

Guidelines for Promotion and Annual Evaluation for Faculty
Department of Plant Pathology
Kansas State University

Approved by Faculty Vote, October 2022

Next Review Scheduled 2027

Megan Kennelly, Department Head, Plant Pathology

Megan Kennelly, Date: January 5, 2023

J. Ernie Minton, Dean, College of Agriculture

J. Ernie Minton, Date: January 9, 2023

Charles S. Taber, Provost, Kansas State University

Charles S. Taber, Date: 2/22/2023

Contents

INTRODUCTION

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Faculty Identity | 3 |
|------------------|---|

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

| | |
|--|----|
| Tenure Track Faculty | 4 |
| Annual Reappointments During Probationary Period | 5 |
| Mid-Probationary Review | 5 |
| Tenure Evaluation and Promotion to Associate Professor | 6 |
| Annual Review of Associate Professors | 8 |
| Promotion to Professor | 8 |
| Post-Tenure Review | 9 |
| Professorial Performance Award | 11 |
| | |
| Non-Tenure Track Faculty | 12 |
| General Information and Appointment Processes | 14 |
| Promotion Processes and Criteria | 18 |
| | |
| Appointment of Adjunct Faculty | 22 |
| | |
| Membership in Graduate Faculty | 23 |

PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION

| | |
|---|----|
| Tenure Track Faculty | 25 |
| Chronic Low Achievement | 27 |
| Non-Tenure Track Faculty | 28 |
| | |
| Appendix I: Description of materials supporting faculty evaluations | 30 |
| Appendix II: Performance criteria | 36 |
| Appendix III: Minimum performance expectations | 39 |
| Appendix IV: External review of extension faculty | 41 |
| Appendix V: Summary of Promotion and Tenure process | 42 |
| Appendix VI: Template Annual Evaluation Summary | 43 |

Introduction

Section C and Appendix Q of the University Handbook state that faculty must be evaluated periodically for accountability, reappointment, and merit salary increases. Each department is responsible for establishing its own document of guidelines, criteria, and standards for faculty evaluation.

The Annual Evaluation procedure in the Department of Plant Pathology is based on performance in each of the critical areas of activity of the University: Research, Teaching, Extension, and Service. Professional performance is exceptionally complex and cannot be evaluated adequately based on a single source of information. Faculty evaluation in the Department of Plant Pathology is based on multiple sources of data for each area.

Faculty Identity

In the Department of Plant Pathology, tenure track faculty may be recruited, hired, and promoted into the following positions: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor

In the Department of Plant Pathology, non-tenure track faculty may be recruited, hired, and appointed into the following positions:

- Senior instructor, advanced instructor, instructor (see University Handbook Section C12.0)
- Research professor, research associate professor, research assistant professor (see University Handbook Section C12.1)
- Senior professor of practice, professor of practice (see University Handbook Section C12.3)
- Teaching professor, teaching associate professor, teaching assistant professor (see University Handbook Section C12.4)
- Extension professor, extension associate professor, extension assistant professor (see University Handbook Section C12.5)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES – Tenure track faculty

These guidelines are not intended to supersede or replace the requirements listed in the University Handbook. A summary of the process is provided in Appendix V of this document.

General comments on tenure.

According to the University Handbook Section C100.1, "there can be no simple list of accomplishments, that, when achieved, guarantee that a faculty member will obtain tenure." Tenure is granted "based on the assessment of the tenured faculty of the university that a candidate has made outstanding contributions in the appropriate academic endeavors." Section C100.3 states "Tenure is not a right accorded to every faculty member. Nor is it granted simply as a result of a candidate's routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies."

The above noted sections suggest that the assessment of a candidate's suitability cannot solely or simply be based on meeting or exceeding expectations in the annual evaluations preceding the time period of application for tenure. For the time period preceding the application for tenure, the candidate should be deemed by the tenured faculty to have made outstanding contributions in the appropriate academic endeavors. In addition to the research, teaching, extension, and service contributions evaluated annually, outstanding contributions in the appropriate academic endeavors will be evaluated by external reviewers.

Similarly, there is no simple list of accomplishments that guarantee that a faculty member will be promoted in rank. Although no explicit time in rank is required for promotion, the median time for promotion at Kansas State University has been approximately six years. Promotion may be granted earlier when the faculty member's cumulative performance at rank clearly meets the standards for promotion.

Expectations of faculty for tenure, promotion, and beyond will depend upon the specific assignment.

General expectations for faculty are listed below; these are to be considered guidelines, not as contractual. All faculty are expected to:

- Contribute regularly to the teaching program.
- Develop and publish scholarly materials in an appropriate forum on a regular basis.
- Be “good citizens” of the department.

All faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor and above are expected to:

- Be a member of the Graduate Faculty.
- Contribute to graduate student training.
- Guide graduate students as major professor and serve on other graduate student committees.
- Obtain extramural funding to partially support their programs.

Annual Reappointments During Probationary Period (Handbook Section c50.1)

- Tenure track faculty members on probationary appointments (generally Assistant Professors) are assessed annually by the tenured faculty to determine whether they will be reappointed for another year. These annual reappointment assessments also provide constructive and substantial feedback to the faculty member about his or her performance in comparison to the department's criteria and standards for tenure. This process is separate and distinct from the Annual Evaluations process. Annual Evaluations consider only the unit member's performance during the stated cycle whereas reappointment assessments take into consideration the unit member's cumulative body of work leading to consideration for tenure and promotion.

The timing, documents, review meeting, vote, and feedback processes for annual reappointment follow those described below for mid-probationary review with the following exceptions:

- No external reference letters will be solicited for these reviews.
- The department and head assessment are forwarded to the Dean, but the materials are not reviewed by the college Promotion and Tenure committee

Mid-Probationary Review (Handbook Section C92.1- C92.4)

Timing and Materials

During the third year of appointment, each tenure-track, non-tenured faculty member will be reviewed in the same materials format and timeline as used for tenure consideration (Appendix V) with the exception of external letters which are not required but may be obtained at the discretion of the Head following consultation with tenured faculty in the department.

Discussion and Vote

The department head is responsible for making the candidate's mid-probationary review file available to the tenured faculty members in the department at least fourteen calendar days prior to the meeting to discuss the candidate's progress. The candidate's faculty mentor or other designee will present the portfolio. Based on the documentation and discussion, at least one day after the meeting, the faculty will recommend, by ballot, non-reappointment or reappointment based on satisfactory progress toward tenure. Faculty must supply anonymous comments to support their vote for or against reappointment.

Departmental Feedback

The department head shall provide a letter of assessment to the candidate, including a summary of faculty comments (redacted to protect confidentiality) and substantive, constructive feedback regarding his or her accomplishments relative to departmental tenure criteria. This letter of assessment and the faculty report will become a part of the candidate's reappointment and mid-probationary review file. The department head will discuss the review and assessment with the candidate. After receiving the assessment, the candidate has the right to submit a written response for the file.

College Review

The document of research, teaching and extension outputs, a summary of service contributions, and the results of the faculty vote and written comments, and the Head's letter will be submitted to the Dean and the College Committee for review, a vote, and written feedback to the candidate.

Tenure Evaluation and Promotion to Associate Professor

Review for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will most commonly occur during the sixth year of appointment. The schedule for applying for tenure, and candidate responsibilities, are outlined in sections C110 and C111, respectively, in the University Handbook. General departmental procedures to be followed are described in sections C112.1-C112.

Based on current policy, it is expected that a recommendation for tenure will be accompanied by a recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor. Unusual circumstances will be handled on an individual basis, such as might occur when a person being considered for tenure was hired at the level of Associate Professor. Under rare circumstances, an individual may be considered for promotion from the rank of Assistant Professor to Associate Professor prior to consideration for tenure. In such circumstances, promotion will be based on the same criteria as those outlined above for granting tenure, but without the need for the demonstration of a sustained research, teaching, and/or extension program.

Review Process

The candidate will submit the evaluation materials required by College and University guidelines, usually in early August. The Department of Plant Pathology solicits external reviews on tenure and promotion from assistant to associate professor (see sections C36.1, C111.2, and C152.2 of the University Handbook). As such, in early August, the candidate will provide a list of ten names of potential referees from outside the department, with at least eight from outside the university. From these names, the head will solicit at least five written tenure evaluations. The head will solicit an additional five external reviews from individuals of his/her choice. The candidate must present a seminar to document their achievements in research, teaching, and/or extension, usually in September or early October, prior to the review meeting. (See Appendix V).

Per the University Handbook C112.1, the Department Head is advised by the eligible tenured faculty members of the department regarding the qualifications of the candidate for tenure. Eligible faculty are those tenured members of the department who hold a rank equal to or higher than the rank being sought by the candidate. The eligible tenured department faculty advise the Department Head regarding the qualifications of the candidate for promotion or promotion and tenure by means of written or electronic ballot.

Using College and University guidelines, the candidate will be evaluated in the Department by all tenured faculty in a meeting with the Head. This meeting will be the same as that at which promotion to Associate Professor is discussed. The department head is responsible for making the candidate's file and departmental tenure criteria documents available to eligible tenured faculty members in the department at least fourteen calendar days prior to the scheduled meeting date to

discuss the candidate's petition. When appropriate, comments are solicited from students, other faculty members, and department heads/chairs in the college or university. Following the meeting, after at least one day for reflection, the faculty will conduct a written vote and provide written comments supporting their individual decisions to recommend/not recommend tenure and promotion for the candidate. Following the vote, the department head will provide a letter which includes his/her recommendation, the rationale for the recommendation, redacted faculty comments to protect anonymity, and the faculty vote to the candidate. The letter will become part of the candidate's promotion file. This letter along with, all recommendations and non-redacted written comments of the department's eligible tenured faculty members and the candidate's complete file are also forwarded to the dean. If the candidate is applying for tenure and promotion at the same time, then only a single letter need be prepared by the head.

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Areas and criteria (as applicable to appointment) used to evaluate faculty for this promotion and tenure are:

Demonstrated satisfactory ability in Teaching.

- Teaching performance should demonstrate both effectiveness and continued improvement. Thus, in addition to TEVAL scores, materials documenting course content, such as syllabi, reading lists, examinations, web content, innovative lab activities, videos, etc., will be evaluated.
- Additional materials for evaluation may include student feedback to the Head, the Head's classroom evaluations, peer classroom evaluations, competitive awards or recognition for outstanding teaching, publications on pedagogy, the candidate's responsiveness to TEVAL evaluations, participation in teaching improvement activities, and curricula innovations and development.

Demonstrated satisfactory ability in Research.

- The establishment of an extramurally-funded, focused, cogent research program reflective of a long-term research strategy.
- A consistent record of research productivity in the form of journal articles, conference proceedings, and book chapters. Consideration may be given to the quality of the outlet and the impact it may have on the profession. Invited review articles, book chapters, and invitations to speak at national and international workshops, meetings, symposia, and conferences are significant because they represent professional recognition.

Demonstrated satisfactory ability in Extension.

- Extension performance should demonstrate impact, effectiveness, and continued improvement. Thus, materials documenting program content, such as workshops, field days, oral presentations, newsletters, numbered and unnumbered publications, mass media articles, etc., videos, online content, improvement activities, extramural funds for Extension, awards and honors, cooperation, creativity, impact assessment, breadth, and Research and teaching relevant to Extension duties, will be evaluated.
- Additional materials for evaluation may include clientele/stakeholder feedback to the Head, the Head's evaluations, competitive awards or recognition for outstanding extension activities, program innovation and development, invitations to participate in program

evaluations and in regional, national, and international workshops, conferences, symposia, and meetings.

Demonstrated satisfactory ability in Service.

- Departmental, college, and university committee efforts; departmental cooperation, initiative, enthusiasm.
- In addition to departmental, college, and university-level administrative service, candidates are expected to serve their profession by participating in professional societies in various capacities, reviewing manuscripts for journals and grant proposals for funding agencies, participating in grant review panels, organizing conferences and symposia, program reviews, etc. Such participation benefits the profession, and also reflects on the standing of the candidate in the scientific community.

Annual Review of Associate Professors

In the Department of Plant Pathology, Associate Professors are reviewed annually by tenured Professors using the same process described for probationary review, including a review meeting and written comments. However, a reappointment vote is not conducted. Following the meeting and submission of written comments, the department head shall provide a letter of assessment to the faculty member, including a summary of faculty comments (redacted to protect confidentiality) and substantive, constructive feedback regarding his or her accomplishments relative to departmental promotion criteria. The department head will discuss the review and assessment with the candidate.

Promotion to Professor

Review for promotion to Professor most commonly occurs during the sixth year in rank as an Associate Professor. The candidate is reviewed by tenured Professors in the department and the department head. External reviews are not solicited. The department head is responsible for making the candidate's file and departmental tenure criteria documents available to eligible tenured faculty members in the department at least fourteen calendar days prior to the scheduled meeting date to discuss the candidate's petition.

Following the meeting to review the candidate's qualifications for promotion, the faculty will conduct a written vote, and will provide written comments supporting their individual decisions to recommend/not recommend tenure for the candidate. The department head will provide a letter which includes his/her recommendation, the rationale for the recommendation, redacted comments to protect anonymity, and the faculty vote to the candidate. The letter will become part of the candidate's promotion file. This letter along with, all recommendations and non-redacted written comments of the department's eligible tenured faculty members and the candidate's complete file are also forwarded to the dean.

Criteria for promotion to Professor

According to the University Handbook Section C120.2, *"Promotion to professor is based on attainment of excellence in the assigned responsibilities of the faculty member and recognition of*

excellence by all appropriate constituencies." The specific criteria are those outlined above for granting of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. However, candidates seeking promotion to the rank of Professor are expected to have demonstrated a sustained and consistent (1) record of productivity in terms of publications and extramural funding, (2) excellence in classroom teaching and graduate student advising, (3) excellence in extension activities, and (4) an excellent record of service to the department, college, university, and profession.

Promotion to Professor usually means that the faculty member has obtained national or international recognition in their discipline or, such as in the case of Teaching or Extension, has had a demonstrated and documentable, significant impact on their students or clientele.

Post-tenure Review

The department's 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."

A. Purpose

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 also is 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 to high professional standards.

Kansas State University recognizes that granting tenure to university faculty is vital for the protection of free inquiry and open intellectual debate. We expressly recognize 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.

B. Faculty to be Reviewed

Tenured Professors and Associate Professors are the only faculty subject to the provisions of this section. Post-tenure review occurs once every six years. The Department Head's five-year review fulfills this requirement and exempts him/her from its provisions.

Faculty may be exempted from post-tenure review if in the past six years they have been promoted to Professor, received a **Professorial Performance Award** (*see below*), entered into a phased retirement program, or have been recognized as a University Distinguished Professor, University Distinguished Graduate Faculty member or University Distinguished Teaching Scholar, or have received an award from a national or international organization for their professional excellence, *e.g.*, Fellow of a Society such as the American Phytopathological Society, American Society for Agronomy, or the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

C. Review Process

Reviews will be conducted by the Department Head during Annual Evaluations, as necessary. The Head may delegate this responsibility to a committee of three tenured faculty, who would be responsible for all of the reviews that occur in any given year.

The Department Head is responsible for:

- Retaining a record of the reviews conducted in the department,
- Notifying faculty in the summer ahead of the year that they are due for review
- Providing the faculty member with a written summary of the discussion between the faculty member and the Department Head.

Faculty must submit to the Department Head at least two weeks prior to the scheduled review:

- Copies of the six previous annual evaluations.
 - A one-page statement of their professional goals for the coming six-year period with a timeline.
 - If one or more annual evaluations were “below expectations” or “fails to meet expectations”, a one-page statement outlining steps taken to remedy the problems that led to the less than satisfactory evaluation.
-
- Following a meeting between the Department Head and the faculty member, the Department Head will prepare a letter to be signed by both the Head and the Faculty member that summarizes their discussions and indicates, in brief the faculty member’s goals for the coming six years. The outcomes of the review will be submitted to the respective Dean, who will review the materials to ensure the review is consistent with the criteria and procedures of the university and those established by the department.
 - If the faculty member disagrees with the content of the letter prepared by the Head, then they may submit a separate letter to be included with the letter prepared by the Department Head. If the determination of 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 utilized in future annual evaluations and post-tenure reviews to review progress toward any goals set in the plan.
 - Except when faculty appeals procedures directs that files be available to aggrieved faculty members, the outcome of evaluations should be confidential, that is, confined to the appropriate college or university persons or bodies and the faculty member being evaluated, released otherwise only at the discretion or with the consent of the faculty member or when required by law.

This policy applies to all faculty reviews from 2015-2016 and beyond.

Professorial Performance Awards

The intent of this award is to recognize excellence and sustained performance of full professors; it is not a promotion that all professors will receive after six years in rank. Criteria for a Professorial Performance award include:

- Eligibility for a Professorial Performance Award will begin after six years in rank as a full professor or six years after the receipt of the last Professorial Performance Award.
- The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity every year for at least the last six years.
- The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards.
- In the annual evaluation, the candidate must have received either “Exceeds” or “Greatly Exceeds” expectations in at least two of the five preceding annual evaluations. The candidate may not have received any ratings of “Below Expectations” or “Fails to Meet Expectations” in any of the five preceding annual evaluations.
- Consideration for Professorial Performance awards occurs during the annual departmental evaluation. Eligible candidates compile and submit a file that documents his/her professional accomplishments for the previous six years according to the same criteria used in annual evaluations. Depending on the candidate’s appointment, materials may include:
 - A one-page summary of major achievements during the evaluation period.
 - A one-page summary of instructional productivity, including courses taught and thesis supervision, TEVAL ratings, and other evidence of instructional quality.
 - A one-page statement of research and other creative activities accompanied by a list of publications and a list of funded grants and contracts.
 - A one-page summary of extension activity providing evidence of productivity, quality, creativity, and originality, accompanied by a list of extension publications, meetings, workshops, online content, *etc.*
 - A one-page statement of service contributions, including evidence of leadership.
 - External evaluations of the candidate are not required.

The head will review the material, prepare a written evaluation of the candidates’ materials and make a recommendation for or against the award. A copy of the head’s written evaluation and recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate. Each candidate for the award will have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the department 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 department head and to the dean. A copy of the department head's/chair’s written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate. The candidate also may submit a written statement describing unresolved differences regarding his/her evaluation to the head or to the Dean.

The recommendation and supporting documentation will be forwarded to the Dean at the same time as the annual evaluations. The submission will include:

- The department head’s evaluation and recommendation.

- A copy of the candidate's evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award.
- Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation.
- Any written statement of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation.

In the case of a negative recommendation by the Head, the candidate has seven working days after the review and discussion, to submit written statements to the Head concerning unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation. If the Head continues to maintain a negative recommendation, the candidate has the right to withdraw the application, request a vote of the faculty on his or her application, or submit a letter of rebuttal to the Dean that would accompany the application package as it goes to the Dean. If a faculty vote is requested, all tenured/tenure-track faculty are eligible to vote and results of the vote, as well as individual comments, will be forwarded to the Dean along with the recommendation of the Head.

Prospective candidates are encouraged to consult with the head to help determine if he/she meets the minimum criteria. Candidates for professorial performance awards who were denied the award the previous year are eligible to reapply in the following year.

Faculty members receiving Professorial Performance Awards reset their six-year clock for evaluation of post-tenure review.

Guidelines for Appointment and Promotion of Non-Tenure-track Faculty

Background

Policies and procedures for appointing and promoting non-tenure-track faculty are found in the University Handbook. In the Department of Plant Pathology, non-tenure track faculty may be recruited, hired, and appointed into the following positions:

- Senior instructor, advanced instructor, instructor (see University Handbook Section C12.0)
- Research professor, research associate professor, research assistant professor (see University Handbook Section C12.1)
- Senior professor of practice, professor of practice (see University Handbook Section C12.3)
- Teaching professor, teaching associate professor, teaching assistant professor (see University Handbook Section C12.4)
- Extension professor, extension associate professor, extension assistant professor (see University Handbook Section C12.5)

Appointments can be either regular, term, or adjunct (C10)

General Guidelines for Non-Tenure-track Positions in the Department of Plant Pathology

1. These ranks will be used for positions that generally fall into one or more of the following scenarios, though there may be exceptions

- a. The position is outside of the Department of Plant Pathology tenure track positions but will enhance the department's capacity to meet its research/teaching/extension mission. Example: a post-doctoral fellow has achieved substantial leadership within a research program and has a funding stream sufficient to support their salary. This individual has a largely independent research program that complements and enhances current faculty expertise and department-wide goals. *Note: if the position would enhance the program of only one faculty member the title of Research Manager may be more appropriate.*
- b. New or partial positions that facilitate spousal hires, provided the individual meets all other guidelines and is approved by the faculty.
- c. Filling essential gaps in research, teaching, or extension when budgeted positions are not available but other funding sources have been identified.
2. These ranks generally will be used for positions that:
 - a. Complement, enhance or fill the gaps of existing research, teaching, and extension missions of the Department of Plant Pathology
 - b. Have clearly identified funding source(s) in place sufficient to support the total compensation of the individual and their research/teaching/extension programs
 - c. Will continue as long as funding is available, productivity is maintained, and activities continue to complement existing programs
 - d. The position will likely end when the person filling the position leaves the department or the funding source(s) is no longer sufficient to support the position
3. Persons appointed to these ranks will be expected to:
 - a. Maintain the high academic/research/teaching/extension standards of the Department of Plant Pathology, with specific duties based on their appointment and funding.
 - b. Maintain high standards of professional ethics and scientific integrity of Kansas State University and the Department of Plant Pathology
 - c. Maintain work responsibilities, productivity and significantly commensurate with faculty in the department.
 - d. More detail on criteria for appointment are provided in the sections below.
4. Service in these positions is not credited toward tenure.
5. Faculty in these positions shall have all voting and participatory privileges within the department, except individuals on these appointments are not eligible for tenure and are not eligible to formally vote on matters of tenure or promotion for tenure-track faculty (Section C12.1 of the University Handbook). They may provide input through other mechanisms, as appropriate.
6. Individuals appointed to these ranks may expect to be promoted on the basis of demonstrated individual merit in relationship to their association with the university's mission and within their own disciplines. Each higher rank demands a higher level of research accomplishment. Generally, time in rank before being considered for promotion will be commensurate to tenure-track positions. Non-tenure track faculty are not subject to the tenure clock requirements of tenure-track faculty in their probationary

appointment. There is no simple list of accomplishments that guarantee that a faculty member will be promoted in rank. Although no explicit time in rank is required for promotion, the median time for promotion at Kansas State University has been approximately six years. Promotion may be granted earlier when the faculty member's cumulative performance at rank clearly meets the standards for promotion. Non-tenure track faculty that are interested in promotion should submit promotion documents yearly following a similar timeline to the tenure-track faculty. Individuals not interested in promotion are exempt from yearly evaluation of promotion materials.

Research appointments (University Handbook Section 12.1)

Criteria for appointment, procedure of appointment and performance expectations

Criteria for appointment to Research Assistant Professor

Note: Criteria for promotion to Research Associate Professor and Research Professor are described below. These criteria are additive to those shown here for Research Assistant Professor and will be considered for an initial appointment at those ranks

1. A Ph.D. in Plant Pathology or related field with a strong background in their area of expertise.
2. Proven ability to conceive, plan, and implement research independently.
3. Strong record of publication in peer-reviewed journals.
4. Stable funding source of funding at the time of appointment and a commitment and demonstrated capacity to develop competitive grants (as PI or Co PI) to maintain funding for their program.
5. Commitment to contributing to undergraduate and graduate student training through informal and/or formal mentoring. Graduate Faculty Membership is described in a separate section below.
6. Demonstrated recognition of research activities by presentations at national or international meetings.
7. Ability to contribute successfully to team and interdisciplinary research activities.

Procedure for appointment

1. Evaluation Committee consisting of three faculty members appointed and charged by the Department Head. If this is an external search for a new position this will function as the search committee. The Committee's responsibilities are:
 - a. Develop position description.
 - b. Screen applicants (if needed in external search) and interview candidates.
 - c. Determine if candidate(s) meet criteria for the rank and qualifications for the position.
 - d. Develop a recommendation on whether the Department Head should move forward with full faculty review/interview process.
2. Materials supplied by the candidate:
 - a. CV and supporting documents.
 - b. Statement of Research Interests and Experience.

- c. Name of three references that can address the job criteria, professional ethics and scientific integrity of the candidate.
- 3. Evaluation and appointment:
 - a. Research seminar followed by one or more interview sessions with the evaluation committee and faculty.
 - b. Non-tenure track faculty are initially appointed to a specific rank only after the tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty at or above the desired rank level have reviewed and voted favorably on the credentials of the prospective appointee.

Typical Performance Expectations for Research Assistant Professor

1. Establish and build a strong research program that complements existing research programs in the department.
2. Demonstrate potential for developing a national reputation.
3. Serve on Departmental, College, or University Committees, as appropriate to the position.
4. Contribute to scholarly professional service (such as manuscript reviews, engagement with professional societies).
5. Participation in the mentoring and educational missions of Department of Plant Pathology. (Formal Graduate Faculty Status is addressed elsewhere in this document).
6. Secure grant funding as lead PI and/or co-PI to support their research program.
7. Create a collegial environment and collaborate in multi-disciplinary research programs.

Teaching Appointments (University Handbook Section C12.4)

Criteria for appointment, procedure of appointment and performance expectations

Note: Criteria for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor and Teaching Professor are described below. These criteria are additive to those shown here for Research Assistant Professor and will be considered for an initial appointment at those ranks

Criteria for appointment to Teaching Assistant Professor

1. A Ph.D. in Plant Pathology or related field with a strong background in their area of expertise.
2. Experience teaching undergraduate/graduate courses and/or online classes.
3. Experience in designing and developing course material related to Plant Pathology or other teaching needs of the department.
4. Commitment and demonstrated capacity to secure internal and/or external funding (as PI or Co PI) that supports the educational mission of the Department.
5. Experience and success working with diverse groups of students.
6. Ability and desire to participate in team and interdisciplinary instructional activities.

Procedure for appointment

1. Evaluation Committee consisting of three members appointed and charged by the Department Head. If this is an external search for a new position this will function as the core of the search committee. The Committee's responsibilities are:
 - a. Develop position description.

- b. Screen applicants (if needed in external search) and interview candidates.
 - c. Determine if candidate(s) meet criteria for the rank and qualifications for the position.
 - d. Develop a recommendation on whether the Department Head should move forward with full faculty review/interview process.
2. Materials supplied by the candidate:
- a. CV and supporting documents.
 - b. Statement of Teaching Interest and Philosophy.
 - c. Name of three references that can address the job criteria, professional ethics and scientific integrity of the candidate.
2. Evaluation and Appointment:
- a. Teaching seminar followed by one or more sessions with the faculty.
 - b. Meet with graduate students.
 - c. Non-tenure track faculty are initially appointed to a specific rank only after the tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty at or above the desired rank level have reviewed and voted favorably on the credentials of the prospective appointee.

Typical Performance Expectations for Teaching Assistant Professor

1. Establish and build a strong instructional program that complements existing courses.
2. Demonstrate potential for developing a national reputation.
3. Serve on Departmental, College, or University Committees as appropriate to the position.
4. Contribute to scholarly professional service (such as manuscript reviews, engagement with professional societies).
5. Advise undergraduate students and departmental student organizations.
6. Participation in the mentoring and educational missions of Department of Plant Pathology. (Graduate Faculty status is described elsewhere in this document).
7. Secure funding as lead PI or co-PI to enhance their teaching activities.
8. Create a collegial environment and collaborate in multi-disciplinary activities.

Extension appointments (University Handbook section C12.5)

Criteria for appointment, procedure of appointment and performance expectations

Criteria for appointment to Extension Assistant Professor

Note: Criteria for promotion to Extension Associate Professor and Extension Professor are described below. These criteria are additive to those shown here for Research Assistant Professor and will be considered for an initial appointment at those ranks

1. A Ph.D. in Plant Pathology or related field with a strong background in their area of expertise.
2. Experience in extension activities including applied research, field days, and conferences, and online educational delivery.
3. Experience in leadership of developing, planning, and implementing extension programs.
4. Commitment and demonstrated capacity to secure competitive grants (as PI or Co PI) to maintain funding for their program.

5. Experience working with diverse groups of stakeholders.
6. Demonstrated impact or recognition of applied research activities by presentations at national or international meetings.
7. Ability to participate in team and interdisciplinary outreach activities.

Procedures for appointment

1. Evaluation Committee consisting of three members appointed and charged by the Department Head. If this is an external search for a new position this will function as the core of the search committee. The Committee's responsibilities are:
 - a. Develop position description.
 - b. Screen applicants (if needed in external search) and interview candidates.
 - c. Determine if candidate(s) meet criteria for the rank and qualifications for the position.
 - d. Develop a recommendation on whether the Department Head should move forward with full faculty review/interview process.
2. Materials supplied by the candidate:
 - a. CV and supporting documents.
 - b. Statement of Extension Experience, Interests and Philosophy.
 - c. Name of three references that can address the job criteria, professional ethics and scientific integrity of the candidate.
3. Evaluation and Appointment process:
 - a. Extension seminar followed by one or more sessions with the faculty.
 - b. Non-tenure track faculty are initially appointed to a specific rank only after the tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty at or above the desired rank level have reviewed and voted favorably on the credentials of the prospective appointee.

Typical Performance Expectations for Extension Assistant Professors

1. Establish and build a strong extension program that complements existing extension activities.
2. Demonstrate potential for developing a national reputation.
3. Serve on Departmental, College, or University Committees as appropriate to the position.
4. Contribute to scholarly professional service (such as manuscript reviews, engagement with professional societies).
5. Contribute to training undergraduates in extension.
6. Contribute to or lead applied research to support the extension program
7. Participation in the mentoring and educational missions of Department of Plant Pathology.
8. Secure funding as lead PI or co-PI to support his/her program.
9. Create a collegial environment and collaborate in multi-disciplinary activities.

Procedures for Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty

The procedures for promotion will be commensurate with the processes for promotion of tenure-track faculty outlined in the University Handbook. Non-tenure-track faculty will submit progress-toward-promotion documents at the start of the fall semester each year for review by senior faculty. There may be rare exceptions when a non-tenure-track faculty member does not wish to be reviewed for future promotion and in a case-by-case basis they may opt out of this review process. However, to be considered for promotion individuals need a track record of consistent annual review of their progress toward promotion.

The typical time in rank before consideration for promotion is approximately at least 6 years. In the year of promotion review, the applicant will provide their documentation for evaluation and deliver a departmental seminar. Criteria used will be those relevant to the assignment of duties of the position, as described below for the different tracks. External review letters will be solicited. As such, in early August, the candidate will provide a list of ten names of potential referees from outside the department, with at least eight from outside the university. From these names, the head will solicit at least 3-5 written evaluations. The head will solicit an additional 3-5 external reviews from individuals of his/her choice. The yearly timeline is set by Department Head to facilitate internal processes required to submit information to the College in time for the College Promotion and Tenure Committee's annual meeting.

All tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty at or above the rank to which the non-tenure track faculty member is requesting promotion will evaluate the submitted materials and seminar, discuss the materials in a meeting, and vote by ballot. The faculty will provide written comments to support their vote. The department head will notify the applicant of the outcome of the departmental decision, along with faculty comments (redacted to protect anonymity). If the vote for promotion is favorable, the outcome will be submitted in writing to the applicant and copied to the Dean and the faculty who participated in the review. If approved by the department, promotions in rank for non-tenure-track positions will be reviewed by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

In the event of a negative decision at the department level, the department head will provide in writing a summary of the faculty's rationale for the decision to the applicant, the faculty who participated in the decision, and the Dean. An appeal of a negative decision may be made by the applicant in writing to the department head.

If a promotion is recommended, the department head will decide with the the dean on the type (regular or term) and potential length of the new appointment and communicate the decision in writing to the candidate. (Details about term and regular appointments are in the University Handbook. For example, see section C11 for term appointments and section C160.1 for standards for non-reappointment for regular appointments.), A job description and set of expectations must be clearly defined in the offer letter.

Non-tenure track faculty may be elected as regular or special members of the KSU Graduate Faculty and direct graduate students if the academic department and Graduate Council approves the nomination. Regular membership in Graduate Faculty includes the expectations of broader

contributions to the department teaching and graduate training mission. Procedures are described below in Membership in Graduate Faculty, and Guidelines for Graduate Faculty Doctoral certification.

For each category below, distinctions between term and regular appointments are listed in the referenced section of the University Handbook.

Promotion criteria - Research appointments (University Handbook Section 12.1))

Criteria for the initial appointment to Research Assistant Professor are described above.

Typically, criteria for promotion to **Research Associate Professor** are:

- National recognition for their scientific research.
- Publications in international, refereed journals as appropriate to the percentage research appointment.
- Presentations at scientific meetings.
- Service on committees within the Department of Plant Pathology, College and/or University.
- Professional service to scientific communities, such as reviewing for national and international scientific journals and granting agencies, working on scientific meeting organizing committees.
- Demonstrated ability to obtain external funding as lead PI and/or co PI.
- Demonstrated contributions to the educational mission of the Department, including student mentoring, guest teaching, and/or other training activities.

Typically, criteria for promotion to **Research Professor** are:

- National and international recognition for their scientific research and a distinguished record of research excellence.
- Consistent record of service on committees within the Department of Plant Pathology, College and/or University including leadership roles.
- Sustained external funding and a substantial record of significant publications in peer-reviewed journals.
- National or international professional service including leadership roles such as editorship or membership on an editorial board of internationally peer-reviewed journal(s), chair of a national or international scientific meeting(s), or service on a board for scientific granting organizations.
- Demonstrated contributions to the educational mission of the Department, including student mentoring, guest teaching, and/or other training activities.

Promotion criteria - Teaching Appointments (University Handbook Section C12.4)

Teaching-track appointments will focus on instruction, but may have other responsibilities as defined in their appointment. Individuals appointed to these positions should have research credentials consistent with criteria for **Teaching Assistant Professor** described above. There is

no simple list of accomplishments that guarantee that a faculty member will be promoted in rank. Although no explicit time in rank is required for promotion, the median time for promotion at Kansas State University has been approximately six years. Promotion may be granted earlier when the faculty member's cumulative performance at rank clearly meets the standards for promotion.

Typically, requirements for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor are:

- Proof of excellence and leadership in teaching at the college level through student evaluations, peer review, teaching improvement activities, teaching innovations and creativity, formal scholarship of teaching publications and/or presentations, and teaching service.
- Service on committees within the Department of Plant Pathology, College and/or University.
- Regional and/or national professional service such as serving on teaching-related committees and working groups within professional societies.

Typically, requirements for promotion to Teaching Professor are:

- Sustained proof of excellence and leadership in teaching at the college level through student evaluations, peer review, teaching improvement activities, formal scholarship of teaching publications and/or presentations, and a national reputation for teaching service.
- Consistent record of service on committees within the Department of Plant Pathology, College and/or University including leadership roles.
- National professional service such as serving on teaching-related committees and working groups within professional societies.

Extension appointments (University Handbook section C12.5)

Criteria for extension excellence are comparable to those of tenure-track faculty and extension track faculty members. Individuals appointed to these positions should have research credentials consistent with criteria for appointment to **Extension Assistant Professor** described above. There is no simple list of accomplishments that guarantee that a faculty member will be promoted in rank. Although no explicit time in rank is required for promotion, the median time for promotion at Kansas State University has been approximately six years. Promotion may be granted earlier when the faculty member's cumulative performance at rank clearly meets the standards for promotion.

Typically, requirements for promotion to Extension Associate Professor are:

- Proof of excellence and leadership in extension through extension evaluations, peer review, extension improvement activities, extramural extension funding, formal scholarship of extension publications and/or presentations.
- regionally-recognized extension-related professional service.
- Service on committees within the Department of Plant Pathology, College and/or University.

Typically, requirements for promotion to Extension Professor are:

- Sustained proof of excellence and leadership in extension through extension evaluations, peer review, extension improvement activities, extramural extension funding, formal scholarship of extension publications and/or presentations.
- Nationally-recognized extension service.
- Consistent record of service on committees within the Department of Plant Pathology, College and/or University including leadership roles.

Instructor Appointments (University Handbook section C12.0)

Appointments at the rank of instructor, advanced instructor, and senior instructor will primarily be committed to instruction, although broader expectations and assignments can be made as a part of the appointment. Individuals on the Instructor-track are not required to hold the terminal degree appropriate to the discipline. Instructors in Plant Pathology are not eligible for tenure, but are eligible for regular appointments. There is no simple list of accomplishments that guarantee that a faculty member will be promoted in rank. Although no explicit time in rank is required for promotion, the median time for promotion at Kansas State University has been approximately six years. Promotion may be granted earlier when the faculty member's cumulative performance at rank clearly meets the standards for promotion.

Typically, requirements for appointment to service as **Instructor** are:

- Evidence of excellence in teaching at the college level, through student evaluations, peer review, teaching improvement activities, or other scholarship of teaching.
- Evidence of excellence in other university mission areas as appropriate to their individual job description.

Typically, requirements for promotion to **Advanced Instructor** are:

1. Demonstrated individual merit in relationship to their association with the university's mission and within their discipline. For example:
 - Evidence of sustained excellence in teaching at the college level, through student evaluations, peer review, teaching improvement activities, or other scholarship of teaching.
 - Evidence of excellence in other university mission areas as appropriate to their individual job description.
 - Service on committees within the Department of Plant Pathology, College and University.

Typically, requirements for promotion to **Senior Instructor** are:

1. Evidence of sustained excellence and leadership in the defined role of the position.
2. Consistent record of service on committees within the Department of Plant Pathology, College and University including leadership roles.

Professor of practice appointments (University Handbook Section C12.3)

- Senior professor of practice, professor of practice.
- Individuals appointed to these positions should have substantial non-academic experience and credentials appropriate to the discipline. The primary responsibility for faculty on these appointments will be teaching, research, or outreach and service or some combination of these duties. The entire set of expectations must be clearly defined in the offer letter.

Individuals appointed to the rank of professor of practice may be promoted to senior professor of practice on the basis of demonstrated individual merit in relationship to their association with the university's mission and within their discipline. The senior professor of practice position demands a higher level of accomplishment consistent with the expectations based on specific criteria, standards, and guidelines. Criteria are similar to those described in the teaching, extension, and research tracks described above.

Appointment of Adjunct Faculty (C25.1 and PPM, Chapter 4650.)

Adjunct faculty are affiliated with the department to help the department fulfill expectations and achieve its goals. These individuals may hold positions in government, *e.g.*, USDA, commercial companies, or research institutes or educational institutions in the United States or elsewhere. When an individual is appointed it may be as an Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor or Adjunct Professor, based on their appointment at their home institution.

Appointment to adjunct status must be requested by the candidate and endorsed by at least one current faculty member who actively collaborates with the individual. Initial appointment to adjunct status will be conducted by faculty vote after review of a one-page letter of intended role/collaborations, CV, seminar presentation, and discussion at a faculty meeting. *Rare exceptions may occur. For example when a current faculty member is departing and adjunct status is mainly to facilitate closing of projects and finishing student committee service the faculty may vote to skip the CV review and seminar component.*

Reappointment at a higher rank may be considered if the faculty member is promoted at their home institution or has demonstrated similar academic achievement.

Adjunct appointments will be reviewed every three years. The adjunct faculty seeking renewal must supply a current CV and a one-page description of intended collaborations for the next 3 years and must be endorsed by at least one regular faculty member. The faculty will then vote whether to renew for an additional three years.

If the collaborative relationship ends, such as through retirement or end of the collaborative project, the Department may vote at any time to end the appointment and inform the faculty member.

Membership in Graduate Faculty, and Guidelines for Graduate Faculty Doctoral certification

Policies and procedures related to Graduate Faculty are outlined in the Graduate Handbook, Chapter 5. Only members holding membership in graduate faculty may vote on matters affecting this group (University Handbook section C10 and FSM 2-14-90). Policy changes in the KSU Graduate Handbook supersede the guidance listed here.

The Graduate Handbook defines several categories of membership and committee service options. Regular members of the Graduate Faculty may serve as major professors for M.S. students and serve on the advisory committee of M.S. and Ph.D. students. To serve as major professor of Ph.D. students, faculty must also be certified to direct doctoral students.

Adjunct faculty may be nominated as members of the Graduate Faculty following procedures outlined in the KSU Graduate Handbook. Non-tenure track faculty also may be nominated as members or associated members of the Graduate Faculty following procedures outlined in the KSU Graduate Handbook.

PhD Certification:

- In general, tenure-track positions in the Department of Plant Pathology are expected to serve as major professors for PhD students. The job description and interview assessments are designed to evaluate candidate suitability and is considered as part of the hiring process and the vote for certification will occur during that time.
 - For faculty in positions where the above is not the case, additional review for certification will be required before an individual can direct doctoral students.
 - Candidates for doctoral certification will:
 - Have terminal degree in Plant Pathology or a related area.
 - Be an author or a co-author of at least four refereed journal articles in Plant Pathology or a related area during the last four years.
 - Have at least one of the following significant experiences supervising student research:
 - Direct supervision of undergraduate student research for at least two years; or
 - Service as the major advisor for a M.S. student for at least two years; or
 - Service as the major advisor for a M.S. student who has completed their degree; or
 - Service on the supervisory committee of a Ph.D. student for at least two years; or
 - Service on the supervisory committee of a Ph.D. student who has completed their degree.

- For non-tenure-track faculty - Have stable funding in place to fund their own position for the anticipated duration of a PhD student.

A member of the Graduate Faculty who leaves the employ of Kansas State University ceases to be a member of the Graduate Faculty but may continue as a member of a master's or doctoral committee for up to one year.

Expectations of Graduate Faculty:

Broadly, “The purpose of the Graduate Faculty is to conduct the graduate degree programs of the University.”

All members of the Graduate Faculty are expected to:

- Be familiar with the policies and procedures in the KSU Graduate Handbook.
- Be familiar with all course and curriculum requirements for graduate students.
- Be familiar with student support offices at KSU (Student Life, etc.).
- Contribute to the broad educational mission of the Department through informal mentoring of students outside their laboratory group, participation in student seminars, participation in faculty meetings focused on graduate program topics.
- Foster their own professional development in teaching and mentoring.
- Complete all required evaluations of students for graduate program and Department processes.
- Be familiar with and follow KSU policies and procedures for individuals in supervisory positions.

ANNUAL EVALUATION PROTOCOL – TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

- 1) In early December, the Department Head requests that tenured and tenure-track faculty members prepare their annual evaluation documents. All documentation should be submitted to the Head by exact date as determined annually by the Head (generally in late Dec or early Jan).
- 2) Each Faculty member prepares their annual evaluation documents relevant for their job assignment (Research, Teaching, Extension and Service). These documents will include summary tables that report the most recent 3 years of activity for research, extension and service, as well as the most recent 4 years of teaching activity (Appendix I). The submitted materials will also include an updated professional *Curriculum Vitae* (CV) or the template in Appendix 1 documenting the information contained in the summary tables, a bulleted list of service contributions, one-page summary of career accomplishments, a one-page bulleted list reporting on goals from the previous year and professional goals for the coming year. A brief summary of special circumstances can also be submitted for consideration by the Department Head (optional).
- 3) The Department Head reviews the annual evaluation documents. This evaluation consists of both quantitative and subjective portions. In the quantitative evaluation, the Head uses the information provided in the summary tables to calculate a numerical score for the relevant areas of job responsibility in Research, Teaching and Extension (These calculations are described in Appendix II). The Head compares these scores to performance expectations based on median and quartiles of historical faculty performance given different types of job responsibilities developed by the faculty. The Head uses the quantitative evaluation and other supporting documentation to inform their subjective evaluation of faculty performance. Overall performance of each faculty member is assigned a rating within the following categories: 5 = greatly exceeded expectations, 4 = exceeded expectations, 3 = met expectations, 2 = fallen below expectations but as met minimum acceptable levels of productivity, and 1 = fallen below minimal acceptable levels of productivity.

Because the evaluation covers a multi-year period, the quantitative scores of individuals with fewer than 4 years of service are less informative. In this case, the overall evaluation will depend more heavily on the subjective measures of performance.

- 4) By February, the Head provides each faculty member with an Annual Evaluation Summary. This summary includes numerical scores of faculty performance described above (section 3), a brief narrative summarizing strengths in performance, and suggestions for improvement. The narrative will document progress on goals for the current evaluation year and a discussion of goals for the coming year.
- 5) Faculty with a rank of Assistant or Associate Professor will meet with the Department Head to review his or her Annual Evaluation Summary. Assistant and Associate Professors may request that their mentor(s) participate in the meeting. In most cases, this meeting is optional for faculty at the Professor rank. Faculty at the rank of Professor should meet with the Head if they are scheduled for a sabbatical leave or plan some other change in job responsibility. In

these meetings, the Head and faculty member will discuss: a) accomplishments; b) degree to which goals for the previous year were achieved; c) any special circumstances influencing professional activities in the past or coming year; d) expectations and/or need for altering the next year's goals and focus in the coming year. It is the responsibility of the Department Head to specify any concerns about performance and it is the responsibility of the faculty member to seek clarification in any area. After this meeting, the Head may revise to the performance evaluation if appropriate. If a faculty member and the Head are unable to resolve major differences of opinion on the evaluation, the faculty member may submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding the evaluations to the Department Head and the Dean of the College of Agriculture within seven working days of their meeting with the Head.

- 6) All faculty must sign the Evaluation Summary acknowledging that they had the opportunity to review and to discuss the evaluation and his or her performance. Following faculty and Department Head signing, the Faculty Performance Evaluation Summary becomes a document of record for the evaluation year.
- 7) The Department Head develops a summary of faculty performance as directed by the Dean and the Provost. This generally includes a table summarizing the overall performance rankings for each faculty member. In some cases the Dean may request the Faculty Performance Evaluation document. This information is submitted to the Dean of the College of Agriculture on or before the deadline established by the College.
- 8) When merit increases are available, the Head will recommend a salary adjustment for each faculty member. The recommended increases will be based on the five performance categories. Faculty in the highest category (5 - Excellent) will receive the greatest salary increases followed by those that received a ranking of 4 - Exceeds Expectations, then those with a rank of 3 - Meets Expectations, etc. For faculty within the first 3 years of their appointment, the Head has the option of a) recommending an increase based on the individual's evaluation based on time with their current job, b) recommending an average increase, or c) recommending the larger of the above, since the length of time for evaluating performance was limited.
- 9) When a faculty member has a temporary change in assignment or duty station, such as going on a sabbatical leave or interim position within the university, the faculty member will draft goals reflecting the anticipated changes to their job responsibilities. These goals should reflect the departmental evaluation criteria, as well as specific, measurable goals and performance standards. The adjustment to job responsibilities and goals must be reviewed and approved by the Head. At the close of the year, the faculty member will be evaluated relative to his or her performance on the adjusted job responsibilities and the agreed-upon goals. These expectations could be developed from the sabbatical application or from other available documentation. If there is a supervisor at the new assignment, this supervisor's evaluation should be utilized as appropriate. In these circumstances, the Head will evaluate the faculty member's performance by prorating for time spent with the respective assignments.

10) In accordance with Section C31.5 – C31.8 of the K-State University Handbook (Chronic Low Achievement), any tenured faculty member that fails to carry out the responsibilities outlined in their job description or does not meet the minimum performance expectations (Appendix III) will be considered to have “fallen below minimal acceptable levels of productivity”. Faculty who fail to achieve the minimal acceptable level of productivity are subject to the procedures and criteria in Section C31.5. That is, if a tenured faculty member's overall performance falls below the minimum acceptable level of productivity for his/her major responsibility, the Head shall inform the faculty member of situation in writing and document a plan for improved performance of the faculty member. In subsequent annual evaluations, the faculty member will report on activities aimed at improving performance and document evidence of improvement. Section 31.7 of the University Handbook should also be consulted for additional remedial options in this process. If the faculty member has two successive overall evaluations indicating that they have “fallen below the minimum-acceptable level of productivity”, or a total of three such evaluations in any five-year period in which minimum standards are not met, then "dismissal for cause" will be considered at the discretion of the Dean.

A faculty member in this category may request an independent evaluation of his or her performance by an ad hoc Department Appeals Committee; this committee will be composed of three faculty members selected from within the department by the Head. The Appeals Committee will review the annual evaluation documents submitted by the faculty member and the performance evaluation summaries prepared by the Head. The committee will advise the Department Head whether or not they support the faculty's performance rating.

ANNUAL EVALUATION PROTOCOL – NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

Non-tenure track faculty are classified as:

1. Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Professor
 2. Extension Assistant Professor, Extension Associate Professor, Extension Professor
 3. Teaching Assistant Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, Teaching Professor
 4. Instructor, Advanced Instructor, Senior Instructor
 5. Professor of Practice, Senior Professor of Practice
-
- 1) In early December, the Department Head requests that non-tenure-track faculty members prepare their annual evaluation documents. All documentation should be submitted to accommodate the date(s) as determined by the Head (generally in late Dec or early Jan).
 - 2) Each Faculty member prepares their annual evaluation documents relevant for their job assignment (Research, Teaching, and/or Extension). These documents should include completing summary tables that report the three most recent three (3) years of activity for research, extension and service as well as 4 years of teaching activity. These tables should be supported by an updated professional Curriculum Vitae (CV) highlighted to show the relevant information for the evaluation period. Similar information could also be provided via the templates provided. Each faculty should provide a list of professional goals for the coming year for each area of appointment and report on progress and goals from the previous year. When appropriate, a brief summary of special circumstances may be submitted for consideration by the Department Head and direct supervisor (if other than the Department Head). Appendix I provides templates and guidelines for the submitted materials.
 - 3) The Department Head reviews the annual evaluation documents and develops an Evaluation Summary. The Head shares this information with the faculty's direct supervisor. The Head and supervisor then determine the overall performance of the faculty member in each area of their job responsibility. The overall performance is assigned a rating within the following categories: 5 = greatly exceeded expectations, 4 = exceeded expectations, 3 = met expectations, 2 = fallen below expectations but met minimum acceptable levels of productivity, and 1 = fallen below minimal acceptable levels of productivity.
 - 4) By the end of February, the Department Head provides each faculty member with an Annual Evaluation Summary. This summary includes an evaluation of faculty performance in each area of appointment, and a brief narrative summarizing strengths in each area as well as suggestions for improvement. The narrative will also document progress on goals for the current evaluation year and a discussion of goals for the coming year.
 - 5) Faculty with a rank of Assistant or Associate Professor, Instructor, Advanced Instructor, or Professor of Practice are expected to meet with the Department Head and supervisor to review the Annual Evaluation Summary. This meeting is optional for faculty at the Professor, Senior Instructor, or Senior Professor of Practice rank. In this meeting, the Head, supervisor and faculty member will discuss: a) accomplishments; b) degree to which goals for the previous year were achieved; c) any special circumstances influencing professional activities

in the past or coming year; d) expectations and/or need for altering the next year's goals and focus in the coming year. It is the responsibility of the supervisor and Head to specify any concerns and it is the responsibility of the faculty member to seek clarification in any area. After this meeting, the supervisor and Head may make revisions to the performance evaluation if appropriate. If a faculty member, supervisor and Head are unable to resolve major differences of opinion on the evaluation, the faculty member may submit written statements documenting these differences to the supervisor, Head and the Dean of the College of Agriculture within seven working days of their original meeting.

- 6) All faculty must sign the Evaluation Summary acknowledging that they had the opportunity to review and to discuss the evaluation and his or her performance rating. Following faculty and Head signing, and acceptance by the Dean, the Faculty Performance Evaluation Summary becomes a document of record for that evaluation year.
- 7) The Department Head develops a summary of faculty performance as directed by the Dean and the Provost. This generally includes a table summarizing the overall performance rankings for each faculty member. This information is submitted to the Dean of the College of Agriculture on or before the deadline established by the College.
- 8) When merit salary increases are possible, the Department Head and supervisor will recommend a salary adjustment for each non-tenure track faculty member. The recommended increases will be based on the five performance categories. Faculty in the highest category (5 - Excellent) will receive the greatest salary increases followed by those that received a ranking of 4 - Exceeds Expectations, then those with a rank of 3 - Meets Expectations, etc.
- 9) When a faculty member has a temporary change in job responsibilities or duty station within the university, the faculty member will draft goals reflecting the anticipated changes to their job responsibilities. These goals should reflect the departmental evaluation criteria, as well as specific, measurable goals and performance standards. The adjustment to job responsibilities and goals must be reviewed and approved by the Head/supervisor. At the close of the year, the faculty member will be evaluated relative to his or her performance on the adjusted job responsibilities and the agreed-upon goals. If there is a supervisor at the new assignment, this supervisor's evaluation should be utilized as appropriate. In these circumstances, the departmental supervisor will evaluate the faculty member's performance by prorating for time spent with the respective assignments.
- 10) Faculty members on regular non-tenure track appointments (see University Handbook [C60](#)) are evaluated annually to determine whether or not they will be reappointed for another year. These faculty members must be explicitly informed in writing of a decision not to renew their appointments in accordance with The Standards of Notice of Non-Reappointment.

Appendix I. Description of Materials Supporting Faculty Evaluations

Each faculty is responsible for completing and submitting the following materials to the Department Head. All documents must be submitted electronically on or before the date identified by the Head. This date generally falls in late December or early January.

These documents will include:

- 1) Summary tables for Research, Teaching, Extension, and Service (templates provided below).

- 2) Documents supporting the information provided in the summary tables:

Option 1: Submit a *Curriculum Vitae* (CV) that clearly documents the information contained in the summary tables. This can be done by highlighting the relevant information for this evaluation period using a text-highlighting tool to color the items for the years under consideration.

or

Option 2: Complete the templates provided below the summary tables below.

- 3) Summary of career accomplishments and impact in all areas of appointment (1 page).
- 4) Bulleted list reporting on goals from the previous year and professional goals for the coming year in all areas of appointment (1 page).
- 5) Brief summary of special circumstances (optional, 1 page).

Faculty Name:

Evaluation Year: 2020

Job Responsibilities Research 00%, Teaching 00%, Extension 00%

Research Contributions (Last 3 Years)

| | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | 3-Year Total |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------------|
| Publications | | | | |
| High impact refereed journals | | | | |
| Other refereed journals | | | | |
| Patent activity | | | | |
| Germplasm release | | | | |
| Book – author or editor | | | | |
| Book Chapter – author | | | | |
| Technical Reports - <i>Plant Disease Management Reports</i> | | | | |
| Non-refereed articles | | | | |
| Extramural funding | | | | |
| Invited seminar & meeting presentations | | | | |
| Contributed presentations | | | | |

Refereed articles in Cell, Nature, Science, PNAS and journals with an impact factor ≥ 10 (documentation provided by faculty member) count as two.

The patent does not count again if it is issued or subdivided.

For the purpose of calculating extramural dollars received from grants that include multiple PIs in the Plant Pathology department, the dollars incoming to the department are divided according to the percent effort attributed to faculty member PIs and co-PIs in the department (Percent Effort Documented in the Project Transmittal Sheets).

Provide a CV with relevant information highlighted or complete the template below:

Template for Research Evaluation Materials

Publications (Include only items published during evaluation period. Do not include publications, in-press, submitted or in revision. Include a Kansas Ag. Experiment Station number for each publication)

Refereed journals

highlight publications in high impact journals

(*Cell, Nature, Science, PNAS, or other journal with an impact factor >10*)

Patent Activity (patent filed or provisional patent received)

Germplasm release

Book Author or Editor

Book Chapter

Technical reports – *Plant Disease Management Reports*

Non-refereed articles

Presentations

Invited seminar or meeting presentations

Contributed presentations

Extension Contributions (Last 3 Years)

| | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | 3-Year Total |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|
| Materials | | | | |
| Numbered extension publications & videos | | | | |
| KSRE Extension article (newsletter or equivalent) | | | | |
| Major reports | | | | |
| Speaker – Extension meeting & plot tours | | | | |
| Web pages, social media, blogs (primary responsibility) | | | | |
| Radio & TV interviews | | | | |
| Laboratory diagnoses | | | | |
| In-field diagnoses | | | | |
| Agent Evaluations | | | | |
| Average | - | - | - | |

¹Descriptions of materials

- Numbered Extension publications = lead or co-author of an official KSRE publication.
- Trade articles = author of an article in a print or electronic trade or popular press publication.
- KSRE article = author of print or e-newsletters or equivalents (a substantial post on FaceBook, for example, that could serve as a stand-alone article). Online material must be archived or otherwise accessible/available to allow verification. Duplicate publication of the same material in multiple locations will only be counted once. If the different publications are in different categories, then the faculty member may choose the category in which the publication is to be counted.
- Major report = This category could include a comprehensive report of diagnostic laboratory activities, GPDN documentation/accreditation reports, etc.
- Web page, Twitter account, or Facebook = primary responsibility for building and maintaining structure and content. In the table list the platform, and provide details on activity below, such as # of posts, # of followers, etc.
- Newspaper/radio/TV/trade publication interviews, including working with K-State Marketing and Communications for K-State press releases.

²Quantitative items tabulated for consideration in the subjective evaluation by the Department Head may include the number of samples diagnosed and the number of field diagnoses performed.

⁴Each Extension faculty member will provide annually to the head a list of ten names of potential reviewers, such as county extension agents, state extension specialists, regulatory officials, etc., who have not been used as reviewers in the previous two years. Reviewers will provide information translated to a quantitative score. In addition, open-ended comments by reviewers will be taken into consideration for the Head’s subjective score (template for agent questions is provided in Appendix IV).

Provide a CV with relevant information highlighted or complete the template below:

Numbered extension publications & videos

KSRE Extension article (newsletter or equivalent)

Major reports

Speaker – Extension meeting & plot tours

Web pages, social media, blogs (primary responsibility)

Other Extension Activities (*report numbers*)

Radio & TV interviews

Laboratory diagnoses

In-field diagnoses

Teaching Contributions (Last 4 Years)

Classroom instruction

Complete using relevant TEVAL documents

| Course | Credits | Sem/Year | # students | TEVAL | | | Co-instructors |
|--------|---------|----------|------------|---------|----------|-----|----------------|
| | | | | Q-1 adj | Q-14 adj | Avg | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

*Adjusted (ADJ) or non-adjusted (RAW) TEVAL scores can be used, whichever is most beneficial. Adjusted scores are most useful for large enrollment classes and RAW scores are more meaningful for low enrollment classes.
If a course is not taught as scheduled, provide an explanation.

Additional related information (Last 4 Years)

Provide a CV with the relevant information highlighted or complete the template below:

Graduate Students

| Name | Degree | Department | Role ¹ | Start Date | Program of Study Approved | Preliminary exam date | Final defense date |
|------|--------|------------|-------------------|------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

¹Role: MP – major professor; CM – Committee Member; OC – Outside chair; RM – Rotational mentor.

Summarize by year other teaching activities (Last 4 Years)

e.g. TA & GRA student training; teaching improvement activities; training TAs; undergraduate student advising; teaching publications and presentations; extramural teaching funds; teaching awards and honors; guest lectures at KSU or elsewhere.

Service Contributions (Last 3 Years)

(List the number of articles or grants handled)

| Activity | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Total |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| Senior Editor | | | | |
| Associate/Consulting Editor | | | | |
| <i>ad hoc</i> external manuscript reviews | | | | |
| Grant review panels | | | | |
| <i>ad hoc</i> external grant reviews | | | | |
| Committees – chair/total | | | | |

Provide a CV with the relevant information highlighted for the 3 years under consideration or complete the template below.

(*Optional* - Provide a one (1) line description of the other service activity and define your role)

Senior Editor – This position is one that assigns reviewers, evaluates reviews, determines a manuscript’s acceptability and works with authors to produce an acceptable final version. Specify journal and number of manuscripts handled.

Associate/Consulting Editor/Editorial Board Member – This position provides regular reviews for a journal and is listed in the front matter of each issue. Specify journal and number of manuscripts handled.

***Ad hoc* external manuscript reviews** – This position provides occasional reviews for a journal and is recognized by a listing once per year in the journal. Specify journal and number of manuscripts handled.

Grant Review Panels – Specify agency/institution, number of grants, and date(s) of panel meeting. Indicate if you were panel manager/chair.

***Ad hoc* external grant reviews** –Specify agency/institution and number of grants reviewed.

Committees –Provide a list of all committees, including departmental, college, university committees plus committees external to the university for professional societies, government, etc. Indicate if you were the chair of the committee. *Optional*: include brief one-line description of committee’s work and your role.

Other service activities (*include a one-line description*)

Appendix II – Performance Expectations – Tenure Track Faculty

This document provides guidelines for the quantitative portions of the annual evaluation of tenure track faculty. The categories and standards below detail the weighting of items considered in the summary tables provided by each faculty and how this information is compared to historical standards of faculty performance within the department.

Categories and Standards for Evaluating Research

| Weight (%) | Category | Standards | Rating |
|------------|---|---|---------------|
| 60 | Publications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refereed article¹ = 1, • Patent filed or provisional patent received² = 1, • Germplasm release = 1, • Book author or editor= 3, • Book chapter author or editor = 1, • Plant Disease Management Reports = 0.25 • Non-refereed article = 0.1, | 3-year WEIGHTED totals assigned to a quartile based on performance of Plant Pathology faculty in the previous year's 3-year rolling average | <u>× 0.60</u> |
| 30 | Funding. ³ Extramural (grant dollars received) | 3-year totals assigned to a quartile based on performance of Plant Pathology faculty the previous year | <u>× 0.30</u> |
| 10 | Presentations of research information. (number of symposia, seminars, abstracts) | 3-year totals assigned to a quartile based on performance of Plant Pathology faculty the previous year | <u>× 0.10</u> |

¹Refereed articles in *Cell*, *Nature*, *Science*, *PNAS* and journals with an impact factor ≥ 10 (documentation provided by faculty member) count as two.

²The patent does not count again if it is issued or subdivided.

³In the case that a proposal includes multiple PI's, funding amounts are divided among the PIs according to the contributions documented in the grant proposal transmittal sheet.

Categories and Standards for Evaluating Teaching

| Weight (%) | Category | Standards | Rating |
|------------|---|---|---------------|
| 50 | <p>Student evaluations. (TEVAL¹; average of the scores for questions numbered 1 & 14). TEVAL report must be submitted as documentation. Failure to submit a TEVAL report results in a default score of 2.0.</p> | <p>TEVAL score (1-5) taken directly as standard. Evaluation based on 4 year average of TEVAL scores.</p> <p><i>The more favorable of RAW or Adjusted TEVAL may be used.</i></p> | <u>× 0.50</u> |
| 50 | <p>Head evaluation of teaching. Based on one or more of the following; but, not limited to these items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress on goals related to teaching improvement activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Efforts to improve course materials ○ Integrating technology where appropriate ○ Participation in teaching workshops • Peer review of classroom teaching (The head may ask for a faculty peer to assist with the evaluation. Arrangements are made in advance to assess the class.) • Service as major professor/mentor for graduate students • Service as member of graduate student committees • Undergraduate student advising • Teaching publications and presentations • Extramural Teaching funds • Teaching awards and honors • Guest lectures provided | Subjective. | <u>× 0.50</u> |

¹ In general, the adjusted TEVAL scores are most useful for large enrollment classes and RAW scores are more meaningful for low enrollment classes.

Categories and Standards for Evaluating Extension

| Weight (%) | Category | Standards | Rating |
|------------|---|--|--------------|
| 60 | <p>Publications, presentations, educational materials¹.</p> <p>Numbered extension publication = 1; KSRE Extension article (newsletter or equivalent) = 0.1; Technical report = 1.0; Responsibility for web page, social media outlets and blogs = 2.0, Speaker at extension meeting = 0.25; Interviews with media = 0.1</p> | 3-year totals assigned to a quartile based on performance of Plant Pathology faculty the previous year | <u>× 0.6</u> |
| 40 | <p>Peer evaluations⁴</p> <p>Based on quantitative survey responses regarding but not limited to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Quality of presentations to extension audiences. 2) Quality and timeliness of responses to questions/inquiries. 3) Quality and timeliness of sample diagnostics. 4) Quality of written and graphical information (newsletters, blog posts, social media, <i>etc.</i>). | Survey results are used directly (1-5 scale). Evaluation is based on 3-year average of survey results. | <u>× 0.4</u> |

¹Descriptions of materials

- Numbered Extension publications = lead or co-author of an official KSRE publication.
- KSRE article = author of print or e-newsletters or equivalents
- Technical report = This category could include a comprehensive report on extension activities.
- Web page, social media, blogs = primary responsibility for building, maintaining and professional content for these communication tools.
- Each Extension faculty member will provide annually to the head a list of *ten names of potential reviewers*, such as county extension agents, state extension specialists, regulatory officials, *etc.*, who have not been used as reviewers in the previous two years. Reviewers will provide information translated to a quantitative score. In addition, open-ended comments by reviewers will be taken into consideration as part of the Head's subjective score.

Appendix III. Minimum Performance Expectations – Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty performance is evaluated annually. Any tenured faculty member that fail to carry out the responsibilities outlined in their job description or does not meet the minimum performance expectations will be considered to have “fallen below the minimum acceptable levels of productivity”. This document and sections C31.5 - C31.8 of the K-State University Handbook (Chronic Low Achievement) describe the Processes associated with this designation.

It should be noted that the performance category “Fallen below minimal acceptable levels of productivity” is distinct from “Below expectations”. It is possible for an individual’s performance to be below expectations in one or more areas of their job responsibilities, but still not fall below the minimal acceptable levels of productivity.

Faculty in the Department of Plant Pathology selected the following indicators that determine if their programs meet minimum performance expectations.

Minimum Research Expectation for Faculty (Last 4 Years):

External Funding: Significant extramural grant funding, *i.e.* from outside K-State or the Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station, as a P.I. or co-P.I. to support their research program or at least annual applications to an appropriate agency for such funding.

Publications: Number of publications over the past 4 years given different levels of teaching and Extension responsibilities (for all tenure track faculty):

| Number of Courses Taught ¹ (Last 4 Years) | Min. Refereed Journal Publications | Research Appointment |
|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 0 | 6 | >50% |
| 1 | 5 | >50% |
| 2-3 | 4 | >50% |
| 4-5 | 3 | 36-50% |
| 6-7 | 2 | 21-35% |
| >7 | 1 | <21% |

Type and weighting of publications is intended to be consistent with those reported as part of the annual evaluation process (Appendix II).

¹“Courses taught” refers to formal courses with 2 or more credit hours and at least two graduate students or at least six undergraduates. Special topics courses taught as formal courses may be considered (negotiated with the Head). Seminar, problems, or research courses are not considered.

Minimum Extension Expectations (Last 4 Years):

For faculty with an Extension Appointment of 50% or greater, the minimum extension expectation is set at an average agent evaluation score of 3.0 (1-5 scale, with 5 as best), and an extension materials score totaling 10 over the 3-year period (see Appendix II for details on the ext. materials score).

Minimum Teaching Expectations (Last 4 Years):

For faculty with a primarily-research appointment, the minimum teaching expectation for faculty with 0.1 teaching appointment is to teach one 2-3 credit course every other year. One additional course is expected every two years for each tenth teaching appointment beyond 0.1. TEVAL scores must average 3.0 (1-5 scale, with 5 as best) over the 4-year period. Classes that do not fill for reasons beyond the control of the instructor will be given special consideration. The publication expectations above apply even if the faculty member misses teaching a course(s) for circumstances beyond their control.

Appendix IV. External Review of Extension Faculty

The following rubric supports the annual evaluation of tenure track faculty with Extension appointments. The Department Head is to prepare and distribute the survey to selected peers within K-State Extension.

Please rate _____ (Year) in the following categories by marking the appropriate box.

| | Always | Usually | Occasionally | Rarely | Never | Cannot evaluate |
|---|--------|---------|--------------|--------|-------|-----------------|
| From your personal experience has the material that ____ presented to general audiences been: | | | | | | |
| Relevant? | | | | | | |
| Current? | | | | | | |
| Well presented? | | | | | | |
| From your personal experience has the material that ____ presented to extension personnel, e.g. county agents, been: | | | | | | |
| Relevant? | | | | | | |
| Current? | | | | | | |
| Well presented? | | | | | | |
| Have your questions/inquiries to ____ during the past year been answered: | | | | | | |
| As accurately as could be expected? | | | | | | |
| As quickly as could be expected? | | | | | | |
| In a professional manner? | | | | | | |
| Have plant disease samples you submitted for diagnosis by ____ been diagnosed: | | | | | | |
| As accurately as could be expected? | | | | | | |
| As rapidly as could be expected? | | | | | | |
| Do the publications, e.g. bulletins, prepared by ____ that relate to your area appear to be: | | | | | | |
| Relevant? | | | | | | |
| Accurate? | | | | | | |
| Timely? | | | | | | |
| Professional? | | | | | | |

Additional Comments:

Appendix V. Summary of Promotion and Tenure Process

In addition to dates in the table:

- Jan/Feb - Discuss P&T timeline and letter with Head at annual evaluation meeting if has not happened yet
- April/May: reserve tentative seminar time slots for anyone going up for promotion during upcoming fall
- August: set the dates in mid-October for the review meetings. Be sure to set dates when at least one mentor is available to present the packets.
- Nov-Dec: Mentor(s) and Mentees meet to discuss the Head's evaluation letter and faculty review comments

| Who? | August | Early September | Mid/Late Sept | First week Oct | Mid Oct | Late Oct/Early Nov | Mid Nov |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|------------------|
| Asst. Profs, <i>not</i> in mid-tenure or tenure year | | Provide draft P&T doc to mentors for review | Submit final P&T doc to Head, and made available at least 14 days prior to the annual <i>P&T meeting</i> | | | Department Head prepares a letter containing a summary of the discussion, the comments, and the vote. The letter is copied to all the review eligible faculty and Dean. | |
| Asst. Profs, in mid-tenure review | | Provide draft P&T doc to mentors for review | Submit final P&T doc to Head, and made available at least 14 days prior to the annual <i>P&T meeting</i> | | <i>P&T review meeting of Assistant Profs</i> - *Mentor presents and leads discussion on packet. *After at least one day to reflect, vote by ballot (reappointment/tenure/promotion as appropriate for the year) and provide anonymous comments. | Department Head prepares a letter containing a summary of the discussion, a summary of comments and the vote. The letter is copied to all the review eligible faculty and Dean. "The department head/chair may discuss the review and assessment of the tenured faculty members in the department with the dean, and shall provide a letter of assessment to the candidate, including a summary of faculty comments and suggestions". This information also goes to College P&T committee | College P&T mtg. |
| Asst. Profs, tenure review year | Give draft P&T doc to mentors for review. Prepare list of 10 referee names for Head | *Submit final P&T doc to Head *Head solicits external letters, with deadline of early October (~1 month working time). In University handbook it states that letters will be confidential except in grievance proceedings | *Present seminar | *Finish seminars, if needed *Add outside letters to packet, and make avail at least 14 days prior to meet | | Department Head prepares a letter containing a summary of the discussion, the comments, and the vote. The letter is copied to all the review eligible faculty and Dean. This information also goes to College P&T committee. The university handbook states "The department head/chair will forward a letter which includes his/her recommendation, the rationale for the recommendation, and the faculty vote to the dean. All recommendations and unedited written comments of the department's eligible tenured faculty members and the candidate's complete file are also forwarded to the dean. A copy of the department head's/chair's letter alone is forwarded to the candidate." | |
| Assoc. Profs, intermediate years | | Provide draft P&T doc to mentors for review | Submit final P&T doc to Head, and made available at least 14 days prior to the annual <i>P&T meeting</i> | | <i>Promotion meeting</i> Mentor leads discussion. No vote, but Professors provide anonymous comments. | Department Head prepares a letter containing a summary of the discussion. Letter sent to candidate and cc'd to all review eligible faculty. | |
| Assoc. Profs, promotion year | Provide draft P&T doc to mentors for review. | | *Submit final P&T doc to Head, and made available at least 14 days prior to the annual <i>P&T meeting</i> *Present seminar | *Finish seminars, if needed | <i>Promotion meeting.</i> Mentor presents and leads discussion. After > 1 day to reflect, Professors vote and provide anonymous comments. | Department Head prepares a letter containing a summary of the discussion, the unedited faculty comments, and the vote. The letter is copied to all the review eligible faculty and Dean, and is shared with college P&T committee. | College P&T mtg. |

Appendix VI

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Name:

Year:

Quantitative Evaluation:

| | Research | Teaching | Extension |
|---|----------|----------|-----------|
| Quantitative evaluation | | | |
| Performance category ¹ based on job responsibilities | | | |

Subjective Evaluation:

Strengths and Areas for Improvement (Research, Teaching, Extension, Service):

Evaluation of Professional Goals (progress and planning):

Other Considerations:

Overall Evaluation (performance category¹):

Signatures:

Department Head: _____

Date:

Faculty: _____

Date:

By signing the document, I certify that I have had the opportunity to review this document and had chance to meet with the Department Head to discuss the evaluation

¹Performance categories: 5 = greatly exceeded expectations, 4 = exceeded expectations, 3 = met expectations, 2 = fallen below expectations but as met minimum acceptable levels of productivity, and 1 = fallen below minimal acceptable levels of productivity.