

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on November 29, 2011;
Revisions approved by Faculty Vote on August 22, 2012)**

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on November 29, 2011;
Revisions approved by Faculty Vote on August 22, 2012)**

**REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES INCLUDING THE CHRONIC
LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE
AWARD*: 8/31/2017**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: 8/31/2017

David K. Lambert, Department Head

Date signed: 8/24/2012

John Floros, Dean

Date signed: 8/27/2012

April Mason, Provost

Date signed: 8/31/2012

**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.*

Professorial Performance Award – Agricultural Economics

On February 14, 2006, the Kansas State University Faculty Senate approved the final version of a ‘Professorial Performance Award’ policy. The procedures were accepted by a majority vote of the Department of Agricultural Economics Faculty on April 11, 2006, and approved with changes during the adoption of the “*Criteria For Faculty Evaluation, Mid-Tenure Review, Tenure And Promotion, Department Of Agricultural Economics*” in 2011. The Professorial Performance Award criteria will be subject to review at least every five years as a part of the review of the “*Criteria for Faculty Evaluation, Mid-Tenure Review, Tenure And Promotion.*”

Professorial Performance Award Policy

In order to be recommended to the Dean of the College of Agriculture for a Professorial Performance Award, a faculty member must be a full-time, full professor in rank at Kansas State University for at least six years since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award, and must, over the previous six-year period, have demonstrated sustained productivity within his/her areas of responsibility.

Minimum Criteria

A candidate must have demonstrated, over the six-year time period preceding application for the Professorial Performance Award a level of productivity and scholarship that is equivalent to departmental expectations for promotion from an associate professor to a full professor.

A candidate must have earned an overall merit evaluation of ‘*Very Good (+)*’ or above in at least four of the preceding six years, with at least two years being rated as ‘*Exceptional (-)*’ or better.

The six-year time frame will include the most recent performance review.

Process

Any candidate meeting the minimum criteria may apply for a performance award. To apply, a candidate must assemble a performance award file that documents his/her scholarly accomplishments over the past six years. A candidate’s file shall be similar in format to a typical promotion file and shall, depending on the individual’s responsibilities, include the following elements:

- 1) A one-page summary of major achievements during the evaluation period
- 2) A one-page summary of instructional productivity, including courses taught, student advisement, and thesis supervision, in addition to evidence of instructional quality such as ratings, peer evaluations, or evaluation of advising
- 3) A one-page statement of research and other creative activities accompanied by a list of publications and a list of funded grants and contracts
- 4) A one-page summary of extension activity providing evidence of productivity, quality, creativity, and originality, accompanied by a list of extension publications, meetings, workshops, etc.
- 5) A one-page statement of service contributions, including evidence of leadership

The candidate will submit the file to the Department Head who will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials in terms of the criteria, standards, and guidelines established, along with a recommendation for or against the award. External reviews of the candidate's file are not required.

A copy of the Department Head's written evaluation and recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate. Within seven working days of receiving the Department Head's evaluation and recommendations, the candidate at his or her discretion may discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the Department Head. Each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. Within seven working days after indicating the right to a meeting with the Department Head is waived or within seven days after meeting with the Department Head to review and discuss the evaluation, each candidate has the right to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation to the Department Head or to the Dean.

The Department Head will submit the following items to the Dean:

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

The ultimate decision of whether a candidate is awarded a Professorial Performance Award will be made by the Provost (University Handbook section C49.10). The timelines for this process will be established each year by the Provost's office, but this process will typically begin sometime in January of each year. Prospective candidates are encouraged to consult with the Department Head to help determine if he/she meets the minimum criteria.

Approved by Agricultural Economics Faculty - September 14, 2011
Revisions Approved by Agricultural Economics Faculty - August 22, 2012

**CRITERIA FOR FACULTY ANNUAL EVALUATION, MID-TENURE REVIEW,
TENURE AND PROMOTION**
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Introduction

Determination of promotion, tenure, mid-tenure, and reappointment of tenure-track faculty are peer-reviewed processes that demand evidence of achievement and professional development. Peer reviews shall consider the quality of the accomplishments, initiative, outcomes, creativity, problem-solving skills, productivity, adaptability, judgment, interpersonal relations, communication skills, organizational planning and decision-making abilities. Competency in the responsibilities of the faculty position description, as indicated in positive annual performance reviews by the unit administrator, may not necessarily justify positive mid-tenure review, or the granting of tenure or promotion.

Review Process

Annual Evaluation of All Faculty Members. All faculty members with a formal assignment of one tenth or greater must annually provide information on position responsibilities, program planning objectives and program accomplishments using the department's standard annual planning and evaluation guidelines and forms. Evaluations are based on the calendar year. The procedures and policies contained in Section C of the KSU University Handbook¹ provide information for faculty and evaluators. In addition, faculty members with an extension appointment of five tenths or more are expected to complete the Monthly Activity Report. Submission for departmental review of additional annual planning and evaluation information requested by the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service, including the Annual Plan of Work, the Four Year Plan of Work, and annual Narrative Accomplishment Report and the annual Individual Development Plan is optional. The department's standard annual evaluation documents may be submitted in lieu of the reporting information required by Kansas State Research and Extension.

Weights assigned to various responsibilities are jointly determined by the faculty member and Department Head during the annual performance evaluation review meeting of the faculty member and the Department Head. During this annual evaluation meeting, faculty goals for the next year are to be discussed and where necessary modifications to goals and/or responsibility weights shall be jointly determined to ensure consistency between goals and faculty responsibilities during the coming year. Given the importance of responsibility weights in determining overall faculty performance, weights may be changed during the year with the mutual agreement of the faculty member and the Department Head. For each responsibility area and for the overall performance rating, five performance ratings are possible: unsatisfactory, fair,

¹ Specific references to faculty annual evaluations are contained in policies C40-C48.3 (Annual Merit Salary Evaluations for Faculty and Unclassified Professionals).

good, very good, and exceptional. Summary statistics are to be reported to individual faculty members in their evaluation letter.

If faculty members do not agree with the annual evaluation received, they are encouraged to seek clarification and further review of the evaluation letter and summary of their performance. Guidance provided in sections C40-C48 of the University Handbook provides procedural details.

In years in which merit pay for performance is available,

(University Handbook) C46.2 *The unit head will recommend a salary adjustment for each person evaluated. The recommended percentage increases based on the annual evaluation for persons with higher levels of accomplishment shall exceed those for persons with lower levels of accomplishment. If merit salary categories are utilized, then the percentage recommended for persons in the first category will be higher than those for the second category, which in turn shall exceed those for level of accomplishment in the third category, etc. As a rough guide, average percentage increases in the highest category are expected to be about twice those in the lowest category; this ratio is expected to fluctuate both with the degree to which members of the unit differ in effectiveness and with the degree to which funds are available. These recommendations are made before the legislature has appropriated funds to support salary increases. Therefore, percentage increases should be projected and identified for each individual or each merit salary category, if used, based upon the governor's budget recommendations. Recommendations of dollar and percentage increases should not be communicated to individuals until the appropriation for salary increases is known.*

Annual Reappointment, Mid-Tenure, Tenure and Promotion Evaluation. All tenure-track faculty members will be evaluated each year to determine reappointment for the following academic year. Current Provost guidelines specify tenure eligible faculty are to be evaluated each November. Reappointment review will evaluate candidate progress towards eventual promotion and tenure decisions outlined by departmental guidelines in this document.

Procedures for reappointment review are outlined in University Handbook sections C50.1-C56. Specific policies include:

C53.1 *Departmental procedures. It is the responsibility of the department chair/head to make the candidate's reappointment file available to all tenured faculty members in the department and other eligible faculty as determined by departmental policy. A cumulative record of written recommendations and accompanying explanations forwarded to the candidate from previous reappointment meetings, and any written comments from relevant individuals outside the department will also be made available to the eligible faculty (See [C53.2](#)). As part of this process, the department chair/head and the eligible faculty will meet at least fourteen calendar days after the review documents are made available, to discuss the candidate's eligibility for reappointment and progress toward tenure. Subsequent to this meeting there will be a ballot of the eligible faculty on reappointment of the candidate. Any member of the eligible faculty may, prior to the submission of any recommendation to the department chair/head, request the candidate meet with the eligible faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate.*

C53.3 *The department chair/head will forward a written recommendation and accompanying explanations to the dean, along with the candidate's complete file, the majority recommendation and unedited written comments of each of the department's tenured faculty members. The department chair/head will also meet with the candidate to discuss the separate issue of the candidate's progress toward tenure. The department chair/head's written recommendation and accompanying explanations alone will be made available to the candidate and will become part of the candidate's reappointment file. (See [C35](#) regarding confidentiality of peer evaluations.)*

All faculty with a formal assignment of one tenth or greater provide evaluation information, when being evaluated for mid-tenure review, tenure or promotion, by using the standard university guidelines and forms in the documents, *Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Mid-Tenure Review* and *Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation* (both forms available at

<http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/index.html>). Although timing considerations are less important than faculty accomplishments, timing of specific faculty reviews are provided by the Provost each year, with normal expectations for the mid-tenure review to occur in the third year of service and full tenure consideration to occur in the sixth year of service.

Procedures for tenure and/or promotion review are outlined in University Handbook sections C110-C116.2 and C150-C156.2. Application materials for a faculty member seeking tenure and/or promotion must contain four external letters from peers in other universities. The faculty member and the Department Head will each select two individuals who will be asked to evaluate the faculty member's record. These peers should be at or above the rank for which the faculty member is being promoted. The Department Head will contact the individuals providing external letters and inform the faculty member of the names of outside reviewers contacted. If a faculty member seeking tenure and/or promotion does not agree with the Department Head's selection of peers, he or she should state the basis for this disagreement in their tenure and promotion documentation.

Providing feedback to evaluated individuals is the responsibility of the Department Head. However, discussions in faculty meetings where faculty are evaluated should be considered public information unless peers request that evaluation comments not be included in the official record of the evaluation discussion. Faculty in attendance should be prepared to provide feedback to individuals being evaluated. A committee of two full professors elected by faculty to rotating two-year terms will be responsible for reviewing evaluation letters regarding reappointment, mid-tenure, tenure and promotion written by the Department Head and addressed to the individuals being evaluated. Evaluated individuals are encouraged to consult with the committee members regarding any questions concerning communications from the Department Head.

Criteria for the Evaluation of Faculty Performance

Evaluation of performance is based on comparing accomplishments to responsibilities and objectives. The most definitive statements of objectives for use in personnel evaluation are expectations of performance. The establishment of standards and the measurement of performance should be as objective as possible. Nevertheless, evaluation involves numerous

subjective judgments because not all responsibilities, objectives and accomplishments are easily quantifiable. They are also not all easily comparable between faculty members because of the diversity between positions, even within one discipline or department. Therefore, substantial flexibility should be permitted in defining expectations and measuring performance. Ultimately, evaluators must use good judgment to fairly and clearly communicate expectations and to evaluate performance compared to these expectations.

The purpose behind presenting performance criteria is to clarify evaluation philosophy and expectations of the evaluators. Responsibility for annual evaluations lies with department administrators. Annual reappointment, mid-tenure, tenure and promotion decisions rely upon the evaluations of department administrators and eligible faculty. Tenured faculty holding ranks equal to or higher than those sought by the candidates are deemed eligible for voting on annual reappointment, mid-tenure, tenure and promotion decisions.

Teaching, research, and extension are each recognized as important activities in accordance with the mission statement of Kansas State University. Criteria are based on what is expected of any faculty member at a major land-grant university such as Kansas State University with a three-fold mission of instruction (teaching or academic programs), research and Extension (including outreach and service). The KSU University Handbook and the KSU Handbook for Annual Evaluation of Unclassified Personnel provide general criteria of performance expectations. Criteria are also based on the missions of Kansas State University, the College of Agriculture, and of the Department of Agricultural Economics:

Mission of Kansas State University

(<http://www.k-state.edu/provost/planning/mission.html>)

The mission of Kansas State University is to foster excellent teaching, research, and service that develop a highly skilled and educated citizenry necessary to advancing the well-being of Kansas, the nation, and the international community. The university embraces diversity, encourages engagement and is committed to the discovery of knowledge, the education of undergraduate and graduate students, and improvement in the quality of life and standard of living of those we serve.

Mission of the College of Agriculture

(<http://www.ag.ksu.edu/p.aspx?tabid=348>)

The mission of the College of Agriculture is to develop human capital at the undergraduate and graduate levels to support agriculture, agriculturally related industries, natural resources management, education and research. In doing so, the College of Agriculture educates people for productive lives that contribute to agriculture, society and to the economic competitiveness of Kansas.

Mission of the Department of Agricultural Economics

(<http://www.ageconomics.ksu.edu/p.aspx?tabid=361>)

Through teaching, research, and extension, our mission is to improve economic choices and management decisions of individuals, families, farms, businesses, communities, organizations, and policy makers in areas related to agriculture, food, resources, and economic development.

Performance Criteria for Extension, Research, Teaching, and Service

I. Extension

Extension programs provide practical, research-based information and education programs on critical issues and decision problems facing citizens in numerous different roles. Those roles include the individual, family member, agricultural producer, employee, business manager, community leader and professional. Extension programs may need to be proactive or reactive (responsive), depending on the situation. They are expected to be action-oriented and to stimulate behavioral changes that help citizens more effectively fill their chosen roles. Faculty with extension responsibilities are expected to first choose audiences, issues, decision problems, subject matter and educational methods and then produce results judged to be highly relevant, of high quality and high impact.

Significant accomplishment in meeting agreed upon professional responsibilities generally requires independent, interdependent and creative work in program management and operations. Significant accomplishment in several but not necessarily all of the following eight unranked areas are required:

1. Program impact assessment and outcomes. Faculty need to conduct or participate in well-planned evaluations of program impact that may span a period of several years. Evaluation of a program needs to focus on impacts and outcomes that have made a measurable difference.
2. Creativity. Examples of creativity include willingness to try new concepts, develop pilot efforts or use innovative approaches in program development, delivery or evaluation.
3. Breadth of activities. Show a breadth of activities related to goals associated with the job description and programming objectives. Activities should not stand alone but support a plan for achieving educational objectives.
4. Leadership. Leadership involves seeking out new opportunities beyond the status quo. Leaders envision the future with a positive and hopeful outlook. Leaders are clear about their values and beliefs, and they encourage people to persist in their efforts by linking recognition with accomplishments, visibly recognizing contributions and the common vision.
5. Teaching techniques and skill. Feedback to the faculty member and appropriate administrators from clientele and peers is useful and encouraged. Administrators/evaluators are encouraged to personally observe faculty perform in an educational environment.
6. Publications and Research Dissemination. Publications should include bulletins, fact sheets, field day reports, refereed journal articles, books, book chapters, invited papers,

presented papers, published abstracts, non-refereed journal articles, white papers, videos, slide sets, computer software, and emerging communication media.

7. Grants and user fees support. The expectation is that faculty will obtain outside support for program development, enhancement, and dissemination. Grant evaluation will include total dollar amount of grants the faculty member is an investigator on awarded to Kansas State University and the dollar contribution of grants directly supporting the Department.
8. Research. Research should support an individual's overall extension program. Research publications in appropriate/relevant outlets are strongly encouraged as is participation in graduate student advising.

All professionals are expected to improve their own professional knowledge and skills to assist in developing other professionals and to be recognized by peers and clientele for their accomplishments. Three additional performance criteria are:

9. Teamwork. Support of issue-based programming teams is critical, and contributions to goal setting, program planning, developing educational materials, program delivery, and/or program evaluations are strongly encouraged.
10. Professional relations, growth and development. Communicating and sharing knowledge with other professionals within the state, nation and world and regularly participating in regional and national meetings enhance one's effectiveness. Writing for peers is strongly encouraged.
11. Professional distinction. Recognition by peers or clientele for outstanding academic, program or service achievements can indicate program excellence.

II. Research.

Evaluating research productivity and quality involves a myriad of products to be considered. Research often results in numerous intermediate products which ultimately end in finished products. Finished research products may include publication, theses, dissertations, or other output. Evidence of a productive and high quality research program resulting in finished research products is essential.

Research productivity needs to be assessed in accordance with individual position appointments. Individuals having relatively high percentages of research appointments are expected to exhibit more productive research programs than those having small percentage appointments.

Research Productivity

Research Productivity

1. Publications:

- i. The number of publications must be considered jointly with the number and order of authors, (sole authorship will receive most credit, followed by senior authorship, etc. Collaborative work is encouraged.)
- ii. Instances of graduate students as first authors and faculty as second generally suggests larger faculty input than publications with other faculty as first author,

Relevant measures of publication output (in decreasing order of importance) include:

- a) Published disciplinary refereed journal articles
- b) Multidisciplinary refereed journals
- c) Other refereed publications including research based books
- d) Book chapters.
- e) Proceedings, invited papers, selected papers, published abstracts, posters, etc.
- f) Non-refereed publications
- g) Computer software and various forms of electronic communication

Quality of research discovery and research impact will be considered in evaluation of the listed publication outputs. Relevant quality measures of individual publications and/or research programs include, but are not limited to, journal acceptance rates, published rankings of journals, journal impact factors, author citations, h-index, and article awards and recognition.

2. Extramural Funding:

Extramural funding should be considered a valuable part of an active research program. Extramural funding should be more strongly evaluated with respect to promotion from associate to full professor. Generally, assistant professors need to establish an expertise and a program before being able to attract grants.

Comparisons based solely on dollars received of extramural funding should be avoided since grant opportunities differ by research specialty area. Participation in large, multidisciplinary grants is considered a valuable component of a successful grant portfolio. Grant evaluation will include total dollar amount of grants the faculty member is an investigator on awarded to Kansas State University and the dollar contribution of grants directly supporting the Department.

3. Presentations:

Presentations of research results are encouraged. Invited presentations are useful in identifying national and international expertise in a program area. Presentations of research are generally an intermediate product, with greater weights applied to subsequent publication of research results.

4. Graduate Student Training:

Graduate student training is an integral part of an active research training program and should be encouraged.

5. Graduate Committees:

Faculty with research appointments and teaching graduate courses should be members of the K-State Graduate Faculty and be certified to direct doctoral dissertations. Criteria governing admission to the K-State Graduate Faculty are detailed at the Graduate School website:

(<http://www.k-state.edu/grad/gscurrent/handbook/chap5.htm#c>).

Directing Doctoral Dissertations:

Research accomplishments that must be met for a faculty member to be certified to direct doctoral dissertations are:

A faculty member must have three articles published in disciplinary refereed journals. In addition, the faculty member must be a sole author on one of the three articles or senior author on more than one.

Research accomplishments that must be met for a faculty member to be recertified to direct doctoral dissertations are:

In a six-year period a graduate faculty member must meet one of the following criteria. (1) Produce three publications in refereed journals. (2) Produce one refereed journal article of which the author is first or second author and six additional publications of scholarly output of which the faculty member is the first author. These publications must be peer reviewed and can include proceedings papers, experiment station publications, extension publications, chapters in research oriented books, and graduate level text books.

B. Quality of Research Program

Assessing the quality, significance, and impact of research is extremely important. The research program should be of sufficient depth to delineate and develop areas of expertise within the guidelines of the faculty member's position. Research programs with excessive breadth may make limited contributions to science. Metrics to be considered in judging research quality include:

1. Journal Quality:

The type of journals one publishes in needs to be considered. Publishing in higher "quality" journals presumably suggests higher level of research contribution.

However, research published in more applied journals can also make significant contributions.

2. Program Prominence:

The faculty researcher needs to develop a nationally or internationally recognized program and develop expertise in an area relevant to the position.

3. Relevance:

Research supported by the Experiment Station should be relevant to important problems consistent with the mission of Kansas State Research and Extension.

4. Creativity:

Researchers should be willing to develop new concepts or use innovative approaches.

5. Interdisciplinary Research:

Independent research is valuable. However, interdisciplinary projects are encouraged for problems requiring interdisciplinary approaches.

6. Professional/Industry Recognition of Research Contributions:

Recognition by peers and clientele for outstanding research achievements may indicate the quality of research programs.

7. Evidence of Professional Contributions:

Organizing symposiums, editing proceedings, reviewing of articles, the author's h-index, journal rankings published in, research awards, and citation listings are considered evidence of quality of research program.

III. Teaching

Teaching is an art rather than a science. Therefore, evaluation is difficult and subjective. Criteria for evaluation of teaching of on-campus courses and Distance Education courses should be flexible, taking into account departmental goals and priorities. Teaching activities should be compatible with the mission of the Office of Academic Programs in the College of Agriculture.

Both quantity and quality of teaching need to be recognized for evaluation procedures. Quantity considerations include course development efforts. The majority of these efforts fall into the semester the course is first taught with some spillover into the second time a course is taught. Subsequent to development of a course, there will be semesters where

maintenance occurs and when substantial updating of material occurs. Some courses require more frequent updating than others which should be recognized.

Characteristics of the courses which impact workload also need to be explicitly recognized. Number of students, homework development and grading, student consulting, paper and exam frequency and grading impact instructor workload. Some of this workload may be shared by teaching assistants. In addition, workload is impacted by type of course; i.e., case studies, lecturing, labs, computer assignments, and general education requirements can all impact workload.

Quality measurement of teaching is subjective, but it is based on several criteria. Teacher evaluations may be used for self-improvement purposes and/or for evaluation purposes. Teacher evaluations used for evaluation purposes are part of a larger process and while they contribute to the evaluation, they should not be isolated from accompanying documentation which provides additional information regarding the course. All faculty members (regardless of rank) must evaluate their courses and submit student evaluation material for faculty evaluation purposes. All teaching faculty must utilize the TEVAL form (with departmentally approved supplemental questions) in every course, and may in addition use other methods or evaluation forms for evaluation and self-improvement purposes. Voluntary use of teaching evaluation services outside the department and peer review of teaching are encouraged. The summary of teaching evaluations for each class should be accompanied by documentation supplied by the instructor that states circumstances which they feel may influence the course evaluations. Circumstances may include (but are not limited to) level of course, number of students, level of difficulty, grading standards, makeup of class (e.g., general education course), popularity of topics, teaching method issues, changes in methods, experimentation, etc. This documentation should accompany teaching evaluation summaries at higher levels of consideration for promotion and tenure.

In addition to the evaluations, materials documenting the course content (outline, reading lists, homework assignments, exams) should be provided by instructors.

Consideration must be given to how well the teaching assignment aligns with the individual faculty member's areas of expertise. If an instructor is teaching a course well outside their area of expertise, but the department has to maintain the assignment, this should be taken into consideration in evaluation procedures.

Senior interviews (with questions approved by the faculty) also provide information regarding instructor performance. The Department Head should relay this information to faculty and the information should be considered in the evaluation process. As with teaching evaluations, documentation related to circumstances that may influence senior exit interview responses should be included in the instructor's evaluation material.

The synthesis of these materials in a subjective fashion results in an overall teacher evaluation. Faculty should be advised of their standing in the evaluation process and be given the chance to respond to the overall teacher evaluation. For promotion and tenure

decisions, faculty must achieve acceptable quantity and quality levels in this subjective synthesis to receive positive recommendations for promotion and tenure.

Criteria to be examined in the evaluation process include the following.

- A. **Criterion 1:** Facilitate student learning and promote students' interest in, and appreciation for, subjects being taught. Important attributes of this criterion include: interest in students, enthusiasm for the subject, ability to stimulate critical thinking, preparation and organization, effective communication, flexibility and sensitivity to class needs, and availability to help students. This criterion may be evaluated by student classroom evaluations, senior exit interviews, and review of course materials.
- B. **Criterion 2:** Maintain relevancy and currency of courses. Instructors should make sure that their courses are relevant to the needs of the students and to the departmental teaching goals. In addition, instructors should periodically review the latest information relating to their courses and make every effort to incorporate significant new information in order for students to have the latest knowledge available to them. The frequency of course revision will vary depending on the field of study. This criterion may be evaluated by student classroom evaluations, lists of objectives for the courses, course outlines/syllabi and reading lists.
- C. **Criterion 3:** Depending on responsibilities, some additional professional activities may be beneficial to faculty development. However, not all of these areas will apply to every instructor. Additionally, few instructors will have an opportunity to engage in all these activities in a single year. These additional areas should aid a teacher's evaluation, but all are not necessarily required to demonstrate teaching effectiveness. These areas include:
 - 1. **Professional Development**
 - a. Continuing education/professional development examples include workshops, professional meetings, and sabbaticals.
 - b. Regional and national distinctions and recognition by peers or students for outstanding achievements related to teaching.
 - 2. **Curriculum Development**
 - a. Contributions to curriculum design and improvement.
 - b. Contributions to solutions of departmental issues or concerns relative to educational programs.
 - c. Development or incorporation of new technologies or techniques in the classroom.
 - d. Development or participation in interdisciplinary or inter-institutional teaching programs.
 - 3. **Student Advising and Supervision**
 - a. Undergraduate student advising. Both quantity and quality of advising need to be recognized for evaluation purposes. Measurement of advising

- quality is subjective, but routine contact with students and senior interviews can provide information regarding advising performance.
- b. Graduate student advising. Both the number of students advised and the quality of advising should be considered. Routine contact with students and exit interviews can provide qualitative information of advising performance.
 - c. Supervision of graduate teaching assistants.

4. Academic Activities.

- a. Grant activity for funds received for teaching-related activities and enhancements. Grant evaluation will include total dollar amount of grants the faculty member is an investigator on awarded to Kansas State University and the dollar contribution of grants directly supporting the Department.
- b. Publication of refereed or non-refereed manuscripts on teaching. (Evaluation of publications to be done according to Section II, A.I)
- c. Authorship of textbooks.

IV. General Recognition of Service.

Faculty members are expected to contribute to the shared governance necessary for the operation of Kansas State University. Recognition of these contributions shall be explicit in faculty annual evaluations as well as in mid-tenure reviews, tenure, and promotion decisions. Service contributions are expected to increase as faculty progress in their careers from assistant to associate to full professor. Service contributions to professional, government, industry, and non-profit organizations shall also be considered in faculty evaluations.

In all cases, the extent and value of the contributions shall be considered in faculty evaluations.

Service contributions shall be characterized as:

- A. Directed Service, to include:** Administrative assignments such as: assistant unit heads, program directors, or state extension leaders.
- B. Non-directed Service, to include:** Supervision of student clubs; memberships on committees (departmental, college, university, national or professional); advisory and consulting activities; participation in non-appointment activities; international activities, (resident faculty only); contribution to development of departmental goals and activities; professional association activities including editorial services, reviewing articles, award committees and holding association offices.
- C. Faculty Citizenship:**
 - 1. Ability to coexist and cooperate with faculty peers.

2. Faculty mentoring. Faculty evaluation should recognize contributions made serving as effective mentors. Mentoring activities should be summarized in the evaluation documentation of faculty serving as mentors.

Chronic Low Achievement Policy

Chronic failure of a tenured faculty member to meet his or her professional duties as a faculty member of Kansas State University may warrant consideration for “dismissal for cause.” (University Handbook sections C31.5-C31.7).

Chronic low achievement will be determined based upon the tenured faculty member's Annual Faculty Evaluation reports. Only ratings from responsibility areas in which the faculty member has formal appointed responsibilities will be considered. The Department Head may initiate a process to improve job performance for a tenured faculty member who has received a rating of “Unsatisfactory” in any responsibility area for which that faculty member has a 20 percent or greater formal appointment. Following an evaluation of an unsatisfactory performance in one or more of the faculty member’s areas of responsibility, the Department Head shall indicate to the faculty member in writing a suggested course of action to improve performance. In the subsequent annual evaluation, the faculty member shall report on activities undertaken to improve performance and provide evidence of performance improvements. If the faculty member receives an unsatisfactory evaluation in the same or in a different responsibility area in the second year following the adoption of a suggested course of remedial action, or three unsatisfactory evaluations in a five-year period, the Department Head will convene a meeting of the tenured faculty members and present annual evaluation summaries, evidence of written suggestions for performance improvement, subsequent actions undertaken by the faculty member to improve performance, and evidence of any impacts on faculty performance of adopted actions. An anonymous written ballot either supporting or not supporting dismissal for cause will be conducted by tenured faculty members. All evidence provided to the tenured faculty members, results of the tenured faculty members vote, and a letter of preferred action from the Department Head reviewed by two elected members of the tenured faculty members will be forwarded to the Dean. The affected faculty member will have seven business days to provide additional materials to the Dean of Agriculture regarding the department finding. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations of unsatisfactory in a responsibility area comprising 20 percent or greater of their appointment, or if the faculty member has a total of three unsatisfactory evaluations in any five-year period, then the Dean may initiate proceedings to “dismiss with cause.”

In cases in which dismissal is not recommended, the Dean and Department Head will provide a letter to the affected faculty member providing clear expectations and necessary actions for improving performance. If the Department Head determines that significant improvement has not taken place in the evaluation of faculty member performance in the year following receipt of remedial actions necessary to improve performance, the Department Head will provide the Dean of Agriculture with evidence supporting his or her finding of continued low achievement. Extenuating circumstances detailed in University Handbook policy C31.7, such as equitable allocation of duties or correctable personal considerations affecting faculty member performance must be considered prior to final dismissal.

Upon receipt of a final decision to dismiss due to chronic low achievement, the faculty member shall have 30 calendar days to appeal the dismissal decision.