

Industrial and Manufacturing Systems Engineering
Department

Carl R. Ice College of Engineering
College


Policy Statement Concerning:

Personnel Review and Evaluation Standards/Procedures

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

Approved by Faculty Vote on (10/10/2023)

NEXT REVIEW DATE:


Department Head's Signature


Date


Dean's Signature

11/27/2023
Date


Provost's Signature

5/15/2024
Date

Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

Department of Industrial and Manufacturing Systems Engineering Kansas State University

Approved: May 5, 2023

Table of Contents

1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
2.0 FACULTY IDENTITY	1
3.0 PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS	1
3.1 Types of Evaluations.....	1
3.2 Performance Standards	2
3.2.1 Information Considered in Evaluating Teaching Activity	2
3.2.2 Information Considered in Evaluating Research.....	2
3.2.3 Information Considered in Evaluating Service	3
4.0 ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCESS	3
4.1 Calendar of Events in Annual Evaluations	4
4.2 Material to Be Submitted for Annual Evaluation.....	4
4.3 Summary of Activities	5
4.4 Guidelines for Activities Planned	5
4.5 Department Head Evaluation	5
4.6 Annual Merit Salary Adjustments.....	6
5.0 REAPPOINTMENT OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	6
5.1 Annual Reappointment of Tenure-Track Faculty Members	6
5.2 Mid-Probationary Review of Tenure-Track Faculty Members.....	6
6.0 PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	7
7.0 REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES FOR NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	7
7.1. Annual Evaluations	8
7.2 Reappointment Evaluation Process.....	8
7.2.1 Reappointment Evaluation Schedule	9
7.2.2 Mid-rank Evaluations.....	9
7.3 Promotion Procedures	9
8.0 MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE FACULTY PERFORMANCE.....	10
8.1 General Statement.....	10
8.2 Minimum Acceptable Level of Productivity.....	10
8.3 Low Achievement.....	10
8.4 Chronic Low Achievement	11
9.0 PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD.....	11
9.1 Award Criteria	11
9.2 Timeline and Procedure	12
10.0 POST TENURE REVIEW	13
ATTACHMENT A - SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES	15
ATTACHMENT B - ACTIVITY PLANS FOR THE COMING YEAR.....	16
ATTACHMENT C - APPRAISAL FORM FOR FACULTY PERFORMANCE.....	17
ATTACHMENT D - APPRAISAL FORM FOR FACULTY PERFORMANCE.....	18
ATTACHMENT E – FORMS FOR POST TENURE REVIEW	19

IMSE DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT

1.0 INTRODUCTION

We prepare students for successful life-long careers and provide leadership in industry and our profession through our research and educational programs. To accomplish these objectives, we commit ourselves to each of the following activities:

- 1) Educate students to become industrial and manufacturing systems engineers who can design, analyze, and improve production systems and processes;*
- 2) Educate students at the graduate level to become masters of industrial and manufacturing systems engineering so that they can apply current IMSE skills and tools and lead the quest to advance the state-of-the-art in IMSE;*
- 3) Perform research in our discipline that is of fundamental importance, of value to industry, our profession, or society as a whole.*
- 4) Serve our institution, community and profession by using our time and skills to help these groups achieve their objectives.*

The evaluation of faculty performance and vitality is critical to institutional growth and development. The purposes of this evaluation are to assure that each faculty member contributes to the accomplishment of departmental missions, to guide the development of each individual member of the faculty, and to provide a sound basis for personnel decisions related to salary, promotion, and tenure.

It is important to emphasize that each faculty member is unique and contributes a special set of strengths and abilities to the department. This document seeks to respect this uniqueness by establishing a set of guidelines and standards that are relatively flexible yet offer enough rigor to allow a framework for guiding and evaluating abilities, accomplishments, responsibilities, and assignments of each member.

We expect each faculty member to contribute to the achievement of the department's goals and objectives as reflected in our mission statement. We realize that we cannot accomplish this mission without a faculty that is committed wholeheartedly to the education of our students. The quality and reputation of the IMSE programs depend on the quality and reputation of our faculty.

2.0 FACULTY IDENTITY

The Department of Industrial and Manufacturing Systems Engineering faculty consists of individuals holding positions in the tenured/tenure-track stream or in the non-tenure track stream.

Tenured/Tenure-track faculty members, with primary responsibilities in teaching, research, and service, may be recruited, hired, and appointed as assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. According to the processes defined here and in the University Handbook (Section C), faculty members in this stream are eligible to be considered for tenure. Initial appointment rank, subsequent promotions in rank, and tenure status are based on advanced degree(s) and experience and achievements over time within a given rank.

Non-tenure track faculty titles indicate the primary responsibilities and credentials associated with the respective positions. Non-tenure track instructional faculty members, with primary responsibilities in teaching and advising, may be recruited, hired, and appointed into regular or term positions, as instructor, advanced instructor, or senior instructor, in the absence of a terminal degree (usually PhD), or into term or regular positions as a teaching assistant professor, teaching associate professor, or teaching professor. Non-tenure track faculty members with primary responsibilities in research, may be recruited, hired, and appointed into regular or term positions as research assistant professor, research associate professor, or research professor if holding a terminal degree. Individuals with industry experience may be recruited, hired, and appointed into regular or term positions as a professor of practice or a senior professor of practice. Initial appointment rank and subsequent promotions in rank are based on advanced degree(s) and experience, and achievements over time within a given rank. Individuals holding these titles are hereafter referred to as non-tenure track faculty members.

3.0 PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

3.1 Types of Evaluations

Several types of evaluations are listed for tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty. Non-tenure-track faculty includes teaching and research faculty. The following list contains various evaluations. Details will be described in the

section in the parenthesis. Note that post tenure reviews are described in Section 10.0.

- Annual Evaluation (Section 4.0)
- Reappointment for Tenure-Track Faculty (Section 5.0)
 - Mid-Tenure Review (Section 5.2)
- Promotion and Tenure for Tenure-Track Faculty (Section 6.0)
- Reappointment and Promotion for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (Section 7.0)

3.2 Performance Standards

The performance standards for teaching, research, and service areas follow a numerical scale from 1 to 4. Each area is assigned a percentage approved by the Department Head who also provides the evaluation score for each area. Performance standards are listed as follows: 1.0-2.49 = failed to meet minimum levels of productivity, 2.5-2.99 = met minimum level of productivity but has fallen below expectations, 3.0-3.49 = met expectations, 3.5-4.0 = exceeded expectations.

3.2.1 Information Considered in Evaluating Teaching Activity

The purpose of this section is to provide evidence of the faculty member's quality of teaching during the reported year. Faculty members must submit student evaluations of their teaching for each course assigned to them during the academic year. This evaluation must use a standardized K-State evaluation instrument.

Besides student evaluations, faculty members are encouraged to provide additional information regarding their teaching effectiveness along with efforts to become better teachers. Some common items that are used to demonstrate effective teaching include:

1. Student ratings of the instructor: Norm-referenced, student classroom evaluations.
2. Course syllabus and materials: Materials supplied by the instructor about their approach to teaching, variety of courses taught, number of students enrolled, and level of course. Course materials selected for review may include course syllabi, course objectives, sequence of topics, time and appropriateness of topics, reading lists, textbooks, audiovisual materials, homework assignments, laboratory work, projects, quality of examinations, and grading.
3. Faculty contribution to course and curriculum development: Contribution to new course development, revisions of courses, services on department and other curriculum committees, development of new or revised programs or curricula, leadership in maintaining a viable curriculum, instructional research, consultation with other faculty on teaching and instruction, and use of innovative approaches to teaching.
4. Awards: Awards related to teaching such as those sponsored by the department, college, or university--as well as other awards sponsored by student groups, external agencies, and professional societies.
5. Peer refereed articles involving educational outcomes or experiences (non-research based).
6. Grants related to the education of students (non-research based).
7. Department Head's in-class assessment of teaching (must be requested by the faculty member).
8. Efforts made to improve effectiveness in the classroom.
9. Survey of peers or alumni along with exit survey comments.
10. Textbooks written.
11. Senior design groups and honor students advised.
12. Advising undergraduate students.
13. Advising graduate students.

3.2.2 Information Considered in Evaluating Research

Significant research generally culminates in peer-reviewed publications. Therefore, primary emphasis is placed on publications that have completed the peer review process within the last year. However, significant work toward developing funding for new research is regarded as an important accomplishment in the research area along with advising graduate students pursuing theses and dissertations. Indications of the significance of a research proposal development effort will be determined in part from the comments of the reviewers when available. Evidence of scholarly and creative work includes but is not limited to:

1. Refereed articles published in recognized technical journals or proceedings of international technical conferences.
2. Authoring or editing: Technical books and monographs issued by nationally recognized publishers.
3. Competitive and non-competitive research grants and contracts.
4. Supporting IMSE students with GRAs.
5. Refereed articles published in the proceedings or records of national or regional technical meetings.

6. Contributions to technical books or monographs.
7. Dissertations and theses supervised.
8. Grants and refereed papers relating to research issues in education.
9. Papers submitted.
10. Patents awarded.
11. Non-refereed technical articles published or distributed widely.
12. Presentations made at international, national, or regional technical meetings and invited seminars (universities, industry, and government laboratories).
13. Research proposals submitted.
14. Active advising of graduate students and effective reviews and critiques of their theses or dissertations through participation in graduate students' supervisory committees¹.
15. Summers and/or sabbaticals spent in industry or national laboratories.
16. Honors or awards for research.
17. Other well-documented evidence of research contributions.

3.2.3 Information Considered in Evaluating Service

Service activity can involve varied types of work not directly related to teaching or research. These include: administrative duties, advising student groups, serving on graduate student committees, serving on department, college, and university committees, being active in professional societies, or by serving the profession through the review of articles and research proposals. Evidence of service to the institution, the profession, and the general public include:

1. Institutional

- a. Serving on committees for the department, college, and university.
- b. Advising professional or honorary student organizations.
- c. Performing special functions assigned by the Department Head.
- d. Providing maintenance (or enhancement) of instructional and/or laboratory facilities.
- e. Serving as supervisory committee members.
- f. Making arrangements for seminars and hosting seminar speakers.
- g. Processing correspondence and applications for the graduate program.
- h. Participating in the recruitment of new faculty.
- i. Fundraising
- j. Extra departmental duties such as graduate program chair, network administrator, graduate seminar coordinator, organization advisor, etc.
- k. Other documentable service to the institution.
- l. Administrative duties and accomplishments to the department or university.

2. Professional or Public

- a. Fostering cordial relations with prospective students, alumni, and industrial clients.
- b. Raising the technical awareness of the lay-public through direct interaction or through print and electronic media.
- c. Holding office or committee positions in professional / honorary societies.
- d. Serving on committees of international, national, and regional technical meetings.
- e. Editing professional journals, technical monographs, and proceedings of conferences.
- f. Serving as a reviewer for journals, publishers of professional literature, and funding agencies.
- g. Conference sessions organized, workshops presented, professional society offices held, committee work, etc.; extra departmental duties such as graduate program chair, network administrator, graduate seminar coordinator, organization advisor, etc.

4.0 ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCESS

The performance of every faculty member is evaluated annually for the following purposes:

- Account for the member's activities.
- Assure that each member's activities contribute to the departmental missions.
- Develop a fair means to distribute merit salary increases.
- Provide feedback to guide an individual's development and improvement efforts.
- Provide a basis for decisions concerning reappointment.
- Assure that each member meets minimum performance expectations.

The period covered by the annual evaluation is the calendar year. The basis for the annual evaluation is the member's performance during the previous calendar year. The evaluation process consists of three sequential steps: coordinated activity planning (at the beginning of the year), self-appraisal (see Attachment C), and the Department Head evaluation. Each merit evaluation considers the faculty member's contributions in teaching, research, and service in proportion to the percent of effort in each area to which the faculty member is assigned during their annual appointment, as determined by each member's distribution of responsibilities. Thus, work that entails external remuneration, such as consulting, teaching overload courses during the academic year, teaching summer courses, funded summer research projects or performing summer advising does not contribute to the percent of effort in an area. Results from such activities may be reported in the promotion and tenure review documents.

Each faculty member's record may involve a different proportion of teaching, research, and service as determined by the faculty member and the Department Head during the prior annual performance evaluation. For faculty members, at least some effort in teaching, research, and service is encouraged since they relate to the long-term strength of the department, college and university. Each faculty member in the IMSE Department annually submits a summary of activities for the previous year and an activity plan for the following year. The process timetable and the required information and documents to be submitted by each member are detailed below.

4.1 Calendar of Events in Annual Evaluations

1. The Department Head prepares a two-year tentative teaching scheduleJanuary 1
2. Each faculty member submits an Activity Summary (Attachment A) for the previous calendar year along with an Activity Plans Document (Attachment B) for the coming year[mid-January]
3. The following tasks are accomplished per specific timelines determined by the Department and the College of Engineering..... [Between mid-January and 3rd week of March]
 - a) The Department Head completes evaluations for each member and returns a written copy to the member.
 - b) The member signs and returns the Department Head's evaluation or further discusses their evaluation with the Department Head. The Department Head may change the evaluation based on the discussion with the member. The member must sign the evaluation document to acknowledge receipt.
 - c) The Department Head forwards the evaluations, the summary of annual evaluation spreadsheets and a notice of any unresolved objection to the annual evaluation rating to the Dean of Engineering.

Details of subsequent processes may be found in the Department Heads manual at:

<http://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/dhmanual/master.html>

4.2 Material to Be Submitted for Annual Evaluation

All material is to be submitted to the Department Head by mid-January each year. Each member must submit the following:

1. Summary of Activities (Attachment A)
2. Student Classroom Evaluations (K-State Standardized Instruments, for each class taught)
3. Activity Plans (Attachment B)

Faculty members may also choose to submit supplemental information to the Department Head for consideration in the annual review. Some common examples are listed in Sections 3.2.1 – 3.2.3.

A primary component of the annual evaluation and documents is the workload allocation percentages. At the beginning of each year, each faculty member provides an estimated workload allocation along with their proposed activity plans. The Department Head will review this activity plan and work with the faculty member to establish an approved activity plan. The standard percentage allocation for a tenure or tenure-track appointment is 40 to 50 percent teaching (4 classes per year), 40 to 50 percent research and 10 to 20 percent service. The workload must add up to 100 %. The activity plans for non-tenure track faculty members will be directly related to their assigned responsibility.

These standard workload allocations can be modified through discussions with the Department Head. If modifications are made through buyouts, there should be a written proposal that accurately reflects the individual's time and effort distribution (see Section 4.4). The final workload for the year is reported in the summary of activities and can be different from the

planned activities workload. The Department Head must agree to these changes in workload before they may be considered in the annual evaluations.

4.3 Summary of Activities

The summary of activities document is presented in Appendix A. It is the responsibility of each member to clearly document the member's efforts and achievements in teaching, research, service, and other activities related to furthering the department's, college's and university's missions. Specific information that may be included in each section is detailed in the following sections.

4.4 Guidelines for Activities Planned

The purpose of this section is to provide a set of guidelines for department faculty to gain approval for their annual work plan.

Our belief is that individual goals and institutional goals can be aligned so as to promote faculty growth and institutional accomplishment. This is attained when an individual faculty member--in concert with the Department Head--develops a plan of work (including professional development activities and goals, as appropriate) and methods of accomplishing work goals, establishes criteria against which the faculty member will be evaluated, establishes the timeline for accomplishing the goals, and determines needed institutional resources. Each faculty member provides these materials annually in the Activity Plans document (Attachment B).

The percent time allocation of a faculty member's teaching and/or research appointment may be reduced to allow time for the member to engage in other activities that benefit the department. In such cases, the faculty member shall submit a written proposal outlining the activities that will be undertaken. The Department Head will review this proposal and decide on its acceptance. This process is outlined below.

In the annual review documents, each faculty member will outline how they expect to spend their time during the coming year. Time may be divided between the areas of teaching, research, service, and other activities as jointly defined by the faculty member and Department Head. The percentage allocation for each area is to be documented. Examples of information which a candidate may include for the "Activity Plans" are: research projects to be completed, proposals to be submitted, papers to be written, service work to be performed, courses/labs to be developed, planned advising responsibilities, and planned professional development activities, etc.

The Department Head will review the activity plan and validate the document and discuss it with the faculty member. If the faculty member does not agree with the assessment, they can discuss the issue with the Department Head. The Department Head may or may not change the evaluation. Each faculty member must have the opportunity to discuss their written evaluation with the Department Head and must sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review and discuss the evaluation. This signature does not mean either agreement or disagreement with the evaluation (see the University Handbook, Appendix Q).

Should a faculty member fail to participate in the process of developing their activity plans, then the Department Head is free to allocate the faculty member's time according to departmental needs.

4.5 Department Head Evaluation

The Department Head will prepare an evaluation report containing the following sections:

1. A narrative summary highlighting the faculty member's most significant accomplishments.
2. A "weight" based on the percentages of effort in the faculty self-appraisal (see ATTACHMENT C).
3. A score (on a range 1 to 4) rating the performance of the work.
4. A summary table prepared to anonymously show the faculty evaluation ratings by range.

The evaluation also contains an overall narrative summary and a composite evaluation score that is based on the total of the weighted scores from the areas of time allocation. The Department Head's evaluation of a faculty member is presented only to that faculty member. The faculty member is given a written copy of the evaluation and should sign the evaluation to indicate that they have been given the opportunity to review the evaluation with the Department Head. If a faculty member

disagrees with the evaluation that he/she has received, then he/she may discuss the issue with the Department Head. If they cannot come to a consensus, the faculty member can follow the procedures outlined in the University Handbook.

4.6 Annual Merit Salary Adjustments

The Department Head uses annual evaluations to allocate merit pay. The merit pay is allocated proportionally to each member per the maximum of the current year's merit score or the average of the merit scores from the current and previous year. Any individual scoring 3.0 or higher receives some merit pay if merit pay is available.

5.0 REAPPOINTMENT OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

The criteria and procedures of the Department of Industrial and Manufacturing Systems Engineering on annual review, promotion and tenure are in accordance with those given in the University Handbook and conform to the policies of the College of Engineering regarding external peer review. The aspects specific to the department are described below.

As a Ph.D. granting department, all tenure-track faculty members are expected to participate in teaching, research, and service in varying degrees according to the time allotment of the faculty member. To be eligible for promotion and tenure, the faculty member should provide evidence of excellence in all the faculty member's assigned areas of responsibility. Nevertheless, the extent of involvement in each category may vary from one member to another depending on circumstances and preference. In addition to technical excellence, the candidate needs to demonstrate the ability to collaborate with the existing faculty members and demonstrate collegiality.

5.1 Annual Reappointment of Tenure-Track Faculty Members

A tenure-track faculty member is evaluated annually for progress toward earning tenure by the committee comprising all tenured faculty members in the department. The Department Head is the chair of this committee, but does not have a vote. The purpose of these evaluations is to help the faculty member prepare for the tenure process and to determine whether he or she will be reappointed. Thus, the candidate is evaluated based upon the department's expectations in research, teaching and service (see Sections 3.2.1 – 3.2.3) according to the faculty member's appointment. This evaluation also determines whether the non-tenured faculty member's appointment will be renewed.

Each tenure-track faculty member will be expected to complete the promotion and tenure documents as if they are going up for promotion each year. In the first year of the appointment, the committee shall vote on the non-tenured faculty member's renewal before the second week of the faculty member's second semester. From the second year until an individual is tenured, the non-tenured faculty member should submit tenure documentation (as defined in <http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/documents/midtenure.doc>) along with any other accompanying information to the Department Head by the second week of each Fall semester. The tenure and promotion committee will then have at least 2 weeks to evaluate these forms. The committee will meet and vote for the faculty member's reappointment. If the vote is for reappointment, then the Department Head will inform the faculty member of the decision in writing and provide suggestions so that the individual can strengthen their tenure application. If the vote is against reappointment, then the candidate must be notified in writing regarding the decision not to reappoint. A schedule of important dates and standards for notice of non-reappointment can be found in "Appendix A" of the University Handbook (<http://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/fhbook/fhxa.html>).

If the committee votes not to reappoint, then this recommendation is forwarded to the Dean of the College of Engineering with a letter from the Department Head. The Dean forwards the written recommendation not to reappoint and an accompanying explanation to the Provost. Final authority in resolving conflicting opinions regarding reappointment is delegated to the Provost (see University Handbook, C53-C55). A non-tenured faculty member who receives a notice of non-reappointment has the right to file a grievance per the K-State policies.

5.2 Mid-Probationary Review of Tenure-Track Faculty Members

During a candidate's third year, he or she will have a mid-probationary review. The mid-probationary review follows similar procedures as the tenure process. The candidate submits their file, which contains similar materials presented while applying for tenure and promotion. Each member of the tenure and promotion committee will individually review this material prior to meeting together for a discussion and vote. The Department Head may write an evaluation report, which is included in the candidate's mid-probationary packet. The candidate's mid-probationary packet and the votes of the

committee are then sent to the College of Engineering for a complete review. This additional review process includes a review by the college's promotion and tenure committee and a review by the Dean. This review is designed to provide the faculty member with substantial feedback from faculty colleagues and administrators regarding their 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. This process may result in a nonrenewal of the individual's appointment.

6.0 PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Within the department, a committee of all the faculty members, who have at least the rank for which the candidate is applying, evaluates the candidate's suitability for promotion. Within the department, a committee of all tenured faculty members evaluates the candidate's suitability for tenure. The Department Head is the chair of this committee but does not have a vote. The committee considers external reviews that evaluate the candidates' potential and accomplishments in accordance with the University Handbook. Written comments by each faculty member evaluating the candidate are forwarded with the Promotion and/or Tenure documents prepared by the candidate to the college advisory committee.

A detailed description of the proposed timeline for the promotion and tenure process is published on the Provost's web page, <http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/depthead/manual/promotion/promote.html>.

To summarize, the major steps in the departmental process are:

1. The candidate submits the promotion documents by September 1.
2. Department Head requests outside evaluations.
3. Department committee for promotion and tenure meets and votes on the promotion and/or tenure by November 1.
4. Department Head forwards the package to the Dean along with the unedited comments of the faculty and their recommendations around November 10.
5. The candidate will be notified of their tenure and/or promotion by the middle of March. If an individual is not granted tenure, then that individual may keep their appointment for the following fall and spring semesters.

The specific items to be evaluated are primarily teaching, research and service. Occasionally, an individual may have some time allotment in another category, which is also evaluated. Examples of evidence that support excellence in these categories are provided in Sections 2.4-2.6. However, it is emphasized that both tenure and promotion are based upon an individual's career and not merely a few years' accomplishments. Thus, the impact of the individual's contribution is important. Consequently, number of papers cited, h-index, and impact factor of journals published can be provided as evidence of the individual's career impact.

Promotion to Associate Professor rests on substantial professional contributions that reflect excellence in teaching, research and service. This includes a demonstrated ability to conduct independent research at a high level of mastery in the chosen area(s). This mastery should be translated to publications and recognition. In addition, the candidate needs to be able to guide graduate students and help them achieve mastery of the research area. The candidate should demonstrate a high level of acceptance by the students in teaching combined with a high level of technical expectations of their students. A candidate should demonstrate excellence in service activities assigned by the Department Head and show active support of the departmental mission and possibly the college's or the university's mission.

Promotion to Professor is based on attainment of consistent excellence in the assigned responsibilities of the faculty member. The candidate needs to demonstrate a clear record of performance, leadership in their area, as well as national and international recognition in the candidate's chosen research area. Promotion to Professor implies consistent and repeated high-level performance in the classroom. The candidate should demonstrate excellence in service by involvement in national and international societies or activities, and/or support of the college's or university's mission.

7.0 REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES FOR NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Non-tenure track faculty include those holding titles of instructor, advanced instructor, and senior instructor; teaching assistant professor, teaching associate professor, and teaching professor; research assistant professor, research associate professor, and research professor; and professor of practice and senior professor of practice. These roles are described in Section 2. The reappointment and promotion procedures for these faculty are described in this section.

The non-tenure track faculty review committee consists of all tenured faculty members actively serving in the department, and any non-tenure track faculty member on regular or term appointments who are above the rank of the individual being considered for promotion or reappointment. The Department Head is the chair of this committee, but does not have a vote.

Eligible Faculty for Non-Tenure Track Faculty Reappointment and Promotion Evaluations

Faculty Seeking Reappointment and/or Promotion	Eligible Faculty								
	Teaching Associate Professor	Teaching Professor	Senior Professor of Practice	Advanced Instructor	Senior Instructor	Research Associate Professor	Research Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
Teaching Assistant Professor	X	X	X					X	X
Instructor	X	X	X	X	X			X	X
Research Assistant Professor						X	X	X	X
Professor of Practice	X	X	X					X	X
Teaching Associate Professor		X	X						X
Advanced Instructor		X			X				X
Research Associate Professor							X		X

If a non-tenure track faculty member is under consideration for promotion, he/she will be excused from the non-tenure track faculty review committee for that academic year. Likewise, consistent with the University nepotism policy (PPM Chapter 4095), should a person of a committee member's immediate household be under consideration for promotion, that committee member will be excused from all related deliberations for that academic year.

7.1. Annual Evaluations

The Department Head will review non-tenure track faculty members on regular or term appointments annually in accordance with Section 2 of this document. Each regular or term faculty member is evaluated in each of the relevant categories of assigned responsibility by the department. In addition, the non-tenure track faculty members on regular appointments will have a separate reappointment evaluation as described below. In both cases, the Department Head will provide information about deadlines and guidelines about materials to be prepared sufficiently in advance of deadlines to allow for preparation and review.

The department head will make a recommendation to the Dean on whether to offer a new term contract to those non-tenure track faculty members on term appointments.

7.2 Reappointment Evaluation Process

Each non-tenure track faculty member on a regular appointment should submit a portfolio of their accomplishments to the Department Head at the same time as the annual evaluation materials are submitted. This portfolio must contain an updated CV and cumulative instructional evaluations including student evaluations. Additional information related to teaching, research and service may also be provided as described in Section 2. The portfolio will be provided to the non-tenure track faculty review committee and the committee members will provide recommendations for reappointment to the Department Head.

If any member of the non-tenure track review committee recommends non-reappointment of a non-tenure track faculty member, the Department Head will schedule a meeting of the non-tenure track review committee to discuss the reappointment of the non-tenure track faculty member. The Department Head will preside over the meeting to discuss reappointment. The purpose of this meeting is to vote for reappointment of the non-tenure track faculty member. Each

member of this committee will have at least 7 days to view the faculty member's portfolio prior to the meeting. The committee meets for a discussion and each member, except the Department Head, votes for reappointment or non-reappointment. The Department Head will forward the vote of the committee and verbatim faculty comments along with their recommendation to the Dean.

7.2.1 Reappointment Evaluation Schedule

All non-tenure track faculty members with regular appointments at all ranks will be reviewed annually with regard to reappointment. Annual deadlines for review and documentation vary somewhat in the first two years of the appointment compared to the deadlines in subsequent years. See Appendix A of the University Handbook for the specific deadlines that apply in specific years of the appointment.

7.2.2 Mid-rank Evaluations

A non-tenure track faculty member who does not hold the highest academic rank for which they are eligible may request a mid-rank evaluation. This evaluation cannot be used for either reappointment or annual merit evaluations. The purpose of this evaluation is to provide the faculty member with guidance toward achieving a promotion.

The mid-rank evaluation should follow the deadlines and timelines of the mid-tenure review process with the exception that no documents are forwarded to the college. The faculty member will submit their portfolio and the non-tenure track faculty review committee and Department Head will have at least 14 days to evaluate the material. The non-tenure track faculty review committee will convene and provide written feedback regarding activities that the faculty should pursue and/or continue to do to achieve promotion. Additionally, the Department Head will also provide a separate written report regarding activities that the faculty should pursue and/or continue to do to achieve promotion. The goal of these reports is to provide guidance and feedback to the faculty member to facilitate success in their professional advancement.

7.3 Promotion Procedures

The procedures for promotion in the instructor, teaching professor, research professor, and professor of practice ranks are like the requirements in the University Handbook; see Sections C110-C116.2 and C150-C156.2. The average time in rank interval prior to consideration for promotion is expected to be 5 years, although shorter and longer intervals are possible. The deadlines for this promotion process follow the timelines for tenure and promotion as shown in Section 6 of this document.

A non-tenure track faculty member seeking promotion should submit their portfolio to the Department Head by Sept. 1. The portfolio should document instructional, service, and research activities (if there is a research effort distribution or research activities to report). The primary items to include in the portfolio are contained in Section 2. Please note, the college has a specific format for submission and the candidate should follow these guidelines.

The non-tenure track faculty review committee will have at least 14 days to review the candidate's portfolio. The committee will meet and discuss the candidate's performance. The Department Head is the chair of this committee, but does not have a vote. The candidate's portfolio is appended with a report from the non-tenure track faculty review committee and the Department Head's written recommendation in accordance with the University Handbook, and information about the outcome is shared with the candidate in accordance with the University Handbook. The updated portfolio is sent to the college's committee on promotion and tenure. This committee attaches its recommendation, which is then forwarded to the Dean. The Dean makes a recommendation to the Deans' Council regarding promotion and is responsible to communicate the outcome to the candidate.

Individuals promoted to advanced instructor, teaching associate professor, or research associate professor should demonstrate strong performance in all areas of their appointment. Additional information related to teaching, research and service may also be provided as described in Section 2. In regards to instruction, performance includes not only the student evaluations, but also the rigor of the material covered and the learning achieved by the students. Individuals promoted to senior instructor, teaching professor, research professor, or senior professor of practice should demonstrate high performance in all areas of their appointment and demonstrate leadership. Leadership positions and activities may be limited to those conducted at Kansas State University and typically include development of courses and curriculum, publications, grants, presentations, and other activities that demonstrate a larger impact from the faculty member.

If a promotion is approved, it may either be to a regular appointment of one year that is entitled to Notice of Non-

Reappointment or to a term appointment for a period of one to three years with no Notice of Non-Reappointment.

8.0 MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE FACULTY PERFORMANCE

8.1 General Statement

This document establishes the minimum acceptable level for the tenured faculty members in the Industrial and Manufacturing Systems Engineering Department. It serves as a supplement to the “Annual Evaluation Guidelines” established within the Department and the University Handbook. It also serves as a guideline for determining chronic low achievement under University Handbook Section C31.5.

8.2 Minimum Acceptable Level of Productivity

The minimum acceptable level of performance established in this document will apply to all tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the department. For tenured faculty members, failure to maintain a minimum acceptable level of productivity may result in a vote of professional incompetence and potential loss of tenure and their faculty appointment according to the University Handbook. In addition to the requirements of the University Handbook, all faculty members in the department are expected to satisfy the following minimum level of productivity requirements based upon the faculty member’s workload allotment:

Teaching

1. Meet regularly scheduled classes except for special circumstances like illness, accident, or attendance at professional meetings
2. Consistently start and stop classes within five minutes of the scheduled times
3. Teach courses such that departmentally defined course objectives are achieved and students who pass the course achieve departmentally defined student learning outcomes.
4. Evaluate students’ performance uniformly and fairly with professionally accepted methods
5. Set standards for student performance that challenge students to learn and are consistent with the level of the class
6. Maintain reasonable office hours during which help is available to students
7. Arrange for student evaluations of teaching according to departmental and university regulations

Research (For an appointment of at least 25% the faculty member should perform at least one of the four items)

1. Publish at least one peer reviewed journal article within the last two years
2. Graduate at least one M.S. student with a thesis in the past two years.
3. Graduate at least one Ph.D. student within the past four years.
4. Provide two semesters of GRA funding within the past two years.

Service

1. Participate on assigned committees (departmental, college or university) and perform tasks assigned within each committee, including advising of assigned graduate or undergraduate students.
2. Attend departmental meetings

A faculty member is in low achievement if they receive the weighted, according to time allotment, annual rating strictly below 2.5. The low achievement is determined each and every year. Individuals with a low achievement may become a chronic low achiever, which may result in dismissal from employment.

8.3 Low Achievement

Low achievement is a serious matter. A faculty member is in low achievement if they receive the weighted, according to time allotment, annual rating strictly below 2.5. The low achievement is determined every year during the annual evaluation process. Tenured faculty members with a low achievement may become a chronic low achiever, which may result in dismissal from employment due to professional incompetence.

When the Department Head’s evaluation identifies a faculty member as a low achiever, then the Department Head and faculty member develop a plan to help this person become a non-low achieving faculty member. Part of this plan may adjust time allocations to emphasize an area of competence rather than pursue chronic low achievement and potential job loss. This plan will be considered part of the faculty member's responsibilities and will be reviewed in subsequent annual evaluations. If desired and initiated by the faculty member, the plan can be shared with the Low Achievement Review

Committee.

The Low Achievement Review Committee consists of all tenured faculty members that are actively serving in the department, excluding the Department Head, the low achieving faculty member and any individual that will be involved later in a chronic low achievement process (Dean, etc.). The Chair of this committee is the eligible faculty member with the highest rank and then the most number of years employed at K-State.

The faculty member and Department Head must both agree to the plan. If the Department Head and low achieving faculty member cannot agree upon a plan, then the Low Achievement Committee meets to create a plan. Both the low achieving faculty member and the Department Head should present plans, ideas or objections. The Low Achievement Review Committee is then charged with creating a plan, which must be ratified with a strict majority vote from the Low Achievement Review Committee. The purpose of this plan is to help the faculty member perform their responsibilities. This plan cannot be changed during the current year without the approval of the Low Achievement Review Committee.

8.4 Chronic Low Achievement

This section describes chronic low achievement. A tenured member with low achievement in any two consecutive years or three out of any five years is considered in chronic low achievement. If the Department Head's annual evaluation ever classifies the tenured faculty member as a chronic low achiever, then the following procedure must be followed prior to the Department Head submitting this faculty member's annual evaluation to the Dean.

1. The Department Head meets with the faculty member. This meeting must include a discussion of chronic low achievement, professional incompetence and losing tenure. The Department Head must give the faculty member sections on low achievement and chronic low achievement from this document along with the University Handbook (Sections C31.1-C31.8).
2. The faculty member must sign either to convene the department's Low Achievement Review Committee to reexamine the Department Head's annual evaluation (see step 3) or to waive the right to engage the Low Achievement Review Committee in the review process. If the faculty member selects not to convene the committee, then the Department Head's annual evaluation is submitted to the Dean.
3. At the request of the tenured faculty member as indicated in step 2, the Department Head provides the faculty member's annual evaluation documents to the Low Achievement Review Committee. The Department Head's evaluation of this document is not included. Upon review of this material and within a time not exceeding 10 business days, a vote is called to determine whether or not the faculty member failed to meet minimum acceptable standards for the current year. If 2/3 or more of the votes are cast for failing to meet the minimum acceptable standards, then the Department Head's evaluation goes forward as is to the Dean with the additional information regarding the vote. If strictly less than 2/3 of the votes are cast for failing to meet minimum standards, then the Department Head must revise the evaluation so that the faculty member's weighted score is at least 2.5. (Observe that the Low Achievement Committee is not charged with assigning annual evaluation numbers, but it does place bounds upon these numbers. In either case, the Department Head still assigns annual evaluation numbers.)

Upon receiving the Department Head's evaluations, the Dean may recommend dismissal from the university for any faculty member in chronic low achievement. The procedure listed in the University Handbook (Sections C31.1-C31.8) is followed precisely in such dismissal situations.

9.0 PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD

9.1 Award Criteria

Professors in the IMSE Department are expected to maintain their excellence and provide leadership in all aspects of the department mission including teaching, research and service.

To be eligible for the Professorial Performance Award, the candidate must have obtained the rank of Professor and served as a Professor for at least six years and have not received a Professorial Performance Award (PPA) in the last six years. The candidate must demonstrate significant sustained productivity of all the qualities required for promotion to the rank of Professor in the IMSE department since the last promotion or PPA award, namely:

1. Show evidence of excellence in undergraduate and graduate teaching, as stated in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines document. Such evidence includes student feedback, senior exit interviews, and course reports. It may also

include success in securing resources to support course, laboratory, and curriculum development/enhancement.

2. Show evidence of nationally recognized scholarly work and the ability to support the graduate/research program in an area sustainable by the candidate, as stated in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines document. Such evidence includes publications of the candidate's research in peer-reviewed journals, securing support for the candidate's work, and successful supervision of graduate students. It may also include development and teaching of graduate courses, securing resources for graduate student support, laboratory development, equipment procurement, as well as other documentation of scholarly excellence.
3. Show evidence of outstanding service to the university community and of contributions to the Engineering and Teaching professions, as stated in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines document. Such evidence includes leadership in the operation and development of the undergraduate and graduate programs, contributions in department and college committee and service assignments. It may also include participation in university governance, nationally recognized leadership, and participation in technical and professional society activities. It does not include consulting.

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

9.2 Timeline and Procedure

In accordance with the University Handbook (C49.1-49.14), this document constitutes the review mechanism and procedure for the PPA of the IMSE Department. This review mechanism and procedure document will be reviewed at least every five years. Any IMSE tenured full-time, full professor is eligible for the PPA if at least six years have elapsed since the faculty member's initial appointment at the rank of Professor or since receiving the last PPA. Tenured full professors holding at least a 50% appointment in IMSE are eligible to review the qualifications of the PPA candidates and report their findings and recommendations to the Department Head. This review committee is hereafter known as the eligible faculty.

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

Fall Semester End (nominally December 15):

The candidate informs Department Head in writing of their wish to be considered for the PPA and presents a draft version of the Accomplishment Summary Table (Attachment D).

Start of Spring Semester (nominally January 15):

The candidate consults with the Department Head and provides the documents and records concerning teaching, scholarship, and service occurring over the previous six years along with the PPA Accomplishment Summary Table. External letters of reference and evaluation are not required.

Last week in January (nominally January 31):

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

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

The eligible faculty will meet to consider the merits of each PPA applicant and the materials submitted by that applicant. No candidate may participate in the review of their own application for the PPA. The Department Head is considered as the Chairperson of that forum. It is the responsibility of the Chairperson to conduct the meeting, to assure the fairness of the proceedings, and to prepare and submit in a timely fashion all documents regarding the review. The purpose of the meeting is for the eligible faculty to assess the merit of the PPA application, and to generate a list containing written evaluations attesting to why each individual is or is not worthy of the PPA, and a counted vote on the matter. A transcript of the written comments pertaining to a particular candidate will be given to that candidate by the Department Head. After considering

the results of the review, the candidate may either choose to continue the application process or to withdraw from further consideration during that year by notifying the Department Head in writing. If the candidate chooses to continue the application process, the Department Head prepares a written recommendation. A copy of the Department Head's written recommendation will be given to the candidate.

Each candidate will have the opportunity to discuss with the Department Head the Department Head's written evaluation and recommendations. Each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to discuss and review the evaluation and recommendations. Within seven working days after the review and discussion of the recommendations each candidate can submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding their evaluation to the IMSE Department Head and to the Dean of Engineering.

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

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

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

If the Department Head wishes to apply for the PPA, a chair will be selected by all the full professors in the department. The chair will fulfill the function of the Department Head in all the above procedures for that individual.

10.0 POST TENURE REVIEW

The purpose of post-tenure review at Kansas State University is to enhance the continued professional development of tenured faculty. The process is intended to encourage intellectual vitality and professional proficiency for all members of the faculty throughout their careers, so they may more effectively fulfill the mission of the university. It is also designed to enhance public trust in the University by ensuring that the faculty community undertakes regular and rigorous efforts to hold all of its members accountable for high professional standards.

Kansas State University recognizes that the granting of tenure for university faculty is a vital protection of free inquiry and open intellectual debate. It is expressly recognized that nothing in this policy alters or amends the University's policies regarding removal of tenured faculty members for cause (which are stipulated in the University Handbook). This policy and any actions taken under it are separate from and have no bearing on the chronic low achievement or annual evaluation policies and processes. Thus, documentation for this review process may only be used by administration for this post tenure review process; however, the faculty may use the results from this process at the faculty member's discretion.

A post tenure review is held for each tenured faculty member six years after their most recent promotion or other qualifying action as described in Appendix W of the University Handbook. When an individual is identified as requiring a post tenure review, the faculty member completes the form located in Appendix E and submits the document to the Department Head no later than October 1. This form documents the accomplishments of the faculty member during the past 6 years and includes a description of the faculty member's professional goals for the next five years and their plans for professional development. The professional development plan should clearly identify and relate objectives to the department mission and identify the resources required to achieve these objectives.

The Department Head conducts the post tenure review. The Department Head's primary charge is to identify the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses, to review the faculty member's professional goals and development plan and suggest courses of action to aid the faculty member's professional development, and respond to the faculty member's requests for resources to achieve professional development plans that align with the department's mission. This review is not based upon whether the faculty member is meeting the past or current standards for tenure.

Upon finishing the review, the Department Head writes a letter summarizing the findings along with the response to the requests. This letter must be delivered to the faculty member by the end of the fall semester.

ATTACHMENT A - SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES

**Department of Industrial & Manufacturing Systems Engineering
Faculty Activity Worksheet**

YEAR

Name: _____ **Rank:** _____

Explain if your workload percentages change from last year's activity plan. _____

I. Teaching (Workload: %)

List Courses Taught During this Year.

<u>Course</u>	<u>Semester</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>		<u>Taught on Video?</u>	<u>1st Time Taught?</u>	<u>New Course For the Dept.?</u>
		<u>Ug</u>	<u>Grad</u>			

Teaching Activities and Achievements during the calendar year -- One item per line.

II. Research (Workload: %)

Research Activities and Achievements during the calendar year -- One item per line.

III. Service (Workload: %)

Service Activities and Achievements during the calendar year -- One item per line.

IV. Other (Workload: %)

Other Contributions You Made to the Department's, College's or University's Missions During this Year.

Faculty Member Date

Department Head Date

ATTACHMENT B - ACTIVITY PLANS FOR THE COMING YEAR
YEAR _____

NAME _____

RANK _____

I. Teaching (Workload: _____%) anticipated major teaching activities for the coming year

II. Research (Workload: _____%) anticipated major research activities for the coming year

III. Service (Workload: _____%) anticipated major service activities for the coming year

IV. Other (Workload: _____%) anticipated other activities for the coming year

ATTACHMENT C - APPRAISAL FORM FOR FACULTY PERFORMANCE

YEAR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FOR

IMSE Faculty Member

SUMMARY OF MAJOR ACTIVITIES

PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE	
1.0 - 2.49	Failed to meet expectations
2.5 - 2.99	Met minimum expectations, but needs improvement
3.0 - 3.49	Met expectations
3.5 - 4.0	Exceeded expectations

INSTRUCTION:

Explanation of ratings.

WEIGHT:

EVALUATION:

RESEARCH:

Explanation of ratings.

WEIGHT:

EVALUATION:

SERVICE:

Explanation of ratings.

WEIGHT:

EVALUATION:

SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION.

COMPOSITE SCORE:

Submitted By:

Department Head

Faculty

Date

ATTACHMENT D - APPRAISAL FORM FOR FACULTY PERFORMANCE

**IMSE Department Professorial Performance Award
Accomplishment Summary Table**

Name: _____
 Ph.D. Degree Institution and Time: _____
 Date Hired at KSU: _____
 Date Promoted to Full Professor: _____
 Date of Last Professorial Performance Award: _____

The candidate should complete the following table, provide a sufficiently detailed CV, and a one-page accomplishment summary for each area of assigned responsibility: Research, Teaching, and Service.

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

ATTACHMENT E – FORMS FOR POST TENURE REVIEW

NAME _____

RANK _____

To fill out this form, only consider the most recent 6 years. The completed form is primarily a compilation of summary statements and I – VI is limited to a page each. Please indicate the 6-year average percent of workload in the % blanks provided below.

I. Significant Teaching Accomplishments for the Past Six Years (Average Workload Past 6 Years: _____%)

II. Significant Research Accomplishments for the Past Six Years (Average Workload Past 6 Years: _____%)

III. Significant Service Accomplishments for the Past Six Years (Average Workload Past 6 Years: _____%)

IV. Significant Other Accomplishments for the Past Six Years (Average Workload Past 6 Years: _____%)

V. A Statement of the Faculty Member's Five Year Goals

VI. Professional Development Plans including identification of resources needed to achieve desired outcomes.