

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRONOMY**

**ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 7/7/2023)**

**PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 7/7/2023)**

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES \*(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **9/2028**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES\*: **9/2028**



**Raj Khosla, Department Head**

**Date signed:** December 4, 2023



**J. Ernest Minton, Dean**

**Date signed:** 5 December 2023



**Debbie Mercer, Interim Provost**

**Date signed:** 5/16/2024

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

# FACULTY EVALUATION: PROCEDURES, CRITERIA, AND STANDARDS FOR ANNUAL MERIT EVALUATION AND PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD <sup>1</sup>

Department of Agronomy Kansas State University

## 1. Introduction and Faculty Identity

[Section C](https://www.k-state.edu/provost/universityhb/) and [Appendix Q](https://www.k-state.edu/provost/universityhb/) of the University Handbook (<https://www.k-state.edu/provost/universityhb/>) 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 periodically at least once every five years.

This document represents the current procedures, criteria, and standards for annual merit evaluation in the Department of Agronomy. The Department of Agronomy uses a system of professional ranks for unclassified positions (term appointment and non-tenure track) that consist predominately of service or support. The evaluation of faculty in professional ranks follows the same procedures as faculty in academic ranks (see Section C10 of the University Handbook). The Department of Agronomy considers individuals holding these positions as faculty members, and they have voting privileges in faculty meetings of the department. To obtain all privileges specifically awarded by the University Handbook to faculty members holding academic rank, individuals with professional rank should also hold a regular academic rank.

Academic (tenure track) faculty are classified as:

1. Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor (see University Handbook, section C10)

Non-tenure track faculty are classified as:

1. Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Professor (see University Handbook, section C12.1)
2. Extension Assistant Professor, Extension Associate Professor, Extension Professor (see University Handbook, section C12.5)
3. Teaching Assistant Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, Teaching Professor (see University Handbook, section C12.4)
4. Assistant Agronomist, Associate Agronomist, Agronomist (see descriptions below).

---

<sup>1</sup> First approved by faculty of the Department of Agronomy on April 18, 1994. The second version of this document was approved on October 13, 2006. Third version: May 5, 2017. Current version approved:

---

5. Instructor, Advanced Instructor, Senior Instructor (see University Handbook, section C12.0)

The following ranking system is used for “Agronomist” professional ranks:

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

Non-tenure track faculty may be recruited, hired, and appointed into regular or term positions (procedures and criteria incorporated in this document were developed and approved by vote of Agronomy Faculty, 6/5/2020). Initial appointment rank and subsequent promotions into rank are based on advanced degree(s) held, experience, performance, and achievements over time within a given rank. They shall have all service, voting, and participatory privileges within the department as tenure-track faculty but cannot vote on tenure or promotion of tenure-track faculty (see University Handbook, section C12.0, C12.1, C12.4, C12.5). Appointment to the KSU Graduate Faculty, with associated rights and privileges, will follow university procedures and criteria (see Graduate Handbook Chapter 5).

## **2. Guidelines and Procedures**

In November of each year, the Department Head sends a letter to all faculty members in the Department of Agronomy requesting them to document personal achievements for review by the Head. As agreed in the faculty meeting of September 14, 1992, we use the calendar year as a basis for the evaluation.

Faculty submit documentation according to a specific outline (Appendix B – tabular format) to provide an Annual Achievement Summary for the present year to the Department Head on or near the end of the calendar year. The achievement summary includes an executive summary, a current position description, and accomplishments for general/non-directed service, directed service, extension, teaching, and research activities, plus progress toward goals for the present

year and goals for the coming year. Faculty submit information about accomplishments in extension, teaching, research, and directed service appropriate to their current assignments.

KSRE faculty, budgeted outside the department, may be tenured in the Department of Agronomy. Annual evaluation of these faculty will be shared jointly by the administrator from their budgetary home and the Agronomy Department Head, with primary evaluation responsibility residing with the budgetary home administrator based on procedures, criteria and standards established in budgetary home.

The Annual Achievement Summary is reviewed by the Head, who assigns a rating of 0 to 100 for each appointment category applicable to the individual faculty member (general/non-directed service for everyone; extension, teaching, research, and directed service according to the individual appointment).

Each faculty position is unique and may have different expectations and evaluation criteria to reflect the nature of the position. The tenths in extension, teaching, research, and directed service are based on current responsibilities and are agreed on by the Head and the faculty member during the evaluation meeting of the previous year (only adjusted and agreed to when qualifying circumstances arise) 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 merit score is weighted  $[0.333 \times \text{general/non-directed service rating}] + 0.667$  (extension tenths  $\times$  extension rating + teaching tenths  $\times$  teaching rating + research tenths  $\times$  research rating + directed service tenths  $\times$  directed service rating)]. 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, more publications would be generally expected for an individual with 1.0 research appointment than for an individual with 0.5 research appointment, but the evaluation process values quality as well as quantity. (See Appendix A. Agronomy Evaluation Form)

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 journal articles. 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 larger number of (1) the mean score in the department or (2) the actual merit score adjusted proportionally to encompass the entire year. For faculty members on sabbatical leave or leave without pay for part of the year, the merit score is based on a consideration of both the merit score obtained for performance during the period they were engaged in university assignments

and the mean merit score over the past three years. For faculty members on leave for the entire year, the merit score is the larger number of (1) the mean merit score of the faculty member for the previous three years or (2) the actual merit score determined using the regular criteria and standards but for work done while the faculty member was away from normal university assignments.

At an annual conference in January or February, the Head and faculty member carefully discuss individual performance relative to their position description and stated goals. The Head and faculty member also determine whether roadblocks exist to obtaining agreed-upon goals. If such roadblocks occur, the Head and faculty member discuss possible strategies to overcome them.

Each faculty member then receives the completed Agronomy Evaluation Form (Appendix A) and an individual letter discussing important points raised during the evaluation conference. The letter should be received by the faculty member, provided deadlines were met, at least 7 days prior to the date the evaluation documents are due to the Dean. It includes a written summary of accomplishments and activities in accordance with the guidelines provided by the department's statement of criteria, standards, and procedures.

Categories for levels of expectations for annual evaluations (see Section C31.8 of the University Handbook) will include (1) significantly exceeded expectations, (2) exceeded expectations, (3) met expectations, (4) fallen below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity, or (5) fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity. The letter to the faculty member will state which of the above categories of level of expectations was used for the evaluation. Faculty are informed of their performance relative to other faculty members in the department by listing the high, low, median, and mean scores. The Agronomy Evaluation Form is then signed by the individual faculty member and returned to the Head for their signature. Both the faculty member and the Head may make written comments on the form. The signature of the faculty member indicates that (1) the evaluation has been discussed with the Head and (2) the faculty member has received a detailed written evaluation from the Head. 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 evaluation letter, 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 (and the Administrative Head/Director for those not budgeted in Agronomy Department). In most years, salary increases cannot be assigned until a later date when the university budget is determined. Therefore, the Dean has the opportunity to consider faculty concerns before making a final decision on the salary increase of an individual faculty member.

### **3. Chronic Low Achievement**

In accordance with Section C31.5 of the [University Handbook](#) (Chronic Low Achievement), the Department of Agronomy is required to establish guidelines describing minimum-acceptable levels of productivity for tenured faculty members. In the Department of Agronomy, the minimum-acceptable level of productivity is a score of 60 in each 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 60 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 their evaluation has fallen below minimum levels of productivity. Unless the faculty member requests otherwise in writing, the Head will consult with the Faculty Evaluation Committee and develop a course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member. The faculty member will be given the choice of having a mentoring committee appointed by the Head to help balance and improve their research, teaching, extension and service responsibilities. The Head informs the faculty member in writing of this suggested course of action.

In subsequent annual evaluations, the faculty member will report to the Head on activities designed to improve performance and any evidence of improvement. Unless the faculty member requests otherwise in writing, the Head will communicate this information to the Faculty Evaluation Committee and will consult with the committee before issuing additional evaluations of failing to meet the minimal acceptable level of productivity.

A faculty member with two successive evaluations below the minimal acceptable level of productivity or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period will be considered for "dismissal for cause" at the discretion of the Dean of the College of Agriculture. Unless the faculty member requests otherwise in writing, faculty members tenured in Agronomy holding a rank equal to or higher than the rank of the faculty member in question will provide input regarding "dismissal for cause".

If faculty members provide input, the Head schedules a meeting of eligible faculty for the sole purpose of addressing the "dismissal for cause". At least 14 days prior to this meeting, the Head provides a summary of the faculty member's evaluation to eligible faculty for the period when evaluations were below the minimal acceptable level of productivity, along with descriptions of the course of action taken to improve the performance of the faculty member, and the outcome of that action. The faculty member facing "dismissal for cause" may provide information to eligible faculty he/she deems appropriate to help the faculty reach an informed decision. The faculty member may choose to meet with the eligible faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment they provide, or provided by the Head. Following discussion by the eligible faculty, formal written ballots are cast. These ballots are retained in departmental files for at least two years. Written recommendations and comments on the ballots are encouraged. Absentee votes are encouraged, provided they are given to the Head prior to the meeting. The

faculty member being considered for “dismissal for cause” will be informed by the Head of the outcome of the vote by the eligible faculty members immediately following the meeting.

The Head will forward a written recommendation for “dismissal for cause” to the Dean, and a copy of the recommendation will be forwarded to the faculty member. If faculty members provided input, the Head will also forward to the Dean unedited written recommendations and comments of the department’s eligible faculty members, and the number of votes by the faculty recommending dismissal, not recommending dismissal, and not voting.

#### **4. Professorial Performance Award**

Details are provided in Section C49 in the [University Handbook](#). To qualify to be recommended to the Dean of the College of Agriculture for a Professorial Performance Award, a faculty member must be a full-time, full professor, in rank at K-State for at least six years since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award and must, over the previous six-year period, have demonstrated sustained productivity within their areas of responsibility.

##### **4.1 Minimum Criteria**

The candidate must show evidence, over at least the preceding six-year period, of sustained productivity and scholarship that is equivalent to what the department expects for an associate professor to be promoted to a full professor.

A candidate must have earned a merit evaluation of ‘exceeded expectations’ or greater in at least four of the six years (evaluation categories used in Agronomy, based on Section C31.8, University Handbook).

For faculty serving interim administrative appointments, earning a merit evaluation of ‘exceeded expectations’ from their supervisor will be equivalent to a faculty member earning a merit evaluation of ‘exceeded expectations’ from the Head. It is the responsibility of the faculty member serving the interim administrative appointment to inform their supervisor of the categories used for evaluation purposes.

The six-year time frame will include the most recent performance review.

##### **4.2 Process**

Any candidate who meets the minimum criteria may apply for a Professorial Performance Award. The Department Head shall notify eligible faculty when the annual call for achievement summaries is made. To apply, a candidate must assemble a performance award file that documents their scholarly accomplishments for at least the previous six-year period. A candidate’s file should follow the guidelines established by the Provost and should, depending on the individual’s responsibilities, include the following elements:

- 1) an executive summary of major achievements during the evaluation period,
- 2) a narrative summary providing evidence of productivity, quality, originality, and leadership in teaching, research, extension, and directed service during the evaluation period.
- 3) a list of awards, invited presentations, publications, grants, and other scholarly output during the evaluation period.

The Department Head will establish a reasonable deadline for submission of the file. Upon submission, the Department Head will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials in terms of the criteria, standards, and guidelines established, along with a recommendation for or against the award. External reviews of the candidate's file are not required.

A copy of the Head's written evaluation and recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate. The candidate will have an opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the Head, and each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, each candidate has the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding their evaluation to the Head or to the Dean.

The Department Head will submit the following items to the Dean (Section C49.7):

- a. the Department Head's written evaluation and recommendation,
- b. a copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award,
- c. documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation,
- d. any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation,
- e. the candidate's file and supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award.

As described in the University Handbook, the ultimate decision of whether a candidate is awarded a Professorial Performance Award will be made by the Provost (Section C49.10, 49.11). The timelines for this process will be established each year by the Provost's Office, but candidates should know that this process will begin sometime in January of each year. Prospective candidates are encouraged to consult with the Department Head to help determine if he/she meets the minimum criteria.

### **5. Criteria and Standards for Annual Merit Evaluation**

All standards in the following tables are subjective. Examples provided in the tables below are not all encompassing, but should demonstrate accomplishments in research, teaching, extension, and service. Levels of accomplishment are determined subjectively by the Head based on careful consideration of the standards for each criterion. Ratings are based on a five-point scale: 5 =



excellent; 1 = unsatisfactory. Some of the criteria used for evaluation are not applicable for all individuals. Moreover, some criteria may not be applicable for an individual in any given year, whereas other criteria could receive more emphasis because of year-to-year needs of the department. A minimum of four criteria in each category will be used. The Head rates faculty on each applicable criterion and develops an overall rating (scale of 0 to 100) for general/non-directed service and for teaching, research, extension, and/or directed service activities. The Head then assigns each faculty member to one of five evaluation categories.

Categories for levels of expectations for annual evaluations (see Section C31.8 of the University Handbook) will include (1) significantly exceeded expectations, (2) exceeded expectations, (3) met expectations, (4) fallen below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity, or (5) fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity.

### 5.1 General /Non-directed Service

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Standards</u>
5.1.a. Service goals	Relevance of goals (1 and 5 year). Progress towards goals during the past year, addressing roadblocks. Evidence of impact of service.
5.1.b. Professional improvement	Sabbatical leaves, retreats, professional meetings, workshops, receipt and maintenance of professional licenses or certifications, or other self-improvement activities. Use three-year summary
5.1.c. Committee Service	Service contributions through department, faculty mentoring, college, and university committees. Intensive committee service can be noted. Examples are College Course and Curriculum Committee, Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee, Agronomy Faculty Evaluation Committee. Use three-year summary
5.1.d. Professional service	Participation in and contributions to the crop science, weed science, range science, soil science, and/or related professions; Reviews of proposals, teaching, manuscripts, etc.; Professional contributions to government organizations, civic groups, or commercial or agricultural groups. Use three-year summary
5.1.e. International activities	Professional contributions to other countries and international groups, including program development, training, consulting, or other activities. Use three-year summary

5.1.f. Private consulting	Amount, extent of involvement, and level of expertise provided as a private consultant. Use three-year summary
5.1.g. Awards and honors	University, professional, governmental, civic, or other awards and honors at the local, state, regional, national, or international level received. Use three-year summary
5.1.h. Collegiality (see <a href="#">University Handbook, Section D12 Professional Conduct</a> )	Maintain a collegial atmosphere; participate as a team player and leader; participate in seminars, faculty meetings, field days, Open House, departmental social events, and other activities. Use three-year summary

## **5.2 Teaching (T), Research (R), and Extension (E)**

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Standards</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>E</u>
5.2.a. Program goals	Relevance of goals (short and long term, 1 and 5 year, respectively) to appointment and position description. Progress towards goals during the past year, addressing roadblocks.	X	X	X
5.2.b. Program quality	Evidence of development and impact (include recognition, adoption, transfer of research to teaching, extension, and the public). Evidence of creativity and innovation. Use three-year summary	X	X	X
5.2.c. Teaching/ Extension Evaluation	<u>Teaching:</u> Quantity determined by number of courses as appropriate for appointment; Quality determined by enrollment, raw and adjusted TEVAL scores for “Amount learned in the course” and “Overall effectiveness as a teacher” over the last 5 years; classroom visits; exit interviews with graduating seniors; teaching portfolio; “Overall quality” evaluation from peer reviews. <u>Extension:</u> Quantity determined by extension effort (meetings, presentations, publications, outreach, and contacts) as appropriate for appointment; Quality determined by surveys at meetings, agent evaluations required for non-tenured faculty.	X		X
5.2.d. Undergraduate research/extension training	Quantity determined by the number of undergraduates trained, including REUs, visiting scholars, interns; Quality determined by poster/oral presentations, awards won, publications at regional or national level professional meetings. Supervision of undergraduate research (e.g. enrolled in AGRON 598) or University Honors. Use three-year summary		X	X

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Standards</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>E</u>
5.2.e. Undergraduate advising	Quantity determined by the number of undergraduate advisees; Quality determined by exit interviews of graduating seniors by the Head or Asst. Head for Teaching; advising surveys, graduation success rates of advisees; service as faculty advisor to department clubs and other official student organizations (competition teams). Use three-year summary	X		
5.2.f. Graduate advising	Quantity determined by the number of graduate committees as advisor, committee member; Quality determined by exit interviews and job placement by the Head. Awards received, grants submitted, and professional development opportunities (such as GTA, extension) provided to students (as advisor, committee member, mentor). Student contribution to publications authored. Use three-year summary.	X	X	X
5.2.g. Refereed publications	Quantity and quality (as demonstrated by progress in publication metrics). The minimum number required is subjective based on the appointment. List of publications (peer-reviewed) in the last three years. Provide updated career and most recent 5 years from Google Scholar for total citations, h-index, and i10-index values. List top 5 cited articles.	X	X	X
5.2.h. Other publications, presentations, or deliverables	Quantity and quality; examples are books, lab manuals, popular articles, meeting presentations (abstracts, posters, oral), tours, demonstrations, audio and video programs; cultivars or germplasm released; software, social media metrics, etc. Use three-year summary	X	X	X
5.2.i. Extramural funding	Level of extramural funding and role on funded projects. Provide summary of active grants (awarded in past 3 years); summarize continuing grants (received in prior 3 years, funds available); proposals submitted but not funded. Identify as competitive, industry, in-kind. Use three-year summary.	X	X	X
5.2.j. Intellectual property	List formal public/private partnerships leading to commercialization revenue, copyrights, trademarks, patents, licenses, and other forms of intellectual property protection. Use three-year summary.	X	X	X
5.2.k. Teamwork and engagement	Program improvement with colleagues, stakeholders, and clientele.	X	X	X
5.2.l. Visiting scientists and post-doctorates	Quantity determined by the number of visiting scientists and post-doctorates during the evaluation period; Quality determined by whether these visits and working relationships resulted in grants, publications, professional training, and other deliverables.	X	X	X

### **5.3 Directed Service**

Portions of time for annual evaluation may be assigned by the Head for specific responsibilities / activities such as the following:

- 1) Coordinator, Crop Performance Testing Program
- 2) Manager, Kansas Foundation Seed Program
- 3) Agronomist-in-Charge, Experiment Fields
- 4) Assistant Head for Teaching
- 5) Extension State Leader
- 6) Graduate Coordinator
- 7) Director, Soil Testing Laboratory
- 8) Academic Coordinator

Specific responsibilities are agreed upon by the Head and the individual in Directed Service positions, and the responsibilities serve as criteria for annual evaluation. These specific responsibilities must be included in the position description of each individual with an appointment that includes directed service.

Standards are subjective and developed individually for each position with directed service responsibilities. If directed service responsibilities do not fit within the Teaching / Research / Extension criteria and standards outlined above (Section 5.2), the following list of criteria and standards can be used.

Criteria	Standards	DS
5.3.a Program Goals	Relevance of goals (short and long term, 1 and 5 year, respectively) to appointment and position description. Progress towards goals during the past year, addressing roadblocks.	X
5.3.b Program quality (plus extra effort)	Evidence of development and impact (include recognition, adoption, transfer of program information to research, teaching, extension, and the public). Evidence of creativity and innovation. Use three-year summary	X
5.3.c Program management – budget and human capital	Includes budget (funding, crop sales, income/expenses), human capital (personnel, hiring, retention). Use three-year summary	X
5.3.d Program management - facilities and equipment	Include Facilities: buildings, equipment, and fields (maintenance, remediation, upgrades). Use three-year summary	X
5.3.e Departmental Engagement and Teamwork	Include connections with department (and college) re: research planning and coordination, support activities, services.	X

5.3.f Industry Engagement and Teamwork	Include connections with industry partners re: research planning and coordination, support activities, services.	X
5.3.g Community / Outreach Engagement and Teamwork	Quantity includes field days and attendance (departmental, industry, tours, visits with reps). Use three-year summary. Quality includes connections with community / outreach activities.	X

**FACULTY EVALUATION: PROCEDURES, CRITERIA, AND STANDARDS FOR  
REAPPOINTMENT,  
MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW, TENURE, AND PROMOTION <sup>1</sup>  
Department of Agronomy  
Kansas State University**

**1. Introduction**

Reappointment, mid-probationary review, tenure, and promotion are based on faculty evaluation as discussed in [Section C](https://www.k-state.edu/provost/universityhb/) of the University Handbook (<https://www.k-state.edu/provost/universityhb/>). 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-probationary review, tenure, and promotion. The document must be approved mutually by a majority of faculty members in the department in consultation with the Department Head and Dean and be reviewed periodically at least once every five years.

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

**2. Guidelines and Procedures**

**2.1 Reappointment of Faculty Members on Probationary Appointments**

**2.1.a. Mentoring committee.** The Head appoints three faculty members to serve as a mentoring committee to each new faculty member on a probationary appointment. The committee should include professionally mature and successful members who are tenured, full or associate professors (or of equivalent professional rank). Mentors should be interested in the professional growth and development of the mentee, be willing to commit time, and give honest feedback. Committee membership should reflect the appointment split of the new faculty member and must avoid developing a competitive relationship with the new faculty.

The mentoring committee is designed to enhance professional development by assisting new faculty to balance and improve their research, teaching, extension, and service responsibilities. The mentoring committee should provide structured assistance to the new faculty member on all aspects of teaching, research, and extension and counsel the mentee on the merit, tenure, and

---

<sup>1</sup> First approved by the faculty of the Department of Agronomy on April 18, 1994. Second version approved by the faculty on September 15, 2006. Third version: May 5, 2017. Current version: July 7, 2023 \_\_\_\_\_

promotion processes. The committee will assist new faculty in understanding the department structure, culture, and socialization processes. The mentoring committee will also identify strategies for avoiding pitfalls, addressing difficult situations, improving communication, and preventing isolation of the new faculty member, and developing a professional network. The mentoring committee must treat all dealings and discussions with a new faculty in confidence. No official evaluation or assessment of the new faculty member is performed by the committee, only supportive guidance for career development, periodic reviews of progress, constructive criticism, encouragement, and compliments on achievements. The committee convenes at the request of either the chair or the mentee. The chair convenes the committee at least once per year. The role of the mentoring committee is to supplement, not replace, the assistance provided by the Department Head.

New faculty must devote adequate time to the mentoring relationship and make use of the advice and opportunities provided by the mentoring committee. The responsibilities of the mentee also include keeping the mentoring committee aware of the academic progress, difficulties, concerns and seeking help and support when needed. In addition, mentees must submit an “Evaluation Package” each year to the committee. This gives tenure-track faculty a chance to obtain feedback on the package substance, style, and work incrementally on their package over time.

**2.1.b. Reappointment Evaluation.** Faculty members on probationary appointments are evaluated to determine if they will be reappointed for another year. Annual evaluations also serve to provide feedback to a faculty member on probationary appointment about their performance in comparison to the department's criteria and standards for tenure.

There are three types of reappointment evaluation: (1) the reappointment evaluation that takes place the first two, the fourth and the fifth probationary years; (The procedures describing reappointment of faculty members on a probationary appointment are in Sections C50.1 - C56 of the University Handbook); (2) the reappointment evaluation that occurs during the third probationary year, which is the mid-tenure review (Sections C92.1-92.4); and (3) the final reappointment evaluation to confer tenure (Section C50.2 & C70-C116).

**2.1.c. Evaluation timeline.** The reappointment file is reviewed by the departmental Faculty Evaluation Committee prior to the Promotion and Tenure Meeting. The Faculty Evaluation Committee provides extensive feedback to the faculty member on their document and a recommendation to the tenured faculty for consideration. Any tenured faculty member may request to meet with the candidate to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate, prior to the Promotion and Tenure Meeting.

The Head makes the reappointment file available to all faculty members tenured in Agronomy at least 14 days prior to the annual Promotion and Tenure Meeting. The reappointment file includes a document prepared following the format of a Promotion and Tenure document described in Section 2.3 below.

The tenured faculty meets in October for an annual Promotion and Tenure Meeting to discuss the progress of all non-tenured faculty in the Department of Agronomy. All discussion at the

Promotion and Tenure Meeting regarding candidates being considered for reappointment is confidential. Formal written ballots (paper or e-mail) are cast at the Promotion and Tenure Meeting for each individual being considered for reappointment. Written comments on the ballots are strongly encouraged, particularly for negative votes. These ballots are retained for at least two years in departmental files. Absentee votes are encouraged, provided they are given to the Head prior to the meeting.

Following the vote by the tenured faculty, a letter summarizing the faculty discussion is provided by the Head to the candidate. 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 not voting.

The Head meets with the candidate to discuss progress towards tenure and promotion within 30 days of the Promotion and Tenure Meeting. 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 that each non-tenured faculty member is aware of the requirements for promotion and tenure and that they are informed of perceived progress toward that goal. A faculty member on a 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).

## **2.2 Mid-Probationary Review of Faculty Members on a Probationary Appointment**

As an extension of the annual process of reappointment, a formal mid-probationary review is conducted for faculty members in their third year of a probationary appointment at Kansas State University. The procedures describing the mid-probationary review of faculty members on probationary appointments are in Sections C92.1 - C92.4 of the University Handbook. The purpose of the review is to provide substantive feedback to the candidate from faculty colleagues and administrators regarding their accomplishments relative to tenure and promotion criteria. A positive mid-probationary review does not ensure that tenure will be granted in the future nor does a negative review mean that tenure will be denied.

The file is evaluated by the Faculty Evaluation Committee prior to the Promotion and Tenure Meeting, and a positive or negative recommendation is made to the tenured faculty for their consideration. Any tenured faculty member may request to meet with the candidate to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate.

The Head makes the mid-probationary review file available to all faculty members tenured in Agronomy at least 14 days prior to the annual Promotion and Tenure Meeting. The file includes a Promotion and Tenure document as described in Section 2.3 below.

All discussion at the Promotion and Tenure Meeting regarding candidates being considered for mid-probationary review is confidential. Formal written ballots (paper or e-mail) are cast at the



Promotion and Tenure Meeting for each candidate being considered. Written comments on the ballots are strongly encouraged, particularly for negative votes. These ballots are retained in departmental files for at least two years. Absentee votes are encouraged, provided they are given to the Head prior to the meeting.

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

### **2.3 Tenure and Promotion**

There is no simple list of accomplishments that guarantee that a faculty member will obtain tenure. Instead, tenure is recommended based on the assessment of the tenured faculty of the University that a candidate has made outstanding contributions in appropriate academic endeavors. By granting tenure only to such individuals, the continued excellence of the university is ensured. The procedures for the evaluation of tenure are in Sections C100.1 - C116.2 of the University Handbook.

For persons appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor, the maximum probationary period for gaining tenure and promotion to Associate Professor consists of six (6) 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 (without tenure), the maximum probationary period for gaining tenure is five (5) regular annual appointments at Kansas State University at a probationary rank.

Faculty members on probationary appointments who have met the criteria and standards for tenure may be granted early tenure (see Section C82.4 of the University Handbook). Because candidates may be considered for tenure at any time during their probationary period, no time credit shall be granted for service prior to employment at Kansas State University. However, general/non-directed service activities and professional productivity (excellence in teaching, research, extension, or directed service) performed prior to appointment at Kansas State University, related to current appointment, and that fall within criteria and standards for tenure and promotion as described in Sections 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3, can be included in the document for consideration.

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. Promotion to Professor is based on attainment of excellence in the assigned responsibilities of the faculty member and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies. Although the median time for promotion at Kansas State University is about six years, promotion can be granted when the faculty member's cumulative performance at rank clearly meets the standards for promotion (Section C131 of the University Handbook).

#### **2.4 Reappointment and Promotion Process of Non-Tenure Track Faculty**

Non-tenure track faculty are initially appointed to a specific rank only after the tenure-track, and non-tenure track faculty at or above the desired rank level, have reviewed and voted favorably on the credentials of the prospective appointee. The procedures for promotion will be identical to the processes for the promotion of tenure-track faculty outlined in the Department of Agronomy's document and the University Handbook (see Section C).

**2.4.a. Reappointment process.** All non-tenure track faculty holding regular (not term) appointments will be evaluated annually for reappointment decisions (see University Handbook, section C60 to C66). The reappointment processes for regular non-tenure track appointments are described in Section C of the University Handbook.

Eligible faculty that can vote on reappointment will include only tenured faculty members and non-tenure track faculty members who hold rank greater than the individual to be reappointed. As a component of the annual evaluation and reappointment process, non-tenure track faculty will receive annual feedback on progress toward promotion.

**2.4.b. Mentoring committee.** The Department Head appoints a mentoring committee of three faculty members selected in consultation with each non-tenure track faculty member. The purpose and activities of the mentoring committee are described in Section 2.1 of the current Agronomy Department P&T document.

**2.4.c. Promotion process.** To be promoted within the non-tenure track ranks, the applicant must make a request to the Department Head. The application also must meet the same criteria (qualifications and time in rank) and provide the same documentation and follow the same procedures for promotion as tenure-track faculty at the same rank. The average time in rank before considering promotion is usually 5 years, although shorter and longer periods are possible. Criteria used will be those relevant to the assignment of duties of the position.

Members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee will provide feedback on promotion documentation to each candidate before review by the faculty at large at the annual Promotion and Tenure Meeting.

All tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty at or above the rank to which the non-tenure track faculty member is requesting promotion will evaluate and vote on the submitted materials by ballot at the Promotion and Tenure Meeting. The department head will notify the applicant of the outcome of the departmental decision. If the vote for promotion is favorable, the outcome will be submitted in writing to the applicant and copied to the Dean. In the event of a negative decision, the department head will provide a summary of the faculty's rationale for the decision to the applicant, the faculty members who participated in the decision, and the Dean. An appeal of a negative decision may be made in writing to the department head.

If a promotion is recommended, the department head will decide with the candidate and the Dean on the length of the new appointment. The options are:

- Regular appointment, one year, entitled to Notice of Non-Reappointment (see University Handbook, section C160.1).
- Term appointment for a one, two, or three-year term, with no Notice of Non-Reappointment (see University Handbook, section C11).

Once the type and length of the appointment is decided, it will need to be communicated in writing in the recommendation to the Dean. Increases in salary associated with promotion will be awarded only if funds to support an increase are available from an appropriate source.

## **2.5 Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation**

All faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion are required to prepare documentation for consideration. Guidelines for the "Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation" at Kansas State University (<http://www.k-state.edu/provost/resources/dhmanual/promotion/promotio.html>) are used to prepare this documentation.

Outside reviewers are not required in the evaluation process for tenure and/or promotion in the Department of Agronomy. However, written comments may be solicited at the request of the candidate and/or the Head from professionals outside the department. In the event of such a request, both the candidate and the Faculty Evaluation Committee will develop a list of four names of recommended referees. Each will rank the names in priority from the other's list to be contacted for letters of evaluation. Letters will be requested from the top two persons on each list. If they refuse, the next person on the list will be contacted. The letters of evaluation will become part of the candidate's file.

Documentation for tenure and/or promotion for each faculty member is reviewed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee, who may further assist the candidate in reviewing and editing the documentation. A recommendation is made by the Faculty Evaluation Committee to the appropriate group of faculty for their consideration.

The Head makes the candidate's file for tenure and/or promotion and the department's document listing criteria and standards for tenure and promotion available to the eligible faculty members

of the department at least 14 days prior to the annual Promotion and Tenure Meeting. Any eligible faculty member may request that the candidate meet with the eligible faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate. Faculty members holding tenure in Agronomy are eligible to participate in the evaluation procedure for tenure. For tenure and/or promotion decisions, faculty members tenured in Agronomy holding a rank equal to or higher than the rank being sought by the candidate can participate.

Faculty members in the professional ranks (non-tenure track) participate in the portion of the meeting where the promotion of faculty holding a professional rank at a lower level is being considered. If a faculty member holds both academic and professional rank, the level of academic rank determines the level of participation in promotion and tenure decisions for academic ranks. The recommendations for promotion in the professional ranks are made by the following faculty members:

Promotion to the Appropriate Professional Rank	Ranks Responsible for Recommending Promotion
Advanced Instructor	Advanced Instructor and Senior Instructor Associate Professor and Professor
Senior Instructor	Senior Instructor Professor
Associate Agronomist	Associate Agronomist and Agronomist Associate Professor and Professor
Agronomist	Agronomist Professor
Research / Extension / Teaching Associate Professor	Research / Teaching / Extension Associate Professor and Professor Associate Professor and Professor
Research / Extension / Teaching Professor	Research / Extension / Teaching Professor Professor
Associate Professor	Associate Professor and Professor
Professor	Professor

Consideration of candidates for tenure and/or promotion follows the sequence: promotion to Advanced Instructor, promotion to Senior Instructor, promotion to Associate Agronomist, promotion to Agronomist, promotion to Research / Teaching / Extension Associate Professor, promotion to Research / Teaching / Extension Professor, tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, tenure and/or promotion to Professor.

Eligible voting faculty members individually review the materials for each candidate before the meeting and discuss the candidate's file at the meeting. All discussion at the Promotion and Tenure Meeting is confidential. Formal written ballots (paper or e-mail) are cast at the Promotion and Tenure Meeting for each individual being considered for tenure and/or promotion. Written comments on the ballots are strongly encouraged, particularly for negative votes. These ballots are retained in departmental files for at least two years. Absentee votes are encouraged, provided they are given to the Head prior to the meeting.

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

Faculty members in professional ranks (instructor, agronomist, research / teaching / extension professor) do not receive the promotion-related salary increases as described in Section C132 of the University Handbook. However, promotion in professional rank is recognition of substantial achievement and should be rewarded. Promotion-related salary increases for professional rank positions come from department sources. Salary increases for promotion to Associate Agronomist and Agronomist are a minimum of 8% and 11%, respectively, of the salary of the promoted faculty member for the year preceding promotion.

### **3. Criteria and Standards for Promotion and Tenure and Mid-Probationary Review**

All standards are subjective and are listed in the Annual Merit Evaluation tables, Section 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3. The department does not have simple lists of accomplishments of standards that guarantee the awarding of tenure and/or promotion or a successful mid-probationary review. Instead, an assessment of the accomplishment of standards is made for each individual by the eligible group of faculty and the Head. Most faculty members have a split appointment in the categories of teaching, research, extension, and/or directed service. All faculty members are expected to have accomplishments in the general/non-directed service category. The criteria and standards of each category for which the faculty member has responsibility in addition to the general/non-directed service category are considered in decisions concerning promotion and/or tenure and mid-probationary review.

Document that provides [Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Documentation](#) is found on the Office of the Provost website. The submitted “Promotion and Tenure Documentation” needs to contain sufficient details to address the criteria and standards described in the Annual Merit Evaluation tables, Section 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3.

#### **4. Post-tenure Review Policy**

The purpose of post-tenure review at Kansas State University 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. It is also designed to enhance public trust in the University by ensuring that the faculty community undertakes regular and rigorous efforts to hold all of its members accountable for high professional standards.

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.

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's policies regarding removal of tenured faculty members for cause (which are stipulated in the University Handbook). This 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.

#### **4.1 Procedure**

All tenured faculty members of the University are required to undergo a performance evaluation annually. A tenured faculty member must submit documentation for post-tenure review every six years. At a minimum, the post-tenure review process may be based solely upon an evaluation of the materials submitted for the previous six annual performance evaluations.

Documentation for post-tenure review shall include the following:

A summary of major achievements during the evaluation period (last six years)

1. A summary of instructional productivity, including courses taught, student advisement, and thesis supervision, in addition to evidence of instructional quality such as ratings, peer evaluations, or evaluation of advising
2. A statement of research and other creative activities accompanied by a list of publications and a list of funded grants and contracts
3. A summary of extension activity providing evidence of productivity, quality, creativity, and originality, accompanied by a list of extension publications, meetings, workshops, etc.,
4. A statement of service contributions, including evidence of leadership.

The six-year post-tenure review clock shall be further defined to mean that post-tenure review will be conducted for all tenured faculty either every six years, or in the sixth year following promotion or awarding of a major university performance award. One of the following events can reset the post-tenure review period:

1. Promotion to full professor
2. Application for the K-State Professorial Performance Award
3. Receipt of any national award or recognition as a Fellow from a professional society that considers scholarly productivity and impact over multiple years across all facets of faculty member's appointment.
4. Being named a University Distinguished Professor or Coffman Teaching Scholar
5. Completion of a 5-year administrative review for people on administrative appointments that hold tenure in Agronomy.

The six-year time frame will include the most recent performance review. For faculty serving interim administrative appointments, the post-tenure review clock is paused for the period for which the interim appointment is effective and resumes when the faculty member returns to their faculty role.

The post-tenure review clock can also be paused for one year to accommodate sabbatical leave, a major health issue, for substantial service duties such as serving as president of a professional society, or another compelling reason (see examples in University Handbook section C83.1, C83.2, C83.3), provided that both the faculty member and department/unit head approve the delay. Requests for a delay in the post-tenure review clock for the above noted reasons shall be made to the department or unit head.

External reviews are not required. The faculty member will submit the file to the head who will evaluate the documentation. The faculty member may request additional review from the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

The review should assess the faculty member's strengths and areas for improvement to determine whether he/she is making appropriate contributions to the university or whether additional plans or activities need to be developed. Once the review is complete, a written evaluation of the faculty member's materials, including suggestions for improvement and/or professional development as appropriate, will be prepared by the head and forwarded to the faculty member. They will have an opportunity to discuss the written evaluation with the head and will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. If the review suggests that a plan for additional professional development should be identified, a face-to-face meeting to discuss options and develop a plan is required. The development plan should be used in future annual evaluations and post-tenure reviews to review progress toward any goals set in the plan.

The department head will submit the following items to the dean:

1. The department head's written evaluation and recommendation
2. A copy of the procedures for performing post-tenure review
3. Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation

If the post-tenure review produces recommendations for improvement or professional development, the faculty member will prepare a brief statement of progress at subsequent annual evaluations.



APPENDIX A

**Kansas State University – Department of Agronomy  
Annual Faculty Evaluation Summary Report  
Calendar Year Ending December 31, 2022**

<b>Name:</b>		<b>Rank:</b>		<b>Rating:</b>		
<b>General Service/ /Professional/ Service</b>	<b>Instruction, Advising, and Mentoring</b>	<b>Research Scholarship and Creative Activity</b>	<b>Extension and Outreach</b>	<b>Directed Service</b>		<b>Overall Evaluation</b>
Appointment tenth: Effort: %	Appointment tenth: Effort: %	Appointment tenth: Effort: %	Appointment tenth: Effort: %	Appointment tenth: Effort: %		
0.0/5.0	0.0/5.0	0.0/5.0	0.0/5.0	0.0/5.0		
0.333 X rating	0.667 X [teach tenths x rating + research tenths x rating + ext tenths x rating + DS tenths x rating]					0.0 / 5.0
Summary Comments:						

Signatures: I have received and read this annual evaluation:

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_

Faculty members comments on evaluation included on next page

Rating Guideline:

5 – Significantly Exceed Expectations; 4.0 – Exceed Expectations; 3.0 – Meet Expectations; 2.0 – Below Expectations; 1.0 Unsatisfactory.

**APPENDIX B.**

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRONOMY ANNUAL ACHIEVEMENT SUMMARY OUTLINE (in tabular format)**

**I. Executive summary.** Highlight your achievements in no more than one page for teaching, research, extension, and directed service.

**Summary of Accomplishments (three-year summary)**

**1.**

**II. Current position description.** Describe your duties in no more than one page and recommended weights for teaching, research, extension, and directed service. (weights agreed at previous annual evaluation meeting with Dept. Head, or as soon as significant change in duties expected).

**III. General service (5.1)**

**5.1.a Service goals**

<b>Previous year goals</b>		<b>Roadblocks</b>	<b>Accomplishments</b>	<b>Impact</b>

<b>1 year goals</b>	

<b>5 year Goals</b>	

**Professional Membership**

--


**Professional improvement activities (refer 5.1.b)**

Sabbatical leaves, retreats, professional meetings, workshops, receipt and maintenance of professional licenses or certifications, or other self-improvement activities).

Date	Type	Title	Location	T, R, E	Outcome
	Workshop				
	Meeting				
	certifications				

**Committee service (refer 5.1.c)**

Service contributions through department, faculty mentoring, college, and university committees.

Unit Level	Description	Time
Faculty Mentoring		
Department		
Department		
Department		
Department		
College		
College		
College		
University		
University		

**Professional service: (refer 5.1.d)**

Participation in and contributions to the crop science, weed science, range science, soil science, and/or related professions; Reviews of proposals, teaching, manuscripts, etc.; Professional contributions to government organizations, civic groups, or commercial or agricultural groups.

Type (examples)	Organization	Description	Time
Committee			
Committee			
Advisory Committee			
Manuscript reviewer			
Grant Reviewer			
Gov't			
Nominations			
Reference letters			
Civic			
Commercial			
Ag Groups			
Ag Groups			

**Media, Gov't Briefings, Public relations**

Type	Title	Date	Source
Print			
Print/E media			
Blog			
TV			
Video			

Radio			
Radio			
Gov't			
Gov't			
Gov't			

**International activities (refer 5.1.e)**

Activity	Role	Time	T, R, E, S	Describe Activity	Country

**Private consulting (refer 5.1.f)**

None
------

**Awards and honors (refer 5.1.g)**

University, professional, governmental, civic, or other awards and honors at the local, state, regional, national, or international level received. Use three year summary.

Award	Year

**Collegiality (refer 5.1.h)**

Provide evidence of collegiality and participation as a team player and leader.

1.
----

**IV. Teaching/Research/Extension (5.2)**

**Program goals (refer 5.2.a)**

Progress towards program goals during the past year. Include comments on roadblocks to achievement. List goals for the coming year. List goals for the next 5 years. Provide evidence of the impact of program goals.

Previous year goals	T, R, E	Progress	Roadblocks

1 year goals	T,R, E

<b>5 year goals</b>		<b>T,R, E</b>

**Program quality (refer to 5.2.b)**

Provide evidence of program development, impact, creativity, and innovation.

1.
----

**Teaching / Extension Evaluations (refer 5.2.c)**

Teaching (as appropriate): Quantity determined by number of courses taught (appropriate for appointment). Quality determined by enrollment and TEVAL scores for the last five years

<b>Class</b>	<b>Semester</b>	<b>Enrollment</b>	<b>Teacher effectiveness</b>	<b>Amount learned</b>	<b>Enrollment demographics</b>
AGRON xxx	F19	20			1 MS Agron, 15 Agron, 4 Bio
	F20				4 Ph,D. (3 Agron, 1 Bio), 3 MS (1 Agron, 1 Bio, 1 Civil), 9 Agron, 3 Bio, 2 Eng
	F21				
	F22				
	F23				
AGRON xxx	S19				
	S20				
	S21				



	S22				
	S23				

**Extension (as appropriate):** Quantity determined by extension effort (meetings, presentations, publications, outreach, and contacts) as appropriate for appointment; Quality determined by surveys at meetings, agent evaluations required for non-tenured faculty. (Use three year summary)

Types		Title / topic	Date	Audience demographic
Extension presentations (recent at top)	1			
	2			
	3			
	4			
	etc.			
Field days				
Outreach (contacts)				
Etc.				

**Undergraduate research/extension training (refer 5.2.d)**

Quantity determined by the number of undergraduates trained (including REUs, visiting scholars, interns; quality determined by poster/oral presentation, awards won, publications at regional or national level professional meetings. Supervision of undergraduate research (AGRON 598) or University Honors.

Name	Project	Timeframe	Presentations or Publications	Awards


**Undergraduate advising (refer 5.2.e)**

Quantity determined by the number of undergraduate advisees; quality determined by exit interviews of students by the Head or Asst. Head for Teaching; advising surveys, graduation success rates of advisees;

Name	Option	Arrival	Departure	Status

**Other Advising Activities:** service as faculty advisor to department clubs and other official student organizations. Competition teams.

1.
----

**Graduate advising (refer 5.2.f)**

Quantity determined by number of graduate committees as advisor, committee member

Quality determined by exit interviews with Dept Head and job placement. Awards received, grants submitted, profession development opportunities (GTA, extension presentations) provided to students. Student author contribution to publications.

**Major Advisor:**

Name	M.S., Ph.D.	Start date	End Date	Awards, Prof. Dev., Grants, co-authored Publications	Current Position

**Member of Advisory Committee:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>M.S., Ph.D.</b>	<b>Start date</b>	<b>End Date</b>	<b>Advisor, Dept</b>

**Graduate Student Development**

1.
----

**Refereed publications (refer 5.2.g)**

Explanation to the contribution of (faculty name) to multiple author publications:

1-Principal investigator; 2-Primary author; 3-Supervised author work; 4-Wrote sections of the manuscript; 5-Collaborative investigator

\*Graduate Student or Postdoctoral Fellow of a faculty member.

**Referred Publications (Career Total \_\_\_\_; recent 3-year total \_\_\_\_)**

(Most recent at the top, published / in press / accepted)

	<b>Authors</b>	<b>KAES #</b>	<b>Contribution</b>
1	Anandhi, A., S. Hutchinson, J. Harrington, V. Rahmani, M.B. Kirkham, and C.W. Rice. 20XX Changes in spatial and temporal trends in wet, dry, warm and cold spell length or duration indices in Kansas, USA. <i>Int. J. Climatology</i> 36:4085-4101. doi:10.1002/joc.4619.	14-372-J	* 3,5
2			
3			

**Manuscripts submitted (in review):**

	<b>Authors</b>	<b>KAES #</b>	<b>Contribution</b>	<b>Status</b>
1				
2				

**Google Scholar 5 year**

Google Scholar	2019			2020			2021			2022			2023		
	Total Citations	h-index	i10-index	Total Citations	h-index	i10-index	Total Citations	h-index	i10-index	Total Citations	h-index	i10-index	Total Citations	h-index	i10-index
5 yr															
Total															
Scopus															

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Citations (Google)					

**Top 5 Cited Referred Publications (Google Scholar)**

Reference	Citations

**Other publications, presentations, or deliverables (refer 5.2.h)**

Three year summary (suggested categories below, report one time only).

Type	No	
Book Chapters (19 total)	1	
	2	
Books (3 total)	1	
Extension Publication (17 total)	1	

	2	
	3	
Technical Publication (58 total)	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
Other		
Video		
Invited Presentation	1	
	2	
	3	
Presentations (Abstracts / Oral / Poster)	1	
Extension presentations	1	
	2	

Twitter		
Facebook		
Websites	1	

**Extramural funding (refer 5.2.i)** Use three-year summary, include new funding that was awarded (start date, for example 2023, 2022, or 2021). For all active funding, indicate status: current/continuing, completed when award has closed]. Most recently awarded at the top. (Substitute suitable alternative (e.g. current and pending form from Cayuse) that provides desired information.

<b>Title of Project</b> <b>Newly Funded, Active, Continuing, and Completed Projects</b>	<b>Duration</b> <b>(year start – year end)</b>	<b>Grant Agency</b>	<b>Total Grant Amount</b> <b>(in parentheses, allocation to KSU, to your program)</b>	<b>Role</b> <b>(PI or co-PI)</b>	<b>Collaborators</b>	<b>Source</b> C=competitive, IK=in-kind IN=industry	<b>R, E, T</b>	<b>Status</b> <b>(New, Continuing, Completed)</b>
(most recent at top of list)								
								C
TOTAL funds (funds allocated specifically to Faculty)								

<b>Pending / Not Funded Projects - Title</b>	<b>Duration</b>	<b>Grant Agency</b>	<b>Total Grant Amount</b> <b>(in parentheses, potential allocation to your program)</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Collaborators</b>	<b>Source</b> C=competitive, IK=in-kind IN=industry	<b>R, E, T</b>	<b>Status: Pending, Not-funded</b>
(most recent at top of list)								




**Intellectual property (refer 5.2.j)**

List formal public/private partnerships leading to commercialization revenue, copyrights, trademarks, patents, licenses, and other forms of intellectual property protection. Use three-year summary.

None

**Teamwork and engagement (refer 5.2.k)**

Program improvement with colleagues, stakeholders, and clientele.

1.

**Visiting scientists and post-doctorates (refer 5.2.l)**

Quantity determined by the number of visiting scientists and post-doctorates during the evaluation period; quality determined by whether these visits and working relationships resulted in grants, publications, professional training, and other deliverables.

Name	Position	Home Institution	Start date	End date	Outcomes


**V. Directed Service**

**Program goals (refer 5.3.a)**

Progress towards program goals during the past year. Include comments on roadblocks to achievement. List goals for the coming year. List goals for the next 5 years. Provide evidence of the impact of program goals.

<b>Previous year goals</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Roadblocks</b>

<b>1 year goals</b>	<b>T,R, E</b>

<b>5 year goals</b>	<b>T,R, E</b>

**Program quality (plus extra effort) (refer to 5.3.b)**

Provide evidence of program development, impact, creativity, and innovation.

2.

**Program management – budget and human capital (refer to 5.3.c)**

Describe budget (funding, crop sales, income/expenses) and human capital (personnel, hiring, retention). Use three year summary.

3.

**Program management – facilities (refer to 5.3.d)**

Describe facilities management (buildings and fields (maintenance, remediation, upgrades). Use three year summary.

4.

**Departmental Engagement and Teamwork (refer to 5.3.e)**

Include connections with department (and college) re: research planning and coordination, support activities, services.

5.

**Industry Engagement and Teamwork (refer to 5.3.f)**

Include connections with industry partners re: research planning and coordination, support activities, services.

6.

**Community / Outreach Engagement and Teamwork (refer to 5.3.f)**

Quantity includes field days and attendance (departmental, industry, tours, visits with reps). Quality include connections with community / outreach activities.

7.

**Appendix**

- A. Full CV
- B. TEVALS (5-years)
- C. Other supporting documents

