

DEPARTMENT OF MECHANICAL AND NUCLEAR ENGINEERING

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 5/15/2006)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 11/18/2010)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): 5/2011

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: 11/2015

Donald L. Fenton, Department Head

Date signed: 11/19/2010

John English, Dean

Date signed: 11/23/2010

April C. Mason, Provost and Senior Vice President

Date signed: 12/19/2010

**Each academic department is required by University Handbook policy to develop department documents containing criteria, standards, and guidelines for promotion, tenure, reappointment, annual evaluation and merit salary allocation. These documents must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty members in the department, by the department head or chair, by the dean concerned, and by the provost. In accordance with University Handbook policy, provision must be made to review these documents at least once every five years or more frequently if it is determined to be necessary. Dates of revision (or the vote to continue without revision) must appear on the first page of the document.*

Annual Faculty Evaluation Documents

- 1. Guidelines for the Professorial Performance Award,**
- 2. Procedures for Faculty Annual Evaluations, and**
- 3. Criteria and Standards for Chronic Low Achievement**

**Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering Department
College of Engineering
Kansas State University**

Approval date: May 15, 2006

Professorial Performance Award
Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering
Award Criteria

Professors in the Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering Department at Kansas State University are expected to accept responsibility for and give leadership in all aspects of the educational community including teaching, research and service.

To be eligible for the Professorial Performance Award, the candidate must have attained the rank of Professor at least six years earlier and have not received a PPA in the prior six years. In the past six years, the candidate must have demonstrated all the qualities required for promotion to Professor in the MNE department, namely

1. Show evidence of excellence in undergraduate teaching. Such evidence must include student feedback, senior exit interviews, and course reports. It may also include success in securing resources to support course, laboratory, and curriculum development/enhancement.
2. Show evidence of scholarly work and the ability to support the graduate/research program in an area sustainable by the candidate. Such evidence must include publication of the candidate's research in peer-reviewed journals, securing support for the candidate's work, and successful supervision of graduate students. It may also include development and teaching of graduate courses, securing resources for graduate student support, laboratory development, equipment procurement, as well as other documentation of scholarly excellence.
3. Show evidence of service to the university community and of contributions to the Engineering and Teaching professions. Such evidence must include effective student advising and documented contributions in departmental and college committee and service assignments. It may also include participation in university governance, leadership, and participation in technical and professional society activities. But it does not include consulting.

In addition, during the previous six years, the candidate must:

1. Show evidence of leadership in the operation and development of the undergraduate and graduate programs.
2. Show evidence of national recognition of scholarly work and professional service.

It is recognized that these examples of desirable activities may vary greatly from candidate to candidate and that the merit of each activity must be evaluated separately for each candidate.

Professorial Performance Award

Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering

Time Line and Procedure

In accordance with Paragraph C49.2 of the University Handbook, this document constitutes the review mechanism and procedure for the Professorial Performance Award of the Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering Department. This review mechanism and procedure document will be reviewed at least every five years. Any Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering (MNE) tenured full professor is eligible for the Professional Performance Award (PPA) provided at least six years have elapsed since the faculty member's initial appointment at the rank of Professor or since receiving the last PPA. The eligible faculty, those full professors holding at least a 50% appointment in MNE, will review the qualifications of the PPA candidates and report their findings and recommendations to the MNE Department Head.

The procedure and time line for those faculty wishing to apply for the PPA are:

Fall Semester End (nominally December 15):

The candidate informs Department Head in writing of his/her wish to be considered for the PPA and consults with the Department Head.

Start of Spring Semester (nominally January 15):

After another consultation with the Department Head, if the candidate decides to continue the PPA application process, then the candidate forwards the documents and records concerning teaching, scholarship, and service occurring over the previous six years with the PPA Summary Table to the Department Head. External letters of reference and evaluation are not required.

Last week in January (nominally January 31):

The forwarded material is made available to the eligible faculty for the purposes of review.

At least 14 days following the previous step (nominally February 15):

The eligible faculty will meet to consider the merits of each PPA applicant and the materials submitted by that applicant. No candidate may participate in the review of his or her own application for the PPA. The eligible faculty will choose a Chairperson from its membership. It is the responsibility of the Chairperson to conduct the meeting, to assure the fairness of the proceedings, and to prepare and

submit in a timely fashion all documents regarding the review to the Department Head. The purpose of the meeting is for the eligible faculty to identify those candidates deemed worthy of the PPA and to forward to the Department Head within one week following the meeting of the eligible faculty a list containing the recommended candidates together with written evaluations attesting to why each individual is or is not worthy of the PPA. A transcript of the written comments pertaining to a particular candidate is given to that candidate by the Department Head. After considering the results of the review, the candidate may either choose to continue the application process or to withdraw from further consideration during that year by so notifying the Department Head in writing. If the candidate chooses to continue the application process, the Department Head prepares a written recommendation. A copy of the Department Head's written recommendation is given to the candidate.

Approximately two weeks following the meeting of the eligible faculty (nominally March 1):

Each candidate will have the opportunity to discuss with the Department Head the written evaluation from the eligible faculty and the written recommendations. Each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to discuss and review the evaluation and recommendations. Within seven working days after the review and discussion of the recommendations and eligible faculty evaluation, each candidate has the opportunity to submit to the MNE Department Head and to the Dean of Engineering written statements of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation by the eligible faculty and the recommendations.

End of the second week in March (nominally March 15):

At a minimum, the MNE Department Head must submit the following items to the Dean of Engineering:

- a) The candidate's supporting materials that served as the basis of evaluating eligibility for the award.
- b) The recommendation prepared by the Department Head.
- c) A copy of the department's evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award,
- d) Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendations,
- e) Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation and recommendations.

If the Department Head wishes to apply for the PPA, the Chair of the MNE Promotion and Tenure Committee will fulfill the function of the Department Head in all of the above procedures for that individual.

Name: _____

Ph.D. Degree Institution and Time: _____

Date Hired at KSU: _____

Date Promoted to Full Professor: _____

Date of Last Professorial Performance Award: _____

MNE Department Professorial Performance Award Accomplishment Summary Table

For items listed in the “Total Since Hire” column, please provide an itemized list, for which a sufficiently detailed CV is an acceptable substitution. For items listed in the “Past 6 Years” column, please provide appropriate documentary evidence.

		Total Since Hire	Past 6 Years
	Books		
	Book Chapters		
	Journal Papers		
	Refereed Conference Papers		
	Non-Refereed Conference Papers		
	Technical Reports		
	Invited Lectures/Seminar Talks		
	Patents Filed		
	Patents Issued		
	Proposals Submitted (Unfunded)		
	Proposals Funded		
	Scholarship Funding (\$)		
	Awards and Honors		
	New Courses Developed		
	Others		
Courses Taught	Undergrad (≤ 599)		
	Split Level (600)		
	Graduate (≥ 700)		
Students	Ph.D. Maj. Prof.		
	MS Chair		
	UG Res. Support		
	Honor Students		
Service Contributions	Professional		
	University		

Procedures for Faculty Evaluations

Department of Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering

Kansas State University

Guidelines for Quantifying the Contributions made by the Faculty for the Betterment of the Department of Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering

Background

The vision of the Department is to excel in education and scholarship for the betterment of our students, the state of Kansas, the engineering profession, and society as a whole. The Department will achieve this vision by recognizing activities that strengthen our current foundation, and then encouraging new activities and efforts that raise the level of that foundation. Teaching, scholarship, extra-mural support, and service are an expectation of all tenured and tenure-track faculty.

The Department's vision is based on a series of education, scholarship, and outreach/service goals that are derived from the College's Performance Objectives. These goals, as they apply to the Department, are reviewed and approved by the Department faculty every three years. The current goals are listed in Appendix A.

The philosophy behind quantifying the contributions made by Department faculty members has two important parts.

- **The “accomplishment plan.”** Each faculty member will submit his/her accomplishment plan to the Head during the latter part of each year and will be based on the currently approved long- and short-term Department goals. These plans will permit each faculty member to work towards individual goals that are aligned with the Department goals. The Head will have the ultimate responsibility of determining if the cumulative affect of the plans meets the Departmental goals. If not, then the Head will meet with individual faculty members to suggest changes to his or her plan.
- **Relative importance.** The Head maintains the responsibility of determining the relative benefit of the individual plans. The relative importance will be based on how well the plan addresses the Departmental goals.

Procedure

The following actions will happen each year:

	Task	Responsibility	Due Date
1.	Review and modify as necessary Departmental five-year goals and objectives. These objectives will be based on the College's goals and objectives, and will be presented to the faculty for approval.	Evaluation Committee	Three year cycle, due Sept. 1
2.	Establish the immediate objectives for the following year from the Department's five-year goals. These objectives will be discussed by the faculty and ultimately approved by a majority vote.	Department Head	Oct. 15
3.	Develop individual accomplishment plans for the following calendar year and submit these plans to the Head. The plan should follow the format provided in Appendix B of this document.	Faculty	Dec. 15
4.	Submit a detailed accounting of accomplishments from the previous calendar year. The accounting should include the Summary provided in Appendix C of this document.	Faculty	Jan. 15
5.	Meet with each faculty member and review the accomplishments from the previous calendar year, the accomplishment plan for the current calendar year, and discuss any modifications to the accomplishment plan. Discussions related to the accomplishment plan should point out potential outcomes and any deficiencies. The Head will give an evaluation of how well the plan meets the Department's performance objectives and the expectations of each faculty member.	Department Head and Faculty members	Jan. 31

Appendix A

Goals and Objectives for the Department of Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering

1. Our education program will be practice oriented, rooted in fundamentals, learning-based, and integrated. The specific objectives are:
 - Attract and then graduate the best students in our undergraduate and graduate programs;
 - Improve advising/mentoring roles;
 - All faculty will be involved in learning-based methodologies, with these methodologies incorporated into at least 60% of the engineering classes;
 - Achieve and maintain ABET 2000 accreditation, including assessment and evaluation plans;
 - 100% of our students will have real-world experience through REU programs, internships, professional society participation, and interdisciplinary project teams.
2. Achieve recognition as a strong research/scholarship department by:
 - Growing extramurally-supported expenditures at a real, annual rate of 20%. The Department Head is responsible for evaluating this on a per faculty basis;
 - Secure extramural support for academic programs;
 - Increase MS enrollment by 60% and Ph.D. enrollment by 100%;
 - All faculty will generate significant extramural funding with at least 50% receiving extramural support from industry;
 - Develop new partnerships with national laboratories or other prominent institutions;
 - Create and grow nationally prominent major research programs/centers that support substantial graduate programs and involve undergraduate students;
 - Include at least 20% of the MNE undergraduates in research programs; and
 - Increase by 50% our archived journal publications, invited presentations at national and international conferences, citations by other scholars, officer-level membership on national and international committees, and membership on editorial boards.
3. Expand our outreach and service activities by:
 - Partner with other universities to co-list courses;
 - Develop an electronically-deliverable master's program;

- Develop an active program of non-credit courses, seminars, and workshops for business and industry;
- Faculty will have recent and active interaction with industry;
- Develop new research, academic, and/or outreach programs in collaboration with other colleges;
- Faculty will serve as leaders in their profession by accepting positions on society-level committees or boards, becoming journal editors, or other position of comparable significance;
- At least one faculty member will be an accreditation visitor; and
- At least one faculty member (from the College) will be an NSF program manager, or serve in a similar capacity with another federal agency.

Appendix B Accomplishment Plan for Year

Scholarly activity¹ and Extramural support²	Number of Journal publications			% Time
	Number of conference proceedings			
	Books			
	Invited lectures			
	Graduate student supervision			
	Other			
	Industry funding (cash contracts)		\$	
	Government funding (cash contracts)		\$	
	In-kind equipment donation		\$	
	Other		\$	
Teaching (list specific courses you plan to teach during the spring, summer, and fall semesters)	Course name and number	New/Modified?	Semester	% Time
Service	Department/College/ University	External to the University		% Time
¹ Provide article names if known on a separate sheet ² List funding sources if known on a separate sheet				

Note: The accomplishment plan is designed to be a stand-alone document. It will be used by the Department Head and individual faculty members to determine an appropriate work load, and to estimate the ranking relative to other Departmental faculty. Completing the accomplishments listed on this plan does not guarantee a specific end-of-year ranking, nor does it guarantee a specific raise.

Appendix C

Summary of Accomplishments for the Preceding Year

Scholarly activity¹ and Extramural support²	Number of Journal publications			
	Number of conference proceedings			
	Books			
	Invited lectures			
	Graduate student supervision			
	Other			
% Time: _____ Score: _____	Industry funding (cash contracts)		\$	
	Government funding (cash contracts)		\$	
	In-kind equipment donation		\$	
	Other		\$	
			\$	
Teaching³	Course name and number	New/Modified?	Semester	
% Time: _____ Score: _____				
Service (Indicate if you were a chair/organizer) % Time: _____ Score: _____	Department/College/University		External to the University	
¹ Provide article names on a separate sheet ² List funding sources on a separate sheet ³ List specific courses taught during the spring, summer, and fall semesters – indicate if a course was new or substantially modified				

Note: This page is meant to summarize the accomplishments during the previous calendar year. Supporting materials should be included on separate sheets with the Summary as the cover sheet. The Department Head will provide an evaluation summary that includes performance relative to the rest of the Department faculty.

FACULTY APPRAISAL FORM

January 1 to December 31

Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering Department

Kansas State University

FACULTY MEMBER:_____ **RANK:**_____

The list below describes the various categories of faculty activity. Assume that a faculty member's total work load is represented by 1.0 points. In column 1, distribution of work load among the three categories (Teaching, Research, Service) is presented to describe faculty member's responsibilities during the evaluation period. For those activities assigned 0.1 or higher in column 1, performance ratings are given in column 2 using the following rating scale.

PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE

1. Fails to meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity
2. Below expectation but meets minimum acceptable levels of productivity
3. Meets expectations
4. Above expectations
5. Far above expectations

RESPONSIBILITY

PERFORMANCE

I. Teaching

(classroom teaching, course development, advising, laboratory supervision and maintenance)

II. Research

(Scholarly research, publications, research grants or contracts, proposals, technical papers,

graduate student supervision,
books, invited lectures)

III. Service

(department, college, and
university committees, professional
service, public service)

IV. Overall

Department Head: _____ Date: _____

REMARKS: _____

Reviewed by Faculty Member: _____ Date: _____

Minimum-Acceptable Level of Productivity (Chronic Low Achievement Standards)

Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering Department
College of Engineering
Kansas State University

INTRODUCTION

Issues concerning minimum-acceptable level of productivity for tenured faculty members within the Department of Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering (MNE) are presented in this document. This document is a supplement to the procedures outlined in the MNE Faculty Evaluation Procedures. The purpose, as required by the Kansas State University (KSU) University Handbook, Section C31.5 Chronic Low Achievement, is to clarify issues related to an evaluation of a tenured faculty member who fails to satisfy the minimum-acceptable level of productivity.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Each tenured faculty member is expected to perform his/her professorial duties in a professional manner and at or above a minimum-acceptable level.

PROCEDURES

During the annual review of the faculty, the Department Head will determine whether a tenured faculty member fails or appears to fail to meet the "minimum-acceptable level of productivity" as defined in this document. The decision will be based on the annual evaluation. If the Department Head determines that a tenured faculty member chronically fails or appears to fail to meet the minimum standard in any area of assigned responsibility, a committee of eligible tenured faculty will be convened (unless the faculty member requests otherwise) to review the performance of the tenured faculty member.

If the Department Head receives adequate evidence that an individual tenured faculty member does not meet the "minimum-acceptable level of productivity" in any substantial or critical assignment, action will be initiated following the 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-acceptable level of productivity" standards established in this document will apply to all tenured faculty members of the Department of Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering.

Decisions on acceptable performance must be fair and contain the individual judgments of the faculty and administrators involved in the decision.

Productivity in each area will be evaluated based on the assigned activities and the percentage of the faculty member's appointment allocated to that activity. Gross and chronic failure by a faculty member to perform assigned responsibilities at these levels of productivity can be construed as professional incompetence and failure to meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity. Each faculty member is expected to perform, as a minimum, the following activities, as assigned:

TEACHING

- a. Be conscientious about meeting classes on time; the content, organization, and presentation of lectures; and the appropriate evaluation of student performance.
- b. Strive to be consistent in content and depth of material covered in required courses such that the students earning a 'C' or better grade are appropriately prepared for following courses.
- c. Work to keep course material current. Ensure that an appropriate balance of analysis, design, and computer applications is included in the course material.

SCHOLARSHIP

- a. Engage in scholarly and other creative activities appropriate to the profession.
- b. Serve as graduate student advisor and/ or committee member.
- c. Engage in extramural funding opportunities

SERVICE

- a. Serve on departmental and other university committees.
- b. Attend departmental and college meetings.
- c. Perform student advising conscientiously and treat all students fairly and as mature individuals.
- d. Participate in external professional activities.
- e. Attend appropriate functions.

PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES

Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering Department

Approved: February 13, 2003

Last Revised: November 18, 2010

I. The P & T Committee

The members of the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee are appointed annually by the Department Head. The Chair of the P&T Committee, a full professor, is elected for a three-year term by the MNE faculty. The Chair also serves on the College P&T Committee. The responsibilities of this committee include:

- Review, modify, and/or develop departmental policies regarding tenure and promotion;
- Facilitate the annual review of faculty on probationary appointments and make a recommendation to eligible faculty concerning re-appointment/tenure/promotion;
- Conduct a formal mid-probationary review of all non-tenured tenure-track faculty;
- Advise non-tenured tenure-track faculty about their progress toward earning tenure and, if ready, see that all necessary forms are completed effectively and forwarded in a timely manner; and
- Review all tenured associate professors who seek the committee's assessment about their progress toward earning promotion. If promotion is desired, ensure that all necessary forms are completed effectively, forwarded in a timely manner, and make a recommendation to the eligible faculty.

General issues related to faculty evaluations are discussed in the University Handbook, Sections C30-C39.

II. Eligible MNE Faculty for P&T Decisions

In this document the term “eligible faculty” identifies those MNE faculty who are responsible for participating in the promotion and tenure decisions. The conditions for eligible faculty members are:

- Tenured faculty members equal to or higher than the proposed promotion rank.
- Faculty members with a 50% or greater departmental appointment.

Eligible faculty are expected to actively participate in the entire evaluation process of the candidate. This includes evaluation of the candidate's promotion and tenure materials and participation in the formal deliberations about the candidate's qualifications. Each individual faculty member must decide whether he/she "actively participated" in the evaluation process. If an individual faculty member decides he/she has not actively participated, then he/she is expected to refrain from voting.

III. Probationary Review (See University Handbook, C50-C66)

1. Each faculty member holding probationary appointment must undergo an annual evaluation to determine if the faculty member shall be reappointed for the following year. As a part of the evaluation, each faculty member on probationary appointment is given feedback regarding his/her performance when judged according to the MNE Department's criteria and standards for tenure.
2. During first year of academic service: The department head evaluates the probationary faculty member. If the faculty member is not to be reappointed, then the department head must first meet with the eligible faculty to present and discuss the reasons for this decision. The faculty member is notified in writing on or before March 1 if his or her appointment is to be terminated at the end of that academic year.
3. Each faculty member on probationary appointment, after the first year of service, must submit to the department P&T Committee material that documents the professional accomplishments since his or her initial appointment. This material must include, but is not limited to:
 - a. Completed University Promotion Forms.
 - b. Evidence of effective teaching including evaluations of teaching.
 - c. Evidence of scholarly work which must include technical articles published or pending publication, summaries of research projects started and underway, copies of research proposals submitted, a list of supervised graduate students, and summaries of any other scholarly activities.
 - d. Evidence of service to Kansas State University, the profession, and appropriate professional societies.
 - e. Copies of all written records forwarded to the probationary faculty member by the P&T Committee from previous reappointment evaluations.
4. The P&T Committee members shall individually attend at least one class taught by a probationary faculty member during each academic year. The P&T Committee shall meet towards the end of the academic year to develop written comments that are then provided to that faculty member.
5. During the second year of academic service: The date for submission of probationary faculty member's evaluation materials follow:
 - a. September, end of second week: Faculty member submits the evaluation materials (described in III.3.) to the P&T Committee. The P&T Committee shall review the evaluation materials as a committee, provide a written summary letter to the candidate, and then meet with the candidate seeking reappointment. The Department

Head shall participate in this meeting. Upon review of the evaluation materials by the P&T Committee, the faculty member may change and/or modify the materials in response to suggestions provided by the P&T Committee.

- b. October, end of second week: The faculty member's materials are made available for review by the eligible departmental faculty.
 - c. November, end of first week: After the evaluation materials have been available to the eligible faculty for at least 14 days, the department head and the eligible faculty will meet to discuss the probationary faculty member's suitability for reappointment and advancement toward tenure (see C53.1). The P&T committee will make its recommendation to the eligible faculty at this time. At this meeting, any eligible faculty member may request that the probationary faculty member (within 5 calendar days) meet with all the eligible faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the evaluation materials submitted by the probationary faculty member. After all discussions are complete, a ballot of the eligible faculty concerning the reappointment of the probationary faculty member will be submitted to the department head. Each vote must have a written explanation supporting the cast vote.
 - d. November, end of second week: Department head submits the final recommendation, explanations, and complete evaluation materials to the Dean (see C53.3). Included in the submitted materials to the Dean are the unedited written comments of each of the eligible faculty members and the numerical results of the ballot. The department head will present to the probationary faculty member the written recommendation and the associated explanations. Also, the department head will discuss with the probationary faculty member their advancement toward tenure. These recommendations and explanations are kept in the probationary faculty member's confidential file.
6. After two or more years of academic service: the date for submission of probationary faculty member's evaluation materials follow:
- a. January, end of second week: Faculty member submits the evaluation materials (described in III. 3.) to the P&T Committee. These materials must include the cumulative record of written recommendations and associated explanations given to the probationary faculty member from previous reappointment meetings and any other written comments from relevant individuals outside the department. The P&T Committee shall review the evaluation materials as a committee, provide a written summary letter to the candidate, and then meet with the candidate seeking reappointment. The Department Head shall participate in this meeting. Upon review of the evaluation materials by the P&T Committee, the faculty member may change and/or modify the submitted evaluation materials.
 - b. February, end of second week: The faculty member's materials are made available for review by the eligible departmental faculty.

- c. March, end of first week: After the evaluation documents have been available to the eligible faculty for at least 14 days, the department head and the eligible faculty shall meet to discuss the probationary faculty member's suitability for reappointment and advancement toward tenure (see C53.1). The P&T committee shall make its recommendation to the eligible faculty at this time. If the P&T Committee recommendation is not unanimous, then a minority statement will also be made. At this meeting, any eligible faculty member may request that the probationary faculty member (within 5 calendar days) meet with the eligible faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the evaluation materials submitted by the probationary faculty member. After all discussions are complete, a ballot of the eligible faculty concerning the reappointment of the probationary faculty member shall be submitted to the department head. Each vote must have a written explanation supporting the cast vote.
- d. March, end of second week: Department head submits the final recommendation, explanations, and complete evaluation materials to the Dean (see C53.3). Included in the submitted materials to the Dean are the unedited written comments of each of the eligible faculty members and the numerical results of the ballot. The department head shall present to the probationary faculty member the written recommendation and the associated explanations. Also, the department head shall discuss with the probationary faculty member their advancement toward tenure. These recommendations and explanations are kept in the probationary faculty member's confidential file.

IV. Mid-Probationary Review (See University Handbook, C92-C93)

Midway through the probationary period, a review of a probationary faculty member is conducted. The mid-probationary review occurs during the faculty member's third year in the department. The purpose of this review is to provide substantial feedback to the probationary faculty member from both the faculty and the administration about how well the faculty member's accomplishments satisfy the department's criteria for obtaining tenure. A favorable mid-probationary review does not guarantee tenure shall be given in the future, nor does a negative review guarantee that tenure shall not be given.

Each faculty member on probationary appointment must submit to the P&T Committee material that documents the professional accomplishments since his or her initial appointment. This material is specified in Section III. 3. As part of the mid-probationary review, the P&T Committee shall provide to the candidate an assessment of the candidate's progress towards tenure and expectations of continued progress.

Procedures and time line for the mid-probationary review are those described in Section III. 6.

V. Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor (See University Handbook, C70-C116)

1. By the first day of the fall semester, each untenured faculty member intending to seek tenure during the academic year (and, if an assistant professor, also promotion to associate professor) must write a letter to the Chair of the P&T Committee (with a copy to the Department Head) indicating the intention to seek tenure. This letter must include completed University Promotion Forms responding to the Department's Promotion and/or Tenure Guidelines, as well as all supporting materials (copies of publications, teaching evaluations, etc.) (see C111).
2. The P&T Committee shall review the letter, forms, and any supporting material as a committee, provide a written summary letter to the candidate, and then meet with the candidate seeking tenure and/or promotion. The Department Head shall participate in this meeting. Suggestions for improving the candidate's application and for addressing any concerns the committee perceives shall be discussed with the candidate. The final decision to go forward rests with the candidate.
3. Faculty members going forward for promotion and/or tenure shall submit to the P&T Committee, by September 1, a list of four potential reviewers outside the University. At least two of these reviewers, plus at least two others selected by the Department Head, shall be contacted for written evaluations (see C112.2). Faculty going forward for promotion and tenure shall prepare the final documentation supporting their application, in consultation with the P&T Committee and the Department Head, by October 1.
4. Eligible MNE faculty members individually review each candidate's file, which shall be available at least fourteen days prior to the meeting at which eligible faculty discuss the candidate's petition (see C112.3). Any eligible faculty, prior to the vote, may request to meet with the candidate to clarify any materials submitted by the candidate (see C112.4). A meeting of eligible faculty shall be called. At this meeting, the P&T Committee shall report to the eligible faculty its deliberations. If the P&T Committee recommendation is not unanimous, then a minority report is also made. The eligible faculty, less the Department Head, then submit their vote and written comments to the Department Head. The vote and unedited faculty comments are forwarded with the candidate's reviewed material to the Dean (see C112.5).
5. The Department Head shall report to the eligible faculty the faculty vote tally and his or her recommendation to the Dean. If the Department Head's recommendation is contrary to the faculty vote, the Head shall meet with the eligible faculty to explain the reasons for not accepting the faculty vote.

VI. Promotion to Full Professor (See University Handbook, C120-C156)

1. By the first day of the fall semester, each tenured associate professor intending to seek promotion during the academic year must write a letter to the chair of the P&T

committee (with a copy to the Department Head) indicating the intention to seek promotion. This letter must include completed University Promotion Forms responding to the Department's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, as well as all supporting materials (copies of publications, teaching evaluations, etc.) (see C151).

2. The P&T Committee shall review the letter, forms, and any supporting material as a committee, provide a written summary letter to the candidate, and then meet with the candidate seeking promotion. The Department Head shall participate in this meeting. Suggestions for improving the candidate's application and for addressing any concerns the committee perceives shall be discussed with the candidate. The final decision to go forward rests with the candidate.
3. Faculty going forward for promotion shall submit to the P&T Committee, by September 1, a list of four potential reviewers outside the University. At least two of these reviewers, plus at least two others selected by the Department Head, shall be contacted for written evaluations (see C152.2). Faculty going forward for promotion shall prepare the final documentation supporting their application, in consultation with the P&T Committee and the Department Head, by October 1.
4. Eligible MNE faculty members individually review each candidate's file, which shall be available at least fourteen days prior to the meeting at which eligible faculty discuss the candidate's petition (see C152.3). Any eligible faculty, prior to the vote, may request to meet with the candidate to clarify any materials submitted by the candidate (see C152.4). A meeting of eligible faculty shall be called. At this meeting, the P&T Committee shall report to the eligible faculty its deliberations. The eligible faculty, less the Department Head, then submit their vote and written comments to the Department Head. The vote and unedited faculty comments are forwarded with the candidate's reviewed material to the Dean (see C152.5).
5. The Department Head shall report to the eligible faculty the faculty vote tally and his or her recommendation to the Dean. If the Department Head's recommendation is contrary to the faculty vote, the Head shall meet with the eligible faculty to explain the reasons for not accepting the faculty vote.

VII. Meetings of the P&T Committee

Meetings of the P&T Committee, when individual qualifications are considered, shall be closed and any written responses shall be confidential.

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering Department

Approved: February 13, 2003

Last Revised: November 18, 2010

Faculty members in the Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering Department at Kansas State University are expected to accept responsibility for and give leadership in all aspects of the educational community including teaching, research and service.

I. Considerations for mid-probationary review

The material should demonstrate the probationary faculty member can become a department leader and be successful in all aspects of professorial duties. The probationary faculty member should show clear progress towards tenure.

Reappointment should be based on clear progress towards tenure. Suitable criteria include effective classroom teaching, progress towards establishing an externally funded scholarly agenda, and effective collaboration with colleagues. The candidate must demonstrate a professional demeanor (see D.3) and a commitment to good citizenship in the department.

II. Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

To qualify for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor a candidate must:

1. Show multiple sources of evidence of excellence in undergraduate teaching. Such evidence must include student feedback, senior exit interviews, and course reports. It may also include success in securing resources to support course, laboratory, and curriculum development/enhancement.
2. Show evidence of scholarly work and the ability to support the graduate/research program in an area sustainable by the candidate. Such evidence must include publication of the candidate's research in peer reviewed journals, securing support for the candidate's work, and successful supervision of graduate students. It may also include development and teaching of graduate courses, and securing resources for laboratory development and equipment procurement and other documentation of research excellence.
3. Show evidence of service to the university community and contribution to the Engineering and Teaching professions. Such evidence must include effective student advising and documented contribution in departmental and college committee and service assignments. It may also include participation in university governance, leadership and participation in technical and professional society activities, but does not include consulting.

4. Demonstrate a professional demeanor (see D.3) and a commitment to good citizenship in the department.

III. Promotion to Full Professor

To qualify for promotion to the rank of Professor a candidate must show substantial and sustained growth in professional leadership and stature. In addition to sustained excellence in the measures required for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate for promotion to Professor must:

1. Show evidence of leadership in the operation and development of the undergraduate and graduate programs, and
2. Show evidence of national recognition of scholarly work and professional service. The documented evidence shall be reviewed by peers from other institutions. Peer reviewers shall be chosen by the candidate and the Promotion and Tenure Committee.
3. Demonstrate a professional demeanor (see D.3) and a commitment to good citizenship in the department.

Examples of such evidence might include a substantial body of published work in peer reviewed journals, sustained support for research program, successful supervision of doctoral students, presentation of research at prestigious conferences, significant citations of published work, authorship of texts, monographs, and other special publications, significant application of research results for the advancement of technology, leadership in professional and technical society activities, organization of sessions at professional meetings, committee leadership and editorial board service for professional societies, proposal and technical paper review services, service on governmental panels, attainment of prestigious honors and awards and other recognition of prominent professional leadership. It is recognized that these examples of desirable activities may vary greatly from case to case and that the merit of each activity must be evaluated for each case.