

Agronomy  
Department

Agriculture  
College

**Policy Statement Concerning:**

**Personnel Review and Evaluation Standards/Procedures**


- Performance Evaluation Criteria
- Annual Evaluation
- Reappointment Evaluation for:
  - Annual Reappointment Reviews
  - Mid-Tenure Review
- Tenure
- Promotion
- Professorial Performance Award
- Chronic Low Achievement
- Post-Tenure Review
- Non-Tenure Track Faculty Titles

Approved by Faculty Vote on ( May 5, 2017 )

NEXT REVIEW DATE: Sept. 2022

  
Department Head's Signature

11/10/17  
Date

  
Dean's Signature

11-10-17  
Date

  
Provost's Signature

14 Nov 17  
Date

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRONOMY**

**ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 5/5/2017)**

**PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 5/5/2017)**

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES \*(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **9/2022**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES\*: **9/2022**

**Gary Pierzynski, Department Head**

**Date signed: 5/5/2017**

**John Floros, Dean**

**Date signed:**

**April C. Mason, Provost**

**Date signed:**

*\*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**

Section C and Appendix Q of the University Handbook (<http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/fhbook/>) 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.

## **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 A) 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.

KAES faculty, budgeted outside the department, may be tenured in the Department of Agronomy. 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. The Head of the Department of Agronomy will use the same procedures, criteria, and standards to evaluate faculty tenured in Agronomy, regardless of budgetary home.

---

<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. Current version: May 5, 2017

The Annual Achievement Summary is reviewed by the Head, who assigns a rating of 0 to 100 for each category applicable to the individual faculty member (general/non-directed service for everyone and 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 as agreed on by the Head and the faculty member in the evaluation meeting of the previous year and as described in the current evaluation document (see Section C45.1 of the University Handbook). The number of tenths in each category is not necessarily the same as the budgeted appointment. The final merit score is weighted  $[(0.333 \times \text{general/non-directed service rating}) + 0.667 (\text{extension tenths} \times \text{extension rating} + \text{teaching tenths} \times \text{teaching rating} + \text{research tenths} \times \text{research rating} + \text{directed service tenths} \times \text{directed service rating})]$ . 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.

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 his/her 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 B) 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 his/her 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 Area Extension Director for Area Extension Specialists). 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 his or her evaluation had 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 his or her 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**

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 his/her areas of responsibility.

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

The candidate must show evidence, over at least the preceding six-year time 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 above in at least four of the six years (evaluation categories used in Agronomy, in descending order, 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). 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 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 his/her scholarly accomplishments for at least the previous six years. 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 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 who 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 his or her evaluation to the Head or to the Dean.

The Head will submit the following items to the Dean:

- 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. 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. 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 - 100) for teaching, research, extension, general/non-directed service, and/or directed service activities. The Head then assigns each faculty member to one of five evaluation categories defined in Section 2.

## **5.1 General 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 road blocks. Evidence of impact of service.
5.1.b. Professional improvement	Sabbatical leaves, retreats, professional meetings, workshops, 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 during the evaluation period. Use three year summary
5.1.h. Collegiality	Maintain a collegial atmosphere; participate as a team player and leader; participate in seminars, faculty meetings, field days, 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. Participant and peer evaluations	Teaching: Provide 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. Extension: 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; quality determined by poster/oral presentations, awards won, publications at regional or national level professional meetings. Supervision of undergraduate research (AGRON 598) or study abroad (AGRON 502). Use three year summary	X	X	X
5.2.e. Undergraduate advising (see Appendix C)	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. Use three year summary	X		
5.2.f. Graduate advising (see Appendix C)	Quantity determined by the number of graduate committees as advisor and committee member; quality determined by exit interviews by the Head and job placement. Awards received, grants submitted, and professional development opportunities provided to students. 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 in the last three years. Provide total citations, h-index and i10-index values for career and the most recent 5 years from Google Scholar. List top 5 cited articles. Tenure and promotion requires publications on teaching, research, and extension conducted at Kansas State University.	X	X	X
5.2.h. Other publications, presentations, or deliverables	Quantity and quality; examples are extension publications, books, lab manuals, popular articles, meeting presentations, tours, demonstrations, audio and video programs; cultivars or germplasm released; software, social media metrics. Use three year summary	X	X	X
5.2.i. Extramural funding	Level of extramural funding and role on funded projects; proposals submitted but not funded. 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 scholars	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

Specific responsibilities are agreed upon by the Head and the individual in such 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.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRONOMY  
ANNUAL ACHIEVEMENT SUMMARY OUTLINE  
(May use this outline or the equivalent in tabular format)

- I. Executive summary.** Highlight your achievements in no more than one page for teaching, research, extension and directed service.
- II. Current position description.** Describe your duties in no more than one page and recommended weights for teaching, research, extension, and directed service.
- III. General service**
- Service goals (5.1.a)
  - Professional improvement (5.1.b)
  - Committee service (5.1.c)
  - Professional service (5.1.d)
  - International activities (5.1.e)
  - Private consulting (5.1.f)
  - Awards and honors (5.1.g)
  - Collegiality (5.1.h)
- IV. Teaching/Research/Extension/Directed Service**
- Program goals (5.2.a)
  - Program quality (5.2.b)
  - Participant and peer evaluations (refer 5.2.c for standards)
  - Undergraduate research/extension training (refer 5.2.d for standards)
  - Undergraduate advising (5.2.e)
  - Graduate advising (5.2.f)
  - Refereed publications (5.2.g)  
Explanation to contribution of (faculty name) to multiple author publications:  
1- Principal investigator

- 2- Primary author
  - 3- Supervised author work
  - 4- Wrote sections of manuscript
  - 5- Collaborative investigator
- IF- Impact Factor of the journal  
\*Graduate Student or Postdoctoral Fellow of faculty member.

EXAMPLE:

1. \*Varanasi A, Prasad PVV, and Mithila J. Impact of climate change factors on weeds and herbicide efficacy. *Advances in Agronomy* (Vol. 135, in press) (KAES # 15-191-J) (1, 3; IF 5.0).
- Other publications, presentations, or deliverables (5.2.h )
  - Extramural funding (5.2.i)

**V. Appendix**

- A. Full CV

**APPENDIX B**

**AGRONOMY FACULTY EVALUATION FORM**

NAME \_\_\_\_\_ RANK \_\_\_\_\_

AGREED DISTRIBUTION OF TIME FROM PREVIOUS EVALUATION:

EXTENSION \_\_\_\_\_ TEACHING \_\_\_\_\_ RESEARCH \_\_\_\_\_ DIRECTED SERVICE \_\_\_\_\_

SCORING<sup>1</sup> OF FACULTY MEMBER ON 0 TO 100 SCALE:

$$\text{Merit Score} = 0.333 \times \frac{\text{_____}}{\text{(Gen..Serv. Rating)}} + 0.667 \left[ \frac{\text{_____}}{\text{(Ext. Tenths)}} \times \frac{\text{_____}}{\text{(Ext. Rating)}} + \frac{\text{_____}}{\text{(Teach. Tenths)}} \times \frac{\text{_____}}{\text{(Teach. Rating)}} + \frac{\text{_____}}{\text{(Res. Tenths)}} \times \frac{\text{_____}}{\text{(Res. Rating)}} + \frac{\text{_____}}{\text{(Dir. Serv. Tenths)}} \times \frac{\text{_____}}{\text{(Dir. Serv. Rating)}} \right] = \text{_____}$$

REMARKS OF DEPARTMENT HEAD AND/OR AREA EXTENSION DIRECTOR:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(Signature)

(Date)

COMMENTS OF FACULTY MEMBER:

(This evaluation has been discussed with me.)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(Signature)

(Date)

Approved by Faculty of Agronomy on September 5, 1991  
Revised by Faculty of the Department of Agronomy  
on April 18, 1994 and August 18, 2000

DISTRIBUTION:

Faculty Member  
Department Head  
Dean and/or Director

**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 of the University Handbook (<http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/fhbook/>). 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**

The Head appoints three faculty members to serve as a mentoring committee to each new faculty member on a probationary appointment. The committee should consist of professionally mature and successful members who are tenured full or associate professors. 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 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

---

<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. Current version: May 5, 2017.

reviews of progress, constructive criticism, encouragement, and compliments on achievements. 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 and style and work incrementally on their package over time. 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 his or her performance in comparison to the department's criteria and standards for tenure. The procedures describing reappointment of faculty members on a probationary appointment are in Sections C50.1 - C56 of the University Handbook. 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. This file includes a cumulative record of written recommendations and accompanying explanations forwarded to the candidate from previous reappointment meetings and any written comments from relevant individuals outside the department. The reappointment file also includes a document prepared following the format of a Promotion and Tenure document described in Section 2.3. The reappointment file is reviewed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee prior to the Promotion and Tenure Meeting, and a 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, prior to the Promotion and Tenure meeting.

The tenured faculty meet 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 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 she or he is 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 - C93 of the University Handbook. The purpose of the mid-probationary review is to provide substantive feedback to the candidate from faculty colleagues and administrators regarding his or her accomplishments relative to tenure and promotion criteria. A positive mid-probationary- review does not insure that tenure will be granted in the future nor does a negative review mean that tenure will be denied.

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. This file includes a cumulative record of written recommendations and accompanying explanations forwarded to the candidate from previous reappointment meetings and any written comments from relevant individuals outside the department. The file also includes a Promotion and Tenure document as described in Section 2.3. 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. All discussion at the Promotion and Tenure Meeting regarding candidates being considered for mid-probationary review is confidential. Formal written ballots are cast at the Promotion and Tenure Meeting for each candidate considered for mid-probationary review. 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 is six regular annual appointments as an Assistant Professor (Section C82.2 of the University Handbook). Tenure is not granted below the rank of Associate Professor, except

in special circumstances approved by the Provost (Section C82.2 of the University Handbook). For persons appointed at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, the maximum probationary period for gaining tenure is five regular annual appointments at Kansas State University at a probationary rank. Faculty members on probationary appointments who have met the criteria and standards for tenure may be granted early tenure.

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

Faculty holding professional rank are evaluated and considered for promotion by the same procedures used for faculty holding academic rank. The following ranking system is used for the 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.

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 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
Assistant Agronomist	Assistant Agronomist, Associate Agronomist, and Agronomist Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor
Associate Agronomist	Associate Agronomist and Agronomist Associate Professor and Professor
Agronomist	Agronomist Professor

Consideration of candidates for tenure and/or promotion follows the sequence: promotion to Assistant Agronomist, promotion to Associate Agronomist, promotion to Agronomist, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, tenure and/or promotion to Professor. Eligible faculty members individually review the materials for each candidate before the meeting and discuss the candidate's file at the meeting. All discussion at the Promotion and Tenure Meeting is confidential. Formal written ballots are cast at the Promotion and Tenure Meeting for each individual being considered for tenure and/or promotion. 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 his or her 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 do not receive the promotion-related salary increases described in Section C132 of the University Handbook. These increases in salary are awarded at the University level and are given only for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor. However, promotion in professional rank is recognition of substantial achievement and should be rewarded. Promotion-related salary increases for professional rank positions come from department sources. Salary increases for promotion to 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 in the following tables are subjective. 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 non-directed service category. The criteria and standards of each category for which the faculty member has responsibility in addition to the non-directed service category are considered in decisions concerning promotion and/or tenure and mid-probationary review.

#### **3.1 General Service**

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Standards (over the period of evaluation)</u>
3.1.a. Service goals	Accomplishments and impact of service. Relevance of goals statement (5 year).
3.1.b. Professional improvement	Sabbatical leaves, retreats, professional meetings, workshops, or other self-improvement activities.
3.1.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
3.1.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.
3.1.e. International activities	Professional contributions to other countries and international groups, including program development, training, consulting, or other activities.
3.1.f. Private consulting	Amount, extent of involvement, and level of expertise provided as a private consultant.

- 3.1.g. Awards and honors University, professional, governmental, civic, or other awards and honors at the local, state, regional, national, or international level received during the evaluation period.
- 3.1.h. Collegiality Maintain a collegial atmosphere; participate as a team player and leader; participate in seminars, faculty meetings, field days, and other activities.

**3.2 Teaching, (T), Research (R), and Extension (E) (Criteria also apply for non-tenured track assistant, associate, and full professor positions.)**

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Standards (for the evaluation period)</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>E</u>
3.2.a. Program goals	Accomplishments and impact of program. Relevance of goals statement (5 year).	X	X	X
3.2.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.	X	X	X
3.2.c. Participant and peer evaluations	Teaching: Provide raw and adjusted TEVAL scores for “Amount learned in the course” and “Overall effectiveness as a teacher” over the evaluation period; Enrollment information; classroom visits; exit interviews with graduating seniors; teaching portfolio; “Overall quality” evaluation from peer reviews. Extension: Surveys at meetings; agent evaluations required for non-tenured faculty.	X		X
3.2.d. Undergraduate research/extension training	Quantity determined by the number of undergraduates trained; quality determined by poster/oral presentations, awards won, publications at regional or national level professional meetings. Supervision of undergraduate research (AGRON 598) or study abroad (AGRON 502)	X	X	X
3.2.e. Undergraduate advising (see Appendix C)	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.	X		

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Standards</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>E</u>
3.2.f. Graduate advising (see Appendix C)	Quantity determined by the number of graduate committees as advisor and committee member; quality determined by exit interviews by the Head and job placement. Awards received, grants submitted, and professional development opportunities provided to students. Student contribution to publications authored.	X	X	X
3.2.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 since appointment or last promotion. Provide total citations, and h-index and i10-index values for career and the most recent 5 years from Google Scholar. List top 5 cited articles. Tenure and promotion requires publications on teaching, research, and/or extension conducted at Kansas State University with the exception of faculty granted tenure and rank at the time of appointment.	X	X	X
3.2.h. Other publications, presentations, or deliverables	Quantity and quality; examples are extension publications, books, lab manuals, popular articles, meeting presentations, tours, demonstrations, audio and video programs; cultivars or germplasm released; software, and social media metrics.	X	X	X
3.2.i. Extramural funding	Level of extramural funding and role on funded projects; proposals submitted but not funded. Use summary for the evaluation period.	X	X	X
3.2.j. Intellectual property	List formal public/private partnerships leading to commercialization revenue, copyrights, trademarks, patents, licenses, and other forms of intellectual property protection. Use summary for the evaluation period.	X	X	X
3.2.k. Teamwork and engagement	Program improvement with colleagues, stakeholders, and clientele.	X	X	X
3.2.l. Visiting scholars	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

### **3.3 Directed Service**

Criteria	Standards (for the evaluation period)
3.3.a. Program goals	Accomplishments and impact of program in support of assigned directed service duties. Relevance of goals statement (5 year).
3.3.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.
3.3.c. Extramural funding and stakeholder support	Level of extramural funding and role on funded projects in support of directed service duties; proposals submitted but not funded; donated goods and services. Use summary for the evaluation period.
3.3.d. Teamwork and engagement	Program improvement with colleagues, stakeholders, and clientele.

## **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.

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.

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.

### **4.1 Procedure**

A tenured faculty member must submit documentation for post-tenure review every six years.

Documentation for post-tenure review shall include the following:

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

2. 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
3. A statement of research and other creative activities accompanied by a list of publications and a list of funded grants and contracts
4. A summary of extension activity providing evidence of productivity, quality, creativity, and originality, accompanied by a list of extension publications, meetings, workshops, etc.,
5. A statement of service contributions, including evidence of leadership.

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 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 department Promotion and Evaluation Committee.

The review should assess the faculty member's strengths and areas for improvement to determine whether he/she is making appropriate contribution 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.