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1. General
   a. This document states the policies and procedures of the Department of Computing & Information Sciences (CIS) for evaluation of faculty for determination of reappointment and merit salary increases; and for recommendations for tenure, promotion, and nomination for the Professorial Performance Award. The document serves as a supplement to the policies and procedures stated in the University Handbook. (http://www.ksu.edu/academicservices/fhbook/fhsecc.html)
   b. The terms "procedures", "guidelines", "criteria", and "standards" are used in the University and Regents requirements. The CIS Department interprets these as follows. "Procedures" and "guidelines" mean the steps of progress, time schedules, uses of forms and evaluation instruments, and responsibilities of the Department Head, the subject faculty member, and the peer members of the faculty. "Criteria" denote the specific and observable activities, both general (as teaching, research, service) and detailed (as preparing curriculum materials, publishing papers) that form the basis for evaluation and the measures, both objective and subjective, that are used to rate faculty performance. Example measures are student evaluation of effectiveness of the instructor, number and level of papers published, and amount and effectiveness of service activities. "Standards" are embodied in the descriptors used to rank performance of activities.

2. Annual Evaluation of CIS Faculty
   a. Procedures/Guidelines
      ▪ Every faculty member is evaluated annually to assess their contribution to the departmental missions, provide feedback to the faculty members, and to provide a fair means to distribute merit salary increases.
      ▪ For new faculty, the Department Head will prepare a statement of initial assignment and goals. For continuing faculty, associated with each annual evaluation, the Department Head and the faculty member will compose a written
statement of goals for the next year(s). The statement will include the expected
distribution of effort for teaching, research, and service. Areas of work may be
identified as "essential" (also referred to as "critical"); unless otherwise specified,
any area of work with an expected effort of at least 25 percent will be deemed
"essential".

- At the end of each calendar year, faculty will provide to the Department Head
information about their teaching, research, and service. Summary information is
provided in the Faculty Evaluation Information Form, which has been approved
by the faculty and which is presented as Appendix A. The Department shall
collect information from each faculty member about their teaching, including a
KSU IDEA or TEVAL form for each course taught and copies of instructional
materials and syllabi developed by the faculty. The Department may develop
additional questions to be included on the IDEA/TEVAL forms. The Department
Head may obtain other information about classroom effectiveness by visiting
classes, by classroom review by other faculty, by interviews with students, or by
evaluation of curriculum content. The faculty member shall provide access to
research artifacts including papers, reports, proposals and reviews, and a self-
assessment of research activities.

- For each faculty member, the Department Head completes a Faculty Evaluation
Form (see Appendix B) and a written evaluation, based on the categories listed on
the Evaluation Form. For each category, a rating of "outstanding", "above
satisfactory", "satisfactory", "needs improvement", "unacceptable", or "NA" (for
not applicable) is assigned. The overall evaluation score is computed based upon
the evaluation of each category weighted by the agreed distribution of effort over
the three major categories. A rating of "unacceptable" on any one of the essential
areas will result in an overall rating of "unacceptable". During the evaluation, the
Department Head and the faculty member may jointly adjust the distribution
numbers in consideration of actual distribution of activities. The Department
Head and the faculty member both sign the Evaluation Form and indicate either
agreement about the evaluation or disagreement on specific points.

- Based on the funding available, the department head computes the percent merit
salary raises for each faculty member as a function of the overall evaluation score.

3. Criteria

- Criteria for the annual evaluation include contribution to Department activities,
contribution to students, and contribution to the profession. Specific components
of the criteria include the following:

- Teaching
  1.1 Contribution to department education programs
  1.2 Student-instructor relationships
  1.3 Student evaluations
  1.4 Course assessment
  1.5 Other
2.0 Research
   2.1 Unpublished research
   2.2 Published research
   2.3 Generation of program support
   2.4 Student support
   2.5 Other
3.0 Service
   3.1 University promotion and support
   3.2 Department committees
   3.3 Professional service
   3.4 Other

- The following are some examples of items that may be assessed by the Department Head in each of these categories:

1.0 Teaching
   1.1 Contribution to department education programs
      • description of courses taught, new courses developed, new teaching materials, teaching of "overload" seminars, and topics courses
   1.2 Student-instructor relationships
      • student advising, advising of student clubs, help with university open house, mentoring activities
   1.3 Student evaluations
      • course evaluations including written comments
   1.4 Course assessment
      • course syllabus, course assessment documentation
   1.5 Other
      • instructional grants; participation in learning enhancement programs

2.0 Research
   2.1 Unpublished research
      • unpublished results, summary of current projects, ideas that have been extended by others
   2.2 Published research
      • papers, research articles in books, department technical reports, papers submitted, papers in preparation
   2.3 Generation of program support
      • grants and contracts, research infrastructure development
   2.4 Student support
      • direction of graduate and undergraduate projects, funding of graduate/undergraduate students
   2.5 Other
      • technical presentations

3.0 Service
3.1 University promotion and support
- work on recruiting visits, visits to secondary schools and other universities

3.2 Department committees

3.3 Professional service
- service on technical and conference committees, editing of journals

3. Other

- In addition, the aspect of collegiality overlays each of the areas of teaching, research, and service. Collegiality is not explicitly ranked, but a failure of collegiality in a major area is grounds for a rating of unacceptable for that area.

b. Standards

- For all faculty members, the primary standard is overall contribution to the Department as suggested by the year-end objectives (initial objectives for new faculty). For untenured faculty, the Department Head endeavors to provide a subjective evaluation that will be consistent with progress towards the standards defined for the mid-probationary and tenure reviews.

c. Chronic Low Achievement

- If the Department Head makes an initial evaluation of "unacceptable" in any essential area of work for a faculty member, the Department Head will consult with all other tenured faculty of equal or higher rank to arrive at a final evaluation. When a tenured faculty member receives an evaluation of "unacceptable", the Department Head, in consultation with the faculty member, will prepare a plan to improve the performance of the faculty member during the next and following review years. As noted in the University Handbook, 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 of Engineering.

- In the area of teaching, unacceptable performance is any continuing pattern of failure to provide an environment of learning. Examples include presentation of technically incorrect or obsolete content, failure to meet classes on time, failure to meet classes as scheduled, failure to monitor and direct progress of graduate students for whom the faculty member is the major professor, and failure to treat students with respect.

- In the area of research, unacceptable performance is failure to produce sufficient evidence of an on-going, quality research program. Examples of such evidence include continuing funding of work, support of graduate students, peer reviewed publications, professional participation, and direction of graduate research and Ph.D. dissertations.

- In the area of service, unacceptable performance is any pattern of failure to meet minimum requirements of assigned service duties. Examples include failure to meet minimum requirements of committees on which the faculty member is assigned to serve, avoidance of assigned advising, and incorrect advising.
In the area of collegiality, unacceptable performance is any pattern of disruptive relationships with university colleagues, technical and office staff, or students.

3. Mid-Probationary Review
   a. Procedures
      • For new faculty at the assistant professor level, the Department Head will appoint an appropriate faculty member to serve as a mentor to provide guidance and feedback during the probationary period. Nevertheless, it is the faculty member's responsibility to achieve the standards defined for tenure and promotion.
      • A mid-probationary review will be conducted as part of the annual review during the third year of employment. The faculty member will supply review materials to the Department Head by end of October of the review year. The review will be overall work of the previous two years and the current semester. The faculty member will provide access to:
        1. All publications and identification of the three or four best publications.
        2. Grant proposals together with reviewer's comments.
        3. Descriptions of distinguishing aspects of classes taught. (For example, information about content of new courses and laboratory materials, description of methods of teaching.)
        4. Self-evaluation of research results and expectations for the next three years.
        5. List of several persons who could serve as outside peer reviewers.

      The Department Head will provide:
        6. Letters of review by at least two outside reviewers with strong credentials in the area of focus of the faculty member. The reviewers are selected from the list provided by the faculty member or nominated by the department head.
        7. A summary of previous annual evaluations.

      • All materials of scholarly work submitted by the faculty member will be sent to at least two outside reviewers. The above materials will be available for review by the tenured faculty members, who then meet to discuss (i) how the faculty member may be expected to progress towards tenure and (ii) how the faculty member can best prepare for future tenure review. The tenured faculty individually report evaluation and recommendations to the Department Head. The Department Head will prepare a letter of evaluation and recommendations for progress. If there is any aspect of performance that would not merit tenure, the Department Head will indicate what level should be achieved. He will report the results to the tenured faculty and then to the faculty member. A complete packet of materials and recommendations will be forwarded to the Dean of Engineering, who will provide the faculty member with letter of results of the mid-probationary review.
b. Criteria
   - The criteria are the same as for the annual salary review, namely, contribution to the Department programs through teaching, research, and service.

c. Standards
   - The standards of evaluation for mid-probationary review are based upon judgment by peers including the tenured faculty of the Department and at least two persons outside of Kansas State University. The faculty member must show substantial progress towards the standards for tenure and promotion.

4. Reappointment of Tenure Track Faculty Members
   a. Procedures
      - All untenured faculty members are expected to prepare reappointment documentation for consideration on an annual basis. In the first year of the appointment, the documentation will consist of the Faculty Evaluation Information Form and the Faculty Evaluation Form (submitted as part of the annual evaluation). From the second year until an individual is tenured, the documentation will consist of university promotion and tenure documents, and must be submitted by the end of January.
      - The documentation is reviewed by the tenured faculty of the department. The tenured faculty meets to discuss the performance of the faculty member. Each tenured faculty individually reports the evaluation and recommendations to the Department Head. The Department Head prepares a letter of evaluation and makes a recommendation to the Dean.

   b. Criteria
      - The criteria are the same as for the annual review, namely, contribution to the Department programs through teaching, research, and service.

   c. Standards
      - The standards of evaluation for reappointment are based upon judgment by the tenured faculty of the Department.

5. Tenure and Promotion
   a. Procedures
      - The overall procedure for the review of a faculty member for tenure and/or promotion is summarized as follows:

         1. The faculty member provides materials for review as for the mid-probationary review. In addition, the faculty member must complete the promotion and tenure form provided at the Academic Personnel web site http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/promotion.html.
         2. The Department Head provides at least three external review letters and summary of past evaluations.
         3. Tenured faculty of higher rank discuss the review materials.
4. The faculty forwards their recommendations to the Department Head.
5. The Department Head makes his/her own recommendation.
6. The recommendations are reported to the faculty of higher rank.
7. The recommendations and the review materials are forwarded to the Dean.

- It is the responsibility of the faculty member to submit the review materials in a timely manner to meet the university schedules for review of candidates for promotion and tenure. The procedures for review for promotion to Professor are essentially the same as that for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Both cases are covered by this section.

b. Criteria
- Criteria for tenure and promotion are contribution to the Department programs through teaching, research, and service, including contribution to students and to the computing profession.

c. Standards
- The standards of evaluation for tenure and promotion are based upon judgment by peers including the tenured faculty of higher rank of the Department and at least three persons outside of Kansas State University.
- For tenure and promotion to rank of associate professor, the faculty member must show at least acceptable performance in all three areas of teaching, research, and service and must have shown very good contribution in either research or teaching. For positive evaluation of teaching, the faculty member must give evidence of contribution to the teaching program of the Department. For positive review of the research assignment, the faculty member must give evidence of contribution to the national body of knowledge in computer science or closely related fields, must show evidence of potential for national recognition of the member’s research, and must be seeking to establish a continuing program of external funding to support graduate students and research activities. It is expected that most candidates for tenure will have established research funding. For positive review of service, the faculty member must give evidence of contribution at the national level. Overall, the guiding standard prescribed by the University is that if there is doubt about overall contribution, then tenure should not be recommended.
- For promotion to rank of professor, the faculty member must demonstrate acceptable performance in all three areas and excellent performance in at least one of the areas. For excellence in the teaching assignment, the faculty member must give evidence of significant national contribution to the teaching of computer science or closely related fields. For excellence in the research assignment, the faculty must establish national recognition of research work. For excellence in service, the faculty must show contribution at the national or international level.

6. Nomination for Professorial Performance Award
   a. Procedures
General procedures for nomination for the Professorial Performance Award are described in the University Handbook, Section C49. Faculty with full-time appointment at the rank of Professor and who have held the rank for at least six years since their last promotion or Professorial Performance Award may submit documents for review for nomination for the Performance Award. Documentation should follow the format required for promotion to the rank of Professor and should focus on (but not be limited to) work performed during the previous six years. Copies of the candidate’s annual statement-of-goals and annual performance evaluation for each of the past six years must be included in the documentation. Documents should be submitted at the beginning of the fall semester so as to conform to the usual timelines for evaluation for promotion.

The Department Head will convene an evaluation committee comprised of faculty at the rank of Professor who are not currently to be considered for the Professorial Performance Award. The Department Head is the default chair of the committee. If the Department Head is in consideration for the Performance Award, then a separate chair of the committee will be appointed. The committee should have at least three members. If necessary, the committee chair may invite faculty who retired at the rank of Professor or faculty from related departments to join the committee. The committee will prepare a written evaluation and vote on the Performance Award request. The results will be processed following the procedures in the University Handbook, Section C49.

b. Criteria

To be recommended for the Performance Award, the faculty candidate must show sustained productivity during the six-year review period (Section C49 notes possible extension of the six year period). While the level of effort and achievement of the nominee should be comparable to that required for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, the specific achievements of the candidate need not be of the same genre as those achievements required of an Associate Professor seeking promotion. It is understood that Professors may undertake efforts of direction, management, and support of the Department’s mission, which may not be required for persons at the Associate Professor rank. In addition, the candidate’s annual statement-of-goals will be given strong weighting for the Professorial Performance Award.

In addition, annual performance evaluations must have been rated at Satisfactory or above for at least four of the last six years.

Appendix A. Faculty Evaluation Information Form

Appendix B. Faculty Evaluation Form
This is a sample of the form to be used for annual evaluations.

### COMPUTING & INFORMATION SCIENCES
#### FACULTY EVALUATION FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Time Assigned</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Cont. to department education programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Student-instructor relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Student evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Course assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Unpublished research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Published research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Generation of program support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Student support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 University promotion &amp; support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Department committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Professional service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Above Satisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This form is designed to remind both you and the department head of the many things the latter needs to know as he/she attempts the admittedly difficult task of evaluating your activities of the past year. As they are appropriate to your situation, please answer the following questions based on your activities from January 1, 20__ to December 31, 20__. Use whatever modes (narration, enumeration, statistics, etc.) seemed appropriate. Give as much detail as is necessary to adequately describe your contributions.

1. TEACHING

1.1 Contribution to Departmental Education Programs

1.1.1. Course information summary:

| Courses number | | | | | |
|----------------|---|---|---|---|
| Students enrolled | | | | |
| TA tenths assigned | | | | |

1.1.2. New courses developed or being developed:

1.1.3. Revisions of existing courses to include new instructional materials:

1.1.4. Overload courses and/or special topics courses taught:

1.1.5. Instructional Grants:
1.2.1. **Student-instructor relationships**

Advisees do not include students for which you are major professor or supervisor.

1.2.1. Current undergraduate advisees:

1.2.2. Current graduate advisees:

1.2.3. Other, to include student club advising, university open house, additional mentoring activities, etc.:

1.3. **Student evaluations**

1.3.1 Teacher effectiveness average: (Complete with the average of the TEVAL "Teacher effectiveness" raw averages for all courses in each level.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Level</th>
<th>100/200</th>
<th>300</th>
<th>400/500</th>
<th>600/700</th>
<th>800</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.2. Written comments from course evaluations:

1.3.3 Interpretation/explanation of TEVAL results:

1.4. **Course assessment**

1.4.1 Self assessment of each course taught. Include any changes made, how the students did, and what you might change in the future:

1.4.2. Department head comments based on classroom visits:
1.5. Other (instructional grants, learning enhancement programs, awards, etc.)

2. RESEARCH

2.1. Unpublished research

2.1.1. New ideas or results which have not been published (including teaching, advising, and professional activities):

2.1.2. Summaries of current research activities including work with MS thesis and PhD students (including names of coworkers):

2.1.3. My ideas which have been used and/or extended by others:

2.2. Published research

Publications categorized as follows:

2.2.1. In preparation (include publication type and destination):

2.2.2. Submitted (indicate if in revision):

2.2.3. Accepted for publication:

2.2.4. Published (include quality indicator such as acceptance percentage):

2.2.5. Technical reports:
2.3. Generation of program support

2.3.1. Details about grants currently funded, pending, or being prepared:

2.3.2. Research infrastructure development:

2.3.3. Other information pertinent to Program/Department/University Research Support:

2.4. Student Support

List each student and their major for each category below. Date is the student’s date of graduation (actual or estimated). Role refers to your role in directing the student’s work (e.g., major advisor, project supervisor, etc.). Funded is from grants only; identify which grant and semesters supported. Title refers to the student’s project, report, thesis, or dissertation title; project titles, if applicable, should be annotated under the Funded column.

2.4.1. Undergraduate projects completed under my direction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.4.2. Undergraduate students working on projects under my direction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.4.3. MS/MSE reports/projects/theses completed under my direction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.4.4. MS/MSE students currently under my direction:
2.4.5. MS/MSE supervisory committees on which I serve/served:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Main Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.6. PhD students currently under my direction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.7. PhD supervisory committees on which I serve/served:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Main Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.8. PhD dissertations completed under my direction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.9. Other information pertinent to Student Support:

2.5. Other

2.5.1. Presentations (include places, audiences - e.g., industry, professional meeting, university, conference, etc. - and subjects):

2.5.2. Other information pertinent to research:

3. SERVICE
3.1. University promotion and support

3.1.1 Recruiting visits, visits to secondary/other schools:

3.1.2. College and university committees on which I've served:

3.1.3. Other college or university activities including service to other persons or departments on campus:

3.1.4. Other activities related to university promotion and support:

3.2. Departmental committees and activities

3.2.1. Departmental committees on which I've served:

3.2.2. Other departmental activities such as extra administrative duties or recruiting:

3.3. Professional service

3.3.1. Societies of which I'm a member:

3.3.2. Society and conference committees which I've chaired or on which I've served:

3.3.3. Journals, conferences, and granting agencies (including numbers of articles) for which I've refereed:

3.3.4. Other information pertinent to Profession Support:
4. OTHER

Additional information not falling under one of the above categories:

I have tried to make the above information accurately describe my contributions as a faculty member during the past year.

________________________________________________________________________

Date     Signature (to be added after printing)
1. Post Tenure Review
   
a. Purpose

   The purpose of post-tenure review at Kansas State University is to enhance the continued professional development of tenured faculty. The process is intended 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. It 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 this policy alters or amends the University's policies regarding removal of tenured faculty members for cause (which are stipulated in the University Handbook). This policy and any actions taken under it are separate from and have no bearing on the chronic low achievement or annual evaluation policies and processes.

   The department policy on post-tenure review follows the overarching purpose, principles, objectives, and procedures in the university policy on post-tenure review (see University Handbook, Appendix W), which was approved by Faculty Senate on February 11, 2014.

b. Procedures

   - The department head will identify the tenured faculty members who will undergo Post Tenure Review during each evaluation period. In general, post tenure review will be conducted every six years in accordance with the timeline and exceptions as outlined in the University Handbook.
   - The review material will include (a) Copies of the six previous annual evaluations, (b) Self-assessment by the candidate, and (c) A statement of goals for the next six years.
   - For each candidate, the department head will appoint a committee of three faculty members at equal or higher rank to conduct the evaluation and provide feedback. The committee will provide written feedback to the candidate that provides guidance on the goals and the self-assessment.
   - If the determination of the review suggests that a plan for additional professional development should be identified, a face-to-face meeting to discuss options and develop a plan is required.

c. Criteria
If the tenured faculty member has met or exceeded expectations for the six previous annual evaluations, then the current level of professional development should be considered sufficient to demonstrate “appropriate contribution to the University”.
Policy Statement Concerning:

Post-Tenure Review
Approved by Faculty Vote on 8/27/2014

Department Head’s Signature 8/28/2014 Date

Dean’s Signature 8/28/2014 Date

Provost’s Signature 2 Sept 14 Date
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Date Posted to Web: ____________