

## **DEPARTMENT BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING**

### **ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES (Approved by Faculty Vote on May 1, 2006)**

**Gary Clark, Department Head  
Date signed: 5/02/06**

**Terry King, Dean  
Date signed: 5/16/06**

**M. Duane Nellis, Provost  
Date signed: 7/19/06**

### **PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES (Approved by Faculty Vote on November 22, 2002)**

**Gary Clark, Department Head  
Date signed: 12/12/02**

**Terry King, Dean  
Date signed: 1/31/03**

**M. Duane Nellis, Provost  
Date signed: 12/21/05**

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

**REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES\*: November 2007**

\*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.

---

**BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT**

**KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY**

---

**GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION,**

Approved by BAE Faculty Vote: November 2002

**MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE LEVEL OF PRODUCTIVITY,**

(Chronic Low Achievement Standards)

Approved by BAE Faculty Vote: November 2002

**PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD  
GUIDELINES**

Approved by BAE Faculty Vote: May 2006

**AND**

**GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

Approved by BAE Faculty Vote: November 2002

---

**GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION,  
MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE LEVEL OF PRODUCTIVITY,  
(Chronic Low Achievement Standards)  
AND PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD GUIDELINES**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation .....	2
Biological and Agricultural Engineering Mission Statement.....	2
Introduction .....	2
I. Faculty Evaluation Guidelines.....	3
A. Job Description and Goals .....	3
B. Evaluation of Teaching, Research, Extension and Service Components of Appointment.....	4
C. Criteria and Procedures for Minimum Faculty Performance .....	4
D. Collegiality .....	5
II. Information Considered in Evaluation .....	6
A. Evaluation Procedure and Timelines .....	6
Table 1. Scales for Faculty Evaluation Categories .....	6
Table 2. Schedule of Activities for Faculty Evaluation .....	8
B. Teaching .....	8
C. Research.....	10
D. Extension .....	11
Table 3. Extension Appointment Evaluation Criteria .....	11
E. Service .....	11
F. Scholarship, Creativity, and Professional Development .....	12
Appendices .....	14
Appendix A Mission Statements.....	15
Appendix B Faculty Annual Achievement Report Forms.....	16
Appendix C Evaluation Forms.....	28
Appendix D Standards for Minimum-Acceptable Level of Productivity .....	35
Appendix E Kansas State University, Principles of Community .....	36
Appendix F Kansas Board of Regents Advising Policy .....	37
Appendix G Reference List.....	39
Minimum Criteria for Tenured Faculty Performance (Chronic Low Achievement Standards) .....	40
Standards for Minimum-Acceptable Level of Productivity for Tenured Faculty .....	40
Teaching .....	41
Research .....	41
Extension .....	41
Service .....	41
Professorial Performance Award Guidelines .....	42
Criteria and Standards.....	42
Procedure .....	43
Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure.....	45
I. Assistant to Associate Professor Rank.....	46
A. The New Phase .....	46
B. The Mid Term Phase .....	47
C. The Advanced Phase.....	47
II. Associate to Full Professor .....	48

**BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT  
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY**

**GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION**

**(Approved by the BAE Faculty, November 2002)**

---

**BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING**

**MISSION STATEMENT**

*The mission of the Biological and Agricultural Engineering (BAE)*

*Department is to provide Biological and Agricultural Engineering teaching, research, and extension programs in food and fiber production, processing, and distribution systems that address environmental quality and safety issues and are responsive to the needs of Kansans. The BAE Department supports the missions of Kansas State University, the Colleges of Agriculture and Engineering, and K-State Research and Extension.*

---

**INTRODUCTION**

The faculty evaluation process should provide a structure that will 1) present an opportunity to examine the accomplishments of the past, 2) identify areas of faculty excellence, 3) reflect on areas of potential improvement, and 4) provide a basis for constructive dialogue between the faculty member and Department Head that leads to additional opportunities for excellence.

Each faculty member has the responsibility of addressing the specifics of their job description in order that the Department may utilize their collective expertise to advance the missions of the Department, College and University (Appendix A). Kansas State University (KSU) has several important missions, and a fundamental one is the education of students. Classroom teaching is the common medium; however, small group or individual instruction, such as supervision of independent studies and research, clinical instruction, and advising students, are

also important forms of teaching. This variety is critical to institutional excellence. Extension specialists teach in diverse settings across the state and they are expected to use a variety of teaching methods and strategies. Original intellectual contributions fulfill a fundamental mission of the University and are crucial to institutional excellence.

The following sections of this document are intended to provide guidance for faculty in the development of their annual achievement report. Faculty annual achievement report forms are patterned after those used in the promotion and tenure process and are provided in Appendix B. Information that goes on these forms will be discussed in the subsequent sections of these guidelines. Upon review of each faculty's achievement report the Department Head will complete an evaluation summary using the evaluation forms in Appendix C.

## **I. FACULTY EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

### **A. Job Description and Goals**

Job descriptions and goals are critical because they establish the boundaries for performance documentation. The position announcement under which a faculty member is hired becomes the initial job description. As job, organization, and faculty responsibilities evolve, the initial job description should be evaluated and changed to reflect evolving responsibilities. These changes should be made prior to the forthcoming evaluation period, but changes can be made during the evaluation year if strongly justified. Changes should be approved by the respective faculty member, the Department Head, and Deans of the College of Engineering and the College of Agriculture.

Short-term and long-term goals are an important component in the planning and execution of future activities. Goals developed by individual faculty should be realistic and relevant to the missions of the Department and respective Colleges. As teaching, research, and extension programs evolve and change throughout the year, the initial set of goals should be evaluated and modified as appropriate. Significant modifications should be discussed between the faculty member and the Department Head. Faculty will be evaluated on their development and attainment of goals.

## **B. Evaluation of Teaching, Research, Extension and Service Components of Appointment**

Each teaching, research, extension and service component of respective faculty appointments is evaluated separately for annual evaluation ratings. The overall rating will be a sum of the respective evaluation components. Professional performance is exceptionally complex and cannot be evaluated adequately based on a single source of information. It is essential that faculty evaluation be based on multiple sources of data for each area evaluated in order to provide various perspectives and to avoid concentration on narrow performance objectives. Lists of suggested activities and forms of documentation appropriate to the evaluation of the various categories of faculty responsibilities can be found in "Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustment, Tenure and Promotion." <http://www.ksu.edu/academicservices/depthead/promotion/finalcon.html/>

## **C. Criteria and Procedures for Minimum Tenured Faculty Performance**

This section relates to the "minimum-acceptable level of productivity" for tenured faculty members in the Department. It serves as an addition to the procedures for annual faculty evaluation. The purpose, as required by the KSU Faculty Handbook, Section C31.5 Chronic Low Achievement, is to clarify issues related to a tenured faculty member's evaluation that fails to satisfy the minimum-level of productivity.

While it is recognized that not all faculty members will excel in all activities enumerated in the Guidelines for Faculty Promotion and Tenure, each faculty member is expected to perform their professional duties at or above a minimum-acceptable level of productivity in each area of substantial or critical work assigned to the faculty member.

During the annual review of all faculty, the Department Head will determine whether any tenured faculty member appears to not meet the minimum-acceptable level of productivity as defined in Appendix D. For all tenured faculty, the decision will be based on annual evaluation material. If the Department Head determines that a faculty member appears not to meet the minimum standard in any area of assigned responsibility, the Department Head shall indicate so in writing to the faculty member. A committee of tenured Professors will be convened (unless the faculty member requests otherwise) to review performance. If the Department Head receives adequate evidence that an individual does not meet the minimum-acceptable level of productivity in any substantial or critical area of work, then action will be initiated following procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

#### **D. Collegiality**

Faculty are expected to be cooperative and active Departmental Citizens. They are members in the community of scholars and endorse the KSU Principles of Community (<http://www.ksu.edu/Welcome/community.html>, also see Appendix E). As a member in the community, they should feel a sense of responsibility for the welfare of the group. They will refrain from actions that harm an individual or the reputations of members of the group or of the group as a whole. Furthermore, faculty are expected to work for the good of the community and toward the achievement of its mission and goals. As Departmental Citizens, faculty are expected to:

- Actively participate on committees and in Departmental meetings (Regularly participate in meetings; Provide contributions to assignments or committee tasks; Provide leadership as active chairs on committees)
- Extend professional courtesy to others and show respect for their opinions (Maintain civility in meetings; Cooperate in meetings and on committees)
- Contribute to the “health” and mission of the BAE Department by: Maintaining a commitment to the quality of their duties in teaching, research, extension, or service activities; Participating and contributing to Departmental functions and activities (such as scholarship days, career fair, new student enrollment, ATM career development event); Helping to maintain a friendly, student-focused atmosphere.

## II. INFORMATION CONSIDERED IN EVALUATION

### A. Evaluation Procedure and Timelines

Each faculty and/or unclassified professional person will provide an annual written summary of accomplishments and activities (using the forms in Appendix B) to the Department Head in accordance with the guidelines provided by the department's statement of criteria, standards, and procedures.

Based on the documentation submitted by the faculty member, the Department Head will prepare a written evaluation for each faculty or unclassified professional person (using the forms in Appendix C.) The Head will use quantitative ratings to summarize evaluative judgments; the basis for such judgments will be explained by a narrative account. In addition to the quantitative ratings, the Department Head will summarize the evaluation in terms of "expectations". The categories will include the following: "greatly exceeded expectations," "exceeded expectations," "met expectations," "fallen below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity," and "fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity," with the "minimum-acceptable levels of productivity" referring to the Department's minimum standards. These "expectations" will be based on the quantitative ratings in accordance with the scale in Table 1. Additionally, the Department Head will indicate, in writing, a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member.

<b>Score</b>	<b>Category or Overall Evaluation</b>
94-100	Greatly exceeded expectations
85-93	Exceed expectations
74-84	Met expectations
60-73	Fallen below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity
<60	Fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity

The evaluation period will be the same for all faculty in the department, with the possible exception of first year appointees and those who have been on leave for all or a part of the year. The evaluation system will be based on performance during the 12-month evaluation period ending December 31. A three-year rolling average of the individual's annual evaluation results will be the basis for determining relative salary recommendations to minimize inequities due to variable legislative actions from year to year.

After the Department Head has drafted the evaluations, the Head will arrange for interviews with each faculty or unclassified person to review and discuss the draft evaluations. The Head will invite the faculty member to correct any errors of fact and to supply additional documentation to correct possible errors of judgment. The purpose of the interview is to insure that the "final evaluation," prepared after the interview, represents the most valid, fair statement of professional achievement possible. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, faculty or unclassified professionals will be given the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding the evaluation.

The Head will recommend a salary adjustment for each faculty based on the three-year rolling average of performance. The recommended percentage increases based on the annual evaluation for faculty with higher levels of accomplishment shall exceed those for persons with lower levels of accomplishment. The Head then will submit the following items to the Dean:

- a. A copy of the evaluation system used to prepare the evaluations.
- b. A written evaluation for each faculty or unclassified professional person employed for at least three months during the calendar year.
- c. A recommended merit salary adjustment for each faculty or unclassified professional person that should be based directly on the person's evaluation (unless other salary adjustment instructions are provided and must be followed).
- d. Documentation (e.g., a statement signed by the faculty evaluated) establishing that there was an opportunity to examine and discuss the written evaluation with the Department Head.
- e. Any written statements submitted by faculty or unclassified professionals of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations.
- f. Any recommendations for salary adjustments on bases outside of the annual evaluation, together with documentation that supports these recommendations.

The Dean will review all evaluation materials and recommendations to insure that:

- a. The merit evaluations are consistent with the criteria and procedures approved for the unit,
- b. There are no inequities in the recommendations based upon gender, race, religion, national origin, age or disability,

- c. Merit salary recommendations are consistent with merit evaluations, and recommendations for salary adjustments on bases outside of the annual evaluations are adequately documented.

Approximate timelines for faculty evaluation are summarized in Table 2 below.

<b>Table 2. Schedule of Activities for Faculty Evaluation</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Date</b>
Department Head notifies the faculty of the submission date of the evaluation materials.	1 <sup>st</sup> week of December
Faculty submits documentation in accordance with Department Guidelines.	2 <sup>nd</sup> week of January
Department Head completes evaluations.	January
Department Head conducts interviews with faculty; goals and appointment assignments are discussed and agreed upon.	January – February
Department Head finalizes evaluations and forwards materials to the Dean.	March
Dean reviews and forwards materials to the Provost.	March
Provost reviews materials and returns evaluation comments and materials to the Dean and Department Head.	March – April
Department Head and Dean finalize evaluation ratings and salary adjustments and submit them to the Provost.	May –

## **B. Teaching**

Effective teaching produces beneficial and purposeful student learning and personal growth. Teaching activities and accomplishments are to be summarized using the forms and outline as shown on pages 20 and 21 of Appendix B. Evaluation will focus on classroom teaching as well as formal and informal student advising and mentoring activities, as they are integrally related in allowing students to reach their educational goals. An adequate system of summative evaluation of teaching should include multiple kinds of information in each category, with no one such kind of information contributing half or more of the weight for the assessment of teaching effectiveness. Student ratings of classroom instruction are an important source of information in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Tenure track faculty with classroom responsibilities shall be rated by students at least once a year in each course that they teach. Tenured faculty with classroom responsibilities shall have at least one course per year evaluated by the students in the course; however, the faculty member may choose which course will be evaluated. Faculty members with classroom teaching responsibilities ought to include the results of student ratings in the documentation they submit for personnel decisions concerning annual merit salary, reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

Student ratings should never be the only source of information about classroom teaching. Data other than student ratings that provide relevant evidence of teaching effectiveness are described in "Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustment, Tenure and Promotion." Examples include: course materials such as reading lists, syllabi, and examinations; special contributions to effective teaching for diverse student populations; preparation of innovative teaching materials or instructional techniques; special teaching activities outside the University; exit interviews, and graduate interviews and surveys to obtain information about teaching effectiveness. Peer evaluation, defined as a critical review by colleagues knowledgeable of the entire range of teaching activities, can be an important component of the University's teaching evaluation program since peers are often in the best position to interpret and understand the evidence and place it in its proper academic context.

Effective academic advising is central to the educational mission of the Board of Regents (Kansas Board of Regents Advising Policy, <http://www.ksu.edu/educadv/kboraa.htm> , also see Appendix F). Advising students is one of the most important responsibilities of the teaching faculty. Faculty are expected to advise both undergraduate and graduate students and to act as more than mere guides through routine scheduling difficulties, such as signing general forms, and are to serve as a direct link between the students and the university. Furthermore, it is assumed that they will assist an individual student throughout the student's entire undergraduate academic career. Ultimately, students are themselves responsible for fulfilling all the requirements of the curriculum in which they are enrolled and they should be familiar with the KSU Undergraduate and Graduate general catalogs regarding assignments and curricula.

Therefore, in order to fulfill their duties, advisors must:

- Make themselves familiar with the curriculum and courses necessary to meet the program requirements within the college.
- Become acquainted with the various resources available under the Student Services program and elsewhere within the university organizations.
- Maintain and post reasonable office hours during which students may meet with them, as and when required, to discuss any aspect of their scholastic career, especially issues related to the student's progress and plans for subsequent work.
- Familiarize themselves with administrative, university, and departmental regulations, procedures, and scheduled activities relating to the advising process.

Faculty evaluations of advising involve both quantity and quality issues. The number of undergraduate students assigned to a faculty member will generally be based upon the proportion of their teaching appointment to the total Departmental FTE's of teaching as a whole and the total number of undergraduate students in both ATM and BAE degree programs. Numbers of students may be adjusted up or down due to other circumstances (sabbatical leave, heavy graduate student activity, etc.).

Student evaluations of faculty advising may be used in the annual faculty evaluation process to assess quality of advising. Student evaluations of advising shall be conducted at least once in each academic year following the enrollment period (See Appendix F for example form). The Department Head may also assess advising quality of faculty during the exit interview process for graduating Seniors. This data may be used in the annual evaluation review with the respective faculty.

For more information related to academic advising, please refer to the KSU advising web site at <http://www.ksu.edu/educadv/> or Section F of the KSU University Handbook, <http://www.ksu.edu/academicsservices/fhbook/fhsecf.html>.

Evaluation of the faculty member's teaching appointment component will be based on the criteria as outlined on pages 20-21 (Appendix B). The percentages listed provide weighting factors for each of the evaluation criteria. Some are percentage ranges. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to meet with the Department Head at the start of each evaluation year to set percentages for each of the variable range factors so that the total of the five criteria percentages equals 100. If no meeting is scheduled the percentages will be 15, 60, 15, 8 and 2 percent respectively for the criteria (midrange values).

### **C. Research**

Research endeavors encompass a broad spectrum of activities that require critical analysis, investigation or experimentation. These endeavors are directed toward discovery, interpretation or application of knowledge. The results of research should be shared with others through publication or other media appropriate to the discipline. The stature of a university is to a large degree judged by quality and quantity of publications produced by its faculty.

Evaluation of the faculty member's research appointment component will be based on the criteria as outlined on the "Research and Other Creative Activity" forms on pages 22 through 24 of Appendix B. The percentages listed provide weighting factors for each of the evaluation criteria. Some are percentage ranges. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to meet with the Department Head at the start of each evaluation year to set percentages for each of the variable range factors so that the total of the five factor percentages equals 100. If no

meeting is scheduled the percentages will be 15, 15, 50 and 20 percent respectively for the criteria (mid range values).

**D. Extension**

Evaluation of extension faculty should have input from peers, supervisors and administrators, and clientele. Extension programs usually are team oriented. In these joint activities the degree of the work done by the person being evaluated should be identified by the respective Department Heads and respective faculty member.

Evaluation of the faculty member's extension component will be based on the evaluation criteria as outlined on pages 25 and 26 of Appendix B. The percentages listed provide weighting factors for each of the evaluation criteria. Some are percentage ranges. It is the faculty member's responsibility to meet with the Department Head at the start of each evaluation year to set percentages for each of the variable range factors so that the total of the five factors equals 100%. If no meeting is held the general guidelines shown in Table 3 shown below will be used for each respective rank.

<b>Table 3. Extension Appointment Evaluation Criteria</b>			
<b>Appointment Time Allocation Guideline</b>			
Activity			
	Assistant	Associate	Full
Extension Focus	15	15	15
Productivity	70	60	50
Extramural Funding	10	15	20
Other Educational Activities	5	10	15
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**E. Service**

In addition to teaching, research and extension, faculty members have the responsibility for directed and/or non-directed service.

Service contributions and activities should be summarized using the form and guidelines as shown on page 27 of Appendix B. Directed service (see Section C5 of the University Handbook) is work that is assigned and is beyond the normal teaching, research and extension activities. Directed service furthers the mission of and is directly related to the goals and objectives of the department and the university, requires academic credentials or special skills, and is a part of a faculty member's explicit assignment. Examples are administrative assignments (e.g., research unit director, assistant unit head, state extension leader, graduate program coordinator, undergraduate

program coordinator, etc.) and temporary international assignments. The nature and time allocated for the directed service assignment will be delineated in the goal statement of the faculty member; criteria and standards for this assignment will be developed by the Department Head and the faculty member.

Non-directed service (see Section C6 of the University Handbook) consists of three categories: profession-based service, institution-based service and public-based professional service. Each of these categories is described below:

1. Profession-based service is work that is directly related to the function of the unit and that provides leadership and service to the faculty member's profession or discipline. Examples are holding office in a professional association, service on an editorial board of a professional journal, and service to state, regional, national and international technical committees or task forces.
2. Institution-based service is work that is essential to the operation of the university. Example are serving on the Faculty Senate, the Graduate Council, task forces, and committees of the department, college or university, or acting as advisor to student organizations.
3. Public-based professional service is service that is not directed service but that is the application of knowledge and expertise intended for the benefit of a non-academic audience. Examples are serving as an expert witness, developing programs and providing training, or providing consultation.

All faculty are expected to contribute 10% of their time and efforts to non-directed service activities.

#### **F. Scholarship, Creativity, and Professional Development**

Life-long learning is an absolutely essential part of a faculty member's activity. Faculty members need to continuously grow in their professional areas including the area of education through learning activities throughout their career. Faculty members should pursue activities that show evidence of scholarship, creativity, and professional development. The extent and nature of such activities is to be determined by the faculty in consultation with the Department Head. Such activities promote excellence in teaching, research, extension, and service and help enhance the capability of an individual faculty member. Activities could include development of multi-media presentations and computer-aided or other innovative instructional methods, such as web-based educational modules. Scholarly and creative activities could also include the development and presentation of new materials in oral, written, or poster format. Written materials include original material in books, book chapters, refereed journal

articles, and other invited or peer reviewed publications.

Professional development activities include attendance at technical and/or enhancement conferences, workshops, and courses. They also include activities that promote and enhance the function of professional/technical organizations such as serving as conference chair, session moderator, editor or associate editor. Professional development, as opposed to professional service, would be to the degree of effort by and educational opportunity for the individual faculty member. For example, serving as a session/symposium moderator would be service if the faculty member only introduces speakers but would be considered a professional development activity if the faculty member selects and reviews all presentation materials for the session. An extension bulletin is an example of productivity by a faculty member but could also be an example of scholarship and professional development activity given that the faculty member did extensive review of literature and/or improved his or her own knowledge base in preparation of the bulletin. Any honors or awards given to a faculty member in recognition of prepared materials or meeting/program organization would be considered evidence of exceptional excellence.

A summary of scholarly activities should be summarized in the "Focus" area for each respective appointment.

## **APPENDICES**

## **APPENDIX A. Mission Statements**

### **MISSION OF THE COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING**

The mission of the College of Engineering is: To provide an educational environment and dedication to scholarship such that all engineering students can reach their full potential both in the study of engineering and as a person. To provide a research environment such that faculty and students can be as successful and productive as their talents will allow. To provide the citizens of Kansas and the nation an effective outreach program in technology and continuing education.

### **MISSION OF THE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE**

The primary mission of the Academic Programs Office in the College of Agriculture is to develop individuals at the graduate and undergraduate levels capable of applying scientific and business principles, appropriate skills and enlighten judgments for successful careers in agriculture and agriculturally related industries, education and research, and in their personal and social lives. To accomplish this mission, the College seeks to help students: Master one or more important areas of scientific agriculture and to gain knowledge and understanding of the supporting scientific areas so that they will be able to understand and assimilate new technological developments and apply new knowledge to problem solving. Develop appropriate skills and abilities to perform tasks efficiently and expertly in chosen areas of professional agriculture. Identify with and understand the ethics and goals of professional agriculture and to continue learning throughout their lives. Develop an appreciation for present-day civilization; understand that many subject areas are required to solve problems; develop and understand a philosophy of life and values; and develop communication and leadership skills and abilities to work with others. Provide non-traditional students opportunities to update information and retrain enabling them to continue learning throughout their lives.

### **MISSION OF K-STATE RESEARCH AND EXTENSION**

K-State Research and Extension is dedicated to a safe, sustainable, competitive food and fiber system, and strong, healthy communities, families and youth through integrated research, analysis, and education.

**APPENDIX B.**

**Faculty Annual Achievement Report Forms**



SUMMARY OF PAST YEAR'S GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

SECTION III - A

---

Instructions: Provide a summary of achievements on your goals and major accomplishments in teaching, research, extension, service, and any other scholarly activity during the evaluation period at the local, regional, national, and international levels.

GOAL STATEMENT

SECTION III - B

Instructions: The purpose of developing a goal statement is to help the faculty member develop and define the performance criteria that will be used to judge their progress towards fulfilling the missions of the department, college, and university, as well as establish guidelines for evaluating their own professional development. Both short-term (annual) and long-term goals should be outlined in the goal statement that establishes expected outcomes and defines measurable progress on objectives. The goal statement should give indicators of impacts to the targeted clientele or measures of program effectiveness. The goal statement should also include plans for professional development and scholarly activities. The goal statement is not limited to one page.

Year:

Assignment of Time: {Specify your assignment of time in teaching, research, extension, and/or directed service }

Teaching, %: \_\_\_\_\_

Extension, %: \_\_\_\_\_

Research, %: \_\_\_\_\_

Non-Direct Service, %: \_\_\_\_\_

Directed Service, %: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Short-Term (Annual) Goals

{List short-term goals for each assignment of time as well as for general service and other scholarly activity }

**Teaching:**

**Research:** Goals of the author's efforts in research for 2003 include:

**Non-Direct Service:**

**Directed Service:**

2. Long-Term Goals—(2 to 5 years)

{List your long-term goals for teaching, research, extension, service, and/or other scholarly activity as appropriate }

Date Faculty Member's Goals Were Agreed On: \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty Member's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Department Head's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Instructions: Summarize activities for the categories listed below. The assessment percentage weights for the Classroom/Courses Activities and Student Advising Activities categories should add up to 75%. For example: If a person has a 60% activity percentage weighting for Classroom/Courses Activities, then they should have a 15% activity percentage weighting for the Student Advising Activities. These percentages may be adjusted with agreement from the Department Head.

1. Teaching Focus : **15% for teaching** Percentage\_\_\_\_\_
  - a. Attainment of previous year's goals
  - b. Relevance to College and Departmental missions
  - c. Interdepartmental and interdisciplinary cooperation
  - d. Scholarship in teaching
  
2. Classroom/Courses Activities: **50 - 70% for teaching** Percentage\_\_\_\_\_
  - a. Classroom instruction
    - Course number
    - Credit hours
    - Contact hours
    - Number of students
  - b. Course development (new/revised)
    - Written materials
    - Electronic media
    - Physical facilities
  - c. Other (guest lectures)
  
3. Student Advising Activities: **5 - 25% for teaching** Percentage\_\_\_\_\_
  - a. Undergraduate Advising
    - Number of advisees
    - Other (honors program, internships, topics, problems, design projects)
  - b. Graduate Advising
    - Number
    - Other (problems, BAE 899 and 999)
  - c. Other (student organizations, recruitment, etc.)

---

<sup>1</sup> Sections IV-A and IV-B constitute the teaching part of the evaluation. Within this part, the sum of percentages assigned to items listed in Sections IV-A and IV-B should be 100%.

Instructions: Provide evidence of instructional quality such as ratings, peer evaluations, evaluation of advisement, outcomes of instructional projects directed, awards, etc. The assessment weighting for each of the instructional quality categories (Classroom/Courses and Student Advising) should be about 13% of the assessment weights assigned to the respective instructional activity categories and rounded to the nearest whole number. The sum of these two categories should equal 10%. For example: If the activity percentage weighting for the Classroom/Courses Activities category is 60%, then the associated "Classroom/Courses Quality" percentage weighting should be 8%. Then the associated "Student Advising Quality" percentage weighting should be 2%.

1. Classroom/Courses Quality: **(7% - 9%) ~ 13% of the Classroom/Courses Activity weighting**

Percentage\_\_\_\_\_

- a. Student evaluations
- b. Department Head evaluation
- c. Other

2. Student Advising Quality: **(1% - 3%) ~ 13% of the Student Advising Activity weighting**

Percentage\_\_\_\_\_

- a. Undergraduate Advising
  - Student evaluations
  - Department Head evaluation
  - Other
- b. Graduate Advising
  - Student evaluations
  - Department Head evaluation
  - Other
- c. Other (student organizations, recruitment, etc.)

Instructions: Provide a statement of research and other creative activities.

1. Research Focus: **15% for research** Percentage \_\_\_\_\_
  - a. Attainment of previous year's goals
  - b. Impact of research to Departmental and K-State Research and Extension missions
  - c. Participation/leadership on K-State Research/Extension team(s)  
Interdisciplinary cooperation
  - d. Scholarship in research
  
2. Research Guided: **10 - 20% for research** Percentage \_\_\_\_\_  
(undergraduate, graduate, post-doctoral, visiting scholars, etc.)
  - a. Advisor/co-advisor
  - b. Graduate/research committees

---

<sup>2</sup>Sections V-A, V-B, and V-C constitute the research part of the evaluation. Within this part, the sum of percentages assigned to items listed in Sections V-A, V-B, and V-C should be 100%.

## RESEARCH AND OTHER CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

### SECTION V - B

---

Instructions: Provide a list of publications and other creative achievements for the evaluation period. Include items accepted but not yet published/presented.

1. Research Productivity: **45 - 60% for research** Percentage\_\_\_\_\_
  - a. Refereed journal publications (2 publications/FTE expected)
  - b. Invited publications
  - c. Non-refereed publications (published, meeting papers, etc.)
  - d. Lab and/or facility development
  - e. CRIS/regional project report
  - f. Others activities: (scholarly presentations, posters, etc.)

Instructions: Provide a list of grants and contracts funded, or applied for, but not funded, during the evaluation period. Include agency, funding level, duration, title, and collaborators.

1. Extramural Funding: **10 - 25% for research**                      Percentage\_\_\_\_\_
  - a. Funded proposals: (on-going research project, new projects)
  - b. Other support: (gifts, in-kind support)
  - c. Non-funded proposals

---

Instructions: Provide a summary of extension activity for the evaluation period.

1. Extension Focus: **15% for extension** Percentage \_\_\_\_\_
- a. Program planning
    - Attainment of previous years goals
    - Plan of work
  - b. Program development
    - Participation/leadership on K-State Research and Extension team(s)
    - Interagency/Interdepartmental/Interdisciplinary cooperation
  - c. Impact and evaluation
    - Program accomplishments
  - d. Scholarship in extension
2. Productivity: **35 - 85% for extension** Percentage \_\_\_\_\_
- a. Written Extension Publications
    - (List separately those works that are completed or in-progress)
    - Electronic materials, slide/powerpoint
    - Bulletin/fact sheet/update
    - Meeting/field day publications and notes
  - b. Written Non-Extension Publications
    - (List separately those works that are completed or in-progress)
    - Refereed journal publications
    - Invited publications
    - Other publications
  - c. Mass media
    - Radio/TV programs/video/DTN
    - Newspaper releases/magazine articles
  - d. Public and agent activities
    - County/multi-county meetings/tours/field demonstration projects
    - KSU or private industry field days
    - Regional meetings
    - Agent/specialist training
    - Other workshops and/or schools
  - e. Consultations
    - Farm/ field visitations or evaluations
    - Telephone/office consultations/one-on-one or small groups activities
    - Electronic/written (e-mail, FAX, web)
    - Design of University facilities

---

<sup>3</sup>Section VI constitutes the extension part of the evaluation. Within this part, the sum of percentages assigned to all items should be 100%.

3. Extramural Funding **0 - 30% for extension** Percentage\_\_\_\_\_
- a. Demonstration/ On-going grant projects
  - b. Funded / non-funded proposals
4. Other Educational Activities **0 - 20% for extension** Percentage\_\_\_\_\_
- a. Guest lecture/class
  - b. Graduate student committee (chair or member)
  - c. Undergraduate/advisor/committee
  - d. Special/emergency response



**APPENDIX C.**

**Evaluation Forms**

### FORM C1. EVALUATION SUMMARY

<b>Department of Biological and Agricultural Engineering</b> <b>Evaluation Summary</b> <b>Evaluation Period: January – December 200_</b>			
Name: _____		Rank: _____	
No. of Years at KSU: _____		No. of Years at Present Rank: _____	
Appointment:	Teaching: _____ %	Research: _____ %	Extension: _____ %
	Directed Service: _____ %	Non-Directed Service: _____ %	
Date of Evaluation by Department Head: _____		Date of Faculty Evaluation Conference: _____	

Current Year Evaluation	Rating	Weight	Weighted Score
Teaching			
Research			
Extension			
Directed Service			
Non-Directed Service		10%	
<b>Total</b>		100%	
<b>Summary of Scores for all BAE Faculty:</b>		Average: _____	Range: _____

OVERALL EVALUATION	20__ __	20__ __	20__ __	Average
Weighted Score				
Greatly exceeded expectations (94 – 100)				
Exceeded expectations (85 – 93)				
Met expectations (74 – 84)				
Fallen below expectations but has met minimum acceptable levels of productivity (60 – 73)				
Fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity (< 60)				

Remarks on Collegiality:

---



---

Department Head Remarks

---



---



---

Faculty Member Remarks

---



---



---

Signatures

---

Faculty Member

Date

Department Head

Date

<b>FORM C2. TEACHING APPOINTMENT SUMMARY</b>					
	1	2	3	4	5
	Maximum Percentage (Range)	Negotiated Percentage	Preliminary Department Head's Evaluation (0-100)	Final Evaluation (0-100)	Final Rating (Col. #2 x Col. #5)
A1. Teaching Focus	15%				
A2. Classroom/Courses Activity	50-70%				
A3. Student Advising Activity	5-25%				
B1. Classroom/Courses Quality	7-9%				
B2. Student Advising Quality	1-3%				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	---	---	

---

Faculty Member Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Meets minimum performance criteria. Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Department Head Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

<b>FORM C3. RESEARCH APPOINTMENT SUMMARY</b>					
	1	2	3	4	5
	Maximum Percentage (Range)	Negotiated Percentage	Preliminary Department Head's Evaluation (0-100)	Final Evaluation (0-100)	Final Rating (Col. #2 x Col. #5)
A1. Research Focus	15%				
A2. Research Guided	10-20%				
B1. Research Productivity	45-60%				
C1. Extramural Funding	10-25%				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	---	---	

---

Faculty Member Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Meets minimum performance criteria. Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Department Head Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

<b>FORM C4. EXTENSION APPOINTMENT SUMMARY</b>					
	1	2	3	4	5
	Percentage (Range)	Negotiated Percentage	Preliminary Department Head's Evaluation (0-100)	Final Evaluation  (0-100)	Final Rating (Col. #2 x Col. #5)
1. Extension Focus	15%				
2. Productivity	35-85%				
3. Extramural Funding	0-30%				
4. Other Educational Activities	0-20%				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	---	---	

---

Faculty Member Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Meets minimum performance criteria.                      Yes \_\_\_\_\_                      No \_\_\_\_\_

Department Head Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation criteria for directed service work will be mutually derived and agreed upon by the Department Head and faculty member prior to the directed service appointment. Directed service appointments may range up to 50% of a faculty members appointment.

**FORM C5. DIRECTED SERVICE APPOINTMENT SUMMARY**

Directed service negotiated appointment percentage \_\_\_\_\_%

	1	2	3	4	5
	Maximum Percentage for each Activity (Range)	Negotiated Percentage	Preliminary Department Head's Evaluation (0-100)	Final Evaluation (0-100)	Final Rating (Col. #2 x Col. #5)
Directed Service					
a. Activity 1	0-100%				
b. Activity 2	0-100%				
c. Activity 3	0-100%				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>		---	---	

---

Faculty Member Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Meets minimum performance criteria. Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Department Head Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

<b>FORM C6. NON-DIRECTED SERVICE APPOINTMENT SUMMARY</b>					
	1	2	3	4	5
	Maximum Percentage (Range)	Negotiated Percentage	Preliminary Department Head's Evaluation (0-100)	Final Evaluation (0-100)	Final Rating (Col. #2 x Col. #5)
Non-Directed Service					
a. Profession Based	0-70%				
b. Institution Based	0-70%				
c. Public Based Professional Service	0-70%				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	---	---	

---

Faculty Member Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Meets minimum performance criteria.                      Yes \_\_\_\_\_                      No \_\_\_\_\_

Department Head Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## **APPENDIX D.**

### **Standards for Minimum-Acceptable Level of Productivity For Tenured Faculty**

All faculty members must perform duties outlined in the KSU Faculty Handbook and be in compliance with all University policies. The "minimum-acceptable level of productivity" standards established herein will apply to all tenured faculty members in the department. Exceptions will be documented and signed by the faculty member and the Department Head.

No exact quotas or guidelines can exist and a combination of objective and subjective elements will enter into a final decision in the evaluation process. Decisions on acceptable performance levels must contain the individual judgments of the faculty and the administrators involved in the decision.

Productivity in each area of responsibility will be evaluated based on assigned activities and the percentage of the individual's appointment allocated to that activity. Each tenured faculty member is expected to perform the following activities in each area of assigned activities:

#### **Teaching**

1. Be conscientious about meeting classes on time; about content, organization and presentation of materials; and about the appropriate evaluation of students.
2. Strive to be consistent in content and depth of material covered so that required learning objectives for each course taught are obtained.
3. Work to keep course materials current. Ensure that appropriate mix of engineering sciences, analysis, and design are used as appropriate to meet learning objectives of their courses. Use technology tools to enhance learning as appropriate.
4. Perform student advising conscientiously.

#### **Research**

1. Engage in scholarly and other activities appropriate to the profession.
2. Serve as advisor of graduate students and/or member on committees.
3. Serve on research teams and work with others in an appropriate manner.

#### **Extension**

1. Develop and maintain programs appropriate to the field of professional competence.
2. Be conscientious about setting and meeting schedules on time and about organization and presentations of information.
3. Serve on program teams and work with others in an appropriate manner.

#### **Service**

1. Serve on departmental and professional committees.
2. Attend departmental meetings.
3. Attend functions appropriate to the areas of responsibilities to assigned.

## **APPENDIX E.**

### **Kansas State University, Principles of Community**

**(<http://www.ksu.edu/Welcome/community.html>)**

*Kansas State University is a land-grant, public research university, committed to teaching and learning, research, and service to the people of Kansas, the nation, and the world. Our collective mission is best accomplished when every member of the university community acknowledges and practices the following principles:*

*We affirm the inherent dignity and value of every person and strive to maintain an atmosphere of justice based on respect for each other.*

*We affirm the right of each person to freely express thoughts and opinions in a spirit of civility and decency. We believe that diversity of views enriches our learning environment and we promote open expression within a climate of courtesy, sensitivity, and mutual respect.*

*We affirm the value of human diversity for community. We confront and reject all forms of prejudice and discrimination, including those based on race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, sexual orientation, religious or political beliefs, economic status, or any other differences that have led to misunderstandings, hostility, and injustice.*

*We acknowledge that we are a part of the larger Kansas community and that we have an obligation to be engaged in a positive way with our civic partners.*

*We recognize our individual obligations to the university community and to the principles that sustain it. We will each strive to contribute to a positive spirit that affirms learning and growth for all members of the community.*

## **APPENDIX F.**

### **Kansas Board of Regents Advising Policy**

**(<http://www.ksu.edu/educadu/kboraa.htm>)**

#### **ACADEMIC ADVISING**

a. Effective academic advising is central to the educational mission of the Board of Regents. To ensure that all students have access to high quality advising, each Regents university shall establish an Academic Advising System which shall provide the following:

(1) Goal Setting: Each Academic Advising System should help students to set both short-term and long-term educational goals.

(2) Information: Each Academic Advising System should be able to accurately inform students of graduation requirements of their department. It should be sensitive to the importance of strategic course selections so as to minimize the number of semesters required for graduation. Additionally, the System should be able to inform students of career opportunities in their field of study.

(3) Transitions: Each Academic Advising System should inform students how to change colleges and/or departments. Furthermore, the System should provide information to explain the process students follow to enroll in their curriculum and to drop or add courses during the semester.

(4) Accessibility: Each Academic Advising System should have reasonable hours and methods of availability for students. Additionally, students should be able to set up appointments within the System for an adequate amount of time to make curricular selections and career choices.

(5) Referral to Campus Resources: Each Academic Advising System should be able to refer students to various campus resources including, but not limited to: university counseling services, student activities, and career and employment services.

b. Each Academic Advising System shall provide information to students to inform them of their responsibilities in the Academic Advising process.

c. Each Academic Advising System shall be responsible for the necessary training of academic advisors to assist them in meeting the responsibilities of this policy.

d. Each Academic Advising System shall have a mechanism to assess academic advising at the department level, relative to this policy, on a yearly basis and shall report the results of said assessment as part of Program Review to the Board of Regents. (5-20-99).

## ADVISOR EVALUATION FORM

Faculty Advisor: \_\_\_\_\_

Semesters that you have been enrolled at KSU: \_\_\_\_\_

- 1 = Definitely False
- 2 = More False Than True
- 3 = More True Than False
- 4 = Definitely True
- 5 = Cannot Judge

1. I can contact my advisor when I need to.	1	2	3	4	5
2. My advisor maintains and posts reasonable office hours available to advisees.	1	2	3	4	5
3. My advisor provides alternatives for posted hours such as scheduling an individual appointment or providing a referral to another academic advisor.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I go to my advising sessions well prepared. I arrive on time, have questions prepared, have identified courses that I would like to take plus have a list of alternative courses.	1	2	3	4	5
5. My advisor is familiar with the curriculum and courses necessary to meet the program requirements within the college.	1	2	3	4	5
6. My advisor takes enough time to answer my questions (either in our advising session or at another scheduled time).	1	2	3	4	5
7. My advisor helps me with my course selections and considers my past courses and performance.	1	2	3	4	5
8. My advisor is courteous, professional, and shows sincere interest in helping me.	1	2	3	4	5
9. My advisor is familiar with the university, college, and departmental deadlines, policies, procedures, and scheduled activities that may concern me; or is familiar with how to obtain the necessary information.	1	2	3	4	5
10. If I have a problem (financial aid, study skills, emotional/physical health, etc.) my advisor helps me or knows where to send me to get help.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Overall I am satisfied with my academic advisor and the advising that I receive.	1	2	3	4	5

## **APPENDIX G.**

### **Reference List**

KSU Manual for Effective Faculty Evaluation; Annual Salary Adjustments, Tenure, and Promotion. KSU Faculty Handbook, 1996. (<http://www.ksu.edu/academicservices/depthead/promotion/finalcon.html>).

KSU University handbook. (<http://www.ksu.edu/academicservices/fhbook>).

**BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT  
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY**

**MINIMUM CRITERIA FOR TENURED FACULTY PERFORMANCE  
(Chronic Low Achievement Standards)**

**(Approved by the BAE Faculty, November 2002)**

---

These criteria relate to the "minimum-acceptable level of productivity" for tenured faculty members in the Department. It serves as an addition to the procedures for annual faculty evaluation. The purpose, as required by the KSU Faculty Handbook, Section C31.5 Chronic Low Achievement, is to clarify issues related to a tenured faculty member's evaluation that fails to satisfy the minimum-level of productivity.

While it is recognized that not all faculty members will

excel in all activities enumerated in the Guidelines for Faculty Promotion and Tenure, each faculty member is expected to perform their professional duties at or above a minimum-acceptable level of productivity in each area of substantial or critical work assigned to the faculty member.

During the annual review of all faculty, the Department Head will determine whether any tenured faculty member appears to not meet the minimum-acceptable level of productivity as defined below. For all tenured faculty the decision will be based on annual evaluation material. If the Department Head determines that a tenured faculty member appears not to meet the minimum standard in any area of assigned responsibility, the Department Head shall indicate so in writing to the faculty member. A committee of tenured Professors will be convened (unless the faculty member requests otherwise) to review performance. If the Department Head receives adequate evidence that an individual does not meet the minimum-acceptable level of productivity in any substantial or critical area of work, then action will be initiated following procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

**Standards for Minimum-Acceptable Level of Productivity For Tenured Faculty**

All faculty members must perform duties outlined in the KSU Faculty Handbook and be in compliance with all University policies. The "minimum-acceptable level of productivity" standards established herein will apply to all tenured faculty members in the department. Exceptions will be documented and signed by the faculty member and the Department Head.

No exact quotas or guidelines can exist and a combination of objective and subjective elements will enter into a final decision in the evaluation process. Decisions on acceptable performance levels must contain the

individual judgments of the faculty and the administrators involved in the decision.

Productivity in each area of responsibility will be evaluated based on assigned activities and the percentage of the individual's appointment allocated to that activity. Each tenured faculty member is expected to perform the following activities in each area of assigned activities:

### **Teaching**

1. Be conscientious about meeting classes on time; about content, organization and presentation of materials; and about the appropriate evaluation of students.
2. Strive to be consistent in content and depth of material covered so that required learning objectives for each course taught are obtained.
4. Work to keep course materials current. Ensure that appropriate mix of engineering sciences, analysis, and design are used as appropriate to meet learning objectives of their courses. Use technology tools to enhance learning as appropriate.
5. Perform student advising conscientiously.

### **Research**

1. Engage in scholarly and other activities appropriate to the profession.
2. Serve as advisor of graduate students and/or member on committees.
3. Serve on research teams and work with others in an appropriate manner.

### **Extension**

1. Develop and maintain programs appropriate to the field of professional competence.
2. Be conscientious about setting and meeting schedules on time and about organization and presentations of information.
3. Serve on program teams and work with others in an appropriate manner.

### **Service**

1. Serve on departmental and professional committees.
2. Attend departmental meetings.
3. Attend functions appropriate to the areas of responsibilities to assigned.

## **BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT**

### **KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY**

## **PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by the BAE Faculty, May 2006)**

---

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. Following are the criteria and guidelines for the PPA in the Department of Biological and Agricultural Engineering (BAE). These criteria and guidelines are based on the guidelines presented in Section C of the K-State University Handbook (<http://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/fhbook/>). These will be subject to review by the BAE faculty at least every five years.

### **Criteria and Standards**

To be considered for the PPA, the candidate must meet the following criteria:

1. The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at KSU at least six years since promotion or receipt of a PPA.
2. Based upon the BAE Department annual evaluation process, the candidate must have had sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review. Evidence includes earning an overall evaluation that, on average, is equal to or better than “exceeds expectations” in the annual evaluation process in the most recent six years since promotion to professor or receipt of a PPA. For this purpose, one “greatly exceeds expectations” will average with one “meets expectations” to equal one “exceeds expectations.”

3. The overall productivity and performance of the candidate must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards. According to the University Handbook (Section 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.” It is one recognition that the individual is accomplished in all aspects of his or her assigned duties and will continue to strive for higher levels of achievement. Since promotion to professor or receipt of a PPA, the candidate is expected to have demonstrated superior accomplishments in the performance of his or her assigned duties (teaching, research, extension, service) and achieved national recognition for excellence in his or her assigned duties.

### **Procedure**

Recommendations concerning PPA are considered annually. The department 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 in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the BAE department. Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation at K-State (<http://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/depthead/promotion/promotio.html>) shall be used to prepare this documentation.
2. Outside reviews will not routinely be used for the PPA; however, the department head may solicit written comments from professionals outside the department.
3. The department 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, along with a recommendation for or against the award.

4. The candidate shall be given the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the department 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 head and to the dean. A copy of the department head's written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate.
5. The department head shall submit the following items to the dean:
  - a. A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award.
  - b. Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation.
  - c. Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation.
  - d. The candidate's supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award.

**BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT  
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY**

**GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

**(Approved by the BAE Faculty, November 2002)**

---

As stated in the “KSU Manual for Effective Faculty Evaluation”, “Tenure should be granted only to those who demonstrate individual excellence and whose expertise corresponds to the present and anticipated continuing needs of the University. Thus tenure decisions are based mainly on candidate’s contribution to institutional mission.” The manual also states “Tenure evaluation is not merely the sum of the annual merit evaluations. In practice the factors of mission relevance of work and supply and demand should receive greater weight in tenure recommendations than in evaluation for annual salary adjustment.”

Well prepared annual evaluations, and the evaluation process provide the probationary faculty member an awareness of his or her performance as well as suggestions for improvement. High quality annual evaluations are a necessary, but not sufficient condition for granting of tenure. The probationary faculty member must be responsive to suggestions for improvement and to Departmental, College, and University missions and objectives.

University policy requires that probationary faculty be evaluated annually for making the reappointment decision. The annual faculty evaluation report that is prepared by faculty members for salary raise considerations, and the annual review interview with the Unit Administrator will be used to assist in making the re-appointment decision the first year. The second year of probation will involve input from the tenured faculty after they have had an opportunity to review the respective probationary faculty member’s annual performance report. The third year a more formal review process will be carried out called the Mid-Probationary Review. This review is designed to provide tenure-track faculty members with helpful and substantive feedback from the tenured faculty and the administrators regarding how their accomplishments contribute to the departmental, College, and University missions objectives and to its constituents.

The format and outline for the KSU Promotion and Tenure Document is used as a guide for preparation of such a document. A copy is attached for reference purposes.

Assistant professors are on a tenure track; promotion to associate professor and the granting of tenure are done at the same time. Hence granting of tenure below the rank of associate professor is not done except under special circumstances approved by the Provost.

### **I. Assistant to Associate Professor Rank**

The respective faculty member's appointment components (Teaching, Research, and Extension) will be taken into consideration in the promotion process as it is in the annual evaluation process. A faculty member with two appointment components (teaching, research, or extension) will be promoted on the basis of his or her productivity in respective appointment components. In the special case of a three component appointment involving teaching, research, and extension, special care will be exercised so that expectations are not unreasonable considering the three-way division of effort.

The assistant professor in the Department of Biological and Agricultural Engineering is viewed as a faculty member in development. Phases of development include new, mid-term, and advanced.

The extent of their teaching, research, extension activities will depend on their appointment and position description. Less is expected of new assistant professors and more of mid-term and advanced.

#### **A. The New Phase**

New assistant professors include tenure track faculty in their first two years in the department. As new assistant professors, they are expected to contribute to the mission of the department, the College, and the University, but not as extensively as other faculty. They are expected to attain Graduate Faculty status.

Teaching. Perform in accordance with Departmental Teaching Evaluation Criteria (pages 6, 7 and 8 of Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation, Biological and Agricultural Engineering, 2002).

Research. Perform in accordance with Departmental Research Evaluation Criteria (pages 8 and 9 of Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation, Biological and Agricultural Engineering, 2002).

Extension. Perform in accordance with Departmental Extension Evaluation Criteria (page 9 of Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation, Biological and Agricultural Engineering, 2002).

Service. New assistant professors are expected to participate in general meetings of the department and of the College, but are not expected to be a member of standing or ad hoc College or University governing committees. The new assistant professors may provide editorial service to professional journals and may be called on by the general public to share their professional expertise. New assistant professors should limit non-directed service

activities that might interfere with establishing themselves as productive assistant professors (pages 9 and 10 of Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation, Biological and Agricultural Engineering Department, 2002).

### **B. The MidTerm Phase**

Mid-assistant professors are in the third and fourth years of their appointment. More is expected of them than of new assistant professors. During this phase, they will undergo mid-tenure review.

Teaching. The mid-assistant professors do what is expected of new assistant professors. In addition, they receive student evaluations of higher than average performance on the IDEAS and/or TEVAL inventories. They successfully direct individual student work, and may develop new courses responsive to departmental and student needs.

Research. The mid-assistant professors have published at least one article per year in refereed journals since the first year of their faculty appointment. They will have written paper reviews for scholarly journals, submitted grant proposals for extramural funding, presented research papers at scholarly meetings and learned societies, directed graduate students and established a focus for a program of research.

Extension. The mid-assistant professor should have produced two extension publications per year and one refereed publication prior to mid-tenure review. His or Her educational program should be functioning with significant support from country agents and area directors. Good working relations with county agents and clientele should be apparent.

Service. In addition to participating in general departmental and College meetings, these assistant professors may serve on governing bodies in the College. They provide editorial service to professional journals and use their professional expertise in consulting with the general public.

### **C. The Advanced Phase**

Advanced assistant professors are in the final two years of their current rank and coming up for tenure and promotion review. More is expected of them than of mid assistant professors.

Teaching. They must continue to do what is expected of mid-assistant professors. In addition they will successfully direct theses, dissertations, or honors projects. Their student evaluations on IDEAS and/or TEVAL will be above average to high average.

Research. These assistant professors will have been published several times in refereed journals. The University will have received extramural funding for one or more of these faculty members' research projects. Other

scholars will cite their work. They will present research papers at scholarly meetings and learned societies. At this time they should have demonstrated potential for becoming a full professor.

Extension. At the completion of the advanced phase the assistant professor should have a strong clientele base, six to eight extension publications and two refereed publications. He or she should be serving on one or two graduate committees and be involved in some applied research or advanced teaching/communication methodology relating to their extension appointment.

Service. These advanced assistant professors will have served on one or more College or University standing or ad hoc committees. They will review a number of research papers being considered for publication. Specific interest groups and the general public will consult them regarding their professional expertise.

## **II. Associate to Full Professor**

The associate professor should be productive in terms of his or her position description and attainment of annual report goals. The associate professor should be an exemplary department citizen and be contributing substantially to the attainment of departmental goals and objectives. He or she should be making progress toward attaining professional visibility at the National level. (Chairing ASAE committees, organizing technical session, etc.)

To be promoted to full professor the faculty member should have notable achievements in the activity area components of his or her appointment as reflected by annual evaluation reports and the promotion document. Furthermore “national recognition” should have been achieved in at least one of the teaching, research or extension activities. National recognition examples in the respective areas are

### Teaching

1. Recipient of a regional or national teaching award (ASAE, ASEE or NACTA).
2. Author of a textbook covering a significant academic topic.
3. Developer of a major software program used nationally.
4. Advisor/Instructor of student groups that have frequently received national awards or recognition.

### Research

1. Recipient of a research-related national award from a professional society (ASAE, ASHRAE, SAE etc.)
2. Program chairperson for a number of major research-oriented conferences.
3. Journal editor
4. Developer of a major software program used nationally.
5. Since promotion to associate professor has averaged annually:
  - a) \$60,000 in outside-sponsored research.
  - b) Two refereed journal articles

### Extension

1. Recipient of a national award from a professional society.
2. Member of a national task force concerned with an extension activity.
3. Sustained high performance level since promotion to associate professor:
  - a) averaged 4 publications per year for off-campus circulation.
  - b) organized and implemented several new extension programs.
  - c) involved in applied research resulting in peer-reviewed publications.