

WESTERN KANSAS AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTERS

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 12/22/2010)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 12/22/2010)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **12/22/2015**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **12/22/2015**

Robert Gillen, Department Head

Date signed: 12/27/2010

Garry Pierzynski, Dean

Date signed: 1/04/2011

April C. Mason, Provost and Senior Vice President

Date signed: 4/26/2011

*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.

Western Kansas Agricultural Research Centers

Department

Agriculture

College

**Policy Statement Concerning:
Annual Evaluations
(including Professorial Performance Award Criteria and
Standards and Chronic Low Achievement Standards)**

Approved by Faculty Vote on: December 22, 2010

Promotion, Tenure, Mid-Tenure Review and Reappointment

Approved by Faculty Vote on: December 22, 2010

Department Head's Signature

Date

Dean's Signature

Date

Provost's Signature

Date

For Office of Academic Personnel Use Only
Date Posted to Web: _____

**Criteria, Standards, and Guidelines
for
Faculty Performance Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure**

**Western Kansas Agricultural Research Center
Kansas State University**

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide a uniform basis for the evaluation of performance of faculty located at the Kansas State University Western Kansas Agricultural Research Centers (WKARC) for use in deciding annual merit pay raises, appointment renewals, promotion and tenure recommendations, and individual career development plans.

Objectives

The objectives of these criteria, standards, and guidelines are to:

- Define general expectations for faculty performance,
- Define specific performance criteria,
- Define specific performance standards,
- Increase job satisfaction,
- Identify performance deficiencies/prescribe remedial action,
- Plan for professional improvement and growth.

Definitions

- Performance criteria: Specific activities that faculty should address as part of their appointment.
- Performance standards: Quantification of criteria for purposes of performance evaluation.
- Research: Activities that result in original intellectual contributions through scholarship.
- Non-directed service: Profession-based service that is directly related to the function of the unit and that provides leadership and service to the faculty member's profession or discipline.
- Directed service: All other work that furthers the mission of and is directly related to the goals and objectives of the unit and the University, that requires academic credentials or special skills, and that is a part of a faculty member's explicit assignment.

Context

Most members of the WKARC faculty hold 100% research appointments. They are expected to create new technology and information relevant to Kansas and advance the science of their individual disciplines. The criteria weights are consistent with a 100% research appointment and seek to reward those activities that are generally recognized as outputs of a productive research program.

Tenure Home

WKARC is considered a multi-disciplinary unit within KSRE. Because tenure cannot be held in a multi-disciplinary unit, newly appointed tenure-track faculty members will be required to identify an academic department with which they wish to be associated for tenure purposes.

Evaluation Process

- The WKARC head will provide leadership in conducting annual performance evaluations and professorial performance award processes for the faculty, based on the WKARC criteria, standards, and guidelines. Academic department heads will participate in annual performance evaluations. The appropriate academic department head will also sign the written annual performance evaluation provided by the WKARC head prior to forwarding it to the dean and director.
- At the beginning of the evaluation year, the faculty member and WKARC head agree on a set of measurable goals for the next evaluation period.
- To allow for differences in research and extension programs, the faculty member and WKARC head may agree to increase the weight applied to one evaluation criteria by 5% with a corresponding reduction of 5% in another category. Any adjustment in weights must be done at the beginning of the evaluation year.
- Near the close of the evaluation year, the WKARC head distributes a copy of the annual goals and requests a status report plus documentation of progress related to the performance evaluation criteria in Table 1.
- The faculty member submits the goal status report, proposed goals for the next evaluation period, and performance case documentation according to the specified format and deadline.
- The WKARC head rates performance according to the standards listed in Table 1 and prepares a written narrative that includes recommendations and other feedback and distributes the rating and narrative to the faculty member.
- The faculty member, WKARC head, and academic department head meet in conference to discuss and acknowledge the evaluation and agree on goals for the next evaluation period.

Table 1. K-State WKARC faculty performance evaluation criteria and standards.

Research Criteria	Performance Standard	Rating<1>	Weight	Score
Refereed Publications	<p>One of three methods used to assign author credit:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Each publication value (raw points)=the reciprocal of the author position. Author 1 (1), author 2 (0.5), author 3 (0.33), author 4-n (0.25). 2. If a graduate student is author 1 and the faculty advisor is author 2, both author 1 and 2 awarded 1.0, authors 3-n as in #1 above. 3. Authors can collectively agree to partition credit in any proportion providing the sum of credits for authors 1-3 \leq 1.83 and author 3 credit \geq 0.33. Authors 4-n (0.25). <p>The unit head is granted discretion to depart from the above methods if there are valid and compelling reasons to do so.</p> <p>To be counted, the manuscript must be in print or have final acceptance for publication. All revisions must be completed and the manuscript must be scheduled for publication in the journal.</p>	Raw points scaled to make highest value=1.	50	Rating x Weight

Non-Refereed Publications	<p>Assignment of author credit shall follow the same method as used for refereed publications. Publication value=author credit x category factor (defined below):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publication category 1 factor=0.2. Abstracts, KAES Reports of Progress such as <i>Chemical Weed Control</i>, variety performance test results, etc. These are generally 1 page publications. • Publication category 2 factor=0.6. Chapters in KAES Reports of Progress produced annually like <i>Southwest Research-Extension Center Field Day Report</i>, <i>Roundup Field Day Report</i>, <i>Kansas Fertilizer Research</i>, <i>Cattleman's Day</i>, newsletter articles, symposia proceedings, KCES circulars, regional reports/abstracts (i.e., NC Weeds, Ogallala Aquifer Program), popular press articles, etc. These are generally 2-4 pages of text. • Publication category 3 factor=0.8. Symposia proceedings that approach journal articles, KAES Reports of Progress that represent some synthesis and which do not have to be updated annually to remain relevant such as <i>Wheat-Grain Sorghum-Fallow Using Reduced Tillage with Herbicides</i>, <i>Keeping Up with Research</i>, etc. • Publication category 4 factor=1.0. KAES and KCES bulletins and works that represent major synthesis; book chapters, etc. Publications in this category can be considered for listing as a refereed publication. • Web-based contributions. The same content standards and rating for print publications shall apply to web site publications. Category assignment is based on similarity to printed publications. Double credit is not allowed for publications posted on web sites that are the same, or substantially the same, as print publications for which credit has been or will be received. 	Raw points scaled to make highest value=1.	25	Rating x Weight
Extramural Funding	Includes competitive grants, non-competitive grants, gifts, and product. Total dollars awarded (over all categories) = raw points.	Raw points scaled to make highest value=1.	10	Rating x Weight
Non-directed Service	<p>Various activities are awarded raw points according to the following guidelines: All categories are rated per documented activity except for collegiality which is a subjective rating (no documentation required).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional memberships=1 to 3 points. State or regional: 1 point. National: 2 points. National elected: 3 points. Professional certification: 1 point. • Professional Committee member/chair=1/2. 	Raw points scaled to make highest value=1.	15	Rating x Weight

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officer of regional or national professional organization in faculty member’s discipline: Secretary (2), President-Elect or Program Chair (3), President (3). • Technical session chair, etc.=1. • University Committee member/chair=0.5/1. • Awards/Honors=1 to 3 points. KSRE/state awards 1-2 points. National awards 2-3 points. • Volunteered/invited oral presentation at professional meetings=0.5/1. Points awarded if faculty member is the actual presenter. Points may also be awarded under publications. • Manuscript or project peer review=0.5. • Editor: tech. or associate=2, journal=3. Manuscripts handled in this capacity should not be listed under peer reviews. • PhD/MS graduate committee=0.75/0.5. • Ph.D./MS graduate advisor=2/1. • Post-Doctoral advisor=2. • Hosting visiting scholars=0.5 to 2 points. 0.5-3 months: 0.5 points. 3-6 months: 1 point. 6-9 months: 1.5 points. 9-12 months: 2 points. • Interdisciplinary participation=1 to 3 points. Points awarded for each activity based on significance. • Advising producers=1 to 5 points. Subjective based on total activity. • Presentations to producer groups=0.5. • Tours=0.3. • Media interviews=0.3. • Informal service activities=0.3. • Uncompensated consulting=1 to 3 points. Points awarded for each consultation based on significance. • Collegiality = 0-10 points. Subjective recognition of leadership, collegiality, cooperation, initiative, and enthusiasm. No specific documentation required. • Self-Improvement=1 to 3 points. Professional meetings, short-courses, training, visits to other research organizations, sabbaticals. State meeting: 1 point. Regional meeting: 2 points. National meeting: 3 points. 			
Totals			100	Max=100
Directed Service	The specific assigned responsibilities serve as criteria for evaluation. Directed service, if less than 100%, is credited by dividing total score by (1-tenths allocated for directed service).	Standards are subjective and developed individually for each position with these responsibilities.		

<1> The total raw points of the faculty member with the highest value in each criterion is set to 1 and the raw point totals for the rest of the faculty are scaled proportionately for that criterion.

Merit Salary Adjustments

Eligibility for merit salary adjustments will be determined solely from raw points from refereed publications. Faculty are eligible to participate in the next award of merit salary increases following the evaluation year if they meet at least one of two criteria: (1) earn a total raw point value of 1.0 or higher for the current evaluation year or (2) maintain a three-year running raw point average of 1.0 or higher. The three-year running average shall include the current and two previous evaluation years. Annual merit salary adjustments within WKARC will be positively correlated with the three-year running averages of the overall performance scores. The comparison pool for merit salary adjustments will consist of the faculty within WKARC.

Tenure-Track and Newly-Appointed Tenured Faculty

Faculty in this category cannot be expected to meet the minimum standard of tenured faculty defined above during the building phase of their program. During this phase, these faculty members will define specific annual goals to accomplish, with concurrence of the unit head, and performance and merit pay will be based on the extent to which these goals are achieved taking into account any mitigating circumstances beyond the control of the individual.

Chronic Low Achievement

Most members of the WKARC faculty have 100% research appointments. The primary product of research is integrated in refereed publications (including patents, germplasm releases) that document creative output. Therefore, the minimum expectation for WKARC faculty is tied solely to this criterion and defined as a running three-year average raw point value of 0.5 or higher. Productivity related to other rated criteria shall be rewarded in merit pay distribution to eligible faculty but does not directly determine minimal acceptable performance.

Overall performance is judged on whether the faculty member meets the minimum expectation. Members of the faculty who meet the minimum expectation are not further classified. It is difficult to define a meaningful boundary between meeting and exceeding expectations in a multi-disciplinary unit. However, merit pay distributions reflect level of output (see Table 5).

Chronic low achievement by a tenured faculty member leading to an overall classification of "fails to meet the minimum expectation" constitutes evidence of "professional incompetence" and invokes University Handbook section C31.5. This assumes the case of an established scientist and no unusual circumstances. When faculty performance falls below the minimum expectation, the unit head will inform the individual and suggest a course of remedial action in writing. Response to the recommendations will be documented in subsequent evaluations. Failure to meet the minimum expectation for two successive evaluations, or a total of three in any five-year period, constitutes grounds for pursuing dismissal for cause at the discretion of the Dean/Director.

Annual Reappointment

Faculty members on probationary appointments are evaluated annually to determine whether or not they will be reappointed for another year (University Handbook Section C50.1). This process will normally start in September and follow the schedule determined by the provost for the given academic year. The candidate will compile and submit the documentation of his or her professional accomplishments, in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines of the academic department, to the WKARC department head and to the academic department head. The WKARC head will solicit recommendations for reappointment from the eligible tenured faculty in WKARC. The WKARC head will forward the recommendations of the faculty and his own recommendation to the academic department head where tenure will reside. Those recommendations will become part of the cumulative record to accompany the recommendation and documentation forwarded by the academic department head to the dean and director.

Promotion and Tenure

Faculty members are hired at the assistant professor level based on academic credentials and demonstrated potential to be successful. Promotion is based upon improvement in achievements in relation to the specific criteria, standards, and guidelines. Promotion to associate professor rests on substantial professional contributions that reflect excellence in research; promotion to professor is based on attainment of excellence in the assigned responsibilities and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies. In short, each academic rank demands a higher level of accomplishment. (University Handbook Section C120)

Promotion to associate professor is contingent upon meeting the qualifications for tenure at K-State. Tenure is granted on the basis of sustained achievements that identify faculty members as being leaders in their fields. Tenure is not acquired simply as a result of routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies, i.e., leadership is essential (University Handbook Section C100). To earn credit for tenure from research activities, a candidate must display a productive and creative mind through published research or artistic and creative projects. Creative output is to be judged for quality as well as quantity and consistency. There should be convincing evidence that the candidate has continuously been engaged in research or other creative activity of high quality and significance. For faculty hired at academic rank other than assistant professor, but without tenure, the criteria and standards for tenure are higher than those for faculty hired at the assistant professor rank.

The academic department head will follow University Handbook guidelines in consultation with the WKARC head to advise and assist the faculty member in preparation of mid-tenure and tenure documents (University Handbook section C116.1). The academic department head will solicit recommendations from the academic department faculty, and from the WKARC head and all eligible tenured faculty members in WKARC. The letter of recommendation to be forwarded to the dean and director from the academic department head will also be signed by the WKARC head. All WKARC and academic unit votes will be forwarded with the candidate's documentation of accomplishments in accordance with the academic department criteria, standards, and guidelines to the dean and director.

Criteria and standards for mid-tenure review and for promotion and tenure are similar to those used to evaluate annual performance. The trend in annual evaluation provides a measure of those attributes of progress and achievement that are consistent with the purpose of academic rank. Mid-tenure review and promotion nominations will consider the trend in annual evaluation scores since the original appointment

or the last promotion and take into account the guidelines in the University Handbook summarized above. Such recommendations shall be made after consultation with the tenured faculty in the unit. Mid-tenure review shall take place during the third year of appointment.

While there is no explicit time-in-rank required for promotion, the median time for promotion at K-State has been about six years (University Handbook Section C131). Promotion may be granted earlier when the faculty member's cumulative performance at rank clearly meets the criteria and standards for promotion. Recommendations for early consideration of tenure and promotion shall be predicated on the expectation that the productivity record-to-date is substantially equivalent to or exceeds that expected of a faculty member with standard time in rank being considered for similar action. Thus, performance should consistently and significantly exceed the minimum expectation to merit consideration for early promotion.

Professorial Performance Award

The Professorial Performance Award (PPA) is described in Sections C49.1 through C49.14 of the Kansas State University Handbook. It is intended to reward high performance for those at the professor rank.

Section C49.2 of the Kansas State University Handbook specifies university-wide requirements for eligibility for the PPA. Those requirements are repeated here for clarity: (1) The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in that rank at Kansas State at least six years since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award; (2) The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review; and (3) The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards. Additionally, each department/unit will specify eligibility criteria according to its own unit's standards of excellence. Eligibility and submission of case materials according to the minimum requirements does not guarantee selection for this award.

The performance period must include the six most recent years of employment but the candidate may choose to include or exclude any additional period since promotion to full professor or since the last PPA. The chosen performance period must be stated to the unit head before preparation of the candidate's summary of performance (a numerical summary providing evidence of performance and ranking within the unit).

The candidate must rank within the upper 1/2 of the unit faculty in at least 4 of the 6 most recent years of employment. Rankings are based on the quantitative annual evaluation procedures and criteria as adopted by the faculty of the WKARC.

The department head will notify those faculty members who are eligible for the PPA during their annual performance evaluation conference in January. Candidates who wish to apply for the PPA must prepare and submit written case materials to meet deadlines determined annually by the Dean/Director (normally mid February). Case materials will be similar to those prepared for promotion and tenure evaluations. Candidates are encouraged to begin preparation of these case materials well in advance of the deadline and to share draft documents with their colleagues and unit head during preparation so that an accurate and strong case can be presented. External letters of evaluation of the finalized case materials are not required.

Review and balloting of the case materials will be conducted by all faculty of assistant professor rank and higher from within the WKARC regardless of discipline or appointment. Emeritus faculty members are excluded from the process because they may no longer have adequate interaction with the candidate in question.

Should any WKARC eligibility criteria, PPA instructions, or PPA case materials documentation format conflict with the University Handbook, Section C49.1 through C49.14, the University Handbook will take precedence.