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DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING
(Approved by the BAE Faculty on May 20, 2014)

BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING
MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Biological and Agricultural Engineering (BAE) Department is to advance the knowledge and application of engineering and technology to living systems, agriculture, and the environment.

Introduction

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

Each faculty member has the responsibility of addressing the specifics of their job description in order for the department to utilize their collective expertise to advance the missions of the department, college, and university (Appendix A). Kansas State University (K-State) has several important missions, and a fundamental one is the education of students. Classroom teaching is the common medium; however, small group or individual instructions, such as supervision of independent studies and research, clinical instruction, and advising students, are also important forms of teaching. This variety is critical to institutional excellence. Extension specialists teach in diverse settings across the state and they are expected to use a variety of teaching methods and strategies. Original intellectual contributions fulfill a fundamental mission of the university and are crucial to institutional excellence.

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

Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

Job Description and Goals

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

Faculty are expected to develop 5-year-program goals as part of their career development while striving for excellence. Goals developed by individual faculty should be realistic and relevant to the missions of the department and respective colleges. As teaching, research, and extension programs evolve and change throughout the year, the
initial set of goals should be evaluated annually and modified if necessary. Significant modifications should be discussed between the faculty member and the department head. Faculty will be evaluated on their development and percent attainment of goals.

Evaluation of Teaching, Research, Extension and Service Components of Appointment

Faculty evaluation is based on each faculty member’s individual appointment comprising of teaching, research, extension and service components. Table 1 outlines the evaluation matrix. Professional performance is exceptionally complex and cannot be evaluated adequately based on a single source of information. It is essential that faculty evaluation be based on multiple sources of data for each area evaluated in order to provide various perspectives and to avoid concentration on narrow performance objectives. Documentation required for annual evaluations can be found at the Office of Academic Personnel website (http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/).

Collegiality

Faculty members are expected to be cooperative and active departmental citizens. They are members in the community of scholars and it is assumed that they endorse the University’s Principles of Community (http://www.ksu.edu/Welcome/community.html). As a member in the community, they should feel a sense of responsibility for the welfare of the group. They will refrain from actions that harm an individual or the reputations of members of the group or of the group as a whole. Furthermore, faculty members are expected to work for the good of the community and toward the achievement of its mission and goals. As departmental citizens, faculty members are expected to:

- Actively participate on committees and in departmental meetings (regularly participate in meetings; provide contributions to assignments or committee tasks; provide leadership as active chair on committees)
- Extend professional courtesy to others and show respect for their opinions (maintain civility in meetings; cooperate in meetings and on committees)
- Contribute to the mission of the department by:
  - Maintaining a commitment to the quality of their duties in teaching, research, extension, or service activities
  - Participating in and contributing to departmental functions and activities (i.e. scholarship days, career fair, new student enrollment, career night, welcome back events, etc.)
  - Helping to maintain a friendly, student-focused atmosphere
Table 1 Annual evaluation matrix used in the Biological and Agricultural Engineering Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Category</th>
<th>Evaluation Weight</th>
<th>Performance Indices</th>
<th>Performance Weight</th>
<th>Examples of Measurement Indices</th>
<th>Max % of Overall Evaluation</th>
<th>University Guidelines **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Growth</td>
<td>10 points</td>
<td>Goal(s) Identification and Progress</td>
<td>50% * (25 to 75)</td>
<td>5 yr goals and progress towards completion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>50% (25 to 75)</td>
<td>Conference, Seminars, Personal Study, Etc</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Service</td>
<td>10 points</td>
<td>Directed</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Non Directed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Invited Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mass media / Web Page Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distance Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement with Allied Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement with Federal and State Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Committees, reviews, technical papers, conference organizer, etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Stakeholder Engagement</td>
<td>10 points</td>
<td>Undergraduate Focus</td>
<td>50% (0 to 100%)</td>
<td>Undergraduate advising</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>IVb Vb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Competitive team advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student project team advising (professional presentation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research project advising (honors, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Club or Open House Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non Undergraduate Focus</td>
<td>50% (0 to 100%)</td>
<td>Graduate student advising</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New faculty mentorship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Focus Teams (Extension)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soft funded personnel (assistants, associates, post-docs, term professors, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Program Delivery</th>
<th>Instructional Efforts</th>
<th>50% (25 to 80%)</th>
<th>Summary of Courses Taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Class Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Major Course Revisions (&gt; 50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction of New Delivery Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Delivery Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distance Education / Web Based Program Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adoption of New Delivery Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of Scholarship &amp; Creativity</td>
<td>25% (10 to 25%)</td>
<td>TEVAL / IDEA Scores or Program Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Awards received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Award nominations or submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Instructional Quality</td>
<td>25% (10 to 25%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appointment Dependent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extension Program Delivery</th>
<th>Outreach Efforts</th>
<th>50% (25 to 75%)</th>
<th>Adoption of New Delivery Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact Evaluation Tools of Existing Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multidisciplinary Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Productivity, Creativity and Originality</td>
<td>25% (25 to 75%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development of new programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revisions to include new technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement in program focus teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Quality</td>
<td>25% (25 to 75%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Awards received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Award nominations or submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>External letters of professional service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publications Performance</th>
<th>Category 1 Externally Reviewed</th>
<th>(60 to 100%)</th>
<th>Book Chapters / Editor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 1 may substitute for Categories 2 or 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extension Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Referred Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 2 Reviewed Conference or Abstracts</td>
<td>(20 to 40%) (0 to 40%)</td>
<td>Educational Software / Web Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 2 may substitute for Category 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewed Abstracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 3 Non Reviewed</td>
<td>(20%) (9 to 20%)</td>
<td>Reviewed Conference Proceedings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non Reviewed Technical Papers / Abstracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final grant report(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 - 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IVc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>|                      |                      |                | Mass Media Articles |
|                      |                      |                | 4 |
|                      |                      |                | Appointment Dependent |
|                      |                      |                | IVc |
|                      |                      |                | Vb |
|                      |                      |                | VII |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Granting Activity</th>
<th>20 points</th>
<th>Grant submissions as PI or Co PI</th>
<th>(60%) (60 to 90%)</th>
<th>Funded</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation or renewals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grant submissions as supporting</td>
<td>(20%) (0 to 30%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>investigators</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation or renewals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above and Beyond</td>
<td>10 points</td>
<td>ABET coordinator</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(max extra)</td>
<td></td>
<td>University Responsibilities (Faculty senate, omnibus person, special class)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Society Responsibilities (division / conference chair, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INFORMATION CONSIDERED IN EVALUATION

Evaluation Procedure and Timelines

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

Based on the documentation submitted by the faculty member, the department head will prepare a written evaluation for each faculty or unclassified professional person (using the forms in Appendix C). The department head will summarize the evaluation in terms of "expectations"; the basis for such judgments will be explained by a narrative account. The categories will include the following: "Greatly Exceeds Expectations", "Exceeds Expectations", "Meets Expectations", "Needs Improvement", and "Unacceptable". These categories will be associated with the quantitative ratings in Table 2. Additionally, the department head will provide written comments related to performance concerns where evidence of excellence is not documented as opportunities for continual excellence.

Table 2. Categories of evaluation and numerical rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Overall Evaluation</th>
<th>Numerical Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greatly Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable / Performance Below Expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Evidence of Performance</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Merit Salary Adjustment

The evaluation period will be based on performance between January 1 and December 31 of a calendar year for all faculty. The evaluation period will be adjusted for faculty on sabbatical, academic leave from department, or special university assignments (i.e. interim position). The evaluation period for first-year appointees will be adjusted based on hiring date. A three-year rolling average of the individual's annual evaluation results will be the basis for determining relative salary adjustment recommendations to minimize inequities due to variable legislative actions from year to year. The relative salary adjustment recommendations for faculty with less than 3 years of service to the department will be based on time of service since hiring.

The head will arrange for meetings with each faculty or unclassified person to review and discuss the evaluations after their review of all evaluation documents. The head will invite faculty members to correct any errors of fact or supply additional documentation to correct possible errors of judgment if observed during the review. The purpose of the review meeting is to ensure that the "final evaluation," prepared after the meeting, represents the most valid, fair statement of professional achievement possible. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, faculty or unclassified professionals will be given the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding the evaluation to the department head and to the next administrative levels.

The department head will provide each faculty member with their evaluation documentation after all evaluations have been conducted. This documentation is to include copies of the Evaluation Summary (Appendix C), Summary Remarks (Appendix D), and the Goals Statement (Appendix B). The evaluation summary is to be signed and returned to the department head.

The department head will recommend a salary adjustment for each faculty based on the three-year rolling average of performance or adjusted for faculty with less than 3 years of service to the department. The University Handbook Section C40-C48.3 provides procedure for salary adjustments based on annual evaluation. The department head will then submit the following items to the Deans of College of Engineering and Agriculture:
A copy of the evaluation system used to prepare the evaluations.

- A written evaluation for each faculty or unclassified professional person employed for at least three months during the calendar year,
- Documentation (e.g., a statement signed by the faculty evaluated) establishing that there was an opportunity to examine and discuss the written evaluation with the department head,
- Any written statements submitted by faculty or unclassified professionals of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations,
- Recommended merit salary adjustment for each faculty or unclassified professional person that should be based directly on the person's evaluation (unless other salary adjustment instructions are provided and must be followed). The timing of this action will be dependent upon availability of salary and merit adjustment information,
- Any recommendations for salary adjustments beyond the annual evaluation must be accompanied by the documentation requested by administration with whom the request is being submitted.

Approximate timelines for faculty evaluation are summarized in Table 3, below.

Table 3. Schedule of Activities for Faculty Evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department head notifies the faculty of the submission date of the evaluation materials.</td>
<td>1st week of December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty submits documentation in accordance with department guidelines.</td>
<td>2nd week of January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department head completes written evaluation reviews.</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department head meets with faculty to discuss draft evaluations, goals, and appointment assignments to be agreed upon.</td>
<td>January – February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department head provides evaluation summaries to faculty.</td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department head finalizes evaluations and forwards materials to the dean.</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean reviews and forwards materials to the provost.</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost reviews materials and returns evaluation comments and materials to the dean and department head.</td>
<td>March – April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department head and dean finalize evaluation ratings and salary adjustments and submit them to the provost.</td>
<td>May –</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty members are expected to develop a nationally and/or internationally recognized program based on their individual appointment. The departmental annual evaluation document provides faculty an opportunity to review performance indicators with personal and departmental program goals and objectives. The objective of the annual evaluation is to identify areas of success as well as opportunities to achieve national or international recognition.

Table 1 outlines the departmental annual evaluation matrix. The annual evaluation document contains information necessary for the completion of the promotion and tenure document. The annual evaluation will be based on eight major evaluation categories with the evaluation weight and measurement indices for each category shown in Table 1.

The annual evaluation will be based on the following categories:

Professional Growth – Faculty members are expected to strive for excellence in developing a nationally and/or internationally recognized program. Personal program development is based on appointment requiring careful consideration of personal goals and attainment, implementation strategies and willingness to participate in professional development activities that will help have a success academic career.

Professional Engagement – Faculty is expected to be engaged professionally beyond the academic community. Engagement with other disciplines and allied partners provides faculty opportunities to share their knowledge in
addressing specific issues as well as identify other professional or future opportunities. Outreach may involve
serving on task force, review grant panel, professional society activities, mass media, etc.

Professional Service - Service contributions and activities are directed or non-directed service (see Section C5-C6 of
the University Handbook). Service is composed of assigned or volunteered responsibilities beyond the normal
teaching, research, and extension activities. Directed service furthers the mission of and is directly related to the
goals and objectives of the department and the university; requires academic credentials or special skills, and is a
part of a faculty member's explicit assignment.

Non-directed service includes:
1. Profession-based service is work that is directly related to the function of the unit and that provides leadership
   and service to the faculty member's profession or discipline.
2. Institution-based service is work that is essential to the operation of the university.
3. Public-based professional service is that is the application of knowledge and expertise intended for the benefit of
   a non-academic audience.

Teaching Program Delivery - Faculty is expected to be engaged in teaching scholarship such that technology tools
and appropriate experiential learning activities enhance the learning environment and professional development of
the students. Faculty must ensure course content is relevant and assessed to meet university and /or accreditation
guidelines as related to appropriate departmental student learning outcomes. Academic professionalism includes
accurate course syllabi reflecting the content and depth of course material necessary to meet student learning
objectives as well as provide clear student expectations. Faculty members are expected to include course evaluation
(TEVAL or IDEA) documents with their annual evaluation materials.

Extension Program Delivery – Faculty is expected to demonstrate extension scholarship utilizing appropriate
technology tools and experiential learning activities enhancing the learning environment and transfer of knowledge
to clientele. Extension faculty must be activity engaged; and provided leadership to program focus teams; and
program focus areas as well as appropriate applied research; and granting activities to maintain relevance in
extension scholarly activities. Extension scholarship includes engagement in extension scholarship with professional
peers, such as development program assessment tools or participation in professional organizations promoting
extension.

Publication Performance – Externally reviewed publications (book chapters, referred, extension, etc) by peers
provide evidence of program relevance. There are other publications such as technical papers or presentations at
professional meeting that provide opportunities to share research, teaching, or extension findings while obtaining
feedback as to project direction or methodologies to enhance prior to externally reviewed publications.

Granting Activities – Faculty members are expected to develop individual programs which are financially self-
sustaining. Grant activities provide the main source of revenue for program development beyond salaries. The
department does have limited financial resources available. Appointments carry the responsibility to be active
leaders and participants in grant procurement as well as administrative oversight of awarded grants. In-kind and
matching gifts from allied industry are included in granting activities provide the gift enhances current programming
effort.

Mentorship / Personnel Development – Academic appointments inherently carry the responsibility to mentor or
develop undergraduates, graduate students and county extension agents. Advising students is the primary focus of
mentoring young people in preparing them for their future careers. Personnel development may include advising
teams or clubs provided faculty is actively engaged with the student leaders to ensure advancement of the group.

Above & Beyond – Faculty often assume (or are assigned) service responsibilities above normal work load which
require significant investment of time and effort. Fulfillment of these responsibilities to advance the department will
be recognized during the evaluation.

The department has highly productive faculty members. Some average indices of past productivity are as follows:
1 refereed publication per MS student
3 refereed publications per PhD student
3 refereed publications per 0.4 research FTE
1 graduate student per 0.15 research FTE
Average granting activity of $500,000 per 1.0 FTE
35 to 45 undergraduate advisees per 1.0 teaching FTE
3 courses plus undergraduate advising per 0.5 teaching FTE
4 externally reviewed extension publications per 1.0 extension FTE
0.5 soft funded positions (post doc, research/ extension assistant, etc.) per 1.0 FTE

These indices are averages and intended to provide guidelines only. Current attainment of these indices has been possible through faculty engagement in grant opportunities and their ability to identify opportunities of significant national concern such as bio fuels, application of controls and sensor in biological systems or environmental issues related to military training grounds. Successful attainment of these indices does not ensure promotion and tenure since collegiality, service and professional outreach are also important in moving a department forward but productivity indices for these categories are more difficult to define.

Annual performance reports will be evaluated based on a 5 point scoring system as shown below. Similarly, the overall annual evaluation scores for each faculty member will be based on the ranges outlined in Table 4.

Table 4. Performance Categories and Score Range.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Category</th>
<th>Category Score</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greatly Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable / Performance Below Expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Evidence of Performance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty in Biological and Agricultural Engineering generally have an extension or teaching appointment. Faculty program delivery evaluation is based on their appointment. Program delivery will equal to 20% of the overall evaluation score and will be adjusted accordingly if a faculty member has both teaching and extension assignments. Above and Beyond recognizes a faculty who has exceeded expectations and their overall evaluation score may be adjusted upward a maximum of 10% and based on extra service or awards. The overall evaluation score will be based on the following guidelines with additional details found Appendices B and C:

- Professional Growth: 10%
- Professional Service: 10%
- Professional Engagement: 10%
- Mentorship & Personnel Development: 10%
- Teaching/ Extension Program Delivery: 20%
- Publication Performance: 20%
- Granting Activity: 20%
While it is recognized that not all tenured faculty members will excel in all activities enumerated in the guidelines for faculty promotion and tenure, all faculty members are expected to perform their professional duties at or above a minimum-acceptable level of productivity in each area of substantial or critical work assigned to the faculty member. Therefore, the criteria in this section establish the minimum acceptable level of productivity in accordance with section C31.1-C31.8 of the University Handbook.

The minimum criteria for tenured faculty performance will be reviewed when a faculty member’s annual evaluation score is less than 1.5 or their overall performance is unacceptable (performance below expectations). During the annual review of faculty, the department head will determine whether any tenured faculty member appears to not meet the minimum-acceptable level of productivity as defined below. For tenured faculty the decision will be based on annual evaluation material. If the department head determines that a tenured faculty member appears not to meet the minimum standard in any area of assigned responsibility, the department head shall indicate so in writing to the faculty member. A committee of at least 3 tenured faculty will be convened (unless the faculty member requests otherwise) to review performance. One member will be recommended by the department head, one member by the faculty member and third will be the chair of the BAE DCOP committee. The DCOP chair will convene the three member review process. The peer panel review process is designed to insure the department head’s evaluation is fair and equitable. The minimum criteria for tenured faculty performance are outlined in the section titled “Minimum Criteria for Tenured Faculty Performance”.

If the department head receives adequate evidence that an individual does not meet the minimum-acceptable level of productivity in any substantial or critical area of work, then action will be initiated following procedures outlined in the University Handbook section C31.1-C31.8.

Standards for Minimum-Acceptable Level of Productivity of Tenured Faculty

All faculty members must perform duties outlined in the University Handbook and be in compliance with all university policies. The “minimum-acceptable level of productivity” standards established herein will apply to all tenured faculty members in the department.

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

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

Teaching
1. Commitment to academic professionalism including being conscientious about meeting classes on time; in regards to course content, organization and presentation of materials; appropriate evaluation of students; developing course syllabi which accurately reflect the content and depth of course material necessary to meet student learning objectives; and provide clear student expectations.
2. Ensure course content is relevant and assessed to meet university and/or accreditation guidelines as related
to appropriate departmental student learning outcomes
3. Engaged in teaching scholarship such that technology tools and appropriate experiential learning activities
to enhance the learning environment and professional development of the students
4. Accessible for faculty-student interactions such as advising, addressing course content questions or
mentoring of students engaged in research activities.

Research
1. Actively be engaged as a leader of scholarly research teams and/or projects,
2. Serving as a major advisor of graduate students as well as a member on graduate student committee(s),
3. Annually serving as principal investigator in granting activities as well as contributing member to other
grant funded activities, and
4. Actively seeking to mentor graduate students in transferring knowledge via submission of peer reviewed
journal articles.

Extension
1. Demonstrated extension scholarship utilizing appropriate technology tools and experiential learning
activities enhancing the learning environment and transfer of knowledge to clientele. Be conscientious about
setting and meeting schedules on time and about organization and presentations of information.
2. Actively engaging and providing leadership to program focus teams and program focus areas
3. Engaged in appropriate applied research and granting activities to maintain relevance in extension scholarly
activities.
4. Engagement in extension scholarship with professional peers, such as development program assessment
tools or participation in professional organizations promoting extension.

Service
1. Service to departmental, university and professional communities
2. Active engagement in short and long range strategic planning to advance the department
3. Attend functions and activities appropriate to academic responsibilities
The Professoral Performance Award (PPA) is designed to reward strong performance at the professorial rank with a base salary increase in addition to that provided for by the annual evaluation process. It is not a right accorded to every professor. Additionally, it is not granted simply as a result of a candidate's routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies. The intent of the award is to recognize excellent and sustained performance of professors. Following are the criteria and guidelines for the PPA in the Department of Biological and Agricultural Engineering (BAE). These criteria and guidelines are based on the guidelines presented in Sections C49.1-C49.14 of the K-State University Handbook (http://www.k-state.edu/academicservices/hbbook/). These will be subject to review by the BAE faculty at least every five years.

Criteria and Standards

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

1. Be a full-time faculty member who has been at the full professor rank at the university for at least six years since the last promotion or receipt of a Professoral Performance Award.

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

3. The overall productivity and performance of the candidate must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards. According to the University Handbook (Section C120.2), "promotion to professor is based on attainment of excellence in the assigned responsibilities of the faculty member and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies." It is one recognition that the individual is accomplished in all aspects of his or her assigned duties and will continue to strive for higher levels of achievement. Since promotion to professor or receipt of a PPA, and dependent upon assigned programmatic responsibilities (teaching, research, extension, and service), the candidate is expected to have demonstrated the following:

   a. Evidence of excellence in undergraduate teaching. Such evidence must include student feedback, senior exit interviews, and course reports. It may also include success in securing resources to support course, laboratory, and curriculum development and/or enhancement.

   b. Evidence of scholarly research work and the ability to support the graduate/research program in an area sustainable by the candidate. Such evidence must include publications of the candidate's research in peer-reviewed journals, securing support for the candidate's work, and successful supervision of graduate students. It may also include development and teaching of graduate courses, securing resources for graduate student support, laboratory development, equipment procurement, as well as other documentation of scholarly excellence.

   c. Evidence of scholarly extension program development and delivery. Such evidence must include development of extension educational media (publications, presentations, website documentation and tools), extension educational program activities (seminars, workshops, short courses, and demonstrations), quality of programs, and securing of support for the candidate's extension program.
4. The candidate must show evidence of leadership and service to university and professional communities. Such evidence must include documented contributions in departmental and college committee and service assignments. It may also include participation in university committees and governance, leadership/participation in technical and professional society activities.

It is recognized that these examples of desirable activities may vary greatly from candidate to candidate and that the merit of each activity must be evaluated separately for each candidate.

Procedure

Recommendations concerning the Professorial Performance Award are considered annually. Any Biological and Agricultural Engineering (BAE) tenured full professor is eligible for the Professional Performance Award (PPA) provided at least six years have elapsed since the faculty member’s initial appointment at the rank of professor or since receiving the last PPA. Procedures for determining awardees shall be consistent with the guidelines presented in the University Handbook Section C49. The timeline for submittal of documentation and determination of awardees shall be consistent with the activities associated with the annual evaluation review process. Eligible faculty, those full professors holding at least a 50% appointment in BAE, will review the qualifications of the PPA candidates and report their findings and recommendations to the BAE Department Head. This review committee is hereafter known as the eligible faculty.

1. Fall Semester End (nominally December 15): The candidate informs the department head in writing of his/her intention to be considered for the PPA and consults with the department head.

2. Beginning of Spring Semester (nominally by January 15). If after consultation with the department head, the candidate decides to continue with the PPA application process, then the candidate shall provide to the department head accurate, thorough, and clear documentation of her or his professional accomplishments for at least the previous six years in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the BAE department. The candidate’s file should, depending upon the individual’s programmatic responsibilities, include the following items:

a. A completed cover sheet found in the “Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion (http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/promotionguidelinesfororganization.pdf)

b. A one-page summary of major achievements during the evaluation period;

c. A summary of instructional productivity including courses taught, student advisement, thesis supervision, and evidence of instructional quality such as student ratings, peer evaluations, or evaluation of advising;

d. A summary of research and other creative activities accompanied by a list of publications and a list of funded grants and contracts;

e. A summary of extension activity that provides evidence of productivity, quality, creativity, and originality, accompanied by a list of extension publications, educational media, meetings, workshops, etc.; and

f. A summary of service contributions including evidence of leadership.

Outside reviews will not routinely be used for the PPA; however, the department head may solicit written comments from professionals within university.

3. Last week in January (nominally by January 31). The candidate’s application files are made available to the eligible faculty for the purposes of review.

4. At least 14 days following the previous step (nominally by February 15). The eligible faculty will meet to consider the merits of each PPA applicant and the materials submitted by that applicant. No candidate may participate in the review of his or her own application for the PPA. The department head is considered as the chairperson of that forum. It is the responsibility of the chairperson to conduct the meeting, to assure the fairness of the proceedings, and to prepare and submit in a timely fashion all documents regarding the review. The purpose of the meeting is for the eligible faculty to assess the merit of the PPA application, and to generate a list containing written evaluations attesting to why each individual is or is not worthy of the PPA, and a
counted vote on the matter. A transcript of the written comments pertaining to a particular candidate will be
given to that candidate by the department head. After considering the results of the review, the candidate may
either choose to continue the application process or to withdraw from further consideration during that year by
notifying the department head in writing. If the candidate chooses to continue the application process, the
department head prepares a written recommendation. A copy of the department head’s written recommendation
will be given to the candidate.

5. Approximately two weeks following the meeting of the eligible faculty (nominally March 1): Each candidate
will have the opportunity to discuss with the department head the written evaluation from the eligible faculty and
the written recommendations. Each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to discuss
and review the evaluation and recommendations. Within seven working days after the review and discussion of
the recommendations and eligible faculty evaluation, each candidate has the opportunity to submit to the
department head and to the dean of engineering any written statements of unresolved differences regarding his
or her evaluation by the eligible faculty and the recommendations.

6. Mid-March (nominally March 15). The department head shall submit the following items to the dean of
engineering:

   a. The candidate’s supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award;

   b. The recommendation prepared by the department head, with the comments from the evaluating faculty and
      the vote on the PPA;

   c. A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award;

   d. Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written
      evaluation and recommendation;

   e. Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation.

If the department head wishes to apply for the PPA, a chair will be selected by all of the full professors in the
department. The chair will fulfill the function of the department head in all of the above procedures for that
individual.
GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE
Department of Biological and Agricultural Engineering
Kansas State University
(Approved by the BAE Faculty on May 20, 2014)

Reappointment

University policy requires that probationary faculty members be evaluated annually for making the reappointment decision. The annual faculty evaluation document prepared by the probationary faculty member for salary raise consideration, the annual evaluation meeting with the department head and the tenured faculty input based upon review of the annual evaluation document will be considered by the department head in making the reappointment decision following the first and second years. Sections C50.1-C66 of the K-State University Handbook provides guidelines for the mid-tenure review process.

Mid-tenure Review

A more formal review process, called the mid-probationary review during year 3, will be carried out based upon preliminary completion of the promotion and tenure document. The promotion and tenure document will be updated and reviewed in years 4 and 5 by tenured faculty who will provide feedback to the probationary faculty member. This review is designed to provide the probationary faculty member with helpful and substantive feedback from the tenured faculty members and the administrators regarding how his or her accomplishments contribute to the departmental, college, and university missions and their constituents. Sections C92.1-C93 of the K-State University Handbook provides guidelines for the mid-tenure review process.

Tenure

The procedures for granting tenure and/or promotion and mid-probationary review for faculty members holding academic ranks are in Sections C70-C156.2 of the K-State University Handbook. The promotion and tenure document shall be used to summarize and organize the tenure and promotion document for the mid-probationary review, promotion from assistant professor to associate professor with tenure, and promotion from associate professor to professor. Appendix E summarizes information that should be included in the promotion and tenure document.

The department does not have simple lists of accomplishments that guarantee successful mid-probationary review or awarding of tenure and/or promotion. Instead, eligible faculty members and the department head will assess the accomplishments of the faculty member under consideration. Most BAE faculty members have split appointment in teaching, research, extension, and/or directed service. All BAE faculty members also are expected to have accomplishments in the non-directed service category. Accomplishments in each category for which the faculty member has responsibility, in addition to the non-directed service category, are considered in the review process. Appendix E provides the general guidelines.

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with Tenure

The assistant professor should be productive in fulfilling his or her position description and attaining annual report goals; which should directly support departmental, college and university missions, strategic priorities, and goals. The assistant professor should be an exemplary departmental citizen. He or she should be making original intellectual contributions through scholarly activities, and making progress toward attaining professional visibility at the regional and/or national level. In all areas of the position description, the assistant professor should demonstrate the following:
- Clear focus and objectives
- Appropriate progress toward and attainment of these objectives
- Peer evaluation and recognition of quality of accomplishments
• Quantity of accomplishments appropriate to achieve objectives
• Evidence of both leadership and collaboration

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

To be promoted to professor, the associate professor should have notable leadership and achievements in the assigned areas of responsibilities that contribute to institutional advancement, as reflected by annual evaluation reports and the promotion document. The associate professor should be productive in fulfilling his or her position description and attaining annual report goals, which should directly support departmental, college and university missions, strategic priorities, and goals. The associate professor should be an exemplary departmental citizen. In all areas of the position description, the Associate Professor should demonstrate the following:

• Clear focus and objectives
• Appropriate progress toward and attainment of these objectives
• Peer evaluation and recognition of quality of accomplishments
• Quantity of accomplishments appropriate to achieve objectives
• Evidence of both leadership and collaboration

Furthermore, national/international recognition should have been achieved in at least one of the teaching, research or extension areas. National/international recognition is obtained by development of programs that are recognized by peers and/or clients nationally and/or internationally as outstanding programs. Demonstration of national/international recognition may include the following:

• Publications, patents, educational materials, or funded project grants that receive rigorous review by national or international peers;
• Awards recognizing individual and/or team accomplishments by national or international organizations;
• Demonstrated impact or utilization of research, education, or outreach programs, products, or materials at national or international levels; and/or
• Leadership on national or international professional committees, panels, or organizations.
DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING
GUIDELINES FOR POST TENURE REVIEW
(Approved by the BAE Faculty on May 20, 2014)

Purpose

The purpose of post-tenure review (PTR) is to enhance the continued professional development of tenured faculty. The process is intended to encourage intellectual vitality and professional proficiency for all members of the faculty throughout their careers, so they may more effectively fulfill the mission of the university. PTR is also designed to enhance public trust in the university by ensuring that the faculty community undertakes regular and rigorous efforts to hold all faculty members accountable for high professional standards.

Kansas State University recognizes that the granting of tenure for university faculty is a vital protection of free inquiry and open intellectual debate. It is expressly recognized that nothing in this policy alters or amends the university policies regarding removal of tenured faculty members for cause (which are stipulated in the University Handbook). PTR policy and any actions taken under it are separate from and have no bearing on the chronic low achievement or annual evaluation policies and processes.

The department PTR policy follows the overarching purpose, principles, objectives, and procedures in the university policy on PTR (see University Handbook, Appendix W), which was approved by Faculty Senate on February 11, 2014.

Procedure

Review period

1. In general, PTR shall be conducted for tenured faculty every 6 years and shall conform to the timeline associated with the annual evaluation review. The 6-year PTR clock shall be further defined to mean that PTR will be conducted for all tenured faculty either every 6 years, or in the 6th year following promotion or awarding of a major university, national or international award. More specifically, the following events shall modify and reset the PTR clock:

   a. Application for promotion to full professor - A positive departmental faculty vote for promotion (as defined by a simple majority of qualified voting faculty) shall be considered making appropriate contribution to university, regardless of the outcome of the promotion process. A negative vote for promotion by the department voting faculty does not qualify as a PTR and does not change the faculty member’s PTR schedule.

   b. Application for the Professorial Performance Award (PPA) - A positive departmental faculty vote for PPA (as defined by a simple majority of qualified voting faculty) shall be considered making appropriate contribution to university, regardless of the outcome of the PPA process. A negative vote for PPA by the department voting faculty does not qualify as a PTR and does not change the faculty member’s PTR schedule.

   c. Receipt of a prestigious college, university, national or international award requiring multi-year portfolio-like documentation (e.g., University Distinguished Professor, University Distinguished
Teaching Scholar, endowed chair, Fellow of a professional society, other national/international awards). Award affecting PTR would need approval by the BAE Post-tenure Review Committee (PTRC – defined page 3) and Department Head.

2. The schedule for PTR could be delayed for one year to accommodate sabbatical leave, major health issue, or another compelling reason, provided that both the faculty member and Department Head approve the delay.

3. Faculty members who are on phased retirement or whose retirement date has been approved by the university will be exempt from PTR.

4. As part of the annual evaluation process, the Department Head will inform each tenured faculty member of the projected date of their next PTR.

Post-tenure review file

1. The faculty member to be reviewed must submit the following materials by January 15 of the PTR year to the Department Head:

   a. Copies of the 5 previous annual review documents and the current one, including the summary comments
   b. Current curriculum vitae
   c. Description of responsibilities with any changes during the review period noted (Section II, Promotion and Tenure Document
   d. Statement of candidate accomplishments during the review period (Section III-A, Promotion and Tenure Document)
   e. Statement of 5-year goals (Section III-B, Promotion and Tenure Document)

Post-tenure review committee (PTRC)

1. The materials will be reviewed by the BAE Post-tenure Review Committee (PTRC), which will include the following members (must have rank at the professor level):

   a. Department Head
   b. Graduate Program Coordinator
   c. Biological Systems Engineering Undergraduate Program Coordinator
   d. Agricultural Technology Management Undergraduate Program Coordinator
   e. Extension State Leader

2. The Department Head will serve as the Chair of the PTRC. To prevent conflict of interest, a PTRC member who is scheduled for PTR in a given year cannot serve on the PTRC during that year.

PTRC review

The PTRC will review the PTR documents submitted by the faculty member and assess whether or not the faculty member is making “appropriate contribution to the university.” The faculty member is considered making appropriate contribution to the university if his/her 5-year goals are aligned with the advancement of the department,
college, or university goals, and if 5 of previous 6 years of annual evaluations are at a minimum of “meets expectations” or if 4 of previous 6 years of annual evaluation are at a minimum “exceeds expectations”.

1. The PTRC will prepare a report (Appendix F), summarizing its findings and assessment regarding the faculty member’s contribution during the review period. The Department Head shall provide a written assessment (Appendix F) of the review to the PTR faculty member. A face-to-face meeting between the faculty member and the PTRC will be held to discuss the PTR result, including any development plan.

2. If the faculty member is making appropriate contribution to the university, the PTR is concluded.

3. If the faculty member is not making appropriate contributions to the university, the PTRC will prepare a written development plan (Appendix F) in conjunction with the faculty member that prescribes areas for improvement as they relate to the faculty member’s assigned areas of responsibility. The individual development plan must include specific expectations and improvement activities, and a specified timeline in which improvement is expected to occur. The plan will serve as the basis for subsequent reviews. Reviews by the PTRC will be conducted annually until such time as the faculty member is considered making appropriate contribution to the university.

**Review by the Dean**

The Department Head will submit the outcome of the review to the Dean, who will review the materials to ensure the PTR is consistent with the criteria and procedures of the university and those established by the department.
APPENDIX A. Mission Statements

MISSION OF THE COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

College of Engineering Mission Statement

The College of Engineering serves the citizens of Kansas, the nation, and the world by providing world-class educational, research, and service programs where students and faculty can develop in their chosen disciplines and advance as successful leaders and professionals.

College of Engineering Vision Statement

The Kansas State University College of Engineering will be a highly ranked college providing quality education within a research environment that develops engineering leaders to benefit society.

MISSION OF THE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE

The mission of the College of Agriculture is to develop human capital at the undergraduate and graduate levels to support agriculture, agriculturally related industries, natural resources management, education and research. In doing so, the College of Agriculture educates people for productive lives that contribute to agriculture, society and to the economic competitiveness of Kansas.

K-STATE RESEARCH AND EXTENSION

Our Mission

"We are dedicated to a safe, sustainable, competitive food and fiber system and to strong, healthy communities, families and youth through integrated research, analysis and education."

Our Vision

K-State Research and Extension is committed to expanding human capacity by delivering educational programs and technical information that result in improved leadership skills in the areas of communication, group dynamics, conflict resolution, issue analysis, and strategic planning that can enhance the economic viability and quality of life in communities.
APPENDIX B. Faculty Annual Achievement Report Forms

**BAE Annual Review Document Format**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment (FTE’s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS
List 4 to 6 major achievements during the evaluation period at the local, regional, national, or international levels – include all aspects of current appointment (one sentence descriptions and please do not be repeated from previous year)

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH (10 points)

Goal Identification and Progress: ____ (50 % or faculty selected weight between 25 to 75 %)

Date Goals Established:

Complete following table outlining five year goals and attainment with respect to teaching, research, service, and any other scholarly activity (this may be updated or renewed annually)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Goal Statements**</th>
<th>Personal Evaluation of Progress Toward Attainment of Goals</th>
<th>Steps planned towards accomplishing goal(s) during the next year*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note if goal is new, then percent attainment is not applicable, however, steps taken towards accomplishing goal must be included
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• ** Goals statement must include all aspects of your academic responsibilities, i.e. if appointment is teaching and extension, goals must be included for both teaching and extension responsibilities.

**Professional Development: ____ (50 % or faculty selected weight between 25 to 75 %)**

List 5 most significant activities participated in during the past year which provided professional development opportunities and briefly describe how they may impact future responsibilities

**PROFESSIONAL ENGAGEMENT (10 points)**

List up to 10 committees or agency where your professional expertise is sought and utilized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee or Agency</th>
<th>University, State, National or International</th>
<th>Current Role</th>
<th>Frequency of Interaction (meetings/yr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example: Kansas Water Institute</td>
<td>Multidiscipline state committee</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>4 times/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monsanto Corporation</td>
<td>Dairy advisor</td>
<td>Technical service</td>
<td>8 to 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROFESSIONAL SERVICE (10 points)**

Provide listing of service contributions and consulting activities beyond the campus community. Provide evidence of leadership. Include club advising as part of institution based service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Title</th>
<th>PRO, KS, K-State, PS*</th>
<th>Current Office</th>
<th>Term End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PRO - Professional Organizations (this would include international or regional organizations)*

KS – Service on Kansas professional organizational committees or executive boards

K-State – Service on Kansas State University committees

PS - Public Service Based – (include activities related to K-State job descriptions - not personal interest)

Consulting Activities

Directed Service
Significant accomplishments and activities associated with directed service responsibilities

MENTORSHIP & PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT (10 points)

Undergraduate Focus: _____ (50 % or faculty selected weight between 0 to 100 %)

Number of Undergraduate Advises: ________

Summary of Undergraduate Mentorship:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Undergraduate</th>
<th>Research Project or Student Involvement</th>
<th>Role (Employer, Project Advisor)</th>
<th>Status (In Progress or Completed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non Undergraduate Focus: _____ (50 % or faculty selected weight between 0 to 100 %)

Summary of Graduate Student Advising:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Role (Chair/Co-Chair, Or Member)</th>
<th>Status (In Progress or Completed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Post-Docs, Visiting Professors, Soft Funded Personnel, Faculty, Agents, etc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Role (Supervisor, Mentor, Advisor, Host, etc)</th>
<th>Status (Beginning &amp; End Dates)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr John Wu</td>
<td>Post Doc</td>
<td>Grant supported</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Thur 12/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla Urban</td>
<td>County Agent</td>
<td>County supported</td>
<td>Ext. mentor</td>
<td>12/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List other examples of individuals where you are contributing professionally toward the development of others
TEACHING PROGRAM DELIVERY (20 points)

Instructional Efforts: _____ (50 % or faculty selected weight between 25 to 75 %)

Provide a summary of courses taught, student advisement, thesis supervision, and any other evidence of instructional productivity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>% New Material</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Contact Hours</th>
<th>Semester/ Year</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide a summary of new teaching methods incorporated into courses during past calendar year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>New Methods*</th>
<th>Classroom or Lab</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Team experiences, hands-on laboratories, constructing models, applications of technologies, etc

Program Outcomes / Student Learning Outcomes
Outcomes to be assessed during the evaluation period
Assessment measures and rubric
Assessment results and summary

Program Maintenance: _____ (25 % or faculty selected weight between 10 to 25 %)

EVIDENCE OF SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVITY

Provide any other evidence of scholarship and creativity that promote excellence in teaching, research or extension such as multimedia presentations, computer-aided instruction, innovative educational methods, presentations, web page development, etc.

Instructional Quality: _____ (25 % or faculty selected weight between 10 to 25 %)

Provide evidence of instructional quality such as ratings, peer evaluations, evaluation of advisement, outcomes of instructional projects directed, awards, etc.

TEVAL Summary Results (YL=1, VH=5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number, Title, and Semester</th>
<th>Overall Teacher Effectiveness</th>
<th>Increased desire to learn</th>
<th>Amount learned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATM XXX S07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAE YYY S07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAE ZZZ F07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IDEA Summary Results (VL=1 VH=5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number, Title, and Semester</th>
<th>Overall Excellence of Teacher</th>
<th>Overall Excellence of Course</th>
<th>Improved Student Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATM XXX S13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAE YYY S13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAE ZZZ F13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide summary of Undergraduate Student Evaluations

Provide list of all awards related to program delivery including award title and organization recognizing your accomplishments

EXTENSION PROGRAM DELIVERY (20 points)

Extension Activities: _____ (50 % or faculty selected weight between 25 to 75 %)

Provide a summary of cooperative extension efforts including evidence of productivity, quality, creativity, and originality. Provide any other evidence of scholarship and creativity that promote excellence in teaching, research or extension such as multimedia presentations, computer-aided instruction, innovative educational methods, presentations, web page development, etc.

Evidence of extension programming scholarship and excellence
1. New educational programs and outreach, efforts with program focus teams, regional, national or international outreach and involvement with e-Xtension
2. Innovation and creativity when developing and delivering extension programs
3. Program collaborations demonstrating impact at regional, national or international levels
4. Invited presentations at state, regional, national or international venues

Extension Program Maintenance: _____ (25 % or faculty selected weight between 10 to 25 %)

1. Program and website revisions
2. Technology transfer tools providing demonstrated value to clientele (e.g., newsletters, blogs, websites, etc.)
3. Listing of major technology transfer tools revisions
4. Examples of one-on-one technology transfer and support (i.e. total number phone calls, emails, etc)

Extension Quality Indicators: _____ (25 % or faculty selected weight between 10 to 25 %)

1. Awards and recognition
2. Adoption of program materials by others (i.e., state, regional, or national level
3. List of publications submitted for ASABE Blue Ribbon Awards
4. Evaluation results of extension programs
5. Unsolicited letters of support from other program organizers

PUBLICATION PERFORMANCE (20 points)

Provide a list of publications and other creative achievements. Do not include items accepted or in review but not yet published. List of publications in following order: (follow ASABE citation guidelines)

Category I Externally Reviewed Publications: _____ (60 % or faculty selected weight between 60 to 100 %)
1) Refereed Paper/Journals
2) Cooperative Extension Publications (new)
3) Proprietary Information
4) Books or Book Chapters
5) KSU AES Publications

Level 2 Reviewed Publications: _____ (20 % or faculty selected weight between 20 to 40 %)

1) Refereed Abstracts
2) Cooperative Extension Publications (revised)
3) Conference (published proceedings)
4) International (invited- non-ASABE)

Level 3 Non Reviewed Publications: _____ (20 % or faculty selected weight between 0 to 20 %)

1) Professional Meeting Technical Papers (i.e. ASABE technical papers)
2) Papers Written for Other Meetings
3) CRIS or Impact Reporting Activities
4) Media (Radio, Video, Television, Webinar, etc
5) Other Types of Publications

GRANTING ACTIVITY (20 points)

Grant Submission as PI or Co PI: _____ (60 % or faculty selected weight between 60 to 90 %)

Provide a list of grants and contracts funded during the evaluation period. Include agency, funding level, duration, title, and collaborators. A separate list of grants and contracts applied for, but not funded may be included.

Title:
Principal Investigator(s):
Additional Principal Investigators:
Funding Agency:
Amount:
Duration:
Funding Status:

Support via In-Kind Match or Equipment:
Support Description:
Support Provider:
Dollar Value:

Grant Submission as Supporting Investigator: _____ (20 % or faculty selected weight between 0 to 30 %)

Title:
Principal Investigator(s):
Additional Principal Investigators:
Funding Agency:
Amount:
Duration:
Funding Status:

Grant Management (includes grants previously funded: _____ (60 % or faculty selected weight between 0 to 30 %)

Final Grant Reports:
Title:
Funding Agency:
Date Submitted:

Funded Projects Continuation:
Title:
Funding Agency:
Amount:
Duration:

Immediate Reports Requiring Submission:

Grant Title:
Frequency of Reporting:
Percent Submitted on Time:

RESEARCH AND OTHER CREATIVE ACTIVITIES
Provide a statement of research and other creative activities.

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS TO INCLUDE
Summary of Job Responsibilities with focus on specialty area: (300 words or less)

Extension: Impact Statements
Research: CRIS Reports
Teaching: Course Syllabus
  Course Evaluation
  Advising Evaluation

ABOVE AND BEYOND (10 points extra)
Special assignments must be agreed upon prior to the annual evaluation between the faculty and department head including responsibilities, time duration and goals / objectives / outcomes.

SPECIAL AWARDS AND RECOGNITIONS
Provide list of awards including award title and organization recognizing your accomplishments

Award Title:
Recognizing Organization:
Date Received: (Month/Year)
### APPENDIX C. Evaluation Form – Example of Completed Form

#### Biological and Agricultural Engineering Departmental Evaluation Form (approved May 20, 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Category</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Faculty Performance</th>
<th>Mark of Improvement</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Goals Identification &amp; Progress</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Service</td>
<td>Directed &amp; Non Directed</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring &amp; Advising</td>
<td>Undergraduate Focus</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Undergraduate Focus</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach Efforts</td>
<td>Instructional Efforts</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of Scholarship &amp; Creativity</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of Instructional Quality</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach Efforts</td>
<td>Outreach Efforts</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Program Delivery</td>
<td>Program Productivity, Creativity and Originality</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0375</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Performance</td>
<td>Evidence of Quality</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
<td>Category 1 - Externally Reviewed</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 2 - Reviewed</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 3 - Non Reviewed</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grant Submission as PI/Co-PI</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grant Submission - Investigator</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grant Management</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above &amp; Beyond</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage ok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Performance Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>3 Yr Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greatly Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory or Meets Expectations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Expectations Met</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3 Yr Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Below Expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Evidence of Performance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Department Head Signature

Date

#### Faculty Signature

Date
APPENDIX D. Review Summary Form

BAE ANNUAL REVIEW SUMMARY COMMENTS
Date of Faculty / Department Head Meeting

Faculty Name:

Strengths of Program

Opportunities for Enhancing Program Impact

Concerns with Program Direction

_____________________________  _______________
Department Head Name (Head)   Date

_____________________________  _______________
Faculty Name                   Date
## APPENDIX E.
### Information for the Promotion and Tenure Dossier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Number in the University P&amp;T Documentation</th>
<th>Evidence / Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| III-A: Accomplishments | Summarize major achievements in all assigned areas of responsibilities during the evaluation period at the local, regional, national, and international levels, demonstrating the following for each assigned area of responsibility (i.e., teaching, research, extension, service):  
1. Clear focus and attainment of objectives  
2. Quantity and quality of accomplishments  
3. Leadership and collaboration |
| IV-A: Instructional Activity |  
1. For classroom teaching, list each course by course number and title, and indicate its enrollment and whether undergraduate or graduate. For other teaching situations, off campus or non-traditional (e.g., independent study), be specific about the type of situation, duration, level, and participants.  
2. Student advisement - include number of advisees  
3. Thesis supervision and graduate student advisement - include list of graduate students supervised, thesis titles, and dates completed; membership in supervisory committees  
4. Other evidence of instructional productivity - briefly describe teaching laboratory development/improvement, new course development, etc. |
| IV-B: Instructional Quality | Evidence of teaching effectiveness  
1. Student ratings of course and instructor (i.e., TEVAL or IDEA). Summarize results in tabular form showing teacher effectiveness rating, effectiveness of course, and amount learned for each course. Ratings for assistant to associate professors should be characterized by a pattern of improving student ratings during the evaluation period resulting in above average ratings, particularly in courses taught multiple times.  
Teaching effectiveness ratings should be supplemented by one or more of the following information:  
2. Peer evaluation – peer observation of in-class teaching performance and peer review of teaching materials and/or teaching portfolio. Written summaries by the evaluator are a documentation of teaching performance  
3. Senior exit interviews  
4. Department head ratings  
5. Teaching honors and awards  
Evidence of advising effectiveness  
1. Academic advising survey reports  
2. Advising honors and awards  
3. Department head ratings |
| IV-C: Scholarship and Creativity in Instruction |  
1. Publications and presentations in teaching, learning, and/or advising  
2. Innovative teaching strategies (e.g., development of classroom demonstrations, educational software, self-paced workbooks, audio-visual media, incorporation of research in teaching, etc.) |
| V-A: Research and Creative Activities (One-page Statement) | Summarize major achievements in research during the evaluation period, demonstrating the following:  
1. Clear focus and attainment of objectives  
2. Quantity and quality of accomplishments  
3. Leadership and collaboration |
| V-B: Research and Creative Capacity (Publications) | Scholarly work is most easily demonstrated by refereed publications. List chronologically by year since last promotion publications. Publications based on work done before coming to K-State should be listed separately. Also, for each publication, indicate (e.g., by asterisks) if the first author is the candidate's advisee. Primary evidence
1. Patents
2. Peer-reviewed journal articles
Secondary evidence
3. Books and book chapters (indicate the level of peer review)
4. Conference proceedings
5. Technical reports/papers
6. Presentations
7. Others |

| V-C: Research and Creative Capacity (Grants and Contracts) | The candidate must secure sufficient funds to develop and maintain a quality research program; the exact amount varies with the program.
1. List chronologically by year since last promotion grants and contracts funded.
   For each grant, include all investigators listed in the order that they appear on the award, title, name of funding agency, duration of the award, dollar amount allocated to the candidate's program, and total amount.
2. The following may also be included:
   a. Research proposals applied for but not funded during the evaluation period
   b. Research proposals pending |

| VI: Service Contributions | Evidence of university service
1. Committee assignments in the department, college or university
2. Participation in student recruiting
3. Special administrative assignments
Evidence of professional service
1. Service to regional and/or national level committees or holding office of appropriate professional societies
2. Membership on editorial boards of professional journals or other reviewing or editing activities
3. Chairing sessions at regional and national meetings
Evidence of public service
1. Unpaid consulting, in the private sector in the candidate’s area of expertise
2. Membership on committees and boards
3. Participation in radio and television programs |

| VII: Cooperative Extension | Evidence of extension scholarship and excellence
5. Publication of appropriate, peer-reviewed products that impact target specific clientele (e.g., extension journals, web-based information and decision support tools, books, numbered extension publications, etc.)
6. Technology transfer tools that provide demonstrated value to targeted clientele (e.g., newsletters, blogs, websites, etc.)
7. Innovation and creativity when developing and delivering extension programs
8. Funding (e.g., grants, fee revenue, donations) appropriate to the project or target clientele
9. Program collaborations demonstrating impact at regional, national or international levels
10. Adoption of program materials by others (i.e., state, regional, or national levels)
11. Invited presentations at state, regional, national or international venues
12. Awards and recognition |

<p>| X: Supporting Documents | A. Teaching evaluations (last three years) – Copies of the teaching evaluation |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Student evaluation forms</th>
<th>reports for all courses during the last three years should be included. Copies of student evaluation forms should not be included; if the candidate wants to include the information in the packet, include unedited transcriptions of students' comments.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Reprints and/or Manuscripts</td>
<td>Include reprints of up to five articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Other materials</td>
<td>This section is for any materials deemed pertinent, but not appropriate for placement elsewhere, such as copies of academic advising survey reports, letters from students or peers that were not part of a structured evaluation process, course syllabi, etc. Keep this section to minimum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Detailed curriculum vitae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F
POST-TENURE REVIEW FORM

Faculty Member: ___________________________

Evaluation Period: January ___ through December ___.

The department policy on post-tenure review follows the overarching purpose, principles, objectives, and procedures in the university policy on post-tenure review (see University Handbook, Appendix W), which was approved by Faculty Senate on February 11, 2014.

Overall assessment:

☐ The faculty member is making appropriate contribution to the university.

☐ The faculty member is not making appropriate contribution to the university. The development plan or activities below should be pursued.

Notable strengths:

Development plan (include specific expectations and activities with timeline):

The BAE Post Tenure Review Committee has completed this post-tenure review based on the materials submitted by the faculty member and the procedures set forth in the Departmental Documents.

Department Head: ___________________________ Date: ________________

I have been given the opportunity to review this evaluation with the Department Head and Post-tenure Review Committee.

Faculty Member: ___________________________ Date: ________________