

Agricultural Economics

Department

Agriculture

College

Policy Statement Concerning:

Annual Evaluations

(including Professorial Performance Award Criteria and Standards)

Approved by Faculty Vote on April 11, 2006

Date

Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment

Approved by Faculty Vote on

Date

Chronic Low Achievement Standards

Approved by Faculty Vote on

Date

Sean Fox / Jantel  
Department Head's Signature

6/19/06  
Date

Fred J. Chalich  
Dean's Signature

6-27-06  
Date

Deanne Miller  
Provost's Signature

8/4/06  
Date

<p>For Office of Academic Services Use Only</p> <p>Date Posted to Web: _____</p>
--

## **DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS**

### **ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 6/11/06)**

### **PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 6/11/06)**

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES \*(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **6/2011**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES\*: **6/2011**

**Sean Fox, Department Head**

**Date signed: 6/19/06**

**Fred Cholick, Dean**

**Date signed: 6/27/06**

**M. Duane Nellis, Provost**

**Date signed: 8/04/06**

*\*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, Faculty Senate approved the final version of a 'Professorial Performance Award' policy. The procedures described below were approved by a majority vote of the Department of Agricultural Economics Faculty on April 11, 2006, for inclusion in the "*Criteria For Faculty Evaluation, Mid-Tenure Review, Tenure And Promotion, Department Of Agricultural Economics*" document. These procedures will be subject to review at least every five years as a part of the review of the "*Criteria For Faculty Evaluation, ...*" document.

### **Professorial Performance Award Policy**

To qualify to be recommended to the Dean of the College of Agriculture for a Professional Performance Award, a faculty member must be a full-time, full professor, in rank at Kansas State 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 preceding six-year time period, a level of productivity and scholarship that is equivalent to what the department expects for an associate professor to be promoted to a full professor.

A candidate must have earned a merit evaluation of '*Very Good (+)*' or above in at least four of the 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, who meets 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 should be similar in format to a typical promotion file and should, 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. The candidate will have an opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the department head, and each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, each candidate has the opportunity 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 adjudicating eligibility for the award.

As described in the University Handbook, the ultimate decision of whether a candidate is awarded a Professorial Performance Award will be made by the Provost. The timelines for this process will be established each year by the Provost's office, but candidates should know that this process will 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.

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

**Introduction**

Promotion, tenure, mid-tenure, and reappointment of faculty review are peer-reviewed processes that demand evidence of achievement and professional development for the faculty member being reviewed. Peer reviews of the documentation and results of the faculty member's efforts should 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, should not necessarily justify positive mid-tenure review, or the granting of tenure or promotion.

**Process**

**Annual Evaluation.** All faculty with a formal assignment of one tenth or greater provide annual information on position responsibilities, program planning objectives and program accomplishments using the department's standard annual planning and evaluation guidelines and forms described in Appendix A. Evaluations are based on the calendar year. The procedures, philosophy and policies contained in Section C of the KSU Faculty Handbook<sup>1</sup> and the KSU Handbook for Annual Evaluation of Unclassified Personnel<sup>2</sup> also provide important information for faculty and evaluators. In addition, faculty with an extension appointment of five tenths or more are expected to complete the Monthly Activity Report. 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 are optional. The department's standard annual evaluation documents may be submitted in lieu of this information.

Weights assigned to various responsibilities are jointly determined by the faculty member and Department Head. For each responsibility and the overall performance rating, five performance ratings are possible: unsatisfactory, fair, good, very good, and exceptional. Summary statistics are to be reported to individual faculty members in their evaluation letter.

---

<sup>1</sup>Available in electronic form in KSU's Unicorn on-line information system and available in the department's main office.

<sup>2</sup>A reference copy is available for review from the department's main office.

If faculty members do not agree with the annual evaluation received then they are encouraged to seek clarification and further review of the evaluation letter and summary of their performance. See sections C40-C49 of the Faculty Handbook for further procedural details.

**Annual Reappointment, Mid-Tenure, Tenure and Promotion Evaluation.** 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 document, Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation (see Appendix B). The procedures, philosophy and policies contained in Section C of the KSU Faculty Handbook and the sample time table for the evaluation process (see Appendix C), provide important information for candidates and evaluators.

In addition to the forms referred to above, each faculty member seeking tenure or promotion will need to submit four external letters from peers in other universities. The faculty member and the Department Head will each select two individuals that 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 that are to provide external letters. If a faculty member seeking tenure or promotion does not agree with the Department Head's selection of peers, he or she can state this in their tenure and promotion documentation.

Providing explicit 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 be off the record. Faculty in attendance should be prepared to provide feedback to evaluated individuals. 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 from the department head to the individuals being evaluated. Evaluated individuals are encouraged to consult with the committee members regarding their perception of the clarity of the communication from the department head.

## **Criteria**

Evaluation of performance is based on comparing accomplishments to responsibilities, resources and objectives. The most definitive statement of objectives for use in personnel evaluation are standards of performance. These are the expectations. The establishments of standards and the measurement of performance should be as objective as possible. Nevertheless, evaluation involves numerous subjective judgments because all responsibilities, resources, objectives and accomplishments are not easily quantifiable. They are also not all easily comparable between faculty because of the diversity between positions, even within one discipline or department. Therefore, substantial flexibility should be permitted in defining comparable 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 criteria is to clarify as much as possible evaluation philosophy and expectations of the evaluators. Evaluators for annual evaluation are department

administrators. Evaluators for mid-tenure, tenure and promotion include department administrators and eligible faculty. Eligibility is based on tenure and rank status relative to those being evaluated.

Criteria should identify what is most important. By implication, what is not mentioned or stressed can be assumed to be less important. This information will assist each faculty member in planning, executing and reporting their professional work.

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). Another area, International Programs, is sometimes addressed separately, but this is more an orientation (i.e., international versus domestic) for teaching, research and extension programs than a separate function. Therefore, it is not discussed separately. The KSU Faculty Handbook and the KSU Handbook for Annual Evaluation of Unclassified Personnel provide some general criteria. Criteria are also based on the mission of College of Agriculture and the Department of Agricultural Economics. The three-fold mission of the College is included in Appendix D and the department's Role and Aspiration Statement is in Appendix E.

## **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, or 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 six sub-criteria 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. Evaluations of this type will probably involve a team. Evaluation of a program needs to focus on impacts and outcomes that have made a 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. It is also helpful if administrators/evaluators personally observe faculty perform in an educational environment.
6. Publications. Publications should include bulletins, fact sheets, field day reports,

refereed

In most, but not all positions, the next three sub-criteria become important in carrying out an effective extension educational program and need to be considered. If these sub criteria are not considered, some indication of why they are not involved in an individual's job performance should be noted.

7. 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.
8. Grants and user fees support. Evaluators need to exercise good judgment here because some fields have greater extramural funding opportunities than others. The expectation is, however, that faculty will obtain outside support for program enhancement.
9. Research. Extension research should focus on applied questions that relate to an

individual

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. Two additional sub-criteria are:

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. Writing for fellow peers is strongly encouraged.
11. Professional distinction. Recognition by peers or clientele for outstanding academic, program or service achievements.

## **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 research program is essential and attempts should be made to assess the quality of the research program.

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

### **F. Research Productivity**

#### **1. Publications:**

The number of publications must be considered jointly with:

- a. 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,
- iii. evidence of the individual's identifiable research program (thus, development of expertise),

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

- a. Published disciplinary refereed journal articles
- b. Multidisciplinary refereed journals
- c. Published non disciplinary refereed journal articles compliment those in part a,
- d. Other refereed publications including research based books and book chapters, proceedings, etc.
- e. Non-refereed publications
- f. Computer software and various forms of electronic communication

2. **Extramural Funding:**

Extramural funding should be considered a valuable part of an active research program. This activity 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 (track record) before being able to attract grants. An additional consideration is that extramural funding availability and opportunities vary across program areas.

3. **Presentations:**

Presentations or extension of research are encouraged and should be rewarded because they are one method of conveying output to broad audiences and clientele groups. Invited presentations are useful in identifying national and international expertise in a program area. Presentations of research are generally an intermediate product. The ultimate publications (refereed or otherwise) are the end product.

4. **Graduate Student Training:**

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

## 5. Graduate Committees:

Faculty with research appointments (and any of those teaching graduate courses) should be on graduate faculty and be certified to direct doctoral dissertations according to the following:

### a. Admission to Graduate Faculty:

See Graduate Handbook for details. Criteria to serve on graduate student committees requires (although is not sufficient to guarantee): "... the nominee must have published at least one research article in a refereed journal. The appropriate Area (Social Sciences) Subcommittee is responsible for ascertaining that the nominee is a major contributor to and a principal author of the article; that the paper represents a substantial original contribution to the discipline; and that the referees apply standards accepted by the discipline." (p. 4-2).

### b. Directing Doctoral Dissertations:

Research accomplishments that must be met for a faculty to be certified to direct doctoral dissertations is as follows: "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 is as follows: "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 either 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 significance of research is extremely important. Does the research contribute to the scientific body of knowledge? The research program should be of sufficient depth to delineate and develop areas of expertise within the guidelines of the position. Research programs with excessive breadth may make limited contributions to science. Quality of research program should be evaluated relative to several traits:

**1. Journal:**

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:**

Research 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 the KAES.

**4. Creativity:**

Willingness to develop or try 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, 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 course 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 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 done 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 situation. All faculty (regardless of rank) should evaluate their courses and submit student evaluation material for faculty evaluation purposes. All teaching faculty should 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 "fits" the individual. If it is not a good fit between instructor and course, 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 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 simulate 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**

- e. Continuing education/professional development examples include workshops, professional meetings, sabbaticals.
- b. Regional and national distinctions any 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 teaching, including some credit for proposals submitted in addition to actual funds received and managed.
- b. Publication of refereed or nonrefereed manuscripts on teaching. (Evaluation of publications to be done according to Section II, A.I)
- c. Authorship of textbooks.

#### **IV. General Recognition of Service.**

##### **A. Directed Service, to include:**

1. Administrative assignments such as: assistant unit heads, state extension leaders.
2. Temporary international assignments.

**B. Nondirected 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. Serving as a mentor for new faculty is an important professional leadership role that provides valuable service to the new faculty member, Department, ESARP/College of Agriculture, and the University. 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**

These guidelines provide the criteria under which a tenured faculty member may be deemed to "Fail to Meet Expectations" under the University Chronic Low Achievement Policy. Ratings on the chronic low achievement section of the evaluation form will not have any relationship to, or influence on, traditional promotion decisions.

The policy implementation will be initiated based on the tenured faculty member's ratings from a series of Annual Faculty Evaluation Summary reports of that faculty member. Multiple years are considered because the term "chronic" refers to achievement over a length of time. Only ratings from responsibility areas in which the faculty member has formal appointed responsibilities will be considered. The department head may initiate the chronic low achievement process 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 on 3 of the previous 5 annual evaluation summary reports. The "Unsatisfactory" ratings do not necessarily have to be in the same responsibility area in each year. The department head shall not violate the basic tenets of Academic Freedom granted to faculty members and shall uphold the spirit of tenure as specified in Appendix C of the Kansas State University Faculty Handbook in the process of evaluating faculty members.

After deciding to initiate the chronic low achievement policy with respect to any tenured faculty member based on these criteria, the department head will call for a written vote of support from all tenured faculty members. Subject to approval by the faculty member in question, tenured faculty will be provided with support materials before the vote. Such materials may include, but are not limited to copies of letters sent to the faculty member following each evaluation by the department head which clearly indicate deficiencies, future expectations, and provide future direction and guidance. The faculty member in question will also be given the opportunity to provide materials in support of his or her position to the tenured faculty prior to the written vote. All tenured faculty will be required to vote by secret ballot to either support the department head's decision, not support the department head's decision, or indicate that they are abstaining from the particular vote. Approval by two-thirds of the tenured faculty will be required for the faculty to be considered in support of the department head's decision. Both the overall recommendation of the faculty and the tally of the faculty vote will be forwarded to the Dean of Agriculture along with the recommendation of the department head.

After the vote, the faculty will provide input for a letter to be sent to the faculty member in question. This letter will provide clear expectations and suggest steps to be taken for improving performance. If the department head determines that significant improvement has not taken place in either of the two subsequent evaluation periods, the chronic low achievement process may be implemented for a second time for the particular faculty member in question. The implementation process will be as outlined above.

A faculty member who is to be dismissed under this policy may appeal the decision under the process outlined in the Kansas State University Faculty Handbook.