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Department of Civil Engineering
Faculty Evaluation Procedures

This is a summary of the procedures used in the Department of Civil Engineering to determine recommendations for merit salary increases for faculty members.

1. At the end of each calendar year, each faculty member is asked to complete and return to the department head forms summarizing accomplishments for the past calendar year. All faculty members must submit a Faculty Activity Report along with Faculty Evaluation Summary, which includes a numerical scoring of the various activities.

2. The department head reviews the information submitted by each faculty member and then prepares Faculty Counseling Form. Performance in various activities is reviewed and written comments for improvements are prepared by the department head. In finalizing the numeric scores of the faculty, the department head looks for consistency in the way faculty members are awarded points in each of the categories.

3. A copy of the Faculty Counseling Form is given to the faculty member and a meeting is held to discuss the evaluation and plans for the next year. The assignment of tenths for teaching, research, and service, for next year is reviewed in light of the future plans. Signed copies of the Faculty Counseling Forms are then forwarded to the Dean of Engineering.

4. Annual merit increases in salary are determined in accordance with Sections C40 - C48.3 in the University Handbook. The sum of the numeric scores from the Faculty Evaluation Summary form in the four categories – teaching activities, research and creative activities, professional activities, and institutional and public service, is used as the criterion for annual merit salary adjustments. In the case of a faculty member whose number of tenths assigned in a given category is different from the rest of the faculty members, the scores in the category are proportionately weighed. In all cases, the merit increase is allotted strictly in proportion to the total scores on Faculty Evaluation Summary form.
On February 14, 2006, the Kansas State University Faculty Senate approved the final version of a Professorial Performance Award Policy. The procedures described below were approved by a majority vote of the Department of Civil Engineering Faculty on May 12, 2006, for inclusion in the department’s Standards and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure document. These procedures will be subject to review at least every five years as a part of the review of the Standards and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure document.

**Professorial Performance Award Policy**

To qualify to be recommended to the Dean of the College of Engineering for a Professorial Performance Award, a faculty member must be a full-time, full professor at Kansas State with at least six years of service since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award, and must, over the previous six year period, have demonstrated sustained productivity within his/her areas of responsibility.

**Minimum Criteria**

A candidate must have demonstrated, over the preceding six-year time period, a level of productivity and scholarship that is equivalent to what the department expects for an associate professor to be promoted to a full professor, as described in the department’s Standards and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure document. The six-year time frame will include the most recent performance review.

**Process**

Any candidate, who meets the minimum criteria, may apply for the performance award. To apply, a candidate must assemble a performance award file that documents his/her scholarly accomplishments over the past six years. A candidate’s file should be similar in format to a typical promotion file and should, depending on the individual’s responsibilities, include the following elements:

1) A one-page summary of major achievements during the evaluation period;

2) A one-page summary of instructional productivity, including courses taught, student advisement, and graduate student supervision, in addition to evidence of instructional quality such as student ratings, peer evaluations, or evaluation of advising;
3) A one-page statement of research and other creative activities accompanied by a list of publications and a list of funded grants and contracts; and

4) A one-page statement of service contributions, including evidence of leadership.

The candidate will submit the file to the department head who will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials in terms of the criteria, standards, and guidelines described above, along with a recommendation to approve or deny the candidate’s application for the award. External reviews of the candidate’s file are not required.

A copy of the department head’s written evaluation and recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate. The candidate will have an 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 or to the dean.

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

1) The department head’s written evaluation and recommendation;

2) A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award;

3) Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation;

4) Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation; and

5) The candidate's file and supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award.

As described in the University Handbook, the Provost will make the ultimate decision of whether a candidate is awarded a Professorial Performance Award. The timelines for this process will be established each year by the Provost’s office, but candidates should know that this process would begin sometime in January of each year. Prospective candidates are encouraged to consult with the department head to help determine if he/she meets the minimum criteria.
Minimum-Acceptable Level of Productivity
(Chronic Low Achievement Standards)

Approved by CE Faculty, February 13, 2004
Reapproved, April 6, 2012

Introduction

This document discusses issues related to the “minimum-acceptable level of productivity” for tenured faculty members within the Department of Civil Engineering. It serves as a supplement to the procedures outlined in the CE Faculty Evaluation Procedures. The purpose, as required by the Kansas State University Handbook, Section C31.5 - C31.8 Chronic Low Achievement, is to clarify issues related to a tenured faculty member’s evaluation which fails to satisfy the minimum-acceptable level of productivity.

General Statement

Each tenured faculty member is expected to perform their professional duties at or above a minimum-acceptable level.

Procedures

During the annual review of all faculty the Department Head will determine whether any tenured faculty appear not to meet the “minimum-acceptable level of productivity” as defined in this document. The decision will be based on annual evaluation material. If the Department Head determines, after following procedure C31.5 in the faculty handbook, that a tenured faculty member appears not to meet the minimum standard in any area of assigned responsibility, a committee of Professors will be convened (unless the faculty member requests otherwise) to review performance.

If the Department Head receives adequate evidence that an individual does not meet the minimum-acceptable level of productivity in any substantial or critical area of work, then action will be initiated following procedures outlined in the KSU University Handbook.

Standards

All faculty members must perform all duties outlined in the KSU University Handbook and be in compliance with all University policies. The minimum number of points per 10% of faculty time are set at 2.0 points per year in each category of responsibilities (see Faculty Evaluation Summary for a description of points corresponding to various faculty activities). These standards are expected to be achieved in each category of assigned responsibilities and will apply to all tenured faculty members in the department.
GENERAL OVERVIEW

Criteria and standards for tenure, promotion and mid-probationary review in the Department of Civil Engineering shall be guided by the following philosophy:

- They must be tied to the annual department evaluation procedure, and priorities.
- They must be flexible, and to a large degree, judgmental.
- Current departmental priorities require satisfactory performance in teaching, research and service.
- Satisfactory performance will be judged at the department level by annual evaluations, peers and the department head.
- They must fit within the University guidelines which follow in Section A.

SECTION A - TENURE, GENERAL UNIVERSITY GUIDELINES

Tenure may be granted to those on full-time probationary appointments at the rank of associate professor and above.

Tenure will not be granted below the rank of associate professor except in special circumstances approved by the provost.

For persons appointed at the rank of assistant professor, the maximum probationary period for gaining tenure and promotion to associate professor consists of six (6) regular, annual appointments at Kansas State University, at the probationary rank.

Tenure will not be granted to an assistant professor without simultaneous elevation to the rank of associate professor.
For persons whose initial appointment is at the rank of associate professor or professor, the maximum probationary period for obtaining tenure shall be five (5) regular, annual appointments at Kansas State University at the probationary ranks.

A formal review of a probationary faculty member shall be conducted midway through the probationary period. The mid-probationary review should normally be conducted during the candidate's third year of appointment. For those whose initial appointment is at associate professor or full professor, the time designated for the mid-probationary review should be agreed upon by the candidate and the department head, preferably at the time of the initial appointment.

General University Standards/Procedures

General principles. 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.

Versatility. A primary purpose of the probationary period is the opportunity it affords candidates to demonstrate versatility and the University to evaluate it. Versatility should be exhibited by the ability to function well across major areas of work (e.g., teaching, research and other creative endeavor, service and extension) as well as in a variety of settings within one or more areas.

Timing. Recommendations for tenure are considered annually. Faculty members in the final year of probation will be automatically reviewed for tenure, unless they resign. A faculty member may request an early tenure review. Ordinarily, this is done after consultation with the department head and the tenured faculty members in the department.

Candidate's responsibilities. The candidate compiles and submits a file that documents her or his professional accomplishments in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the department.

SECTION B -DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR TENURE

General. Tenure evaluation is not merely the sum of the annual merit evaluations. In practice, the factors of mission relevance of work, and supply and demand should receive greater weight in tenure recommendations than in evaluation for annual salary adjustment. Too, tenure decisions are focused on the anticipated future responsibilities of the University and the department while annual salary evaluations are focused on the recent past. Nonetheless, well prepared annual evaluations should, in general, give the probationary faculty member an awareness of his or her progress toward tenure and promotion within the department as well as career guidance. As such, annual evaluations provide relevant, but not sufficient, information to predict tenure decisions.
Philosophy. Wise tenure decisions (be they positive or negative) are never made solely on the basis of individual excellence. Tenure should be granted only to those who have demonstrated individual excellence and whose expertise corresponds to the missions of the University and the department. Therefore, probationary faculty members should be regularly informed of the evolution of institutional missions just as they must be notified of evaluations of their performance.

Tenure should be granted only to those who have demonstrated individual excellence and whose expertise corresponds to the present and anticipated continuing needs of the University and the department. Thus tenure decisions are based mainly on the candidate’s contribution to the institutional mission.

Although service time per se is not a criterion for tenure and promotion, because it could be granted at any time, six years, both initially and between promotions, should be considered average and four years should be considered a minimum, except in cases of extraordinary achievement.

Because faculty members on probationary status, who have met the criteria and standards may be granted tenure prior to the above maximum times, no credit shall be granted for years of service prior to employment at Kansas State University. However, this does not preclude credit for previous accomplishments, e.g., published works.

Departmental procedures. The department head is advised by the tenured faculty members of the department regarding the qualifications of the candidate for tenure. Department heads are responsible for making the candidate’s file available to tenured faculty members in the department in a timely manner.

At the department head’s discretion, comments are solicited from students and from other faculty members and department heads in the college or University. Outside reviewers recognized as having competent, technical, knowledge in the area(s) of the candidate’s expertise will be asked to advise. An equal number will be selected by the candidate and the department head by mutual agreement.

Ordinarily, eligible faculty members individually review the candidate’s file, considering the department’s criteria, standards and guidelines for tenure, and then meet to discuss the candidate’s petition. It is expected that this meeting is only for the purpose of sharing relevant facts and discussing concerns; not for the purpose of a collective decision. The recommendation(s) and written comments of the faculty members should be made individually, in writing, after this meeting, and forwarded to the department head. The department shall adopt the forms attached as Attachment A and Attachment B for tenure and promotion, respectively.

Any member of the eligible faculty may, prior to the submission of any recommendations to the department head, request that a candidate meet with the eligible faculty to discuss, for purpose of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by that candidate.

Following receipt of written recommendations from all eligible faculty, the department head forwards a written recommendation to the dean, accompanied by an explanation of her or his judgment. The individual recommendation(s) and written comments (unedited) of the tenured faculty members and the candidate’s complete file also are forwarded. Recommendations will be based on the criteria in the following sections.
SPECIFIC CRITERIA

Criterion No. 1  Have all positive annual evaluations.

The relevance of the annual evaluation data to tenure decisions resides in the fact that positive annual evaluations are a necessary, albeit not sufficient, condition for tenure. Relative standing (to other department faculty) on annual evaluations is less important than actual accomplishments; e.g., being first in the department would be meaningless if it were because no one else had any accomplishments.

Criterion No. 2  Demonstrate excellence and versatility in teaching.

Teaching evaluations. All non-tenured faculty shall have each and every course taught evaluated by students, and a record shall be kept by the department. Also, materials similar to those required by ABET should be kept for each and every course. These shall include:

- course descriptions,
- course outlines,
- tests and quizzes,
- grades and grade distributions,
- any other relevant material.

Institutional excellence is enhanced by faculty versatility. For example, if several people had equal competence in their area(s) of specialization, one who could also perform outside the specialty would be of greater value to the department. A major purpose of the probationary period is to provide opportunity to assess a candidate’s versatility.

Versatility may be exhibited in numerous ways. Within teaching and advising, one may be able to perform well in various modes of instruction such as undergraduate classroom teaching, undergraduate laboratory instruction, graduate classroom teaching, graduate laboratory instruction, and graduate seminar instruction. In addition, one may exhibit excellence in undergraduate and/or graduate advising. Faculty may also be proficient in teaching across areas.

In the Department of Civil Engineering a candidate must be capable of excellence in teaching in her/his area of expertise in undergraduate and graduate courses, advising of both undergraduate and graduate students, and directing Masters and PhD thesis. Other evidence of versatility is the ability and willingness to teach undergraduate service courses, in accordance with departmental needs.

If it is in the best interest of fulfilling the department’s mission, and the department head and faculty concur, some versatility may be sacrificed in order to achieve excellence in a new or developing area, or developing specialized laboratories or courses in a particular area.
Criterion No. 3  Demonstrate excellence in the research area.

Excellence in research should be demonstrated by: a) showing an ability to attract extramural research from competitive sources; b) satisfactorily conducting the research; and c) having the results of research published in refereed publications of recognized quality in the candidate’s area of expertise.

Criterion No. 4  Have a good record of service to the university, college, department and the profession.

The candidate must: a) perform in an exemplary manner on departmental, college and university committees as requested; b) show interest and success in being a productive member of outside committees and organizations that make use of the candidates professional expertise; and c) show evidence of having made active contributions on one or more professional committees. In summary, the candidate should be able to show a record of contributory participation and accomplishments beyond simply holding membership.

An additional significant factor within non-directed service is simply good citizenship within the department. This includes such things as helping to build and maintain departmental student activities and helping to provide stability and a sense of collegiality among the faculty in the department.

It is expected that the candidate show a record of interest in and support for the engineering and/or teaching profession by such activities as:

• attending or otherwise supporting student chapter activities, particularly ASCF,
• active membership in one or more professional societies,
• committee work for one or more professional societies,
• participating in professional society activities,
• registration as a Professional Engineer,
• professional consulting, and
• community service that utilizes the candidate’s professional expertise.

Criterion No. 5  Show professional demeanor.

The candidate should have no substantiated cases of unprofessional or incompetent behavior in his/her record. For example, suppose a probationary faculty member performs well in instruction, has a fine record of research or other creative endeavor, and a solid performance in non-directed service; yet there are in the records several, independent, substantiated complaints by students of research exploitation with regard to credit for publications, sexual harassment, or violation of the rights of human subjects, etc. Although a narrow numeric calculation of such a person’s performance might yield an acceptable or better “score”, such a person should not be tenured because tenure should be awarded only to those who are excellent overall and who are at least adequate in every significant aspect of job performance. Similarly, behaviors that adversely affect collegiality or are chronically disruptive would properly influence tenure decisions in a negative manner.
Criterion No. 6  Have no unsatisfactory record on any criteria.

The candidate should have demonstrated excellence when considering the above criteria taken as a whole, i.e., no less than “satisfactory” on major aspects of performance, in teaching, research and service.

GUIDANCE FOR DOCUMENTING PERFORMANCE

The candidate should be aware of the forms that he/she is required to complete and submit. As a whole, these constitute the “significant aspects of job performance” in the Department of Civil Engineering. These forms, one page each, are from “Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation” (CE Office). Browse through this document and the following statements and guidance will be more meaningful. Pages from this document are listed by their headings (10 items) in the following pages. These forms contain only headings. The “guidance” statements have been added below where appropriate and are given here as expectations of the Civil Engineering Department.

The following ten form headings, 1 through 10, are forms that the candidate must complete and submit. To give guidance to the candidate on what the Civil Engineering Department expects, the form headings are repeated and guidance is given in italics. The guidance given in italics is intended to be an enhancement of the material presented above in this document.
1. **STATEMENT OF CANDIDATE'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS**  

*Instructions*: Candidate is to provide a one-page summary of major achievements during the evaluation period at the local, regional, national, and international levels. Candidate may provide any other information he/she feels pertinent to the tenure/promotion decision.

*Added C.E. Departmental Guidance/Expectations*: Candidate must keep detailed files documenting accomplishments throughout the probationary period.

2. **STATEMENT OF FIVE-YEAR GOALS**  

*Instructions*: Candidate is to provide a one-page statement of the individual’s five-year goals with respect to teaching, research, service, and any other scholarly activity.

*Added C.E. Departmental Guidance/Expectations*: Candidate’s goals should not conflict with departmental goals. It is the candidate’s responsibility to enquire about departmental goals.

3. **SUMMARY OF CANDIDATE’S INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY**  

*Instructions*: Candidate is to provide a one-page summary of courses taught, student advisement, thesis supervision, and any other evidence of instructional productivity.

4. **SUMMARY OF CANDIDATE’S INSTRUCTIONAL QUALITY**  

*Instructions*: Candidate is to provide a one-page summary showing evidence of instruction quality such as student ratings, peer evaluations, evaluation of advisement, outcomes of instructional projects directed, awards, etc.

*Added C.E. Departmental Guidance/Expectations:*

4.1 *All non-tenured faculty should keep a record of all courses taught, course outlines, grade distribution, quizzes and tests, and other relevant material.*

4.2 *All classes must be evaluated by the students and the evaluations reviewed by the department head.*

4.3 *In-class observation by peers or the department head shall be at the discretion of the department head.*

4.4 *The method of evaluation(s) and a summary should be discussed annually by the department head with each faculty member.*
5. OTHER EVIDENCE OF SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVITY IN INSTRUCTION

Instructions: Candidate is to provide any other evidence of scholarship and creativity to promote excellence in teaching such as multimedia presentations, computer-aided instruction, innovative teaching methods, instruction-related publication, presentations, etc. (Summary is limited to one page.)

_Added C.E. Guidance/Expectations_: Candidate must keep detailed records, conduct evaluations and show evidence of positive results of innovations.

6. RESEARCH AND OTHER CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

Instructions: Candidate is to provide a one page statement of research and other creative activities.

_Added C.E. Guidance/Expectations_: This form is to list general or unfunded research activities and other creative activities, i.e., specific publications are listed on form V-B and specific grants and contracts are listed on form V-C.

7. RESEARCH AND OTHER ACTIVITIES: PUBLICATIONS

Instructions: Candidate is to provide a list of publications and other creative achievements for the evaluation period. Include items accepted but not yet published/presented.

_Added C.E. Guidance/Expectations:_

7.1 It is expected that a person be the primary author of several refereed publications in high quality journals. One publication per year, in high quality archived journals should be a minimum but not necessarily sufficient condition for tenure or promotion. The primary determination of quality, quantity and sufficiency of refereed publications shall be made primarily by the tenured faculty in the candidate's area of expertise, or tenured faculty in the candidate's area of expertise that rank above a person being considered for promotion to Professor.

7.2 In case of disagreement, either the department head or the person being considered may decide on, or request, outside reviewers of authored publications by faculty of peer institutions.
8. RESEARCH AND OTHER CREATIVE ACTIVITIES:  
GRANTS AND CONTRACTS  

Instructions: Candidate is to provide a list of grants and contracts funded during the evaluation period. Include agency, funding level, duration, title and collaborators. Multi-investigator grants and contracts should be documented to indicate candidate's level of effort and contribution. Candidate may provide a separate list of grants and contracts applied for but not funded during the evaluation period.

**Added C.E. Guidance/Expectations:**

8.1 As a prerequisite to tenure or first promotion after becoming a member of the CE departmental faculty at KSU, there should be evidence of ability to 1) obtain extramural funding as a principal investigator from a competitive source by a proposal; 2) successfully conduct research and 3) have research results published in a refereed publication of recognized quality in the person's area of expertise. The following sub-section is presented for clarification.

8.1.1 Proficiency in conduct of research shall be evaluated by means decided at the department head's discretion and discussed annually with the candidate.

9. SERVICE CONTRIBUTIONS  

Instructions: Candidate is to provide a statement of service contributions during the evaluation period. Statement should provide evidence of leadership. A list of committees on which the person served may be provided. Statement and committee listing may not exceed two pages.

**Added C.E. Guidance/Expectations:**

9.1 Conscientious service on University, College and Department committees is expected.

9.1.1 Evaluation of service shall be at the discretion of the department head and shall follow the same general guidelines as the annual evaluation.

9.2 Service to the engineering and teaching profession is desirable.

9.3 Professional service to the community is desirable.
10. EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

Instructions: Candidate is to provide a one page summary of his/her record of extension activities for the evaluation period. The statement should provide evidence of productivity, quality, creativity and originality. A separate list of extension publications (including those accepted but not yet published), meetings, workshops, etc. may be provided.

Added C.E. Guidance/Expectations: Civil Engineering Department faculty are not normally involved in extension activities, per se, however, developing successful conferences, workshops, etc., as the principal organizer-promoter, when in addition to the candidate's normal duties, shall be considered additional evidence of versatility.

SECTION C - PROMOTION IN RANK, GENERAL UNIVERSITY GUIDELINES

General principles. Successful candidates for promotion will demonstrate superior professional accomplishments 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 of the department conveyed during annual evaluations.

Definition. Faculty members may be expected to advance through the academic ranks on the basis of demonstrated individual merit in relation to their association with the University's mission, the Department's mission and within their own disciplines. (Each higher rank demands a higher level of accomplishment and peer recognition.)

Promotion is based upon an individual's achievements related to the specific criteria, standards, and guidelines developed by departmental faculty members in consultation with the department head and the appropriate dean as presented in this document.

Promotion to assistant professor reflects an acceptable level of achievement and potential for excellence. Promotion to associate professor rests on substantial professional contributions that reflect excellence in three areas: teaching, research, and other creative endeavor, directed service, or extension. Promotion to professor is based on attainment of excellence in the assigned responsibilities of the faculty member and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies, i.e., national recognition.

Terminal degree requirements. A doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree is a prerequisite for holding the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor. The provost maintains a list of appropriate terminal degrees as recommended by the deans. There may be special cases in which accomplishments or experience other than the terminal degree will allow promotion to one of the professional ranks. Such situations will be considered on an individual basis.

Time in rank. While there is no explicit time in rank required for promotion, the median time for promotion at Kansas State University has been about six years. Promotion may be granted earlier when the faculty member's cumulative performance at rank is generally outstanding and clearly meets the standards for promotion.
Timing. Recommendations concerning promotion are considered annually. Department heads are expected to notify faculty members regarding their progress toward or readiness for promotion review.

Candidate’s responsibilities. A faculty member, after consultation with the department head or appropriate departmental faculty, may request a review for promotion. The candidate compiles and submits a file that documents his or her professional accomplishments in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the department.

Departmental procedures. The department head is advised by the eligible faculty members of the department regarding the qualifications of the candidate for promotion. Department heads are responsible for making the candidate’s file available to eligible faculty members in the department in a timely manner.

At the department head’s discretion, comments are solicited from students and from other faculty members and department heads in the college or university. Outside reviewers recognized as having competent, technical, knowledge in the area(s) of the candidate’s expertise will be asked to advise. An equal number will be selected by the candidate and the department head by mutual agreement.

Ordinarily, eligible faculty members individually review the candidate’s file, considering the department’s criteria, standards and guidelines for promotion, and then meet to discuss the candidate’s petition. It is expected that this meeting is only for the purpose of sharing relevant facts and discussing concerns; not for the purpose of a collective decision. The recommendations and written comments of the faculty members should be made individually, in writing, after this meeting, and forwarded to the department head. The department shall adopt the forms attached as Attachment A and Attachment B for tenure and promotion, respectfully.

Any member of the eligible faculty may, prior to the submission of any recommendations to the department head, request that a candidate meet with the eligible faculty to discuss, for purpose of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by that candidate.

Following receipt of written recommendations from all eligible faculty, the department head forwards a written recommendation to the dean, accompanied by an explanation of her or his judgment. The individual recommendation(s) and written comments (unedited) of the eligible faculty members and the candidate’s complete file also are forwarded. Recommendations will be based on the following criteria.

SECTION D – DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION IN RANK

The guidance shall be essentially the same as those contained herein under guidelines for tenure. It is expected that the level of excellence that led to tenure be continued. It is further expected that professional productivity and recognition in his or her field grow steadily. When evaluating a person for a second promotion, the primary consideration shall be evidence of activity since the previous promotion. The accomplishments of the candidate in teaching, research, and service since the previous promotion shall be documented in a format similar to that outlined in Section B, items 1 to 10. Full professor is the highest standard rank in academy. For promotion to professor, it is expected that the candidate have a long and distinguished record of professional activity recognized by his or her peers. “Time in grade” or longevity are not suitable reasons to promote to full professor. National and international reputation in scholarly activities, and
adequate performance in all assigned areas of work are expected for promotion to Professor. The award of nationally competitive grants, publications in high quality archived journals, national and international citations, and leadership roles in professional societies and national and international organizations are some of the outcomes that must be part of the promotion documentation package.
Attachment A

Recommendations for Tenure

I have reviewed the materials submitted by ______________________________ in support of reappointment conferring tenure. On the basis of these materials, supplemented where appropriate by my knowledge of the candidate and the candidate's work and/or relevant comments from colleagues whose opinions I have reason to value, I recommend as follows:

____ I believe the candidate **definitely should** be tenured for the following reasons.

____ I believe the candidate **probably should** be tenured for the following reasons.

____ I believe the candidate **probably should not** be tenured for the following reasons.

____ I believe the candidate **definitely should not** be tenured for the following reasons.

Date: __________ Signature: ______________________________________
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Attachment B

Recommendation for Promotion

I have reviewed the materials submitted by __________ in support of a promotion. On the basis of these materials, supplemented where appropriate by my knowledge of the candidate and the candidate’s work and/or relevant comments from colleagues whose opinions I have reason to value, I recommend as follows:

_____ I believe the candidate **definitely should** be promoted for the following reasons.

_____ I believe the candidate **probably should** be promoted for the following reasons.

_____ I believe the candidate **probably should not** be promoted for the following reasons.

_____ I believe the candidate **definitely should not** be promoted for the following reasons.

Date: __________ Signature: ____________________________________
1. RECOMMENDATION BY DEPARTMENT HEAD

To be completed by the Department Head
Department/Unit: Civil Engineering.

A. Name of Candidate: ________________________________.

B. For tenure: Yes_____; No_____. If already tenured, date: _____________________.

C. For promotion: Yes_____; No_____. To rank of: _________________________.

D. Current rank: ____________________________ Year and month received: ________.

E. Average distribution of Assignment:
   Research
   Instruction
   Service
   Cooperative
   Extension
   Administration

F. Highest degree:_____; date: ___________; institution: _________________________.

G. Years of professional experience prior to KSU_____; at KSU_______.

H. Years of prior service credited toward tenure consideration: ________.

I have reviewed the documents contained herein and they contain all of the materials I wish to submit.

Candidate's Signature__________________________________________

To be completed by the Department Head after departmental review.

Faculty Recommendation: Tenure Promotion

Number voting yes: _______ _______
Number voting no: _______ _______
Number abstaining: _______ _______
Number absent: _______ _______
Department Head Recommendation: Yes_____; No_____.

Department Head's Signature______________________________________
II. RESPONSIBILITIES DURING EVALUATION PERIOD

To be completed by Department Head and signed by Candidate and Head

\[\text{Candidate's Signature} \quad \text{Department Head's Signature}\]

\[\text{Date} \quad \text{Date}\]
III. STATEMENTS BY CANDIDATE

III-A. STATEMENT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Instructions: Candidate is to provide a one page summary of major achievements during the evaluation period at the local, regional, national, and international levels. Candidate may provide any other information he/she feels pertinent to the mid-probationary review. Summary is limited to the space provided below.
III-B. STATEMENT OF FIVE-YEAR GOALS

Instructions: Candidate is to provide a one page statement of the individual’s five-year goals with respect to teaching, research, service and any other scholarly activity. Statement is limited to the space provided below.
IV. INSTRUCTION CONTRIBUTIONS

IV-A. STATEMENT OF ACTIVITIES

Instructions: Candidate is to provide a one page summary of courses taught, student advisement, thesis supervision, and any other evidence of instructional productivity. Summary is limited to the space provided below.
IV-B. EVIDENCE OF INSTRUCTIONAL QUALITY

Instructions: Candidate is to provide evidence of instructional quality such as student ratings, peer evaluations, evaluation of advisement, outcomes of instructional projects directed, awards, etc.
Summary is limited to the space provided below.
IV -C. OTHER EVIDENCE OF SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVITY

Instructions: Candidate is to provide any other evidence of scholarship and creativity that promote excellence in teaching such as multimedia presentations, computer-aided instruction, innovative teaching methods, instruction-related publication, presentations, etc. Summary is limited to the space provided below.
V. RESEARCH AND OTHER CREATIVE ENDEAVORS

V-A. SUMMARY

Instructions: Candidate is to provide a one page statement of research and other creative activities. Statement is limited to the space provided below.
V -B. LISTING OF RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS

Instructions: Candidate is to provide a list of publications and other creative achievement for the evaluation period. Include items accepted but not yet published/presented.
V -C. LIST OF GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

Instructions: Candidate is to provide a list of grants and contracts funded during the evaluation period. Include agency, funding level, duration, title and collaborators. Candidate may provide a separate list of grants and contracts applied for but not funded during the evaluation period.
VI. SERVICE CONTRIBUTIONS

Instructions: Candidate is to provide a statement of service contributions during the evaluation period. Statement should provide evidence of leadership. A list of committees on which the person served may be provided. Statement and committee listing may not exceed two pages.
VII. COOPERATIVE EXTENSION

Instructions: Candidate is to provide a one-page summary of his/her cooperative extension record for the evaluation period. The statement should provide evidence of productivity, quality, creativity, and originality. A separate list of extension publications (including those accepted but not yet published), meetings, workshops, etc. may be provided.
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.

**Process:** Each faculty member shall complete post tenure review as documented in Appendix W of the University Handbook: Post-Tenure Review Policy, and within the specified timeline. The specific steps in this process for the Department of Civil Engineering are:

1. **Materials to be used for the review.**

   - Copies of the six previous annual evaluations.
   - Other materials may be submitted as described below:
     - A one-page summary of major achievements during the evaluation period;
     - A one-page summary of instructional productivity, including courses taught, student advisement, and graduate student supervision, in addition to evidence of instructional quality such as student ratings, peer evaluations, or evaluation of advising;
2. **Who conducts the review.** The department head will review faculty materials and provide recommendations. Each faculty member shall receive the written review prior to its submission to the Dean’s Office, and a meeting between faculty and department head will be conducted to focus on long-term faculty development. Individual faculty members will be given the opportunity to provide input to their development plans.

3. **How the department head will determine whether the faculty member is making appropriate contributions to the university.** The department head review of the information provided will assess whether the current level of professional development undertaken by the faculty member in the past six years has been sufficient to demonstrate “appropriate contribution to the university.” Criteria include:

- All six annual evaluations meet or exceed the Department’s Minimum Acceptable Levels of Performance (MALP).

- Must, over the previous six year period, have demonstrated sustained productivity within the faculty member’s areas of responsibility.

The basic standard for appraisal should be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position, not whether the faculty member meets the current standards for the award of tenure or promotion.