DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRICAL AND COMPUTER ENGINEERING

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on 4/11/2023)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES
(Approved by Faculty Vote on 4/11/2023)

EVALUATION, REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION OF NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY
(Approved by Faculty Vote on 4/11/2023)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **6/2028**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **6/2028**

Don Gruenbacher, Department Head
Date signed: 4/11/2023

Matt O'Keefe, Dean
Date signed: 4/13/2023

Charles Taber, Provost
Date signed: 6/13/2023

*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

1. Faculty Annual Evaluation Procedures

This section specifies the criteria, standards, and procedures used in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering for annual evaluation of tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track faculty members of the department. This evaluation is used to determine recommendations for annual merit salary adjustments for all faculty, help evaluate candidates for promotion and tenure, help evaluate faculty for mid-tenure review, reappointment, post-tenure review, identify professors for the Professorial Performance Award, and to identify tenured faculty with Chronic Low Achievement.

    i.   At the end of each calendar year each faculty member is asked to complete and return to the department head forms summarizing accomplishments for the past calendar year and plans for the coming year. All faculty members must submit a Faculty Accomplishments/Plans form. All faculty must submit student evaluations of their teaching for all courses taught that year. These evaluations must be done with forms that meet Section C34 in the University Handbook. All faculty members must submit assessment data for all classes as required by the ABET and KSU assessment plans.

    ii.   The department head reviews the information submitted by each faculty member and then prepares an evaluation of the performance of each faculty member. The evaluation is summarized on a Faculty Appraisal form. Criteria are established in the areas of teaching, research and service, and the evaluation is based on these criteria. The criteria are established by the ECE Promotion and Tenure document. The merit factor is a weighted sum of the performance levels in each of the three areas of effort. The performance level is rated from 1 to 5 with 3 corresponding to "met expectations" and 5 being the best possible rating. The weighting factors in each of the areas are the tenths time a faculty member is assigned to work in the respective area. A typical assignment in the department might be 0.5 teaching, 0.4 research and 0.1 service.

    iii.   The department head computes percent merit salary increases as a function of faculty merit factors based on monies available.

    iv.   A copy of the department head's evaluation is given to the faculty member and a meeting is held to discuss the evaluation and plans. Signed copies of the Faculty Accomplishments/Plans and Faculty Appraisal forms are then forwarded to the Dean of Engineering.

2. Promotion, Tenure, Mid-Tenure Review and Reappointment of Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty

This section discusses issues related to promotion, tenure, mid-tenure review and reappointment within the Electrical and Computer Engineering Department. It serves as a supplement to the procedures and policies outlined in the University Handbook of Kansas State University. The purpose is to clarify issues related to ECE priorities on matters of reappointment, promotion, and tenure of tenured or tenure-track faculty .

2.1 General Statement

The issues discussed are consistent with the University's expectations for the ECE Department. It is expected that faculty will perform at different levels in the various activities enumerated in this document. Significant variance is to be expected due to differences in responsibilities and assignments of individual faculty members.

It is essential that all faculty members are able to work well with their colleagues, technical and office staff, and students. Continued disruptive or anti-social behavior which is objectionable to other persons within the department would constitute grounds for denying reappointment, promotion, or tenure.

The College of Engineering and the ECE Department have historically placed a high value on excellence in the classroom. It should be recognized that one must be an effective teacher in order to expect reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

Research is also of equivalent importance to the mission of Kansas State University and the ECE Department. Research performance will play an important role in reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions.

The extent of service assignments will vary among the academic ranks. Service contributions are important at all ranks, but it should be recognized that teaching and/or research functions carry more importance in the determination of reappointment, tenure, and promotion to Associate Professor. For promotion to Professor, service contributions may be viewed as having an increasing influence.

The decisions on reappointment, promotion and tenure must contain the individual judgments of the faculty as to whether the criteria have been met.

2.2 Eligible Faculty

Faculty who are eligible to participate in reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions for tenured and tenure-track faculty in the ECE Department are those tenured faculty that have a current departmental appointment of at least fifty percent. In addition, for promotion, only tenured faculty with an equal or higher rank than the proposed promotion rank may participate.

Eligible faculty are expected to actively participate in the entire evaluation process. This includes evaluation of the candidate's material and participation in the discussions of the candidate's qualifications. Any eligible faculty member who does not actively participate is expected to abstain from voting.

2.3 Reappointment

All untenured, tenure-track faculty will be expected to prepare documentation for consideration for reappointment on an annual basis. This must be done so that the deadlines defined in the University Handbook (Appendix A) for notice of non-reappointment can be met. Failure to submit documentation may be grounds for non-reappointment. Documentation will consist of the university promotion and tenure documents.

Reappointment decisions will be based on the ECE Department criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. Positive recommendations will indicate that the faculty member under consideration is making adequate progress to achieve promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

2.4 Mid-tenure Review

For new faculty at the assistant professor level, the Department Head will appoint an appropriate faculty member to serve as a mentor to provide guidance and feedback during the probationary period. Nevertheless, it is the faculty member's responsibility to achieve the standards defined for tenure and promotion.

During a candidate's mid-point of their probationary period (third year for Assistant Professors, second year for newly appointed Associate Professors and Professors), he or she will have a mid-tenure review. The mid-tenure review follows the same deadlines as the annual review with the exception that after the departmental committee votes, the Department Head shall write a letter, which is included in the candidate's mid-tenure packet. The candidate's mid-tenure packet and the votes of the committee are then sent to the college 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 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. This process may result in a nonrenewal of the individual's appointment.

2.5 Promotion, Tenure, and Mid-Tenure Review Documents

All Assistant Professors and Associate Professors will be expected to prepare the documentation for promotion, tenure and/or mid-tenure review on an annual basis as part of the promotion and tenure process. This ongoing effort will not only raise their awareness of the requirements for promotion and/or tenure, it will help build a record of their contributions. The Department Head will discuss each individual's progress and plans during the annual merit review.

All Assistant Professors and Associate Professors will be required to submit student evaluations of their classes. These evaluations must be done with forms that meet Section C34 in the University Handbook.

2.6 Promotion, Tenure, and Mid-Tenure Review Evaluation

The first three sections that follow discuss the contributions to teaching, research, and service that are of importance to the ECE Department. A fourth section discusses collegiality which overlays each of these areas. Higher levels of performance are expected for promotion to Professor than for promotion to Associate Professor. This can take the form of higher performance in a single area or more contributions over a wider area of responsibility. As stated in the College expectations, promotion to Professor is recognition that the individual is accomplished in all aspects of his or her assigned duties and will continue to strive for higher levels of achievement.

2.6.1 Teaching Evaluation

There are many ways to contribute to the teaching effort of the department. Items in Group I are expected of all faculty. Items in Group II are important, but not all faculty are expected to perform in all these areas.

Group I

1. Integrating design topics into appropriate courses.
2. Advising undergraduate students.
3. The guiding of design projects for undergraduate design experiences.
4. The development of new courses and revisions of existing courses to reflect advances in the state of the art.
5. The development, maintenance, and use of computer software as an aid in appropriate courses.
6. Content and depth of material covered in required courses in line with that of other teachers in the same course and appropriate to the needs of following courses.
7. Execution of responsibility for an area of study or for a laboratory course (e.g., preparing experiments and supervising graduate students).
8. Ability to recruit an adequate number of students into elective classes for the class to be offered. (consistent with popularity of area)
9. Performing and documenting all student assessment required for the ABET and KSU assessment plans.

Group II

1. Journal and conference papers on teaching, laboratory development, design projects, etc.
2. Proposals and grants for teaching innovations, laboratory development, or design projects.
3. The use of outside people as guest lecturers or team members in a design project.
4. The writing and classroom evaluation of a new textbook.
5. Involvement in interdisciplinary courses.

The following information may be used by the department head in formulating an evaluation:

Evaluations by students in classes. Recognition of differences between required and elective classes will be part of the process.

Observations of Department Head and/or other professors during pre-announced visits to the class.

Evaluation of course material (syllabus, exams, homework, handouts, etc.) by the department head and/or other professors.

Surveys of recent graduates who have had time to evaluate the quality of preparation for their careers.

Comments of graduating seniors during exit surveys and interviews.

Class grade point averages in line with the departmental average for similar courses.

2.6.2 Research Evaluation

The items below are listed more or less in the order of importance. Evidence of activity in those areas listed first will carry greater weight than effort in the areas appearing lower on the list. Claims that a paper is refereed should be supported with hard evidence when there is likely to be a question.

The quality and quantity of the following are generally accepted measures of the candidate's performance as a researcher:

1. Journal Papers – refereed with less than 50% acceptance.

2. External research funding (research, not equipment or course development support).

3. Ph.D. students graduated.

4. M.S. (thesis) students graduated.

5. Patents awarded.

6. Conference papers – refereed with less than 50% acceptance.

7. Books or contributions to books (if research oriented).

8. Internal university funding (e.g. EPAP, AMI, EES) in support of research.

9. Conference papers – other.

10. Research reports and other non-reviewed works.

11. Ph.D. students supervised.

12. M.S. students supervised.

13. Supervision of undergraduate research

14. Proposals submitted

15. Graduate student committees

16. Other: presentations, short courses, etc.

2.6.3 Service Evaluation

University service involves the formulation and implementation of departmental, college, and University policies. It is important to recognize the impact of these service activities on the work environment of colleagues.

Professional and Public service activities usually extend beyond the campus environment. These outreach activities may bring significant recognition to the University and to the individual; however, service to the profession and to the public may only indirectly impact the functioning of the faculty member's academic unit. It is important to clearly distinguish service to the public from civic and personal service.

Service to the Institution: Examples may include:

1. Chairing of, membership on, and contribution to departmental, college, and University committees.
2. Chairing of, membership on, and contribution to committees involving faculty governance.
3. Serving as faculty advisor to a recognized student group or organization.

4. University and department promotion in support of such activities as student recruitment.

5. Special assignments such as representing the University at national and international meetings, or organizing and holding conferences at the University.
6. Honors or special recognition for contributions to the department, college, University or to faculty governance.

Service to the Profession: Examples may include:

1. Holding office in professional societies.
2. Service on state, national, and international committees.
3. Giving presentations at professional meetings.
4. Chairing and organizing conferences or technical sessions at professional meetings.
5. Reviewing or editing manuscripts for professional journals and publishers.
6. Membership on review panels.
7. Honors or special recognition for contributions to an organization, discipline, or profession.

Service to the Public: Examples include only those activities that are job related.

1. Providing expert testimony to courts or legislative bodies.
2. Consulting for individuals or corporations engaged in related industry, educational, or scholarly endeavors.
3. Providing technical consultation to professional or non-academic groups.

2.6.4 Collegiality

Collegiality overlays each of the areas described in the above three sections. Collegiality is a much more intangible and nebulous criterion than the other standards.   In most instances, faculty members are professional and mature, and collegiality should not be an issue. On the other hand, to protect department well-being, it is important to make this criterion explicit so that collegiality may be considered as a criterion for evaluation.

Collegiality is not explicitly ranked, but a failure of collegiality is considered to be disruptive to the Department and may adversely affect how well the individual or others carry out their assigned responsibilities. Failure of collegiality in a major area is grounds for a rating of unacceptable for that area.

3. 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 its members accountable for high professional standards.

A post-tenure review should be performed for all tenured faculty either every six years, in the sixth year following promotion or awarding of a major university performance award or in the sixth year following other post-tenure review clock reset events as specified in Appendix W of the University Handbook. For such reviews faculty will prepare a post-tenure review document containing a summary of his or her accomplishments for the past 6 years and a statement of their goals for the coming 6 years. The Department Head will perform the post-tenure review using that document and the annual evaluations for the 6-year period as the basis for the review. It will be determined that the faculty member is making appropriate contributions to the University if they have received at least satisfactory annual evaluations, there is evidence that deficiencies listed in any evaluation are being appropriately addressed by the faculty member, and the Department Head approves of the faculty member's goals for the next 6 years.

Kansas State University recognizes that the granting of tenure for university faculty is a vital protection of free inquiry and open intellectual debate. It is expressly recognized that nothing in this policy alters or amends the University's policies regarding removal of tenured faculty members for cause (which are stipulated in the University Handbook). This policy and any actions taken under it are separate from and have no bearing on the chronic low achievement or annual evaluation policies and processes.

The department policy on post tenure review follows the overarching purpose, principles, objectives, and procedures in the university policy on post tenure review (see University

Handbook, Appendix W), which was approved by Faculty Senate on February 11, 2014."

4. Professorial Performance Award

Documents: Faculty at the professor level will use their annual evaluation documents to collect data needed to apply for a Professorial Performance Award (PPA). When a decision has been made to apply for the PPA, the candidate must compile a file that documents her or his professional accomplishments for the previous six years. These accomplishments should be in accordance with department-level criteria, standards, and guidelines for productivity associated with promotion to Professor. External letters of candidate's performance evaluation are not required.

Evaluation: University policies together with department-level annual evaluations will be used to determine a professor's eligibility for the PPA. To be eligible for consideration, the individual must have overall annual evaluation ratings of at least 4.0 in at least five of the last six years. Professors who were not evaluated by the department head due to significant administrative appointments during the last six years must have overall annual evaluation ratings of at least 4.0 in the years they were on non-administrative appointments. All the candidates must also satisfy the performance criteria specified in section C49 of the University Handbook.

The department head may appoint a 3-person committee from the department faculty who are at the rank of Professor to assist in the review. This committee will have access to the material submitted by the candidate.

5. Chronic Low Achievement

Procedure: If the department head determines that a tenured faculty member appears not to meet the minimum standard in any area of assigned responsibility, a committee of Professors will be convened (unless the faculty member requests otherwise) to review performance. If the department head receives adequate evidence that an individual does not meet the minimum-acceptable level of productivity in any substantial or critical area of work, then action will be initiated following procedures outlined in the University Handbook.

Standards: All faculty members must perform all duties outlined in the KSU University Handbook and be in compliance with all university policies. The "minimum-acceptable level of productivity" standards established in this document will apply to all tenured faculty members in the department. Exceptions will be documented and signed by the faculty member and the department head.

Decisions on acceptable performance levels must contain the individual judgments of the faculty and administrators involved in the decision.

Productivity in each area will be evaluated based on assigned activities and the percentage of the individual's appointment allocated to that activity. Each faculty member is expected to perform, as a minimum, the following activities, as assigned:

Teaching

1. Be conscientious about meeting classes on time; about the content, organization and presentation of lectures; and about the appropriate evaluation of students.

2. Strive to be consistent in content and depth of material covered in required courses such that the students earning a 'C' or better are appropriately prepared for following courses.

3. Work to keep course materials current. Ensure the appropriate mix of analysis, design, and computer tools is covered.

4. Perform student advising conscientiously.

Research

1. Engage in scholarly and other creative activities appropriate to the profession.
2. Serve as graduate student advisor and/or committee member, and be conscientious about attending exam presentations of all students in whose committee they serve on.

Service

1. Serve on departmental committees.

2. Attend departmental meetings.

3. Attend appropriate functions such as graduation.

6. Evaluation, Reappointment and Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Non-tenure track faculty members will have primary responsibilities in either teaching or research. Non-tenure track research faculty members may be recruited, hired, and appointed into regular or term positions, as assistant research professor, associate research professor, or research professor.   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 as assistant teaching professor, associate teaching professor, or teaching professor, if holding a terminal degree (usually PhD). Individuals with industry experience may be appointed as professor of practice or 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.

Both the department head and the non-tenure track faculty review committee provide recommendations for reappointment and promotion to the college. The non-tenure track faculty

review committee consists of all faculty members on regular appointments actively serving in the department (excluding the department head) who are above the rank of the individual being considered for promotion or reappointment. The chair of this committee is a full-time tenured faculty member with the highest rank in the department and is selected by the department head. The chair is also a voting member of the committee.

In the event that 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.

The Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering recognizes the value of and contributions made by all faculty whether on regular, term, or adjunct appointment. While participation on certain faculty committees like CCOP/DCOP, promotion, tenure and reappointment committees and Faculty Senate is reserved for those holding regular appointments, we encourage all faculty to participate and provide leadership in faculty meetings as well on other committees and activities.

Annual Evaluations

Non-tenure track faculty members will be reviewed by the department head and/or designated supervisor annually in accordance with Section 1 in the Faculty Evaluation Procedures defined earlier in this document.   In addition, faculty members on regular appointments also have a separate reappointment evaluation.   In both cases, the Department or Unit Head will provide information about deadlines and guidelines about materials to be prepared, sufficiently in advance of deadlines to allow for preparation and review.

Annual Reappointment Evaluation

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 2.6. 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 inform the chair of the non-tenure track review committee and schedule a meeting of the non-tenure track review committee to discuss the reappointment of the non-tenure track faculty member. The chair of the non-tenure track review committee 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 votes for reappointment or

non-reappointment. The chair of the non-tenure track review committee will provide the vote and verbatim comments of committee members to the Department Head within one week of the meeting. The Department Head will forward the vote of the committee and verbatim faculty comments along with her/his recommendation to the Dean. The Department Head's letter alone will be made available to the candidate.

Mid-rank Evaluations

A non-tenure track faculty member who does not hold the highest academic rank for which she or he is eligible may request a mid-rank evaluation by the department head, usually three years after the most recent rank appointment. 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 his or her 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 member 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 member 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 in order to facilitate success in his or her professional advancement.

Promotion Procedures

The procedures for promotion in the instructor, teaching professor, research professor, and professor of practice ranks are similar to 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 of tenure-track faculty.

A non-tenure track faculty member seeking promotion should submit his or her portfolio to the department head by Sept. 1. The portfolio should document scholarship in 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 of documentation 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 candidate's portfolio is appended with a report from the non-tenure track faculty review

committee. This report must contain the results of the vote for promotion along with unedited comments from the non-tenure track review committee. The portfolio is also appended with a report from the department head which includes his or her recommendation on promotion. A copy of the department head's written recommendation letter alone is forwarded to the candidate. 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 will make a recommendation to the Deans Council for its consideration and is responsible to communicate the outcome back to the candidate.

Individuals promoted to advanced instructor, teaching associate professor, or research associate professor should demonstrate strong performance in all areas of their appointments. Additional information related to teaching, research and service may also be provided as described in Section 2.6. In regard 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 appointments 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 or to a term appointment for a period of one to three years.   Regular appointments are entitled to Notice of Non-Reappointment, while term appointments have no Notice of Non-Reappointment.

Attachments: Faculty Appraisal Form
Faculty Accomplishments/Plans Form
ECE Promotion, Tenure, Mid-Tenure Review, and Reappointment Guidelines