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FACULTY EVALUATION: REAPPOINTMENT, MID-TENURE REVIEW, TENURE, PROMOTION; AND PROCEDURES, CRITERIA, AND STANDARDS FOR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION,
Department of Horticulture, Forestry and Recreation Resources
Kansas State University

Reappointment, mid-tenure review, tenure, and promotion

1. Introduction

Reappointment, mid-tenure review, tenure, and promotion are based on faculty evaluation as discussed in Section C of the University Handbook (http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/fhbook/fhsecc.html). 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 own document of guidelines, criteria, and standards for reappointment, mid-tenure 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 at least once every five years. This document represents the current procedures, criteria, and standards for reappointment, mid-tenure review, tenure, and promotion used in the Department of Horticulture, Forestry and Recreation Resources.

2. Horticulture, Forestry and Recreation Resources Faculty Committee on Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure and Annual Performance Evaluation (hereafter referred to the Promotion and Tenure Committee)

This committee consists of five faculty members that are appointed at the discretion of the department head. The members of the committee must be tenured faculty and hold the rank of associate professor or professor.

3. Guidelines and Procedures

3.1 Reappointment of Faculty Members on Probationary Appointments

During the first year of appointment, the head appoints a tenured faculty member(s) as mentor(s) to each new faculty member on probationary appointment. After the candidate becomes acquainted with the tenured departmental faculty, a different mentor or group of mentors may be assigned. The mentor(s) assist and advise the candidate during the promotion and tenure process; provide advice in the preparation of promotion and tenure materials; provide general advice to the candidate about structuring and conducting their professional program; and advise 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, typically in September, 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 - C56 of the
University Handbook. Until the probationary faculty member has been through Mid-Tenure review the form entitled ‘Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Mid-Tenure Review Documentation’ will be filled out to use as the reappointment file. After Mid-Tenure review until a decision is made on granting tenure is made the probationary faculty member will use form entitled ‘Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Document’ as the reappointment file. These forms will be supplied by the Head. The head makes the reappointment file available to all tenured faculty members in the department at least 14 days prior to the meeting of the 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 reappointment file is reviewed by all tenured faculty. 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.

Formal written ballots are cast for each individual being considered for reappointment. Written comments on the ballots are encouraged. Following the vote by the tenured faculty, a statement is prepared outlining the faculty’s recommendation regarding reappointment to the candidate. The statement will include the results of the faculty vote. The head forwards a written recommendation and accompanying explanations to the Dean of the College of Agriculture, along with the candidate’s complete reappointment file, unedited written comments of the department’s tenured faculty members, and number of votes by the tenured faculty in the categories of yes, no, and abstain, and also the number and name(s) of eligible faculty not voting. If the recommendation of the head differs from that of the faculty, the reasons for the difference will be explained in the head’s statement and communicated in writing to the faculty.

The head meets with the candidate to discuss progress towards tenure and promotion within 30 days of the reappointment vote. The head’s written recommendation to the Dean and accompanying explanations will be made available to the candidate and will become part of the candidate’s reappointment file. Throughout this process, the goal is to ensure each non-tenured faculty member is aware of the requirements for promotion and tenure and that she or he is informed of perceived progress toward that goal. A faculty member on probationary appointment who will not be reappointed must be informed explicitly in writing of the decision not to renew their appointment in accordance with The Standards of Notice of Non-Reappointment (see Appendix A of the University Handbook).

The following guidelines will be used when reviewing the reappointment file with the knowledge that the appointment along with percentages in combination with the time (years) in the position may impact the expectation and the level of importance of the listed criteria:

1. Teaching appointments should have
   a. developed teaching portfolio for all courses taught.
   b. demonstrated teaching excellence or continual improvement as measured by TEVAL scores (or other student input system as agreed to by the Department).
   c. assumed advising role and responsibilities to assist with advising load.
   d. conducted scholarly activity related to the teaching assignment in consultation with department head and based upon annual performance goals.
3. Research appointments must have
   a. met or exceeded the required number of published refereed publications. The actual number of
      publications would be adjusted for the research appointment with two publications for a 1.0
      research FTE. This would require one publication for a faculty member with a 0.50 research
      appointment.
   b. prepared and submitted appropriate number of funding proposals to potential granting agencies.
      The appropriate number is based on the appointment and the field of research and determined in
      consultation with the department head and based upon annual performance goals.
   c. acquired graduate faculty status and became active in our graduate program, if assigned to the
      Horticulture Division. Active is defined as serving as an advisor, co-advisor, or on a graduate
      committee.

4. Extension appointments must have
   a. developed major program initiative(s) with supporting educational materials introduced into
      county extension system appropriate for the appointment.
   b. prepared and submitted appropriate number of funding proposals to potential granting agencies.
      The appropriate number is based on the appointment and in consultation with department head
   c. has participated in the appropriate Program Focus Team (PFT). (KSRE agents and specialists are
      engaged in an ongoing process of programming and professional development. Teams
      determine appropriate professional development opportunities to assist agents in developing
      expertise in the area of program focus and lead program development initiatives.)
   d. demonstrated scholarly activity related to their extension appointment in consultation with the
      department head and based upon annual performance goals.

5. All faculty must have demonstrated an ability to have collegial relationships with other departmental
   faculty and staff, relate to state agencies and industry groups, respond to industry-related anticipated
   needs and established a relationship with industry, agency, and field extension faculty/staff as related
   to the general assigned responsibilities.

3.2 Mid-tenure Review of Faculty Members on a Probationary Appointment

As an extension of the annual process of reappointment, a formal mid-tenure review is conducted for
faculty members in their third year of a probationary appointment at Kansas State University. The
procedures describing the mid-tenure review of faculty members on probationary appointments are in
Sections C92.1 - C92.4 of the University Handbook. The purpose of the mid-tenure 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-tenure review does not insure
that tenure will be granted in the future nor does a negative review mean that tenure will be denied.

The head makes the mid-tenure review file available to all tenured faculty members in the department at
least 14 calendar days prior to the meeting of the 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.
This same file dually serves the role of both the mid-tenure review document and the reappointment
document. The file is evaluated by the faculty at its meeting, and a positive or negative recommendation
is made to the head. 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. Formal written ballots are cast for each individual being considered for mid-tenure review. 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 faculty. This letter of assessment and the faculty report of comments and suggestions, along with the faculty vote become a part of the candidate's reappointment and mid-tenure 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 14 calendar days. The head forwards a written recommendation and accompanying explanations to the Dean, along with the candidate's complete mid-tenure review file and the number of votes by the tenured faculty in the categories of yes, no, and abstain, as well as the number and name(s) of eligible faculty not voting.

3.3 Tenure and Promotion

There is no simple list of accomplishments that guarantee a faculty member will obtain tenure. Instead, tenure is recommended based on the assessment of the tenured faculty that a candidate has made outstanding contributions in appropriate academic endeavors commensurate with current faculty. In addition, behaviors that adversely affect collegiality or are chronically disruptive will influence tenure decisions. 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 C70 - 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 University 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 (Section C82.3 of the University Handbook). 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, extension or directed service. Associate Professors are evaluated typically in August to determine if they will be supported for promotion to Professor. Promotion to Professor is based on attainment of sustained 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).
3.4 Expectations for Promotion and Tenure
Horticulture Forestry and Recreation Resources

All requirements for acquiring tenure and promotion in rank as defined in the University Handbook must be followed and met with additional definitions and requirements described below.

Mid-Tenure Review

1. Annual evaluations that meet or exceed Satisfactory/Meets Expectations in all general appointment categories in annual evaluation documents.

2. Teaching appointments must have
   a. developed teaching portfolio for all courses taught.
   b. demonstrated teaching excellence or continual improvement as measured by TEVAL scores (or other student input system as agreed to by the Department).
   c. assumed advising role and responsibilities to assist with advising load.
   d. conducted scholarly activity related to the teaching assignment in consultation with department head and based upon annual performance goals.

3. Research appointments must have
   a. met or exceeded the required number of published refereed publications. The actual number of publications would be adjusted for the research appointment with six publications for a 1.0 research FTE. This would require three publications for a faculty member with a 0.50 research appointment.
   b. prepared and submitted appropriate number of funding proposals to potential granting agencies. The appropriate number is based on the appointment and the field of research and determined in consultation with the department head and based upon annual performance goals.
   c. acquired graduate faculty status and become active in our graduate program, if assigned to the Horticulture Division. Active is defined as serving as an advisor, co-advisor, or on a graduate committee.

4. Extension appointments must have
   a. developed major program initiative(s) with supporting educational materials introduced into county extension system appropriate for the appointment.
   b. prepared and submitted appropriate number of funding proposals to potential granting agencies. The appropriate number is based on the appointment and in consultation with department head.
   c. has participated in the appropriate Program Focus Team (PFT). (KSRE agents and specialists are engaged in an ongoing process of programming and professional development. Teams determine appropriate professional development opportunities to assist agents in developing expertise in the area of program focus and lead program development initiatives.)
   d. demonstrated scholarly activity related to their extension appointment in consultation with the department head and based upon annual performance goals.

5. All faculty must have demonstrated an ability to have collegial relationships with other departmental faculty and staff, relate to state agencies and industry groups, respond to industry-related anticipated needs and established a relationship with industry, agency, and field extension faculty/staff as related to the general assigned responsibilities.
6. Mid-tenure candidates will present their work in a department seminar in year three of the tenure process.

**Tenure**

1. Annual evaluations that meet or exceed *Satisfactory/Meets Expectations* in all general appointment categories on annual evaluation documents.

2. Teaching appointments must have
   a. submitted for review a teaching portfolio for all courses taught containing: syllabi, course materials, exams, student comments or anecdotal feedback, notices of awards or special recognitions, listing and/or examples of publications, presentations and grants related to instruction, and teaching goals for the next 5 years.
   b. demonstrated satisfactory or better teaching performances as measured by TEVAL scores (or other student input system as agreed to by the Department).
   c. assumed advising role and responsibilities to assist with advising load when called upon.
   d. provided assistance in curriculum development when called upon.
   e. made a scholarly contribution to the teaching profession (for those with greater than 0.5 teaching appointment: publish at least one paper in an education-related journal or communicate such information formally at a professional meeting).
   f) for those with 1.0 FTE teaching appointment they must have received one extramurally funded grant or other extramural support to support their teaching scholarship or classroom/lab activities.

3. Research appointments must
   a. meet or exceed the minimum required number of refereed publications some of which must be based upon KSU work. The minimum is equivalent to 10 publications for a 1.0 research appointment during the tenure process.
   b. have received funding for at least one submitted research proposal and submitted 5 others to potential granting agencies, received adequate funding to build and maintain a successful research program.
   c. submit for review a research portfolio containing copies of publication’s cover page (with those having been peer-reviewed clearly identified), grant proposals funded or pending, notices of recognitions or awards for research activities, and a listing of research goals for the next 5 years

4. Extension appointments must have
   a. developed two major program initiatives with supporting educational materials introduced into county extension system.
   b. received at least two funding proposals and submitted 5 others to potential granting agencies
   c. submitted for review an extension portfolio containing copies of major program initiatives, cooperation in ‘team-oriented’ extension activities, communications, news releases, and other media support of extension programming, unique and traditional extension delivery systems implemented, grant proposals funded or pending, notices of recognitions or awards for extension activities, and a listing of extension goals for the next 5 years.
   d) demonstrated scholarly activity related to their extension appointment in consultation with department head and based upon annual performance goals.
5. Demonstrated an ability to have collegial relationships with other departmental faculty and staff, relate to state agencies and industry groups, respond to industry-related anticipated needs and established a relationship with industry and field extension faculty/staff as related to the general assigned responsibilities.

**Promotion to Associate Professor**

1. Met requirements for tenure process as mentioned above including the presentation of the requested portfolios as described above.

2. Developed regional/national reputation as an outstanding educator, researcher, or specialist as indicated by excellence in all appointment areas and general service. This status can be documented by indications of regional/national influence such as: professional society responsibilities, regional/national recognitions or awards, invited presentations, requested publications, etc.

3. The candidate will provide the department head the names of three peer faculty at other institutions or equivalent agency representatives to provide an assessment and recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor. The head will choose three additional names for outside reviews. These individuals should be recognized leaders in the candidate’s academic field, but should not have had a strong affiliation with the candidate so that they can provide objective evaluations without conflict of interest. Any affiliation with the candidate should be made clear.

4. Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor are expected to present a departmental seminar in his/her discipline or area of scholarly activity.

**Promotion to Professor**

1. Submit portfolios as described above which document that the candidate has earned a national reputation as an outstanding educator, researcher, or specialist as indicated by continued excellence in all appointment areas and general service. This status can be documented by indications of national influence such as: professional society responsibilities, national recognitions or awards, invited presentations at national meetings or conferences, requested publications from professionals around the country and internationally.

2. Demonstrated the ability to provide program leadership for areas related to their assigned responsibilities.

3. The candidate will provide the department head the names of three peer faculty at other institutions or equivalent agency representatives to provide an assessment and recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor. The head will choose three additional names for outside reviews. These individuals should be recognized leaders in the candidate’s academic field, but should not have had a strong affiliation with the candidate so that they can provide objective evaluations without conflict of interest. Any affiliation with the candidate should be made clear.

4. Candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to present a departmental seminar in his/her discipline or area of scholarly activity.
FACULTY EVALUATION: REAPPOINTMENT, MID-TENURE REVIEW, TENURE,Promotion; AND PROCEDURES, CRITERIA, AND STANDARDS FOR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION,
Department of Horticulture, Forestry and Recreation Resources
Kansas State University

PROCEDURES, CRITERIA, AND STANDARDS FOR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

1. Introduction

Section C and Appendix Q of the University Handbook (http://www.ksu.edu/academicservices/fbhbook/) 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 its own 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 at least once every five years. This document represents the current procedures, criteria, and standards for annual performance evaluation in the Department of Horticulture, Forestry and Recreation Resources.

2. Guidelines and Procedures

2.1 Annual Performance Evaluation

In the fall of each year, the department head sends a memo/e-mail message to all faculty in the Department of Horticulture, Forestry and Recreation Resources requesting documentation of personal achievements for review by the head. As agreed to by the faculty, the calendar year is the evaluation period. Faculty in the Department of Horticulture, Forestry and Recreation Resources submit documentation according to a specific outline (Appendix A) to the department head by December/January. The achievement summary includes accomplishments for general responsibilities/service and teaching, research and extension activities plus progress toward goals for the present year and goals for the up-coming year. Faculty submit information for extension, teaching and research appropriate to their respective appointments. This report will also include goals for the upcoming year. These upcoming goals will be discussed during the annual evaluation meeting.

The annual achievement summaries are reviewed by the head, forming the basis for the annual evaluation and individual conferences are arranged and conducted during the month of January/February. The head and faculty member discuss individual performance relative to his/her position description and determine whether impediments exist in obtaining agreed upon goals. If such impediments occur, the head and faculty member discuss possible strategies to overcome them.

The head assigns a numerical score for each category applicable to the individual faculty member according to the individual appointment (Appendix B). The final score is weighted \( \{(0.25 \times \text{general responsibilities/service}) + [0.75 (\text{extension tenths} \times \text{extension rating} + \text{teaching tenths} \times \text{teaching rating} + \text{research tenths} \times \text{research rating} + \text{directed service tenths} \times \text{directed service rating, where applicable})]\}. \) Since each faculty member has different tenths of time in teaching, research and extension, this formula accounts for differences in appointment. The annual conference will include a
review of the Evaluation Form, which has been previously prepared by the head. A copy of the report is sent to the faculty member prior to the annual conference.

If the University budget includes raises the head will recommend a salary adjustment for each person evaluated. The recommended percentage increase will be based on the annual evaluation and persons with higher levels of accomplishment shall exceed those for persons with lower levels of accomplishment. Depending upon the range of annual evaluations the faculty shall be divided into categories with similar evaluations, typically resulting in 4 to 5 categories. If merit salary categories are utilized, then the percentage recommended for persons in the first category will be higher than those for the second category, which in turn shall exceed those for level of accomplishment in the third category, etc. As a rough guide, average percentage increases in the highest category are expected to be about twice those in the lowest category; however, this ratio is expected to fluctuate both with the degree to which members of the unit differ in effectiveness and the degree to which funds are available.

At the conclusion of the annual performance review meeting, the Horticulture, Forestry and Recreation Resources Faculty Evaluation form (Appendix B) is signed by the individual faculty member and by the head, each of whom may make written comments. The head then summarizes the faculty evaluations and transmits that information to the Dean. As noted in the Guidelines for Evaluating Unclassified Personnel in Section C46.3 of the University Handbook, "within seven working days after the review and discussion, faculty or unclassified professionals have the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations which will only then be forwarded to the next administrative level (Dean).

2.2 Criteria and Standards for Annual Merit Evaluation

The Annual Faculty Evaluation Report (Appendix A) is reviewed by the head, who assigns a rating of 0 to five (5) for each category applicable to the individual faculty member (general responsibilities/service for everyone and extension, teaching, research, and directed service according to the individual appointment). Levels of accomplishments are subjectively determined by the head based on careful consideration of the standards listed for each criterion. Ratings are based on a five point scale: 5 = Exceptional; 4 = Excellent; 3 = Above Average; 2 = Average; 1 = Needing Improvement; and 0 = Unacceptable. The tenths time in extension, teaching, research, and directed service are based on current responsibilities as agreed on by the head and the faculty member in the evaluation meeting of the previous year and as described in the current evaluation document (see Section C45.1 of the University Handbook). The number of tenths in each category is not necessarily the same as the budgeted appointment. The final score is weighted $$\{(0.25 \times \text{general responsibilities/service}) + [0.75 \times \text{extension tenths} \times \text{extension rating} + \text{teaching tenths} \times \text{teaching rating} + \text{research tenths} \times \text{research rating} + \text{directed service tenths} \times \text{directed service rating} (\text{where applicable}) + \text{center director service tenths} \times \text{directed service rating} (\text{where applicable})]\}}$$. Since each faculty member has different tenths of time in teaching, research, extension, and/or directed service, this formula accounts for differences in appointment. It is further expected that for any criterion, the productivity will be proportional to the tenths assignment. For example, twice as many publications would be generally expected for an individual with 1.0 research appointment than for an individual with 0.5 research appointment. The Total Weighted Average Score for a faculty member is used to determine the level of performance. The performance levels of the different faculty will be placed into the following groups: 'Below Expectations', 'Meets Expectations', 'Exceeds Expectations' and 'Greatly Exceeds Expectations'. The
distribution of faculty between the groups and the final ranking of faculty within the groups is to be determined by the Head.

The report to the faculty member will state which of the above categories was used for the evaluation. Faculty are informed in the report of their performance relative to other faculty members in the department by listing the high, low, median, and mean scores. The evaluation form is then signed by the individual faculty member and returned to the head for his/her signature. Both the faculty member and the head may make written comments on the form. As noted in Section C46.3 of the University Handbook, faculty members have seven working days after receiving their written evaluation from 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 current faculty evaluation document approved by the department, the signed evaluation form, and any written statements of unresolved differences. The head only makes recommendations for salary increases that are subject to review and final approval by the Dean. Therefore, the Dean has the opportunity to consider faculty concerns before making a final recommendation on the salary increase of an individual faculty member.

Sometimes the demonstrated productivity of a faculty member will vary annually because of special work assignments or other factors such as an uneven distribution of refereed publications. To adjust for this annual variation, a faculty member and the head may collectively decide to use the mean merit score 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 score used for the evaluation is the highest of (1) the mean score in the department or (2) the actual score adjusted proportionally to encompass the entire year. For faculty members on sabbatical leave or leave without pay for part of the year, the score is based on a consideration of both the score obtained for performance during the period they were engaged in university assignments and the mean score over the past three years. For faculty members on leave for the entire year, the score is the highest of (1) the mean score of the faculty member for the previous three years.

2.3. Chronic Low Achievement

In accordance with Section C31.5 of the University Handbook (Chronic Low Achievement), the Department of Horticulture, Forestry and Recreation Resources is required to establish guidelines describing minimum acceptable levels of productivity for tenured faculty members. In the Department of Horticulture, Forestry and Recreation Resources, the minimum-acceptable level of productivity is a score of less than 2.0 in any category (teaching, research, extension, and/or directed service) in which the faculty member holds an appointment. A faculty member who receives a performance rating of less than 2.0 in teaching, research, extension, or directed service fails to achieve the minimal acceptable level of productivity and 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 had fallen below minimum levels of productivity. The head then consults with the Promotion and Tenure Committee 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.

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 Promotion and Tenure Committee and will consult with the committee 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 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.

**HFRR Guidelines for K-State Professorial Performance Awards**

**Institutional criteria for the award must, at a minimum, include the following**

1. The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at least six years since the last promotion or professorial performance award.

2. The candidate must show evidence of **sustained** productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review.

3. The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to the **current** approved departmental standards;

**Procedures:**

1. Any Horticulture, Forestry and Recreation Resources full professor who believes they meet the above criteria will inform the department head that they request a departmental review. This should be done during the annual evaluation following their sixth year after promotion to full professor.

2. The department head will compile the last **six** years of annual review documents and request that the candidate prepare a **two-page synopsis** highlighting the past six years of effort.

3. The department’s full professors will review the above information packet and

*4. Vote to approve or disapprove the candidate’s application packet.

   A. If the faculty vote carries a two-thirds majority, the packet goes forward to the Dean with a cover (transmittal) letter from the department head.

   B. If the candidate fails to achieve the two-thirds faculty approval vote, the packet fails and is not transmitted. There will be no departmental review if the vote fails.

* The candidate can meet with the reviewing faculty to answer questions about the packet. This is done
at the request of the candidate.

Appendix A

ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION CRITERIA
Horticulture, Forestry, and Recreation Resources
Kansas State University.

All standards in the following tables are subjective. Levels of accomplishment are determined subjectively by the head based on consideration of the standards for each criterion. Ratings are based on a scale of 0 = Unacceptable to 5 = Exceptional. Some of the criteria used for evaluation are not applicable for all individuals. Moreover, some criteria may not be applicable for an individual for a specific year, whereas other criteria could receive more emphasis because of year-to-year needs of the department. The department head rates faculty on each applicable criterion and develops an overall rating for teaching, research, extension, general service, and directed service activities, as applicable.

GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES

GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND SERVICE. (25%)
All faculty should complete G1 to G4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Standards (minimum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(G1) Professional Development</td>
<td>• Attend one appropriate professional meeting every two years or earn recognized CEUs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In addition to the professional meetings specified above, attend and participate in one professional development activity every year (e.g., on-campus seminars, workshops, webinars, or other training)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G2) Service to professional societies, commodity groups, or other discipline-related organizations and agencies</td>
<td>• Belong and provide service to appropriate professional society(ies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide service for commodity groups or other discipline related organizations and agencies (extension must go beyond normal assignment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G3) University/College Service, University and college committees or other working groups</td>
<td>• Service contributions through college and university committees and working groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Guest lectures outside the department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(G4) Departmental Relations/Service

Leadership, collegiality, cooperation, initiative, and mentoring

- Contribute to positive working atmosphere within department
- Provide leadership when asked
- Participate as a team player and support the department by attending departmental meetings and other activities
- Mentor junior faculty members as assigned
- Guest lectures within the department

TEACHING (________ tenths)

T1 is required by all teaching faculty. T5 and T6 are required for all teaching faculty with a 0.5 or greater teaching appointment. A minimum of 5 of the 9 criteria must be addressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(T1)* Student Evaluations</td>
<td>• Provide three-year summary (or less for a new course) of adjusted TEVAL scores for Amount Learned and Teacher Effectiveness, and/or other appropriate student input as agreed to by the dept. head. An adjusted score of less than 3.0 in this category indicates that the teaching of the course does not meet the expectations of the department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T2) Teaching Scholarship (publications, presentations and other scholarly contributions related to teaching)</td>
<td>• Publications and presentations that directly concern teaching; examples include journal publications, textbooks, laboratory manuals, book chapters, presentations (poster or oral) at professional meetings, newsletter articles or essays, new software developed, invited guest lectures or teaching seminars given outside of the department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T3) Extramural funding for teaching</td>
<td>• Level of extramural funding for teaching activities. List all efforts at generating teaching program support, including proposals submitted but not funded and solicitations for donations of equipment or course materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T4) Contributions to the curriculum and program development</td>
<td>• Contributions to overall curriculum by providing innovative curriculum proposals and/or by working on multi-faculty or departmental curriculum planning or evaluation efforts. • Assisting colleagues by helping with the labs, field trips, or giving guest lectures within the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T5) Teaching improvement*</td>
<td>• Participation in workshops or meetings that improve teaching; participation in peer evaluation of teaching; sabbatical leave used for teaching improvement • Self-improvement activities that can be documented such as reading appropriate books, attending off-campus self-improvement seminars and workshops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(T6)
Undergraduate advising*  
- Quantity determined by the number of undergraduate advisees; quality determined by interviews or other assessment of students by the Head  
- Service as faculty advisor to department clubs and other official student organizations

(T7)
Graduate advising  
- Quantity determined by the number of graduate advisees; quality determined by interviews or other assessment of students by the Head

(T8)
Teaching awards and honors  
- Teaching awards and honors received during the evaluation period at the college, university, or national level

(T9)
Accomplishment of Teaching Goals  
- Progress toward goals since the previous evaluation

* These items in bold must be addressed in the self-evaluation report.

RESEARCH (_________tenths)

A minimum of 5 of 7 criteria must be addressed with R1 and R3 required for research faculty. R4 is required for those faculty associated with the Horticulture graduate program. The faculty can use a rolling 3 year average for publications since publications are not necessarily consistent across years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(R1) Peer-Reviewed publications*</td>
<td>• Quantity and quality of peer reviewed journal articles, books and book chapters. (minimum standard, 2 refereed publications per year per 1.0 FTE); • Publications with multiple authors where the faculty member is not the senior author are encouraged and count towards the required number of publications; • Copies of publication cover pages must be submitted to Dept. Head</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(R2) Other publications and presentations
- List publications in proceedings or edited publications (cite references and AES number)
- * non-refereed and self-published books
- * List published abstracts (cite references)
- List publications of research related information in technical/industry/popular press
- List oral and poster presentations
- Computer software/web development
- Video tapes/CD Rom

(R3) Generation of program support*
- Grants and requests for financial support [indicate source, amount, general nature of grant, and status (funded, not funded, in review, continuing)]
- Examples of non-monetary (in-kind) program support (indicate products/supplies/services donated, estimated value, and general use areas intended)

(R4) Graduate research advising*
- Quantity determined by the number of graduate committees as advisor and number of graduate committees as committee member

(R5) Collaborative efforts in accomplishing research
- Collaboration with researchers outside the department or within the department
- Visiting scientists and post-doctorates

(R6) Research awards and honors
- Research awards and honors received during the evaluation period at the college, university, national, or international level

(R7) Accomplishment of research goals
- Goals accomplished since the previous evaluation

* These items in bold must be addressed in the self-evaluation report.

EXTENSION (tenths __________)

A minimum of 7 of the 10 criteria must be addressed with E1, E2, E3, E4, and E6 required for inclusion in this assessment.
| E1. Extension program development, effectiveness and effort* | • Focus of extension program relative to position responsibilities and clientele needs  
• Level of effort in attaining extension goals  
• Must have individual or group plan of work on a yearly and 5-year basis that is complete and up-to-date |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| E2. Program implementation* | • Quantity determined by number of meetings, tours, educational events, demonstrations, etc.  
• Quality determined by the overall impact of the program as evaluated through visits by the head and assistance provided to stakeholders. |
| E3. Extension educational materials* | • Quantity and quality of extension educational material prepared (journal articles, website development, software, bulletins, fact sheets, software, news releases, radio tapes, videos, etc.)  
• Co-authored materials are considered for each author |
| E4. Peer and clientele evaluations* | • Evaluation of departmental survey sent to agents/stakeholders. Specialists are encouraged to use formal evaluation documentation for meetings and events where this is possible |
| E5. Teamwork, clientele relationships | • Level of intra- and interdepartmental work  
• Level of involvement with stakeholders.  
• Accessibility (prompt response)  
• Collaboration with industry and other agency groups related to subject matter responsibilities |
| E6. Extramural funding* | • Level of extramural funding for extension activities  
• Proposals submitted but not funded. Includes other means of generating program support including commodity group support, in-kind donations and supplies, and educational material support |
| E7. Extension improvement | • Participation in retreats, professional meetings, workshops, etc. that enhance professional improvement for extension  
• Self-improvement activities that can be documented  
• Sabbatical leave used for extension improvement |
| E8. Proceedings, abstracts, invited presentations | • Quantity and quality of proceedings, abstracts, and/or invited presentations |
| E9. Extension awards and honors | • Extension awards and honors received during the evaluation period at the college, university, or national level |
| E10 Accomplishment of extension goals | • Progress toward goals since the previous evaluation. |

* These items in bold must be addressed in the self-evaluation report.
DIRECTED SERVICE (_________ tenths)

Portions of time for annual evaluation assigned by Department Head for specific responsibilities and activities. Examples include: Teaching Program Coordinator, State Extension Leader, Assistant Department Head, Graduate Research Coordinator and others such as chair of Task Force or committee which required more than the typical time commitment.

| D1 Significant Accomplishments | • List responsibilities during current year; include comments on achievements and roadblocks to achievements. |

CENTER DIRECTOR (_______ tenths)

This category is only for those faculty who have responsibility in overseeing operation of one of the research centers within HFRR: John C. Pair Center; KSRE Center-Olathe; Pecan Experiment Station; Tuttle Forestry Center; Rocky Ford Turfgrass Research Center.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(CD1) Personnel Management</td>
<td>• Number of staff managed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Quality of management (e.g., Are performance evaluations done on time? Are mid-year coaching sessions employed)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (CD2) Physical Resource Management | • Effort in infrastructure maintenance  
• Effort in infrastructure improvement |

| (CD3) Public Relations | • Field Days and related activities  
• Other examples of efforts in public relations |

| (CD4) Funding | • Gifts and others forms of financial support pursued and received in support of Center  
• Examples of non-monetary (in-kind) program support (indicate products/supplies/services donated, estimated value, and general use areas intended) |

NEW COLUMN HEADINGS ON FORM:

0= Unacceptable  
1= Needing Improvement  
2= Average  
3= Above Average  
4= Excellent  
5= Exceptional