

Animal Science & Industry

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 ( 5/16/2018 )

**NEXT REVIEW DATE: April 2023**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Department Head's Signature

8-3-2018  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean's Signature

8-3-18  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Provost's Signature

8-6-18  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## **DEPARTMENT OF ANIMAL SCIENCES AND INDUSTRY**

### **ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 4/11/2018, with minor changes approved by Faculty Vote on 5/16/2018)**

### **PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 4/11/2018, with minor changes approved by Faculty Vote on 5/16/2018)**

**REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES \*(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): 4/2023**

**REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES\*: 4/2023**

**Evan Titgemeyer, Interim Department Head**

**Date signed: 8/3/2018**

**J. Ernie Minton, Interim Dean**

**Date signed: 8/3/2018**

**Brian Niehoff, Acting Provost**

**Date signed: 8/6/2018**

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

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

Department of Animal Sciences and Industry  
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://k-state.edu/provost/universityhb/fhsecc.html>). This process of faculty evaluation is designed to ensure that personnel decisions are both reasonable and defensible. At Kansas State University, each department is responsible for establishing its own document of guidelines, criteria, and standards for reappointment, mid-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 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 Animal Sciences and Industry.

## 2. Animal Sciences and Industry Faculty Committee on Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

The University Handbook requires that decisions of reappointment, promotion, tenure, and documentation of annual merit evaluation be made with significant opportunity for faculty input to the department head. The Faculty Committee on Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure and Annual Merit Evaluation (hereafter referred to as the Faculty Evaluation Committee) is assembled to provide appropriate faculty counsel to the department head on matters of reappointment, promotion, tenure, and annual merit evaluation.

The Faculty Evaluation Committee consists of five faculty members serving staggered five year terms, although terms may be shortened if a vacancy occurs. One member will be elected each year based on a vote of the faculty by early September. Should a vacancy occur during the academic year, a special election will be held to elect a member to fill the vacancy. In this case, members who have been on the committee for less time than the vacating member will move one year closer to the Chair position and their term will be shortened by one year.

The members of the committee must be tenured faculty and hold the rank of professor. The composition of the committee will be: one member with at least 50% extension appointment; one member with at least 50% teaching appointment; one member with at least 50% research appointment; and two at-large members with no restrictions on percentage appointment. If two or more members of a particular discipline (Animal Breeding and Genetics, Food Science, Meat Science, Monogastric Nutrition, Ruminant Nutrition, or Physiology) are on the committee, no additional member of that discipline is eligible for election at that time.

When a member completes a term on the Faculty Evaluation Committee, that member

is not eligible for re-nomination until one year following the completion of their term on the Committee.

The member serving in their last year will be the chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee for that academic year. The chair will convene and conduct the meetings of the Committee, conduct the election of a new committee member, and communicate to the faculty and department head on behalf of the committee.

The chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee will prepare the ballot listing the name of all faculty eligible for service on the committee by early September and distribute them to all tenure-track faculty (Assistant Professor and above). Ballots shall be returned within one week of distribution. The members of the committee at the time of the election will serve as tellers for the election. Should one of the candidates receive a majority of the votes cast, that individual will be declared a newly elected member of the committee. Should no candidate receive a majority of the votes cast, the names of the two persons receiving the largest number of votes will appear on a second ballot that will be distributed to the faculty as detailed above. The candidate receiving a majority of the votes cast will be declared elected to the committee. In the event of a tie on the second ballot, the chair will flip a coin in the presence of the two candidates to determine the new committee member.

The Faculty Evaluation Committee meets at least once annually, generally in mid-October. The role of the Committee will be to: consider reappointment of faculty members on probationary appointments; mid-probationary review of faculty members on probationary appointments; and review and provide feedback on documentation of faculty to be considered for promotion and(or) tenure; and evaluate and make changes, as needed, to the Annual Evaluation Guidelines and the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to be considered for reappointment, mid-probationary review, tenure, or promotion, in consultation with the department head, to prepare documentation (consistent with departmental and University Handbook policies and procedures) to clearly summarize the history of the faculty member's appointment and professional contributions before any deliberations begin. This documentation is then made available to eligible faculty 14 days before voting of the eligible faculty. The Faculty Evaluation Committee shall be provided copies of documentation by the faculty member 14 days before presentation to the faculty (28 days before departmental vote) in order for the committee to review the document and provide feedback to the faculty member.

The chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee prepares and distributes a ballot for each faculty member being considered for reappointment, mid-probationary review, tenure, or promotion to faculty eligible to vote. For reappointment and mid-probationary review, all tenured faculty are eligible. For promotion to associate professor, all faculty holding the rank of associate professor or professor are eligible. For promotion from associate professor to professor, only faculty members holding the rank of professor are eligible. For tenure, only tenured faculty are eligible to vote.

All ballots shall be returned within one week of distribution with the return of ballots coinciding with the conclusion of the 14-day period available to eligible faculty to view

documentation of faculty under consideration for reappointment, mid-probationary review, tenure, or promotion.

The Faculty Evaluation Committee will serve as the tellers for the vote of eligible faculty. The committee will record votes on each faculty member in the categories of in favor (yes), not in favor (no), and abstention, and record the number of eligible faculty not voting. Written comments are encouraged to support the votes on individual ballots. These unedited comments will be transcribed as a part of the recommendation to the department head. The department head also will be provided the names of faculty not returning ballots.

The department head will prepare a statement of recommendation that addresses how the faculty member has or has not satisfied applicable departmental criteria for reappointment, promotion, or tenure. The statement will detail whether or not the performance of the faculty member adequately fulfills the published standards for the proposed personnel action. The faculty member shall be informed by the department head if a recommendation for reappointment, promotion or tenure is not being sent forward to the dean and shall be provided counsel regarding how she or he might be successful in a subsequent consideration. If the recommendation of the department head differs from the faculty vote, the reasons for the difference will be explained in the department head's statement.

The head will forward his recommendations, supporting statements, and documentation to the Dean of the College of Agriculture.

For annual evaluation procedures, criteria, and standards please go to page 13.

### 3. Guidelines and Procedures

#### 3.1 Reappointment of Faculty Members on Probationary Appointments

Sometime during the first year of appointment, the department head appoints tenured faculty members as mentors to each new faculty member (candidate) on a probationary appointment. Initially, the head may assign the chair of the search committee from which the candidate was selected for hire as the mentor. Then, after the candidate becomes acquainted with other tenured departmental faculty, a different mentor or group of mentors may be assigned. The mentor(s) assist and advise the candidate during the promotion and tenure process; provide advice in the preparation of promotion and tenure materials; provide general advice to the candidate about structuring and conducting their professional program; and advise the head, the Faculty Evaluation Committee, and the tenured faculty of the progress of the candidate in the promotion and tenure process.

Faculty members on probationary appointments are evaluated annually to determine whether or not they will be reappointed for another year using the same list of criteria and guidelines (Section 4, Tables 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3) as used for promotion and tenure. 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 tenured faculty members in the department at least 14 days before voting by eligible faculty. This file includes a cumulative record of written recommendations and accompanying explanations forwarded to the candidate from previous reappointment meetings and any written comments from relevant individuals outside the department. The reappointment file also includes a document prepared according to the format of a Promotion and Tenure document described in Section 3.3. The reappointment file is reviewed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee. Any tenured faculty member may request the candidate to meet with the tenured faculty members to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate. Such meetings should take place before review of the documents by the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

Formal written ballots are cast for each individual being considered for reappointment. Written comments on the ballots are encouraged and are expected in cases of votes against reappointment. These ballots are retained for at least five years in departmental files. Absentee votes are encouraged, provided they are given to the chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee before the meeting.

Following the vote by the tenured faculty members, the department 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 members in the categories of yes, no, and abstain, and also the number of eligible faculty not voting. If the recommendation of the department head differs from that of the faculty vote, the reasons for the difference will be explained in the department head's statement.

The department head meets with the candidate to discuss progress towards tenure and promotion within 30 days of the reappointment vote. The head's written recommendation to the dean and accompanying explanations will be made available to the candidate and will become part of the candidate's reappointment file. Throughout this process, the goal is to ensure 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).

### 3.2 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 ensure that tenure will be granted in the future nor does a negative review mean that tenure will be denied.

The department head makes the mid-probationary review file available to all tenured faculty members in the department at least 14 days before the meeting of the Faculty Evaluation Committee. This file includes a cumulative record of any 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 3.3. This same file dually serves the role of both the mid-probationary review document and the reappointment document. The file is evaluated by the Faculty Evaluation Committee. Any tenured faculty member may request the candidate to meet with the tenured faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate. Formal written ballots are cast for each individual being considered for mid-probationary review. A separate vote is required for mid probationary review and reappointment, even when they occur in the same year. These ballots are retained in departmental files for at least five years.

Before proceeding further, the department 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. This letter of assessment and the faculty report of comments and suggestions, along with the faculty vote, become a part of the candidate's reappointment and mid-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 members in the categories of yes, no, and abstain, as well as the number of eligible faculty not voting.

### 3.3 Tenure and Promotion

There is no simple list of accomplishments that guarantees that a faculty member will obtain tenure. Instead, tenure is recommended based on the assessment of the tenured faculty that a candidate has made outstanding contributions in appropriate academic endeavors commensurate with current faculty. 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 C110-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, extension, or directed service. Promotion to Professor is based on attainment of sustained excellence in the assigned responsibilities of the faculty member and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies. Although the median time for promotion at Kansas State University is about six years after achieving the rank of associate professor, 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).

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 reviews are not required in the evaluation process for tenure and/or promotion in the Department of Animal Sciences and Industry. Written comments, however, may be solicited at the request of the candidate and/or head, from professionals outside the department. In the event of such a request, both the candidate and the 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 decline, 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, together with the faculty mentor, may further assist the candidate in reviewing and editing the documentation.

The head makes the candidate's file for tenure and/or promotion and the department's document listing criteria and standards for tenure and promotion available to the eligible faculty members of the department at least 14 days before voting by eligible faculty members. 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 are eligible to participate in the evaluation procedure for tenure. For promotion decisions, faculty members holding a rank equal to or greater than the rank being sought by the candidate can participate.

Following the vote by the tenured faculty members, the department head forwards a written recommendation and accompanying explanations to the Dean of the College of Agriculture, along with the candidate's complete promotion and tenure file, unedited written comments of the department's tenured faculty members, and number of votes by the tenured faculty members in the categories of yes, no, and abstain, as well as the number of eligible faculty not voting. If the recommendation of the head differs from that of the faculty, the reasons for the difference will be explained in the department head's statement. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion are informed by the head of the outcome of the vote by the eligible faculty members and of the department head's recommendation to the dean. A copy of the head's written recommendation also is forwarded to the candidate.

#### 4. Criteria and Standards for Promotion, 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. The department subscribes to the Boyer's<sup>1</sup> perspective, that true academic scholarship would be a blend of "discovery, integration, application, and teaching scholarship". Most faculty members have a split appointment in the categories of teaching, research, extension, and/or directed service. Faculty members with teaching appointments should attain a sufficient level of teaching proficiency within the area of their appointment and demonstrate excellence in teaching, and faculty members with predominant teaching appointments should demonstrate scholarship of teaching commensurate with appointment. Faculty members with major research appointments should demonstrate the potential of acquiring a national reputation within an area related to his or her discipline. Faculty members with extension appointments should develop an extension program in agreement with their position responsibilities, client needs, and extension goals. All faculty members are expected to have accomplishments in the non-directed service category (defined in 4.4). 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.

#### 4.1 Teaching

Criteria	Examples
Teaching activity	Courses taught in relation to assigned responsibility. The minimum number required is subjective for each individual and discipline group.
Teaching portfolio	Evaluation of teaching materials such as syllabi, course outlines, exams, assignments, or web pages; statements of progress; evidence of innovative and effective teaching methods; course revisions, new courses developed; and advising honors students.
Teaching improvement	Participation in workshops, meetings, or field trips that improve teaching; participation in peer evaluation of teaching; sabbatical leave used for teaching and improvement.
Student evaluations	TEVAL, IDEA, or other teaching evaluation scores (required); scores for preparation/organization, responsiveness to students, stimulation, communication, feedback; scores for amount learned and teacher effectiveness; scores should be viewed in a historical context whenever possible. Quality may also be determined by interviews of students by the head or designate.

<sup>1</sup> Boyer, EL. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered Priorities of the Professoriate*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA. pg 23.

Undergraduate advising	Quantity determined by the number of undergraduate advisees in relation to teaching tenths; quality determined by interviews of students by the head or designate; University Academic Advising Survey summaries; service as faculty advisor to department clubs and other official student organizations.
Teaching-related committee work	Service on department, college, or university committees that directly influence teaching; examples are departmental or College Scholarship Committee, departmental Teaching Advisory Committee or College Course and Curriculum Committee, College Academic Standards Committee, Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee.
Teaching scholarship	Formal activities that directly address teaching and resulting learning in the setting of a like-minded community outside of the classroom.
Teaching publications and presentations	Publications, presentations, etc. that directly concern teaching; examples are refereed publications, textbooks, oral and poster presentations, abstracts, computer software, laboratory manuals, and video tapes; guest lectures and/or invited presentations.
Teaching awards and honors	Teaching awards and honors received during the evaluation period at the college, university, or national level.
Funding	Level of funding for teaching activities; proposals submitted but not funded.
Interdisciplinary teaching and team work	Participation in group teaching activities; providing guest lectures; working with colleagues for teaching improvement.

#### 4.2 Research

Criteria	Examples
Research program focus	Level of accomplishment of responsibilities listed in the position description or the annual assignment of responsibilities.
Refereed publications	Minimum number required is subjective for each individual and discipline group.
Other publications and presentations	Oral and poster presentations; invited presentations; abstracts; book chapters; non-refereed research reports; website development; computer software; bulletins; radio tapes; newspaper articles; video

	tapes.
Significant findings or development of unique research	Development of intellectual property; key research findings; new techniques developed that contribute to scientific knowledge and benefit society.
Funding	Level of funding; proposals submitted but not funded.
Graduate research advising	Quantity determined by the number of graduate committees as advisor; quality determined by approved outcome assessment measures.
Research improvement	Participation in retreats, professional meetings, workshops, etc. that enhance professional improvement for research; self-improvement activities that can be documented; sabbatical leave used for research improvement.
Research awards and honors	Research awards and honors received at the college, university, national, or international level.
Interdisciplinary research and team work	Participation in interdisciplinary research activities; working with colleagues for improvement in research.

#### 4.3 Extension

Criteria	Examples
Extension program focus and aggressiveness (effort)	Focus of extension program relative to position responsibilities and clientele needs; level of assertiveness (effort) in attaining extension goals.
Program development and implementation	Quality determined by the overall impact of the program.
Extension educational materials	Quality determined by impact of extension educational material prepared (journal articles, website development, software, bulletins, fact sheets, software, news releases, radio tapes, videos, etc.).
Peer and clientele evaluations	Evaluation of meetings, tours, and/or demonstrations by peers; input from clientele.
Teamwork, clientele relationships	Level of intra- and interdepartmental work; level of involvement with clientele (county agents, individuals, or groups); accessibility (prompt response).
Creativity and innovation in delivery	Development of new innovative extension programs; use of new technology in delivery of extension programs; development of programs directed to non-traditional clientele.

Funding	Level of funding for extension activities; proposals submitted but not funded.
Extension improvement	Participation in retreats, professional meetings, workshops, etc. that enhance professional improvement for extension; self-improvement activities that can be documented; sabbatical leave used for extension improvement.
Extension publications, proceedings, abstracts, invited presentations	Quantity and quality of publications, proceedings, abstracts, and/or invited presentations.
Extension awards and honors	Extension awards and honors received during the evaluation period at the college, university, or national level.

#### 4.4 Non-Directed Service

Criteria	Examples
Committee assignments	Service contributions through department, college, and university committees during the period under consideration.
Profession-based service and recognition	Participation in and contributions to the animal science, food science, and/or related professions; service on review teams or proposal review panels; recognition by peers outside the university and/or clientele groups.
Leadership, collegiality, cooperation, initiative, and enthusiasm	Chairing committees; providing help when asked; participating as a team player to benefit the department; participation in departmental seminars, faculty meetings, field days, and other departmental activities.

#### 4.5 Directed Service

Criteria	Examples
Accomplishment of responsibilities given in the position description used in the previous annual evaluation	Level of accomplishment of responsibilities listed in the position description.
Professional improvement	Participation in retreats, professional meetings, workshops, etc. that enhance professional improvement; self-improvement activities that can be documented.
Awards and honors	Awards and honors received during the evaluation period at the college, university, national, or international level.
Publications and presentations	Quantity and quality of refereed journal articles; oral and poster presentations;

	invited presentations; abstracts; website development; computer software; bulletins; radio tapes; newspaper articles; video tapes.
Funding	Level of funding; proposals submitted but not funded.
Teamwork, clientele, relationships	Level of intra- and interdepartmental work; level of involvement with clientele; accessibility.

# FACULTY EVALUATION: PROCEDURES, CRITERIA, AND STANDARDS FOR ANNUAL MERIT EVALUATION

Department of Animal Sciences and Industry  
Kansas State University

## 1. Introduction

Section C and Appendix Q of the University Handbook (<http://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 at least once every five years. This document represents the current procedures, criteria, and standards for annual merit evaluation in the Department of Animal Sciences and Industry.

## 2. Guidelines and Procedures

In December of each year, the department head notifies all faculty members to document personal achievements for review by the head. The calendar year will serve as the basis for the evaluation. Faculty members provide a summary of their annual activities for the past year to the department head shortly after the end of the calendar year. The achievement summary includes 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. See appendices A and B.

The annual faculty evaluation report is reviewed by the head, who assigns a rating of 0 to 100 for each category applicable to the individual faculty member (non-directed service for everyone and extension, teaching, research, and directed service according to the individual appointment). The tenths time in extension, teaching, research, and directed service are based on current responsibilities as agreed on by the head and the faculty member in the evaluation meeting of the previous year and as described in the current evaluation document (see Section C45.1 of the University Handbook). The number of tenths in each category is not necessarily the same as the budgeted appointment. The final merit score is weighted  $[(0.25 \times \text{non-directed service rating}) + 0.75 [( \text{extension tenths} \times \text{extension rating}) + (\text{teaching tenths} \times \text{teaching rating}) + (\text{research tenths} \times \text{research rating}) + (\text{directed service tenths} \times \text{directed service rating})]$ . Because each faculty member has different tenths of time in teaching, research, extension, and/or directed service, this formula accounts for differences in appointment. It is further expected that for any criterion, the productivity will be proportional to the tenths assignment. For example, twice as many publications would be generally expected for an individual with 1.0 research appointment than for an individual with 0.5 research appointment.

Sometimes the demonstrated productivity of a faculty member will vary annually

because of special work assignments or other factors such as an uneven distribution of refereed publications. To adjust for this annual variation, a faculty member and the head may collectively decide to use the mean merit score for the previous two years and the current year. In addition, it is recognized that departmental faculty have expertise and assignments that include a range of diverse disciplines. It is understood that for any criterion, the level of scholarly output (e.g., refereed publications, refereed reviews, etc.) are related in part to the ease of acquiring experimental units (e.g., microbiology versus prolonged large animal growth assays).

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 greater 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 greater 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 the annual evaluation meeting in January or February, the head and faculty member carefully discuss individual performance relative to his/her position description and previously stated goals and set goals for the next year. The head and faculty member also determine whether impediments exist to obtaining agreed upon goals. If such impediments occur, the head and faculty member discuss possible strategies to overcome them.

Each faculty member then receives an individual letter discussing important points raised during the evaluation meeting. The letter should be received by the faculty member at least 10 days before 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. Consistent with Section C31.8 of the University Handbook, categories for levels of expectations for annual evaluations will include (1) superior, (2) exceeded expectations, (3) met expectations, (4) below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity, or (5) 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. The evaluation form is then signed by the individual faculty member and returned to the head for his/her signature. Both the faculty member and the head may make written comments on the form. 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 accordance with Section 46.2 of the University Handbook. 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 is required to establish guidelines describing minimum acceptable levels of productivity for tenured faculty members. The minimum-acceptable level of productivity is a score of 60 in each category (teaching, research, extension, and/or directed service; See Appendix B) 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. The head then develops a course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member. The head informs the faculty member in writing of this suggested course of action.

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

### 4. 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 ten point scale: 10 - 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. The head rates faculty on each applicable criterion and develops an overall rating (scale of 0-100) for teaching, research, extension, non-directed service, and/or directed service activities.

#### 4.1 Teaching

Criteria	Examples
----------	----------



Teaching activity	Courses taught in relation to assigned responsibility. The minimum number required is subjective for each individual and discipline group.
Teaching portfolio	Evaluation of teaching materials such as syllabi, course outlines, exams, assignments, or web pages; statements of progress; evidence of innovative and effective teaching methods; course revisions, new courses developed; advising honors students.
Teaching improvement	Participation in workshops, meetings or field trips that improve teaching; participation in peer evaluation of teaching; sabbatical leave used for teaching improvement.
Student evaluations	TEVAL, IDEA, or other teaching evaluation scores (required); scores for preparation/organization, responsiveness to students, stimulation, communication, feedback; scores for amount learned and teacher effectiveness; scores should be viewed in a historical context whenever possible. Quality may also be determined by interviews of students by the head or designate.
Undergraduate advising	Quantity determined by the number of undergraduate advisees in relation to teaching tenths; quality determined by interviews of students by the head or designate; University Academic Advising Survey summaries; service as faculty advisor to department clubs and other official student organizations.
Teaching-related committee work	Service on department, college, or university committees that directly affect teaching; examples are departmental or College Scholarship Committee, departmental Teaching Advisory Committee or College Course and Curriculum Committee, College Academic Standards Committee, Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee.
Teaching scholarship	Formal activities that directly address teaching and resulting learning in the setting of a like-minded community outside of the classroom.
Teaching publications and presentations	Publications, presentations, etc. that directly concern teaching; examples are

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

#### 4.2 Research

Criteria	Examples
Research program focus	Level of accomplishment of responsibilities listed in the position description.
Refereed publications	The minimum number required is subjective for each individual and discipline group.
Other publications and presentations	Oral and poster presentations; invited presentations; abstracts; book chapters; non-refereed research reports; website development; computer software; bulletins; radio tapes; newspaper articles; video tapes.
Significant findings or development of unique research	Development of intellectual property; key research findings; new techniques developed that contribute to scientific knowledge and benefit society.
Funding	Level of funding; proposals submitted but not funded.
Graduate research advising	Quantity determined by the number of graduate committees as advisor; quality determined by approved outcome assessment measures.
Research improvement	Participation in retreats, professional meetings, workshops, etc. that enhance professional improvement for research; self-improvement activities that can be documented; sabbatical leave used for research improvement.
Research awards and honors	Research awards and honors received at

	the college, university, national, or international level.
Interdisciplinary research and team work	Participation in interdisciplinary research activities; working with colleagues for improvement in research.
Goal setting and accomplishment of goals	Appropriateness of goals set for the coming year at the annual evaluation meeting; progress toward goals since the previous evaluation.

#### 4.3 Extension

Criteria	Examples
Extension program focus and aggressiveness (effort)	Focus of extension program relative to position responsibilities and clientele needs; level of aggressiveness (effort) in attaining extension goals.
Program development and implementation	Quality determined by the overall impact of the program.
Extension educational materials	Quality determined by impact of extension educational material prepared (journal articles, website development, software, bulletins, fact sheets, software, news releases, radio tapes, videos, etc.).
Peer and clientele evaluations	Evaluation of meetings, tours, and/or demonstrations by peers; input from clientele.
Teamwork, clientele relationships	Level of intra- and interdepartmental work; level of involvement with clientele (county agents, individuals, or groups); accessibility (prompt response).
Creativity and innovation in delivery	Development of new innovative extension programs; use of new technology in delivery of extension programs; development of programs directed to non-traditional clientele.
Funding	Level of funding for extension activities; proposals submitted but not funded.
Extension improvement	Participation in retreats, professional meetings, workshops, etc. that enhance professional improvement for extension; self-improvement activities that can be documented; sabbatical leave used for extension improvement.
Extension publications, proceedings, abstracts, invited presentations	Quantity and quality of publications, proceedings, abstracts, and/or invited presentations.
Extension awards and honors	Extension awards and honors received during the evaluation period at the college, university, or national level.

Goal setting and accomplishment of goals	Appropriateness of goals set for the coming year at the annual evaluation meeting; progress toward goals since the previous evaluation.
--	---

#### 4.4 Non-Directed Service

Criteria	Examples
Committee assignments	Service contributions through department, college, and university committees during the period under consideration.
Profession-based service and recognition	Participation in and contributions to the animal science, food science, and/or related professions; service on review teams or proposal review panels; recognition by peers outside the university and/or clientele groups.
Leadership, collegiality, cooperation, initiative, and enthusiasm	Chairing committees; providing help when asked; participating as a team player to benefit the department; participation in departmental seminars, faculty meetings, field days, and other departmental activities.

#### 4.5 Directed Service

In accord with Section C5 of the University Handbook, portions of time for annual evaluation may be assigned by the head for specific responsibilities/activities such as the following: 1) Teaching Coordinator; 2) Research Coordinator; 3) Extension Coordinator; 4) Others (examples could include specifically defined research unit or service laboratory coordination; chair of standing departmental committee, etc.).

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.

Criteria	Examples
Accomplishment of responsibilities given in the position description used in the previous annual evaluation	Level of accomplishment of responsibilities listed in the position description.
Professional improvement	Participation in retreats, professional meetings, workshops, etc. that enhance professional improvement; self-improvement activities that can be documented.
Awards and honors	Awards and honors received during the evaluation period at the college, university, national, or international level.

Publications and presentations	Quantity and quality of refereed journal articles; oral and poster presentations; invited presentations; abstracts; website development; computer software; bulletins; radio tapes; newspaper articles; and video tapes.
Funding	Level of funding; proposals submitted but not funded.
Teamwork, clientele, relationships	Level of intra- and interdepartmental work; level of involvement with clientele; accessibility.

## APPENDIX A

### Annual Faculty Evaluation Report

To facilitate annual evaluation by the department head, faculty submit a packet consisting of:

1. A 1- to 2-page executive summary of the current calendar year accomplishments and includes a statement of objectives for the coming calendar year.
2. Current curriculum vitae listing publications, grants, etc.
3. Other supporting materials (such as examples of teaching scholarship, cover page of published papers, title page of book chapters, TEVAL, IDEA, or other teaching evaluation scores, etc.).

APPENDIX B

Annual Faculty Evaluation  
Department of Animal Sciences & Industry

NAME:				CALENDAR YEAR:			
Teaching 10ths:		Research 10ths:		Extension 10ths:		Other 10ths:	

RATING SHEET (completed by Department Head)

TEACHING	RATING
Teaching activity	
Teaching portfolio	
Teaching improvement	
Student evaluations	
Undergraduate advising	
Teaching-related committee work	
Teaching scholarship	
Teaching publications and presentations	
Teaching awards and honors	
Funding for teaching	
Interdisciplinary teaching and team work	
Goal setting and accomplishment of teaching goals	
OVERALL TEACHING RATING	
RESEARCH	
Research program focus	
Refereed publications	
Other publications and presentation	
Significant findings or development of unique research	
Funding for research	
Graduate research advising	
Research improvement	
Research awards and honors	
Interdisciplinary research and team work	
Goal setting and accomplishment of research goals	
OVERALL RESEARCH RATING	
EXTENSION	
Extension program focus and effort	
Program impact, development and implementation	
Extension educational materials	
Peer and clientele evaluations	
Teamwork and clientele relationships	
Creativity and innovation in delivery	
Funding for extension	
Extension improvement	
Extension publications, proceedings, abstracts, invited presentations	
Extension awards and honors	
Goal setting and accomplishment of extension goals	
OVERALL EXTENSION RATING	
DIRECTED SERVICE	

Teaching coordinator	
Research coordinator	
Extension coordinator	
Other	
<b>OVERALL DIRECTED SERVICE RATING</b>	
<b>NON-DIRECTED SERVICE</b>	
Committee assignments	
Profession-based service and recognition	
Leadership, collegiality, cooperation, initiative and enthusiasm	
<b>OVERALL NON-DIRECTED SERVICE RATING</b>	
<b>OVERALL RATING: [(0.25 x non-directed service rating) + 0.75 [(extension tenths x extension rating) + (teaching tenths x teaching rating) + (research tenths x research rating) + (directed service tenths x directed service rating)]</b>	



## **Professorial Performance Award – Animal Sciences and Industry**

### **Professorial Performance Award Policy**

The Professorial Performance Award (PPA) is designed to reward strong performance at the professorial rank with a base salary increase in addition to that provided for by the annual evaluation process. It is not a right accorded to every professor. In addition, it is not granted simply as a result of a candidate's routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies. The intent of the award is to recognize excellent and sustained performance of professors. Following are the criteria and guidelines for the PPA in the Department of Animal Sciences and Industry. These criteria and guidelines are based on the guidelines presented in Sections C49.1-C49.14 of the University Handbook (<http://www.k-state.edu/provost/universityhb/fhsecc.html>). These will be subject to review by the ASI faculty at least every five years.

### **Minimum Criteria and Standards**

1. A candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in the rank of professor at least six years since promotion or last receipt of a PPA.
2. Based on the ASI Department annual evaluation and P/T criteria, a candidate must have demonstrated during the preceding six-year time period a level of sustained productivity and scholarship that is equivalent to what the department expects for promotion to a full professor.
3. A candidate must have earned a merit evaluation in the category of '*Exceeds Expectations*' or above in each of the previous six years.
4. The six-year time frame will include the most recent performance review.

### **Procedure**

Any candidate, who meets the minimum criteria, may apply for a performance award. To apply, a candidate must assemble a performance award file that documents his/her scholarly accomplishments over the past six years. Recommendations concerning PPA are considered annually. The department head is expected to notify faculty members regarding their eligibility for a PPA review. The procedures for determining awardees shall be consistent with the guidelines presented in the University Handbook. The timeline for submittal of documentation and determination of awardees shall be consistent with the activities associated with the annual evaluation review process.

1. Candidates shall provide accurate, thorough, and clear documentation of her or his professional accomplishments for at least the previous six years in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the department. 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>) may be used to prepare this documentation or the candidate may submit sections I (cover sheet) and II (job responsibilities) from the Promotion and Tenure Documentation in addition to a current curriculum vitae containing the documentation.

2. The department head shall review the candidate's file and prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials in terms of the criteria, standards, and guidelines established, along with a recommendation for or against the award.
3. The candidate shall be given the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the department head, and shall sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, the candidate shall be given the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation to the department head and to the dean. A copy of the department head's written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate.
5. The department head will submit the following items to the dean:
  - a. The department head's written evaluation and recommendation.
  - b. A copy of the department's evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award.
  - c. Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation,
  - d. Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation.
  - e. The candidate's supporting materials that served as a basis for 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 the awards process will begin sometime in January of each year.