion, but it is equally important that they understand the process to attain tenure and promotion in rank. The following steps address procedures at the departmental level designed to ensure that candidates for tenure and promotions are kept advised of their progress toward those goals. These processes do not address University or year to year changes in the University Handbook and so each faculty member should remain familiar with this online guide (refer to: http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/fhbook/).
For information on suggested university deadlines refer to: http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/depthead/master.html.

Mentoring
The department head, in consultation with senior and new faculty, will establish a mentoring partnership between a senior faculty and a new employee with an expectation that the mentor will provide appropriate assistance in acclimating the new faculty to processes and procedures within the department and/or university. The mentor serves as an advisor to the new faculty member and should be knowledgeable of the faculty’s progress toward tenure and advancement in rank. The mentor/mentee relationship will be addressed in the annual evaluation of each and the department head may appoint a different mentor at the request of either party. Since mentee/mentor meeting notes are included in annual evaluations, mentee/mentor meeting notes from the final three years prior to submittal of the academic portfolio will be included in the final review of candidate work. See the department Mentoring Non-Tenured Policies for further information (page 31, below).

Mid-Tenure Review
Unless otherwise stated in the candidate's contract, the mid-probationary review shall take place during the third year of appointment. In addition to the procedures outlined in C92.2 of the University Handbook, the Mid-Tenure Review in our department includes an oral presentation to the entire department faculty prior to the tenured faculty vote. The mid-tenure review provides the faculty member with substantive feedback from faculty colleagues and administrators regarding his or her accomplishments relative to departmental tenure criteria. A positive mid-probationary review does not insure that tenure will be granted in the future nor does a negative review mean that tenure will be denied.
C92.2 of the University Handbook states that procedures for the mid-probationary review are similar to procedures for the tenure review and are established by the departmental faculty in consultation with the department head and the dean. The candidate prepares a mid-tenure portfolio following the university’s outline for Promotion and Tenure documents. The department head is responsible for making the candidate's mid-tenure portfolio 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, mentee reports documenting recommendations made by the candidate’s mentor year to year, 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 tenured faculty. The department head must discuss the review and assessment of the tenured faculty members in the department with the dean, and shall provide a letter of assessment to the candidate, including a summary of faculty comments and suggestions. (See C35 regarding confidentiality of peer evaluations see also Appendix G). 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.
C92.4 College procedures. The candidate's mid-probationary review file as well as other materials specified in C92.2, and a copy of the departmental criteria and standards will be forwarded to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee. C153.1 is incorporated herein by reference as the evaluation procedure to be followed by the Tenure and Promotion Committee. The dean will provide a letter of assessment to the candidate that includes a summary of recommendations from the college advisory committee.
At Time of Tenure and Promotion
A faculty member undergoing review for tenure and promotion to associate professor, or from associate to professor, must prepare a portfolio for evaluation by the department’s tenured faculty, the department head, the dean of the college and outside reviewers. The portfolio is a compilation of representative materials that support the candidate’s request for tenure and/or promotion and is based on the requirements and procedures contained in the University Handbook sections C151 – C152.5. In addition to the procedures outlined in these sections of the University Handbook, the Tenure and Promotion Review in our department includes an oral presentation to the entire department faculty prior to the tenured faculty vote.

C153.1 of the University Handbook sets forth the evaluation procedure to be followed by the college advisory committee. The dean will provide a letter of assessment to the candidate that includes a summary of recommendations from the college advisory committee.

Portfolio Content, Procedure and Responsible Party
The candidate’s portfolio is to be organized following the university Promotion and Tenure Transmittal documentation format found at http://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/forms/promotio.html.

It is important to note that the faculty member should be selective in choosing materials for their final Tenure and Promotion (T&P) portfolio. This is best done by providing information and materials most relevant to one’s individual responsibilities, interests, objectives, and accomplishments. For example: If one did not play the major role in developing a course they would generally be advised to not provide the syllabus for this course in their final T&P portfolio. If they receive letters of support (solicited or otherwise) from students, other faculty, or other parties they would not place these letters in their final T&P portfolio. In both cases, such work may be included in earlier T&P documents, but such items are generally seen as non-essential in the final T&P portfolio (padding the submission as opposed to focusing reviewers on essential primary and supporting statements and evidence).

Guidelines for the Organization and Format of the Tenure and Promotion Materials with Additions Specific to the Department of LARCP

I. Cover Sheet
   Recommendation by the Department Head (University form to be completed by the Department Head)

II. Description of Responsibilities during Evaluation Period (to be completed by the Department Head prior to development of this portfolio)

III. Statement by Candidate
   A. Candidate’s statement of accomplishments
   B. Statement of Five-Year Goals

IV. Instructional Contribution
   A. Statement of activities (classes taught, student advisement, etc.)
   B. Evidence of instructional quality (student ratings, peer evaluations, evaluation of advisement, etc.)
   C. Other evidence of scholarship and creativity that promote excellence in instruction (multimedia presentations, computer-aided instruction, papers published or presented)

V. Research and Other Creative Endeavors
   A. One page statement
   B. Listing of research publications and creative achievements
   C. List of grants and contracts
VI. Service Contributions (two page summary)

VII. Cooperative Extension (not applicable to LARCP)

VIII. External Letters (see guidelines in text following outline, external letters are not solicited in Reappointment or Mid-Tenure Reviews)
   A. External letters of evaluation
   B. Student letters of support
   C. External letters of support

IX. Other Summary Information Considered Pertinent by the College (not applicable to LARCP)

X. Supporting Documents
   A. Teaching Evaluations
      For candidates seeking tenure and promotion to associate professor, copies of standardized teaching evaluations for all semesters at Kansas State must be included. For candidates to full professor, standardized teaching evaluations for at least the preceding three years must be included – supplied by the candidate;
   B. A copy of the candidate’s annual reviews by the department head for at least the preceding three years – supplied by the department head;
   C. A copy of the candidate’s annual reappointment letters and tenured faculty comments for every year of their probationary period.
   D. Examples of student work, reports and projects;
   E. Reprints and/or Manuscripts;
   F. Evidence of Creative Endeavors;
   G. Professional development (as needed or required for each individual faculty member’s expertise or area[s] of specialization);
   H. Other Materials
      Ballots and accompanying rationale from all faculty voting in the review. Associate and full professors evaluate candidates for associate professor and full professors evaluate candidates for full professor – facilitated by the department head or a designated faculty member;
   I. Detailed Curriculum Vitae

C92.3 Comments also may be solicited from relevant faculty members in the college or university, and from outside reviewers. Letters from former students, other KSU faculty members, and other outside reviewers may be suggested by the candidate but the formal request for a letter of support from such individuals will come directly from the department head. At the time of tenure review, the candidate will be asked to submit a list of three potential “external peer reviewers” to the department head. The department head will provide a list of three “external peer reviewers” to the candidate to review for potential conflict of interest or concerns. If there is a conflict of interest or significant concern, the name would be documented, the name removed from the department head’s list, and another acceptable external peer reviewer selected. The department head will select four “final external peer reviewers” who will remain anonymous to the candidate. The department head will contact the external peer reviewers and take responsibility for forwarding the candidate’s materials and gathering the outside reviewer’s comments. It should be noted that the external peer reviews are seen as very important to the process and thus deserve special attention by both the candidate and the department head.
For Consideration of Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor with Indefinite Tenure

The granting of tenure and promotion to associate professor is recognized as an indication of a career commitment on the part of the university to an individual faculty member. According to the University Handbook: C100.1

There can be no simple list of accomplishments that, when achieved, guarantee that a faculty member will obtain tenure. Instead, tenure is granted. This action, taken by the Kansas Board of Regents, is based on the assessment of the tenured faculty of the university 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.

Tenure and promotion to associate professor, therefore, should be based upon clear evidence of the potential for sustained contribution and leadership over a candidate’s career. There should be evidence of continuous intellectual inquiry and professional development of sufficient quality to provide a basis of confidence in future growth and performance. Professional achievement(s) should also be considered significant, especially when related to professional growth, scholarship and influence. C140 of the University Handbook states:

C140 General Principles. [The] Successful candidates for promotion will demonstrate superior professional accomplishment and excellence in the performance of their assigned duties. The assessment of a faculty member’s performance upon which a recommendation regarding promotion will be based must reflect the professional expectations conveyed during annual evaluation.

Evidence of achievement for promotion to associate professor with indefinite tenure will vary, depending upon a faculty member’s professional interests and role in the department. There are distinct expectations for faculty members engaged in traditional academic endeavors and for those focused on professional practice-related practical and integrative problem solving. However, all landscape architecture, and regional and community planning faculty are expected to engage in written scholarship and/or creative work. The expectations addressed in a candidate’s initial hiring and in subsequent annual evaluations will serve as the foundation for this review.

For Consideration of Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

For promotion to the rank of professor there is the expectation of continued and clear evidence of significant contribution to the professional development of the individual and enhancement of the department’s reputation. As noted in the University Handbook in section C120

Faculty members may expect to advance through the academic ranks on the basis of demonstrated individual merit in relation to their association with the university’s mission and with their own disciplines. Each higher rank demands a higher level of accomplishment.

The aforementioned standards and criteria continue to apply in evaluating this ongoing contribution. Particular attention should be given to special contributions that markedly and creatively enhance the growth and quality of the Department’s programs and outreach, including achievements while serving as head.

For this level of advancement there should be evidence of leadership and broad reputation in one or more areas of the candidate’s field. Advancement to professor will reflect a faculty member’s acknowledged excellence and achievements significant to landscape architecture or regional and community planning, such as research, scholarship, creative activities, professional practice, professional service and outreach. Criteria for promotion include both those achievements listed earlier and the following indicators:

Evaluations:

- Recognition as a reputable scholar in evaluations by other senior faculty and professionals in the field.
- Recognition among designers, professionals or public officials as a leading innovator.
Publications and products:
- Solicitations to write or contribute to major scholarly books and compilations of important ideas and/or historical compendia.
- Solicitations to write or contribute to professional monographs, studies, articles, methodologies.
- Single or joint authored articles in journals widely recognized by landscape architects and planners as leading sources of scholarly or professional practice information, and/or innovative teaching practice.
- Publication of books, reports or articles recognized to be innovative or of strong or seminal value in advancing the field.
- Editorship of peer-reviewed journals or monograph series in the field.
- Serving regularly as a peer reviewer for scholarly journals.
- Solicitations to consult or lead in solving major (i.e., important and/or high-profile) planning, design and policy problems.
- High placement in major design competitions; honors, awards, and mentions from major design competitions.
- Recognition of creative work at a national or international level through inclusion in juried exhibits, selection for competitive awards, and residencies (such work may include awards or recognition for the creation of digital tools and/or techniques as well as other creative works).

Presentations:
- Invited plenary speeches to regional or national level conferences.
- Invited testimony before elected officials’ committees.

Honors and awards:
- Awards from professional, scholarly and government organizations.
- Design and planning awards of disciplines especially at a national level.
- Service on juries for major design, professional, or research award competitions.
- University and national recognition awards for teaching, service, achievement, or scholarship.

Service:
- Election to regional or national level office in professional and scholarly organizations and demonstrated evidence of substantial contributions.
Per the University Handbook (C50.1), faculty members on probationary appointments within the Department of Landscape Architecture/Regional and Community Planning are evaluated annually to determine whether or not they will be reappointed for another year. (For “Standards of Notice of Non-Reappointment” refer to C162.3 and Appendix A of the University Handbook). The annual LA/RCP Academic Portfolio review serves as an opportunity to provide feedback to a faculty member on probationary appointment about his/her performance in comparison to the department's criteria and standards for tenure.

The LA/RCP candidate compiles an Academic Portfolio of professional accomplishments in accordance with departmental criteria, standards, and guidelines. (See C52 Candidate's responsibilities and LA/RCP “Promotion and Tenure Guidelines” and note that the Academic Portfolio is also called a reappointment, mid-tenure, or final promotion and tenure document by the department).

The LA/RCP department head makes the candidate's reappointment file available to all tenured faculty members in the department who are considered by the LA/RCP Department to be “eligible faculty.”

Per the University Handbook (C53.2) the cumulative record of written recommendations from previous reappointment meetings and reviews are made available to LA/RCP’s eligible faculty.

As part of this process, the LA/RCP department head and the eligible faculty meet at least fourteen calendar days after the review documents are made available to discuss the candidate's eligibility for reappointment and progress toward tenure. Subsequent to this meeting there is a ballot of the eligible faculty on reappointment of the candidate. Any member of the eligible faculty may, prior to the submission of any recommendation to the department head, request the candidate meet with the eligible faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate.

The LA/RCP department head forwards a written recommendation and accompanying explanations to the dean, along with the candidate's complete file, the majority recommendation and unedited written comments of each of the department's tenured faculty members (C53.3).

The LA/RCP department head also meets with the candidate to discuss the separate issue of the candidate's progress toward tenure. The department head's written recommendation and accompanying explanations alone are made available to the candidate and become part of the candidate's reappointment file. (Refer to C35 regarding confidentiality of peer evaluations.)

The Dean of the College of Architecture, Planning, and Design (APD) along with the recommendation of the department head and, on behalf of the college, forwards his/her written recommendation and accompanying explanation to the university provost, along with the majority recommendation and any written comments (unedited) of eligible LARCP faculty members. This written recommendation includes the recommendation of the department head.

Per the University Handbook final authority in resolving conflicting opinions regarding reappointment of an LA/RCP candidate is delegated to the provost (C55 University procedures). LA/RCP candidates are informed of the college's recommendation prior to the time that the file and recommendations are forwarded to the provost (C56 Notification of candidates).
LA/RCP Departmental Requirements for Submittal of an Academic Portfolio
See University Handbook (C52 Candidate's responsibilities).
Non-Tenured faculty within the Department of Landscape Architecture/Regional and Community Planning on Probationary Appointments are required:

- To annually develop and submit their Academic Portfolio in a timely manner to the department head following Kansas State University’s calendar for Promotion and Tenure submittals. (Note that these submittals are distinct from, but are supported by, annual faculty evaluation submissions.); and
- The Academic Portfolio must follow the University Guidelines for the Organization and Format of the Tenure and Promotion Materials.

Non-Tenured LARCP faculty on a Probationary Appointment should familiarize themselves with the department’s most current Tenure and Promotion Guidelines.
GUIDELINES FOR MINIMUM YEARLY EXPECTATIONS OF REVIEW FOR TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS
Adopted 12 May 1997
Readopted 11 May 2006
Readopted 28 April 2011
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Introduction
A necessary precondition of a strong faculty is that it has a first-hand concern with its own membership. This is properly reflected both in appointment to and in separation from the university community when the faculty agree on their several functions and complementary roles. The fundamental responsibilities of faculty members as teachers and scholars include maintenance of competence in their area(s) of specialization and the exhibition of professional competence in the classroom, studio or laboratory, and in the public arena through activities such as discussions, lectures, consulting, publications and participation in professional organizations and meetings.

A “performance has fallen below minimum acceptable level” evaluation is an indication of failure on the part of a tenured faculty member to adequately perform the prime duties of teaching, scholarship, service, and collegiality mutually agreed upon by the university community and the members of the academic unit, see UHB C31.5.

Minimum Acceptable Level of Productivity
Each faculty member will be evaluated on the basis of achievement in the areas of teaching and professional performance; scholarship, creative endeavors, advising and/or administration directed toward the maintenance and enhancement of lifelong development skills; service – at a minimum – to the unit, college and university; and, civility with faculty and students appropriate to maintaining a setting conducive to the free exchange of ideas, expression, and mutual trust.

Annual faculty evaluations will be based upon the yearly and long-term objectives of the faculty member, as agreed to by the department head and faculty member. It is also expected faculty may, in agreement with the department head, restate their objectives during an evaluation period, to meet unforeseen opportunities or circumstances.

Some faculty members will choose, over the course of their university careers, and after consultation and full agreement with their faculty and department head, to place more emphasis and effort in a particular aspect of their professional development. Thus, it may be the choice of a faculty member – in concert with their yearly self-development goals and evaluations – to dedicate a majority of their time to achieving innovation and excellence in the instructional mission of the College. At the same time, others may propose to advance their development – and thus further their contribution to the instructional mission of the College – through evidence of a body of work contributing to the profession, the university, college and department missions. Evidence can be exhibited through competitions, scholarship and writing, preparing research proposals, funded research, and/or professional work or service. However, career development, which reflects the nature of university life, is multidimensional and that concentration in a particular endeavor must not be used as an excuse for failure to contribute to the overall advancement and growth of the educational unit.
1. Evidence of underachievement in teaching or professional performance should include, but is not always limited to:

   i. A failure to supply students with teaching materials that reflect currency in a faculty member’s chosen field such as course outlines, examinations, and supplementary materials.

   ii. A failure to meaningfully respond to a charge on a yearly evaluation clearly pointing to the need for self-improvement.

   iii. Poor performance and/or lack of evidence of effectiveness in the direction of projects or research of undergraduate and graduate students; also, lack of willingness to participate in unit examination activities, such as written and oral examinations for graduate degree candidates and critique of undergraduate projects.

   v. Failure in the development and implementation of special projects, resource tools, and/or the use of creative techniques in the performance of classroom duties.

   vi. Habitual failure to make conscientious preparations or efforts to deliver quality classroom and studio (or special projects) instruction, including normal courtesies and due regard for the special obligation to attend to the instructional needs of students.

   vii. An unexplained pattern of absenteeism in the classroom or studio.

Note: UNIVERSITY APPROVED TEACHING EVALUATIONS and other measures of classroom evaluations, including peer teaching observation, faculty developed questionnaires and syllabus reviews, as agreed to by a faculty member and the department head, will be used to support instructional achievements and teaching effectiveness.

2. Evidence of underachievement in scholarship and/or creative activities demanded by the normal expectations of university life should include, but is not always limited to:

   i. A consistent failure to contribute to the body of professional, scientific, or educational literature in a faculty member’s chosen field of endeavor, as evidenced by a lack of attempt to produce books, papers, research reports, competitions and exhibitions, professional design experiences, documented classroom innovations, or other similar items that advance the state of either profession.

   ii. A failure to demonstrate professional competence through a lack of effort to remain current in the literature and knowledge of a faculty member’s chosen field of expertise and teaching.

   iii. A consistent failure to engage in the discourse of professional thought and ideas as evidenced by a lack of effort to attend and actively participate in continuing education, special seminars, conferences, and meetings of chosen professional societies.

3. Evidence of underachievement in service demanded by the normal expectations of university life should include, but is not always limited to:

   i. A consistent pattern of lack of involvement in the maintenance of the curriculum and normal governing and developmental duties of the university, college, and the unit.

   ii. A failure to interact with or contribute to the profession or discipline and a failure to acquaint students with the obligations of professional discourse and development.

4. Evidence of underachievement in promoting collegiality with faculty and students demanded by the normal expectations of university life should include, but is not always limited to:

   i. A pattern of failure by a faculty member to exercise professional integrity in their everyday contacts with other faculty, students, and the public as evidenced by inaccuracy, inability to exercise appropriate restraint, or a willingness to listen to and show respect to others expressing different opinions.
ii. Continuing or repeated failure to perform duties or meet responsibilities to the institution as defined in the offer letter or letter of expectations and/or yearly objectives, and/or to meet the normal obligations in servicing the needs of students.

iii. A failure to protect the rights of privacy of students and faculty. (FERPA violations are considered extremely serious transgressions and will be addressed by University attorneys and administrators as well as college deans and the department head.)

5. Chronic Low Achievement
The concept of “chronic low achievement” flows from the notion of persistent failure to meet the minimum expectations of a profession. Chronic low achievement is not suddenly discovered; rather, it is an assessment of performance that follows fair warning and constructive notice that a tenured faculty member’s actions, in whole or part, constitute a liability for the unit as a whole. Except on an emergency basis, all signs of failure and underachievement are indicated in the yearly evaluation and its supplemental or supporting materials. It is the clear responsibility of the department head, using the criteria supplied in these guidelines, to assess the severity or magnitude of faculty deficiency based on common reason and in comparison to faculty peers. Likewise, it is the department head’s responsibility to set forth actions or corrections that would assist the faculty member in mitigating actions or items that are singled out as “performance below minimum acceptable level of productivity” or as underachievement. Important concepts leading to the assessment of a “performance below minimum acceptable level of productivity” evaluation are:

i. To assess a faculty member’s overall evaluation as “performance below minimum acceptable levels of productivity” requires that the department head balance the total record of a faculty member’s yearly performance with the particular action(s) in question.

ii. It must be recognized that certain failures spelled out in the guidelines above, may override faculty strengths. For instance, unexplained and persistent absences from assigned duties, including classes and studios, may well trigger an overall “performance below minimum acceptable level of productivity” evaluation regardless of faculty strengths in other endeavors.

iii. Several marginal evaluations, especially where a faculty member fails to respond to reasonable requests for correction, may lead to a “performance below minimum acceptable level of productivity” evaluation or a series of poor evaluations. Therefore, a “performance below minimum acceptable level of productivity” assessment is based less on an action itself than it is on lack of meaningful response to a reasonable request for change.

6. Procedure for Assessing Underachievement by Yearly Faculty Evaluations.
In keeping with regular procedures in matters of tenure (see Faculty Handbook sections C31.5, C31.7 and C31.8) when a tenured faculty member’s overall performance falls below the minimum acceptable level, as indicated by the annual evaluation, the department or unit head shall indicate so in writing to the faculty member. The department head will also indicate, in writing, a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member. 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 who fail to meet minimum standards for the year following the department head’s suggested course of action will be forwarded to the Dean of the College of Architecture, Planning and Design. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations following the initial evaluation that indicated “performance below minimum acceptable level of productivity” 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 of the College of Architecture, Planning and Design.

i. Notification: The dean will notify faculty member of intent to dismiss for chronic low achievement, following the receipt of three successive or three “performance below minimum acceptable level of productivity” evaluations in any five years.
ii. Burden of Proof and Procedure: The burden is on the College Dean and Department Head to show clear and convincing evidence warranting dismissal. Evidence shall include, but is not limited to, yearly departmental evaluations, supporting course materials and other material objects used in classroom or studio instruction, and testimony of students and faculty. At the charged faculty member’s request, the dean or department head will present evidence warranting dismissal to eligible departmental faculty (those faculty at the same rank and above). Each eligible departmental faculty may then provide written and confidential input to the dean or department head for their consideration.

iii. Administrative Decision: The dean or department head, acting through the dean, shall decide the effective date of termination. In cases of professional incompetence or willful neglect of duty, the effective date of termination shall not be less than one year from the date of notification. In cases of gross personal or professional misconduct, the effective date of termination may coincide with the final decision of the Committee to Hear a Case Regarding the Dismissal of a Tenured Faculty Member. See Appendix M of the University Handbook.

iv. Rights of the Faculty Member: The faculty member has a right to present a defense against the specified causes for his/her termination as described in Appendix M, Procedure for Review of Dismissal of Tenured Faculty, University Handbook. Sections C.31.1, C.31.5, C.31.7, and C.31.8 (http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/fhbook/fhsecc.html)
PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD PROCESS
Adopted: 6 April 2006
Readopted 28 April 2011
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The Faculty Handbook policy for the Professional Performance Award states:

C49.1 Significance of the Award. The Professorial Performance Award rewards strong performance at the highest rank with a base salary increase in addition to that provided for by the annual evaluation process. The Performance Award review, it is important to note, is not a form of promotion review. It does not create a "senior" professoriate. Furthermore, the Professorial Performance 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 notable deficiencies.

C49.2 Development and Revisions of the Professorial Performance Award Process. Departments develop their own mechanisms for review as they have for annual merit evaluation. As is the case in merit review, it may be that responsibility for the evaluation of materials involves personnel of any rank or several ranks. Each department will also specify criteria according to which candidates qualify for the award according, to its own disciplinary standards of excellence. Nonetheless, all such criteria for the award will adhere to the following guidelines:

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

C49.4 Recommendations for the Professorial Performance Award will follow the timeline associated with the annual evaluation review outlined in the University Handbook.

Department’s Nomination Criteria for the Professorial Performance Award
To apply for the Professorial Performance Award, a candidate must provide evidence of leadership and broad reputation in one or more of the candidate's areas of expertise. The supporting materials will reflect a faculty member's acknowledged excellence and achievements significant to landscape architecture or regional and community planning in research, scholarship, and/or creative activities. Review for the Professorial Performance Award will be based upon the applicant’s demonstrated performance over the previous six years. Responsibilities of Professorial Performance Award Candidates are explained in UHB C49.5.

Evaluation Criteria (as noted in 3. above) are described in the current approved departmental standards for promotion to professor in the LA/RCP Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

Applicants for the Professorial Performance Award will submit their application no later than the first Monday in September of that year.

Materials to be presented are described in UHB C49.5.

Upon receipt of the Candidate’s information, the department head will:
Make the Candidates application available for review and recommendation by the faculty within the department at the rank of associate professor and professor.
A ballot will be taken, including the vote and rationale of each eligible faculty member. A majority faculty vote will constitute a recommendation by the faculty to the department head, of the merits of the candidate’s qualifications for the Professorial Performance Award. Upon the department head’s review of the Candidates application and the recommendations from the department’s faculty at the rank of associate professor and professor, the department head will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate’s materials in terms of the criteria, standards, and guidelines established, along with a recommendation for or against the award.

Each candidate for the award 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. (C49.6)

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

- A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award,
- Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation,
- Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation,
- The candidate’s supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award. (C49.7)

The dean will review all evaluation materials and recommendations to ensure that the evaluations are consistent with the criteria and procedures established by the department for the Professorial Performance Award. (C49.8)

A dean who does not agree with recommendations for the Professorial Performance Award 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. (C49.9)

The provost will review all evaluation materials and recommendations to ensure that (a.) the evaluation process was conducted in a manner consistent with the 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. (C49.10)

If the provost does not agree with recommendations for Professorial Performance Awards 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. (C49.11)

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. (C49.12)

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. (C49.13)
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. (C49.14)
MENTORING NON-TENURED FACULTY POLICIES
Approved by faculty vote December 14, 2009
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Importance: The faculty wish to provide every opportunity for a new faculty member to be successful in meeting the department’s tenure and promotion guidelines related to scholarship, teaching, service and professional activities. The department’s faculty desire to contribute positively to a new faculty member’s morale, motivation and sense of community. A mentorship relationship is provided for ongoing support as faculty members develop their careers.

ORIENTATION
Within the first month of joining the department a new faculty member will meet with the department head and/or other assigned faculty to be given a tour of the department, college and university facilities and to be introduced to important information related to the following:

University, College and Departmental Documents
University, College and Department Mission and Vision Statements
Kansas State University http://www.k-state.edu/provost/planning/mission.html
College of Architecture, Planning and Design http://www.capd.ksu.edu/about/mission-statement
LA/RCP http://capd.ksu.edu/larcp/about/the-department/mission-statement
LA/RCP Strategic Plan
LA/RCP Faculty KSOL site
Handbooks
University Handbook http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/fhbook/
Department Head’s Manual
http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/depthead/contents.html
http://www.k-state.edu/policies/ppm/1000/1020.html MLA/MRCP Handbook
Policies
http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/index.html
Guidelines for Faculty Members Regarding Student Conduct
Conflict of Interest and Time Commitment
Intellectual Property Policy
Confidential Student Information
Information for Course Syllabi
Final Exam Policy
Information Technology Policies

Discussion of Expectations and Criteria for Tenure and Promotion
Department head will assist non-tenured faculty members in understanding what is required for tenure and promotion and in setting teaching, scholarship, service and professional objectives. The new faculty member will be provided with a copy of the Department Documents
http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/add/arch/land/
Requirements for the Reappointment for Faculty on Probationary Appointments
Expectations for Mid-Tenure Review
Process for Annual Faculty Evaluation
When meeting to discuss the tenure and promotion process, the Department Head and new faculty member will review the time tables, deadlines and materials required for reappointment, mid-tenure review and tenure and promotion: http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/promotio.doc. The discussion will include explicit information about the way in which a new faculty member will be evaluated including the importance of: acceptance to Graduate Faculty, professional registration/licensure, professional development and advanced degrees. The discussion will also include review of the venues of achievement recognized by the Department as defined in the Department’s Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

Teaching and Career Development
Research and Scholarship: Scholarly Publication, Creative, Professional and Artistic Achievement
Service and Leadership

The orientation discussion will also include information related to the calendar of events for unclassified annual evaluations
http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/depthead/unclass/unclass.html and resources such as:
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
Pre-Award Services
University Research Compliance Office
Center for Engagement and Community Development
Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning

SELECTION OF A MENTOR AND THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE MENTOR AND MENTEE
Each new faculty member is required to establish a mentorship with more experienced faculty for information and support as they develop their academic careers.

1. Within the first semester of a new faculty member’s hire, the Department Head will suggest potential mentors among the faculty who share the new member’s teaching, scholarship and service interests. At the same time, the new faculty member should visit with individuals on the department’s faculty to discuss shared interests related to the college and department mission statements.

2. By the end of the second semester, the new faculty member should determine which member(s) of the faculty could provide guidance and information for advancement toward tenure and promotion and meet with them to discuss their willingness to be a mentor.

3. A non-tenured faculty member may select more than one formal mentor but one should be identified as the primary mentor. For example, one mentor might be selected for scholarship and another for teaching. If more than one mentor is selected, the mentee should schedule a meeting with all mentors at least once each semester.

4. One of the mentor’s must be a tenured faculty member and a member of the department’s faculty. However, additional mentors may be non-tenured and not be in the same department.

5. The department head should be provided the name of the primary mentor and any other mentors.

6. It is the responsibility of the mentee to schedule appointments with their mentor to discuss their progress toward reappointment. A minimum of one meeting per semester with the primary mentor is required.

7. At the conclusion of any mentoring meeting between the primary mentor and mentee, a brief report should be written by the mentee stating the recommendations and directions upon which both have agreed.

8. The above report is to be signed by both parties and submitted to the department head with the mentee’s annual evaluation submittal and copied to all the mentee’s mentors.

9. These reports will become part of the mentee’s academic material submitted for the annual reappointment review and the tenure and promotion documentation.
10. A mentee may decide, based upon acceptable reasoning that a change in mentor is desired. Similarly, a mentor may request that a different mentor be selected. Those desiring a change should discuss this in a meeting including the mentee, mentor and department head before a change is approved by the department head.

Suggestions for Mentors and Mentees
The following suggestions for mentors and mentees as they work together was taken from the University of Wisconsin at Oshkosh and from an article entitled, *Mentoring New Faculty: Advice to Department Chairs*, by Marjorie Olmstead. They are included as support for the policies outlined above.

**A mentor’s general role may include, but is not limited to:**
- **Advisor:** Provide mentee with useful information about the University; offer mentee an avenue for social and emotional support during his/her transition into the University; familiarize mentee with the numerous sources and resources located throughout the University community.
- **Role model:** Teach mentee how to succeed in the University by modeling how individuals in senior positions conduct themselves and interact with others.
- **Coach:** Advise mentee on how to accomplish his/her goals and provide feedback. Help the mentee develop alternatives to address work-related problems or create learning opportunities. Teach the mentee organizational and professional skills and help "decode" the University culture; create an atmosphere where mentees can learn from their own and each other's experiences, mistakes, and successes as well as from their mentors' experiences.
- **Supporter:** Encourage the participation of the mentee on committees to increase visibility; enhance the mentee's self-esteem through supportive, nonjudgmental discussions and "pep talks." Help the mentee establish a professional network.

**A mentor’s specific role may include, but is not limited to:**
- Recognize and evaluate what you can offer, keeping in mind that you should not expect yourself to fulfill every mentoring function
- Clarify expectations with your mentee about the extent to which you will offer guidance concerning personal as well as professional issues such as advice about how to balance family and career responsibilities
- Give constructive feedback (as well as praise) when warranted but present it with specific suggestions for improvement
- Help new faculty learn what kinds of available institutional support they should seek in order to further their own career development - such as faculty development funds
- Take time to be available to your mentee (can keep in contact by dropping by, calling, sending e-mail, or inviting your mentee to lunch); ask questions and to read proposals and papers, and for periodic reviews of progress; to constructively criticize errors and to recognize and praise excellence
- Tell your mentee if he/she asks for too little - or too much - of your time
- Maintain confidentiality
- Discuss with the mentee the "rules" of the department or team
- Advise on tenure and promotion requirements and processes
- Provide advice on University, college, and department/team policies
- Suggest strategies for effective teaching, grading, and writing grant proposals
- Propose effective ways of interacting with students and colleagues
- Help sort out priorities: budgeting time, publications, teaching, obtaining appropriate resources, setting up a lab or experimental work if appropriate, committees
- Suggest how to say "no" to certain demands on his/her time
- Provide social support, act as an advocate for the new faculty member
- Introduce him/her to colleagues from other departments
- Explain the written and unwritten rules of the University
- Discuss research, publication, and presentations at conferences
Benefits for a new faculty member in having a mentor:

- Expand your view of the University
- Receive honest and informal feedback
- Receive advice on how to balance teaching, research, and other responsibilities and set professional priorities
- Obtain knowledge of informal rules for advancement (as well as political and substantive pitfalls to be avoided)
- Obtain knowledge of skills for showcasing one’s own work
- Understand how to build a circle of friends and contacts both within and outside one’s department or team
- Provide a perspective on long-term career planning
- Connect you closer to the University and to other employees
- Increase communication about what is happening in other areas of the University
- Expand growth in your sense of competence, identity, and effectiveness as a professional
- Provide an outlet to discuss concerns
- Increase your value to the university
- Learn to cope with the formal and informal structure of the University
- Provide a successful and productive integration to the University

Mentee responsibilities:

- Meet regularly with the mentor (At a minimum once a semester)
- Maintain confidentiality
- Keep themselves informed in regard to the requirements for tenure and promotion and your progress toward meeting those requirements
- Ask for and give feedback
- Take responsibility for own growth and success
- Follow through on referrals from mentor to appropriate office for specific information
- Listen actively
- Ask your mentor for guidance and assistance whenever it is needed
- Present needs in an articulate way