

**Department of Clinical Sciences**

**College of Veterinary Medicine**

**Policy Statement Concerning:**

**Annual Evaluations**

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

Approved by Faculty Vote on April 22, 2015

**Promotion, Tenure, Mid-Tenure Review and Reappointment**

Approved by Faculty Vote on April 22, 2015

**Post-Tenure Review**

Approved by Faculty Vote on April 22, 2015

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES \*(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC  
LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **4/2020**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES\*: **4/2020**

**Bonnie Rush, Department Head**

**Date signed: 4/23/2015**

**Ralph C. Richardson, Dean**

**Date signed: 4/24/2015**

**April C. Mason, Provost**

**Date signed: 4/27/2015**

**\*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.**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>3-4</b>
Annual Evaluation Materials.....	5-7
Mid-Tenure.....	8
Tenure and Promotion .....	9
Teaching.....	9
Research.....	10
Directed Service.....	11
Non-Directed Service.....	12
Process and Timeline .....	13
Guidelines for Clinical-Track Faculty Appointments.....	15
Reappointment of Multi-Year Contracts.....	15
Faculty Activities.....	16
Transfers between Clinical-Track and Tenure-Track Appointments...	16
Eligibility.....	16
Professorial Performance Award.....	17
Minimum Standards for Faculty Performance.....	17
Post-tenure Review .....	18
<b>Appendixes.....</b>	<b>20-32</b>
Faculty Annual Evaluation Form.....	20
Proposed Annual Plan of Work and Goals.....	21
Section Head Clinical Services Evaluation.....	22-23
Intern/Resident Evaluation of Faculty Hospital Performance.....	24
Student Evaluation of Didactic Teaching .....	25
Student Evaluation of Clinical Teaching .....	26
Associate Dean of Clinical Programs Evaluation of Clinical Perf.....	27-28
Peer Didactic Teaching Evaluation.....	29-30
Peer Clinical Teaching Evaluation.....	31
Professorial Performance Award Evaluation Form.....	32

## **Introduction:**

This document describes Guidelines for Clinical and Tenure-track Faculty for Annual Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure, Professorial Performance Awards, Minimum Standards of Faculty Performance, and Post-tenure Review in the Department of Clinical Sciences. These guidelines are in conformance with Kansas State University policy. Components of this document have been drawn from the University Handbook; the University Guideline for Evaluation of Unclassified Personnel; the Office of Unclassified Affairs and University Compliance; the Faculty Evaluation Document from the Department of Diagnostic Medicine / Pathobiology; and previous Departmental documents.

## **Annual Evaluation:**

The purposes of the annual evaluation process are to 1) assess the performance of each faculty member and 2) evaluate and adjust the percent effort each faculty member applies to various areas of responsibility. During the annual review process, previous goals for each faculty member will be reviewed and new goals will be developed. Establishing goals is an important process that defines the direction of each faculty member's professional development in relation to the missions of the Department of Clinical Sciences and the Veterinary Health Center (VHC). It should be noted however, that the annual evaluation process assesses faculty performance and accomplishments independent of pre-established goals.

The Guidelines for Annual Evaluation, Professorial Performance Awards, and Minimum Standards of Faculty Performance are designed to reflect the unique aspects of the mission of the Department of Clinical Sciences, while recognizing the diversity of faculty interests, abilities, assignments, and academic/scientific disciplines. Within this context, the guidelines are intended to promote and recognize excellence in all areas of academic responsibility without favoritism or preference to any activity or discipline. These guidelines are designed to balance the quality and quantity of a faculty member's contribution and to match the changing needs of the department and VHC with the evolving talents of the faculty.

Given the diversity of faculty assignments, disciplines, and responsibilities within the department (one of the broadest in the university), this evaluation system is founded on the understanding that evaluations should be based on multiple sources of input from different perspectives. It is important to recognize that evaluation of faculty performance in a professional environment is complex and multi-factorial and that even highly specific evaluation criteria may not accurately reflect a faculty member's contribution.

The department's evaluation system is based on the precept that multiple professional judgments provided by academic peers as well as the evaluating administrator will increase the likelihood of accurate assessments. Competent persons will ordinarily arrive at similar, although not identical, judgments regarding the merit of teaching activities, and the pooled judgment of several competent professionals tends to be more reliable than the judgment of any one person. Use of multiple raters enhances the reliability with which clinical and didactic teaching, instructional materials, and student rating of teaching effectiveness are evaluated. Although it is recognized that the use of peer review increases both the cost and complexity of the evaluation, the benefit of the additional input is a reasonable and desirable tradeoff.

## **Annual Evaluation Procedures:**

Untenured faculty are subject to annual reappointment, see UHB Section C50.1, C53.1 and Appendix A Standards for Notice of Non-Reappointment. Faculty assignments are determined with each faculty member via an agreement between the evaluating administrator and the faculty member at the beginning of each evaluation year and should reflect the faculty member's goals and objectives in relation to departmental programs and missions. It is important for the assignment to be established as early in the evaluation period as

practically possible. Faculty assignments are subject to re-negotiation in the event of changes in the faculty member's responsibilities or to meet unanticipated needs of the department.

Annual merit evaluation of clinical-track faculty will be conducted by the associate dean of Clinical Programs with input from the department head. The degree of input will reflect the distribution of effort and the nature of the appointment (Appendix, Form 1). During this review, the faculty member and associate dean of Clinical Programs may agree to modify the distribution of effort to meet the individual's professional development goals and the programmatic needs of the VHC and the department.

Annual Evaluation materials are due on the first Monday in December each year. Faculty members will be notified in early October to provide ample opportunity to assemble and submit required materials. If a faculty member, in spite of reasonable notice, fails to provide the necessary information, the department head will send a written reminder. If after being informed of the possible consequences, the faculty member still does not make the materials available, the evaluating administrator may assign that faculty member a "fails to meet expectations" rating. Since annual evaluation provides the basis for salary adjustment recommendations, any faculty member who fails to submit materials in a timely fashion provides the evaluating administrator with justification to recommend no increase in salary. For details regarding Annual Merit Salary Adjustment, see UHB Sections C40-C48.3.

Two major communication requirements associated with the evaluation process are: 1) To establish an understanding of the plans of work/goals (UHB C45.1) in the coming year in terms of assignments and the relative importance of each assignment, and 2) To communicate the results of the evaluation clearly and constructively.

The written evaluation of each faculty member will contain three parts: 1) a review of the individual's assignment and the weight attached to each responsibility during the preceding evaluation period; 2) succinct assessments of effectiveness in performing each responsibility and a statement of the overall evaluation, which must be consistent with the weights assigned to the individual ratings; and 3) where appropriate, suggestions for improvement. (See Appendix, Form 1)

For the purpose of annual salary adjustments, the overall performance of each faculty member will be rated using the following "Overall Performance Categories".

1. Fails to meet expectations
2. Meets expectations at a minimal level
3. Meets expectations
4. Meets expectations at a high level
5. Exceeds expectations

Each faculty member will review and be given the opportunity to discuss his or her final written evaluation with the evaluating administrator. Before the evaluation is submitted to the next administrative level, each faculty member must sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review and react to the Evaluation and Overall Performance category. Because the amount of funds available for merit salary increases is generally not known at the time, specific percent salary increases may not be discussed at this stage. When this information becomes available, the Dean, Associate Dean of Clinical Programs, or Department Head will inform each faculty member in writing of the recommended percent salary adjustment. (UHB C40-C48.3)

## Annual Evaluation Materials:

Part 1: To be completed/compiled by the individual faculty member

1. Proposed Annual Plan of Work and Goals for Next Year (Appendix, Form 2) - UHB C45.1
  - Includes percents of time allocated to teaching, service, and scholarly activities
  - Agreed upon by both faculty member and evaluating administrator
2. Approved Goal Statement for the Current Year
3. Electronic Standardized Curriculum Vitae (CV) with activities of the evaluated year highlighted.
4. Letter of Self-assessment
  - To allow the individual to review/personalize materials and responsibilities not quantifiable in the CV. Not to exceed two pages.
  - This letter should generally include: high points of your accomplishments, including major innovations; factors which may have precluded you from achieving all that you had planned; and other scholarly work or acknowledgments not described elsewhere.

Part 2: Materials from outside sources

1. Section Head Evaluation of Clinical Service and Clinical Teaching (Appendix, Form 3)
2. Intern/Resident Evaluation of Faculty Hospital Performance (Appendix, Form 4)
  - Optional at the discretion of the individual House Officer
  - Any House Officer can evaluate any faculty member
3. Student Evaluation of Didactic Teaching (Appendix, Form 5)
  - It is strongly recommended that all faculty obtain teaching evaluations for every classroom course.
  - For didactic courses, the university standardized questions for student evaluation of instruction will be used (Questions 1-14). Students are prompted to provide written comments.
4. Student Evaluation of Clinical Teaching (Appendix, Form 6)
  - For senior year rotations, student responses are submitted and compiled in a web-based format to provide scored data and written comments.
5. Associate Dean of Clinical Programs Evaluation of Clinical Performance (Appendix, Form 7)
6. Peer-review of didactic activities (Appendix, Form 8)
  - Groups of three faculty will be randomly selected (although each group is a mix of junior and senior faculty), with each member evaluated by the other two. Faculty with both clinical service and didactic teaching responsibilities, need two didactic and one clinical review. Department head reviews do not count toward the totals.
    - a) Each evaluator will evaluate at least one lecture of each peer or a substantial collection of examination questions (e.g. 20 multiple choice questions).

- b) Each evaluatee will provide a lecture schedule to each evaluator, and he or she may indicate which lectures they feel may be more appropriate for evaluation.
- c) Evaluations should be turned in to the DCS office as soon as they are completed. Our office will provide a copy to the evaluatee.
- d) Failure of an evaluator to perform this assignment may influence his or her own evaluation.

7. Peer-review of clinical teaching activities (Appendix, Form 9)

- To accomplish this goal, the faculty peer groups established above will be used.
  - a) At least one clinical teaching activity period will be evaluated.
  - b) Faculty without didactic teaching are required to solicit three clinical reviews.
  - c) Evaluations should be turned in to the DCS office as soon as completed.
- Failure of an evaluator to perform this assignment may influence his or her own evaluation.

Part 3: Form to be completed by evaluating Administrator (Appendix, Form 1)

Part 4: Criteria evaluated by the Department Head and Associate Dean of Clinical Programs

Department Head

Associate Dean of Clinical Programs

Didactic Teaching

TEVALS  
Peer Reviews

Student Comments  
Self-Assessment Letter

Scholarship

Curriculum vitae  
Self-Assessment Letter

Directed Clinical Service

Section Head Evaluation of  
Clinical Teaching  
House Officer Evaluation of  
Teaching  
Student Evaluation of Clinical  
Teaching  
Self-Assessment Letter

Directed Clinical Service

Section Head Evaluation of  
Clinical Performance  
House Officer Evaluation of Clinical  
Clinical Performance  
Student Evaluation of  
Clinical Performance  
Client and RDVM input

Non-Directed Service

Curriculum vitae  
Self-Assessment

Administration (Section Heads)

Faculty Evaluation  
(if applicable)  
House Officer Evaluation  
(if applicable)  
Self-Assessment Letter

Failure to meet expectations in any category by either the Department Head or Associate Dean of Clinical Programs will result in an overall rating of "Fails to Meet Expectations".

Point Scale for overall performance categories:

12-15	Exceeds Expectations
9-11.99	Meets Expectations – High
6-8.99	Meets Expectations
3-5.99	Meets Expectations – Minimal
0-2.99	Fails to Meet Expectations

Using the discriminators outlined above, the reporting Administrator will assign a numerical score for each category. Please note that failure to meet expectations in any category will result in an overall rating of “Fails to Meet Expectations”.

Example:

Teaching:	8	Meets Expectations
Scholarship:	5	Meets Expectations - Minimal
Non-Dir Service:	8	Meets Expectations
Service:	12	Exceeds Expectations

**(Percent Effort) X (Score) = Point subtotal for category**

Category	% Effort	Score	Final
Teaching	20%	8	1.6
Scholarship	15%	5	.75
Non-Directed Service	10%	8	.8
Directed, Clinical Service	55%	12	6.6
Total	100%		9.75

Overall Evaluation = 9.75 = Meeting Expectations-High

## **Process for Mid-tenure Review: (UHB C92.1-C93)**

Mid-tenure review is a formal review of a probationary faculty member conducted midway through the probationary period. The mid-probationary review shall take place during the third year of their appointment. This review provides the faculty member with substantive feedback from faculty colleagues and administrators regarding his or her accomplishments relative to departmental tenure criteria. 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. (C92.1)

### **Timeline**

Early February: Department head provides a letter to the candidate detailing the timeline and documents to be uploaded for the mid-tenure packet.

February-early April: Candidate uploads mid-tenure information to KSOL.

Minimum documentation for each candidate for mid-tenure:

- 1) Original letter of appointment
- 2) Current curriculum vitae (Use designed template)
- 3) Copies of annual evaluations
- 4) Plan of work (which includes their goals)
- 5) Copies of publications and manuscripts submitted
- 6) Grant proposals/awarded/submitted
- 7) Continuing education
- 8) Course Notes
- 9) Student and peer teaching evaluations (Department office will upload)
- 10) Any other material candidate believes would be beneficial
- 11) Letter from mid-tenure committee (Department office will upload)
- 12) Letter from Department Head (Department office will upload)

Early April: Candidate materials are available to the mid-tenure committee. The mid-tenure committee consists of three tenured faculty, appointed by the department head. Access to the site is restricted to committee members only.

Mid April: Mid-tenure committee meets and provides a letter to the department head outlining the findings of the mid-tenure review.

Late April: Department head provides a letter to the candidate detailing their progress toward tenure and promotion.

Early May: Candidate materials are available to College Advisory Committee and administrators participating directly in the process.

## **Procedures and Criteria for Tenure and Promotion**

The departmental missions of directed service, research, and professional education require investment in faculty with varying time allocations to these missions. Specific criteria for faculty tenure and promotion cannot be rigidly applied to all candidates, but must take into consideration responsibilities outlined in the appointment letter and modifications of these responsibilities recognized during the annual evaluation process.

There is no simple list of accomplishments that guarantee a faculty member will obtain tenure and/or promotion. Tenure and promotion are recommended based on the assessment of the tenured faculty of the department, college, and university that a candidate has made outstanding contributions in assigned academic endeavors. Scholarly productivity, teaching ability, clinical aptitude, academic citizenship, and collegiality are all factors that are considered in a tenure/promotion decision.

## **Teaching**

Faculty members with a substantial distribution of effort directed towards teaching are expected to demonstrate scholarship in these duties. Under specific circumstances tenure and promotion may be granted primarily on the basis of teaching provided

that most of the individual's time is spent in this role; an unusual level of excellence has been demonstrated; the teaching fulfills a particularly important need for the department or college; and the candidate has an active program in didactic, laboratory, or clinical educational research.

Teaching commitments may include classroom, laboratory, and clinical instruction for veterinary students, house officers, and graduate students. Documentation of teaching participation must include a description of the teaching activities, lecture and/or student contact, and the candidate's relative importance to the teaching program (ie. course coordinator, laboratory coordinator, hours taught). The quality of the teaching is more important than the quantity. Quality teaching is judged by (A) peer faculty members, both within and outside the department, (B) student questionnaires and evaluations, and (C) the department head.

Examples of indicants of teaching effectiveness are listed below:

1. Student ratings from standardized instruments that assess teaching effectiveness.
2. Materials produced for individual courses such as course notes, posted slide sets, syllabi, instructional videos, and other instructional materials.
3. Evaluations of testing materials and student test data.

4. A record of consistent and effective course administration: posted lecture schedules, on-line course materials, and grade reporting.
5. Development of innovative teaching materials, or creative contributions to the departmental instructional program.
6. Assessment of teaching by peer faculty colleagues.
7. Successful direction of high quality individual student work (DVM, graduate, or house officers), e.g., independent studies and special student projects.
8. Successful performance of teaching responsibilities that are unusually demanding requiring special expertise or preparation.
9. Compiled student comments that indicate ability to inspire student interest and stimulate work and achievement by students.
10. Letters of evaluation from former graduate and/or professional veterinary medical students.
11. A record of student or faculty visitors from other institutions to study with the instructor.
12. Receipt of competitive grants or contracts to fund innovative teaching activities or investigation into effective teaching.
13. Professional publication of teaching materials in peer-reviewed journals, textbooks, commercial audio-visual tutorials, or peer-reviewed internet posted materials.
14. Honors or special recognition for teaching accomplishments.

## **Research**

Scholarship is activity that results in a unique concept, conclusion, or product disclosed in a peer or public forum. Research must reflect original studies, which contribute new knowledge to the field. The record of faculty scholarship activity should be consistent with the distribution of their appointment. It is important to document that the candidate has an essential role in the development and testing of new ideas and hypotheses. The quality of the research is more important than the quantity. The impact of research is judged by the quality of journals in which the work is published, the sources of research support, external reviews by scholars with expertise in the candidate's field, and invitations to present work at national or international venues. Candidates heavily weighted in research appointments must demonstrate independence as a scholar, documented by first, mentored, or senior authorship on publications, the major creative or intellectual force in the planning and development of projects, and principal investigator on research grants. Original research is normally considered as evidence only after acceptance for publication. Both collaborative and individual contributions in research and publication are desirable. Research productivity alone, in the absence of effectiveness in other assignments; will not be adequate for positive recommendations for promotion or tenure.

The following are indicants of research scholarship:

1. Competitive grants and contracts to finance the development of ideas.

- 2 Presentation of research papers to peers at scientific meetings.
- 3 Publications of original work in peer-reviewed journals.
- 4 Citation reports of published work.
- 5 Textbooks which are intended to train veterinary students or advanced clinical trainees.
- 6 Accomplishments of the faculty member's present and former graduate students.
- 7 Honors or special recognition for research accomplishments.
- 8 Development of patents or copyrights for processes or instruments useful in solving important problems.
- 9 Invitations to testify before governmental groups concerned with research or other creative activities.
- 10 Service on study sections or editorial boards for high impact journals or funding agencies.

### **Directed Service**

Faculty members in the Department of Clinical Sciences typically have a significant distribution of effort in directed service with responsibility for patient care. Excellence in directed service requires excellence in service to patients and excellence in service to customers, including clients and referring veterinarians. Faculty with clinical responsibilities are recognized as experts in the pathophysiology and treatment of disorders related to their specialty. These faculty are responsible for the interpretation and transmission of new knowledge related to patient care, pathophysiology, medical and/or surgical management, professional ethics, and medical legal issues. Faculty are expected to maintain board certification directly applicable to their clinical service responsibilities. When there are no directly applicable specialty boards, the candidate must have advanced training or a graduate degree relevant to the clinical specialty. A variety of directed service roles contribute to the departmental mission. The department explicitly understands that these roles are fundamentally important to excellence in its academic programs. Productivity in directed service alone, in the absence of effectiveness in other assignments, will not be adequate for endorsement of tenure.

The following may be used as indicants of the quality of directed service:

- 1 Excellence in patient care, herd health management, preventative health care, diagnostic testing, and innovative medical and surgical management.
- 2 Timely maintenance of case records, and communication with clients and veterinarians.
- 3 Excellent ratings by clients regarding satisfaction with service.
- 4 Assessment by practicing professionals who receive directed service from the faculty member.
- 5 Ratings by peers or supervisors who observe and are qualified to rate the delivery of professional services.
- 6 Documentation of continuing education or supplemental training in the area of specialty.

## **Non-Directed Service**

Non-directed service is classified as professional, institutional, or public-based professional service. Institutional service represents work essential to the operation of the section, department, college or university through committees, including faculty advising to student organizations. Professional service provides leadership to one's profession or discipline at a national or international level. Committee responsibilities and officer positions held in national organizations indicate recognition for contributions to the discipline. Public service involves the application of a faculty member's professional time and expertise for the benefit of non-academic audiences. Non-directed service is an indication of academic citizenship; however, non-directed service cannot be the major grounds upon which tenure and promotion decisions are based. Expectations for productivity in non-directed service increase with seniority, with the greatest level of expectation at the rank of full professor. Service activities, while important and appreciated, command less influence than teaching, research, and directed service in considering an individual's contributions and qualifications for promotion and tenure.

Several indicants of excellence in non-directed service include:

### *Service to the Institution:*

Delivery of continuing education in support of the institution.

Contributions to departmental, college or university committees.

Contributions to faculty governance, such as Faculty Council, Faculty Senate, Graduate Council, and College Committees on Planning.

Special assignments to represent the university at local, national or international venues.

Honors or special recognition for contributions to department, college or university committees or faculty governance.

### *Service to the Profession:*

Delivery of continuing education for veterinarians at local, state, regional, national or international venues.

Service to professional organizations through state, national, and international committee work.

Reviewing or editing professional journals or textbooks.

Reviewing grants and contract proposals for non-profit organizations.

Special recognition for contributions to a professional organization or discipline.

### *Service to the Public:*

Dissemination of professional knowledge to non-academic audiences through lay publications or public forums.

Providing expert testimony to courts or legislative bodies.

## **Process for Promotion and Tenure [University Handbook – Promotion C120-C156.2; Tenure C70-116.2)**

### **Candidate Materials**

Minimum documentation for each candidate for promotion and/or tenure includes:

- 1) Original letter of appointment and amendments
- 2) Candidate Promotion and Tenure Document
- 3) Current curriculum vitae
- 4) Outside letters of evaluation
- 5) Department head letter
- 6) Copies of annual evaluation w/ clear job description
- 7) Teaching evaluations
- 8) Recommendations and comments of department faculty

### **Timeline**

Late June/early July: Department head provides a letter to the candidate detailing the timeline and documents to be included in the evaluation packet.

July: Candidate begins completing standardized promotion documents including 1) statement of academic accomplishments to date, 2) 5-year goal statement, 3) accomplishments in teaching, 4) accomplishments in research/scholarship, including a list of funded and non-funded grant proposals, and publication record, 5) accomplishments in direct and non-directed service, including a summary of cooperative extension/outreach activity, and 6) detailed updated curriculum vitae (by using a designed template), and plan of work (which includes their goals). Teaching evaluations are provided by the departmental office.

The template for standardized promotion documents is located at:

<http://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/forms/promotio.doc>.

Mid August: Candidate prepares a list of six or more potential external reviewers familiar with their academic work. Reviewers should be associate professors or professors (depending on rank under consideration) and well-established members of the profession. Established private practitioners, corporate employees, or veterinary public officials with national recognition, academic experience, and a unique perspective on the candidate's accomplishments may be submitted as external references. The candidate must include a brief description of each suggested reviewer's present position and standing/expertise/experience in their field.

Department head requests letters of external review for suitability for promotion from list of references and other sources. Reference letters are to be submitted to the department office by mid -September.

Late September: Candidate promotion materials are posted on KSOL. Access to the site is restricted to faculty eligible to vote on the promotion, College P&T Committee, and administrators participating directly in the process.

## **Departmental Review**

Early October. The department head is advised by tenured faculty members of the department regarding tenure recommendations and by faculty at the ranks equal to or above that sought by candidate for promotion. The department head notifies eligible faculty that candidate dossiers are ready for review on KSOL. Eligible faculty members review the file, meet as a group (mid- October) to discuss the candidate's petition, and make written independent recommendations to the department head. Any member of the eligible faculty may, prior to the submission of any recommendations to the department head, request that the candidate meet with the eligible faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate. The recommendation(s) and written comments by faculty members are forwarded to the department head. The department head notifies the dean that the candidate's complete promotion file is on KSOL and submits written recommendation and unedited recommendations of the departmental faculty to the dean.

## **College Review**

Early November: Department head submits on KSOL a detailed letter to the dean summarizing ballot votes, outlining accomplishments and/or lack of accomplishments in teaching, research and scholarly activities, non-directed service activities, and external letters of evaluation. The Dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine is advised by a College Tenure and Promotion Committee consisting of one full or tenured-associate professor from each academic department elected at-large, and two full or tenured-associate professors selected by the dean. The Faculty Council according to College-By-Laws will coordinate the election of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Each faculty member will be elected to a three-year term of office. A person may not be elected for more than two consecutive terms. Faculty appointed by the dean will serve staggered two-year terms and cannot serve more than two consecutive terms (including election by the faculty). It is important that the College Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure be balanced to represent the dimensions of teaching, research, and directed service. The committee will make recommendations in light of the departmental criteria, standards, and guidelines and the overall expectations of the college. The College Advisory Committee will elect a new chair each year. The chair will organize meetings of the committee and will make the candidate's complete file, including all department recommendations, available to the committee members for their review. The chair will make the recommendations of the committee available to the dean. Recommendations will contain clearly stated reasons for or against tenure and/or promotion of the candidate under consideration.

## **University Review and Candidate Notification**

Late November/Early December: The dean notifies candidate and department head/chair of college and dean's recommendations. Candidates may withdraw within 7 days. The dean subsequently submits documents and a recommendation to Dean's Council of those candidates who have not withdrawn. The Dean's Council notifies the candidate and department head/chair of the council recommendation and provides a written report to candidate, department head/chair and dean if the finding differs from that of the college. The Dean's Council sends documents to the provost for approval of tenure and promotion. The provost sends recommendations for tenure and promotion to president. Finally, the dean informs the candidates of the decision.

University guidelines do not provide candidates an opportunity to appeal either the department or college recommendations prior to action by the university. At anytime during the promotion and tenure process, the candidate may remove his or her file from further consideration (UHB C113.4. Candidates may withdraw from further consideration for tenure by submitting to the dean a written request for withdrawal. This must be done within seven (7) days following notification of the college's recommendations. Withdrawal by a candidate who is in the final year of the probationary period may be done only by formal resignation (UHB C110).

## Guidelines for Clinical-track Faculty Appointments

The primary responsibilities of faculty on clinical-track appointments are clinical service, patient care, and clinical instruction of veterinary students. The distribution of effort for clinical-track faculty consists of a 60% to 100% appointment devoted to clinical service and clinical instruction. Clinical track faculty members are classified by the University and Board of Regents as regular or term appointments. As such, a clinical track faculty member at any rank on a regular appointment is a member of the general faculty and is afforded all perquisites accorded to the general faculty (C12.2), with the exception that years of service on a regular appointment will not be counted toward tenure.

Clinical-track assistant professors on regular appointment receive one-year annually renewable appointments. Clinical-track associate professors on regular appointment receive renewable three-year appointments. Clinical-track full professors on regular appointment receive renewable five-year appointments. The appointing administrator is the Associate Dean of Clinical Programs.

Clinical-track faculty rank is assigned as defined below, and in accordance with university policies. Faculty appointed to these positions should have credentials appropriate to the discipline. Recommendations for appointment are made by the Associate Dean of Clinical Programs according to the guidelines and procedures described in the University Handbook.

- A. Clinical Assistant Professor:** Faculty members must possess a DVM (or equivalent) degree. Candidates must be qualified to provide quality clinical services and participate in the teaching programs of the department and college. During the annual review process, the appointing administrator will discuss progress towards promotion.
- B. Clinical Associate Professor:** Faculty members appointed or promoted to clinical associate professor must possess a DVM and demonstrate excellence in clinical service, patient care, and clinical instruction. The most important consideration for promotion to clinical associate professor is recognition of exceptional service and teaching by peers, house officers, students, and clients. Additional credentials attained during the review period including board certification, an advanced degree, publication of clinical material, collaboration in applied research, completion of a certificate program, or formal training which contributes to the missions of clinical service and clinical instruction provide additional support for promotion.
- C. Clinical Professor:** Faculty members appointed or promoted to clinical professor must possess a DVM and demonstrate sustained excellence in clinical service and dedication to continued professional development. Sustained recognition by peers, house officers, students, and clients for delivery of exceptional clinical service and instruction are important considerations for promotion to professor. Demonstration of continued professional development, including attainment of board certification, an advanced degree, publication of clinical material, collaboration in applied research, or a certificate program, which contributes to the missions of the VHC and department, provide supportive evidence for promotion to full professor. Clinical professors are eligible for consideration of the Professorial Performance Award after 6 yrs in rank (University Handbook C49.1).

### Reappointment of Multi-Year Contracts:

Reappointment of clinical track faculty for 3 and 5-year terms is based on a mandatory review during the penultimate year of appointment. All reviews for reappointment of multi-year contracts require submission of a dossier documenting performance in the areas reflected in the distribution of effort for the preceding contract years. Letters from external evaluators are optional. The review of clinical associate professors consists of

evaluation and vote by professorial rank faculty for recommendation to the Associate Dean of Clinical Programs. Recommendation for reappointment of clinical-track professors is determined by the Associate Dean of Clinical Programs based on recommendation from professoriate rank faculty. Professorial Performance Awards may be considered for clinical-track professors during a reappointment year or between reappointment contracts (Appendix, Form 10) after 6 years in rank. Withdrawal from the mandatory review for reappointment during the final probationary year indicates reappointment will not be granted. Evaluation for promotion may or may not take place in the same cycle as the review for 3-year reappointment.

### **Faculty Activities:**

Clinical-track faculty members are appointed within the Department of Clinical Sciences by the Associate Dean of Clinical Programs, and are governed by the policies applicable to other university non-tenure-track (regular) faculty as outlined by the Kansas State University Handbook and the Kansas Board of Regents. Clinical-track faculty members will participate in faculty governance processes as defined by the Department of Clinical Sciences, College of Veterinary Medicine, and University Faculty Senate. Clinical-track faculty members have voting rights in college and departmental matters and elections and may serve on departmental, college, and university committees unless policies limit membership to tenure-track faculty. Clinical-track faculty are eligible to submit grant applications and direct research as principal investigators (Pre-Awards Policy and Procedures Manual .060). Clinical-track 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). Clinical track faculty members may be CVM course coordinators without graduate faculty status. Clinical track faculty are eligible for sabbatical leave as outlined by the University Handbook, Section E2. However, clinical-track faculty are not eligible for tenure, and the years of service on a regular appointment are not applied toward tenure (C12.2).

### **Transfers between Clinical-Track and Tenure-Track Appointments:**

Faculty may transfer one-time from tenure track to clinical track or from clinical track to tenure track appointments (BOR:1-19-06). Transfer approval is determined by a vote of the departmental faculty of higher rank to the faculty member under consideration, and by recommendation of the Associate Dean of Clinical Programs and the department head. Final approval is determined by the dean.

### **Eligibility:**

Clinical-track faculty policies and guidelines do not apply to visiting faculty, adjunct faculty, or temporary (term) appointments. Faculty with term appointments are appointed by the Associate Dean of Clinical Programs. Term appointments may be at the rank of assistant, associate, or full professor, and term faculty may be full or part-time. Service on a term appointment carries no expectation of continued employment beyond the period stated in the contract. Years of service on a term appointment is not credited towards tenure, and the standards for notice of non-reappointment do not apply (C12.2).

### **Professorial Performance Award: (UHB C49.1-C49.14)**

The Professorial Performance Award (PPA) rewards strong performance and sustained productivity by a full-time, clinical or tenured professor who has been in rank at least six years since the last promotion or PPA. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity during that time and the performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor by current departmental standards. The PPA award will provide a salary enhancement in accordance with University Handbook Section C: Faculty Identity, Employment, Tenure (C49.1-49.14) and will be added to the base salary of the recipient. The award will be in addition to the merit raise provided by the annual evaluation process. Importantly, this award is not a form of promotional review and does not create a “senior” professoriate.

Evidence of strong performance and sustained productivity is based on the professor's scholarship record, national and/or international recognition, and a distinguished career that demonstrates excellence in teaching, research, and/or service/outreach.

#### Qualifying Guidelines and Criteria:

- 1) The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at Kansas State 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 before the performance review.
- 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) In the last six years, the candidate must have received a minimum of four annual overall assessments for faculty performance of **Meets Expectations - High** or **Exceeds Expectations**.

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

- Faculty Evaluation Forms since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award
- Current electronic CV
- Current departmental standards for promotion to professor

The evaluating administrator's recommendation contained on the Professorial Performance Award form (Appendix, Form10) and supporting materials will be forwarded to the dean at the same time as the annual evaluations are forwarded to the dean.

### **Chronic Low Achievement Policy: (UHB C31.1 –C31.8)**

All tenured and clinical-track faculty members receiving a performance of “not-meeting-expectations” as determined by the department head or Associate Dean for Clinical Programs for any consecutive two year period in any critical area of responsibility of the regular annual faculty evaluation will be reviewed by an ad-hoc committee of peers selected by the Dean who will provide specific and timely recommendations to improve the area(s) of poor performance. These recommendations will be guidelines for a written agreement between

the department head and the faculty member in question as to the standard(s) is expected for improvement to a designation of “meeting expectations” in the deficient area(s).

A faculty member receiving a designation of “not-meeting-expectations” as determined by the department head or Associate Dean for Clinical Programs for any consecutive 3 year period in any critical area of responsibility of the regular annual faculty evaluation will have fulfilled the criteria of chronic low achievement in an area of responsibility as outlined in the plan of work, and shall be considered for a recommendation of dismissal for cause based on chronic low achievement.

### **Termination and 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 departmental chronic low achievement and University (C160.3 and C75) policy. Standards of notice of non-reappointment apply to clinical-track faculty as outlined in the University Handbook (C170.3 and Appendix A). Grievance procedures will follow policy guidelines and procedures used for tenure-track faculty grievances. Clinical-track faculty members are eligible to grieve as outlined in Appendix G of the University Handbook. Clinical and tenure-track faculty are subject to dismissal necessitated by University or College financial exigency (Appendix B University Handbook/ BOR).

### **Post-Tenure Review**

Complete guidelines for Post-Tenure Review are detailed in the Kansas State University Handbook, Appendix W. In summary, the K-State University Handbook, Appendix W, lists the following criteria:

- a) Written criteria for post-tenure review should be developed and periodically reviewed by faculty.
  - a. Review should be developmental in nature and supported by available resources for professional development or change of direction.
  - b. Review should be flexible to acknowledge different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different faculty career stages.
- b) The basic standard for review is “whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position, not whether the faculty member meets the current standards for the award of tenure or promotion.”

The Department of Clinical Sciences procedures for post-tenure review are as follows:

1. At six year intervals following tenure or promotion of each individual faculty, the department head shall request, in addition to compulsory materials submitted for annual performance review, a brief (1-2 page) bullet-point or narrative that outlines major accomplishments and professional growth during the previous six years. The summary of accomplishments should reflect the faculty member’s distribution of effort for the previous six years and should outline major changes in appointment or direction anticipated over the next six years.
2. The department head will review the individual summary of accomplishments, a current CV, and the results of the current and previous five annual evaluation reviews as a packet for post-tenure review. The department head may consider input from the Veterinary Health Center Director regarding faculty with significant service appointments or other appropriate direct supervisors and may share pertinent

information from the faculty record with the director/supervisor for that purpose. Specific standards for the review include:

- a. The aggregate of annual evaluation reviews should reflect that the candidate has acted conscientiously in the position, met expectations for professional competence and professional growth in the individual appointment, and is making appropriate contributions to the university. Reviews which indicate the individual has not met this standard should be accompanied by detailed suggestions to improve performance.
  - b. The review should acknowledge deficiencies of available resources that reasonably limit performance and should suggest changes in effort or resource enhancements to improve future performance.
  - c. The review should address requests or intentions of faculty desire to change professional direction and should prescribe specific accommodations when desired appointment changes coincide with department needs.
3. The faculty member shall be given a copy of the completed review. If the completed review suggests that a plan for enhanced or modified professional development is necessary, a face-to-face meeting of the individual and department head to discuss options and develop an individualized plan to occur within a reasonable time. The development plan should be utilized in future annual evaluations and post-tenure reviews.
  4. A dossier for promotion in rank or Professorial Performance Award shall substitute for post-tenure review if both coincide in the same year. Subsequent post-tenure reviews shall occur six years after a successful promotion or Performance Award. Other events which modify the post-tenure review clock are listed in the K-State University Handbook, Appendix W, Section 2.e.
  5. The outcome of completed reviews shall be submitted to the Dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine, who shall review the materials to ensure the review is consistent with the criteria and policies of the department and the university.

**Appendix, Form 1:**

**Department of Clinical Sciences  
Faculty Annual Evaluation  
Calendar Year \_\_\_\_\_**

Faculty Member:

Category	% Effort	Score	Final
Teaching			
Scholarship			
Non-Directed Service			
Directed, Clinical Service			
Total	100		

Overall Evaluation =

**Comments Regarding Performance**

**Concurrence with Goals for Next Year**

**Distribution of Effort for Next Year**

Teaching                    %  
Scholarship                %  
Non-Dir Service          %  
Service                     %  
Administration            %

\_\_\_\_\_  
Evaluating Administrator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

I have reviewed my annual evaluation and have had an opportunity to meet with the department administration.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Faculty

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**Appendix, Form 2**

Department of Clinical Sciences  
Proposed Annual Plan of Work and Goals  
for the Period January 1, \_\_\_ to December 31, \_\_\_

Faculty name: \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Academic Plan	<u>% of time</u>
I. Teaching (includes: clinical, didactic, laboratory, and graduate student/intern/resident instruction)	_____
II. Directed clinical service	_____
III. Research	_____
IV. Non-directed university and public service	_____

Academic Goals

- I. Teaching
  - A. Goals for:
    - 1. Specific changes proposed for lectures, if any
    - 2. Other teaching changes/innovations
    - 3. Other goals to change or improve teaching (i.e., attending seminars/courses on teaching)
  - B. Long-term goals
- II. Directed clinical service
  - A. Annual goals
  - B. Long-term goals
- III. Research
  - A. Annual goals
  - B. Long-term goals
- IV. Non-directed (university and public) service
  - A. Annual goals
  - B. Long-term goals

Appendix, Form 3

**Section Head Clinical Service Evaluation  
Veterinary Health Center  
College of Veterinary Medicine  
Kansas State University**

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

Faculty member being evaluated:

Evaluator:

<b>Scale</b>	
Exceeds Expectations	5
Meets Expectations – High	4
Meets Expectations	3
Meets Expectations – Low	2
Does Not Meet Expectations	1

<b>Clinical Competence and Quality of Care</b>	<b>Score</b>
Demonstrates Clinical Competence	
Efforts to Improve Clinical Competence	
Seeks Appropriate Collaboration and Consultation	
Current with Professional Literature and Clinical Techniques	
Provides Appropriate, Timely and High-quality Medical Care	

<b>Communication and Responsiveness</b>	<b>Score</b>
Client Communication	
RDVM Communication	
Staff Communication	
Peer Communication	
House Officer Communication	

<b>Hospital Citizenship</b>	<b>Score</b>
Interactions with Peers are Positive, Collegial and Supportive	
Interactions with Students, Staff and House Officers are Positive, Collegial and Supportive	
Works Constructively Within the System	
Willingness to Collaborate and Assist in Case Care When Needed	
Open, Direct and Straightforward Communication	
Available and Willing to Provide Service When on Clinic Duty	

<b>House Officer Training</b>	<b>Score</b>
Clinical Supervision of House Officers	

Available For Back-up After Hours	
Attendance and Contribution at House Officer Rounds and Seminars	
Expectations for House Officers are Appropriate	
Provides Appropriate Level of Case Management Opportunities for House Officers	

<b>Outreach and Caseload Development</b>	<b>Score</b>
Efforts to Sustain or Build Caseload	
Efforts to Promote KSU-VHC Externally	
Accepts Cases Willingly	
Service to Referring Veterinarians	

<b>Hospital Policies and Procedures</b>	<b>Score</b>
Follows Client Communication Protocols	
Follows RDVM Communication Protocols	
Follows Estimate and Deposit Protocols	
Follows Established Charging Protocols, Includes all Appropriate Fees	
Follows Medical Records Protocol	

COMMENTS:

**Appendix, Form 4**

**Intern/Resident Evaluation of Faculty Hospital Performance**

Faculty member being evaluated: Dr. _____					Date:
The following statements are ranked using this scale: 1 = exceeds expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = minimally meets expectations; 4 = does not meet expectations; 5 = not applicable or did not directly observe faculty performance.					
<b>STATEMENTS</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
1. The faculty member provided useful guidance in the skills of patient evaluation, surgery, anesthesia, and other medical specialty techniques or skills, and provided direct assistance when needed.					
2. Faculty member's assistance in helping interns and residents practice their case decision-making by being readily available and easily approachable to provide timely, constructive verbal consultation individually as needed.					
3. Faculty member's contributions to student/intern/resident consultations or rounds.					
4. Faculty member provided a positive example of effective and compassionate verbal and written client communications, and provided feedback to me on my client communications.					
5. The faculty member is available and helpful when on assigned emergency duty and provided useful input regarding patient care, client consultation, and was available for direct assistance when requested.					
6. Faculty member is a role model of positive, compassionate, and supportive behavior.					
7. Overall effectiveness of faculty member as an instructor of interns and residents.					

Comments:

## Appendix, Form 5

**Student Evaluation of Didactic Teaching  
Department of Clinical Sciences  
College of Veterinary Medicine  
Kansas State University**

**Rate the instructor on:**

1. Overall effectiveness as a teacher.
2. Making clear the goals and objectives of this course.
3. Being well prepared for class.
4. Explaining the subject matter so that you understood.
5. Communicating interest in helping students learn.
6. Stimulating you to think more deeply about the subject (e.g. applying information, analyzing, solving problems).
7. Commenting on your work (tests/assignments) in ways that helped you learn.
8. Using grading procedures that were fair and equitable.
9. Realizing when students did not understand.
10. Being willing to help students outside of class.
11. Increasing your desire to learn about this subject.

**Rate Yourself on:**

12. Your interest in taking this course before you enrolled.
13. Your effort to learn in this course (for example -- studying, doing assignments, thinking about the ideas).
14. The amount you have learned in this course.

Use this space to write any additional comments you wish to make. The written comments will not be anonymous.

**Appendix, Form 6**

**Student Evaluation of Clinical Teaching  
Department of Clinical Sciences  
College of Veterinary Medicine  
Kansas State University**

Questions from the on-line teaching evaluation system:

1-Unacceptable, 2 –Average, 3-Good, 4-Superior

1. Evaluate the clinical instructor on the basis of overall effectiveness as a teacher.
2. Evaluate the clinical instructor on the basis of ability to motivate students.
3. How well does the clinical instructor present clear rationale for case management?
4. How well does the clinical instructor communicate effectively with students?
5. Evaluate the clinical instructor as a role model for teamwork with students, staff, and clinicians.

Please provide constructive input regarding clinical teaching of the specified faculty member. Your name will be identified with your comments to the faculty member.

**Appendix, Form 7**

**Associate Dean of Clinical Programs Evaluation of Clinical Performance Evaluation  
Veterinary Health Center  
College of Veterinary Medicine  
Kansas State University**

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

Faculty member being evaluated:

Evaluator:

<b>Scale</b>	
Exceeds Expectations	5
Meets Expectations – High	4
Meets Expectations	3
Meets Expectations – Low	2
Does Not Meet Expectations	1

<b>Clinical Competence and Quality of Care</b>	<b>Score</b>
Demonstrates Clinical Competence	
Efforts to Improve Clinical Competence	
Seeks Appropriate Collaboration and Consultation	
Current with Professional Literature and Clinical Techniques	
Provides Appropriate, Timely and High-quality Medical Care	

<b>Communication and Responsiveness</b>	<b>Score</b>
Client Communication	
RDVM Communication	
Staff Communication	
Peer Communication	
House Officer Communication	

<b>Hospital Citizenship</b>	<b>Score</b>
Interactions with Peers are Positive, Collegial and Supportive	
Interactions with Students, Staff and House Officers are Positive, Collegial and Supportive	
Works Constructively Within the System	
Willingness to Collaborate and Assist in Case Care When Needed	
Open, Direct and Straightforward Communication	
Available and Willing to Provide Service When on Clinic Duty	

<b>House Officer Training</b>	<b>Score</b>

Clinical Supervision of House Officers	
Available For Back-up After Hours	
Attendance and Contribution at House Officer Rounds and Seminars	
Expectations for House Officers are Appropriate	
Provides Appropriate Level of Case Management Opportunities for House Officers	

<b>Outreach and Caseload Development</b>	<b>Score</b>
Efforts to Sustain or Build Caseload	
Efforts to Promote KSU-VHC Externally	
Accepts Cases Willingly	
Service to Referring Veterinarians	

<b>Hospital Policies and Procedures</b>	<b>Score</b>
Follows Client Communication Protocols	
Follows RDVM Communication Protocols	
Follows Estimate and Deposit Protocols	
Follows Established Charging Protocols, Includes all Appropriate Fees	
Follows Medical Records Protocol	

COMMENTS:

**Appendix, Form 8**

**CRITERIA FOR CLASSROOM PEER REVIEW**

Date of Review: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of the Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty Member Being Reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_

Subject Reviewed (Course and lecture title): \_\_\_\_\_

**Criteria:**

Did the presented materials pertain to the assigned/scheduled topic?

**Effective teaching:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Need improvements:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments:**

Was the material updated to current developments in veterinary medicine?

**Effective teaching:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Need improvements:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments:**

Was the faculty member being-reviewed well prepared for the class?

**Effective teaching:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Need improvements:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments:**

Were the materials presented & explained logically and orderly?

**Effective teaching:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Need improvements:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments:**

Were the slides/audio presentations/videos/handouts adequate to support the didactic lecture?

**Effective teaching:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Need improvements:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments:**

Did the instructor involve the students in the learning process?

**Effective teaching:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Need improvements:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments:**

When and if the students were involved was the instructor helpful to students when they had questions or problems?

**Effective teaching:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Need improvements:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments:**

Did the faculty member being-reviewed speak clearly & audibly?

**Effective teaching:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Need improvements:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments:**

Was the syllabus reviewed?

**Yes:** \_\_\_\_\_

**No:** \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, comments:

Use this space to outline teaching strategies that were well executed and summarize constructive suggestions for improvement.

## Appendix, Form 9

**Peer Clinical Teaching Evaluation  
Department of Clinical Sciences  
College of Veterinary Medicine  
Kansas State University**

Because most faculty members in the Department of Clinical Sciences have significant time percent assignments to clinical teaching, this document was developed to help evaluate clinical teaching. Please fill out this form and return it to the Department Head.

Faculty member being evaluated: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Clinical Service/Rotation: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

### **I. Clinical Teaching Styles/Strategies:**

- A. Please describe the teaching format (sit-down rounds, hospital case walk-through rounds, ambulatory truck discussions, etc)
- B. What teaching strategies were used in this clinical teaching?
- C. Were the teaching strategies appropriate?
- D. Was a good clinical teaching environment achieved and maintained?
- E. Did the instructor create an atmosphere in which students were willing to ask and answer questions?
- F. Did the instructor involve the students in the clinical teaching process?  
If yes, was this involvement conducive to learning?
- G. Was feedback provided to the students? (please explain/describe)
- H. Did teacher-student or student-student interactions enhance learning?
- I. Was the instructor encouraging and constructive?

### **II. Summary:**

- A. Overall, how would you rate this educator?
- B. Please provide suggestions for improvement or additional comments on the clinical teaching observed.

**PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD EVALUATION FORM**  
**DEPARTMENT OF CLINICAL SCIENCES**  
**COLLEGE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE**

Name:

Date:

Date of Promotion to Professor at K-State:

Date of Last Performance Review:

---

---

Overall Annual Assessment of Performance for the last six years:

mm/dd/yr <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Expectations – High <input type="checkbox"/>	Exceeds Expectations
mm/dd/yr <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Expectations – High <input type="checkbox"/>	Exceeds Expectations
mm/dd/yr <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Expectations – High <input type="checkbox"/>	Exceeds Expectations
mm/dd/yr <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Expectations – High <input type="checkbox"/>	Exceeds Expectations
mm/dd/yr <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Expectations – High <input type="checkbox"/>	Exceeds Expectations
mm/dd/yr <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Expectations – High <input type="checkbox"/>	Exceeds Expectations

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

---

**Signatures:**

Faculty Member \_\_\_\_\_

My signature signifies that I have seen the evaluating Administrator's recommendation.

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluating Administrator \_\_\_\_\_

---

**Comments by Dean**

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