

DEPARTMENT OF GRAIN SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 8/31/2012)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 8/31/2012)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **8/2017**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **8/2017**

Dirk Maier, Department Head

Date signed: 9/26/2012

John Floros, Dean

Date signed: 10/02/2012

April C. Mason, Provost & Senior Vice President

Date signed: 10/10/2012

*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.

FACULTY EVALUATION: PROCEDURES, CRITERIA, AND STANDARDS FOR REAPPOINTMENT, MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

Grain Science and Industry Department

Kansas State University

SUMMARY

Reappointment, mid-probationary review, tenure, and promotion are based on faculty evaluation as discussed in Section C (<http://www.ksu.edu/academicsservices/fhbook/>) of the University Handbook. This process of faculty evaluation is designed to ensure that personnel decisions are both reasonable and defensible. At Kansas State University, each department is responsible for establishing its document of guidelines, criteria, and standards for reappointment, mid-probationary review, tenure, and promotion. The document must be approved mutually by a majority of faculty members in the department in consultation with the Department Head and Dean, and be reviewed periodically at least once every five years.

This document presents the current procedures, criteria, and standards for reappointment, mid-probationary review, tenure, and promotion used in the Department of Grain Science and Industry. The faculty of the Department of Grain Science and Industry consists of academic ranks and professional ranks, which are unclassified positions (regular and term appointments and non-tenure track) that consist predominately of service or support. Promotion of faculty in academic and professional ranks follows the same procedures.

The Grain Science and Industry's evaluation process is based on the focusing of all activities towards meeting our departmental Vision and Mission statements. These statements have been

developed with input from the faculty, staff and students in the department and are reviewed every 5 years.

Our new (PROPOSED) Vision Statement is as follows:

To be the center of excellence in research, education, and technology for all aspects of grain handling, storage, quality, processing and utilization.

The vision will be realized using a multifaceted teaching, research and technology transfer program focused on meeting the needs of grain related clientele.

Approved by Faculty on December 13, 2004

Our new (PROPOSED) Mission Statement is as follows:

- **-Ensure the future competitiveness and profitability of the grain industry by creating –**
 - **Leaders with fundamental and professional skills needed to lead grain related clientele through rapidly changing times.**
 - **Solution-based research to solve short and long term problems and issues in grain science and processing.**
 - **Basic research to explain the fundamental role of genetics and biochemical components on grain quality, product formulation, processing, and health.**

- **State of the art teaching, research and pilot facilities to ensure that students, faculty, and visitors have access to the most modern, efficient and up-to-date resources.**
- **Strong partnerships with AIB, USDA, National Laboratories, Universities, and Industry Associations and Members.**

Approved by Faculty on December 13, 2004

The Grain Science and Industry Department's programs address the Kansas State University Strategic implementation themes as follows:

Research - Research and graduate programs are to be kept strong and have recognition nationally and internationally, and must be supported with extramural grant funds.

Education - Undergraduate students must obtain an education based on science programs through University core curricula and specialty courses and electives that prepare students to be effective leaders in the grain industry. This education must include a solid foundation in natural sciences, mathematics, social sciences and communications.

Economic Enhancement and Outreach Service- The program has a long history in enhancing economic development in the State of Kansas and the nation by enhancing the use, marketability, processing, and quality of wheat and other grains and oilseed crops.

Cultural Awareness- Current students at the undergraduate and graduate level represent a multitude of countries and cultures. Each faculty member across the various programs must

instill a cross-cultural appreciation in all students so that they are able to pursue their careers world-wide in the grain industry.

International Reputation and Service - The Department of Grain Science and Industry is a lead program in the university through the International Grains Program and the Grain Industry Alliance for enhancing the reputation of KSU as a world-wide resource for information and knowledge on all aspects of grain trading, processing and utilization.

Evaluation Approach

To help ensure a smooth and effective probationary period, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure career for a faculty member, the Department of Grain Science and Industry has divided its review program into three distinct phases: (A) Annual Evaluation and Achievement; (B) Reappointment of Faculty on Probation plus Mid-Probationary Review; and (C) Tenure and Promotion. The entire career evaluation program is based on using the annual evaluation as an accurate and regular benchmark of a faculty member's contributions to the department's growth and achievements towards its vision and mission statements.

It is the philosophy of the faculty of the Department of Grain Science and Industry that effective leadership, strong teamwork, and effective daily communication between all faculty members, staff and administration, on a daily basis, will ensure that there are no surprise results in those review procedures.

A. FACULTY ANNUAL EVALUATION: PROCEDURES, CRITERIA, AND STANDARDS FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION.

Grain Science and Industry Department's Annual Evaluation Document.

approved by Faculty on December 13, 2004.

1. Introduction.

At Kansas State University the evaluation of faculty and unclassified professionals is based on a series of policies that have been established by the [University Handbook \(UH\)](#). Each department/unit has a set of guidelines that conform to the general requirements. The major components of the annual merit evaluation process are outlined below.

- Each person "will meet annually with the unit head to jointly establish personal goals and objectives in research and other creative endeavors, teaching, extension, and directed and non-directed service for the upcoming evaluation period and to discuss their relative importance within the context of the unit's goals" ([University Handbook, Section C 45.1](#)).
- -At the end of the evaluation period - "Each faculty and/or unclassified person will provide an annual written summary of accomplishments and activities in accordance with the guidelines provided by the unit's statement of criteria, standards, and procedures." ([UH, Sec. C 45.2](#)).
- -After receiving the individual's annual written summary, the unit head will prepare a "written evaluation" ([UH, Sec.C 46.4b](#)).
- -"Annual written evaluations conducted for the purpose of determining merit salary increases are based on the distribution of responsibilities assigned, the relative difficulty

and importance of these responsibilities, and the level of success with which each was performed. " ([UH, Sec. C 40](#)).

- Unit heads are to provide a summary performance evaluation and give greater weight in that summary to responsibilities (as determined by the goals and objectives) that required more time and effort from the individual.

The individual reviews a written draft of the summary performance evaluation prepared by the unit head. This includes "an opportunity to examine the written evaluation and to discuss with the evaluator the individual's resulting relative standing for the purpose of merit salary increase in the unit." ([UH, Sec.C 46.4d](#)). This opportunity for review of the completed summary will be documented with a signature of the faculty member ([UH, Sec. C 46.4d](#)). An opportunity will be provided for "written statements submitted by unclassified individuals of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations. " ([UH, Sec. C46.4e](#)).

The unit head will recommend "a merit salary adjustment for each unclassified professional person that should be based directly on the person's evaluation." ([UH, Sec. C 46.4c](#)).

The unit head will also provide "recommendations for salary adjustments on bases outside of the annual evaluation, together with documentation which supports these recommendations." ([UH, Sec. C 46.4f](#)). This would include increases for adjustments and promotions.

The Dean will review the evaluations, resolve any problems, and forward them to the provost.

The provost will review the evaluations for consistency with requirements jointly established by the Faculty Senate and the Provost, and for equity. Evaluations are returned to the college deans, along with feedback from reviewers, for final actions.

2. Grain Science and Industry Annual Review Procedures

The Grain Science Department's Academic (Appendix I) Annual Evaluation procedure is based on performance in each of the three critical areas of activity of the University; research, education, and service. The 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. The Department's annual evaluation of unclassified professionals in Outreach (Appendix II) includes program focus and pursuit of goals, program implementation, educational materials, creativity in delivery, impact, teamwork, and extension improvement, whereas that in the International Grains Program (IGP) (Appendix III) includes international and service activities.

a. Introduction

Section C and Appendix Q of the University Handbook state that faculty must be evaluated periodically for accountability, reappointment, and merit salary increases. The process of faculty evaluation is designed to ensure that personnel decisions are both reasonable and defensible. At Kansas State University, each department is responsible for establishing a document of guidelines, criteria, and standards for faculty evaluation. The document must be approved mutually by a majority of faculty members in the department in consultation with the Department Head and Dean and be reviewed periodically at least once every five years. This document presents the current procedures, criteria, and standards for annual merit evaluation in the Grain Science and Industry Department (www.ksu.edu/academicservices/fhbook/).

Because of temporary under-staffing of Faculty during the 1999 – 2004 period, which forced the expanded use of professional non-tenured non-classified staff, the Grain Science and Industry department has elected to use professional unclassified positions (term appointment and non-tenure track) predominately for service or support. The evaluation of faculty in professional ranks follows the same procedures as faculty in academic ranks (see Section C10 of the University Handbook). The Department of Grain Science and Industry considers individuals holding these positions as full-time, temporary faculty members, and they have voting privileges in faculty meetings of the department. To obtain privileges specifically awarded by the University Handbook to faculty members holding academic rank, individuals with professional rank should also hold a regular academic rank. The one exception to the voting privileges is the inability of non-tenured faculty to vote on tenure decisions.

b. Guidelines and Procedures

In November of each year, the Department Head sends a letter to all faculty members in the Grain Science and Industry Department requesting them to document personal achievements for review by the Head. The calendar year is the basis for the evaluation. Faculty submit documentation according to a specific outline (Appendix I, II or III) to produce an Annual Achievement Summary that is given to the Department Head near the end of the calendar year. The summary for the past year includes accomplishments towards goals in each area and a statement of goals for the coming year. Faculty submit information about accomplishments appropriate to their current assignments.

On an annual basis, the Department Head and the Faculty negotiates the appropriate weightings of assigned areas. The negotiated weightings are not be the same for each faculty, and they may

not reflect the official appointment tenths. The weightings reflect the actual service activities and demands that the faculty responded to during the year. For example, someone having an official appointment of 20% Teaching and 80% Research, who can document time spent in directed or nondirected Service might negotiate an assignment of 25% Teaching, 65% Research and 10% Service. These values are used when determining ratings in the assigned areas.

Guidelines for assessing tenths are given in Appendix IV. In certain circumstances the Head may agree to revise the negotiated weighting assignment during the evaluation period. This flexibility is necessary to allow Grain Science and Industry faculty to respond to varying needs on a timely and non-prejudicial manner. Service (directed and non-directed) is expected of all faculty with credit not to exceed 30% of total assignment. The annual faculty report contains information relative to faculty activities in all key areas.

The documentation of productivity of a faculty member may vary from year to year because of a time-lag in demonstrating the completion of a task, e.g. submission of a manuscript until publication. To adjust for such annual variation, a faculty member and the Head usually decide to use the mean merit (achievement) rating for the previous two years and the current year.

Special rules apply for faculty members who are evaluated in their first year of appointment (Section C43 of the University Handbook) and for faculty members on leave (Section C44 of the University Handbook). For first year appointees, the merit rating used for the evaluation is the higher of (1) the mean rating for all faculty in the department or (2) the actual merit rating of the new member adjusted proportionally to encompass the entire year. For faculty members on sabbatical leave or leave without pay for part of the year, the merit rating is based on a consideration of both the merit rating obtained for performance during the period they were

engaged in university assignments and the mean merit rating over the past three years. For faculty members on leave for the entire year, the merit rating is the higher of (1) the mean merit rating of the faculty member for the previous three years or (2) the actual merit rating determined using the regular criteria and standards for work done on university assignments (adjusted proportionally to the entire year) while the faculty member was on leave.

c. Performance Rating System -

The rating system used to evaluate performance of faculty was implemented to ensure that performance is measured on contributions towards meeting the Departmental Vision and Mission Statements, and the individual faculty member's annual goals and objectives. The rating system consists of ratings for achievements in the various areas, negotiated weightings of assigned areas, and averaging over multiple years. All of those factors are used to determine the final Performance Rating.

Ratings for Achievement. In each area of official assignment ratings are based on five levels: Excellent, Very Good, Satisfactory, Improvement Needed, and Unsatisfactory.

Factors such as teamwork, communication, sharing of limited resources, collegiality with faculty, staff, and off-campus representatives are all important performance factors relating to the success of the department in reaching its specified Vision and Mission Statements. Each faculty may highlight accomplishments showing evidence of behavior in these crucial performance areas.

Averaging Over Multiple Years. Performance is usually based on a three-year rolling average of the overall performance ratings.

Weighting and Overall Performance Evaluation. To accommodate the differences in official and negotiated assignments, adjustments are made to reach the overall rating. The Overall Performance Rating for a faculty member is determined from the area ratings and the negotiated weightings.

d. Evaluation summaries. Activities for each faculty member are reviewed and summarized by the Department Head in a written Performance Evaluation Summary. The Performance Evaluation Summary is presented in January or February in draft form to the faculty member for examination.

e. Basis for salary increases. According the Section C40 of the Faculty Handbook, annual written evaluations must be conducted for the purpose of determining merit salary increases. The performance evaluation procedures described in this document will serve as the department's evaluation tool.

f. Annual meeting to review performance score and evaluation

At an annual meeting in January or February, the Head and each faculty member carefully discuss his/her achievements relative to his/her position description and stated goals. They review achievements reported according to the Department of Grain Science and Industry's faculty evaluation form (Appendix I, II, or III), and also discuss the draft of the Performance Evaluation Summary written by the Head.

The Head and faculty member determine whether impediments exist to obtaining agreed upon goals. If such impediments occur, the Head and faculty member discuss possible strategies to overcome them.

At least 10 days prior to the date the evaluation documents are due to the Dean, each faculty member is presented with his/her final Performance Evaluation Summary for signature.

According to Section C31.8 of the University Handbook, categories for levels of expectations in the Performance Evaluation Summary include (1) exceeded expectations, (2) met expectations, (3) has fallen below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity, or (4) has fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity.

The Performance Evaluation Summary presented to the faculty member will state the Head's judgement on which of the four levels of expectations was achieved. In most years, salary increases cannot be assigned until a later date when the University budget is determined. The Performance Evaluation Summary is signed by the individual faculty member and the Head. .

Both the faculty member and the Head may make written comments on the form. The signature of the faculty member indicates that (1) the Evaluation Summary has been discussed with the Head and (2) the faculty member has received a copy from the Head. As noted in Section C46.3 of the University Handbook, faculty members have seven working days after reviewing and discussing the Performance Evaluation Summary with the Head, to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations to the Head and to the Dean of the College of Agriculture.

The Head then submits copies of the evaluation materials to the Dean of the College of Agriculture. These materials include the completed faculty evaluation document, the signed

Performance Summary, and any written statements of unresolved differences. The Head makes recommendations for salary increases that are subject to review and final approval by the Dean (and the Area Extension Director for Area Extension Specialists). The Dean has the opportunity to consider faculty concerns before making a final decision on the salary increase of an individual faculty member.

3. Chronic Low AchievementApproved by Faculty on December 13, 2004

In accordance with Section C31.5 of the University Handbook (Chronic Low Achievement), the Department of Grain Science and Industry is required to establish guidelines describing minimum acceptable levels of productivity for tenured faculty members.

In the Department of Grain Science and Industry the minimum-acceptable level of productivity is an overall performance rating of “fallen below expectations but has met minimum levels of productivity.” If the faculty obtains an overall performance ratings of “fallen below minimum acceptable levels of productivity,” the faculty member becomes subject to the procedures and criteria in Section C31.5.

When a tenured faculty member's performance first falls below the departmental standards, the Head shall inform the faculty member in writing that his or her evaluation has fallen below minimum levels of productivity. The Head then consults with the University administration and develops a course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member. The Head informs the faculty member in writing of this suggested course of action. The faculty member is formally under the Chronic Low Achievement review process at this point.

In subsequent annual evaluations, the faculty member will report on activities designed to improve performance and any evidence of improvement. The Head will communicate this information to the University administration and will consult with the administration before issuing additional evaluations of failing to meet the minimal acceptable level of productivity. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations below the minimal acceptable level of productivity or a total of three such evaluations in any five-year period, then a possible "dismissal for cause" will be considered by secret ballot by tenured faculty members holding a rank equal to or higher than the rank of the faculty member in question. The results of this vote will be sent by the Head to the Dean of the College of Agriculture. Further consideration of "dismissal for cause" is at the discretion of the Dean.

Professorial Performance Award

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 Grain Science and Industry (GRSC). 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/>). Criteria and guidelines will be subject to review by the GRSC 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 and in the Department of Grain Science at least six years since promotion or receipt of a PPA.
2. Based upon the GRSC Department annual evaluation process, the candidate must have had sustained productivity for at least the last six years before the performance review. Evidence includes earning an overall evaluation of “exceeded expectations” or higher in at least four or the most recent six years and have no evaluations below “met expectations” during that six year period.
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.” Both promotion and the PPA are 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, and/or service) and achieved international recognition for excellence in his or her discipline.

Procedure

Professorial Performance Award applications are considered annually. The department head is expected to notify faculty members regarding 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. (C49.4)

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 GRSC 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. (C49.5) Faculty members awarded a PPA are not eligible to apply for a subsequent award for a period of six (6) years after receipt of the award.

2. Outside reviews of the applicant's file will not be used for the PPA; however, the department head and/or the candidate 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. (C49.5)
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. (C49.6)
5. The department head shall submit the following items to the dean for further action as described in C49.8:
 - a. Department head's recommendation for or against the award.
 - b. A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award.
 - c. Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation.
 - d. Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation.
 - e. The candidate's supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award. (C49.7)

B. REAPPOINTMENT OF FACULTY ON PROBATION AND MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW

Approved by Faculty Vote on December 13, 2004

1. Probationary Status

Academic faculty not yet approved for Tenure are on a probationary status. The Head appoints a tenured faculty member as a Mentor to each new faculty member (candidate) on a probationary appointment. Each new faculty can discuss the need to change the mentor with the Head following the first year annual evaluation. The Mentor assists and advises the candidate during the promotion and tenure process; advises on the preparation of promotion and tenure materials; provides general advise to the candidate about structuring and conducting his/her professional program; and advises the Head and the tenured faculty of the progress of the candidate in the promotion and tenure process.

Faculty members on probationary appointments are evaluated annually to determine whether or not they will be reappointed for another year. Annual evaluations also serve to provide feedback to a faculty member on probationary appointment about his or her performance in comparison to the department's criteria and standards for tenure. The procedures describing reappointment of faculty members on a probationary appointment are in Sections C50.1 - C 56 of the University Handbook. The Head makes the reappointment file available to all tenured faculty members in the department at least 14 days prior to the annual Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Meeting. This file includes a cumulative record of written recommendations and accompanying

explanations forwarded to the candidate from previous reappointment meetings and any written comments from relevant individuals outside the department. Subsequent to the meeting there will be a ballot of eligible faculty on reappointment of the candidate.

2. Mid-Probationary Review of Faculty Members on a Probationary

Appointment

The formal mid-probationary review is conducted for faculty members in their third year of a probationary appointment at Kansas State University. The procedures describing the mid-probationary review of faculty members on probationary appointments are in Sections C92.1 - C93 of the University Handbook. The purpose of the mid-probationary review is to provide substantive feedback to the candidate from faculty colleagues and administrators regarding his or her accomplishments relative to tenure and promotion criteria. A positive mid-probationary review does not insure that tenure will be granted in the future nor does a negative review mean that tenure will be denied. Much of the final tenure decision is based on how well the candidate accepts and responds positively to the suggestions of the Head and the tenured faculty. The mid-probationary review is to give the candidate an accurate benchmark and evaluation on which the individual can improve his/her performance and chance of receiving a positive tenure vote. The mid-probationary review is not to decide tenure.

The Head makes the mid-probationary review file available to all tenured faculty members in the department at least 14 days prior to calling a review meeting of all tenured faculty. This file includes a cumulative record of written recommendations and accompanying explanations forwarded to the candidate from previous reappointment meetings and any written comments from relevant individuals outside the department. The file is evaluated by the tenured faculty

prior to the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Meeting. Any tenured faculty member may request the candidate to meet with the tenured faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate. All discussion at the review meeting regarding candidates being considered for mid-probationary review is confidential. Formal written ballots are cast at the meeting for each individual undergoing mid-probationary review. These ballots are retained in departmental files for at least two years. Absentee votes are encouraged, provided they are given to the Head prior to the meeting.

Before proceeding further, the Head may discuss the review and assessment of the candidate by the tenured faculty members with the Dean of the College of Agriculture. The Head provides a letter of assessment to the candidate and a summary of comments and suggestions by the tenured faculty. This letter of assessment and the faculty report of comments and suggestions become a part of the candidate's reappointment and mid-probationary review file. The Head meets with the candidate to discuss the review and assessment. After receiving the assessment, the candidate has the right to submit a written response for the file within 10 working days. The Head forwards a written recommendation and accompanying explanations to the Dean, along with the candidate's complete mid-probationary review file and the number of votes by the tenured faculty in the categories of yes, no, and not voting.

3. Criteria and Standards for Mid-Probationary Review

All standards in Appendix V are subjective. For Mid-Probationary Review, the department does not have lists of accomplishments and standards that guarantee a successful mid-probationary review. Instead, an assessment of the accomplishments is made for each individual by the tenured faculty and the Head. Most faculty members have a split appointment in the areas of

teaching, research, extension, and/or directed service. All faculty members are expected to have accomplishments in the non-directed service area. The criteria and standards of each area for which the faculty member has responsibility, in addition to the non-directed service area, are considered in decisions at the mid-probationary review.

C. TENURE AND PROMOTION

1. Academic Faculty

There is no simple list of accomplishments that guarantee that a faculty member will obtain tenure. Instead, tenure is recommended based on the assessment of the tenured faculty of the University that a candidate has made outstanding contributions in appropriate academic endeavors. By granting tenure **only** to such individuals, the continued excellence of the university is ensured. The procedures for the evaluation of tenure are in Sections C100.1 - C116.2 of the University Handbook. For persons appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor, the maximum probationary period for gaining tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is six regular annual appointments as an Assistant Professor (Section C82.2 of the Faculty Handbook). Tenure is not granted below the rank of Associate Professor, except in special circumstances approved by the Provost (Section C82.2 of the University Handbook). For persons appointed at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, the maximum probationary period for gaining tenure is five regular annual appointments at Kansas State University at a probationary rank. Faculty members on probationary appointments who have met the criteria and standards for tenure may be granted early tenure.

Faculty members are promoted based on merit using criteria, standards, and guidelines. The procedures for granting promotion for faculty holding academic rank are in Sections C120 - C156.2 of the University Handbook. According to Section C120.2 of the University Handbook, promotion to Associate Professor rests on substantial professional contributions that reflect excellence in teaching, research, directed service, or extension. 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. Although the median time for promotion at Kansas State University is about six years, promotion can be granted when the faculty member's cumulative performance at rank clearly meets the standards for promotion (Section C131 of the University Handbook).

2. Faculty with Professional Rank

Faculty holding professional rank are evaluated and considered for promotion by the same procedures used for faculty holding academic rank. Individuals may hold rank in both the professional rank system of the Department of Grain Science and Industry and in the regular academic rank system of the University. Consideration of appointment to or promotion in one rank system will be independent of consideration in the other rank system. For persons holding professional rank and having a Baccalaureate or Masters degree, the appropriate academic rank is Instructor - regular appointment. The following ranking system is used for the professional ranks:

- Graduate Assistant: Entry level appointment. Individuals at this level hold a baccalaureate degree in an appropriate field of study and evidence of potential for effective and successful performance of the assigned responsibilities.

- Assistant Scientist: Individuals at this level hold an appropriate Baccalaureate degree or have a Baccalaureate degree with at least three years of professional experience in the field of appointment. They have a record of effective and successful performance and evidence of potential for making substantive contributions to the University and/or field of appointment.
- Associate Scientist: Individuals at this level hold an appropriate Baccalaureate degree or have a Baccalaureate degree with at least five years experience at the assistant level or appropriate experience. In addition, they possess a record of effective and successful performance and leadership and have made substantial contributions to the field of appointment and, in the case of promotions to this rank, to the University.
- Scientists: Individuals at this level hold an appropriate graduate degree, have at least ten years of experience in the field of appointment, possess a record of excellence that is recognized nationally, and have made substantial contributions to the field and, in the case of promotions to this rank, to the University.

3. Procedures

All faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion are required to prepare documentation for consideration. Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation at Kansas State University) are used to prepare this documentation. Appendix VI contains an optional outline to assist the candidate in documenting all key accomplishments for annual and other reviews.

<http://www.ksu.edu/academicservices/depthead/promotion/promotio.html>)

Outside reviewers are not used in the evaluation process for tenure and/or promotion in the Department of Grain Science and Industry. However, written comments may be solicited at the request of the candidate and/or Head from professionals outside the department. In the event of such a request, both the candidate and the Head (with input from tenured faculty) will develop a list of four referees. Each will rank the names in priority from the other's list to be contacted for letters of evaluation. Letters will be requested from the top two persons on each list. If they refuse, the next person on the list will be contacted. The letters of evaluation will become part of the candidate's file. Documentation for tenure and/or promotion for a faculty member may be reviewed by a tenured faculty of the candidate's choice who may further assist the candidate in revising the documentation.

The Head makes the candidate's file for tenure and/or promotion and the department's document listing criteria and standards for tenure and promotion available to the eligible faculty members of the department at least 14 days prior to the annual Promotion and Tenure Meeting. Any eligible faculty member may request that the candidate meet with the eligible faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishments submitted by the candidate. Faculty members holding tenure are eligible to participate in the evaluation procedure for tenure. Only tenured faculty can vote on tenure decisions. For promotion decisions, faculty members holding a rank equal to or higher than the rank being sought by the candidate can participate.

Consideration of candidates for tenure and/or promotion follows the sequence: promotion to Assistant Professor, promotion to Associate Professor, promotion to Professor, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, tenure and promotion to Professor. Eligible faculty members individually review the materials for each candidate before the meeting and discuss the

candidate's file at the meeting. All discussion at the Promotion and Tenure Meeting is confidential. Formal written ballots are cast at the Promotion and Tenure Meeting for each individual being considered for tenure and/or promotion. These ballots are retained in departmental files for at least two years. Absentee votes are encouraged, provided they are given to the Head prior to the meeting.

The total number of votes in the categories of yes, no, and not voting are recorded on the Promotion and/or Tenure document and submitted to the Dean of the College of Agriculture. The Head also submits to the Dean a written recommendation accompanied by an explanation of his or her judgment, all recommendations and unedited written comments of the department's eligible faculty members, and the document describing the criteria and standards for tenure and promotion used by the department. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion are informed by the Head of the outcome of the vote by the eligible faculty members immediately following the Promotion and Tenure Meeting. A copy of the Head's written recommendation is forwarded to the candidate.

Faculty members in professional ranks do not receive the promotion-related salary increases described in Section C132 of the University Handbook. These increases in salary are awarded at the University level and are given only for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor. However, promotion in professional rank is recognition of substantial achievement and should be rewarded. Promotion-related salary increases for professional rank positions come from department sources. Salary increases for promotion to Assistant Scientist, Associate Scientist, and Scientist are a minimum of 2.5%, 5%, and 7.5%, respectively, of the salary of the promoted faculty member for the year preceding promotion. Decisions on promotion of professional staff

are up to the immediate supervisory faculty member and the Department Head. The promotion must be based on increased responsibility and/or excellent performance ratings for two consecutive years.

4. Criteria and Standards for Promotion and Tenure

All standards in Appendix V are subjective. For Tenure the department does not have lists of accomplishments and standards that guarantee the awarding of tenure and/or promotion. Instead, an assessment of accomplishments is made for each individual by the eligible group of faculty and the Head. Most faculty members have a split appointment in the areas of teaching, research, extension, and/or directed service. All faculty members are expected to have accomplishments in the non-directed service area. The criteria and standards in each area for which the faculty member has responsibility in addition to the non-directed service area are considered in decisions concerning promotion and/or tenure.

Appendix I

Dept of Grain Science and Industry's Annual Review and Evaluation of a Faculty Member's Achievements

Introduction

The annual review submitted by a faculty member consists of : (i) the current year's official appointment tenths in the areas of research, teaching, and service, the individual's goal and objectives, and any negotiated weighting of those areas with the Department Head; (ii) a description of one's achievements in those areas; (iii) a table summarizing major achievements; (iv) selected documentation, and (v) goals and objectives for next year. Achievements are provided for the current year and two or more prior years. Achievements in each area are evaluated by the Head of the Department with ratings of excellent, very good, satisfactory, improvement needed, and unsatisfactory. The overall annual rating by the Head is arrived at by considering the ratings and negotiated weightings in all areas of responsibility. The overall ratings are; exceeded expectations, met expectations, fell below expectations but met minimum acceptable level of productivity, and fell below average expectations.

Documents to support achievements may include: in the research area, abstracts of publications, presentations, research proposals, and descriptions of awards; in the teaching area, course outlines, TEVAL results, innovative teaching methods, and awards; and in service, duties of committee chairs and members, duties of professional office holders, and contents of symposia and short courses.

Areas Reviewed

I. Research. Achievements are reported in research with respect to the following criteria; originality, impact, transfer/commercialization, publications, presentations, awards, honors, funding, equipment donated, and safety. A list is provided of the research associates, MS students, and PhD students who the faculty member serves as major advisor, and the number of graduate student advisory committees on which the faculty member serves.

II. Teaching. Achievements in teaching are reported with respect to the following criteria; classes taught, class contact hours, new class developed, percent responsibility for a class, number of students, student evaluations, learning outcomes, advising honors students, advising student clubs, and teaching awards.

III. Service.

A. Directed Service.

Achievements are reported in: (i) supervision of the Feed Mill, Flour Mill, Bakery, or Extrusion Center; (ii) performing service for clients such as assays; (iii) and international outreach.

B. Nondirected Service.

Achievements are reported in: (i) professional service, including editing a journal or book, reviewing manuscripts and research proposals, organizing and speaking at symposia and workshops, consulting, and occupying a leadership position in a professional society; (ii) institutional service, including chairing a major(meets >30h/year) or minor committee, being a member of a major or minor committee, and mentoring a new faculty member; and (iii) public service, including responding to messages by e-mail, fax, telephone, and letter, and greeting and meeting with visitors to the department and the university.

Appendix II

Department of Grain Science and Industry's

Annual Review and Evaluation of Extension

Faculty

AREAS REVIEWED

I. Program Focus and Pursuit of Goals

This area is to assess the relevance of the individual's program and the aggressiveness (effort) to attain extension goals.

II. Program Implementation

The criteria in this area are: (i) the number of meetings, tours, and demonstrations, and the evaluation of those events by clientele, county agents, State extension leaders, and other peers, and (ii) improvement in extension by participation in professional retreats and workshops and by self-improvement activities.

III. Educational Materials

The criteria here are the quantity and quality of journal articles, extension bulletins, on web sites developed, software developed, fact sheets, and audio and visual news releases. The breadth of activities in this area is a measure of effectiveness of the individual's program.

IV. Creativity In Delivery

The criteria here are development of new, innovative extension programs using new technology in delivery, or development of a program for new clientele. In addition, cite proposals submitted and funded to support extension activities.

V. Impact Assessment

Provide evidence of adoption of the individual's new ideas by target clientele. Cite

awards and honors received at the college, university, and national level.

VI. Teamwork Extension Improvement

Provide information on the level of intra- and inter-departmental work, involvement with county agents or other clientele, and on one's accessibility.

Appendix III

Department of Grain Science and Industry's

Annual Review and Evaluation of International Grains

Program (IGP) Faculty

I. International Activities

- A. Short Courses organized and/or taught to domestic and international clientele.
- B. Booklets, reports, and other documents compiled for IGP activities
- C. International assignments, including those for U.S. Wheat Associates, Agency for International Development, U.S. Grains Council, and others. Include presentations and other participation at meetings and workshops.
- D. Hosting visitors and coordinating their activities.

II. Service Activities

- A. Non-directed service, such as professional based service (e.g. officer of a professional organization), institution-based services (e.g. member of a University committee), and public-based service (e.g. responding to inquiries from clientele, conducting tours, and consulting).
- B. Directed Service. Expanding the activities of IGP and increasing support facilities and dollars. Supervision of IGP facilities.

APPENDIX IV

Guidelines for Negotiated Weighting of Assignments

PROPORTIONAL TEACHING ASSIGNMENT. A full-time (10 tenths) teaching assignment in the Department of Grain Science and Industry is currently represented by teaching approximately 6 courses per year. Lecture courses are weighted as one course; laboratories are weighted as 0.5 course. When a course has both laboratory and lectures, it is weighted 1.5. More weighting may be negotiated for classes that require an extraordinary expenditure of time. Teaching, other than formal courses, may be documented and considered as part of one's teaching assignment. This would include time spent teaching techniques, procedures, and/or concepts to individual students and would be assigned at the Head's discretion.

PROPORTIONAL SERVICE ASSIGNMENT. The total service tenths and their distribution among the various types of service are negotiated with the Head using the following guidelines for each type of service. Maximum assignment in the total service area is three tenths. When considering the proportion of time spent on service assignments, faculty should keep in mind that nondirected service cannot be the major grounds upon which tenure or promotion is based (Section C32.6, Faculty Handbook). Tenure-earning faculty should probably limit negotiated assignments in the nondirected service area to one tenth or less.

Nondirected service is apportioned into three categories (Section C6, Faculty Handbook):

1. Profession-based service: work that is directly related to the function of the unit and that provides leadership and service to the faculty member's profession as a discipline; for example, holding office in a professional association or service on an editorial board of a professional journal.

2. Institution-based service: work that is essential to the University; for example, contributing to the formulation of academic policy and programs, serving on the Faculty Senate, the Graduate Council, and committees of the department, college or University, or acting as advisor to student organizations

3. Public-based professional service - efforts that are not directed service but that are the application of knowledge and expertise intended for the benefit of a non-academic audience; for example, serving as an expert witness, and providing consultation.

Directed service - work that furthers the mission of and is directly related to the goals and objectives of a unit and the University, that requires academic credentials or special skills, and that is a part of a faculty member's specific assignment (Section C5, Faculty Handbook).

OTHER AREA PROPORTIONAL ASSIGNMENTS will be made relative to the proportional Teaching and Service assignments.

APPENDIX V

Department of Grain Science and Industry

Criteria for Evaluation of Mid-Probationary Review,

Promotion and Tenure

I. TEACHING

Criteria	Standards
Student Evaluations	TEVAL scores; scores for preparation/organization, responsiveness to students, stimulation, communication, feedback; adjusted scores for amount learned and teacher effectiveness; scores should be viewed in a historical context whenever possible.
Teaching portfolio	Teaching materials such as syllabi, course outlines, exams, assignments, or web pages; statements of progress; evidence of innovative and effective teaching methods; course revisions, and new courses developed; advising honors students.

Teaching improvement	Participation in workshops, meetings or field trips that improve teaching; participation in peer evaluation of teaching; sabbatical leave used for teaching improvement.
Undergraduate advising	Quantity determined by the number of undergraduate advisees; quality determined by interviews of students by the Head; service as faculty advisor to department clubs and other official student organizations.
Graduate academic advising	Quantity determined by the number of graduate committees as advisor and number of graduate committees as committee member; quality determined by exit interviews by the Head.
Teaching-related committee work	Service on department, college, or university committees that directly affect teaching; examples are Grain Science and Industry or College Scholarship Committee, Undergraduate or Graduate Course and Curriculum Committee, College Academic Standards Committee, Univ. Academic

	Affairs Committee.
--	--------------------

Teaching publications and presentations	Publications, presentations, etc. that directly concern teaching; examples are refereed publications, textbooks, oral and poster presentations, abstracts, computer software, laboratory manuals, and video tapes; guest lectures and/or invited presentations; evidence of scholarship and innovation.
Teaching awards, honors and other recognition	Teaching awards, honors and other forms of recognition received during the evaluation period at the college, university, or national level.
Extramural funding	Level of extramural funding for teaching activities; proposals submitted but not funded.
Interdisciplinary teaching and team work	Participation in group teaching activities; providing guest lectures; working with colleagues for teaching improvement.
Goal setting and accomplishment of goals	Appropriateness of goals set for the coming year at the annual evaluation meeting; progress towards goals since the previous evaluation.

II. RESEARCH

Criteria	Standards
Accomplishment of responsibilities given in the position description	Level of accomplishment of responsibilities listed in the position description.
Refereed publications	The minimum number required is subjective for each individual; the award of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor for a faculty member with a research appointment requires demonstrated ability to publish research work conducted at Kansas State University. Quantity and quality of publications.
Other publications and presentations	Oral and poster presentations; invited presentations; abstracts; website development; computer software; bulletins; radio tapes; newspaper articles; video tapes.
Extramural funding	Level of extramural funding; proposals submitted but not funded.
Significant findings or development of unique research techniques	Key research findings; new techniques developed that contribute to scientific knowledge and benefit society.
Graduate research advising	Quantity determined by the number of

	graduate committees as major advisor and the number of graduate committees as committee member; quality determined by interviews of graduate students by the Head.
Visiting scientists and post-doctorates	Quantity determined by the number of visiting scientists and post-doctorates during the evaluation period; quality determined by whether these visits and working relationships resulted in new research findings, grants, and publications.

Research improvement	Participation in retreats, professional meetings, and workshops that enhance improvement in research; self-improvement activities that can be documented; sabbatical leave used for research improvement.
Research awards, honors, and other recognition	Research awards, honors and other forms of recognition received at the college, university, national, or international level.
Interdisciplinary research and team work	Participation in interdisciplinary research activities; working with colleagues on and

	off campus for improvement in research.
--	---

III. EXTENSION

Criteria	Standards
Extension program focus and aggressiveness (effort)	Focus of extension program relative to position responsibilities and clientele needs; level of aggressiveness (effort) in attaining extension goals.
Program development and implementation	Quantity determined by number of meetings, tours, and demonstrations; quality determined by the overall impact of the program as evaluated through visits by the Head and/or Extension State Leader.
Extension educational materials	Quantity and quality of extension educational material prepared (journal articles, website development, software, bulletins, fact sheets, software, news releases, radio tapes, and videos).
Peer and clientele evaluations	Evaluation of meetings, tours, and/or demonstrations by peers; evaluation cards

	completed by county agents, and/or input from clientele.
Teamwork, clientele relationships	Level of intra- and interdepartmental work; level of involvement with clientele (county agents, individuals, or groups); accessibility (prompt response).
Creativity and innovation in delivery	Development of new innovative extension programs; use of new technology in delivery of extension programs; development of programs directed to non-traditional clientele.
Extramural funding	Level of extramural funding for extension activities; proposals submitted but not funded.
Extension improvement	Participation in retreats, professional meetings, and workshops that enhance professional improvement for extension; self-improvement activities that can be documented; sabbatical leave used for extension improvement.
Proceedings, abstracts, invited presentations	Quantity and quality of proceedings, abstracts, and/or invited presentations.
Extension awards, honors, and recognition	Extension awards, honors, and other

	recognition received during the evaluation period at the college, university, or national level.
Goal setting and accomplishment of goals	Appropriateness of goals set for the coming year at the annual evaluation meeting; progress toward goals since the previous evaluation.

IV. NON-DIRECTED SERVICE

Criteria	Standards
Committee assignments, mentoring, and other service activities	Service contributions through department, college, and university committees. Mentoring of faculty members on probationary appointments.
Profession-based service and recognition	Participation in and contributions to professional societies related to grain science; service on review teams or proposal review panels; recognition by peers outside the university and/or clientele groups.

Professional public service	Professional contributions to government organizations, civic groups, or commercial or agricultural groups. International activities including professional contributions to other countries and international groups, such as program development, training, consulting, or other activities.
Private consulting activities	Amount, extent of involvement, and level of expertise provided as a private consultant.
Leadership, cooperation, initiative, and enthusiasm	Chairing committees; providing help when asked; participating as a team player to benefit the department, participation in departmental seminars, faculty meetings, retreats, and other departmental activities.

V. DIRECTED SERVICE

Criteria	Standard
Accomplishment of responsibilities given in the position description.	Level of accomplishment of responsibilities listed in the position description.

Achievements	Give significant achievements and discuss extra efforts. Is the service generating a positive cash flow?
Impact and five year plan	Provide information on long-term benefits, and plans for the future.

APPENDIX VI

ANNUAL ACHIEVEMENT SUMMARY OUTLINE

I. General/Non-Directed Service

A. Current position description (describe your duties in no more than one-half page) and recommended weights for teaching, research, extension, and directed service.

B. Continuing professional improvement activities (sabbatical leaves, retreats, professional meetings, workshops, or other self-improvement activities).

C. Awards, honors, and other forms of recognition. University, professional, governmental, civic, other (local, state, regional, national).

D. Contributions to the Department, the College, the University.

1. Mentoring of faculty members.

2. Committees.

A. Department.

B. College of Agriculture.

C. University.

3. Other activities.

E. Professional activity. Participation in and contributions to professional societies related to grain science (paper and poster presentations, session chairpersons, seminars, symposia, committee membership, offices, editorial services for professional journals).

F. Professional public service. Professional contributions to government, civic groups (local, state, national), or industrial, commercial, and agricultural organizations.

G. Private consulting activities. Subject, nature of clientele, duration.

H. International activities (resident faculty only; faculty on international assignment should detail achievements under extension, teaching or research).

I. Long-term benefits/impact of General/Non-Directed Service to the Department, College, University, profession, public, and international groups.

J. Five-year plan of General/Non-Directed Service to the Department, College, University, profession, public, and international groups.

K. Extra effort. Describe exceptional or unusual contributions to General/Non-directed Service that are not covered above.

II. Extension

A. List goals and progress towards goals in Extension for the current year. Include comments on roadblocks to achievement.

B. K-State Research and Extension Impact Report for the current year.

C. Significant accomplishments.

D. Extension activities.

1. Summary of Extension Agronomist Evaluation cards (mandatory for non-tenured faculty; highly recommended for associate professors).

2. Summary of meetings and attendance at each meeting.

3. Educational materials for current year. Include bulletins (extension, experiment station, other), films, radio tapes, slide tapes, websites developed, computer software, regularly published newsletters, feature articles, refereed journal articles, and other. List by category with author, year, title, and citation. Attach a complete list from previous years in the Appendix.

4. Other extension activities not covered above.

E. Extension grants.

1. New proposals applied for and received during the current year (give source, date, amount, and duration).

2. Grant proposals that were submitted but not funded.

F. Extension awards, honors, and other forms of recognition.

G. Goals for the coming year. Include comments on potential roadblocks to achievement.

H. Long-term benefits/impact of Extension activities.

I. Five-year plan of Extension activities.

J. Extra effort. Describe exceptional or unusual contributions to Extension that are not covered above.

III. Teaching

A. List goals and progress towards goals in Teaching for the current year. Include comments on roadblocks to achievement.

B. Courses taught during the past year.

C. Enrollment in course(s) for last five years (or less for new course).

D. Student rating scores (TEVAL Student Evaluation of Instruction). Provide complete summary sheets for courses taught during the last year in the Teaching Portfolio. Provide a table for TEVAL scores of courses taught in the past five years in the Teaching Portfolio.

E. Significant accomplishments.

F. Teaching activities.

1. Publications and presentations during past year. Include refereed journal articles, laboratory manuals, books, bulletins (experiment station, extension, other), films, radio tapes, slide tapes, websites developed, computer software, regularly published newsletters, feature articles, other. Include those publications that are accepted but not yet published. Do not include publications in

preparation. Provide a complete list from previous years in the Teaching Portfolio.

2. Teaching improvement activities.

3. Undergraduate advising.

4. Graduate academic advising.

5. Other teaching activities not covered above.

G. Teaching awards, honors, and other forms of recognition.

H. Extramural funding for teaching activities.

I. Teaching portfolio (attach as an appendix).

J. Goals for the coming year. Include comments on potential roadblocks to achievement.

K. Long-term benefits/impact of Teaching activities.

L. Five-year plan of Teaching activities. M. Extra effort. Describe exceptional or unusual contributions to Teaching that are not covered above.

IV. Research

A. List goals and progress towards goals in Research for the current year. Include comments on roadblocks to achievement.

B. K-State Research and Extension Impact Report for the current year.

C. Current experiment station projects or team membership (include number and title for Hatch, RRF, and state OR funded projects; do not include 3000 or 5000 projects). Include a one paragraph summary of the project or team membership.

D. Significant research findings on at least one important problem and/or key issue (include economic value of these findings).

E. Research activities.

1. Publications for current year. Include refereed journal articles, bulletins (experiment station, extension, other), films, radio tapes, slide tapes, computer software, websites developed, regularly published newsletters, feature articles, other. List by category with title, principal author, other contributors, by whom published. List publications with AES number but not published yet (be sure to provide AES number). Do not include manuscripts in preparation, etc. Attach a complete list from previous years in the Appendix.

2. Research grants.

I. New proposals (sponsored projects) applied for and received during current year (give source, date, amount, and duration).

II. Current sponsored projects with amount of the project if past first year of grant.

III. Multi-sponsored projects (those that receive a small amounts of funds from many sources) with the total amount for current year.

IV. Grant proposals that were submitted but not funded.

3. Graduate research advising (M.S. and Ph.D.).

I. Advisees graduated during current year (include title and journal publication status of thesis or dissertation).

II. Current advisees and their arrival date and estimated departure date (which may be sooner than their actual graduation date).

4. Visiting scientists and post doctorates and their arrival date and estimated departure date.

5. Other research activities not covered above.

F. Research awards, honors, and other forms of recognition.

G. Goals for the coming year. Include comments on potential roadblocks to achievement.

H. Long-term benefits/impact of Research activities.

I. Five-year plan of Research activities.

J. Extra effort. Describe exceptional or unusual contributions to Research that are not covered above.

V. Directed Service

A. List goals and progress towards goals in Directed Service for the current year. Include comments on roadblocks to achievement.

B. Brief overview of responsibilities.

C. Significant accomplishments.

D. Summary of activities not included under Non-Directed Service, Extension, Teaching, or Research.

E. Goals for the coming year. Include comments on potential roadblocks to achievement.

F. Long-term benefits/impact of Directed Service activities.

G. Five-year plan of Directed Service activities.

H. Extra effort. Describe exceptional or unusual contributions to Directed Service that are not covered above.

I. Attachments. Publications, articles, grant proposals, requested letters of recommendation, and impact.