

NORTHEAST AREA EXTENSION OFFICE

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 6/24/06)

Dale Fjell, Department Head

Date signed: 7/07/06

Fred Cholick, Dean

Date signed: 7/07/06

M. Duane Nellis, Provost

Date signed: 8/04/06

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 6/21/05)

Dale Fjell, Department Head

Date signed: 7/13/05

Fred Cholick, Dean

Date signed: 7/14/05

M. Duane Nellis, Provost

Date signed: 7/25/05

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*: 6/2010

**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.*

Kansas State University
Northeast Area Extension Specialist Annual Review Document

Name _____

Title/Position _____

Performance Review Period _____

OBJECTIVES

1. To increase job satisfaction.
2. To increase job understanding.
3. To recognize areas in which performance is satisfactory.
4. To provide an opportunity to plan for personal improvement and professional growth.

PROCEDURE

This document presents criteria and standard deemed important for assessing faculty effort in job performance, professional development and in the pursuit of high achievement.

Because of the unique nature of individual positions, the amount of emphasis for each criterion will vary. This is due to job descriptions, department linkages, the position locations, and the funding provided by the university in support of the Cooperative Extension Mission. Each area specialist, with the support of the Area Director and Department Head, will determine the amount of emphasis given to each criteria identified in this document. This will be indicated in points or percentages in which the total equals 100. Criteria and standards for achieving tenure and promotion should be considered.

Specialists will record their work and accomplishments in preparation for their annual review using this document as a guideline for information to include. Attach to this document:

- Job Description
- Annual Goals
- Annual Impact Report

Additional information may be included for activities not covered in these reports.

A plan for personal improvement and professional growth should be agreed upon and attached to this document.

The faculty member has the prerogative of appending explanatory remarks regarding any evaluation.

Administrator(s) Comments: (Attach comments to this form)

Area Extension Specialist _____ Date _____
(Signature Does Not Necessarily Indicate Agreement)

Area Extension Director _____ Date _____

Department Head _____ Date _____

CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

	Emphasis	Score	Emphasis Next Year
Criteria I. Achievement in preparation for carrying out job responsibilities.			
<p>Standards: Accomplishments may include several but not all of the following.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plan for educational programming implementation and evaluation. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Conduct and/or assessments, Surveys, questionnaires. b. Involve agents and clients in identifying program issues and goals. c. Prioritize programs based on identified needs of agents, clientele, producers, organizations, etc. d. Identified program appropriate for resources available. e. Collaborate with other specialist in assessing needs, developing priorities, and planning programs. f. Approved Plan of Work. 			

Criteria II. Accomplishments in carrying out job responsibilities.			
<p>Standards: Accomplishments may include several but not all of the following.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Program impact assessment and outcomes <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Implement or oversee implementation of appropriate program, b. Conduct appropriate evaluation involving agents, clientele, and/or other specialists. c. Completed Annual Impact Report. d. Other 2. Creativity <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Initiate new program b. Use creative teaching methods for activities/meetings c. Develop programs resources d. Enhance teamwork e. Other 3. Breadth of Activities <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Presentations b. Demonstrations c. Individual consultations d. News Releases e. Newsletters f. Popular press article g. TV and radio h. Other 4. Leadership <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Committee member/chairperson 			

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Coordinate program/meeting c. Coordinate demonstration/research projects d. Leadership and teamwork with co-workers e. Volunteer leader development f. Support to professional and leadership development of agents g. Aid in agent program development h. Other <p>5. Teaching techniques and skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Knowledgeable in subject matter b. Information presented based on current research c. Uses appropriate teaching techniques to meet clients' needs. d. Relates well to agents, groups, and individuals e. Uses a variety of methods when teaching f. Exhibits professionalism as a teacher/educator g. Develops mass media when appropriate h. Other <p>6. Publications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Abstracts b. Journal articles c. Extension bulletins d. Extension fact sheets e. Book chapters f. Field day reports g. Proceedings for meetings h. Non-refereed journal articles i. Overheads, slides, and/or computer presentations w/scripts j. Videos k. Computer software l. Resource notebook m. Web or electronic publications n. Other <p>7. Teamwork support and work with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Agents b. Area Specialists c. State Specialists d. Specialists from other departments e. Administration f. Other organizations g. Other state University staff h. Other <p>8. Grants</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Grant proposals written b. Pending/rejected c. Grants received <p>9. Research</p> | |
|---|--|

	Emphasis	Score	Emphasis Next Year
Criteria III. Professionalism			
<p>Standards: Accomplishments may include several but not all of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional relations/growth/development <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. State meetings/programs attended b. National meetings/programs attended c. State meetings – present paper/poster d. National meetings – present paper/poster e. Member graduate committee f. Serve on graduate committee g. Membership/organization service h. Manuscript reviewer i. Reviewer of grant proposals j. Editor/editorial board for journal k. Appointed/elected officer of committee/organization l. Exhibit professionalism in all Extension activity 2. Professional Distinctions <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. State awards/recognition b. National awards/recognition c. Invited paper presentation out-of-state d. Professional certification 			
TOTAL		100	100

Preceding Years Evaluation Scores	Below Minimum Standard of Expectation Below 50	Meets Expectation 50-79	Exceeds Expectation 80-100
200_____	_____	_____	_____
200_____	_____	_____	_____
200_____	_____	_____	_____
200_____	_____	_____	_____
Current Evaluation 200_____	_____	_____	_____

Reviewed and Approved by Northeast Area Specialists on June 21, 2005

A “Below Minimum Standard of Expectation” evaluation score will be accompanied with a suggested course of action for specialist improvement. Procedures outlines in Section C31.5 of the Faculty Handbook will be followed. When a specialist is evaluated below minimum standard of expectation for the second successive evaluation or for a total of three evaluation in any five-year period, then “dismissal for cause” will be considered at the discretion of the Dean/Director.

Kansas State University
Northeast Area Extension Specialist
Annual Review Procedure Criteria and Standards
Reviewed and Approved by Northeast Area Specialists on June 21, 2005

OBJECTIVES

1. To increase job satisfaction.
2. To increase job understanding.
3. To recognize areas in which performance is satisfactory.
4. To provide an opportunity to plan for personal improvement and professional growth.

PROCEDURE

The document presents criteria and standards deemed important for assessing faculty effort in job performance, professional development and in the pursuit of high achievement.

Because of the unique nature of individual position, the amount of emphasis for each criteria will vary. This is due to job descriptions, department linkages, the position locations, and the funding provided by the university in support of the Cooperative Extension Mission. Each area specialist, with the support of the Area Director and Department Head, will determine the amount of emphasis given to each criterion identified in this document. This will be indicated in points or percentages in which the total equals 100. Criteria and standards for achieving tenure and promotion should be considered.

Specialists will record their work and accomplishments in preparation for their annual review using the document as a guideline for information to include. Attached to the document are:

- Job Description
- Annual Goals
- Annual Impact Report

Additional information may be included for activities not covered in these reports.

A plan for personal improvement and professional growth should be agreed upon and attached to this document. The faculty member has the prerogative of appending explanatory remarks regarding and evaluation.

CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

Criteria I: Achievement in preparation for carrying job responsibilities.

Standards: Each specialist should have an approved Plan of Work that demonstrates preparation for a proactive educational program based on interaction with county agents, clientele and other specialists.

Criteria II: Accomplishments in carrying out job responsibilities.

Standards: Accomplishments should include several but not all of the following:

1. Impact: Faculty needs to conduct or participate in well-planned evaluation of programs 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 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 objective. 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 contribution to the common vision.
5. Teaching techniques and skills: Feedback to the faculty member and appropriate administrators from clientele and peers is useful and encouraged. It is also helpful is administrators/evaluators personally observe faculty perform in an education environment.
6. Publications: Publication should include bulletins, fact sheets, field day reports, refereed journal articles, book chapters, non-refereed journal articles, abstracts, videos, slide sets, computer

presentations, computer software, web or electronic publication, etc.

7. **Teamwork:** Support of issue-based programming teams is critical, and contribution to goal setting, program planning, developing educational materials, programs delivery, and/or program evaluation are strongly encouraged.
8. **Grants:** Evaluators need to exercise good judgment here because some fields have a greater extramural funding opportunities than others. The expectation is, however, that faculty will obtain support for program enhancement.
9. **Research:** Extension research should focus on applied question

that relate to an individual's overall Extension program and may include demonstration, experiments and surveys.

Criteria III: Professionalism

Standards: Accomplishments should include several but not all of the following.

1. **Professional relations/growth/development:** Communicating and sharing knowledge with other professionals within the state and regularly participating in regional and national meetings.
2. **Professional Distinctions:** Recognition by peers or clientele for outstanding academic, program or service achievements.

**Kansas State University
Northeast Area Extension Specialists
Procedure, criteria, and Standards for Mid Tenure Evaluation, Tenure Evaluation
And Promotion to Associate Professor, and Promotion to Full Professor**

PROCEDURE

Criteria and standards for promotion and tenure for Area Extension Specialists are consistent with the established criteria and standards for annual review.

Candidates for Mid-Tenure Evaluation, Tenure Evaluation and Promotion to Associate Professor, and Promotion to Full Professor must demonstrate superior professional accomplishment and excellence in the performance of their assigned duties. The promise of continues professional growth is especially important in tenure decisions. Candidates should have made continues progress on Area Extension Specialist Annual Review as established by the specialist with the support of the Area Director and Department Head where appropriate.

DEFINITIONS

Standards for Mid-Tenure Evaluation

Candidate shall have mid-tenure opportunity to receive feedback in preparation for future tenure and promotion. Candidate must have an approved CES plan of work. Candidate must have made acceptable progress toward standards set for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.

Standards for Tenure Evaluation and Promotion to Associate Professor

Candidate must have at least four years in present rank and/or position. Time frames for achieving tenure and promotion must follow established university policy. Typically this is done by the sixth year following appointment.

Candidate must have an approved CES plan of work. Candidate must be able to document at least 3 major accomplishments during their tenure at KSU that show creativity and significant impact toward the mission of the University.

Candidate should have authored or co-authored at least 2 publications since last being hired or promotes, provided funds are made available to allow them to publish. Publication should be from a combination of the items listed Below:

- New or major revision of numbered Extension Publication

- Computer software or similar resource
- Refereed Journal article, or similar publication

Standard for Promotion to Full Professor

Candidate must have completed at least four years in present rank and/or position. Candidate must have an approved CES plan of work. Candidate should be able to document at least 3 major accomplishments since last promotion that show creativity and significant impact toward the mission of the University.

Candidate should have authored or co-authored at least 4 publications provided funds are made available to allow them to publish. Publication should be from any combination of the items listed below:

- New or major revision of numbered Extension Publication
- Computer software of similar resource

Candidate should have authored or co-authored at least one refereed journal article since last promotion, provided funds are made available to allow them to publish. Candidate demonstrated the ability of obtain the grant support needed to fund project to an acceptable level. Candidate demonstrated abilities that have gained them recognition as an accomplished professional at the regional or national level.

Professorial Performance Award – Northeast Extension Unit

Professorial Performance Award Policy

The Professorial Performance Award (PPA) is designed to reward strong performance at the professorial rank with a base salary increase in addition to that provided for by the annual evaluation process. It is not a right accorded to every professor. Additionally, it is not granted simply as a result of a candidate's routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies. The intent of the award is to recognize excellent and sustained performance of professors. These criteria and guidelines are based on the guidelines presented in Section C 49.1-49.14 of the K-State University Handbook (<http://www.k-state.edu/academic/services/fhbook/>).

Minimum Criteria and Standards

1. A candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in the rank of professor at least six years since promotion or last receipt of a PPA.
2. A candidate must have demonstrated, over the preceding six-year time period, a level of sustained productivity and scholarship that is equivalent to what the department expects for promotion to a full professor.
3. A candidate must have earned a merit evaluation in the category of '*Exceeds Expectations*' in each of the previous six years. **

Procedure

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. Recommendations concerning PPA are considered annually. The department/unit head is expected to notify faculty members regarding their eligibility for a PPA review. The procedures for determining awardees shall be consistent with the guidelines presented in the University Handbook. The timeline for submittal of documentation and determination of awardees shall be consistent with the activities associated with the annual evaluation review process.

1. Candidates shall provide accurate, thorough, and clear documentation of her or his professional accomplishments for at least the previous six years. Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation at K-State (<http://www.k-state.edu/academic/services/depthead/promotion/promotio.html>) shall be used to prepare this documentation.
2. The department/unit head shall review the candidate's file and prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials in terms of the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the Northeast Extension Unit, along with a recommendation for or against the award.
3. The candidate shall be given the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the department/unit head, and shall sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, the candidate shall be given the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation to the department/unit head and to the dean. A copy of the department/unit head's written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate.
4. The Department/Unit Head will submit the following items to the Dean:
 - a. The department/unit head's written evaluation and recommendation.
 - b. A copy of the department's 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 supporting materials that served as a basis for 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.

** Merit evaluation ranking scale:

- 1) Exceeds Expectations
- 2) Meets Expectations
- 3) Falls below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity