

Department

College

Policy Statement Concerning:

Personnel Review and Evaluation Standards/Procedures

- Performance Evaluation Criteria
- Annual Evaluation
- Reappointment Evaluation for:
 - Annual Reappointment Reviews
 - Mid-Tenure Review
- Tenure
- Promotion
- Professorial Performance Award
- Chronic Low Achievement
- Post-Tenure Review
- Non-Tenure Track Faculty Titles

Approved by Faculty Vote on ()

NEXT REVIEW DATE:



 Department Head's Signature

1/12/2023


 Date



 Dean's Signature

2/15/2023

 Date



 Provost's Signature

4/6/2023

 Date

**Policies and Procedures
Annual Merit Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure, and
Professional Performance**

Kansas State University

Department of Computer Science

*Approved October 20, 2004, Revised January 2006, Extended May 12, 2006,
Revised September 5, 2012, Amended August 27, 2014, Revised and Amended
May 2, 2016. Revised and Amended October 4, 2017. Revised and Amended
January 12, 2023.*

http://www.cs.ksu.edu/docs/faculty/CS_promotionandtenure_2023.pdf

1. General

- a. This document states the policies and procedures of the Department of Computer Science 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 CS 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, advising) 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.
- c. Additionally, the term "assignment" refers to the distribution of responsibilities for a faculty member's teaching, research, service, and advising.
- d. This document establishes procedures for promotion, tenure, and evaluation of faculty holding the following positions:
 - i. Tenured or probationary tenure-track
 - assistant professor, associate professor, professor

ii. Non-tenure track

- Appointment: The non-tenure track instructional positions may be appointed as regular appointments or term appointments as follows.
 - o Term appointments carry no expectation of continued employment beyond the period stated in the contract. The Standards for Notice of Non-reappointment do not apply.
 - o Faculty on a regular appointment are members of the general faculty and are afforded all perquisites accorded to the general faculty. Regular appointees are entitled to Notice of Non-Reappointment (see Appendix A, University Handbook).
- Rank: Instructional faculty are ranked as follows.
 - o instructor, advanced instructor, senior instructor (see C12.0, University Handbook)
 - o professor of practice, senior professor of practice (see C12.3, University Handbook) – there is no assistant professor of practice
 - o teaching assistant professor, teaching associate professor, teaching professor (see C12.4, University Handbook)

The ranks of the following instructional faculty are determined to be the same: (1) instructor and teaching assistant professor; (2) advanced instructor, teaching associate professor, and professor of practice; and (3) senior instructor, teaching professor, and senior professor of practice. For non-tenure track faculty, “faculty of higher rank” shall refer to (1) all tenured faculty and (2) non-tenure track faculty of higher rank. For example, for an advanced instructor, the faculty of higher rank consist of all tenured faculty, senior instructors, teaching professors, and senior professors of practice.

- e. This document is organized, with the section numbers documenting each procedure and faculty class, as follows:

	Tenured Faculty	Tenure-Track Faculty	Non-Tenure-Track Faculty
Annual Evaluation	2	2	2
Reappointment	N/A	3(a)	3(b)
Mid-Tenure Review	N/A	4	N/A
Tenure	N/A	5	N/A
Promotion	5	5	6

Post-Tenure Review	7	N/A	N/A
Nomination for Professorial Performance Award	8	N/A	N/A

2. Annual Evaluation of CS Faculty

a. Procedures/Guidelines

- i. Every faculty member is evaluated annually to assess his or her contribution to the departmental missions, provide feedback to the faculty members, and to provide a fair means to distribute merit salary increases.
- ii. 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 assignments for teaching, research, service, and advising that are determined based upon discussion with the department head. 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".
- iii. At the end of each calendar year, faculty will provide to the Department Head information about their teaching, research, service, and advising, along with an annual plan and statement of goals for the coming year. Summary information is provided in the *Faculty Evaluation Information Form*, which has been approved by the faculty and which is presented as Appendix A in this document. The Department Head shall collect information from each faculty member about his or her teaching, including a TEVAL form for each course taught and copies of instructional materials and syllabi developed by the faculty. The Department Head, in consultation with faculty members, may develop additional questions to be included on the IDEA/TEVAL forms of individual faculty. The Department Head may obtain other information about classroom effectiveness by visiting classes, from classroom reviews by other faculty, by interviews with students, or by evaluation of curriculum content. The faculty member shall provide access to research artifacts (if applicable), including papers, reports, proposals and reviews, and a self-assessment of research activities. For advising, the faculty member shall provide a list of students whom he/she has advised.
- iv. For each faculty member, the Department Head completes a *Faculty Evaluation Form* (see Appendix B of this document) 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 upon 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.

- v. 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.

b. Criteria

- i. 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:

- 1.0 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, college, or university committees
- 3.3 Professional service
- 3.4 Other

- 4.0 Advising

- 4.1 Contribution to department academic advising load
- 4.2 Contribution to new student enrollment and orientation
- 4.3 Student evaluations
- 4.4 Other

- ii. 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

4.0 Advising

4.1 Contribution to department academic advising load

- regular meetings with all advisees, work on new advising materials (flowcharts, website materials, appointment schedulers, etc.), plans to track and assist "at-risk" students

4.2 Contribution to new student enrollment and orientation

- helping incoming freshmen and transfer students on new student enrollment and orientation days

4.3 Student evaluations

- student advising surveys, senior exit interviews

4.4 Other

- service towards transfer course evaluations, participation in or contribution towards advising conferences or workshops

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

c. Standards

- i. 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).
- ii. For probationary tenure-track faculty, the Department Head endeavors to provide a subjective evaluation that will be consistent with progress towards the standards defined for the mid-tenure and tenure reviews.

ci. Chronic Low Achievement

- i. If the Department Head makes an initial evaluation of "unacceptable" in any essential area of work for a tenured 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 (Section C31.5), 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.
- ii. In the area of teaching, unacceptable performance is any continuing pattern of failure to provide an environment of learning. Examples include but are not limited to 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.
- iii. In the area of research, unacceptable performance is a continuing pattern of failure to produce sufficient research-focused evidence of an on-going, quality research program. Examples include but are not limited to continuous failure in two or more of the following activities: (1) to obtain extramural funding of research and other related scholarly activities; (2) to achieve peer-reviewed publications; (3) to participate in professional research activities, such as participating as reviewers, chairs, and delegates at conferences, reviewing articles for journals, and serving on technical committees; (4) to direct graduate research and Ph.D. dissertations.

- iv. In the area of service, unacceptable performance is any pattern of failure to meet minimum requirements of assigned service duties. Examples include but are not limited to failure to meet minimum requirements of committees on which the faculty member is assigned to serve, avoidance of assigned advising, and incorrect advising.
- v. In the area of advising, unacceptable performance is a continuing pattern of failing to assist advisees in their academic plans. Examples include but are not limited to failure to attend advising appointments, failure to assist with group enrollment sessions, and giving incorrect advice.
- vi. In the area of collegiality, unacceptable performance is any pattern of disruptive relationships with university colleagues, technical and office staff, or students.

3. Reappointment of Tenure-Track Faculty and Regular Non-Tenure Track Faculty

a. Reappointment Procedures for Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

- i. All probationary tenure-track 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.
- ii. The documentation is reviewed by the tenured faculty of the department. The tenured faculty meet to discuss the performance of the faculty members undergoing reappointment. Each tenured faculty member individually reports his or her evaluation and recommendation to the Department Head. The Head will also meet with the candidate to discuss the separate issue of the candidate's progress toward tenure. The Department Head prepares a letter of evaluation, which includes his or her recommendation, the rationale for the recommendation, and the faculty vote. The Department Head's letter alone will be made available to the candidate and will become part of the candidate's reappointment file. This file will be forwarded to the Dean. (See C53.1-C53.3, University Handbook.)
- iii. The candidate is informed of the college's recommendation prior to the time that the file and recommendations are forwarded to the provost. (see C56, University Handbook)
- iv. For the full details of the above reappointment procedure, consult Sections C52 through C56 of the University Handbook.
- v. Probationary tenure-track faculty members will be assigned a tenured faculty mentor prior to their first reappointment and are encouraged to meet with this mentor when preparing documentation for reappointment or tenure, or as needed.

b. Reappointment Procedures for Regular Non-Tenure Track Faculty

- i. Based upon C63.1-C63.3 in the University Handbook, the Department Head is responsible to make the candidate's file available to the department faculty

members who are eligible to make recommendations. *Eligible faculty are those of the same or higher rank.* The file includes the Evaluation Information Form and the Faculty Evaluation Form (submitted as part of the non-tenure track faculty member's annual evaluation). The Department Head is advised by the eligible faculty members of the department regarding the qualifications of the candidate for reappointment. 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 purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by that candidate. Comments may be solicited from other faculty members and department heads in the college or university. The Department Head forwards a written recommendation and accompanying explanation to the dean, along with the candidate's complete file, and the majority recommendation and written comments (unedited) of the departmental faculty members. The department head's letter alone will be made available to the candidate.

- ii. The faculty member will be assigned a faculty member of higher rank as a mentor prior to their first reappointment and are encouraged to meet with this mentor when preparing documentation for reappointment or as needed.

c. Procedures for Term Non-Tenure Track Faculty

- i. No reappointment process is required.
- ii. All term non-tenure track faculty will go through the annual evaluation process and progress towards promotion.

d. Criteria

The criteria are the same as for the annual review, namely, contribution to the Department programs through teaching, research (if applicable), service, and advising.

e. Standards

The standards of evaluation for reappointment are based upon the judgment of the Department Head and faculty of higher rank.

4. Mid-Tenure Review for Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

a. Procedures

- i. For new tenure-track 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.
- ii. A mid-tenure review will be conducted as part of the annual review during the third year of employment. The tenure-track 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 reviewers' 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.

- iii. All materials of scholarly work submitted by the tenure-track 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/She will report the results to the tenured faculty and then provide the letter of assessment and summary of faculty comments and suggestions 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 assessment that includes a summary of recommendations from the college advisory committee.

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-tenure 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.

5. Tenure and Promotion (Tenure-Track and Tenured)

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-tenure review. In addition, the faculty member must complete the promotion and tenure form provided at the web site of the university provost: <http://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/dhmanual/promotion/promotio.html>. The Department Head provides at least three external review letters and summary of past evaluations.
2. Tenured faculty of higher rank discuss the review materials.
3. These faculty forward their recommendations to the Department Head.
4. The Department Head makes his/her own recommendation.
5. The recommendations are reported to the tenured faculty of higher rank.
6. The recommendations and the review materials are forwarded to the Dean.
7. A copy of the Department Head's written recommendation letter alone is forwarded to the candidate.

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 contributions to the Department programs through teaching, research, and service, including contributions to students and to the computing profession.

c. Standards

- i. 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.
- ii. 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.

- iii. 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 essential 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. It is expected that candidates have demonstrated significant leadership in at least one of the essential areas.

6. Promotion for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

a. Procedures

- i. The overall procedure for the review of a faculty member for promotion is summarized as follows:
 - 1. The faculty member provides past evaluation materials for review. In addition, the faculty member must complete the promotion form provided at the web site of the university provost: <http://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/dhmanual/promotion/promotio.html>
 - 2. The Department Head provides a summary of past evaluations.
 - 3. Faculty of higher rank discuss the review materials.
 - 4. These faculty forward their recommendations to the Department Head.
 - 5. The Department Head makes his or 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.
 - 8. A copy of the Department Head's written recommendation letter alone is forwarded to the candidate.
- ii. 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. The procedures for review for promotion to any top rank (Teaching Professor, Senior Instructor, Senior Professor of Practice) are essentially the same as that for promotion to an intermediate rank (Teaching Associate Professor, Advanced Instructor). Both cases are covered by this section.

b. Criteria

Criteria for promotion are contributions to the Department programs through teaching, service, and advising, including contributions to students and to the computing profession, in accordance with the specific appointment of the candidate. Furthermore, based on the candidate's appointment, research may be included among these criteria.

c. Standards

- i. The standards of evaluation for promotion are based upon judgment by peers including the faculty of higher rank of the Department.
- ii. For promotion to any intermediate rank, the faculty member must show at least acceptable performance in all applicable areas of teaching, research, service, and advising in accordance with their official appointment. Also, the faculty member must have shown very good contribution in the essential areas. 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 in computer science, computer science education, or closely related fields. For positive review of service, the faculty member must give evidence of institutional contribution. For positive review of advising, the faculty member must give evidence of continued contribution of aiding students in their academic plans. Overall, the guiding standard prescribed by the University is that if there is doubt about overall contribution, then promotion should not be recommended.
- iii. For promotion to any top rank, the faculty member must demonstrate acceptable performance in all applicable areas (teaching, research, service, and advising) and excellent performance in at least one of the essential areas. In particular, for promotion to a teaching professor, the faculty member must establish external recognition of work in the applicable essential areas. It is further expected that candidates have demonstrated significant leadership in the essential area.

7. Post-Tenure Review for Tenured Faculty

a. Purpose

- i. 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.

- ii. 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.
- iii. 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

- i. 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.
- ii. 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.
- iii. 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.
- iv. 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”.

8. Nomination for Professorial Performance Award for Tenured Full Professors

a. Procedures

- i. 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.

- ii. 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

- i. 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.
- ii. 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

Computer Science Faculty Evaluation Information Form

(Revised 2021)

Name:

Rank:

This form allows you to provide input to the department head as he/she evaluates your activities of the past year. Answer the following questions based on your activities from January 1, 2022 to December 31, 2022. Use whatever modes (narration, enumeration, statistics, etc.) seemed appropriate. Give as much detail as is necessary to adequately describe your contributions; excessive details is not required.

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. Student-instructor relationships

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

1.2.1. Current number of undergraduate advisees:

1.2.2. Activities related to improving the advising process and individual advising:

1.2.3. Current non-research graduate advisees:

1.2.4. 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.)

Course Level	100/200	300	400/500	600	700	800
Teacher Effectiveness						

1.3.2. Written comments from course evaluations (cut and paste all comments here):

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 in the current year (include quality indicator such as acceptance percentage):

2.2.5. Technical reports:

2.3. Generation of program support

2.3.1. List of *new* grants:

Include the start date (month, year) and expected end date (month, year) and your role (PI, co-PI, senior personnel, etc.) and the percentage assigned to you from the grant expenditures. For submitted grants, also include status (pending, recommended, declined, etc.).

Funding Agency	Start Date	End Date	Title	K-State Amount	Role	%

2.3.2. List of continuing grants:

Funding Agency	Start Date	End Date	Title	K-State Amount	Role	%

2.3.3. List of submitted grants:

Funding Agency	Start Date	End Date	Title	K-State Amount	Role	%	Status

2.3.1. List of grants in preparation:

Funding Agency	Start Date	End Date	Title	K-State Amount	Role	%

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. Check *Research* if the project is research related.

2.4.1. Undergraduate projects completed under my direction:

Student Name	Major	Date	Title	Funded	Research

2.4.2. Undergraduate students working on projects under my direction:

Student Name	Major	Role	Date	Title	Funded	Research

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

Student Name	Major	Date	Title	Funded

2.4.4. MS/MSE students currently under my direction:

Student Name	Major	Role	Date	Title	Funded

2.4.5. MS/MSE supervisory committees on which I serve/served:

Student Name	Main Advisor

2.4.6. PhD students currently under my direction:

Student Name	Major	Title	Funded

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

Student Name	Main Advisor

2.4.8. PhD dissertations completed under my direction:

Student Name	Date	Title

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

Evaluation of Goals and Plans for 2022

Please evaluate the goals and plans you had for 2022. What went as planned, what did not, etc.

Goal and Plans for 2023

Include your plans for 2023 and the projected percentage allocation of your time between teaching, research and service activities

Appendix B. Faculty Evaluation Form

April 5, 2023

To: _____

Subject: Faculty Evaluation _____

Time Allocation: Teaching: _____ Research: _____ Service: _____

Teaching

TEVALS	Score	Top 1/3	Middle 1/3	Bottom 1/3
Undergraduate				
Graduate				

Teaching Evaluation	Outstanding	Above Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unacceptable
Cont. to dept education programs					
Student-instructor relationships					
Student evaluations					
Course assessment					
Other					

Research

Productivity	Goal	Number	Top 1/3	Middle 1/3	Bottom 1/3
PhD Students					
Publications					
Expenditures					

Research Evaluation	Outstanding	Above Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unacceptable
Unpublished research					
Published research					
Generation of program support					
Student support					
Other					

Service

Service Evaluation	Outstanding	Above Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unacceptable
University promotion & support					
Department committees					
Professional service					
Other					

Overall Evaluation

Greatly exceeds expectations	
Exceeds expectations	
Meets Expectations	
Above satisfactory	
Satisfactory	
Needs improvement	
Does not meet minimal expectations	

Comments:

Plans for next year:

Signature
Professor and Head

I have read this evaluation.

Signature
Rank

Comments: