

**DEPARTMENT OF ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY**

**ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 6/18/2014)**

**PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 6/18/2014)**

**POST-TENURE REVIEW GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 6/18/2014)**

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES \*(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **6/2019**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES\*: **6/2019**

**Michael J. Kenney, Department Head**

**Date signed: 6/20/2014**

**Ralph C. Richardson, Dean**

**Date signed: 6/23/2014**

**April C. Mason, Provost and Senior Vice President**

**Date signed: 3/1/2015**

\*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.

**GUIDELINES FOR  
FACULTY EVALUATION,  
PROMOTION AND TENURE**

**Department of Anatomy and Physiology  
College of Veterinary Medicine  
Kansas State University**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Required Page including dates of approval, review, and signatures.....	i
Title Page.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
<b>A INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>B MISSION COMPONENTS AND EVALUATION STANDARDS.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1 Instruction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.11 Examples to Document Teaching Quality and Effectiveness.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1.2 Evaluation of the Scholarship of Teaching.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.21 Examples of Accomplishments in the Area of Scholarship of Teaching.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2 Research.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.1 Examples to Document Excellence in Research and Publication.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.2 Examples of Effectiveness in Research and Publication.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3 Service.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3.1 Examples to Document Excellence in Service.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3.2 Examples of Effectiveness in Service.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>C POSITIONS THAT SUPPORT THE MISSIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1 Research Assistant and Assistant Scientist.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2 Instructor.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3 Assistant Professor.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4 Associate Professor.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>5 Professor.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>6 Research Faculty.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>7 Clinical Faculty.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>D ADVANCEMENT CRITERIA.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>1 Appointment.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>1.1 Research Assistant and Assistant Scientist.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>1.2 Instructors and All Professorial Ranks.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>1.21 Instructors.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>1.22 All Professorial Ranks.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2 Annual Review.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2.1 Faculty Effort Report.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2.2 Curriculum Vitae.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2.3 Faculty Evaluation Summary.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2.4 Plan of Work.....</b>	<b>10</b>

2.5	Department Head-Faculty Conference.....	11
2.6	Faculty on Probationary Appointments.....	11
2.7	Transfers between Research, Clinical-Track and Tenure-Track Appointments.....	11
3	Mid-probationary review.....	11
4	Tenure and/or Promotion.....	12
4.1	Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee.....	12
4.2	Dossier of Materials for Tenure and/or Promotion Review.....	13
4.3	Outside Letters of Evaluation.....	13
4.4	Departmental Review.....	13
4.5	College Review.....	14
4.6	Variance for Interdisciplinary Appointments.....	14
4.7	Exceptions and Criteria for Research and Clinical Track Appointments.....	15
E	CRITERIA FOR THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD.....	15
F	MERIT COMPENSATION.....	15
G	POST-TENURE REVIEW.....	16
1	Purpose and Rationale.....	16
2	Review Procedures.....	16
2.1	Candidates for Post-tenure Review.....	16
2.11	Exclusions from Post-tenure Review.....	16
2.2	Documents.....	17
2.3	Reviewer Responsibilities.....	17
H	CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT.....	17
I	NON-RENEWAL OF CLINICAL-TRACK FACULTY.....	18
J	GRIEVANCE RESOLUTION.....	18
K	CIVILITY, COLLEGIALITY AND CITIZENSHIP.....	18
L	SUMMARY.....	19
M	APPENDICES.....	20
	Appendix 1. Peer Evaluation of Instruction	
	Appendix 2. Unclassified Professional Evaluation Form	
	Appendix 3. Faculty Effort Report	
	Appendix 4. Faculty Evaluation Summary	
	Appendix 5. Plan of Work	
	Appendix 6. Professorial Performance Award Evaluation	

## **A INTRODUCTION**

---

The scope of this document pertains to persons in the Department of Anatomy and Physiology with regular appointments. This includes research assistant, assistant scientist, and instructor; along with assistant professor, associate professor, and professor in the tenure-track, clinical and research lines. Guidelines that cover research assistant professors with term appointments are contained in the document "Research Assistant Professor Term Appointment", adopted: May 18, 2000 (Anatomy & Physiology, Policies and Procedures).

The goals and objectives of the department and individual faculty members are not static. A general set of evaluation guidelines congruent with the long-range goals and objectives of the department is established. The intent is to suggest examples of excellence and effectiveness that will serve as benchmarks for individual planning, goal-setting, and performance evaluation.

The professorial role has three major dimensions: 1) instruction; 2) research and publication; and 3) service to the institution, the profession, and external constituencies. Each of these dimensions is important to the attainment of college goals of excellence and national prominence. A faculty member's contribution within these dimensions is expected to vary as a function of skills, interests, assigned responsibilities and stage of career development.

This document describes modal patterns of emphasis that are most likely to lead to career development and to positive evaluations. Non-tenure track faculty with a regular appointment can fulfill key roles that advance the mission of the department, college, and university. Research and clinical track faculty that seek appointment in, or promotion to, advanced ranks must excel in their focus areas and may contribute substantially in other areas. Faculty members presenting themselves for tenure as well as promotion or merit compensation are expected to excel in at least two of the three dimensions mentioned above.

## **B MISSION COMPONENTS AND EVALUATION STANDARDS**

---

### **1 Instruction**

High-quality instruction is an important aspect of faculty evaluation. Faculty members that have time budgeted for teaching are expected to contribute in the area of instruction and student development, to be effective in the classroom, to strive continuously to improve their teaching effectiveness, and to contribute to the development of the department's instructional programs. Effectiveness in teaching and scholarship is an important component in decisions on merit compensation, tenure and promotion. The impact of teaching on these decisions will be directly affected by the budgeted time for teaching in an individual faculty member's job assignment.

#### **1.1 Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness**

- a. Teaching and course effectiveness should be evaluated by current students, peers (i.e., faculty of the department) and the department head. Evaluation procedures outlined in this document adhere to the *University Handbook* (available online at the K-State Office of Academic Personnel).
- b. The relative weight of the input from students, peers and the department head in determining the teaching effectiveness of a faculty member should be: 34% student evaluation (TEVAL, adjusted scores, see subsection c.i., below), 33% peer evaluation, and 33% department head evaluation.
- c. Student Evaluation Procedure: For evaluations by students, procedures outlined in i and ii, below, should be followed. As per the *University Handbook* (Section C34.1), "... documentation submitted by faculty members with teaching responsibilities would be considered incomplete and presumed inadequate, unless evidence of teaching effectiveness is included." In the department, all those with teaching responsibilities should submit documentation derived from student evaluations of teaching to the department head.

- i. The TEVAL form (available via K-State Online, Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning at Kansas State University) with the option of 15 individualized questions crafted by the teacher should be the instrument used by all faculty members at the instructor level or above. If the teacher desires to use other forms for improving his/her teaching, this option is open, but these forms would be in addition to the TEVAL instrument.
  - ii. Students should evaluate each faculty member in each course and section in which the faculty member teaches and has a role in administering grades.
- d. Peer Evaluation of Instruction: For evaluations by peers, the following procedures should be followed.
- i. A non-tenured faculty member will be peer-reviewed in each course by two tenured faculty members. These evaluations should each include at least one lecture.
  - ii. A tenured faculty member will be peer-reviewed in each course by one tenured faculty member. This evaluation should include at least one lecture.
  - iii. At the request of the faculty member being reviewed, or at the discretion of the department head, additional faculty may be asked to perform a peer review.
  - iv. It is the responsibility of the department head to designate peer reviewers for all faculty members with teaching responsibilities and to provide peer reviewers with appropriate course schedules. Peer reviewers may evaluate one or more lectures of their choice although they may seek guidance from the faculty member being reviewed regarding lectures of greatest interest. It is the responsibility of the faculty member being reviewed to notify the department head of any changes in the course schedule that may affect the peer review process.
  - v. The instrument for peer review ("Peer Evaluation of Instruction"; Appendix 1) is a two-page form. The first page of this instrument ending with "... **reasons for any Not Acceptable (NA) ratings given:**" is confidential and goes only to the department head unless the evaluator indicates specifically that a copy of the page may be given to the faculty member being evaluated. The second page of the document containing "**GENERAL COMMENTS**" and "**SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT**" goes to both the faculty member being reviewed and to the department head. This allows for a sincere evaluation by the reviewer, and is in compliance with the *University Handbook* (Section C35), while allowing the person being reviewed to receive input from the peer reviewer.
- e. Department Head Evaluation Procedure: The department head evaluation of teaching should involve the following procedures:
- i. The department head, or a faculty administrator who is designated by the department head, will attend at least one lecture in each course of each of the faculty in the department, including faculty who teach only graduate school courses.
  - ii. The department head will use the "Peer Evaluation of Instruction" and whatever additional instrument(s) he/she chooses to evaluate equitably the teaching effectiveness of the faculty in the department.

### 1.11 Examples to Document Teaching Quality and Effectiveness

- a. Evaluations of teaching performance by students
- b. Evaluations of teaching performance by the department head
- c. Evaluations of teaching performance by peer reviewers
- d. Exit interviews with professional students or graduate students
- e. Results of surveys of graduates relative to knowledge gained and preparation for their chosen career

- f. Accomplishments in the area of awards for teaching, e.g., Norden Award, Student Chapter of the American Veterinary Medical Association (SCAVMA) Award for Basic Science, university awards
- g. Recognition for continuing education and extension activities
- h. Evaluations from previous employers of the faculty member or from employers of previous students of the faculty member
- i. Coordination of multidisciplinary courses

## **1.2 Evaluation of the Scholarship of Teaching**

Evaluation of the scholarship of teaching is particularly important for those faculty members with substantial teaching assignments and is evaluated by the department head in consultation with the faculty member. Some examples of the scholarship of teaching are listed in the following section (Section 1.21). It is understood that, depending on the assignment of the faculty member and their contributions in the areas of scholarship in research and directed service, scholarship in teaching may impact the overall evaluation of the faculty member well beyond the department head's 33% input into the evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

### **1.21 Examples of Accomplishments in the Area of Scholarship of Teaching**

- a. Development of new teaching materials or radical improvement of current teaching materials in existing courses
- b. Development of innovative pedagogical methodologies and materials
- c. Development of new undergraduate, graduate, professional, or extension courses or major revision to the content of existing courses
- d. Publication of instruction-related materials, e.g., case reports, textbooks, auto-tutorials, results of surveys or articles on the theory of education
- e. Development of survey instruments for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness
- f. Contribution to the development of new instructional programs
- g. Record of speaking engagements on instruction-related topics at local, regional, state, national, and/or international meetings
- h. Completion of programs/workshops resulting in improved teaching methods
- i. Proof of significant self-development leading to enhanced instructional effectiveness
- j. Chair of MS and/or PhD committee(s)
- k. Member of MS and/or PhD committee(s)
- l. Direction of independent student research, e.g., summer projects by veterinary students

## **2 Research**

High-quality research and publication are fundamental to attaining the goals of academic excellence and national prominence. Faculty contributions to the body of knowledge are critical to the department's academic reputation for excellence.

The quality of the research contribution to the body of knowledge is one of the major criteria in evaluation. Indices of quality include: a) A consistent record of publication in leading refereed journals in relevant disciplines, b) peer recognition via research or publication awards, and c) membership on prestigious editorial boards.

Original research normally should be considered as evidence only after acceptance for publication. A given achievement should not be counted as an accomplishment justifying advancement of a faculty

member if it has been employed in earlier justifications (e.g., included as evidence of current activity in a previous performance evaluation), except when considered as part of a cumulative record. One permissible exception to this general rule is the occasional instance in which a scholarly or creative work increases considerably in stature and importance after its initial publication. In such instances, the increase in stature must be shown through such evidence as reviews and significant citations.

Both collaborative and individual contributions in research and publications are desirable and are required especially for those with appointments to interdisciplinary research centers and institutes. However, individuals are encouraged to develop a publication record that is balanced between primary or senior authorship and contributing authorship. External funding of research will be an indicator of excellence when such research seeks to contribute to the body of knowledge through high quality publication and/or to student development.

Effectiveness in research and publication is an important component in decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion. However, this productivity in the absence of quality of performance in other assignments will not be adequate for positive recommendations and action. Multiple indicators of excellence in research and publication over an extended period of time, together with effectiveness in instruction, and/or service usually represent the most important components in the tenure and promotion process.

## **2.1 Examples to Document Excellence in Research and Publication**

- a. Recognition from peers in the field, e.g., fellowships, research awards, publication awards
- b. Publications in the leading refereed journals of appropriate disciplines
- c. Significant external funding for research
- d. Publication of critically acclaimed book(s)
- e. Significant intellectual participation in patents and royalty/licensing agreements
- f. Editorship of major journal
- g. Board of editors of major journal(s)
- h. Grant/contract reviewer for research organizations and institutions, e.g., NIH, NSF, USDA

## **2.2 Examples of Effectiveness in Research and Publication**

- a. Publication of book(s)
- b. Publication of technical reports or monographs
- c. Presentation of papers at professional meetings
- d. Publication of significant review articles
- e. Publication of chapters or sections in scholarly books
- f. Publication of papers in proceedings of regional professional meetings
- g. Ad hoc reviewer for major refereed journals
- h. Consultant to industry
- i. Publication in non-refereed but widely recognized professional journals
- j. Clear contribution to the research of others
- k. Significant self-development activities leading to increased research and publication effectiveness
- l. Member of thesis/dissertation committees
- m. Chair of Master's thesis and PhD dissertation committees

- n. Direction of independent student research
- o. Editor of published conference proceedings
- p. Publication of case reports in refereed journals
- q. Invited reviewer of professional books

### **3 Service**

The Department of Anatomy and Physiology must serve several constituencies effectively to achieve excellence and national prominence. The academic profession, the veterinary profession, the public, the agricultural community, and the university are among the major constituencies.

A variety of service roles can contribute to attainment of departmental goals of excellence and national prominence. All tenure-track faculty members are expected to contribute in the service area. As noted in preceding sections, the amount and nature of the service contributions are likely to differ as a function of individual skills, interests, and stage of career development.

Excellence in service will be an important component in decisions on merit compensation, tenure and promotion. However, this productivity alone, in the absence of quality of performance in other assignments, will not be adequate for positive recommendations and actions. Multiple indicators of excellence in service over an extended period of time, together with effectiveness in instruction, and/or research and publication usually represent the most important components in the tenure and promotion process.

#### **3.1 Examples to Document Excellence in Service**

- a. Officer in a national professional organization
- b. Program, division, or area chair of a national meeting
- c. Service on institutional, state or national commissions, task forces, committees or boards
- d. Consultation with state, national or international governmental offices
- e. Attraction of significant external development support
- f. Evidence of leadership and outstanding contributions on university, college and department committees and task forces
- g. Invitations to speak at regional and national meetings
- h. Editorship of major journal
- i. Board of editors of major journal(s)

#### **3.2 Examples of Effectiveness in Service**

- a. Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced service proficiency and effectiveness
- b. Consulting with industry, veterinary practitioners and client groups
- c. Officer, program, or area chair in regional professional organizations
- d. Service on university, college and department committees and task forces
- e. Contribution to external development efforts
- f. Advisor to student organizations
- g. Administrative roles within the department or college
- h. Publications of importance to the college with a local, regional or national distribution
- i. Ad hoc reviewer for major refereed journals

- j. Consultant to industry
- k. Editor of published conference proceedings
- l. Invited reviewer of professional books

## **C POSITIONS THAT SUPPORT THE MISSIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT \_\_\_\_\_**

### **1 Research Assistant and Assistant Scientist**

Research assistants and assistant scientists possess unique skill sets that are critical to the ongoing success of the research mission within the department. The skill sets may be particularly valuable to an ongoing investigation or they may be associated with a shared resource or core facility that requires a dedicated expert. Typically, persons in these positions are supervised by a laboratory director within the department. Thus, the performance expectations will be determined by the supervising individual in consultation with the department head. Regularly appointed research assistants and assistant scientists are covered by the *University Handbook*.

### **2 Instructor**

Instructors have responsibilities for the education of professional and graduate students in the classroom and in the teaching laboratory. An instructor appointed on a regular appointment is a member of the general faculty and is afforded all perquisites accorded to the general faculty, including Notice of Non-Reappointment (*University Handbook*, Appendix A), with the exception that years of service on a regular appointment will not be credited toward tenure. An effective instructor on a regular appointment may not be denied a continuing appointment in order to avoid granting benefits (*University Handbook*, Section C12).

### **3 Assistant Professor**

Primary emphasis should be placed on establishing a productive pattern of research and publication in leading academic journals and on developing competence in instruction. Promotion to associate professor will be based on evaluation of performance in assigned responsibilities in instruction, research and service.

### **4 Associate Professor**

Continued emphasis should be placed on competence in instruction and research. For those with major service roles, continued excellence in service contributions is expected, along with the development of leadership in the individual's specialty area. Associate professors will be expected to exhibit increased contributions, excellence and effectiveness in two or more of the dimensions of instruction, research and service. For associate professors aspiring to professorship, excellence in instruction and service contributions must be combined with a research and publication record demonstrating leadership, continued development and contributions to the field as judged by peers and external scholars.

### **5 Professor**

Continued excellence and national recognition in at least two of the three dimensions of instruction, research, and service are required. Leadership can be manifested in a variety of ways, such as continued major contributions to the body of knowledge; contribution to the development of junior faculty; leadership in one or more of the areas of excellence in service; and leadership in one or more of the areas of excellence in instruction. While there will likely be great heterogeneity in the nature of contributions of professors, excellence in several areas are expected. Merit compensation will be the primary extrinsic means of recognizing such excellence.

### **6 Research Faculty**

In certain cases, the department's interests are served best by entering into ongoing relationships with personnel that have a distinct research focus for career development. Research faculty members are

engaged in the research endeavors of the department. There is no stated requirement for activities in the areas of either teaching or service, although such activities may be undertaken and may be considered in decisions regarding promotion. Research faculty will participate in governance processes as defined by the department, College of Veterinary Medicine, and University Faculty Senate. Research faculty members have voting rights in college and department matters and elections, and may serve on department, college, and university committees unless policies limit membership to tenure-track faculty. Research faculty are eligible for graduate faculty status, which allows faculty to serve as major professor, graduate committee member, and course coordinator for graduate-level courses (*Graduate Handbook*, Chapter 5, Section C). Individuals appointed at the rank of research assistant professor, research associate professor, and research professor should have research credentials consistent with those mandated for the comparable tenure-track rank. These individuals are expected to develop and maintain an independent line of research investigation.

Individuals appointed to these ranks may expect to be promoted on the basis of demonstrated merit in research that supports the department's mission(s). Each higher rank demands a greater level of accomplishment consistent with the research expectations for tenure-track faculty. Annual evaluation and promotion are based upon an individual's achievements related to the specific criteria, standards, and guidelines developed by the department faculty member in consultation with the department head. Research professors are eligible for consideration of the Professorial Performance Award after 6 years in rank since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award (*University Handbook*, Section C49.2).

A research assistant professor must perform above minimum standards to maintain an expectation for continuing reappointment. Such standards will be determined on a case by case basis in consultation with the department head. Examples of minimum standards may include ongoing efforts to obtain extramural funding (e.g., more than one competitive proposal that is of sufficient size to fund a line of investigation should be submitted each year with the incumbent as the project director or principal investigator), clear leadership and contributions to the mission of an interdisciplinary research center or institute, and a record of publication (e.g., at least one senior [i.e., first or last] author publication and one other publication per year).

Research professors at all ranks on a regular appointment are members of the general faculty and afforded all perquisites accorded to the general faculty (*University Handbook*, Section C12.1), including Notice of Non-Reappointment (*University Handbook*, Appendix A), with the exception that years of service on a regular appointment will not be counted toward tenure. Research faculty receive one-year, annually renewable, appointments.

## **7 Clinical Faculty**

The primary responsibility of faculty on clinical track appointments is teaching veterinary students, interns and residents in preclinical, clinical and field settings. The distribution of effort for clinical track faculty consists of a 60% to 100% teaching load in the veterinary medicine curriculum. There is no stated requirement for activities in the areas of either research or service, although such activities may be undertaken and may be considered in promotion decisions. Clinical-track faculty members are especially encouraged to develop and deliver elective courses in the veterinary curriculum that build on their experience and expertise.

A clinical track faculty member at any rank is a member of the general faculty and is afforded all perquisites accorded to the general faculty (*University Handbook*, Section C12.2). Clinical assistant professors receive one-year, annually renewable, appointments. Clinical associate professors receive annually renewable three-year appointments. Clinical professors receive annually renewable five-year appointments. Notice of non-reappointment must be given 12 months before the end of the contract. Individuals appointed to these ranks may expect to be appointed or promoted on the basis of demonstrated merit in relationship to their association with the department's mission(s). Each higher rank demands a higher level of effectiveness and scholarship in teaching to prepare students for careers in medicine and the biomedical industry, consistent with the expectations for instruction by tenure-track

faculty. Annual evaluation and promotion are based upon an individual's achievements related to the specific criteria, standards, and guidelines developed by the faculty member in consultation with the department head. Clinical professors are eligible for consideration of the Professorial Performance Award after six years in rank (*University Handbook*, Section C49.1).

Clinical faculty will participate in faculty governance processes as defined by the department, College of Veterinary Medicine, and University Faculty Senate. Clinical-track faculty members have voting rights in college and department matters and elections, and may serve on department, college, and university committees unless policies limit membership to tenure-track faculty. Clinical-track faculty members are eligible to submit grant applications and direct research as principal investigators (*Policy and Procedures Manual* 7010.060). Clinical-track faculty members are eligible for graduate faculty status, which allows them to serve as major professor, graduate committee member, and course coordinator for graduate-level courses (*Graduate Handbook*, Chapter 5, Section C). Clinical-track faculty members may be course coordinators in the College of Veterinary Medicine without graduate faculty status. Clinical-track faculty members are eligible for sabbatical leave (*University Handbook*, Section E2) and are eligible for faculty development funds, if available.

A clinical assistant professor must perform above minimum standards to maintain an expectation for reappointment. Such standards will be determined on a case by case basis in consultation with the department head. Examples of minimum standards may include development of new course materials, ongoing efforts to obtain extramural funding, a record of publication, and other evidence of scholarship in instruction.

## **D ADVANCEMENT CRITERIA**

---

### **1 Appointment and Reappointment**

#### **1.1 Research Assistant and Assistant Scientist**

These regular, non-faculty appointments address distinct research areas within the department. Typically, each position is supervised by a laboratory director within the department. Thus, the position description and performance expectations will be determined by the supervising individual in consultation with the department head. The supervising individual, on behalf of the department head, will work with the University Division of Human Resources to generate the position description and to develop the screening tools that will be used to identify qualified candidates. Further, the supervising individual will be responsible for reviewing credentials and for obtaining any additional information necessary for the appointment process. Ultimately, that supervising individual will be advisory to the department head, who will advance a recommendation for appointment along with supporting materials to the dean. **Reappointment:** Subsequent contracts will be extended in accordance with university policies (*University Handbook*, Sections C170.1-C171).

#### **1.2 Instructors and all Professorial Ranks**

Initial contracts are issued to personnel by the provost, who acts after receiving advice, either directly or indirectly from the department faculty, the department head, and the dean. The department head is advised on appointments by faculty members in the department. A search committee may be appointed by the department head to assist with the process of identifying candidates for academic positions. The department head will work with the search committee and the University Division of Human Resources to generate the position description and to develop the screening tools that will be used to identify qualified candidates. The department head is responsible for making candidates' files and other pertinent information available to the search committee members.

##### **1.21 Instructors**

For appointments to the rank of instructor, the department head will provide all faculty members access to the file(s) of the leading candidate(s) and faculty members will advise the department head by providing written comments in a timely fashion. After the comment period is closed and

all comments have been reviewed, the department head will provide a written recommendation to the dean, along with the candidate's complete file. Initial contracts will be extended in accordance with university policies (*University Handbook*, Section C12). **Reappointment:** Subsequent contracts applicable to regular instructors will be extended in accordance with university policies (*University Handbook*, Sections C60-C66).

## 1.22 All Professorial Ranks

For appointments at the rank of assistant professor, associate professor and professor, in either research, clinical, or tenure track, faculty members will advise the department head through a vote on the appointment of a candidate. The department head will provide all faculty members access to the file(s) of the leading candidate(s). A faculty meeting may be called to discuss the qualifications of the candidate(s) prior to casting a vote to prioritize the candidates and to determine whether each of the preferred candidates has the support of the faculty. Only faculty members of equal or higher academic rank than the position being filled are eligible to vote. Each eligible faculty member will cast a vote using either written or electronic means and the ballot will include space for personal comments that are advisory to the department head. Eligible faculty members that are unavailable at the time of balloting may designate another eligible faculty member to act as their proxy by informing the department head in advance. The department head will receive the numerical tally of the votes from the eligible faculty along with all ballots. The department head will provide a written recommendation and an accompanying explanation to the dean, along with the candidate's complete file, the numerical results of the vote, and any unedited written comments from faculty members. The dean will provide a recommendation to the provost along with all appropriate supporting materials. Initial contracts for research track faculty and clinical track faculty will be extended in accordance with university policies (*University Handbook*, Sections C12.1 and C12.2). **Reappointment:** Subsequent contracts prior to tenure will be extended in accordance with university policies (*University Handbook*, Sections C50.1-C56). For the length of probationary period for assistant professor, associate professor, and professor; refer to *University Handbook*, Sections 82.2 and 82.3.

## 2 Annual Review

Review of research assistants and assistant scientists occurs annually, typically early in the calendar year. It is the responsibility of the supervisor and department head to initiate the process and to ensure that all documentation is completed in a timely fashion. An "Unclassified Professional Evaluation Form" (Appendix 2) is completed by the appointee's supervisor and is reviewed by the appointee with the option to include written comments before both the supervisor and appointee sign the document. The signed form is forwarded to the department head, who will advance a recommendation for reappointment along with appropriate supporting materials to the dean.

Review of all faculty members occurs annually and requires some documents that are completed by the faculty member (see sections 2.1 and 2.2), some documents that are completed by the department head (see section 2.3), and some documents that are completed cooperatively by the department head and the faculty member (see section 2.4). Typically, the review process occurs early in the calendar year. It is the responsibility of the both the department head and the faculty member to complete all documentation and to conduct all meetings in a timely fashion. Typically, the annual review process is initiated with a solicitation from the department head of pertinent forms completed by each faculty member. Documents that are completed in the annual review provide the basis for decisions regarding reappointment (*University Handbook*, Sections C50.1-C66 and C160.1-162.5) and are a portion of the information that is assessed during more thorough evaluations that are associated with mid-tenure review, promotion, tenure, and professorial performance awards.

### 2.1 Faculty Effort Report – Completed by the Faculty

The "Faculty Effort Report" (Appendix 3) has been developed to provide an annual summation of faculty accomplishments in teaching, research and service. The report provides an opportunity to

enumerate and describe student counseling activities, administrative and committee activities, professional activities, civic activities, honors and any other professional activities pertinent to the effectiveness of the faculty member during the year.

## **2.2 Curriculum Vitae – Completed by the Faculty**

Each faculty member is required to submit current curriculum vitae in conjunction with the Faculty Effort Report. The style and format may be of the faculty's own choosing. Regardless of the format, however, the following information must be included:

- Name
- Date
- Telephone numbers (office and home)
- Universities attended, degrees and dates
- Specialty board certification
- Employment record
- Professional organizations
- Honors, awards, special recognitions
- Academic committee experience
- Government and other professional experience
- Research grants, contracts, royalties, patents, license incomes
- Consultative experience
- Publications
- Presentations
- Abstracts

The inclusion of other information is optional. It is suggested that the curriculum vitae be developed in a format one would want to send to peer groups outside Kansas State University.

## **2.3 Faculty Evaluation Summary – Prepared by Department Head**

The "Faculty Evaluation Summary" (Appendix 4) is prepared annually by the department head after reviewing the faculty member's updated curriculum vitae and Faculty Effort Report for the current year and any other pertinent information. The annual Faculty Evaluation Summary is designed to evaluate progress in assigned areas of activity, to identify opportunities for professional development, and to serve as an instrument of communication between the department head and faculty member. The summary, comments, and ratings by the department head may be used to indicate performance in rank and progression toward promotion.

## **2.4 Plan of Work – Completed by Faculty Member and Department Head Jointly**

The "Plan of Work" (Appendix 5) is designed as a communication instrument for arriving at a joint understanding of duty assignments and expectations. Specific objectives to be accomplished are stressed and resources available to accomplish the assignments are identified. The Plan of Work can be used to formulate or identify measures that will foster progression toward promotion.

## **2.5 Department Head-Faculty Conference**

Annually, the department head meets individually with each faculty member early in the calendar year to review that member's performance and, as appropriate, progress toward tenure and promotion. At this meeting, the department head's evaluation of the faculty member's performance, as reflected on the Faculty Evaluation Summary, will be reviewed. Disagreements may be noted on the form, which is signed at that time. Faculty assignments and goals for the coming year will be discussed and agreed upon at the same meeting.

## **2.6 Faculty on Probationary Appointments**

Faculty members on probationary appointments are evaluated annually by the tenured faculty. The department head will make the candidate's reappointment file available to all tenured faculty members in the department and other eligible faculty as determined by departmental policy. A cumulative record of written recommendations and the accompanying explanations that were forwarded to the candidate following previous reappointment meetings, along with any written comments from relevant individuals outside the department will be made available to the tenured faculty. The department head and the tenured faculty will meet at least fourteen calendar days after the review documents are made available to discuss the candidate's eligibility for reappointment and progress toward tenure. Subsequent to this discussion, tenured faculty members will cast a vote using either written or electronic means and the ballot will include space for personal comments. Eligible faculty members that are unavailable at the time of balloting may designate another eligible faculty member to act as their proxy by informing the department head in advance. Faculty recommendations relative to reappointment along with all ballots are conveyed to the department head. Any member of the eligible faculty may, prior to the submission of any recommendation to the department head, request the candidate meet with the eligible faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate. The department head will forward a written recommendation and accompanying explanations to the dean, along with the candidate's complete file, which includes the tally of votes cast by tenured faculty members and their unedited written comments. The department head's written recommendation and accompanying explanations alone will be made available to the candidate and will become part of the candidate's reappointment file. (*University Handbook*, Sections C50.1-56 and C35).

## **2.7 Transfers between Research, Clinical-Track and Tenure-Track Appointments**

Faculty members may apply for a one-time, one-way transfer between appointment categories (tenure track, non-tenure track [i.e., clinical track or research]). Once a transfer from non-tenure track to tenure track has occurred, the guidelines for earning tenure apply. Time and title in the non-tenure track does not count toward the probationary period to obtain tenure. (*BOR Policy Manual* paragraph II C 2b vi (3)). Transfer approval is determined by a vote of the department faculty of higher rank to the faculty member under consideration and by recommendation of the Department Head. Final approval is determined by the Dean.

## **3 Mid-probationary review**

A formal review of a tenure-track faculty member is conducted midway through the probationary period, in most cases, during the third year of appointment. This review provides the candidate with substantive feedback from faculty colleagues and administrators regarding his or her accomplishments relative to the department's mission, goals and objectives. A positive mid-probationary review does not insure that tenure will be granted in the future; nor does a negative review necessarily mean that tenure will be denied, except when notice of non-reappointment is given (*University Handbook*, Appendix A).

Procedures for the mid-probationary review are similar to procedures for the tenure review. The department head is advised by the tenured faculty and is responsible for making the candidate's file, which includes a cumulative record of written recommendations and accompanying explanations forwarded to the candidate following previous reappointment meetings, available to the tenured faculty at least fourteen calendar days prior to a meeting to discuss the candidate's progress. The department head may constitute a committee of tenured faculty to conduct a thorough systematic review of the candidate's credentials. The department head and/or the committee may solicit information from students, from other faculty members or from peers outside the university. The committee will report their observations to the department head with the expectation that these observations will be shared with all qualified faculty members in the department. The department head will convene a meeting of the tenured faculty to discuss the candidate's credentials and progress toward tenure. Subsequent to this discussion, tenured faculty members will cast a vote using either written or electronic means and

the ballot will include space for personal comments and suggestions. Eligible faculty members that are unavailable at the time of balloting may designate another eligible faculty member to act as their proxy by informing the department head in advance. The tally of this vote along with all ballots and comments are conveyed to the department head. The department head discusses the review with the candidate and provides a letter of advisement, including a summary of faculty comments and suggestions. After receiving the assessment, the candidate has the right to submit a written response for the file. A copy of the letter of advisement is forwarded to the dean along with the faculty member's file (*University Handbook*, Sections C92.1-C92.3 and C35).

Research assistant professors and clinical assistant professors may request, and the department may provide, a similar review in their third year with the goal of determining whether the candidate is making progress toward promotion. All faculty of higher academic rank than the candidate will participate in this review process as specified above.

#### **4 Tenure and/or Promotion**

Individuals recommended for promotion and/or tenure will be those who are expected to earn the rank of professor in accordance with the department's and the university's guidelines. Personal qualities, professional knowledge, competence, and standards of professional integrity are important factors. The individual must have the promise of maintaining a high level of productivity and scholarly activity.

The basic questions to be satisfied when the record is reviewed prior to the granting of tenure are:

- a. Does this person have a high level of competence for the position at hand?
- b. Is this an individual whose personal qualities, professional knowledge and competence, and standards of professional integrity measure up to the level desired for the department and College of Veterinary Medicine?

Tenure and promotion usually are linked for persons hired as assistant professors. Thus, a recommendation for early promotion typically is coupled with a recommendation for early tenure and vice versa.

If it becomes clear at any time during the probationary period that a person is not going to qualify for tenure, the appointment will be terminated (*University Handbook*, Sections C160.2 and C162.3, and Appendix A).

The department head initiates the tenure and/or promotion process, after consulting with the candidate, by notifying the eligible departmental voting faculty (Section 4.1). The department head is responsible for reviewing all persons eligible for tenure and/or promotion, and obtaining input from the voting faculty before providing tenure and/or promotion recommendations to the dean.

##### **4.1 Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee**

Only tenured faculty members may vote on recommendations for tenure. Only faculty members with higher rank than the candidate may vote on recommendations for promotion. All faculty votes and input are advisory to the department head.

##### **4.2 Dossier of Materials for Tenure and/or Promotion Review**

Faculty members who are identified as candidates for tenure and/or promotion will be asked by the department head to submit a dossier containing the following materials (*University Handbook*, Section C111):

- a. a current curriculum vitae
- b. a representative sample of publications
- c. documentation of awards, honors, appointments
- d. documentation of service contributions

- e. documentation of teaching innovation, teaching effectiveness, and other materials relevant to excellence and effectiveness in instruction

The department head will add to the file of candidates for tenure and/or promotion:

- a. a minimum of four letters of evaluation from nationally respected extramural scholars who are qualified to comment on the candidate's scholarly activities (Section 4.3)
- b. such other letters of evaluation as may be useful
- c. copies of the latest Faculty Effort Reports
- d. copies of the most recent annual Faculty Evaluation Summaries
- e. additional documentation required by the university to complete the file

The department head may constitute a sub-committee of qualified faculty to conduct a thorough systematic review of the incumbent's credentials. The committee will report their observations to the department head with the expectation that the report will be shared with all qualified faculty members in the department as a portion of the materials to be reviewed and that the report will become a part of the dossier.

### **4.3 Outside Letters of Evaluation**

Letters of evaluation from scholars outside the department with recognized distinction in the candidate's field of specialization are extremely helpful in arriving at a judgment concerning research capability and are required in cases of tenure or promotion. A minimum of four outside letters must be included in the dossier. At least half of the letters should be solicited from persons on a list submitted by the candidate, if the candidate chooses to supply such a list. Unless the candidate's list preempts all qualified persons, two or more referees may be designated independently by the department head. Candidate-designated referees should be identified in the dossier. The value of outside letters depends on the choice of appropriate persons who are discriminating judges and who are familiar with the candidate's work or agree to evaluate it. Letters from the candidate's major professor or the candidate's graduate student colleagues are to be avoided. Outside referees should be asked to comment on the candidate's research and other creative work. Where appropriate, referees may be asked to comment on teaching and service abilities (*University Handbook*, Sections C36.1, C36.2, and C112.2).

### **4.4 Departmental Review**

The department head reviews all persons for eligibility for tenure and/or promotion, and then convenes the departmental voting faculty to discuss the qualifications of the candidate with one member designated by the department head as the chairperson of the group. Faculty members are provided with the dossier (Section 4.2) at least 14 calendar days prior to this meeting. Subsequent to the discussion, each eligible faculty member will cast a vote using either written or electronic means and the ballot will include space for personal comments that are advisory to the department head. Eligible faculty members that are unavailable at the time of balloting may designate another eligible faculty member to act as their proxy by informing the department head in advance. Faculty recommendations relative to tenure and/or promotion along with all ballots are conveyed to the department head by the group chairperson.

The department head is responsible for conveying the departmental recommendation concerning tenure and/or promotion to the dean. If the recommendation of the voting faculty is at variance with the recommendation of the department head, both recommendations should be forwarded as clearly reasoned recommendations for or against tenure and/or promotion. The group chairperson will be tasked with composing the faculty recommendation when required. The department head also notifies the candidate of the departmental decision regarding tenure and/or promotion at this time (*University Handbook*, Section C112.1).

The dossier of materials for tenure and/or promotion review (Section 4.2) will be forwarded to the dean, together with the departmental recommendation on tenure and/or promotion, and any other

forms required by the college and university administration according to guidelines and schedules issued annually by the university.

#### **4.5 College Review**

The department's review of tenure and promotion applications is followed by a college review process. Comments and recommendations resulting from the college review are forwarded to the dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine, who will then forward the college's recommendations to the University Provost.

Any appeal process will be in accordance with the *University Handbook*.

#### **4.6 Variance for Interdisciplinary Appointments**

There are a number of interdisciplinary 'centers' and 'institutes' in the university that focus on research topics that are either emerging as fields or that cross traditional departmental boundaries. It is anticipated that faculty in interdisciplinary programs who have expertise in either traditional or emerging fields may have their primary academic appointment in the department. In these cases, it may be challenging for the department head and/or faculty to evaluate credentials effectively. Nonetheless, criteria and procedures for appointment, review, tenure and promotion will be conducted as outlined above with the following exceptions.

- a. Initial appointment: If a prospective faculty member is associated with a recognized interdisciplinary program, the program director will consult with the department head to ensure that an appointment within the department would be consistent with the department's goals and mission. The candidate's credentials will be presented to the qualified faculty as defined in Section D1. The credentials may include a letter of recommendation and/or justification from the interdisciplinary program director. The interdisciplinary program director may be present and participate in the meeting that includes the qualified department faculty members. As indicated above, in matters of appointment, department faculty members are advisory to the department head. Academic appointments may be split between departments that are associated with the interdisciplinary program. Candidates for a primary appointment in the department must have at least 75% of their research, teaching, and service effort allocated to the Department of Anatomy and Physiology.
- b. Review: Department faculty members who are associated with interdisciplinary programs will be evaluated annually using the procedures and tools described in Sections D2-D2.5. The interdisciplinary program director will be advisory to the department head and may work closely with the department head while conducting and completing the annual review.
- c. Mid-probationary Review, Tenure, and Promotion: Department faculty members who are associated with interdisciplinary programs will be evaluated for tenure and promotion using the procedures and tools described in Sections D3 and D4-D4.5. It is expected that additional documentation and feedback may be necessary for the department head and qualified department faculty members to develop an informed opinion to support these decisions. In addition to the documents listed above, the department head will solicit a letter of evaluation from the interdisciplinary program director and at least one letter of evaluation from a tenured program faculty member from outside the department. Extramural letters of evaluation should cover topic areas that are appropriate for the interdisciplinary program. The interdisciplinary program director will be advisory to the department head in identifying prospective extramural evaluators. The interdisciplinary program director may be present and participate in a part or all of the meeting that includes the qualified department faculty members. As indicated above, in matters of tenure and promotion, department faculty members are advisory to the department head.

#### **4.7 Exceptions and/or Criteria for Research and Clinical Track Appointments**

When being evaluated for promotion; research and clinical track faculty are expected to provide documentation of service contributions, research or teaching effectiveness only to the extent to which these components are included in the appointment documents.

## **E CRITERIA FOR THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD**\_\_\_\_\_

The Professorial Performance Award rewards strong performance at the highest rank with a base salary increase in addition to that provided for by the annual evaluation process (*University Handbook*, Section C49.1).

Qualifying Guidelines and Criteria:

- a. The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at Kansas State University at least six years since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award.
- b. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review.
- c. The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to currently approved departmental standards.
- d. In the last six years, the candidate must have received a minimum of four annual overall assessments for faculty performance of 'High Meets' or 'Exceeds' Expectations.

Supporting materials that will serve as the basis of judging eligibility for the award:

The faculty member will provide each Faculty Evaluation Summary since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award and current curriculum vitae.

The department head's recommendation, contained on the Professorial Performance Award Evaluation (Appendix 6), and the candidate's current curriculum vitae will be forwarded to the dean at the same time as the annual evaluations are forwarded to the dean.

## **F MERIT COMPENSATION**\_\_\_\_\_

Merit compensation represents an opportunity to reward short-term contributions of excellence, to recognize progress toward tenure and promotion, and to reward tenured faculty for their contributions. For non-tenured assistant and associate professors, the basis of merit compensation evaluations will be progress made toward tenure and/or promotion, i.e., continued development of a high-quality research and publication record, effectiveness in instruction, and high-quality service contributions. For tenured faculty, merit compensation evaluations will be based on the level of performance in at least two of the following dimensions: instruction, research, and service.

The evaluation period will be the same for all individuals in the department, with the possible exception of first year appointees and individuals who have been on leave for all or part of the year. The department's evaluation system will be based normally on performance during the 12-month period ending December 31<sup>st</sup>.

It is emphasized that accumulation of "activities" does not constitute the basis for favorable merit compensation. It is the degree of excellence that is crucial to the merit compensation decision. Again, it remains for each faculty member, in consultation with the department head, to identify the specific contributions that will best integrate the individual's skills, interests, and goals, with the department's goals of excellence and national prominence.

## **G POST-TENURE REVIEW**\_\_\_\_\_

### **1 Purpose and Rationale**

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 faculty members throughout their careers so that they may fulfill the mission of the university more effectively. The post-tenure review process is designed to enhance public trust in the

university by ensuring that the academic community undertakes regular and rigorous efforts to hold all of its members accountable to high professional standards.

Kansas State University recognizes that the granting of tenure to 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 university policies regarding removal of tenured faculty members for cause, as stipulated in the *University Handbook*. The post-tenure review policy and any actions taken under it are separate from and have no bearing on the chronic low achievement policy (see Section H) or annual evaluation policies and processes (Sections D-F).

The department policy on post tenure review follows the overarching purpose, principles, and objectives defined in the *University Handbook*, Appendix W (Section 1) and the procedures defined in that document (Section 2).

## **2 Review Procedures**

### **2.1 Candidates for Post-tenure Review**

In general, a post-tenure review of each tenured faculty member as defined by this policy shall be conducted every six years and shall conform to the timeline associated with the annual review (Section D). The six-year post-tenure review clock shall be further defined to mean that post-tenure review will be conducted for each tenured faculty member either every six years or in the sixth year following either a promotion or the awarding of a major university performance award. More specifically, the following events shall modify and reset the post-tenure review clock:

- a. Application for promotion to professor;
- b. Application for the Professorial Performance Award (*University Handbook*, Section C49);
- c. Receipt of a substantial college, university, national or international award requiring multi-year portfolio-like documentation, such as University Distinguished Professor, University Distinguished Teaching Scholar, an endowed chair or other national/international awards (see list of Faculty Awards at <http://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/natlawards.html>).

The schedule for post-tenure review also can be delayed for one year to accommodate sabbatical leave, a major health issue, or another compelling reason, provided that both the faculty member and the department head approve the delay.

#### **2.11 Exclusions from Post-tenure Review**

- a. Faculty members who have announced their retirement through a written letter to the department head or have begun phased retirement are exempt from post-tenure review.
- b. Faculty members who have been identified as not meeting minimum standards according to the policies and department procedures relating to chronic low achievement are exempt from post-tenure review. The process defined in Section H, Chronic Low Achievement, will serve in lieu of post-tenure review.

### **2.2 Documents**

The department head will identify and inform candidates for post-tenure review prior to the submission of documents for annual review (see Section D 2). The department head will request that, in conjunction with materials submitted for annual review, the faculty member to be evaluated will submit: 1) a brief narrative (1-2 pages) outlining his/her major accomplishments and professional growth during the past six years, and 2) copies of faculty evaluation summaries for the past six years. The narrative of accomplishments will reflect the nature of the faculty member's appointment.

### **2.3 Reviewer Responsibilities**

The department head has primary responsibility to conduct the post-tenure review with the assistance of an ad hoc review committee. The committee will be appointed by the department head and selected from tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the person being reviewed. The committee will conduct a thorough systematic review of the submitted materials and report their observations and conclusions to the department head. This report will include an assessment of whether the faculty member is demonstrating appropriate professional growth expected of their professorial rank and whether the faculty member is making appropriate and adequate contributions to the university mission. Reasonable minimal benchmarks might include that the overall assessment on all faculty evaluation summaries for the review period were categorized as 'Meets Expectations Med' or above, and that the faculty member has demonstrated professional growth over the six year period. For faculty whose professional growth does not meet these criteria, a recommendation may be made by the committee for the formulation of a professional growth and development plan by the faculty member.

The department head will review the submitted documents along with the committee report, will summarize his or her observations and will meet with the faculty member to review the outcomes. This meeting may be held in conjunction with the Department Head-Faculty Conference (see Section D 2.5). A copy of the committee's assessment and the department head's comments will be provided to the faculty member prior to the meeting. If appropriate, the department head may take this opportunity to initiate a plan for professional growth and development.

The department head will submit the outcome of the review to the dean.

## **H CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT**

---

Chronic failure of a tenured faculty member to perform his/her professional duties shall constitute evidence of "professional incompetence" and warrant consideration for "dismissal for cause" under existing university policies (*University Handbook*, Section C31.5). In general, the **Minimal Standard for Acceptable Teaching** requires competent and committed instruction as evidenced by appropriate professional behavior like being prepared for class, conducting class and examination sessions as scheduled and contributing to the overall teaching mission of the department.

**Minimal Standard for Research** performance involves the maintenance of a functional and productive research laboratory as evidenced by periodic scientific presentations at state and national scientific meetings, publications in appropriate scientific journals and sincere attempts to secure extramural funding to support their research efforts.

Should the department head conclude for two consecutive years, or for three years within a five-year period, that a faculty member's overall accomplishments do not meet the minimum expectations of the department, the department head will exercise one of two options:

- a. The department head may recommend to the dean that a set of corrective measures be established to help the faculty member attain success in his/her professional endeavors. These measures may include requiring the faculty member to specify a set of goals, a reasonable plan and timeline for attaining the stated goals, reassignment of responsibilities within the context of the needs of the department and the faculty member's talent, and/or establishing a mentoring relationship between the faculty member and faculty member who will provide advice and guidance. Should the department head choose this option, the following steps will be followed:
  - i. The department head will meet with the faculty member to inform him/her of the decision, and to define the corrective measures that will be employed.
  - ii. The faculty member has the right to request that additional faculty input be provided to the department head, to influence both the initial evaluation of the accomplishments and the set of corrective measures. The department head will then convene the tenured faculty in the department and solicit additional input from them regarding both the evaluation and the proposed remedial activities.

- b. The department head may recommend to the dean that the faculty member be dismissed from employment at the university. Should the department head choose this option, the following steps will be followed:
  - i. The department head will inform the faculty member of this decision.
  - ii. The department head will convene the tenured faculty in the department and request that they examine the credentials of the faculty member being reviewed. The tenured faculty will select an acting chair for the meeting. After reviewing all appropriate documentation, the tenured faculty will provide a substantive rationale, composed by the acting chair and acknowledged as a correct reflection of the meeting by all faculty members in attendance, for their support, or non-support, of the department head's recommendation. The tenured faculty members' report should include numerical results of a ballot with the opportunity for individual personal comments. The faculty member being reviewed may request that the department head not seek this additional faculty input.
  - iii. The department head will forward the tenured faculty members' recommendation, along with all the documentation used to formulate his/her recommendation, to the dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine.
  - iv. The dean may then reject the recommendation or initiate activities for dismissal for cause following the procedures outlined in the *University Handbook*, Appendix M.

**I NON-RENEWAL OF CLINICAL-TRACK FACULTY**\_\_\_\_\_

Termination of clinical track faculty during the term of the appointment must be in accordance with university policies for termination of a continuous appointment. Termination is based on the department and the *University Handbook* (Sections C31.5-31.8) standards for chronic low achievement. Standards of notice of non-reappointment apply to clinical track faculty (*University Handbook*, Appendix A). Grievance procedures will follow policy guidelines and procedures used for tenure-track faculty grievances (*University Handbook*, Appendix G). Clinical and tenure track faculty are subject to dismissal necessitated by university or college financial exigency (*University Handbook*, Appendix B).

**J GRIEVANCE RESOLUTION**\_\_\_\_\_

In the event that serious disagreements arise (salary, promotion, tenure, or other employment conditions) between unclassified persons and their immediate or higher level supervisors, a process for registering and hearing grievances is delineated in the *University Handbook*, Appendix G. All efforts should be made by the aggrieved person and his/her immediate or one-level higher, supervisor to resolve the issue prior to a grievance being filed formally. An ombudsperson will be available for advice, counseling, and perhaps mediation during this phase of the issue resolution.

**K CIVILITY, COLLEGIALLY AND CITIZENSHIP**\_\_\_\_\_

A fundamental premise of academic life is the inviolable dignity of the individual. Respect for others is essential to the pursuit of the common missions of higher education. Discrimination, harassment, or other conduct that diminishes the worth of any individual person is incompatible with the fundamental values of the department. Every person; regardless of race, color, ethnic; or national origin, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, age, ancestry, disability, military status; or veteran status; shall be treated with respect and dignity (*University Handbook*, Appendix J). No person shall be subject to sexual, racial; or similar harassment or abuse; either of physical, verbal; or psychological nature. No one shall be denied equitable consideration for access to employment; to professional advancement; or to the programs, services, activities; and privileges within the department. (*University Handbook*, Section D3)

All members of the department are expected to conduct themselves in a collegial and professional manner within the department and the university. Specifically, employees are expected to contribute to the pursuit of department goals and work with faculty, unclassified staff, and other employees to achieve the mission of the university. Faculty and unclassified staff should contribute to an academic environment that:

- a. supports academic freedom, freedom of expression, professional discourse, inquiry, and respect for the academic rights and professional expertise of others; and
- b. is free of workplace bullying such as repeated threatening, humiliating, or intimidating behavior.

Kansas State University has endorsed the "Principles of Community" (<http://www.k-state.edu/welcome/community.html>). Every member of the university community, including every member of the department, is expected to acknowledge and practice these principles.

Individuals are expected to promote citizenship through mutual respect for individuals and sharing in the workload needed to achieve the collective goals of the department.

Performance reviews of faculty and other unclassified employees will include consideration of overall contribution or detriment to the department, which includes citizenship and other personal conduct affecting the workplace. Faculty and other unclassified employees are expected to have cooperative interactions with colleagues, show civility and respect to others with whom they work and interact, show respect for the opinions of others in the exchange of ideas, and demonstrate a willingness to follow appropriate directives from supervisors (*University Handbook*, Section C46.1).

Faculty members and other unclassified employees may be dismissed or otherwise disciplined for professional incompetence, misconduct or unethical behavior, or persistent violation of university rules and/or policy (*University Handbook*, Section C161.1).

Employees who make complaints or serve as witnesses in proceedings regarding violations of this policy may not be targeted for retaliation for such actions.

Resources for individuals with concerns related to professional conduct include the department head and dean, the Office of Academic Personnel, the Office of the Provost and Senior Vice President, the Ombudspersons, Counseling Services, Human Resources, Mediation Assistance; and; in cases of alleged discrimination; the Office of Affirmative Action (*University Handbook*, Section D12).

## **L SUMMARY**

---

This document provides guidelines for faculty appointment, evaluation and promotion. These guidelines are indicators of excellence and effectiveness in the three core dimensions used for periodic reviews. Within this general set of guidelines, a variety of contributions to stated goals of excellence and national prominence is possible. Indeed, such heterogeneity of contribution is itself a component within the pursuit of excellence.

## **M APPENDICES**

---

Departmental forms required for periodic reviews.

- Appendix 1. Peer Evaluation of Instruction
- Appendix 2. Unclassified Professional Evaluation Form
- Appendix 3. Faculty Effort Report
- Appendix 4. Faculty Evaluation Summary
- Appendix 5. Plan of Work
- Appendix 6. Professorial Performance Award Evaluation

**Appendix 1:**

**PEER EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION**  
DEPARTMENT OF ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY

**Please return both pages to the Department Head**

Put an "X" in the box if you want a copy of page 1 returned to the faculty member being evaluated.

---

Responsible evaluations can help the instructor improve and provide salient information regarding teaching effectiveness.

---

**Instructor:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Course:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

---

Rating System for THE INSTRUCTOR relative to the issues set forth below:  
1 = not acceptable (NA); 3 = meets expectations (ME); 5 = exceeds expectations (EE).

	<i>NA</i>		<i>ME</i>		<i>EE</i>
	1	2	3	4	5
Preparedness for class	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Clarity of Presentation	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Instructor/Student rapport	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Challenging the student to think more deeply about the subject	<input type="checkbox"/>				

---

**Overall effectiveness as a teacher** \_\_\_\_\_

**Please provide reasons for any "Not Acceptable" ratings given:**

**PEER EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION**  
**DEPARTMENT OF ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY**

**Page 2 will be copied and returned to the faculty member being evaluated.**

**GENERAL COMMENTS:**

**SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:**

Evaluator Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix 2: UNCLASSIFIED PROFESSIONAL EVALUATION FORM**  
**CALENDAR YEAR 20\_\_**  
DEPARTMENT OF ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Position:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date Position Attained:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Years in Position:** \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

**GENERAL COMMENTS:**

---

---

**Overall Assessment of Performance**

**Below Expectations**  **Meets Expectations**  **Low**  **Med**  **High**  **Exceeds Expectations**

---

**Professional's Expectations Response:**

---

**Signatures:**

Unclassified Professional: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
My signature signifies that I have seen my supervisor's evaluations. This does not mean that I agree with all of them.

Supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

**Comments by the Department Head**

Department Head: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix 3:**

**FACULTY EFFORT REPORT**  
**CALENDAR YEAR 20\_\_**  
DEPARTMENT OF ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Budgeted Effort:** \_\_\_\_\_ Teaching \_\_\_\_\_ Research \_\_\_\_\_ Service \_\_\_\_\_ Administration \_\_\_\_\_

**I. Teaching**

Level of courses taught, competence as a teacher, student evaluation, peer evaluation, academic student counseling, availability to students, additional work with students (i.e., independent studies, thesis/dissertation committees), graduate student advisement, development of teaching or other materials.

**II. Published Research and Grants Received**

Quality and quantity of completed books, chapters, productions, exhibits, papers, reviews, abstracts, etc. during this year; nature of the journal in which publications appear, originality and significance of the work; outside review of publications, grants received.

**III. Works in Progress: Research and Academic Projects**

Current research projects, grants, and research support applied for, development of teaching or other materials, editorial or review responsibilities, service on granting agency review panels, refereed panel presentations.

**IV. Professional Development Service**

Offices held in and other contributions to professional organizations, conferences attended, workshops given, panel presentations, other activities enhancing the College's reputation through professional service, honors received, future potential for professional development, patient or client service.

**V. Other Service**

Departmental, School and University service (committees, offices held), participation in student activities, responsible conduct in meeting scheduled classes, available for counseling, attending graduation, providing grades promptly, special circumstances contributing to an assessment of performance this year, organizations, communities, institutions outside KSUCVM, contributions to individuals.

**APPENDIX 4: FACULTY EVALUATION SUMMARY**  
**CALENDAR YEAR 20\_\_**  
DEPARTMENT OF ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Academic Rank:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date Rank Attained:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Years in Rank:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Tenured (Y/N):** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date Tenure Attained:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Current Annual Salary:** \$ \_\_\_\_\_ **Previous 4 Years:** \$ \_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_

**Budgeted Effort:** \_\_\_\_\_ Teaching \_\_\_\_\_ Research \_\_\_\_\_ Service \_\_\_\_\_ Administration \_\_\_\_\_

**I. Teaching**

Level of courses taught, competence as a teacher, student evaluation, peer evaluation, academic student counseling, availability to students, additional work with students (i.e., independent studies, thesis/dissertation committees), graduate student advisement, development of teaching or other materials.

**DEPARTMENT HEAD SUMMARY AND COMMENTS:**

<p>OVERALL RATING FOR SECTION I</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Below Expectations <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations - Low <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations
--

**II. Published Research and Grants Received**

Quality and quantity of completed books, chapters, productions, exhibits, papers, reviews, abstracts, etc. during this year; nature of the journal in which publications appear, originality and significance of the work; outside review of publications, grants received.

**DEPARTMENT HEAD SUMMARY AND COMMENTS:**

<p>OVERALL RATING FOR SECTION II</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Below Expectations <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations - Low <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations
---

**III. Works in Progress: Research and Academic Projects**

Current research projects, grants, and research support applied for, development of teaching or other materials, editorial or review responsibilities, service on granting agency review panels, refereed panel presentations.

**DEPARTMENT HEAD SUMMARY AND COMMENTS:**

<p>OVERALL RATING FOR SECTION III</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Below Expectations <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations - Low <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations
--

---

**FACULTY EVALUATION SUMMARY**

---

---

---

**IV. Professional Development Service**

Offices held in and other contributions to professional organizations, conferences attended, workshops given, panel presentations, other activities enhancing the College's reputation through professional service, honors received, future potential for professional development, patient or client service.

**DEPARTMENT HEAD SUMMARY AND COMMENTS:**

OVERALL RATING FOR SECTION IV

- Unknown
- Below Expectations
- Meets Expectations - Low
- Meets Expectations
- Exceeds Expectations

---

---

**V. Other Service**

Departmental, School and University service (committees, offices held), participation in student activities, responsible conduct in meeting scheduled classes, available for counseling, attending graduation, providing grades promptly, special circumstances contributing to an assessment of performance this year, organizations, communities, institutions outside KSUCVM, contributions to individuals.

**DEPARTMENT HEAD SUMMARY AND COMMENTS:**

OVERALL RATING FOR SECTION V

- Unknown
- Below Expectations
- Meets Expectations - Low
- Meets Expectations
- Exceeds Expectations

---

---

**GENERAL COMMENTS:**

---

---

**Overall Assessment of Faculty Performance**

**Below Expectations\***  **Meets Expectations** **Low**<sup>§</sup>  **Med**  **High**  **Exceeds Expectations**

In reference to the *University Handbook*, Section C31.8:

\* Below Expectations = "fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity"

<sup>§</sup> Meets Expectations - Low = "fallen below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity"

---

**Faculty expectations Response:**

**FACULTY EVALUATION SUMMARY**

---

---

**Signatures:**

Faculty Member: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
My signature signifies that I have seen the Department Head's evaluations. This does not mean that I agree with all of them.

Department Head: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

**Comments by Dean**

Dean: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix 5:**

**PLAN OF WORK  
CALENDAR YEAR 20\_\_  
DEPARTMENT OF ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY**

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Academic Rank:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date Rank Attained:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Years in Rank:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Tenured (Y/N):** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date Tenure Attained:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Budgeted Effort:** \_\_\_\_\_ Teaching \_\_\_\_\_ Research \_\_\_\_\_ Service \_\_\_\_\_ Administration

---

<b>Assignments</b>	<b>Goals</b>
--------------------	--------------

---

**I. Instruction**

---

**II. Research**

---

**III. Service**

**APPENDIX 6: PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD EVALUATION**  
DEPARTMENT OF ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Promotion to Professor at K-State: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Last Performance Review: \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

**Overall Assessment of Faculty Performance for each of the last six years:**

mm/dd/yy

- \_\_\_\_\_ **Below Expectations**  **Meets Expectations L**  **M**  **H**  **Exceeds Expectations**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **Below Expectations**  **Meets Expectations L**  **M**  **H**  **Exceeds Expectations**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **Below Expectations**  **Meets Expectations L**  **M**  **H**  **Exceeds Expectations**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **Below Expectations**  **Meets Expectations L**  **M**  **H**  **Exceeds Expectations**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **Below Expectations**  **Meets Expectations L**  **M**  **H**  **Exceeds Expectations**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **Below Expectations**  **Meets Expectations L**  **M**  **H**  **Exceeds Expectations**

In reference to the *University Handbook*, Section C31.8:

Below Expectations = “fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity”

Meets Expectations - L = “fallen below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity”

---

---

**Recommendation:**

---

---

**Signatures:**

Faculty Member: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

My signature signifies that I have seen the Department Head’s recommendation.

Department Head: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

**Comments by Dean**

Dean: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_