

DEPARTMENT OF APPAREL, TEXTILES, AND INTERIOR DESIGN

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 8/20/2014)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 8/20/2014)

POST-TENURE REVIEW

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 8/20/2014)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): 8/20/2019

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: 8/20/2019

REVIEW DATE FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW: 8/20/2019

Barbara G. Anderson, Department Head

Date signed: 8/21/2014

John Buckwalter, Dean

Date signed: 8/21/2014

April C. Mason, Provost and Senior Vice President

Date signed: 9/2/2014

**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.*

Apparel, Textiles, and Interior Design
Department

Human Ecology
College

Policy Statement Concerning:

**Annual Evaluations
(including Professorial Performance Award Criteria and
Standards and Chronic Low Achievement Standards)**

Approved by Faculty Vote on (08/20/2014)

Promotion, Tenure, Mid-Tenure Review and Reappointment

Approved by Faculty Vote on (08/20/2014)

Post-Tenure Review

Approved by Faculty Vote on (08/20/2014)

Barbara G Anderson
Department Head's Signature

8/21/2014
Date

John Blum
Dean's Signature

8.21.14
Date

Apuel C Mason
Provost's Signature

2 Sept 14
Date

For Office of Academic Services Use Only

Date Posted to Web: _____

I. Table of Contents

II.	Introduction	3
III.	Appointment.....	4
A.	Individualized Assignments.....	4
1.	Faculty Appointment Categories and Typical Percentages of Time Assigned for Each.....	4
2.	Collegiality/Academic Citizenship (refer to Appendix 6).....	5
IV.	Annual Merit Salary Adjustments	6
A.	Annual Evaluation Guidance	6
1.	Evaluation of Instructional Performance	8
2.	Evaluation of Scholarship Performance	8
3.	Evaluation of Service Performance	9
4.	Evaluation of Professional Staff Performance.....	9
5.	Evaluation of Collegiality/Academic Citizenship Performance.....	10
V.	Reappointment	10
A.	Procedures for Reappointment of Non-tenured Faculty	11
B.	Criteria for Reappointment of Non-tenured Faculty.....	12
VI.	Mid-Tenure and Tenure	12
A.	Mid-tenure Review	12
B.	Tenure Review	12
C.	Criteria for the Granting of Tenure	14
VII.	Promotion	14
A.	Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	14
B.	Promotion to Professor.....	15
VIII.	Graduate Faculty/Certification	16
IX.	Professorial Performance Award	17
X.	Post-Tenure Review	18
XI.	Chronic Low Achievement	19
XII.	APPENDICES	19
	Appendix 1. Development of the Letter of Expectation.....	19
	Appendix 2. Annual Merit Salary Adjustments and Reappointment Evaluation Documentation.....	22
	Appendix 3. Information about Evaluation of Instruction	24
	Appendix 4. Information about Evaluation of Scholarship	26
	Appendix 5. Information about Evaluation of Service, Outreach and Engagement.....	28
	Appendix 6. Information about Evaluation of Collegiality/Academic Citizenship.....	29
	Appendix 7. Forms for Annual Merit Salary Adjustments Evaluation and Faculty Ballots for Reappointment, Mid-Tenure, Tenure, Rank Promotions, and the Professorial Performance Award	30
	Appendix 8. Schedules for Evaluation Processes in ATID.....	38

II. Introduction

Academic and scholarship programs in the Department of Apparel, Textiles, and Interior Design (ATID) focus on the relationship between people and their environment. There are two undergraduate programs in ATID: 1) apparel and textiles, and 2) interior design. The Interior Design program is a professional program accredited by the Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA). Both the apparel design specialization and interior design program are accredited by the National Association for Schools of Art and Design. The department also has a Master's program (resident and distance) and doctoral specialization in apparel and textiles within the College of Human Ecology Doctoral degree program.

ATID benefits from the diverse academic and professional cultures represented by faculty and students in the department and the range of scholarly outcomes that result from this diversity. While each area is distinctly different, there are many commonalities and each area is respected and valued by faculty and staff in the department.

Throughout this document the unclassified employees with responsibilities to conduct scholarship, teaching, and service will be referred to as "faculty" and the unclassified employees in positions that do not have obligations in all three of these areas will be referred to as "professional staff". In addition, this document will frequently refer to the *University Handbook*. It is located at the following URL: <http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/fhbook/index.html>

There are seven types of review addressed in this departmental document:

The first type is annual merit salary adjustments evaluations, which are "...conducted for the purpose of determining merit salary increases [and] are based on the distribution of responsibilities assigned, the relative difficulty and importance of these responsibilities, and the level of success with which each is performed." (*University Handbook*, C40).

The second type is a reappointment evaluation for faculty on probationary appointments. This review determines if a faculty member will be reappointed or not. Reappointment decisions have different timeframes depending on the contract year. See section C50.1 – C56 of the *University Handbook* for specific information.

The third type is the tenure review, which includes a mid-tenure review requirement. See section C70 – C116.2 of the *University Handbook* for additional information.

The fourth type is rank promotion review, which includes promotion to associate professor and professor. See section C120 – C156.2 of the *University Handbook* for additional information.

The fifth type addresses graduate faculty status and certification to direct doctoral students.

The sixth type is the Professorial Performance Award review, which is described in section C49.1-C49.14 of the *University Handbook*.

The seventh type is the Post-Tenure review, which is described in Appendix W of the *University Handbook*.

III. Appointment

A. Individualized Assignments

Each tenure-track faculty member and professional staff member is unique and contributes a special set of strengths and abilities to the department. Thus, the proportion of time assigned to instruction (teaching and advising), scholarship, service, and other duties may vary within and across programmatic areas and staff roles within the department according to faculty/staff strengths, priorities at different points in an individual's career, needs of the department, academic programs, and source of salary (for example, K-State instructional budget, Agricultural Experiment Station, grant or contract sponsor). Typically, time assignments for tenure-track faculty range from 5% to 80% for each of the following areas: service, instruction, and scholarship (not to exceed 100% of time). Conventional workloads usually have a maximum 5-10% service appointment with 60-80% for instruction, and the remainder of time for scholarship. Teaching roles and advising/mentoring activities are assigned separate percentages for the allocation of time in the category of instruction. There are no typical assignments in tenths for professional staff.

Assignments for the upcoming year are negotiated with the department head during the annual evaluation and are documented in a **Letter of Expectation**. Professional staff negotiate their Letter of Expectation with each contract renewal. Faculty members in their first year negotiate the assignment and expectations for their first year as part of the contract negotiation. (Refer to Appendix 1 for more information). However, the department head or faculty member may request an adjustment to these ratios and expectations during the year in the event that unforeseen opportunities, constraints, or obligations arise. In preparing the Letter of Expectation and in decisions regarding faculty evaluation, the department head will consider the appropriateness of the expectations to the stage of career and specific professional circumstances of each faculty member, for example those who are new hires and have worked for only one semester, those who have been on sabbatical, medical leave, or on leave without pay.

1. Faculty Appointment Categories and Typical Percentages of Time Assigned for Each

Following are descriptions of how appointments are made equitable within the department by using standards for percentages of time allocated to each category of work typically assigned to departmental faculty members.

a) *Instruction (refer to Appendix 3)*

The university combines teaching and advising under the term instruction. ATID includes mentoring with advising.

(1) Classroom Instruction

Typically teaching a course is equal to 12-15% of the nine-month academic year appointment. Faculty members typically teach four or five classes each academic year.

(2) Non-Classroom Instruction

Typically non-classroom instruction, such as teaching an independent readings course to one or a few students, is not factored into the nine-month academic year appointment as a percentage of faculty assignments. However, these activities are recognized as contributing to the functioning of the department by the department head when conducting faculty evaluations.

(3) Undergraduate Advising and/or Mentoring

Advising and/or mentoring undergraduates is typically 5% of the nine-month academic year appointment. A 5% assignment is used when the faculty member has an approximately equal share of all undergraduate advisees/mentees as the other faculty members in the program area.

(4) Graduate Advising and Mentoring

Advising and mentoring of graduate students is typically 5-10% of the nine-month academic year appointment for those faculty members with graduate faculty advising and mentoring responsibilities.

b) Scholarship (refer to Appendix 4)

Typically, scholarship appointments are 10-20% of the nine-month academic year appointment. The primary exception is in cases where faculty members have AES or extramural funding to support scholarship at higher percentages. When these special circumstances arise, the percentages will be negotiated between the department head and faculty member with the guide that a course release is typically considered 12-15% of the nine-month academic year appointment, thus a course release would reduce instruction by 15% and increase scholarship by 15%.

c) Service (refer to Appendix 5)

Typically, service appointments are 5-10% of the nine-month academic year appointment. On occasion, there are circumstances in which service obligations in any category (instruction, scholarship, or service) may exceed typical obligations of faculty members. When that is the case, the percentages appointed will be adjusted in the nine-month academic year appointment.

2. Collegiality/Academic Citizenship (refer to Appendix 6)

Collegiality and academic citizenship are expected of all faculty members and will be evaluated in merit salary adjustments evaluations, reappointment evaluations, tenure evaluations, promotion evaluations, and professorial award evaluations.

IV. Annual Merit Salary Adjustments

A. Annual Evaluation Guidance

Each year the department head is responsible for evaluating faculty members and professional staff based on their performance relative to the expectations established for the evaluation period (see Example Letter of Expectation in Appendix 1). In accordance with *University Handbook C42*, ATID has chosen the 12-month period from August 1 through July 31. This is a change from the prior calendar year basis for annual evaluation.¹ The university mission statement provides a guide for establishing “expected performance” between the department head and each faculty member.

“The mission of Kansas State University is to foster excellent teaching, research, and service that develop a highly skilled and educated citizenry necessary to advancing the well-being of Kansas, the nation, and the international community. The university embraces diversity, encourages engagement and is committed to the discovery of knowledge, the education of undergraduate and graduate students, and the improvement in the quality of life and standard of living of those we serve.” (<http://www.k-state.edu/provost/planning/mission.html>)

It is therefore expected that ATID faculty members will endeavor to perform their obligations with the intention of contributing to this mission of excellence. Each individual is expected to work with the department head to develop a Letter of Expectation that results in personal growth and development and meets professional obligations in ways that are appropriate to his or her appointment to teach, produce scholarship, and provide service. These performance expectations should be based on impact and will also be defined in a manner that mutually benefits the department’s goals and objectives as well as the college and institutional missions.

The department head uses the evidence available to them through multiple means including the evidence described herein and provided in the materials submitted by the faculty member in the Faculty Activity Report to undertake reviews as described in section C.40 of the *University Handbook*. Faculty members must refer to Appendix 2 for guidance on the Annual Merit Salary Adjustments evaluation documentation. Professional staff will submit up to four pages (digital pdf) of text articulating how his or her performance in the prior year met the expectations in the Letter of Expectation for the year being evaluated. Each faculty member and professional staff member will review and have the opportunity to discuss his/her evaluation with the department head in accordance with *University Handbook C45.3*.

Categories used for annual evaluation will be consistent with the recommendations provided in C31.8 a. of the *University Handbook* and will be used to assess performance in each category of assigned responsibility. They are as follows:

¹ In the first year after adoption of this new timeframe for annual evaluation, the fall semester that was evaluated as part of the calendar year in the prior evaluation will be evaluated again as part of the academic year in the first annual evaluation under this new document.

- Exceeded expectations (4 points)
Performance and measureable outcomes exceeded all agreed upon expectations in the category
- Met expectations (3 points)
Performance and measureable outcomes met all agreed upon expectations in the category
- Fallen below expectations but has met minimum acceptable levels of productivity (2 points)
Performance and measureable outcomes met greater than half or half of all agreed upon expectations in the category
- Fallen below minimally acceptable levels of productivity (1 point)
Performance and measureable outcomes met fewer than half of all agreed upon expectations in the category

The department head will assign points, in whole number increments, to each of the categories listed in Appendix 7, Merit Salary Adjustments Evaluation Rating Sheet. These performance expectation scores will be weighted by time allocation per category; then summed to result in an “Overall Rating” score that is used to determine merit raise distribution. Distribution of annual merit salary adjustments will utilize a three-year rolling average (current year overall rating plus two preceding year overall ratings) measured against the following criteria:

- Exceeded Overall Expectations (3.50 - 4.00 or higher)
- Met Overall Expectations (2.50 – 3.49)
- Below Overall Expectations (2.00 – 2.49)
- Eligible for Chronic Low Achievement (<2.00)

Total dollars allotted to ATID for annual merit salary adjustment will be divided by the total salary dollars of current faculty members to determine the baseline percentage. (When the university provides merit salary adjustment funds for unclassified personnel, or when it is available through other means within the department or college, annual merit salary adjustments will be awarded to professional staff as provided by the university/college or upon renewal of their contracts as determined by the department head.) The baseline percentage will be used as the starting point for the department head to develop the formula for distribution of salary increases. Annual merit salary increases will be allocated based on the following guidance:

- Faculty exceeding overall expectations will be awarded the ATID baseline percentage for annual merit salary adjustments, plus a bonus percentage to be determined by the department head.
- Faculty meeting overall expectations will be awarded the ATID baseline percentage for annual merit salary adjustments, unless changes in allocations are necessary to accommodate bonuses and/or reductions for faculty members who have exceeded or fallen below expectations.
- Faculty falling below expectations will be awarded the ATID baseline percentage for annual merit salary adjustments, *less* a percentage to be determined by the department head.
- Faculty eligible for Chronic Low Achievement will not receive annual merit salary adjustments.

ATID has elected to use a three-year rolling average of each faculty member's annual evaluation results (the average of the current evaluation results plus two preceding evaluation results) to determine relative merit salary increase recommendations so as to minimize inequities due to variable legislative actions from year to year. Faculty members in their third year appointment will receive a merit salary increase based on an average of their evaluation scores for their first two years. Faculty members in their second year appointment will receive a merit salary increase based on their evaluation score for their first year. First-year appointees will not have the opportunity for a merit salary adjustments review prior to the award of their second annual contract; therefore they will be awarded a salary increase equal to the percentage raise awarded for meeting expectations.

1. Evaluation of Instructional Performance

High quality instructional performance by faculty is fundamental to attaining a national reputation for educational programs in their disciplines and contributes to overall excellence in the department, college, and university.

a) Evaluating Teaching and Advising Quality, Impact, and Significance

Section C2 of the *University Handbook* defines teaching as those instructional activities which assist undergraduate and graduate students in gaining knowledge, understanding, or proficiency (e.g., planning and teaching courses, curriculum development, advising undergraduates, and supervising graduate students). As appropriate to the individual's appointment and expectations, the department head will evaluate each of the following: undergraduate teaching, graduate teaching, undergraduate advising, and graduate advising and mentoring.

Although classroom teaching is the most common activity, small group or individual instruction, such as independent studies, honors projects, study tours, and internships are also important forms of teaching. Professional performance in teaching is exceptionally complex and cannot be evaluated adequately based on a single source of information. Effective teaching successfully addresses the teaching responsibilities of instructional content, instructional methods, instructional delivery skills, management of instructional activities, undergraduate advising and mentoring, and graduate advising and mentoring.

The department head will use the following sources to evaluate instruction: 1) the standardized student evaluations of teaching (either TEVAL or IDEA in the online format), 2) the student evaluations of advising as appropriate, 3) the documentation and self-assessment provided by the faculty member, 4) faculty members may also include other evidence of teaching effectiveness, See Appendix 3, and 5) other evidence indicating whether the faculty member followed (or did not follow) established university and departmental policies in managing his or her instructional responsibilities.

2. Evaluation of Scholarship Performance

High quality scholarship is fundamental to attaining a national reputation in the field and academic excellence in a land-grant university. Excellent faculty members maintain consistent scholarship programs focused in a particular area(s) and regularly engage in a variety of rigorous scholarly activities.

a) Evaluating Scholarship Productivity Quality, Impact, and Significance

Scholarship productivity is assessed in accordance with individual appointments and areas of responsibility that might impact outcomes in scholarship productivity. Individuals having higher percentages of scholarship appointments are expected to exhibit proportionately more productive scholarship programs than those having smaller percentage appointments. In addition, stage of career, working with graduate students, being assigned the assistance of GTAs and GRAs, and the type or method of scholarship may have an impact on the quantity of accomplishments each faculty member produces each year. For these reasons, the evaluation of productivity must be based on the expectations established for the year in the Letter of Expectation.

Faculty members are not expected to engage in *all categories* of scholarship or participate in *all types* of activities. However, faculty members should choose scholarship activities that meet the levels of rigor expected in their own professional field and make significant contributions to the department, university, and discipline or profession. In addition, a faculty member should be able to demonstrate (over the long term) that his or her body of scholarly work has focus and coherence and that the faculty member is achieving recognition as an expert in his or her focus area. Finally, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to document the amount of scholarship accomplished relative to their time assignment and to describe the quality of the scholarly work and its impact and value.

Ultimately the evaluation of faculty productivity requires the department head to consider factors such as stage in career and both quality and quantity of scholarly work. However, quantification comparisons between diverse scholars in diverse disciplines are difficult and the department head will be expected to use discretion rather than simply counting and totaling accomplishments as the basis for evaluation. Refer to Appendix 4 for guidance.

3. Evaluation of Service Performance

Excellence in institutional service can be evidenced by leadership and/or a high degree of participation in service activities such as committees, task forces, etc. Excellence in professional service can be evidenced by leadership and/or a high degree of participation in regional, national, and international organizations.

The amount and nature of a faculty member's service contributions are likely to differ as a function of the individual's skills, interests, and stage in career development. However, all faculty members are expected to participate in 1) institutional committees and activities at various levels, and 2) professional organizations related to their field. Faculty members may also document and be evaluated on public service activities directly related to their academic areas of expertise and thus qualify as outreach. The department head will evaluate service performance. Refer to Appendix 5 for guidance.

4. Evaluation of Professional Staff Performance

Excellence in performance of duties assigned will be as indicated in the Letter of Expectation for each professional staff member's appointment.

5. Evaluation of Collegiality/Academic Citizenship Performance

Collegiality refers to the commitment and ability of a faculty member to work effectively and cooperatively with others in achieving the goals of the department, college, university, and profession.

“The University needs collegiality to function effectively, and units may wish to consider it in evaluation, either as a part of the more traditional areas or as a separate domain of achievement. Some faculty members foster goodwill and harmony within a department, mentor colleagues, and generally contribute to the pursuit of common goals. Other individuals may display behavior that is highly disruptive to the department; as a result, collegiality and morale suffer.” (Retrieved September 22, 2011 from <http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/depthead/promotion/chap2.html#E>)

Academic citizenship refers to the individual faculty member’s willingness to a) participate in program, departmental, and college events and meetings; b) fulfill obligations of self-governance within the department (for example, participating in all faculty votes for which one is qualified); c) maintain confidentiality when required by university policy; and d) work for the advancement of the unit, department, or college by volunteering to take on tasks and roles that may not benefit themselves, but benefit the whole. When unique talents or abilities are needed and the individuals with them step forward to benefit the group through their effort, it is an act of academic citizenship and should be rewarded. Refer to Appendix 6 for guidance.

In the merit salary increase formula, there are three categories of evaluation for collegiality or academic citizenship: exceeded expectations, met expectations, fallen below expectations (see Appendix 7). The department head will evaluate each faculty member’s level of collegiality or academic citizenship. The evaluation of collegiality or academic citizenship is used as a multiplier for the score earned in all other categories through the merit salary adjustments evaluation. In the evaluation of collegiality or academic citizenship, those who earn a score of exceeded expectations will have their score multiplied by 1.1. Those who earned a score of met expectations will have their scores remain the same (same as being multiplied by 1.0) and those who earned a score of fallen below expectations will have their score multiplied by 0.9. In this way collegiality and academic citizenship will be incorporated into the department’s annual merit salary adjustments evaluation process and incentivize the behaviors that are desired.

V. Reappointment

Probationary faculty (those on tenure track but not yet tenured) must be reviewed annually for reappointment (See University Handbook C50.1-C66). These evaluations serve two purposes: as a means of determining whether a probationary faculty member will be reappointed or not, and as a means of providing feedback regarding the faculty member’s performance relative to the department’s criteria and standards for tenure.

A. Procedures for Reappointment of Non-tenured Faculty

With the exception of second-year faculty who will be evaluated in November with documentation for evaluation due in early November, the evaluation process for reappointment will occur in January and February. Documentation for reappointment review will be due on or about January 15. Reappointment reviews for faculty in his or her first year are based solely on their first semester, will use the same format as Annual Merit Salary Adjustments reviews. For faculty undergoing mid-tenure review, the documentation for mid-tenure evaluation will be the basis for reappointment review. For all other reappointment reviews the documentation submitted for the most recent Annual Merit Salary Adjustments evaluation is used.

A faculty member in his or her first contract year will be informed of the decision concerning reappointment for the following year (or termination at the end of the first year) by March 1 of the first year of service. A faculty member in his or her second contract year will be informed of the decision concerning reappointment for the following year (or termination at the end of the second year) by December 15 of the second year of service. After completion of two or more years of service at the university, faculty members receive 12 months' notice of non-reappointment. For example, a third-year employee would be notified at the end of the third year regarding non-reappointment for the fifth year of service.

Beginning with the second annual evaluation, all non-tenured faculty members will be evaluated by tenured faculty members in the department (regardless of rank) for reappointment each year. In addition, if the department head desires tenured faculty member's opinions on reappointment decisions for first-year faculty members, he or she may request it.

In accordance with the University Handbook C53, the department head will send a Faculty Recommendation Form (Appendix 7) to tenured faculty members and notify them of a meeting to discuss the reappointment decisions. The tenured faculty members will have 14 days to review annual evaluation documents for each faculty member being considered for reappointment prior to the meeting. Tenured faculty members will be required to evaluate each candidate for reappointment against the annual evaluation criteria and produce a Merit Salary Adjustments Evaluation Rating Sheet (See Appendix 7), write their recommendations (votes) and comments on the Faculty Recommendation form, sign the form, and submit the form to the administrative assistant designated by the department head no less than 24 hours after the reappointment consideration meeting.

After receipt of the faculty recommendations and comments, the department head will prepare a consolidated summary of the recommendations. This summary will be reviewed by all tenured faculty members prior to the department head including the recommendations in reappointment letters. After tenured faculty members have reviewed the consolidated comments, the department head will follow the procedures defined in University Handbook C53.3.

B. Criteria for Reappointment of Non-tenured Faculty

Reappointment of probationary faculty will be judged on the basis of whether or not the faculty member is meeting expectations (i.e. earning an average score of “3”) in each category of his or her appointment. This will be determined by the collective tenured faculty and department head evaluations using the Merit Salary Adjustments Evaluation Rating Sheet. If a probationary faculty member is scored an average of below “3” in any category, the faculty member must demonstrate he or she is following the recommendations of the tenured faculty and taking steps to achieve an average of “3” or higher in that category during the next annual evaluation. If the faculty member cannot demonstrate these efforts, non-reappointment should be considered.

VI. Mid-Tenure and Tenure

A. Mid-tenure Review

A formal review of a probationary faculty member is conducted during spring semester of the third year of his or her appointment (*University Handbook*, C92.1). This **mid-probationary review** is designed to give the faculty member substantive feedback from faculty colleagues and administrators regarding their accomplishments relative to departmental tenure criteria. The outcome of this review at the departmental level is a letter from the department head that summarizes the views of the tenured faculty. The letter does not include a vote of the tenured faculty. This letter is separate from the outcomes of the annual evaluation process and re-appointment process. A positive mid-probationary review does not ensure that tenure will be granted in the future; nor does a negative review mean that tenure will be denied.

Candidates should prepare their mid-tenure review documentation following the **Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Mid-Tenure Review Documents** which can be found on the K-State web page at: <http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/documents/midtenure.doc>. According to these instructions, faculty members are required to prepare summaries of their accomplishments in the areas of their appointment (i.e., instruction, scholarship, and service) during their first three academic years at K-State. In ATID the procedures defined in the *University Handbook* C92.1-C92.4 are followed with the exception that for mid-tenure review comments from students, other relevant faculty, and outside reviewers are not sought. The documentation must be submitted digitally as a searchable pdf.

In the year a faculty member is being reviewed for mid-tenure, the annual merit salary adjustments review and reappointment review will use the same documents as the mid-tenure review. Submission of the documents will follow the schedule of mid-tenure review assigned by the university and college.

B. Tenure Review

Faculty members hired at the rank of assistant professor must submit their documentation for tenure at the beginning of their **sixth** year of employment (*University Handbook*, C82.2). After the evaluation process is complete (during spring semester), the faculty member will be notified whether they will be granted tenure at the beginning of the seventh year of employment or

whether the seventh year of employment will constitute the terminal year of appointment at K-State. Faculty members hired at the rank of associate professor or above (without tenure) will be evaluated for tenure at the beginning of their **fifth** year of employment and receive tenure at the beginning of the sixth year (or notification that the sixth year is their terminal year of appointment) (*University Handbook*, C82.3). Faculty members on probationary appointments who have met the criteria and standards for tenure prior to the above maximum times may be granted early tenure. Because candidates may be considered for tenure at any time during their probationary period, no time credit shall be granted for service prior to employment at Kansas State University (*University Handbook*, C82.4). In special circumstances, a one-year delay of the tenure clock may be requested by the probationary faculty member (*University Handbook*, C83.1). Faculty members in the final year of probation will be automatically reviewed for tenure unless they resign.

Candidates for tenure should prepare their documentation following the **Guidelines for Organization of Documentation for Promotion and Tenure** which can be found on the K-State web page at: <http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/promotionguidelinesfororganization.pdf> According to these instructions, faculty members are required to prepare summaries of their accomplishments in the areas of their appointment (i.e., instruction, scholarship, and service) during the last five years, or four years if hired at the rank of associate professor or above (without tenure). The candidates for promotion/tenure are responsible for identifying the impact, quality and value of their accomplishments in the areas of their appointment. The documentation must be submitted digitally as a searchable pdf.

External reviewers who are recognized as leaders in the candidate's discipline or profession will be asked to discuss the candidate's job performance relative to scholarly contributions to the discipline, especially the candidate's expertise and impact. Outside reviewers are not expected to evaluate the quality of instruction or service, but may find it helpful to know the candidate's other obligations and accomplishments to give perspective to the whole of the candidate's productivity. Comments from a candidate's major professor or graduate school classmates are generally less persuasive and should not be solicited (*University Handbook*, C36.2). A list of three possible reviewers will be prepared by the candidate and a list of three will be prepared by the department head in consultation with the K-State faculty in the candidate's area of specialization. The department head will send a letter, the candidate's vita, and other supporting materials* to two reviewers selected by the candidate and to two reviewers selected by the faculty (i.e., four total). If an external expert declines the request to review the candidate's credentials, another reviewer will be selected from the candidate's list or the department head's list. If necessary because potential external reviewers decline, additional reviewers will be solicited by the department head. The reviewers will be provided a copy of the departmental criteria for granting tenure and informed of the proportion of time devoted by the candidate to research, instruction, service, etc. during the probationary period. The candidate will not be permitted to see the external reviews.

*Supporting materials should be determined by the faculty member in consultation with the department head. The materials sent for external reviews are typically the full documentation for promotion and tenure required of the candidate by the university.

In the year a faculty member is being reviewed for tenure, the annual merit salary adjustment review and reappointment review will use the same documents as the tenure review and submission of the documents will follow the schedule of tenure review assigned by the university and college.

C. Criteria for the Granting of Tenure

Promotion to associate professor is usually granted simultaneously with tenure.

Candidates for tenure should demonstrate **versatility** – the ability to function well in instruction, scholarship, and service. Qualifications for granting of tenure require evidence of substantial professional contributions that reflect excellence in instruction, scholarship, and service (*University Handbook*, C120.2). In addition, demonstration of both collegiality and academic citizenship is required for granting of tenure. To be awarded tenure, faculty members must be experts in their chosen fields (*University Handbook*, C90) and have made outstanding contributions in appropriate academic endeavors, for example, instruction, scholarship, and institutional and professional service (*University Handbook*, C100.1). In addition, they must be qualified for graduate faculty status at K-State.

Eligible faculty members reviewing the documents will consider the following:

- Outstanding and innovative instruction as evidenced by student evaluations, course materials, awards, and other evidence as identified in Appendix 3.
- Outstanding scholarship as evidenced by the quantity, quality, and significance of a focused body of work including refereed publications, invited or peer reviewed presentations at national or international meetings, design work selected for national or international juried exhibitions, professional practice, extramural funding, awards, and other evidence as identified in Appendix 4.
- As appropriate to appointment, outstanding contributions to service at all, or most, levels: departmental, college, university, profession, and public as identified in Appendix 5.
- Evidence of collegiality and academic citizenship as defined in Appendix 6.

VII. Promotion

A faculty member, in consultation with the department head, may request a review for promotion to a higher rank. Promotion to a higher rank is usually granted to deserving individuals after serving **six** or more years at a given rank. For individuals of outstanding performance, promotion may be granted with four years in a rank. However, in such cases much greater justification in terms of demonstrable accomplishments is required. Upon promotion, the faculty member will receive a standard promotion raise in addition to the merit salary increase for the year (*University Handbook*, C120-156.2).

A. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

For faculty members in tenure-track appointments at the rank of assistant professor the granting of tenure and rank promotion to associate professor are considered at the same time.

Promotion from assistant professor to associate professor will not be granted without meeting the criteria for tenure *as defined in VI. C.*:

Expectations: The candidate for promotion to associate professor with tenure must demonstrate excellence as a scholar with evidence of potential to contribute to the knowledge base of the chosen discipline at a national and/or international level. The candidate for promotion to associate professor with tenure must have attained scores of “met expectations” in 4 of the prior 5 years under the evaluations for merit salary adjustments (see section IV). The *University Handbook*, C120.2, reads: “Promotion to associate professor rests on substantial professional contributions that reflect excellence in teaching, research, and other creative endeavor, directed service, or extension.”

The faculty member is expected to maintain a coherent program of research and scholarship with clearly defined theoretical, empirical, and/or intervention-oriented goals. If appropriate, the candidate is expected to play a significant and clearly-defined role in developing and/or maintaining a multi-disciplinary research program (on a local, national, or international scale).

There are multiple forms of scholarship that result in disseminated, peer-reviewed outcomes. For a list of such scholarship, see Appendix 4. For each 20% appointment to scholarship for each academic year, faculty members are expected to have the equivalent of one peer-reviewed manuscript published in a scholarly journal.

B. Promotion to Professor

Expectations: “Promotion to professor is based on attainment of excellence in the assigned responsibilities of the faculty member and recognition of **excellence** [emphasis added] by all appropriate constituencies” (*University Handbook*, C120.2). Appendices 3, 4, 5, and 6 provide guidance for evaluation of “excellence in assigned responsibilities.”

The candidate for promotion to professor must demonstrate a sustained record of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally. The consideration of outcomes should not be based solely in quantitative measures because each candidate’s scholarly outcomes will be unique and will be impacted by the scope of his or her other responsibilities. In addition, the candidate must provide evidence of serving as a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. In addition, Apparel and Textile faculty members should be certified to direct doctoral students in the Apparel and Textiles specialization of the Human Ecology Ph.D. program.

In the case of a candidate for promotion to the rank of professor, the evaluating faculty members will look for recent evidence of a sustained and high quality program of scholarship with national or international impact. According to the *University Handbook*, C152.1, faculty members of the department who hold a rank equal to or higher than the rank being sought by the candidate are eligible to advise the department head regarding the qualifications of the candidate for promotion. If the candidate has been at the associate professor rank for more than six years, the evaluating faculty will evaluate the productivity and accomplishment in all

areas of appointment and take a holistic view of the candidate's complete work and its national or international impact.

External reviewers who are recognized as leaders in the candidate's discipline or profession will be asked to evaluate and discuss the candidate's attainment of excellence in assigned responsibility. Appendices 3, 4, 5, and 6 provide guidance for evaluation of "excellence in assigned responsibilities." Comments from a candidate's research partners, major professor or graduate school classmates are generally less persuasive and should not be solicited (*University Handbook*, C36.2). A list of three possible reviewers will be prepared by the candidate and a list of three will be prepared by the department head in consultation with the K-State faculty in the candidate's area of specialization. The department head will send a letter, the candidate's vita, and other supporting materials** to two reviewers selected by the candidate and to two reviewers selected by the faculty (i.e., four total). If an external expert declines the request to review the candidate's credentials, another reviewer will be selected from the candidate's list or the department head's list. If necessary because potential external reviewers decline, additional reviewers will be solicited by the department head. The reviewers will be provided a copy of the departmental criteria for promotion and informed of the proportion of time appointed to all assigned duties research, instruction, service, etc. The candidate will not be permitted to see the external reviews.

**Supporting materials should be determined by the faculty member in consultation with the department head. The materials sent for external reviews are typically the full documentation for promotion required of the candidate by the university.

VIII. Graduate Faculty/Certification

Criteria for Graduate Faculty Membership:

The department follows the criteria of the Graduate Handbook found at the following URL:
<http://www.k-state.edu/grad/graduate-handbook/chapter5.html>

To be eligible for graduate faculty status, a faculty member must 1) have the terminal degree in his or her field of specialization; and 2) within the last five years been either sole author, or a major contributor to and principle author of, at least one research article published in a refereed journal; or in lieu of publication in a refereed journal, there must be material evidence of research or other creative acts performances, exhibitions, published creative writings, patents that represent a comparable achievement within the nominee's field.

When providing the materials for consideration by the departmental graduate faculty, those faculty members being considered should describe their role relative to that of others involved in collaborative scholarship.

Criteria for certification to direct doctoral students in the Ph.D. program in Human Ecology:

A faculty member should direct one master's thesis to completion or serve on one Ph.D. committee to completion.

IX. Professorial Performance Award

The Professorial Performance Award is described in Section C49.1 of the *University Handbook*.

Criteria for Professorial Performance Award

1. The candidate must be a full professor and have been in the rank at least six years since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award.
2. The candidate must show evidence of ***sustained*** productivity in at least the last six years since before the performance review for the award.
 - a) The candidate must show evidence of outstanding and sustained scholarship in a focused area in the discipline and demonstrate that he or she has sustained a national and international reputation in this area. The significance and impact of the candidate's contributions to the field must be documented.
 - b) The candidate must show evidence of outstanding instruction.
 - c) The candidate must show evidence of outstanding institutional service and/or professional service at the national or international level.
3. The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to ***current*** approved departmental standards.
4. The candidate must demonstrate collegiality and institutional citizenship, as described in Section IV. Among the qualities of collegiality and institutional citizenship that must be exhibited to a high degree by the candidate is a track record of mentoring the next generation of emerging scholars including those at lower instructional ranks and those in graduate programs.
5. The majority of faculty members in the department (not including the candidate for the Professorial Performance Award) must vote through an anonymous means, which may include electronic voting, and must be based on the criteria identified above to support the award.

ATID Procedures for Professorial Performance Award

Eligible candidates for consideration for this award will prepare a digital (pdf) file that documents their professional accomplishments for at least the previous six years. Accomplishments from a longer period may be included as long as they occurred after the candidate's most recent promotion or Professorial Performance Award. This file will be submitted to the department head at the same time the file of materials for annual merit salary adjustments evaluation is submitted. The file should contain the following:

- The candidate's current vita.
- A one-page summary of the candidate's accomplishments in a focused area of scholarship and a discussion of the significance and impact on the field.
- A one-page summary of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching and advising and a discussion of the significance to the academic program(s).

- A one-page summary of the candidate’s professional service activities and their significance to the field.
- A one-page summary of the candidate’s collegiality and academic citizenship qualities and accomplishments.
- Supporting materials.

Faculty members in the department will review the file and supporting materials and each will make a confidential written recommendation for or against the Professorial Performance Award to the department head. The department head will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate’s materials with respect to the university and departmental criteria for the award and make a recommendation for or against the award to the dean. Subsequently, the process to be followed is consistent with the process described in C49.8-C49.14 of the *University Handbook*.

X. Post-Tenure Review

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.

Procedures for post-tenure review are as follows:

The department head reviews the last six annual evaluation materials and up to a two-page statement that is prepared by the faculty member if he or she chooses to provide one. The department head prepares a letter of review and meets with the faculty member. Alternately, when requested by the faculty member being reviewed, a standing faculty committee with multi-year staggered terms provides the review instead of the department head.

If the faculty member’s prior six annual evaluations resulted in ratings of met or exceeded expectations, the faculty member will be evaluated as demonstrating appropriate contributions to the university.

XI. Chronic Low Achievement

Chronic low achievement is addressed in Sections C31.5 through C31.8 of the *University Handbook*. In ATID the assessment of faculty performance by the department head during the annual merit salary evaluation process uses a rating scale that is consistent with the one described in C31.8 of the *University Handbook*.

In accordance with section C31.5 of the *University Handbook*, tenured faculty who in any year earn an overall annual merit salary adjustment evaluation of **Fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity** [in ATID that is a score of less than 2.0] will receive written notice from the department head that suggests actions to improve the performance of the faculty member. In subsequent annual merit salary adjustment evaluations, the faculty member will report on activities aimed at improving performance and any evidence of improvement. The names of faculty members who fail to meet minimum standards for the year following the department head's suggested course of action will be forwarded to the dean. 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 (C31.5). If this decision is made, standards for notice of non-reappointment apply (*University Handbook*, Appendix A).

XII. APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Development of the Letter of Expectation

Annual merit salary adjustments and reappointment evaluations are based on the Letter of Expectation for each faculty member and professional staff. The Letter of Expectation for the next academic year will be discussed and a draft developed by the faculty member/professional staff and the department head during the evaluation meeting for the prior academic year. The Letter of Expectation must be completed and signed by both the faculty member/professional staff and department head prior to signing the contract for the year it will be used to evaluate. For annual merit salary adjustments evaluations the scale in Section IV will be used and if the expectations in each category of the Letter of Expectation are met, a score of 3 for "met expectations" will be awarded. Likewise other categories of performance will be awarded the proper category and score. The Letter of Expectation must include the following information as appropriate to the duties of the faculty member/professional staff:

- a) Percentage of time devoted to teaching and a list of courses by semester, including summer when appropriate.
- b) Professional growth goals for upcoming year to enhance teaching.
- c) Specific teaching activities to be pursued during the academic year and a discussion of expected outcomes from those activities.
- d) Percentage of time devoted to advising/mentoring and a description of advising/mentoring activities at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.
- e) Professional growth goals for upcoming year to enhance advising.
- f) Specific advising/mentoring activities to be pursued during the academic year and a discussion of expected outcomes from those activities.

- g) Percentage of time devoted to scholarship. If different from previous year, provide a rationale for change.
- h) Professional growth goals for upcoming year to enhance scholarship.
- i) Specific scholarship activities to be pursued during the academic year and a discussion of expected outcomes from those activities.
- j) Specific outcomes that are expected to come to fruition from scholarly activities in previous year(s).
- k) Percentage of time devoted to service.
- l) Specific service activities anticipated for the upcoming year.
- m) Expectations regarding collegiality/academic citizenship for upcoming year.
- n) Description of how faculty member's activities in all categories contribute to departmental, college, and university mission of excellence.
- o) Description of other duties as appropriate to the position held with percentage of time devoted to these duties.
- p) Specific activities and outcomes that are expected for performance at the categories defined under IV. A.

The process for developing the Letter of Expectation will be as follows:

1. For faculty members in the second or subsequent contract years and for professional staff not on their first term contract, a Letter of Expectation is drafted by the faculty member/professional staff and submitted to the department head at least one week in advance of the annual merit salary adjustments evaluation meeting in the year prior to the year for which it is being developed.
2. The department head reviews the Letter of Expectation draft and makes recommendations for clarifications, additions, or deletions. The department head and faculty member/professional staff discuss revisions to the Letter of Expectation during the annual merit salary review meeting.
3. Through subsequent meetings as necessary, the department head and faculty member attempt to come to an agreement so that the Letter of Expectation can be signed by both. To ensure that these meetings have the potential for success, both the faculty member/professional staff and department head must provide the other with a document outlining points of discussion/compromise at least one week prior to the next scheduled meeting.
4. If the department head and faculty member/professional staff do not reach agreement prior to the academic year contract signature deadline, the faculty member/professional staff may attach written comments to the Letter of Expectation indicating his or her reasons for disagreement with the expectations that have been established by the department head.
5. Signed Letter of Expectation becomes part of the faculty member's/professional staff's evaluation file and a copy is provided to the faculty member/professional staff.

**Letter of Expectation
Department of Apparel, Textiles, and Interior Design**

Name _____ Evaluation Year: 20 _____

TEACHING (____ % time assigned)

Fall Courses	Spring Courses	Summer Courses

Professional growth goals, activities to be pursued, and expected outcomes:*

Accomplishments for achieving a score of met expectations:

ADVISING (____ % time assigned)

Professional growth goals, activities to be pursued, and expected outcomes:*

Accomplishments for achieving a score of met expectations:

SCHOLARSHIP (____ % time assigned)

Professional growth goals, activities to be pursued, and expected outcomes from both the evaluation year and the efforts of prior (two) years:*

Accomplishments for achieving a score of met expectations:

SERVICE (____ % time assigned)

Professional growth goals, activities to be pursued, and expected outcomes:*

Accomplishments for achieving a score of met expectations:

COLLEGIALITY AND ACADEMIC CITIZENSHIP

Specific expectations regarding collegiality/academic citizenship for upcoming year.

OTHER DUTIES FULLY DESCRIBED WHEN ASSIGNED

Goals, activities to be pursued, and expected outcomes:*

Accomplishments for achieving a score of met expectations:

*Consider how faculty member’s activities in all categories contribute to departmental, college, and university mission of excellence.

Signatures below indicate agreement with the expectations indicated above.

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Faculty Member/Professional Staff

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Department Head

Signature below indicates disagreement with the expectations indicated above.

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Faculty Member/Professional Staff

Appendix 2. Annual Merit Salary Adjustments and Reappointment Evaluation Documentation

Annual merit salary adjustments and reappointment evaluation documentation in the department will comply with the following format requirements except when the faculty member is being reviewed at mid-tenure and for tenure and promotion at which times they will use the university-required formats. The document will be known as the Faculty Activity Report. The Faculty Activity Report is due in September of each year on the date determined by the department head and announced to faculty at least 14 calendar days in advance of the due date.

FACULTY ACTIVITY REPORT SUBMITTED BY FACULTY MEMBER IN DIGITAL (SEARCHABLE PDF) FORMAT

- a) Cover sheet indicating name, rank, and years at rank for those tenured; or name, rank, and academic year of appointment to tenure-track position for those not tenured.

- b) Copy of Letter of Expectation for the academic year being evaluated notated with comments about activities and accomplishments.
- c) The candidate's current vita with all items accomplished/completed in the academic year being evaluated highlighted in yellow.
- d) At most, a four-page summary of the candidate's activities and accomplishments in teaching and advising/mentoring for the academic year being evaluated and a discussion on the significance of his or her work to the academic program(s). This statement must include the following for each course taught: course number/name, credit hours/contact hours per week, and enrollment. This section may also include information about independent studies, honor student mentoring, etc. Include a discussion of each course that includes a self-assessment of the quality of the candidate's teaching activities described in Appendix 3 and an interpretation of data from the summary of student ratings. This section may also include a discussion of unique circumstances in or out of the classroom that contributed either positively or negatively to the overall classroom experience. In addition, for undergraduate advising, if they are assigned to faculty members, it must contain the number of undergraduate advisees assigned as of the date of the advising survey in fall semesters; the number of graduate advisees assigned at the beginning of the fall term; and the number of graduate student supervisory committees (indicate if chair). This description should also indicate if a GTA was assigned to the faculty member during the year being evaluated and how the GTA assisted the faculty member.
- e) At most, a two-page summary of the candidate's activities and accomplishments in a focused area of scholarship in the academic year being evaluated and a discussion of the significance and impact of the faculty member's work. This description should indicate if a GRA was assigned to the faculty member during the year being evaluated and how the GRA assisted the faculty member. For collaborative work, indicate the role of each member of the collaborative team.
- f) At most, a one-page summary of the candidate's service (service, engagement and outreach) activities in the academic year being evaluated and their significance. This should include an indication of the time commitment per month and per year.
- g) At most, a one-page summary of the candidate's collegiality and citizenship qualities and accomplishments.
- h) Evidence of instructional quality as available (syllabi, student evaluations of teaching, evaluation of advisement)
- i) Chart showing grade distribution in each course taught. See example in Appendix 3.
- j) Optional Supporting materials:
 - i. Evidence of excellence in the scholarship of instruction (multimedia presentations, computer-aided instruction, papers published or presented)
 - ii. Evidence of scholarly endeavors, for example, presentations, publications, competitions, exhibitions, grants and contracts, etc.
 - iii. Evidence of service contributions.

- iv. Peer evaluations of teaching.
- v. Other evidence of accomplishments.

Appendix 3. Information about Evaluation of Instruction

Instructional quality is a major factor in educational excellence. Quality teaching is characterized by effectively carrying out the teaching responsibilities related to instructional content, instructional methods, instructional delivery skills, management of instructional activities, and advising.

The primary concern in evaluation of teaching is that courses taught have the proper content to support the curriculum structure of each program and that student learning outcomes meet program expectations for rigor. (This is why evaluation of teaching should not rely solely on student evaluations of teaching. Students are more likely to be able to assess methods, delivery skills and management than content or learning outcomes/appropriate level of rigor.) The primary concern in evaluation of advising is that students are advised accurately relative to curricular requirements and university, college, and departmental policies. The primary concern in the evaluation of mentoring is that students receive the guidance they seek in professional development.

AREAS OF TEACHING RESPONSIBILITY

Instructional content refers to that body of skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area. Best practices in instructional content may be demonstrated by:

- a) Having an understanding of the theoretical framework that underpins the content body of knowledge.
- b) Staying current in subject area by reading, networking, attending professional development workshops and presentations in content area, and applying knowledge to course content.
- c) Creating appropriate and reasonable course objectives that reflect new ideas and understandings in the course content areas.
- d) Contributing to program curriculum development and revision.
- e) Creating new courses, redesigning existing courses, or teaching a course for the first time.

Instructional methods include those skills, competencies, and knowledge of teaching strategies that allow a faculty member to facilitate student learning. Best practices in instructional methods may be demonstrated by:

- f) Developing, sequencing, and utilizing appropriate experiences that challenge students and induce appropriate levels of student learning.
- g) Developing and organizing instructional materials which may include utilizing appropriate instructional media and technologies to accomplish student learning objectives.
- h) Designing, developing, and implementing tools and procedures for assessing student learning outcomes.

Instructional delivery skills include those human interactive skills and characteristics that establish an environment of respect and rapport and a culture for learning. Best practices in instructional delivery may be demonstrated by:

- i) Clear and engaging communication of information, concepts, and attitudes.

- j) Promoting or facilitating learning by creating an appropriate, effective learning environment.
- k) Flexibility and responsiveness in seeking out and using a variety of strategies to meet the various learning needs of the students.
- l) Providing adequate assistance for in-class and out-of-class instructional activities.

Management of instructional activities includes those skills necessary for operating and managing a course. Best practices in management of instructional activities may be demonstrated by:

- m) Following university policies and expectations regarding teaching (e.g., final exam policy, timely submission of grades, timely submission of textbook and supply requirements, and accommodation of students with special learning needs as defined by the Student Access Center).
- n) Timely grading of examinations and other course requirements.
- o) Timely completion of forms (e.g., independent study, incomplete grade, grade change).
- p) Timely submission of Student Learning Outcomes reports.
- q) Maintaining class times and published office hours.
- r) Arranging for and coordinating activities to enhance the learning experience (guest lecturers, field trips).
- s) Making arrangements for facilities and resources (K-State Online, supply kits) required in the teaching of a course.

Undergraduate student mentoring includes a variety of activities that assist students in their academic pursuits and in preparation for academic and career opportunities after graduation from ATID programs. The effective mentor:

- t) Advises students concerning career planning and professional development.
- u) Mentors students conducting honor's projects or independent problems/readings courses.
- v) Mentors students for competitions, papers, and other related events.
- w) Writes letters of recommendation for scholarships, awards, employment, and graduate school admissions.

Undergraduate student advising includes skills and knowledge that link the student and university and assist students throughout their academic career (*University Handbook* sections F4-5). The effective adviser:

- x) Accurately advises students concerning academic programs and enrollment.
- y) Is acquainted with various resources available under the Student Services program and elsewhere within the university.
- z) Posts and maintains reasonable office hours during which students may meet with them to discuss any aspect of their scholastic career.
- aa) Is familiar with and follows administrative, university, and departmental regulations, procedures, and scheduled activities relating to the advising process and completes forms (e.g., substitutions, drop/add courses) in a timely manner.

Graduate student advising and mentoring includes the academic advising skills and knowledge presented in the undergraduate student advising section, as well as the mentoring of students through their scholarly activity. The effective graduate advisor and mentor:

- bb) Accurately advises graduate students concerning academic program and enrollment.
- cc) Serves as a member of a graduate student’s committee. Provides input to proposal, thesis/report or dissertation; reviews written examination.
- dd) Serves as a major professor for a graduate student (non-thesis, distance non-thesis, thesis/report, or dissertation). Mentors and facilitates major events towards degree completion: program of study, proposal, preparation of written examination, defense of the written exam, conducting research and/or design activity, defense of thesis/report or dissertation, graduation, and submission of work to appropriate peer-reviewed or juried venues.
- ee) Serves as an outside chair of a doctoral student’s supervisory committee.
- ff) Recruits graduate students through personal contacts and professional venues.
- gg) Encourages advisee involvement in the wider scholarship community, such as attending and presenting work at conferences.
- hh) Nominates students for appropriate awards and writes letters of recommendation for scholarships and postgraduate positions.

Other Professional Activities

- ii) Participates in faculty development activities (training, workshop, etc.) related to instruction.
- jj) Seeks and obtains funding for enhancement of instructional activities.

Example Chart format for reporting grade distributions in each class

Course Number	Number Enrolled (when grades are reported)	Percentage Earning A	Percentage Earning B	Percentage Earning C	Percentage Earning D	Percentage Earning F	Percentage Earning INC

Appendix 4. Information about Evaluation of Scholarship

High quality scholarship and academic excellence is fundamental to attaining a national and international reputation in the apparel and textiles and interior design fields. Faculty members are expected to maintain consistent scholarship programs focused in one or more particular areas and regularly engage in a variety of rigorous scholarly activities. Scholarly *activities and outcomes* are evaluated in the annual merit salary adjustments evaluation process. The intention of evaluating activities in addition to outcomes is that when faculty members engage in scholarly activities at the level

of rigor and productivity required to produce outcomes that can be counted in all forms of review, the individual faculty member and the department meet their productivity goals.

The intention of evaluating activities in addition to outcomes is so that when faculty members engage in scholarly activities but do not produce actual outcomes, the department head will consider the faculty member's efforts in relation to the evaluation of scholarship and overall scholarly productivity.

ATID faculty members are expected to achieve a minimum of one major accomplishment (or a combination of multiple accomplishments equal to one major accomplishment) in scholarship per year, for every 0.2 (20%) of a faculty member's time assignment. If a faculty member is using research methods that are more time-consuming, starting a new project, or otherwise doing scholarly work that would explain a lower level of productivity, those issues will be taken into consideration in the evaluation with the understanding that over a two- to three-year period the overall productivity will meet the expectation. Likewise, when a faculty member is doing scholarly work that can, by its nature, produce outcomes at a higher rate per year, or is being supported with GRA or GTA assistance, the expectation will be understood and valued within that context.

The following are examples of the results of productive scholarly efforts with possible indicators of excellence in scholarship:

- a) Published manuscripts in peer-reviewed, professional journals and proceedings – documented journal acceptance/rejection rates, rigor of the review process, etc.
- b) Published books (including textbooks, research-based monographs, and edited volumes).
- c) Publications in editor-reviewed outlets (including book chapters, editorials published in a journal, etc.).
- d) Presented papers at juried international, national, and regional conferences and meetings – documented acceptance/rejection rates, rigor of the review process, etc.
- e) Exhibitions of creative scholarship in juried international, national, and regional exhibitions, conferences, and meetings – documented exhibition acceptance/rejection rates, rigor of the review process, etc.
- f) Invited presentations and exhibitions at the international, national, and regional level.
- g) Awards/recognition received for scholarship, including student work performed under the faculty member's supervision.
- h) External and internal competitive funding (including grants and contracts) to support scholarly activities – documentation of value of grants, number of graduate students supported, equipment and supplies obtained, etc.
- i) Professional practice that requires specialized knowledge related to the faculty member's scholarly expertise – including designing interiors, buildings, and apparel; developing laboratory procedures, computer software; and earning patents and copyrights for intellectual property.
- j) Post-occupancy evaluations of work produced as professional practice indicating excellence in design to meet user needs.
- k) Citations by other scholars, use of work in other publications or standards.
- l) Featured articles or reviews of faculty/student scholarship in the media.

- m) School-solicited external letters of support from experts in the discipline (for promotion and tenure).
- n) Other evidence of high quality, significant scholarship provided by the faculty member.

Appendix 5. Information about Evaluation of Service, Outreach and Engagement

As part of a faculty member's responsibilities, the department expects engagement in a range of institutional and professional service. All faculty members have a responsibility to contribute through service to the department, college, university, and the academic profession beyond the campus. In addition, faculty members are encouraged to engage in public service, including the sharing of information and knowledge with the public as well as the application of knowledge to solving problems.

The primary concern in evaluating service is that faculty members are engaged in service at an appropriate level for their individualized appointment. Leadership in service efforts carries more value than membership. Winning awards or commendations for exceptional service is also valued unless the awards and/or commendations are routinely made at the conclusion of a term of service.

THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES ARE INDICATORS OF EXCELLENCE IN SERVICE

1) Institutional Service

- a) Serves as chair or as a member of a department, college, or university committee.
- b) Performs directed service role at the departmental, college, or university level.
- c) Advises a student interest group.
- d) Advises for study abroad or exchange programs in an academic program area.
- e) Actively participates in recruitment/retention of students and new faculty (e.g., prepares information for recruitment brochures/website; participates in faculty interview activities, etc.).
- f) Participates in fundraising activities for the department or college.
- g) Acquires donations of equipment or other physical resources for the department.

2) Professional Service

- h) Holds an elected or appointed office in a state, regional, national, or international professional organization.
- i) Serves as a journal editor, editorial board member, or review committee member of a professional organization or an accreditation/certification body.
- j) Serves as a committee member for a professional organization at the state, regional, national, or international level.
- k) Serves as a peer reviewer of manuscripts submitted to refereed journals or book publishers; reviews proposals submitted to public/private funding sources; reviews papers/abstracts for inclusion in proceedings and/or presentation at a professional meeting.
- l) Serves as an organizer of workshops, panels, or meetings in areas of professional expertise.
- m) Serves as a professional consultant to a public or private organization.
- n) Represents the profession in public forums (e.g., expert testimony).

- o) Attends professional meetings.
- p) Serves as an external reviewer of candidates for tenure, promotion, or awards.

3) Engagement/Public Service

The University definition of engagement is "...a form of research, teaching or service in which collaborative efforts between university and community stakeholders results in scholarly activity and community benefit around a public issue." <http://www.k-state.edu/cccd/>

- q) Uses expertise to facilitate or implement a project for community enhancement.
- r) Gives talks/lectures/workshops to the public on topics related to area of expertise.
- s) Serves as resource for the media (e.g., gives interviews, provides information).
- t) Consults for state, national, and international public and private groups engaged in educational, scholarly, and artistic endeavors.
- u) Consults for individuals or corporations engaged in business or industry.
- v) Activities supporting the college and department K-State 2025 strategic plans.

Appendix 6. Information about Evaluation of Collegiality/Academic Citizenship

The department needs collegiality to function effectively. Faculty evaluations will include assessment of behaviors that positively or negatively affect others in carrying out their assignments in the department. In the absence of collegiality and good academic citizenship, other evidences of academic excellence will not suffice to offset this deficiency in the pursuit of merit pay increases, reappointment, tenure, and promotion. There should be no effort by the department to discourage debate or disagreement on policies; rather, it is vital to foster and maintain an environment conducive to vigorous debate and inquiry. Faculty disagreement with colleagues and administrators is not to be taken as evidence of lack of collegiality, but should proceed in a manner consistent with civil debate, constructive criticism, and the resolution of differences.

Personal qualities such as integrity, leadership, objectivity, candor, fairness, willingness to cooperate, and a positive attitude are vital to the team functioning of the department's faculty members and are highly valued. In addition, the ability and willingness of faculty members to place the needs of the department, or program area, above the needs of the self contributes to the advancement of the units/department and is one measure of academic citizenship that is highly valued.

THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES ARE INDICATORS OF EXCELLENCE IN COLLEGIALLY AND ACADEMIC CITIZENSHIP

- a) Attends and participates in departmental and college faculty meetings.
- b) Attends and participates in departmental and college events.
- c) Participates in institutional activities (e.g., career fairs; Open House, commencement).
- d) Attends meetings and participates in self-governance regarding curriculum through curriculum and assessment efforts at the program level (e.g., AT or ID).

- e) Eligible faculty members fully participate in self-governance decisions regarding faculty at the department level such as interviewing/hiring, reappointment, mid-tenure, tenure, promotion, and professorial awards.
- f) Faculty members seek to maintain open communications with colleagues and administrators and to work toward solutions to shared problems.
- g) Commitment to working effectively and cooperatively with others.
- h) When disagreements are present, being committed to resolving differences by engaging in civil debate as characterized by open, honest communication, and constructive criticism.
- i) Fostering of goodwill and harmony.
- j) Mentoring of colleagues.
- k) Contribution to the pursuit of unit and department goals even at the expense of personal goals.

Appendix 7. Forms for Annual Merit Salary Adjustments Evaluation and Faculty Ballots for Reappointment, Mid-Tenure, Tenure, Rank Promotions, and the Professorial Performance Award

EXAMPLE

Merit Salary Adjustments Evaluation Rating Sheet

Department of Apparel, Textiles, and Interior Design

Personnel Name: _____ **Academic Year** _____

	Time Allocation (in tenths)*		Numerical Rating		Total Rating
ACTIVITY					
Instruction/ Teaching	.6	x	3	=	1.8
Instruction/ UG Advising or Mentoring	.05	x	3	=	0.15
Instruction/ Grad Advising	.05	x	3	=	0.15
Scholarship	.2	x	3	=	0.6
Service	.1	x	4	=	0.4
Other:		x		=	0

Subtotal Evaluation Score					3.1
Collegiality/ Academic Citizenship	Multiplier for Collegiality/Academic Citizenship				1.1
*Full time will equal 1.0 on an annual basis.		OVERALL RATING = 3.41			

OVERALL RATING FOR FISCAL/ACADEMIC YEAR = _____

Department Head Signature _____ Date _____

Faculty/Professional Staff Signature _____ Date _____

Faculty/Professional Staff Comments (if any)

Eligible Faculty Recommendation Form for

Reappointment Decisions in the Department of Apparel, Textiles, and Interior Design

Based on the information available to me, I recommend that _____

_____ be reappointed

_____ not be reappointed

_____ abstain

Detailed justification for my recommendation or abstention is given below. (Verbatim comments will remain anonymous when required to accompany materials/vote and reported out.)

Signature _____ Date _____

Return to the Administrative Assistant to the Department Head by _____

Eligible Faculty Form for

Mid-Tenure Review in the Department of Apparel, Textiles, and Interior Design

Based on the information available to me regarding mid-tenure review for _____

_____, I have the following formative feedback regarding this

individual's accomplishments relative to departmental tenure criteria:

(Verbatim comments will remain anonymous when required to accompany materials/vote and reported out. The typical use of these comments is that they are summarized in a letter to the candidate from the department head and they are not attributed to the author.)

Signature _____ Date _____

Return to the Administrative Assistant to the Department Head by _____

Eligible Faculty Recommendation Form for

Tenure and Associate Professor Promotion

Decisions in the Department of Apparel, Textiles, and Interior Design

Based on the information available to me, I recommend that _____

_____ be tenured

_____ be promoted to associate professor

_____ not be tenured

_____ not be promoted to associate professor

_____ abstain

Detailed justification for my recommendation or abstention is given below.

(Verbatim comments will remain anonymous when required to accompany materials/vote and reported out.)

Signature _____ Date _____

Return to the Administrative Assistant to the Department Head by _____

Eligible Faculty Recommendation Form for

Rank Promotion to Professor Decisions in the Department of Apparel, Textiles, and Interior Design

Based on the information available to me, I recommend that _____

_____ be promoted to professor

_____ not be promoted to professor

_____ abstain

Detailed justification for my recommendation or abstention is given below.

(Verbatim comments will remain anonymous when required to accompany materials/vote and reported out.)

Signature _____ Date _____

Return to the Administrative Assistant to the Department Head by _____

Faculty Recommendation Form for

Award of the Professorial Performance Award

in the Department of Apparel, Textiles, and Interior Design

(To be used in a way that maintains confidentiality. If a digital survey works, that will be used.)

Based on requirements for the award and the information available to me, I recommend that

_____ be awarded the Professorial Performance Award

_____ not be awarded the Professorial Performance Award

_____ abstain

Detailed justification for my recommendation or abstention is given below.

No Signature

Return to the Administrative Assistant to the Department Head by _____

Appendix 8. Schedules for Evaluation Processes in ATID

Annual Evaluation for Merit Salary Adjustments Process and Reappointment Review

BEFORE JULY 1

Letter of Expectation completed for *upcoming academic year*.

BEFORE OCTOBER 1

Submit evaluation materials for *prior academic year (August 1- July 31)*. Materials for all faculty members in their second contract year are made available to the tenured faculty for reappointment review. Faculty members in their first contract year will submit documents addressing their first semester activities/accomplishments in the format for annual evaluation prior to January 15 to be used for reappointment decisions.

As stated in the *University Handbook*, C46.1: The unit head will prepare, by January 31, a written evaluation for each full or part-time regularly appointed faculty or professional staff member.

DURING NOVEMBER AND DECEMBER

Faculty members/professional staff will individually meet with the department head to review and discuss the written evaluation for annual evaluation for merit salary adjustments. C45.3 in University Handbook requires that "Each faculty and/or unclassified professional person will review, and must have the opportunity to discuss, her or his written evaluation with the individual who prepared it. Before the unit head submits it to the next administrative level, each faculty or unclassified professional person must sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review and to discuss the evaluation and his or her relative position in the planned assignment of merit salary increases within the unit. Because the amount of funds available for merit increases is generally not known at this time, specific percentage increases will not normally be discussed. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, faculty and/or unclassified professionals have the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations by the unit head to the unit head and to the next administrative level."

BEFORE NOVEMBER 15

Faculty members in their second contract year evaluated and recommendation for reappointment forwarded to the dean.

BEFORE DECEMBER 15

Faculty members in the second contract year are notified if they will not be reappointed for the next academic year.

BEFORE JANUARY 15

Materials for all untenured faculty (excluding second-year faculty members) made available to tenured faculty for reappointment review. Faculty members in their first contract year will submit documents addressing their first semester activities/accomplishments in the format for annual evaluation prior to January 15 to be used for reappointment decisions.

BETWEEN JANUARY 24 AND 30

Tenured faculty members meet to discuss reappointment of untenured faculty members.

BEFORE FEBRUARY 15

Department head submits recommendations for reappointment and merit salary increases along with verbatim comments in evaluations to the dean.

BEFORE MARCH 1

Faculty members in the first contract year are notified if they will not be reappointed for the next academic year.

EARLY MARCH

Dean forwards summary evaluations materials to the Provost.

MID-APRIL

Provost returns evaluations comments and evaluations to deans and department heads.

Raises are finalized if budget is finalized. If not, when the budget is final the raises are determined.

Mid-Tenure Review Process

BEFORE JANUARY 15

Candidate submits documentation to the department head.

Documents are made available to tenured faculty for review for a period of no less than 14 days.

JANUARY 29-FEBRUARY 14

Tenured faculty members meet to discuss mid-tenure evaluation and submit recommendations to department head.

MID TO LATE FEBRUARY

Department head summarizes comments of the tenured faculty in a letter and provides his or her own assessment of the candidate. Tenured faculty members have the opportunity to review the draft letter and correct errors. This letter is copied to the candidate and becomes part of the candidate's file. The candidate has the right to submit a written response that becomes part of the file. The department head meets with the candidate to discuss the review and assessment. Department head's letter is forwarded to the dean. Dean forwards letter to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

USUALLY IN MARCH

College Promotion and Tenure Committee reports its findings to the dean.

ONE WEEK AFTER COLLEGE PROMOTION & TENURE COMMITTEE REPORT TO DEAN

Dean notifies candidate and department head of college and dean's evaluation.

Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Process

BEFORE SEPTEMBER 1

Candidate submits documentation to department head. Department head verifies that the documentation is complete and appropriately formatted.

BEFORE SEPTEMBER 15

Department head solicits letters from outside reviewers

BEFORE OCTOBER 7

Documents made available for review by tenured faculty at or above the rank being sought (eligible faculty) for a period of no less than 14 days.

OCTOBER 28-NOVEMBER 4

Eligible faculty members meet to discuss tenure and promotion decisions and submit recommendations to department head. Eligible faculty members may request a meeting with the candidate prior to submitting recommendations.

MID-NOVEMBER

Department head submits his or her recommendation and documents (including verbatim comments in eligible faculty evaluations) to the dean.

Dean forwards documents to College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

EARLY DECEMBER

College Promotion and Tenure Committee reports its findings to the dean.

ONE WEEK AFTER COLLEGE PROMOTION & TENURE COMMITTEE REPORT TO DEAN

Dean notifies candidate and department head of college and dean's recommendations. Candidate may withdraw from evaluation within seven days.

MID-DECEMBER

Dean submits documents and recommendation to Deans Council of those candidates who have not withdrawn.

EARLY FEBRUARY

Dean notifies candidate and department head of the Deans Council recommendation. Deans Council sends recommendations to the provost. Candidates not recommended by the Deans Council have 14 days to appeal to the provost.

LATE FEBRUARY

Provost sends recommendations for tenure and promotion to President.

EARLY MARCH

Provost informs candidates of decision.

Professorial Performance Award

BEFORE OCTOBER 1

Candidate submits materials to the department head. Department head makes the material available for faculty review.

BEFORE NOVEMBER 1

ATID Faculty, not including the candidate, cast anonymous ballots. (See Section IX for criteria and Appendix 7 for ballot).

BEFORE JANUARY 15

Department head provides a written evaluation and recommendation to the candidate and meets with the candidate to discuss them. Within seven days the candidate has the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation to the department head and dean.

BEFORE FEBRUARY 15

Department head submits a final written evaluation and recommendation, the candidate's materials, and other materials as described in the *University Handbook* C49.7 to the dean. A copy of the department head's final recommendation is provided to the candidate.

EARLY MARCH

Dean forwards recommendations to the provost along with the candidate's materials.

EARLY TO MID-APRIL

Provost approves or denies the award.