

**DEPARTMENT OF ENTOMOLOGY**

**ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES**  
(Approved by Faculty Vote on 6/29/12)

**PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**  
(Approved by Faculty Vote on 6/29/12)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES \*(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **6/29/17**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES\*: **6/29/17**

**David C. Margolies, Department Head**  
**Date signed: 6/29/12**

**Gary Pierzynski, Interim Dean and Director**  
**Date signed: July 2012**

**April C. Mason, Provost and Senior Vice President**  
**Date signed: 9/19/2012**

\*Each academic department is required by University Handbook policy to develop department documents containing criteria, standards, and guidelines for promotion, tenure, reappointment, annual evaluation and merit salary allocation. These documents must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty members in the department, by the department head or chair, by the dean concerned, and by the provost. In accordance with University Handbook policy, provision must be made to review these documents at least once every five years or more frequently if it is determined to be necessary. Dates of revision (or the vote to continue without revision) must appear on the first page of the document.

**CRITERIA, POLICIES, AND PROCEDURES**

**FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENTOMOLOGY**

**KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY**

**Approved by Department Faculty on June 29, 2012\***



---

**David C. Margolies, Professor and Interim Head**

---

**Gary Pierzynski, Interim Dean and Director**

---

**April Mason, Provost**

\*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.

<b><u>CONTENTS</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE #</u></b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Annual Evaluation Protocol</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Reappointment and Mid-Tenure Review Process</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Tenure and Promotion Criteria and Procedures</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Professorial Performance Award Criteria and Procedures</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Appendix I – Annual Progress Report Template</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Appendix II – Performance Evaluation Summary Template</b>	<b>15</b>

## **INTRODUCTION**

Section C and Appendix Q of the University Handbook state that faculty must be evaluated periodically for accountability, reappointment, and merit salary increases. Each department is responsible for establishing its own document of guidelines, criteria, and standards for faculty evaluation.

The Annual Evaluation procedure in the Department of Entomology is based on performance in each of the critical areas of activity of the University: Research, Teaching, Extension, and Service. Weighting in each area is set at the beginning of the evaluation period through consultation with the Department Head, and the weightings are used to determine all performance scores. Professional performance is exceptionally complex and cannot be evaluated adequately based on a single source of information. Faculty evaluation in the Department of Entomology is based on multiple sources of data for each area.

KAES faculty, budgeted outside the Department of Entomology, may be tenured in the Department of Entomology. The Department will use the same procedures, criteria, and standards for mid-tenure review, tenure, and promotion regardless of budgetary home.

## ANNUAL EVALUATION PROTOCOL

- 1) In early December, the Department Head makes a request of each tenured and tenure-track faculty member for a summary of activities and achievements to be prepared as a Faculty Annual Progress Report. The report should be submitted to the Head before winter break. In addition, the Department Head asks all faculty members to compile a list of goals for the next calendar year.
- 2) Each Faculty member prepares an Annual Progress Report, guided by their official job assignment in Research, Teaching, and/or Extension, with documentation of Service. The categories of activity and accomplishments (e.g., proposals, publications, presentations, etc.) should be enumerated and described following the departmental Faculty Annual Progress Report Form (Appendix I). Faculty who engage in activities outside of their official areas of responsibility should list those activities in an appropriate assigned area. A brief (1-page) cover letter may accompany the Report to summarize and put accomplishments in context.
- 3) The Head reviews all Annual Progress Reports at the beginning of the new calendar year. From these, the Head generates a Faculty Performance Evaluation Summary (Appendix II) for each faculty member. Each area of the faculty member's responsibility (Research, Teaching, Extension, and Service) is evaluated based on overall performance in that area, considering performance in all relevant categories. Performance is rated as: 1 = Unsatisfactory; 2 = Needs Improvement; 3 = Meets Expectations; 4 = Exceeds Expectations; 5 = Excellent. The proportion of effort expected in each area is based on the faculty member's appointment tenths, but can be modified, usually by no more than 10%, by arrangement with the Head. These changes should be proposed in writing when preparing the annual goals statement. The total annual performance rating is calculated by multiplying the rating (1–5) in each area by the proportion of effort in that area summed over all applicable areas. An average of the total annual performance ratings for the three most recent years is then calculated. If the faculty member has not been in the department for three years, the average will be calculated based on the number of years he or she has been in the department.
- 4) By February, the Head provides each faculty member with his or her written Faculty Performance Evaluation Summary including the numerical rating describing faculty performance in each area of appointment for the evaluation year; a summary narrative describing the overall performance, strengths and deficiencies in performance in each area of appointment, the level of accomplishment of the faculty member's goals set in the previous year, and appropriateness of the goals set for the coming year; and the three-year average performance rating.
- 5) Each faculty member reviews his or her written evaluation in a meeting with the Head to jointly discuss: a) accomplishments; b) degree to which goals for the previous year have been met; c) any special circumstances influencing professional activities in the past or coming year; d) expectations and/or need for altering the next year's goals and focus in the coming year. At the meeting, faculty members are provided with their overall performance rating and their performance rating in each of their major areas of responsibility (Research, Teaching, Extension, and Service). It is the responsibility of the Head to specify any concerns and it is the responsibility of the faculty member to seek clarification if there is any uncertainty in any

area. After discussion the Head may make revisions as he or she thinks is appropriate. If a faculty member and the Head are unable to resolve major differences of opinion on the evaluation, the faculty member may submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations to the Head and the Dean of the College of Agriculture within seven working days after the review and discussion.

- 6) Before the Head submits the Faculty Performance Evaluation Summary to the Dean, each faculty or unclassified professional person must sign a statement acknowledging that they had the opportunity to review and to discuss the evaluation and his or her performance rating. Following faculty and Department Head signing, and acceptance by the Dean, the Faculty Performance Evaluation Summary becomes a document of record for the evaluation year.
- 7) The Head assigns faculty to one of the five performance categories and submits this information to the Dean of the College of Agriculture, together with any other information requested by the Dean and the Provost. After all evaluations are submitted to the Dean of the College of Agriculture, each faculty member receives a list of the performance evaluation ratings of all faculty members in the department without individual identifying information.
- 8) When merit increases are available, the Head will recommend a salary adjustment for each faculty member evaluated. The recommended percentage increases will be based on the five performance categories, such that the percentage recommended for persons in the top category (5 - Excellent) will be higher than those for the next category (4 – Exceeds Expectations), which in turn shall exceed those for level of accomplishment in the third category (3 – Meets Expectations), etc. For first-year appointees, the Head has the option of a) recommending an increase based on the individual's evaluation (adjusted proportionally to encompass the entire year), b) recommending an average increase, or c) recommending the larger of the above, since the length of time for evaluating performance was limited.
- 9) When a faculty member has a temporary change in assignment or duty station, such as going on a sabbatical leave, the faculty member will draw up an agreement with the Head on the expectations for the new assignment or duties. These may include, beyond the departmental evaluation criteria, specific, measurable goals and performance standards. The faculty member will then be evaluated relative to his or her performance on the new job using the agreed-upon goals. These expectations could be developed from the sabbatical application or from other available documentation. If there is a supervisor at the new assignment, this supervisor's evaluation should be utilized as appropriate. In undertaking the departmental annual evaluation, the Head will evaluate the faculty member's performance in changed assignment along with his or her regular performance, prorating each for time spent with the respective assignments. In case an individual is on a different assignment for an extended period of time, the average evaluation for the most recent three years will be used as the basis for merit increase recommendations. A departmental seminar describing the activities during the temporary assignment is encouraged.
- 10) In accordance with Section C31.5 of the K-State University Handbook (Chronic Low Achievement), any tenured faculty who receives a performance rating of less than 2 (on a 5-point scale) in any area of responsibility (Teaching, Research, Service, or Extension), will have failed to achieve the minimum acceptable level of productivity for that year. The faculty member may request an independent evaluation of his or her performance by an ad hoc

Department Appeals Committee; this Committee will be composed of three faculty members appointed by the Department Evaluation Committee. The Appeals Committee will review the Annual Progress Report submitted by the faculty member and the Performance Evaluation Summary prepared by the Head and advise the Department Head whether or not they support his or her performance rating. Faculty who fail to achieve the minimal acceptable level of productivity would be subject to the procedures and criteria in Section C31.5. That is, if a tenured faculty member's performance falls below the minimum acceptable level of productivity in any area of major responsibility, the Head shall inform the faculty member in writing and also suggest a course of action, in writing, to improve the performance of the faculty member. In subsequent annual evaluations, the faculty member will report on activities aimed at improving performance and any evidence of improvement. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations below the minimum-acceptable level of productivity in any one area of responsibility, or a total of three such evaluations in any five-year period in which minimum standards are not met, then "dismissal for cause" will be considered at the discretion of the Dean.

## **REAPPOINTMENT AND MID-TENURE REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Annual reappointments during probationary period**

Each tenure-track, non-tenured faculty member will be evaluated each year, usually in August, by the tenured faculty in the Department to determine the progress being made towards promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. Research, Teaching, Extension, and Service outputs will be reviewed, depending upon assignment. Items to be considered may include publications, grants, courses taught/initiated, student evaluations, agent evaluations, presentations to various groups, etc. No external reference letters will be solicited for these reviews.

The Department Head and tenured faculty will meet at least fourteen calendar days after the review documents are made available to discuss the candidate's eligibility for reappointment and progress toward tenure. Within one week after this meeting there will be a ballot of the tenured faculty on reappointment of the candidate; each tenured faculty member will be asked to vote by ballot and to provide written comments. Any member of the tenured faculty may, prior to the submission of his or her ballot to the Head, request the candidate meet with the eligible faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate. Following the vote of the tenured faculty, the Department Head will meet with the faculty member and review the faculty discussion and vote (with appropriate safeguards for confidentiality) and the recommendation to the Dean. The Head will follow this discussion with a letter to the faculty member that summarizes these same points, and is copied to tenured faculty in the department and to the Dean of the College of Agriculture. The results of the vote will be transmitted to the Dean along with a separate recommendation from the Department Head.

### **Mid-Tenure Review**

During the third year of appointment, each tenure-track, non-tenured faculty member will be reviewed in the same format as used for tenure consideration at the same time as tenure decisions are made (usually in October-November). Comments also may be solicited from students, other relevant faculty members in the college or university, and from outside reviewers at the discretion of the Head following consultation with tenured faculty in the department. Based on this documentation, the faculty will assess and provide comments on progress toward tenure. The Head will discuss the assessment and comments with the candidate. After receiving the assessment, the candidate has the right to submit a written response for the file. Research, teaching, extension, and service outputs and the results of the faculty assessment, along with any response from the candidate if provided, will be submitted to the Dean for consideration. A review will be prepared by the Department Head for the faculty member that will provide substantive feedback from faculty colleagues and administrators regarding his or her accomplishments relative to departmental tenure criteria.



## TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

### Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Evaluation

The schedule for applying for tenure, and candidate responsibilities, are outlined in sections C110 and C111, respectively, in the University Handbook. General departmental procedures to be followed are described in sections C112.1-C112.5. The Department of Entomology solicits external reviews on promotion and tenure decisions (also see sections C36.1, C112.2, and C152.2 of the University Handbook). The candidate must submit with his or her promotion or promotion and tenure dossier a list of names of six to eight external reviewers. These reviewers must hold a rank that is equal to or higher than that the candidate is being considered for and should not include the candidate's graduate or post-doctoral advisors; graduate school classmates should also be avoided. The Department Head will choose three to four of those and add an equal number of external reviewers of her or his choice. These individuals will be requested to provide written evaluation of the candidate's promotion or promotion and tenure dossier.

Per the University Handbook C112.1, the Department Head is advised by the eligible tenured faculty members of the department regarding the qualifications of the candidate for tenure. Eligible faculty are those tenured members of the department who hold a rank equal to or higher than the rank being sought by the candidate. Non-eligible faculty members are those below the rank being sought. In the Department of Entomology, all faculty are invited to review documents supporting tenure and participate in the seminar and discussions at Faculty meetings. However, only eligible tenured department faculty may advise the Department Head regarding the qualifications of the candidate for promotion or promotion and tenure by means of written or electronic ballot.

A faculty member seeking tenure and/or promotion must present a department seminar, open to the public, in the Fall semester prior to the faculty vote.

### Criteria for Tenure

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

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

### **1. For faculty with research appointments:**

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

### **2. For faculty with teaching appointments:**

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

### **3. For faculty with extension appointments:**

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

### **4. For all faculty:**

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

### **Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor before Tenure:**

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

### **Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor:**

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."* The specific criteria are those outlined above for granting of tenure. However, candidates seeking promotion to the rank of Professor are expected to have demonstrated a sustained and consistent (1) record of productivity in terms of publications and extramural funding, (2) excellence in classroom teaching and graduate student advising, (3) excellence in extension activities, and (4) a record of service to the department, college, university, and profession.

## **PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD**

### **Eligibility**

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

### **Criteria**

In addition to the six-year rule, as described above, candidates must be able to meet the following criteria:

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

### **Guidelines for Evaluating Performance**

Based on the timeline associated with the annual evaluation review outlined in the University Handbook, any faculty member who wishes to be considered for a PPA will contact the Department Head when he or she becomes eligible. The Department Head will then request that the faculty member submit: (a) a summary of scholarly productivity (e.g., lists of publications, grants, website materials, workshops, other tangible evidence) organized by year for the six-year period immediately preceding application; and (b) a narrative statement not to exceed two, single-spaced pages in 12-point font that describes the quality and impact of their efforts in all major areas of responsibility (Research, Teaching, Extension and Service as appropriate for his or her appointment).

### **Procedure**

The Head will evaluate the information and make a decision regarding the award for the candidate. Each candidate for the award will have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the Head, and each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging they had the opportunity to review the evaluation. In the case of a negative recommendation by the Head, the candidate has seven working days after the review and discussion, to submit written statements to the Head concerning unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation. If the Head continues to maintain a negative recommendation, the candidate has the right to withdraw the application, request a vote of the faculty on his or her application, or submit a letter of rebuttal to the Dean that would accompany the application package as it goes to the Dean. If a faculty vote is requested, all tenured/tenure-track faculty are eligible to vote and results of the vote, as well as individual comments, will be forwarded to the Dean along with the recommendation of the Head.

## **APPENDIX I**

### **ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT TEMPLATE**

**Name:**

**Academic Rank:**

**Appointment:** Extension: Teaching: Research:

#### **EXTENSION:**

##### **Training Activities**

- Conferences/Workshops
- TV/Radio programs
- Contest judging
- Extension/Research demonstrations
- Extension/Research presentations

##### **Publications and Educational Materials**

- Books
- Book chapters
- Refereed journal articles
- Trade journal articles
- Magazine articles
- Numbered publications
- Revisions to numbered publications
- Brochures
- Kansas Cooperative Extension Fact sheets
- Computer programs
- Video/Web presentations
- Slide sets
- Posters
- Displays
- Media releases
- Other

##### **Competitive Grant Proposals**

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

##### **Cooperation Involvement**

- County
- Area
- State
- Federal
- International

##### **Clientele Feedback**

## **RESEARCH:**

### **Competitive Grants Proposals**

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

### **Publications**

- Books
- Book chapters
- Refereed journal articles
- Non-refereed journal articles
- Experiment Station Bulletins
- Abstracts
- Newsletters
- Other (e.g. conference proceedings, etc.)

### **Presentation of Research**

- International
- National
- Regional
- State
- Local

### **Other**

## **TEACHING:**

### **Classroom/Online Courses**

- Student evaluations
- Department Head and peer evaluation of classroom teaching
- Course syllabi, reading lists, and other course documents
- GTA training evaluation (to be solicited by the Department Head)

### **Teaching Publications or Presentations**

### **Undergraduate Student Advising**

- Number of students advised
- Average amount of time spent with students, both face-to-face and electronically

### **Graduate Student Advising**

- Major advisor
- Co-major advisor
- Advisory committee member
- Advisee evaluation (to be solicited by the Department Head)

**SERVICE:**

**Institutional Service**

University

College

Department

Other (e.g., Graduate School representative on a Ph.D. committee, committee member at another university)

**Service to Professional and Scientific Organizations**

National organizations

Regional organizations

Committees

Task forces

Elected offices

Editor or editorial board member

**Reviews**

Extramural grant proposals

Refereed journal manuscripts

Book reviews

**HONORS AND AWARDS:**

*Please sign and date your completed Progress Report.*

## APPENDIX II

### PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SUMMARY TEMPLATE

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Academic Rank:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Extension Appointment:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Rating:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Research Appointment:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Rating:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Teaching Appointment:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Rating:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Rating:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Accomplishment of Goals:**

**Honors & Awards:**

**Narrative Summary:**

**Overall Annual Performance Rating:**

(5 = Excellent; 4 = Exceeds Expectations; 3 = Meets Expectations; 2 = Needs Improvement; 1 = Unsatisfactory)

**Rolling Average Performance Rating:**

Current Year

One Year Before CY

Two Years Before CY

3-Year Average

\_\_\_\_\_  
Faculty Member\*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Head

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

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