

DEPARTMENT OF ENTOMOLOGY

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 5/12/2006)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 5/12/2006)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **5/2011**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **5/2011**

Jim Nechols, Interim Department Head

Date signed: 6/21/2006

Fred Cholick, Dean

Date signed: 6/26/2006

M. Duane Nellis, Provost

Date signed: 8/07/2006

*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.

CRITERIA, POLICIES, and PROCEDURES

2006 FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

DEPARTMENT OF ENTOMOLOGY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Approved by Department Faculty on May 12, 2006

Printed 5/24/2007

<u>CONTENTS</u>	<u>PAGE #</u>
Evaluation Protocol	3
Faculty Progress Report	9
Faculty Performance Evaluation Summary	12
Calculation of Faculty Performance Ratings	13
Tenure and Promotion Criteria and Procedures	18
Professorial Performance Award Criteria and Procedures	21

EVALUATION PROTOCOL

INTRODUCTION Annually faculty administered primarily by the Department of Entomology are requested to prepare documentation for their Annual Performance Evaluation to be submitted during early January. This document includes a signed and dated Annual Faculty Progress Report, a set of goals for the coming calendar year, and updated curriculum vitae. The Annual Progress Report is composed of specific information relative to faculty activities in extension, teaching, research and service. Information is also requested on any awards or honors received by the faculty that year. Finally, faculty are asked to provide a description of their accomplishments relative to the goals mutually agreed upon with the Department Head at the beginning of the year.

DOCUMENTS for each faculty member are reviewed and summarized by the Department Head, and individual performance reviews are arranged and conducted in January and February. The Department Head and faculty member candidly discuss the faculty member's performance relative to their overall position description and determine if impediments exist which have prevented them from obtaining their goals. Agreement is reached as to the relative degree of accomplishment for each area of responsibility as described on the Annual Faculty Progress Report (see Attachment).

PERFORMANCE RATINGS Accomplishment in each area of responsibility is based on the following five-point performance scale:

- 1 = Unsatisfactory
- 2 = Improvement Needed
- 3 = Satisfactory
- 4 = Very Good
- 5 = Excellent

Within each area of responsibility, performance is proportionally rated as follows:

EXTENSION:

Training activities	20%
Educational materials developed, including manuscripts published, in press, or accepted	40%
Cooperative efforts	10%
Grant proposals submitted (unfunded & funded)	10%
Clientele Feedback	10%*
Department Head Rating	10%**

* This would be based on obtaining feedback on the approved form from 3-5 individuals

** This would be based on the head "sitting" in on sessions that extension faculty may be involved in and based on oral feedback from clientele/stakeholders/customers.

RESEARCH:

Grant proposals submitted (unfunded & funded*)	30%
Manuscripts published, in press, or accepted	60%
Presentation of research information	10%

* For extension and research, credit is awarded annually for funds received within a given calendar year. Co-principal investigators are given equal full dollar value credit.

TEACHING:

Student classroom ratings (TEVAL or IDEA)	30%*
Dept. Head classroom rating	10%*
Grad. Teaching Asst. Training evaluation	15%**
Course syllabi & reading lists ⁺	25%*
Undergraduate student advising ratings	10%***
Graduate student advising ratings	10%

* If no classroom teaching occurs during the evaluation period, the rating from the most recent evaluation will be used.

Teaching faculty are required to undertake a course evaluation by enrolled students using TEVAL, IDEA, or a quantitative instrument of their choice, with the approval of the department head.

** If there is no GTA supervision by the faculty member, this percentage is split and added equally to the Student and Department Head teaching evaluations.

*** If there is no undergraduate advising, this percentage is added to the percentage for graduate student advising. If no undergraduate or graduate students are advised, the combined advising percentages are split and added equally to the percentages for Student & Dept. Head classroom evaluation.

⁺ If a textbook is written specifically for classroom use, at the request of the faculty author it may be evaluated under the Course Syllabi & Reading Lists category in the year that it is published, and one year before publication. This option applies to sole- or jointly-authored textbooks and must be negotiated in advance (e.g., at the time goals for the following year are submitted). To further credit the substantial time investment and scholarship, the percentage from the Undergraduate Advising category will be combined for a total of 35%. If undergraduate advising is being done during this period, a *bonus credit* of 10% will be added to maintain the 35%.

SERVICE:

Committees (college, department, national and regional)
Participation in professional and scientific organizations
Reviews of manuscripts and extramural grant proposals
Other

PROPORTIONALITY: Each faculty member has different tenths of appointment in teaching, extension, or research. To equalize these differences, adjustment factors will be applied to the performance rating for the activities in each area of responsibility. Proportionally less productivity is expected for faculty with less than 10 tenths assignments. Differences will be adjusted by multiplying the expectations of a 10 tenths assignment by the actual tenths assigned to the individual. For example, if a 10 tenths researcher is expected to publish 4 manuscripts in a given year to merit the five (excellent) rating, then a faculty with a 5 tenths research appointment would receive a five rating for 2 publications.

ACCOMPLISHMENT OF GOALS: Consideration is also given to determining to what extent the individual goals set by each faculty member and the Department Head have been attained and in identifying factors that may have affected the faculty's ability to attain a goal. Further, the Department Head works with each faculty member to establish appropriate goals for the coming year. Performance rating for goals accomplishment is an additional 0, 0.1 or 0.2 points added to the overall performance rating, dependent on the degree of accomplishment of professional goals.

HONORS AND AWARDS presented for exceptional or meritorious performance in professional activities will be acknowledged as accomplishment over and above the standard evaluation criteria as described above.

SUBJECTIVITY The above performance ratings are somewhat objective and used as the basis of the performance evaluation. The Department Head also uses subjective factors to complement these objective ratings. These factors include, but are not limited to, consideration of: (in Research): the different types of extramural funding and publications relative to position descriptions; the complexity of a publication (book, book chapter, monograph, journal article); the utility of the information published; authorship (sole, first or second author versus third author or greater); (in Teaching) class and student loads, and (in Extension) the types of programs developed.

Subjectivity may also be used to periodically revise or refine how specific levels of performance are determined. For instance, what level of publication constitutes satisfactory performance versus excellent performance in a given year? These determinations are not static, because the range of research, teaching, extension, and service opportunities and performance levels may change from year to year.

WEIGHTING of the performance rating within each area of responsibility is accomplished according to the faculty member's tenths of appointment. For example, a faculty member with a 0.8 research and 0.2 teaching appointment would be evaluated as follows:

The performance rating for research is 3.70 and is calculated as:

Extramural funding Rating of 3 x 30% = 0.90

Publications	Rating of 4 x 60% = 2.40
Presentations	Rating of 4 x 10% = <u>0.40</u>
	Total 3.70

The performance rating for teaching is 4.05 and is calculated as:

Syllabi/textbook & readings	Rating of 4 x 25%* = 1.00
Student evaluation ratings	Rating of 4 x 30% = 1.20
Dept. Head evaluation	Rating of 4 x 10% = 0.40
GTA evaluation	Rating of 5 x 15% = 0.75
Undergraduate advising ratings	Rating of 3 x 10% = 0.30
Graduate advising ratings	Rating of 4 x 10% = <u>0.40</u>
	Total 4.05

* If textbook is included, percentage increases to 35%

The performance rating for service is 4.00 and is calculated as:

Committees, Organizational activities, Manuscript and grant reviews	Rating of 4 x 100% = <u>4.00</u>
	Total 4.00

Accomplishment of goals was rated as excellent and 0.2 additional points were added to the total performance rating.

The total performance rating is calculated as the sum of the proportionally adjusted weighted sums of the ratings in research, teaching, service and goals accomplishment:

Research	3.70 x 0.75* = 2.78
Teaching	4.05 x 0.15* = 0.61
Service	4.00 x 0.10 = 0.40
Goals	<u>+0.20</u>
Total Rating	3.99, 1 (lowest), 5 (highest)

* 5% credit from each of the research and teaching categories were moved to service to make up the 10% of credit given for service contributions.

MULTIPLE YEAR AVERAGES of the total yearly performance ratings over a rolling three year period are calculated in order to evaluate progress as fairly as possible. The proportion of each year of the three-year average is 33%. The rolling average is employed to avoid salary inequities that arise from differences between evaluation ratings in years when large salary increases are awarded, compared to years when the same differences in evaluation ratings occur but small average salary increases are awarded. The first year in which the Department of Entomology instituted a Progressive Evaluation protocol was 1990. A two-year average was used in the 1991 evaluations. A three-year average has been used since.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SUMMARIES are prepared by the Department Head for each faculty member. A numerical rating describing faculty performance in each area of appointment is provided on the calculation summary (see attachment). Statements reflecting the outcome of the faculty evaluation session are also prepared. A summary narrative is then prepared by the Department Head, describing the overall performance, strengths and deficiencies in performance in each area of appointment. Statements are also included which indicate the level of accomplishment of the faculty member's goals set in the previous year and of the appropriateness of the goals set for the coming year. The weighted evaluation ratings for each area of appointment, service and goals accomplishment are provided as the total performance rating, in addition to the name and number of the corresponding overall performance rating.

Faculty are provided with a separate sheet, detailing the calculation of individual and overall performance scores and the standards of performance used to calculate ratings and scores for that particular year. The Performance Evaluation Summary is then presented in draft form to each faculty for examination. Faculty are encouraged to discuss questions of, or corrections to, their summary during individual meetings between each faculty member and the Department Head. *At that meeting, faculty members are told whether they meet, exceed, or fail to meet expectations overall, and in each of their major areas of responsibility (research, teaching, and/or extension).* If a faculty member and the Department Head are unable to resolve major differences of opinion on the first draft of the evaluation, the faculty member will present their case in writing for review by the College Administration. Following faculty and Department Head signing, the summary and the Annual Faculty Progress Report becomes a document of record for that calendar year. After all evaluations are submitted to the Dean of the College of Agriculture, each faculty member receives an anonymous summary of the performance evaluation ratings of all faculty members in the department.

CRITERIA FOR CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT. In accordance with Section C31.5 of the KSU Faculty Handbook (Chronic Low Achievement), tenured faculty who, in any year, receive a 3-year rolling average performance rating of less than 2.0 (on a 5-point scale) in teaching, research, extension, or directed service, will fail to achieve the minimal acceptable level of productivity. This performance rating is defined by the Department of Entomology's most current version of *Criteria, Policies, and Procedures: Faculty Performance Evaluation*. Those who fail to achieve the minimal level of productivity would be subject to the procedures and criteria in Section C31.5. If a tenured faculty member's 3-year average performance falls below the departmental standards in any area of major responsibility, the department head shall inform the faculty member in writing and also suggest a course of action, in writing, to improve the performance of the faculty member. The faculty member may request an independent evaluation of performance by a Faculty Advisory/Appeals Committee. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations below the minimal acceptable level of productivity, or a total of three such evaluations in any five-year period, then "dismissal for cause" will be considered at the discretion of the Dean.

CRITERIA FOR EXCEEDING EXPECTATIONS. To be recognized as exceeding expectations, a faculty member must have an overall performance rating of at least 5.0 based on his/her 3-year rolling average, and shall not fall below a 4.0 (3-year rolling average) on any assigned category of responsibility.

UNTENURED (TENURE-TRACK) FACULTY. The untenured, tenure-track faculty member shall be evaluated on his or her achievement in fulfilling the basic assignment and duties as described in that faculty member's position description. The untenured faculty member will be evaluated using the same evaluation protocol instrument as used in evaluating tenured faculty members, but the translation of the resulting score (for purposes of merit salary adjustment) will be subjective for those untenured faculty members who have not yet undergone mid-probationary review. In each of the first two years on the faculty, the untenured faculty member shall choose whether or not that year's evaluation score will be included in the following years' calculations of three-year rolling average. The score for the third full year of a faculty member's evaluation, and for each following year, will be included in three-year rolling average calculations. After the mid-probationary review, a faculty member is expected to meet or exceed expectations in assigned teaching, research, extension, and service functions with the same relationship between evaluation scores and merit salary adjustments as used for tenured faculty members.

SABBATICAL, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND OTHER ASSIGNMENTS AWAY FROM THE NORMAL DUTY STATION. When a faculty member has a temporary change in assignment or duty station, such as going on a sabbatical leave, the faculty member will draw up an agreement with the Department Head on the expectations for the new assignment or duties. These may include, beyond the departmental evaluation criteria, specific, measurable goals and performance standards. The faculty member will then be evaluated relative to his/her performance on the new job using the agreed upon goals. These expectations could be developed from the sabbatical application or from other available documentation. If there is a supervisor at the new assignment, this supervisor's evaluation should be utilized as appropriate. In undertaking the departmental annual evaluation, the Department Head will evaluate the faculty member's sabbatical performance along with his/her regular performance, prorating each for time spent with the respective assignments. In case an individual is on a different assignment for an extended period of time, the average evaluation for the most recent three years will be used as the basis for merit increase recommendations. A departmental seminar describing the activities during the temporary assignment is encouraged.

**DEPARTMENT OF ENTOMOLOGY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
2006 FACULTY PROGRESS REPORT**

Name:

Academic Rank:

Appointment Tenths: E/I/R

EXTENSION:

Training activities

- Conferences
- Workshops
- TV/radio programs
- Contest judging
- Research & Extension demonstrations

Publications and Educational Materials

- Books
- Book chapters
- Refereed journal articles
- Trade journal articles
- Magazine articles
- Numbered publications
- Revisions to numbered publications
- Brochures
- Fact sheets
- Published computer programs
- Computer programs
- Video cassette presentations
- Extension/research presentations
- Slide sets
- Posters
- Displays
- Media releases

Extramural Grant Proposals

- Submitted
- Funded (source, amount & duration)
- Unfunded

Cooperation and Involvement

- County
- Area
- State
- Federal

Clientele Feedback

RESEARCH

Extramural grant proposals

- Submitted
- Funded (source, amount & duration)
- Unfunded

Publications

- Books
- Book chapters
- Refereed journal manuscripts
- Non-refereed journal manuscripts
- Experiment Station Bulletins
- Abstracts
- Newsletters
- Video manuscripts

Presentation of research

- International
- National
- Regional
- State
- Local

TEACHING:

Student ratings

Department Head rating (to be solicited by the Department Head)

GTA training ratings (to be solicited by the Department Head)

Course syllabi & reading lists

Teaching publications or presentations

Undergraduate student advising rating

- Number of students advised
- Approximate amount of time spent with students
- Accessibility to students for advising

Graduate student advising rating

- Major advisor
- Co-major advisor

Advisory committee member

Graduate student advisee evaluation rating (to be solicited by the Department Head)

SERVICE:

Committee assignments

National
Regional
University
College
Department

Service to professional and scientific organizations

Committees
Task forces
Elected offices
Editor or editorial boards

Reviews

Extramural grant proposals
Refereed journal manuscripts
Book reviews

HONORS AND AWARDS:

Please sign and date your completed Progress Report.

**2006 FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SUMMARY
DEPARTMENT OF ENTOMOLOGY**

Name: _____ **Faculty Rank:** _____

Appointment: _____

Extension: Rating: _____

Research: Rating: _____

Teaching: Rating: _____

Service: Rating: _____

Accomplishment of Goals: _____

Honors & Awards: _____

Narrative Summary: _____

Overall 2006 Performance Rating:

(>5 = Excellent; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Improvement Needed; 1 = Unsatisfactory)

Rolling Average Performance Rating:

2004

2005

2006

Average

Faculty Member*

Head

Date

** My signature implies that I have read and discussed the evaluation with the department head but does not imply agreement or disagreement with my performance evaluation.*

**CALCULATION OF 2006 FACULTY PERFORMANCE RATINGS
DEPARTMENT OF ENTOMOLOGY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY**

Using the five-point performance rating scale agreed on by the faculty (5 = Excellent Performance; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Improvement Needed; 1 = Unsatisfactory) the following ranges of performance were used to calculate the 2005 performance evaluation ratings. These ranges are for a 10 tenths appointment. Faculty with less than a 10 tenths appointment in any given area have their productivity assessed proportionally.

NOTE: The range of numbers shown for the ratings for each activity will serve as guidelines for performance. Recognizing that evaluation in many areas cannot be done adequately with only an objective (numerical) rating system based on numbers of units produced or dollars obtained, and also that faculty members in different sub-disciplines or with different assignments, may have different opportunities, needs, and expectations with respect to the kind and rate of publications produced and grants sought, the Department Head may make adjustments to the performance ratings based on discussions with individual faculty and after a subjective review of the submitted documentation. Some credit will be given to extension, research, and teaching faculty for cross-responsibility accomplishments.

Extension:

Training activities (#)	5=25-34; 4=18-24; 3=11-17; 2=6-10; 1= \leq 5
Publications & other	
Educational materials (#)	5= \geq 40; 4= 30-39; 3= 20-29; 2= 10-19; 1= <10
Client phone/email requests	Subjective, based on verbal input provided by a sample of clients and faculty documentation
Cooperation	Subjective, based on clientele feedback & reporting
Extramural funding (#)	5= >\$20K; 4= >\$12-20K; 3= >\$5-12K; 2=\$1-5K; 1=<\$1K
Clientele Feedback	Subjective, based on written/oral feedback from clientele and department head evaluations

Research:

Extramural funding (\$) ¹	5=\$76-100K; 4=\$51-<76K; 3= >\$25-<51K; 2= >\$1-25K; 1=<1K
Proposals submitted(#) ²	5= \geq 7; 4=5-6; 3=4-5; 2=2-3; 1=1
Publications(#) ³	5= \geq 5; 4=4; 3=3; 2=2; 1= \leq 1
Presentations(#) ⁴	5= \geq 10; 4=6-9; 3=4-5; 2=2-3; 1=1

¹If the number of dollars awarded is not high, but multiple proposals have been funded during the evaluation period, the ratings will be adjusted upward.

²Preproposals will be given credit, the amount determined after review by the Department Head.

³Half credit will be given for articles submitted in 2005; full credit will be given during the year of publication.

⁴Full credit will be given for any presentation on which the individual being evaluated appears as an author (senior or junior).

Teaching:

Student evaluation	Subjective, based on student comments
Dept. Head evaluation	Subjective, based on classroom visits & review of syllabus & reading list.
GTA evaluation	Subjective, based on GTA evaluation.
Publications(#)	(If no one authors a publication, it will not be used as an evaluation category)
Presentations(#)	(If no one delivers a presentation, it will not be used as an evaluation category)
Ugrad. advising	Subjective, based on # of students & time spent with students.
Grad. advising	Subjective, based on GRA evaluation & student advisory committee service.
Textbook authorship	(If no textbook is written, it will not be used as an evaluation category)

Service:

Committees, Service to organizations, Reviews of manuscripts & grants, etc. This category is subjective, based on degree of involvement and complexity of each assignment.

Goals Accomplishment: Subjective, but basically credit given for showing indication of meeting most, some or none of the goals set in the previous year.

Your performance rating for **extension** was and was calculated as:

Training activities	Rating of	x 25% =
Publications & Educational Materials	Rating of	x 50% =
Cooperative Efforts	Rating of	x 15% =
Extramural Funding	Rating of	x 10% =
	Total Extension Rating	

Your performance rating for **research** was and was calculated as:

Extramural funding (proposals submitted & funded)	Rating of	x 30% =
Manuscripts	Rating of	x 60% =
Presentations	Rating of	x 10% =
	Total Research Rating	

Your performance rating for **teaching** was and was calculated as:

Student ratings	Rating of	x 30% =
-----------------	-----------	---------

2006 Evaluation:

Meeting, Exceeding, or Failing to meet Expectations

Rolling Average Calculations within the major categories (T, R, E) are determined to assess whether the candidate exceeds, meets, or fails to meet expectations as required by University evaluation procedures.

Three year rolling average:

	Annual Research Rating	Annual Teaching Rating	Annual Extension Rating
2004			
2005			
2006			
Sum	-----	-----	-----
Divisor	3	3	3
AVG*	-----	-----	-----

If AVG* in any area of responsibility equals or exceeds 5.0 and no individual category falls below 4.0 then the individual EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS. If AVG* in any area of responsibility falls below 2.0 then the individual FAILS TO MEET MINIMAL EXPECTATIONS. If AVG* in any area of responsibility is equal to or greater than 2.0 and less than 5.0 then the individual MEETS EXPECTATIONS. If the individual equals or exceeds 5.0 in one category but falls below 4.0 and above 2.0 in another area then the individual MEETS EXPECTATIONS. The Department Head will clearly indicate which of these classifications applies in the written summary of evaluation comments. The Department Head will provide guidance as required under current Faculty Handbook guidelines to those individuals failing to meet minimal expectations.

At the beginning of each year during the annual faculty-department head conference, individual faculty members would have the option of proposing for each area of responsibility (research, teaching, extension) a change of up to 10% in time committed to specific activities. These changes would be proposed in writing when preparing the annual goals statement. This may involve the creation of a new category (examples: client phone calls or software development for extension; writing a textbook for classroom teachers; pursuing a new research direction for researchers). Or, it may entail a shift in percentages for established categories. Nothing in this statement is intended to preclude additional adjustments during the course of the year which are in the best interests of our mission as determined by mutual agreement of the Department Head and faculty members.

Requests typically would involve no more than one category change per responsibility area, and would need to be negotiated with and approved by the Department Head. *These discretionary changes would not alter the official tenths of time devoted to the major areas of responsibility (i.e., a .2 teaching/.8 research faculty member would have the same proportion of effort for his/her respective areas).*

Cross-responsibility credit: Teaching, research, and extension faculty who engage in activities outside of their official areas of responsibility should list those activities. The Department Head will give some credit toward their assigned area.

Subjective assessment by Dept. Head: The evaluation in a number of areas cannot be done adequately with only an objective (numerical) rating system based on numbers of units produced or numbers of dollars brought into the department. Areas requiring a subjective assessment include time investments for extramural grants and research and extension publications. Faculty in different subdisciplines, or with different assignments, have different opportunities, needs, and expectations with respect to the type and rate of publications produced and the kind of grants sought (which may affect the average amount of grant funds brought in annually). The mechanism for making reasonable adjustments on the performance evaluations will be a multi-step feedback process. First, the Dept. Head will make a preliminary assessment based on the information received from faculty members and a subjective adjustment to the numerical ratings. Then, further adjustments may be made based on the 1-on-1 meeting between individual faculty and the Head. The faculty member will have an opportunity to review the revised draft of the evaluation prepared by the Department Head. A statement to this effect will be drafted; it will be placed at the beginning of the evaluation protocol document.

Shared credit -- To encourage intra- and interdepartment/institutional collaborations, full and equal credit will be given to all faculty members for grants awarded, grant dollars brought in, and publications *regardless of position of authorship* on a grant proposal or publication.

New faculty evaluations: A statement will be appended that the Department Head will make subjective allowance with regard to productivity for faculty who have been in their positions for three years or less. However, performance standards in all areas that can be assessed should be the equivalent of any other faculty member. Carry-over publications from graduate or postdoctoral research are expected. Setting reasonable goals will help, as will the three-year rolling average.

TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

Criteria for Tenure:

According to the Faculty Handbook Sec. C100.1, *"there can be no simple list of accomplishments, that, when achieved, guarantee that a faculty member will obtain tenure."* Tenure is granted *"based on the assessment of the tenured faculty of the university that a candidate has made outstanding contributions in the appropriate academic endeavors."* Section C100.3 states *"Tenure is not a right accorded to every faculty member. Nor is it granted simply as a result of a candidate's routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies."*

The above two sections suggest that the assessment of a candidate's suitability cannot solely or simply be based on meeting or exceeding expectations in the annual evaluations preceding the time period of application for tenure. During the time period preceding the application for tenure, the candidate should be deemed by the tenured faculty to have made outstanding contributions in the appropriate academic endeavors. In addition to the research, teaching, extension, and service contributions evaluated annually, outstanding contributions in the appropriate academic endeavors will be evaluated by external reviewers.

Procedures for Tenure Evaluation:

The schedule for applying for tenure, and candidate responsibilities, are outlined in sections C110 and C111, respectively, in the Faculty Handbook. General departmental procedures to be followed are described in sections C112.1-C112.5.

The Department of Entomology solicits external reviews on promotion and tenure decisions (also see sections C36.1 and C112.2 of the Faculty Handbook). The candidate must submit with his (her) promotion or promotion and tenure dossier a list of names of six to eight external reviewers. These reviewers must hold a rank that is equal to or higher than that the candidate is being considered for and should not include the candidate's graduate or post-doctoral advisors. The Department Head will choose three to four of those and add an equal number of external reviewers of his (her) choice. These individuals will be requested to provide written evaluation of the candidate's promotion or promotion and tenure dossier.

1. For faculty with significant research appointments:

- a. The establishment of an extramurally-funded, focused, cogent research program reflective of a long-term research strategy.
- b. A consistent record of research productivity in the form of journal articles, conference proceedings and book chapters. Consideration may be given to the quality of the outlet and the impact it may have on the profession. Invited review articles, book chapters, and invitations to speak at national and international workshops, meetings, symposia, and conferences are significant because they represent professional recognition.

2. For faculty with significant teaching appointments:

- a. Teaching performance should demonstrate both effectiveness and continued improvement. Thus, in addition to TEVAL scores, materials documenting course content, such as syllabi, reading lists, examinations, etc., will be evaluated.
- b. Additional materials for evaluation may include student feedback to the Head, department Head's classroom evaluations, competitive awards or recognition for outstanding teaching, publications on pedagogy, the candidate's responsiveness to TEVAL evaluations, and curricula innovations and development.

3. For faculty with extension appointments:

- a. Extension performance should demonstrate both effectiveness and continued improvement. Thus, materials documenting program content, such as workshops, field days, oral presentations, newsletters, numbered and unnumbered publications, mass media articles, etc., will be evaluated.
- b. Additional materials for evaluation may include clientele/stakeholder feedback to the Head, department Head's evaluations, competitive awards or recognition for outstanding extension activities, and program innovation and development, invitations to participate in program evaluations and in regional, national, and international workshops, conferences, symposia, and meetings.

4. For all faculty:

- a. In addition to departmental, college, and university-level administrative service, candidates are expected to serve their profession by participating in professional societies in various capacities, reviewing manuscripts for journals and grant proposals for funding agencies, participating in grant review panels, program reviews, etc. Such participation benefits the profession, and also reflects on the standing of the candidate in the scientific community.
- b. Faculty who have requested tenure and promotion or promotion must present a departmental seminar summarizing their programmatic accomplishments since appointment to current rank.

Criteria for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor before tenure:

Under rare circumstances, an individual may be considered for promotion from the rank of Assistant Professor to Associate Professor prior to consideration for tenure. In such circumstances, promotion will be based on the same criteria as those outlined above for granting tenure, but without the need for the demonstration of a sustained research, teaching, and/or extension program at Kansas State University.

Criteria for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor:

According to the Faculty Handbook Sec. C120.2, *"Promotion to Professor is based on attainment of excellence in the assigned responsibilities of the faculty member and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies."* The specific criteria are those outlined above for granting of tenure. However, candidates seeking promotion to the rank of Professor are expected

to have demonstrated a sustained and consistent (1) record of productivity in terms of publications and extramural funding (2) excellence in classroom teaching and graduate student advising, (3) excellence in extension activities as defined in (3) above, and (4) a record of service to the department, college, university and profession.

PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD

ELIGIBILITY. To be eligible for a Professorial Performance Award (hereafter, PPA), candidates must be full-time faculty who have held the rank of Professor at Kansas State University for at least six years, and have served for a minimum of six years since the last PPA.

CRITERIA. In addition to the six-year rule, as described above, candidates must be able to demonstrate the following additional criteria:

1. Evidence of sustained quality and productivity during the six years prior to application for a PPA.
2. Productivity and quality of performance must compare to that of candidates being considered for promotion to full professor.

GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING PERFORMANCE. Any faculty member who wishes to be considered for a PPA will contact the Department Head when he/she becomes time-eligible. The Department Head will then request the faculty member to submit (a) a summary of scholarly productivity (e.g., lists of publications, grants, website materials, workshops, other tangible evidence) organized by year for the six-year period immediately preceding application, and (b) a narrative statement not to exceed two, single-spaced pages in 12-point font that describes the quality and impact (research, teaching and/or extension) of the programs in all major areas of responsibility (research, teaching, and/or extension).

These materials will be distributed to the full professors of the department who, individually and confidentially, will evaluate them against standards similar to those used for promotion from associate professor to professor as described above and in Sec. C120.2 of the Faculty Handbook. Each full professor will cast a “yes-no” ballot and return it to the Department Head with explanatory comments. If the full professors vote unanimously in favor of the candidate, the Department Head will recommend approval of the PPA to the Dean of the College of Agriculture. If a candidate receives two dissenting votes, the application will not be forwarded that year, and the faculty member will be required to wait 12 months to reapply. If there is one vote against, the Department Head will review the comments and may, at his/her discretion, recommend the candidate for a PPA.